UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 93—PART 8

JULY 21, 1947, TO NOVEMBER 17, 1947
(PAGES 9463 TO 10644)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1947

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
MAY 24 '48

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 21, 1947

(Legislative day of Wednesday, July 16, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Albert Joseph McCartney, D. D., minister emeritus, Covenant-First Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

And now, O Lord God, we have come to the last long pull of the first session of the Eightieth Congress. Wherefore we ask for strength and wisdom to endure to the end. May no one of us grow weary or discouraged in welldoing, but may we be found faithful to the last. Amid the rush and tumble of these concluding days, help us to think clearly, to speak sincerely, and to act with dispatch. Guard us against careless or needless legislation. So may we merit Thy divine approval and the tribute of a grateful people, "Well done, good and faithful servants of the Republic."

So may Thy kingdom come and Thy will be done. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, July 19, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1508) to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance, approved March 9, 1945 (59 Stat. 33).

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 758) to promote the national security by providing for a National Security Organization, which shall be administered by a Secretary of National Security, and for a Department of the Army, a Department of the Navy, and a Department of the Air Force within the National Security Organization, and for the coordination of the activities of the National Security Organization with other departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security, with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House insisted upon its amendments, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HOFFMAN, Mr. BENDER, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. WADSWORTH, Mr. MANASCO, Mr. MCCORMACK, and Mr. HOLIFIELD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 238) to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. I ask unanimous consent, without prejudice to the pending business, that the Judiciary Committee may be privileged to sit during today's session of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary which is considering the nomination of Roy W. Harper to be United States district judge in Missouri may meet this afternoon, and possibly this evening, while the Senate is in session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

RESIGNATION OF HON. ROBERT P. PATTERSON, SECRETARY OF WAR

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a well-deserved tribute, in the form of an editorial published in the Washington Post of July 20, 1947, to Hon. Robert P. Patterson, who is retiring as Secretary of War after having rendered during difficult and critical years faithful, efficient, and devoted service to his country.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PATTERSON'S DEPARTURE

The letter in which President Truman accepted the resignation of Secretary Patterson was a richly deserved tribute to a man who prosecuted the war with a rare devotion. It was always as if there were not enough hours in the day for Secretary Patterson. And out of every minute of his working time he extracted 60 seconds of service to his job. He felt there could never be enough contribution to the sustenance of the fighting forces. It was a total war in which everybody in his way was engaged, and sometimes we thought Mr. Patterson lacked a proper appreciation of the needs on the home front. But it was the knowledge of the military task confronting the generals that drove him remorselessly and single-mindedly to insist in their behalf upon the Army's requirements. He was the most compelling advocate in the councils of those who allocated the national resources. If in most cases he got what he wanted, however, it was not because of his presentation, but because he himself was the living exemplification of the sacrifice he pleaded for. A model of self-discipline, except when he was crossed as a claimant for the soldiers, a Spartan in his private habits—here was an administrator who behaved throughout the war as if he had a personal responsibility for winning it.

The sweetest praise in Judge Patterson's ears would be to call him a good soldier. In the First World War he was literally that, and he came back from the fronts with a chest full of medals, proof of his conspicuous gallantry and leadership in battle. But he was as good a soldier at his desk, first as Under Secretary and then as Secretary, as he was on the battlefield. Perhaps he had in his mind's eye the lot of the men in the foxholes and thought of himself as a comrade in arms. But we doubt it. We rather think his dedication to his work came from a pure patriotism—a patriotism unmarred by the slightest particle of selfish or political ambition. There were few men like him in wartime Washington. His absorption in the huge and many problems of his post, coupled with his dour personality, kept him somewhat aloof. Yet this man of war would have been at home in Athens as well as Sparta, for in private life he was a judge, and a judge rated by his fellows as one having authority and learning and wisdom. In the years to come we hope he will be rewarded by higher preferment on the bench.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on Civil Service:

H. R. 1995. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the return of the amount of deductions from the compensation of any employee who is separated from the service or transferred to a position not

within the purview of such act before completing 10 years of service; without amendment (Rept. No. 633).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Civil Service:

S. 1416. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1945; without amendment (Rept. No. 635);

S. 1426. A bill to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 637);

S. 1493. A bill to amend section 19 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 387), and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 636); and

S. 1562. A bill to amend section 102 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 to exclude certain experts and consultants from the coverage of the act; without amendment (Rept. No. 638).

By Mr. FLANDERS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 342. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Reading, Pa.; without amendment (Rept. No. 639);

S. 722. A bill to authorize the issuance of Oregon Trail commemorative 50-cent pieces to the Oregon Trail Monument Association, Idaho Unit, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 640);

S. 1042. A bill to provide for the completion of Mount Rushmore National Memorial and the financing thereof by issuance of a special coin; without amendment (Rept. No. 641);

S. 1304. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the organization of Minnesota as a Territory of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 642);

S. 1614. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the patriotic services of Gen. Maurice Rose and to perpetuate the General Rose Memorial Hospital as a historic shrine; without amendment (Rept. No. 643); and

S. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski; without amendment (Rept. No. 644).

By Mr. CAPEHART, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

H. R. 3448. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 645).

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Public Lands:

S. 1367. A bill to amend section 10 of the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1273), as amended June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1978; 43 U. S. C., sec. 315i); with amendments (Rept. No. 647);

H. R. 185. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Catholic Society of Alaska for use as a mission; without amendment (Rept. No. 650);

H. R. 197. A bill to transfer part of block 14 and the school building thereon of Petersburg town site, Alaska, used for school purposes, to the town of Petersburg, Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 648); and

H. R. 3376. A bill to ratify and confirm Act 10 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1947, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945; without amendment (Rept. No. 649).

By Mr. ECTON, from the Committee on Public Lands:

S. 1507. A bill authorizing the sale of undisposed of lots in Michel Addition to the town of Polson, Mont.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 634).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Public Lands:

S. 1006. A bill to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended, so as to increase the acreage of sodium leases which may be issued in any State to a person, association, or corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 646).

By Mr. BRICKER:

From the Committee on Banking and Currency:

H. R. 2800. A bill to amend section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 652).

From the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

S. Res. 152. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to make additional expenditures and employ temporary assistants; without amendment (Rept. No. 651); and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 257. A bill for the relief of Yoneo Sakai; without amendment (Rept. No. 653);

S. 535. A bill for the relief of Adelbert E. Tuller; without amendment (Rept. No. 654);

S. 939. A bill for the relief of Charles Howard Richards; with amendments (Rept. No. 655);

S. 1674. A bill for the relief of Roman Toporow; without amendment (Rept. No. 656);

H. R. 640. A bill for the relief of Harley Shores; without amendment (Rept. No. 657);

H. R. 1565. A bill to codify and enact into positive law, title 1 of the United States Code, entitled "General Provisions"; without amendment (Rept. No. 658);

H. R. 1566. A bill to codify and enact into positive law title 4 of the United States Code, entitled "Flag and Seal, Seat of Government, and the States"; without amendment (Rept. No. 659);

H. R. 1567. A bill to codify and enact into positive law title 6 of the United States Code, entitled "Official and Penal Bonds"; without amendment (Rept. No. 660);

H. R. 1652. A bill to provide for the naturalization of certain United States Army personnel—Yugoslav fliers; without amendment (Rept. No. 661);

H. R. 1737. A bill for the relief of Owen R. Brewster; with an amendment (Rept. No. 662);

H. R. 2083. A bill to codify and enact into positive law title 17 of the United States Code, entitled "Copyrights"; without amendment (Rept. No. 663); and

H. R. 2084. A bill to codify and enact into positive law title 9 of the United States Code, entitled "Arbitration"; without amendment (Rept. No. 664).

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

EVAN HOWELL, of Illinois, to be judge of the United States Court of Claims, vice Marvin Jones, elevated;

LEO F. RAYFIEL, of New York, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of New York, vice Grover M. Moscowitz, deceased;

Joseph T. Votava, of Nebraska, to be United States attorney for the district of Nebraska;

Irving J. Higbee, of New York, to be United States attorney for the northern district of New York;

Ward Hudgins, of Tennessee, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Tennessee, vice Horance Frierson;

Carl J. Werner, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Illinois; and

George E. Proudfit, of Nebraska, to be United States marshal for the district of Nebraska.

NOMINATION OF PHILIP B. PERLMAN—EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk the nomination reference and report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary recommending that the nomination of Philip B. Perlman, to be Solicitor General of the United States, vice J. Howard McGrath, resigned, be confirmed.

I ask that the nomination be received and placed on the Executive Calendar, but I wish to state for the RECORD that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary agreed, without objection, to permit the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to file an adverse report by Thursday of this week, which means that in fairness to the junior Senator from Michigan the committee will object to any consideration of the nomination prior to Thursday when the junior Senator from Michigan can submit his statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and the nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BREWSTER (by request):

S. 1677. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VANDENBERG (by request):

S. 1678. A bill to provide for the reincorporation of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. WAGNER, and Mr. MCGRATH) introduced Senate bill (S. 1679) to provide for a national program of retirement, survivors, and extended disability insurance, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. BUTLER introduced the following bills, which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and appear under a separate heading:

S. 1680. A bill to remove restrictions on the property and moneys belonging to the individual enrolled members of the Menominee Indian Tribe in Wisconsin, to provide for the liquidation of tribal property and distribution of the proceeds thereof, to confer complete citizenship upon such Indians, and for other purposes;

S. 1681. A bill to remove restrictions on the property and moneys belonging to the individual enrolled members of the Turtle Mountain Indian Tribe in North Dakota, to provide for the liquidation of tribal property and distribution of the proceeds thereof, to confer complete citizenship upon such Indians, and for other purposes;

S. 1682. A bill to remove restrictions on the property and moneys belonging to the individual enrolled members of the Flathead Indian Tribe in Montana, to provide for the liquidation of tribal property and distribution of the proceeds thereof, to confer complete citizenship upon such Indians, and for other purposes;

S. 1683. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the courts of the State of New York with respect to offenses committed on Indian reservations within such State;

S. 1684. A bill to remove restrictions on the property and moneys belonging to the individual enrolled members of the Osage Indian Tribe of Oklahoma, to provide for the liquidation of tribal property and distribution of the proceeds thereof, to confer complete citizenship upon such Indians, and for other purposes;

S. 1685. A bill to remove restrictions on the property and moneys belonging to the individual enrolled members of the Hoopa, Mission, and Sacramento Tribes of California, to provide for the liquidation of tribal property and distribution of the proceeds thereof, to confer complete citizenship upon such Indians, and for other purposes;

S. 1686. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain obligations of the United States to the Indians of New York;

S. 1687. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the courts of the State of New York with respect to civil actions between Indians or to which Indians are parties; and

S. 1688. A bill to remove restrictions on the property and moneys belonging to the individual enrolled members of the Potawatomi Indian Tribe, to provide for the liquidation of tribal property and distribution of the proceeds thereof, to confer complete citizenship upon such Indians, and for other purposes.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1689. A bill for the relief of Johann Hauser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. LANGER also introduced Senate bill 1690, to provide for full and fair hearings before deportation or removal of persons now or hereafter interned under the provisions of the act of July 6, 1798 (1 Stat. 577), as amended, relating to alien enemies, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH (for himself and Mr. GURNEY):

S. 1691. A bill for the relief of the First, Second, and Third National Steamship Cos.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL SOCIAL INSURANCE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the attention of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] and the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend Title II of the Social Security Act by extending and liberalizing the Federal old-age-insurance program.

Representative DINGELL, a distinguished member of the House Ways and Means Committee, is introducing a companion bill in the House of Representatives which contains provisions calling for:

First. A flexible retirement provision for persons who become disabled for a period longer than 6 months, before they reach the age of 65.

Second. Reduction of the retirement age from 65 to 60 for women employees, widows, wives, and mothers.

Third. Increasing the amount of earnings which a beneficiary may receive without loss of his insurance benefit from the present $14.99 to $30 a month.

Fourth. Increasing the minimum monthly insurance benefit to $30 for a man and wife, and increasing the maximum monthly insurance benefit to $120 instead of the present $85.

Fifth. Payment of a lump-sum burial benefit equal to 6 months' insurance benefits in all cases where a deceased person dies insured. The present law provides for such a payment only in case no monthly insurance benefit is payable.

Sixth. Payment of supplementary insurance benefits for a disabled aged husband or widower of a retired insured woman, and continuation of payment to a child after he reaches 18 if he is permanently disabled.

I shall not undertake to discuss the bill at this time, but shall seek an opportunity to do so tomorrow.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1679) to provide for a national program of retirement, survivors, and extended disability insurance, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. WAGNER, and Mr. MCGRATH), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON CERTAIN INDIAN TRIBES

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for reference to the Committee on Public Lands nine Indian bills. I request that an explanatory statement by me may be printed in the RECORD preceding the titles of the bills.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bills will be received and referred as requested by the Senator from Nebraska; and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD preceding the titles of the bills.

There being no objection, the explanatory statement presented by Mr. BUTLER was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUGH BUTLER, OF NEBRASKA, IN EXPLANATION OF BILLS INTRODUCED TO REMOVE ALL RESTRICTIONS ON NINE INDIAN TRIBES

It is time to give serious consideration to the matter of setting the American Indians free. As rapidly as it can be done, the Indians should be emancipated from Federal wardship and control.

This is no new statement. Scores of our predecessors in the Halls of Congress, and in administrative positions of our Government, have advocated speedy emancipation of the Indians. Numbers of those who now compose this body, and particularly those who, like myself, represent States of our Union with Indian reservations and Indian populations, have advocated from time to time that we render this tardy justice to the Indians by freeing as many of them as possible.

The Indian Bureau was established March 11, 1824, the office of Commissioner of Indian Affairs was created in 1832, and in 1849 the Department of the Interior was established by act of Congress and the Bureau of Indian Affairs transferred to that Department from the War Department, where it has since remained.

Numerous Indian leaders and citizens, from every tribe, in every State, and in every community where Indians reside, have beseeched their representatives in the Senate and in the House to pass legislation granting them equal rights of citizenship with their white neighbors. Every Senator from a State with Indian constituents receives mail almost daily asking for action along this line. It is time to give serious consideration to legislation which will answer their pleas.

More than 22,000 Indians served with our fighting forces during the recent war. Many gave their lives for freedom; many more won decorations for brave and sacrificial service. About 45,000 other Indian men and women engaged in essential war work during the emergency. They proved their love of their country, equally with the descendants of any other race.

Yet many Indians have never been given the equality of citizenship promised to them by act of Congress in 1924, when they were declared full citizens of this Nation. The act of Congress which granted this citizenship was approved June 2, 1924, and provided:

"That all noncitizen Indians born within the territorial limits of the United States be, and they are hereby, declared to be citizens of the United States: *Provided*, That the granting of such citizenship shall not in any manner impair or otherwise affect the right of any Indian to tribal or other property."

Despite this act, thousands of Indians, particularly those living upon reservations, have never been emancipated. They are restricted in property rights. They live under conditions of racial segregation. They are subject to limitations and exemptions because they are Indians. Governmental regulations constantly remind the Indians of their inferior status.

Lyman K. Wilbur, while Secretary of the Interior, said that the Bureau of Indian Affairs should "work itself out of a job." He meant that it was the duty of the Federal Government, charged by our Constitution to control Indian affairs, to make the Indian so self-supporting and independent that he need no longer be considered a ward.

In 1932, a leading student of Indian affairs declared: "Our Indian Bureau is paternalistic and bureaucratic, and pretends to do through paid employees all and everything which human beings normally do for themselves. Coupled with this paternalism is the Indian Bureau's policy of monopolizing the Indian Service and duplicating, through pigmy services of its own, the work of the Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of Reclamation, the work of the State agricultural, educational, health, and welfare departments, and even the work of the courts."

And who made this indictment of the Office of Indian Affairs? None other than Mr. John Collier, who within a year after speaking those words became Commissioner of Indian Affairs, serving until early 1946. Yet under his administration the cost of the Indian Office steadily and persistently rose. The Indian Bureau continued and expanded its paternalism, absorbed more and more services previously handled by other agencies of the Federal Government or of the States, and inaugurated a program the clear effect of which has been to perpetuate the status of Indian wardship forever.

I refer here, Mr. President, to the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934, which is the so-called Wheeler-Howard Act. Here is perhaps America's most outstanding example of control by race legislation. A distinguished authority of the American Indian and his problems, Hon. Byron J. Brophy, who for years served in the Indian Office, recently characterized the Reorganization Act as follows: "The Reorganization Act attempts to 're-Indianize' the Indians. Its general acceptance would establish a bigger and better Indian Bureau permanently. It would give permanent status to Indian reservations and provide for establishing new reservations as needed. It gives the Secretary of the Interior, and through him the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the final say in all matters pertaining to those operating under this act."

I call the attention of this body to a report of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, of which the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] was chairman (No. 1031), June 22, 1944, which states: "The Wheeler-Howard Act has been a perfect failure from the standpoint of Indian welfare and should be repealed."

This report in effect states that the act, among other effects, results in:

1. Perpetuating a system of indefinite land titles which insures perpetual Government supervision and control.

2. Complete incompatibility of Indian land policies with the American system of land tenure.

3. Placing more than a half million acres of land under Indian Bureau supervision, much of which will be unused.

4. Providing for complete regimentation of Indians through the system of loans.

5. Strengthening and perpetuating the reservation system, which is obnoxious to all thinking Americans.

The Wheeler-Howard Act has the merit of encouraging organization of Indian tribes for consideration and action on their own affairs. If it then gave them responsibility for the administration of their reservations, it would be good. There is no such provision, however. The superintendent and his staff remain totally independent of the people they serve. Such a fundamental institution as the schools for their children are entirely independent of the Indian people. They have no voice in the determination of the curricula, employment of teachers, formulation of policies, or any aspect of education. Even in those matters over which they are supposed to have some voice, they are subject to the pressures which the Indian Bureau representative in the person of the reservation superintendent can apply as the need may arise.

We can move quickly to grant emancipation from Federal wardship and control to many tribes of Indians, the members of which are capable of conducting their own personal and collective affairs. In this regard, let me cite the testimony of the Honorable William Zimmerman, Jr., Assistant Commissioner of the Office of Indian Affairs, before the Senate Committee on Civil Service. The chairman of this committee, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, Mr. LANGER, had requested data by which the personnel and expenses of the Indian Office might be reduced. Acceding to this request, Mr. Zimmerman said:

"I have brought with me a number of proposals for specific steps which the Department and the Congress might take to bring about the results you have been seeking. As I have said before, the personnel of the Indian Service is engaged in rendering a variety of services that provide education, medical service, building roads, developing irrigation systems, and generally developing Indian reservations, and assisting the Indians in bringing them into use. Obviously, the cost of this service can be reduced. It is possible to curtail or eliminate any one of those. It would also be possible to reduce the number of Indians who are entitled to this service."

Following this and other statements to the committee, Mr. Zimmerman submitted a list of the Indian groups in the United States, by their present jurisdictional units or reservations. The list was divided into three parts. The first part includes those Indians which in the opinion of Mr. Zimmerman can be granted immediate freedom from all Federal control and wardship. In the second group he had listed a number of tribes which in his opinion are able to function with a small degree of Federal supervision or no Federal supervision whatever, within a period of 10 years. The third group includes those tribes which he feels will require longer than 10 years under continued Federal supervision.

According to Assistant Commissioner Zimmerman, the following Indian tribes, listed under his group 1, are ready for immediate emancipation: Flathead, Hoopa, Klamath, Menominee, Mission, New York, Osage, Potawatomi, Sacramento, Turtle Mountain.

This group comprises about 60,000 Indians. I doubt that any person familiar with the members of these highly civilized and enterprising tribes would take issue with this official of the Office of Indian Affairs in his contention that these American citizens of Indian descent should be granted all the rights and privileges of full and equal citizenship.

The second group of Indian tribes, for which the Assistant Commissioner thinks there should be a further period of Federal control, is as follows: Blackfeet, Cherokee, Cheyenne River, Colville, Consolidated Chippewa, Crow, Fort Belknap, Fort Peck, Fort Totten, Grand Ronde, Great Lakes, Northern Idaho, Quapaw (in part, Wyandotte, Seneca), Taholah, Tulalip, Tomah, Umatilla, Warm Springs, Wind River (Shoshone only), Winnebago.

All other Indian tribes, not listed in these two groups, in the opinion of Mr. Zimmerman would require longer than 10 years under continued Federal supervision and control.

While I do not go on record as endorsing completely these recommendations of the Assistant Commissioner of the Office of Indian Affairs, yet I do feel that he has made a very worthwhile proposal with respect to the immediate emancipation of a number of our Indian tribes. I urge that we proceed to carry this into effect.

NEW YORK INDIANS

The situation with respect to the Indians in the State of New York is somewhat peculiar. The State of New York has dealt directly with Indian tribes in New York. The State of New York has always assumed the burden of establishing and maintaining schools for the education of the Indian youth within her borders. The State of New York has constructed improved highways through the reservations. The State of New York has to some extent enforced sanitation, health, and other public measures of this kind among the Indians. For all Indian services, the cost to the State of New York is approximately $400,000 annually.

The nature and extent of New York's authority over reservation Indians has been in a more or less continuous state of confusion ever since ratification of the Federal Constitution in 1787.

The New York Indians now receive an annuity of $6,000 arising out of the treaty of September 15, 1797, and the act of February 19, 1831.

Also a permanent annuity of $4,500 in clothing and other useful articles (treaty of November 11, 1794).

These are items in the Interior Department appropriations bill each year.

I have directed that a bill be prepared to commute these annuities into a capital fund.

I have also directed that two additional bills be prepared for introduction concerning the New York Indians, (1) concerning criminal jurisdiction, (2) concerning civil jurisdiction. These two bills were recommended by a Joint Legislative Committee on Indian Affairs, State of New York, March 15, 1946.

An attempt to formulate legislation agreeable to all, is an impossible task, but since a definite expression has been obtained from the Indian Bureau officials, the introduction of these bills will give the Indian tribes, the Indian welfare organizations, the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Members of Congress something definite on which to proceed.

There being no objection, the bills introduced by Mr. BUTLER were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands, as follows:

S. 1680. A bill to remove restrictions on the property and moneys belonging to the individual enrolled members of the Menominee Indian Tribe in Wisconsin, to provide for the liquidation of tribal property and distribution of the proceeds thereof, to confer complete citizenship upon such Indians, and for other purposes;

S. 1681. A bill to remove restrictions on the property and moneys belonging to the individual enrolled members of the Turtle Mountain Indian Tribe in North Dakota, to provide for the liquidation of tribal property and distribution of the proceeds thereof, to confer complete citizenship upon such Indians, and for other purposes;

S. 1682. A bill to remove restrictions on the property and moneys belonging to the individual enrolled members of the Flathead Indian Tribe in Montana, to provide for the liquidation of tribal property and distribution of the proceeds thereof, to confer complete citizenship upon such Indians, and for other purposes;

S. 1683. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the courts of the State of New York with respect to offenses committed on Indian reservations within such State;

S. 1684. A bill to remove restrictions on the property and moneys belonging to the individual enrolled members of the Osage Indian Tribe of Oklahoma, to provide for the liquidation of tribal property and distribution of the proceeds thereof, to confer complete citizenship upon such Indians, and for other purposes;

S. 1685. A bill to remove restrictions on the property and moneys belonging to the individual enrolled members of the Hoopa, Mission, and Sacramento Tribes of California, to provide for the liquidation of tribal property and distribution of the proceeds thereof, to confer complete citizenship upon such Indians, and for other purposes;

S. 1686. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain obligations of the United States to the Indians of New York;

S. 1687. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the courts of the State of New York with respect to civil actions between Indians or to which Indians are parties; and

S. 1688. A bill to remove restrictions on the property and moneys belonging to the individual enrolled members of the Potawatomi Indian Tribe, to provide for the liquidation of tribal property and distribution of the proceeds thereof, to confer complete citizenship upon such Indians, and for other purposes.

DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for full and fair hearings before deportation or removal of persons now or hereafter interned under the provisions of the act of July 6, 1798, and so forth.

There are 207 aliens—Germans—on Ellis Island who have been ordered deported by the Alien Enemy Control Board because of a finding that they are detrimental to the interests of the United States.

It is asserted by many of them that they did not have a full and fair hearing as in other deportation cases.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1690) to provide for full and fair hearings before deportation or removal of persons now or hereafter interned under the provisions of the act of July 6, 1798 (1 Stat. 577), as amended, relating to alien enemies, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REHABILITATION AND SECURITY OF WAR VETERANS

Mr. HAWKES (for himself and Mr. BYRD) submitted the following concur-

rent resolution (S. Con. Res. 27) which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in recognition of the obligation of the Nation to make every effort compatible with its resources to provide a sound, adequate, equitable, and integrated program of benefits for the rehabilitation and security of veterans who served in the armed forces of the United States in any of the wars in which the United States has engaged or in the Regular Establishment and to make such special provision as may be necessary for the assistance of dependents of such persons whose death resulted from their military or naval service and of such persons having disabilities resulting from such service and their dependents, and to provide a guide for the Congress in the consideration of future legislation, there is hereby established a Joint Committee on Veterans' Benefits (hereinafter referred to as the "committee"). The committee shall be composed of six Members of the Senate appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate (three from the majority party and three from the minority party), and six Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives (three from the majority party and three from the minority party). Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the committee to—

(a) Conduct a comprehensive survey of the categories of veterans who have performed wartime military or naval service, or who have been members of the Regular Establishment, and their dependents, to ascertain their needs for benefits under a sound and constructive national program of assistance;

(b) Prepare a clear and detailed summary of the benefits and services now or heretofore received by persons of each such category from Federal, State, and local governments;

(c) Prepare a fair and impartial evaluation of the relative needs of each of the several categories of such persons;

(d) Prepare a statement of principles recommended for observance in the evolution of a sound, adequate, and constructive national program of benefits for veterans and their dependents, together with an analysis and evaluation of the social and economic factors involved therein;

(e) Prepare specific recommendations for the enactment and administration of such legislation as may be considered necessary or desirable to establish such a program, together with estimates as to the number of persons who would be benefited and the cost of providing such benefits; and

(f) Prepare and transmit to the Senate and the House of Representatives on or before March 1, 1948, its report on each of the foregoing subjects.

SEC. 3. Within the limitation of appropriated funds, the committee is authorized to employ and fix the compensation of such experts and other employees as it deems necessary for the performance of its duties: *Provided*, That the committee shall to the greatest practicable extent use, without additional compensation, the services of the professional staff members of the standing committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives to which proposed legislation pertaining to veterans' benefits normally is referred.

SEC. 4. (a) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not exceed 25 cents per hundred words.

(b) The committee is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government, and each such department or agency is directed to provide without reimbursement such information as may be required by the committee. The committee may request such information and assistance as it may require from the government of any State, Territory, or local political subdivision thereof, and may accept the voluntary assistance of any private individual or organization in assembling necessary information.

SEC. 5. The expenses of the committee shall not exceed $. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of disbursements so made.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES PAY ACT OF 1945—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1416) to amend section 203 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945; which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. IVES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4002) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 8, line 7 before the period insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That the existing rivers and harbors project at Fire Island Inlet, N. Y., as authorized by the act approved August 26, 1937, is hereby modified in accordance with the report of the Division Engineer dated May 16, 1947, subject to final approval by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and the Chief of Engineers."

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 238) to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

THE AHOSKIE (N. C.) AUTOMOBILE RAFFLE AND WORK AMONG THE NAVAJO INDIANS

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by A. B. Stoney, member of the House of Representatives of the North Carolina General Assembly, under date July 19, 1947, and an article entitled "A Page From a Missionary Bishop's Diary," by Rt. Rev. James M. Stoney, published in the June 21, 1947, issue of the Southern Churchman, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TAX BILL—EDITORIAL FROM THE CAMDEN (ARK.) NEWS

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article regarding the tax bill, by Al Rose, from the Camden (Ark.) News, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHINESE-AMERICAN RELATIONS—ARTICLE BY JOHN J. SULLIVAN AND FRED H. LYSONS

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article regarding Chinese-American relations, by John J. Sullivan and Fred H. Lysons, of Seattle, Wash., which appears in the Appendix.]

ASPIRATIONS OF THE IRISH PEOPLE—STATEMENT BY ANTI-PARTITION OF IRELAND LEAGUE

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the Anti-Partition of Ireland League in reply to an article entiled "Ireland Turns Away From the U. S. A.," written by Demaree Bess, and published in the Saturday Evening Post of June 21, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

TWO YEARS OF THE UNITED NATIONS—EDITORIAL FROM ATLANTA CONSTITUTION

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Two Years of the UN," published in the Atlanta Constitution of June 26, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ROOSEVELT SHRINE IN GEORGIA—EDITORIAL FROM ATLANTA CONSTITUTION

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Roosevelt Shrine in Georgia," published in the Atlanta Constitution of June 25, 1947, which apears in the Appendix.]

CONSERVATION SILLINESS—EDITORIAL FROM FARMERS GUILD NEWS

[Mr. JENNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Conservation Silliness," published in the Farmers Guild News for June-July 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have four editorials relating to the admission of Hawaii as a State. I want them to follow my very brief remarks, to this effect: They do not express my position. Some are for and some are against the proposal. I am inserting them merely that they may be available to Senators.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Topeka (Kans.) Daily Capital of July 3, 1947]

HAWAII NEXT STATE?

Admission of Hawaii as the forty-ninth State of the Union, a long-sought goal advanced by its proponents as a matter of political justice, moved a step closer to fulfillment when the House voted 196 to 133 for a bill favoring such a move, and sent the proposal to the Senate. Final action during the current session is unlikely.

Aside from the physical fact that the Hawaiian Islands are so far away from our mainland, there are two considerations which will compel Congress to weigh the question carefully.

If it became a State, could Hawaii be trusted in time of war? Would the mixed racial composition of the islands be a political hazard in time of peace? Boosters for the islands have ready answers. Although a large percentage of the people of Hawaii are of Japanese origin, they declare they were loyal to the United States—considerably more loyal, in fact, than those of Japanese descent who were living in California. Therefore, it is argued, they can be trusted in the future.

Nevertheless, there are those who fear that statehood for Hawaii would help pave the way for a new influx of Japs into the islands and would result in time in a heavy infiltration of Orientals into our citizenship. Many believe, too, that the mixed population of Hawaii would be a detriment to this country if the islands emerged from Territorial control. Another objection is voiced in a charge that Hawaii is under the domination of several big business firms which control sugar production.

On the other side of the picture, as many see it, is the fact that Hawaii is of great strategic importance as a military outpost and will continue to occupy that position whether it becomes a State or remains a Territory. Statehood, it is asserted, would strengthen our military arm in the Pacific. Back in 1935 a House committee made an investigation and reported that the Territory was "a modern unit, with a political, social, and economic structure of the highest type."

If Hawaii does add the forty-ninth star to our flag, Alaska and Puerto Rico will be under renewed consideration. Alaskans appear to want statehood but there are many in Puerto Rico who prefer independence. Apparently, neither wants to remain as it is.

Puerto Rico is not ready for statehood, most observers declare, because of its illiteracy and its economic unpreparedness. Comparatively little English is spoken. Alaska, on the other hand, might be able to shift to statehood without presenting too many problems. Admission of Alaska is being pressed because of its geographical position and its natural resources, in the light of our strained relations with Russia and in the fact that the next war, if and when it comes, may develop in northern battlegrounds.

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger of July 3, 1947]

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII WOULD CREATE PROBLEMS

The House of Representatives, with brief debate, votes 196 to 133 to pass a bill enabling Hawaii to become the forty-ninth State.

Senate consideration of the proposal is likely to be more deliberate. Senate opposition also may be stronger.

Most of the opposition in the House was frankly based on racial grounds, on doubt regarding the ability of the Union to absorb such a large group of Orientals as full citizens, and on doubt of the dependability of the loyalty of a large percentage of the Hawaiian populace.

Most of the people living in Hawaii are Orientals. About a third of them are Japanese or of Japanese descent.

Some House opposition, detailed by Representative COUDERT, New York, Republican, was based on the contention that the granting of full statehood would give Hawaii a disproportionate degree of influence in the United States Senate, compared with the population of the other States, all of which have two Senators.

That argument has its weaknesses, but Mr. COUDERT stated a plain fact when he said: "We are confronted here with something that will change the character of our country."

That's true. Hawaii would become the first State separated from the continental United States by 2,000 miles of Pacific Ocean. It would be the first State in which most of the citizens are of other than the white race. Its admission would create problems, and would probably complicate or aggravate existing racial problems within the continental United States. The two Hawaiian Senators might hold the decisive votes on all major legislation involving these problems.

The Hawaiian Delegate, JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, told the House that the people of Hawaii had been led to believe since the island republic became American Territory that Territorial government would be a stepping stone to full statehood. If there had been any definite commitment to this effect, he doubtless would have cited it.

The potentialities of the proposal are so important that the Senate doubtless will give the matter more deliberate consideration than the House did. Meantime, we are glad to note that the opposition in the House was not restricted to the members of one party, and think the same will prove true in the Senate.

The same questions and problems were raised by the proposal that the Philippine Islands be admitted as a State. Most of the Philippine people preferred full independence, which has been achieved, with the new Philippine Republic holding the friendship of the United States, enjoying American protection against any aggression, and with the question of retention of American naval bases there amicably settled.

That might be the wiser program for Hawaii, best for the islands, best for the United States.

[From the Houston Post of Friday, July 4, 1947]

HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

The Hawaiian Islands move a step nearer statehood. By a vote of 196 to 133 the House voted to permit the paradise of the Pacific to enter the Union, and add a forty-ninth star to the flag. The measure, introduced by Delegate JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, would enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution, set up a State government, and go into business as a full-fledged member of the American Commonwealth.

There was, and is, however, considerable opposition to granting the eight Pacific islets, and their estimated 500,000 population, mostly of Asiatic origin, a large part of them Japanese, the full right of statehood. The Texas delegation in the House of Representatives was solidly against it, and opposition in the Senate is sufficiently strong to delay immediate action.

With a land area of 6,454 square miles, much of it mountainous, the Hawaiian Islands had a population of 423,330 in 1940. They have considerably more now. In spite of their size they are larger than several of the Original States. Rhode Island, for instance, with only 1,058 square miles, is smaller than some Texas counties.

As to population, the islands contain more people than many of the States did when they were admitted. Wyoming came into the Union in 1890 with 62,000 souls, and had only 250,742 in 1940.

The issue turns then, not on size, population, or state of civilization, but rather on social and political implications. This was brought out in the House debate where critics pointed out that one-third of the islanders are of Japanese origin. Proponents countered with the assertion that the island Japanese were more loyal than those of California.

Views of the opposition were summed up by Representative COUDERT, of Kentucky, who said: "This will give Hawaii the right to exercise two Senators' worth of self-determination on us." That seems to be the core of the matter. Statehood would place Hawaii on a par with New York or Texas and all of the other States regardless of size, population, or wealth in the Senate. In the House the islands would have two Representatives.

Senators planned to give the bill careful study, postponing decision until the next session.

Hawaii was annexed by the United States in 1898 when sovereignty was voluntarily ceded. It became a Territory in 1900. For many years the economic life of the islands has been dominated by five large concerns.

Since the end of the war, however, there have been radical changes, with events having all the earmarks of a social revolution. Harry Bridges' west coast union has organized the plantation workers with consequences as yet uncertain. Unless the new Labor Act proves a deterrent some observers fear an intensified struggle for economic and political control of the islands. Such a condition would not improve the prospects of favorable action by the Senate.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of July 4, 1947]

A NEW STAR FOR OLD GLORY?

The House of Representatives has approved by 196 votes to 133 the bill giving statehood to the Territory of Hawaii. Now the issue is up to the Senate, but a crowded calendar will delay a vote until next year, and it would take a year or so after that for statehood to become a reality. Anyone can understand the aspirations of Hawaiians to be brought integrally into our great Union after 47 years of probationary status. The long wait seems no better characterized than by the islanders' own word for their spirit of leisure, "mahope," which means "tomorrow, let it go until later; there's no sense rushing."

Can the legitimate claims of Hawaii to statehood be much longer denied? Here is a problem to which Americans as a whole have given little thought; 101 members of the House did not vote the other day, and they might easily have upset the majority of 63 by which the bill got through.

Shall the United States in its great tradition of encouraging self-government among dependent peoples neglect this opportunity to set an example of democracy in the Pacific that might give new strength to democratic elements in Japan, Korea, and China? Mindful on this Fourth of July of its own birth cry, "No taxation without representation," shall this Nation perpetuate that condition in Hawaii, whose people pay Federal taxes but cannot vote for a President, and must accept a federally appointed Governor?

Would not Hawaii, a crucible of racial tolerance, be a fitting addition to a nation founded on that very principle but still striving to perfect it? Has not the Territory proved its loyalty, demonstrated its economic and social stability? Not one act of sabotage was committed against the United States by a resident of Hawaii during the war. Its 160,000 persons of Japanese ancestry—all but 35,000 of whom are American citizens—maintained allegiance to our flag; 18,000 of Hawaii's Japanese-American sons fought in the war with distinction.

Or will we set a bad precedent by extending the United States beyond its continental limits? Will the statehood clamor now increase from Puerto Rico and Alaska? Have we something to fear from Japanese-American Senators and Representatives coming to Washington, if they are so elected? Is Hawaii's polyglot population really unassimilable into the Union? Or have we forgotten so soon our own roots in other lands? These are grave questions, honest doubts. The Nation must soon decide.

ALLEGED VOTE FRAUDS IN KANSAS CITY—EDITORIAL FROM BRIDGEPORT (CONN.) POST

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the RECORD an editorial entitled "Strong Odor From Kansas City," published in the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post of July 18, 1947. This editorial pertains to the resolution submitted by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRONG ODOR FROM KANSAS CITY

The charges made in the House and Senate about Kansas City's alleged vote frauds are beginning to have a pungent odor. The charges go back to the congressional primary held last August, when Representative Roger Slaughter was trimmed for the Democratic nomination by Enos Axtell, who had the full endorsement and blessing of President Harry S. Truman, a voter from Missouri.

Accusations of vote frauds flew thick and fast around the President's home county, and played an important part in the defeat at the polls of the man he favored.

Nine months after the election a State grand jury returned a long string of indictments charging vote frauds, declaring also that Mr. Slaughter "was deprived of the nomination by fraudulent miscount of votes and by other types of fraud.

Then there was a silence. Attempts by the Senate Judiciary Committee to recommend further investigation of the alleged frauds were stymied when Senator LANGER, a Republican, of North Dakota, voted with the Democratic minority against it, thus tossing the issue into a committee file.

The Republicans didn't let the matter rest however, as they would like to show that the vote last fall was rigged by the Pendergast machine, which had always supported Mr. Truman, to say the least, much as it was rigged in the scandals of 1936.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has come in for a lot of severe condemnation by Republican leaders, who say that nothing was done by the Bureau to uncover the frauds. In fact the Republicans say the FBI condoned the action last fall.

Senator JAMES P. KEM, Missouri Republican, is leading the battle now on the Senate floor, charging that Texas Tom, Attorney General Tom C. Clark, tied the hands of the FBI and "whitewashed" the whole incident. He is fighting to force the FBI to investigate the case under Senate resolution, if he can get the matter out of the committee's pocket.

Senator KEM and Senator WILEY, the committee chairman, now declare there is enough evidence for a full Senate inquiry, and assert that if Texas Tom is innocent of the charges, he is "entitled to a triumphant vindication" following a complete inquiry. Looks as though Texas Tom is on a spot, because he seems to be the only man in Washington who hasn't sniffed the odor of a rotten political scandal blowing all the way from Missouri to the Capital.

House Republicans, fearing that the Democrats in the Senate will block the inquiry by a filibuster—and adjournment is only a week off—plan their own investigation. If anyone is trying now to forecast the election issues of 1948, he can put this mess at the top of the list.

MIDYEAR ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 409)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives.)

UNIFICATION OF THE ARMED SERVICES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 758) to promote the national security by providing for a National Security Organization, which shall be administered by a Secretary of National Security, and for a Department of the Army, a Department of the Navy, and a Department of the Air Force within the National Security Organization, and for the coordination of the activities of the National Security Organization with other departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this act may be cited as the "National Security Act of 1947."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section 2. Declaration of policy.

TITLE I—COORDINATION FOR NATIONAL SECURITY

Section 101. National Security Council.
Section 102. Secretary of Defense.
Section 103. Military assistants to the Secretary.
Section 104. Civilian personnel.
Section 105. Central Intelligence Agency.
Section 106. National Security Resources Board.

TITLE II—THE NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

Section 201. National Military Establishment.
Section 202. Department of the Army.
Section 203. Department of the Navy.
Section 204. Department of the Air Force.
Section 205. United States Air Force.
Section 206. Effective date of transfers.
Section 207. War Council.
Section 208. Joint Chiefs of Staff.
Section 209. Joint Staff.
Section 210. Munitions Board.
Section 211. Research and Development Board.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

Section 301. Compensation of Secretaries.
Section 302. Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries.
Section 303. Advisory committee and personnel.
Section 304. Status of transferred civilian personnel.
Section 305. Saving provisions.
Section 306. Transfer of funds.
Section 307. Authorization for appropriations.
Section 308. Definitions.
Section 309. Separability.
Section 310. Effective date.
Section 311. Succession to the Presidency.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. In enacting this legislation, it is the intent of Congress to provide a comprehensive program for the future security of the United States; to provide for the establishment of integrated policies and procedures for the departments, agencies, and functions of the Government relating to the national security; to provide three military departments for the operation and administration of the Army, the Navy (including naval aviation and the United States Marine Corps), and the Air Force, with their assigned combat and service components; to provide for their authoritative coordination and unified direction under civilian control but not to merge them; to provide for the effective strategic direction of the armed forces and for their operation under unified control and for their integration into an efficient team of land, naval, and air forces.

TITLE I—COORDINATION FOR NATIONAL SECURITY

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

SEC. 101. (a) There is hereby established a council to be known as the National Security Council (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Council").

The President of the United States shall preside over meetings of the Council: *Provided*, That in his absence he may designate a member of the Council to preside in this place.

The function of the Council shall be to advise the President with respect to the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies relating to the national security so as to enable the military services and the other departments and agencies of the Government to cooperate more effectively in matters involving the national security.

The Council shall be composed of the President; the Secretary of State; the Secretary of Defense, appointed under section 102; the Secretary of the Army, referred to in section 202; the Secretary of the Navy; the Secretary of the Air Force, appointed under section 204; and the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, appointed under section 106.

(b) In addition to performing such other functions as the President may direct, for the purpose of more effectively coordinating the policies and functions of the departments and agencies of the Government relating to the national security, it shall, subject to the direction of the President, be the duty of the Council—

(1) to assess and appraise the objectives, commitments, and risks of the United States in relation to our actual and potential military power, in the interest of national security, for the purpose of making recommendations to the President in connection therewith; and

(2) to consider policies on matters of common interest to the departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security, and to make recommendations to the President in connection therewith.

(c) The Council shall have a staff to be headed by a civilian executive secretary who shall be appointed by the President, and who shall receive compensation at the rate of $14,000 a year. The executive secretary, subject to the direction of the Council, is hereby authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to perform such duties as may be prescribed by the Council in connection with the performance of its functions.

(d) The Council shall, from time to time, make such recommendations, and such other reports to the President as it deems appropriate or as the President may require.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

SEC. 102. (a) There shall be a Secretary of Defense, who shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That a person who has held a commission in a Regular component of the armed services shall not be eligible for appointment as Secretary of Defense. The Secretary of Defense shall be the principal assistant to the President in all matters relating to the national security. Under the direction of the President and subject to the provisions of this act he shall perform the following duties:

(1) Establish general policies and programs for the National Military Establishment and for all of the departments and agencies therein;

(2) Exercise general direction, general authority, and general control over such departments and agencies;

(3) Take appropriate steps to eliminate unnecessary duplication or overlapping in the fields of procurement, supply, transportation, storage, health, and research;

(4) Supervise and coordinate the preparation of the budget estimates of the departments and agencies comprising the National Military Establishment; and supervise the

budget programs of such departments and agencies under the applicable appropriation act.

Provided, That nothing herein contained shall prevent the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force from presenting to the President or to the Director of the Budget, after first so informing the Secretary of Defense, any report or recommendation relating to his department which he may deem necessary: *And provided further*, That the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force shall be administered as individual executive departments by their respective Secretaries and all powers and duties relating to such departments not specifically conferred upon the Secretary of Defense by this act shall be retained by each of their respective Secretaries.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall submit annual written reports to the President and the Congress covering expenditures, work, and accomplishments of the National Military Establishment, together with such recommendations as he shall deem appropriate.

(c) The Secretary of Defense shall cause a seal of office to be made for the National Military Establishment, of such design as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

MILITARY ASSISTANTS TO THE SECRETARY

SEC. 103. Officers of the armed services may be detailed to duty as assistants and personal aides to the Secretary of Defense, but he shall not establish a military staff.

CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

SEC. 104. (a) The Secretary of Defense is authorized to appoint from civilian life not to exceed three special assistants to advise and assist him in the performance of his duties. Each such special assistant shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 a year.

(b) The Secretary of Defense is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such other civilian personnel as may be necessary for the performance of the functions of his office.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

SEC. 105. (a) There is hereby established under the National Security Council a Central Intelligence Agency with a Director of Central Intelligence, who shall be the head thereof. The Director shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $14,000 a year.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Director of Central Intelligence may, in his discretion, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Agency whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States, but such termination shall not affect the right of such officer or employee to seek or accept employment in any other department or agency of the Government if declared eligible for such employment by the United States Civil Service Commission.

(c) For the purpose of coordinating the intelligence activities of the several Government departments and agencies in the interest of national security, it shall be the duty of the Agency, under the direction of the National Security Council—

(1) to advise the National Security Council in matters concerning such intelligence activities of the Government departments and agencies as relate to national security;

(2) to make recommendations to the President through the National Security Council for the coordination of such intelligence activities of the departments and agencies of the Government as relate to the national security;

(3) to correlate and evaluate intelligence relating to the national security, and provide for the appropriate dissemination of such intelligence within the Government using where appropriate existing agencies and facilities: *Provided*, That the Agency shall have no police, subpena, law-enforcement powers, or internal-security functions: *Provided further*, That the responsibility and authority of the departments and other agencies of the Government to collect, evaluate, correlate, and disseminate departmental intelligence shall not be affected by this section: *And provided further*, That the Director of Central Intelligence shall be responsible for protecting intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure;

(4) to perform, for the benefit of the existing intelligence agencies, such additional services of common concern as the National Security Council determines can be more efficiently accomplished centrally;

(5) to perform such other functions and duties related to intelligence affecting the national security as the National Security Council may from time to time direct.

(d) To the extent recommended by the National Security Council and approved by the President, such intelligence operations of the departments of the Government as relate to the national security shall be open to the inspection of the Director of Central Intelligence, and such intelligence as relates to the national security and is possessed by such departments and other agencies of the Government shall be made available to the Director of Central Intelligence for correlation, evaluation, and dissemination.

(e) Effective when the Director first appointed under subsection (a) has taken office—

(1) the National Intelligence Authority (11 Fed. Reg. 1337, 1339, Feb. 5, 1946) shall cease to exist; and

(2) the personnel, property, and records of the Central Intelligence Group are transferred to the Central Intelligence Agency, and such group shall cease to exist. Any unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds available or authorized to be made available for such Group shall be available and shall be authorized to be made available in like manner for expenditure by the Agency.

NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD

SEC. 106. (a) There is hereby established a National Security Resources Board (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Board") to be composed of the Chairman of the Board and such heads or representatives of the various executive departments and independent agencies as may from time to time be designated by the President to be members of the Board. The Chairman of the Board shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $14,000 a year.

(b) The Chairman of the Board, subject to the direction of the President, is authorized, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to assist the Board in carrying out its functions.

(c) It shall be the function of the Board to advise the President concerning the coordination of military, industrial, and civilian mobilization, including—

(1) policies concerning industrial and civilian mobilization in order to assure the most effective mobilization and maximum utilization of the Nation's manpower in the event of war;

(2) programs for the effective use in time of war of the Nation's natural and industrial resources for military and civilian needs, for the maintenance and stabilization of the civilian economy in time of war, and for the adjustment of such economy to war needs and conditions;

(3) policies for unifying, in time of war, the activities of Federal agencies and departments engaged in or concerned with production, procurement, distribution, or transportation of military or civilian supplies, materials, and products;

(4) the relationship between potential supplies of, and potential requirements for, manpower, resources, and productive facilities in time of war;

(5) policies for establishing adequate reserves of strategic and critical material, and for the conservation of these reserves;

(6) the strategic relocation of industries, services, government, and economic activities, the continuous operation of which is essential to the Nation's security.

(d) In performing its functions, the Board shall utilize to the maximum extent the facilities and resources of the departments and agencies of the Government.

TITLE II—THE NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

SEC. 201. (a) There is hereby established the National Military Establishment, and the Secretary of Defense shall be the head thereof.

(b) The National Military Establishment shall consist of the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force, together with all other agencies created under title II of this Act.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

SEC. 202. (a) The Department of War shall hereafter be designated the Department of the Army, and the title of the Secretary shall be changed to Secretary of the Army. Changes shall be made in the titles of other officers and activities of the Department of the Army as the Secretary of the Army may determine.

(b) All laws, orders, regulations, and other actions relating to the Department of War or to any officer or activity whose title is changed under this section shall, insofar as they are not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, be deemed to relate to the Department of the Army within the National Military Establishment or to such officer or activity designated by his or its new title.

(c) The term "Department of the Army" as used in this act shall be construed to mean the Department of the Army at the seat of government and all field headquarters, forces, Reserve components, installations, activities, and functions under the control or supervision of the Department of the Army.

(d) The Secretary of the Army shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Department of the Army, of such design as the President may approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

(e) In general the United States Army, within the Department of the Army, shall include land combat and service forces and such aviation and water transport as may be organic therein. It shall be organized, trained, and equipped primarily for prompt and sustained combat incident to operations on land. It shall be responsible for the preparation of land forces necessary for the effective prosecution of war except as otherwise assigned and, in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of peacetime components of the Army to meet the needs of war.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

SEC. 203. (a) The term "Department of the Navy" as used in this act shall be construed to mean the Department of the Navy at the seat of government; the headquarters, United

States Marine Corps; the entire operating forces of the United States Navy, including naval aviation, and of the United States Marine Corps, including the Reserve components of such forces; all field activities, headquarters, forces, bases, installations, activities, and functions under the control or supervision of the Department of the Navy; and the United States Coast Guard when operating as a part of the Navy pursuant to law.

(b) In general the United States Navy, within the Department of the Navy, shall include naval combat and service forces and such aviation as may be organic therein. It shall be organized, trained, and equipped primarily for prompt and sustained combat incident to operations at sea. It shall be responsible for the preparation of naval forces necessary for the effective prosecution of war except as otherwise assigned, and, in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of the peacetime components of the Navy to meet the needs of war.

All naval aviation shall be integrated with the naval service as a part thereof within the Department of the Navy. Naval aviation, both combat, service and training, shall include the entire aeronautical organization of the United States Navy; all land-based naval aviation; ship-based aviation; naval air transportation services; fleet air forces; carrier forces; all aviation components of the United States Marine Corps; and all other aviation, air weapons and techniques involved in the operations and activities of the United States Navy, together with the personnel necessary therefor.

The Navy shall be generally responsible for naval reconnaissance, antisubmarine warfare, and protection of shipping. Matters of joint concern as to the air aspects of those functions shall be coordinated between the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy, including the development and procurement of aircraft and air installations located on shore, and use shall be made of personnel, equipment, and facilities in all cases where economy and effectiveness will thereby be increased. Subject to the above provision, the Navy will not be restricted as to types of aircraft maintained and operated for these purposes.

The Navy shall maintain the air transport necessary for essential naval operations and for air transport over routes of sole interest to naval forces where the requirements cannot be met by normal air transport facilities.

The Navy shall develop aircraft, weapons, tactics, technique, organization and equipment of naval combat and service elements; matters of joint concern as to these functions shall be coordinated between the Army, the Air Force and the Navy.

(c) The United States Marine Corp, within the Department of the Navy, shall include land combat and service forces and such aviation as may be organic therein. The primary mission of the Marine Corps shall be to provide fleet marine forces of combined arms, together with supporting air components, for service with the fleet in the seizure or defense of advanced naval bases and for the conduct of such land operations as may be essential to the prosecution of a naval campaign. It shall be the duty of the Marine Corps to develop, in coordination with the Army and the Air Force, those phases of amphibious operations which pertain to the tactics, technique, and equipment employed by landing forces. In addition to its primary mission, the Marine Corps shall provide detachments and organizations for service on armed vessels of the Navy, shall provide security detachments for the protection of naval property at naval stations and bases, and shall perform such other duties as the President may direct: *Provided*, That such additional duties shall not detract from or interfere with the performance of the primary mission hereinbefore set forth. The Marine Corps shall be responsibe, in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of peacetime components of the Marine Corps to meet the needs of war.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

SEC. 204. (a) There is hereby established a military department to be known as the Department of the Air Force, and a Secretary of the Air Force, who shall be the head thereof. The Secretary of the Air Force shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(b) Section 158 of the Revised Statutes is amended to include the Department of the Air Force and the provisions of so much of title IV of the Revised Statutes as now or hereafter amended as is not inconsistent with this act shall be applicable to the Department of the Air Force.

(c) The term "Department of the Air Force" as used in this act shall be construed to mean the Department of the Air Force at the seat of government and all field headquarters, forces, Reserve components, installations, activities, and functions under the control or supervision of the Department of the Air Force.

(d) There shall be in the Department of the Air Force an Under Secretary of the Air Force and two Assistant Secretaries of the Air Force, who shall be appointed from civilian life by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(e) The several officers of the Department of the Air Force shall perform such functions as the Secretary of the Air Force may prescribe.

(f) So much of the functions of the Secretary of the Army and of the Department of the Army, including those of any officer of such Department, as are assigned to or under the control of the Commanding General, Army Air Forces, or as are deemed by the Secretary of Defense to be necessary or desirable for the operations of the Department of the Air Force or the United States Air Force, shall be transferred to and vested in the Secretary of the Air Force and the Department of the Air Force: *Provided*, That the National Guard Bureau shall, in addition to the functions and duties performed by it for the Department of the Army, be charged with similar functions and duties for the Department of the Air Force, and shall be the channel of communication between the Department of the Air Force and the several States on all matters pertaining to the Air National Guard: *And provided further*, That, in order to permit an orderly transfer, the Secretary of Defense may, during the transfer period hereinafter prescribed, direct that the Department of the Army shall continue for appropriate periods to exercise any of such functions, insofar as they relate to the Department of the Air Force, or the United States Air Force or their property and personnel. Such of the property, personnel, and records of the Department of the Army used in the exercise of functions transferred under this subsection as the Secretary of Defense shall determine shall be transferred or assigned to the Department of the Air Force.

(g) The Secretary of the Air Force shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Department of the Air Force, of such device as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

SEC. 205. (a) The United States Air Force is hereby established under the Department of the Air Force. The Army Air Forces, the Air Corps, United States Army, and the General Headquarters Air Force (Air Force Combat Command), shall be transferred to the United States Air Force.

(b) There shall be a Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of 4 years, from among the officers of general rank who are assigned to or commissioned in the United States Air Force. Under the direction of the Secretary of the Air Force, the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, shall exercise command over the United States Air Force and shall be charged with the duty of carrying into execution all lawful orders and directions which may be transmitted to him. The functions of the Commanding General, General Headquarters Air Force (Air Force Combat Command), and of the Chief of the Air Corps and of the Commanding General, Army Air Forces, shall be transferred to the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force. When such transfer becomes effective, the offices of the Chief of the Air Corps, United States Army, and Assistants to the Chief of the Air Corps, United States Army, provided for by the act of June 4, 1920, as amended (41 Stat. 768), and Commanding General, General Headquarters Air Force, provided for by section 5 of the act of June 16, 1936 (49 Stat. 1525), shall cease to exist. While holding office as Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, the incumbent shall hold a grade and receive allowances equivalent to those prescribed by law for the Chief of Staff, United States Army. The Chief of Staff, United States Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, shall take rank among themselves according to their relative dates of appointment as such, and shall each take rank above all other officers on the active list of the Army, Navy, and Air Force: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall have the effect of changing the relative rank of the present Chief of Staff, United States Army, and the present Chief of Naval Operations.

(c) All commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men, commissioned, holding warrants, or enlisted, in the Air Corps, United States Army, or the Army Air Forces, shall be transferred in branch to the United States Air Force. All other commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men, who are commissioned, hold warrants, or are enlisted, in any component of the Army of the United States and who are under the authority or command of the Commanding General, Army Air Forces, shall be continued under the authority or command of the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, and under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Air Force. Personnel whose status is affected by this subsection shall retain their existing commissions, warrants, or enlisted status in existing components of the armed forces unless otherwise altered or terminated in accordance with existing law; and they shall not be deemed to have been appointed to a new or different office or grade, or to have vacated their permanent or temporary appointments in an existing component of the armed forces, solely by virtue of any change in status under this subsection. No such change in status shall alter or prejudice the status of any individual so assigned, so as to deprive him of any right, benefit, or privilege to which he may be entitled under existing law.

(d) Except as otherwise directed by the Secretary of the Air Force, all property, records, installations, agencies, activities, projects, and civilian personnel under the jurisdiction, control, authority, or command of the Commanding General, Army Air Forces, shall be continued to the same extent under the jurisdiction, control, authority or command, respectively, of the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, in the Department of the Air Force.

(e) For a period of 2 years from the date of enactment of this act, personnel (both military and civilian), property, records, installations, agencies, activities, and projects may be transferred between the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air

Force by direction of the Secretary of Defense.

(f) In general the United States Air Force shall include aviation forces both combat and service not otherwise assigned. It shall be organized, trained, and equipped primarily for prompt and sustained offensive and defensive air operations. The Air Force shall be responsible for the preparation of the air forces necessary for the effective prosecution of war except as otherwise assigned and, in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of the peacetime components of the Air Force to meet the needs of war.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF TRANSFERS

SEC. 206. Each transfer, assignment, or change in status under section 204 or section 205 shall take effect upon such date or dates as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

WAR COUNCIL

SEC. 207. There shall be within the National Military Establishment a war council composed of the Secretary of Defense, as chairman, who shall have power of decision; the Secretary of the Army; the Secretary of the Navy; the Secretary of the Air Force; the Chief of Staff, United States Army; the Chief of Naval Operations; and the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force. The War Council shall advise the Secretary of Defense on matters of broad policy relating to the armed forces, and shall consider and report on such other matters as the Secretary of Defense may direct.

JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

SEC. 208. (a) There is hereby established within the National Military Establishment the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which shall consist of the Chief of Staff, United States Army; the Chief of Naval Operations; the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force; and the Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief, if there be one.

(b) Subject to the authority and direction of the President and the Secretary of Defense, it shall be the duty of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—

(1) to prepare strategic plans and to provide for the strategic direction of the military forces;

(2) to prepare joint logistic plans and to assign to the military services logistic responsibilities in accordance with such plans;

(3) to establish unified commands in strategic areas when such unified commands are in the interest of national security;

(4) to formulate policies for joint training of the military forces;

(5) to formulate policies for coordinating the education of members of the military forces;

(6) to review major material and personnel requirements of the military forces, in accordance with strategic and logistic plans; and

(7) to provide United States representation on the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

(c) The Joint Chiefs of Staff shall act as the principal military advisers to the President and the Secretary of Defense and shall perform such other duties as the President and the Secretary of Defense may direct or as may be prescribed by law.

JOINT STAFF

SEC. 209. There shall be, under the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a Joint Staff to consist of not to exceed one hundred officers and to be composed of approximately equal numbers of officers from each of the three armed services. The Joint Staff, operating under a Director thereof appointed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, shall perform such duties as may be directed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The director shall be an officer junior in grade to all members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

MUNITIONS BOARD

SEC. 210. (a) There is hereby established in the National Military Establishment a Munitions Board (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Board").

(b) The Board shall be composed of a Chairman, who shall be the head thereof, and an Under Secretary or Assistant Secretary from each of the three military departments, to be designated in each case by the Secretaries of their respective departments. The Chairman shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $14,000 a year.

(c) It shall be the duty of the Board under the direction of the Secretary of Defense and in support of strategic and logistic plans prepared by the Joint Chiefs of Staff—

(1) to coordinate the appropriate activities within the National Military Establishment with regard to industrial matters, including the procurement, production, and distribution plans of the departments and agencies comprising the Establishment;

(2) to plan for the military aspects of industrial mobilization;

(3) to recommend assignment of procurement responsibilities among the several military services and to plan for standardization of specifications and for the greatest practicable allocation of purchase authority of technical equipment and common use items on the basis of single procurement;

(4) to prepare estimates of potential production, procurement, and personnel for use in evaluation of the logistic feasibility of strategic operations;

(5) to determine relative priorities of the various segments of the military procurement programs;

(6) to supervise such subordinate agencies as are or may be created to consider the subjects falling within the scope of the Board's responsibilities;

(7) to make recommendations to regroup, combine, or dissolve existing interservice agencies operating in the fields of procurement, production, and distribution in such manner as to promote efficiency and economy;

(8) to maintain liaison with other departments and agencies for the proper correlation of military requirements with the civilian economy, particularly in regard to the procurement or disposition of strategic and critical material and the maintenance of adequate reserves of such material, and to make recommendations as to policies in connection therewith;

(9) to assemble and review material and personnel requirements presented by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and those presented by the production, procurement, and distribution agencies assigned to meet military needs, and to make recommendations thereon to the Secretary of Defense; and

(10) to perform such other duties as the Secretary of Defense my direct.

(d) When the Chairman of the Board first appointed has taken office, the Joint Army and Navy Munitions Board shall cease to exist and all its records and personnel shall be transferred to the Munitions Board.

(e) The Secretary of Defense shall provide the Board with such personnel and facilities as the Secretary may determine to be required by the Board for the performance of its functions.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD

SEC. 211. (a) There is hereby established in the National Military Establishment a Research and Development Board (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Board"). The Board shall be composed of a Chairman, who shall be the head thereof, and two representatives from each of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, to be designated by the Secretaries of their respective departments. The Chairman shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $14,000 a year. The purpose of the Board shall be to advise the Secretary of Defense as to the status of scientific research relative to the national security, and to assist him in assuring adequate provision for research and development on scientific problems relating to the national security.

(b) It shall be the duty of the Board, under the direction of the Secretary of Defense—

(1) to prepare a complete and integrated program of research and development for military purposes;

(2) to advise with regard to trends in scientific research relating to national security and the measures necessary to assure continued and increasing progress;

(3) to recommend measures of coordination of research and development among the military departments, and allocation among them of responsibilities for specific programs of joint interest;

(4) to formulate policy for the National Military Establishment in connection with research and development matters involving agencies outside of the National Military Establishment;

(5) to consider the interaction of research and development and strategy, and to advise the Joint Chiefs of Staff in connection therewith; and

(6) to perform such other duties as the Secretary of Defense may direct.

(c) When the Chairman of the Board first appointed has taken office, the Joint Research and Development Board shall cease to exist and all its records and personnel shall be transferred to the Research and Development Board.

(d) The Secretary of Defense shall provide the Board with such personnel and facilities as the Secretary may determine to be required by the Board for the performance of its functions.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

COMPENSATION OF SECRETARIES

SEC. 301. (a) The Secretary of Defense shall receive the compensation prescribed by law for heads of executive departments.

(b) The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force shall each receive compensation at the rate of $14,500 a year.

UNDER SECRETARIES AND ASSISTANT SECRETARIES

SEC. 302. The Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force shall each receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 a year and shall perform such duties as the Secretaries of their respective departments may prescribe.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES AND PERSONNEL

SEC. 303. (a) The Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, and the Director of Central Intelligence are authorized to appoint such advisory committees and to employ, consistent with other provisions of this act, such part-time advisory personnel as they may deem necessary in carrying out their respective functions and the functions of agencies under their control. Persons holding other offices or positions under the United States for which they receive compensation while serving as members of such committees shall receive no additional compensation for such service. Other members of such committees and other part-time advisory personnel so employed may serve without compensation or may receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $35 for each day of service, as determined by the appointing authority.

(b) Service of an individual as a member of any such advisory committee, or in any

other part-time capacity for a department or agency hereunder, shall not be considered as service bringing such individual within the provisions of section 109 or 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 18, secs. 198 and 203), or section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, unless the act of such individual, which by such section is made unlawful when performed by an individual referred to in such section, is with respect to any particular matter which directly involves a department or agency which such person is advising or in which such department or agency is directly interested.

STATUS OF TRANSFERRED CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

SEC. 304. All transfers of civilian personnel under this act shall be without change in classification or compensation, but the head of any department or agency to which such a transfer is made is authorized to make such changes in the titles and designations and prescribe such changes in the duties of such personnel commensurate with their classification as he may deem necessary and appropriate.

SAVING PROVISIONS

SEC. 305. (a) All laws, orders, regulations, and other actions applicable with respect to any function, activity, personnel, property, records, or other thing transferred under this act, or with respect to any officer, department, or agency, from which such transfer is made, shall, except to the extent rescinded, modified, superseded, terminated, or made inapplicable by any other authority of law, have the same effect as if such transfer had not been made; but, after any such transfer, any such law, order, regulation, or other action which vested functions in or otherwise related to any officer, department, or agency from which such transfer was made shall, insofar as applicable with respect to the functions, activity, personnel, property, records, or other thing transferred and to the extent not inconsistent with other provisions of this act, be deemed to have vested such function in or relate to the officer, department, or agency to which the transfer was made.

(b) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the head of any department or agency or other officer of the United States, in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties, shall abate by reason of the taking effect of any transfer or change in title under the provisions of this act; and, in the case of any such transfer, such suit, action, or other proceeding may be maintained by or against the successor of such head or other officer under the transfer, but only if the court shall allow the same to be maintained on motion or supplemental petition filed within 12 months after such transfer takes effect, showing a necessity for the survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain settlement of the questions involved.

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of the second paragraph of section 5 of title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941, the existing organization of the War Department under the provisions of Executive Order No. 9082 of February 28, 1942, as modified by Executive Order No. 9722 of May 13, 1946, and the existing organization of the Department of the Navy under the provisions of Executive Order No. 9635 of September 29, 1945, including the assignment of functions to organizational units within the War and Navy Departments, may, to the extent determined by the Secretary of Defense, continue in force for 2 years following the date of enactment of this act except to the extent modified by the provisions of this act or under the authority of law.

TRANSFER OF FUNDS

SEC. 306. All unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, nonappropriated funds, or other funds available or hereafter made available for use by or on behalf of the Army Air Forces or officers thereof, shall be transferred to the Department of the Air Force for use in connection with the exercise of its functions. Such other unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, nonappropriated funds, or other funds available or hereafter made available for use by the Department of War or the Department of the Army in exercise of functions transferred to the Department of the Air Force under this act, as the Secretary of Defense shall determine, shall be transferred to the Department of the Air Force for use in connection with the exercise of its functions. Unexpended balances transferred under this section may be used for the purposes for which the appropriations, allocations, or other funds were originally made available, or for new expenditures occasioned by the enactment of this act. The transfers herein authorized may be made with or without warrant action as may be appropriate from time to time from any appropriation covered by this section to any other such appropriation or to such new accounts established on the books of the Treasury as may be determined to be necessary to carry into effect provisions of this act.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 307. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions and purposes of this act.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 308. (a) As used in this act, the term "function" includes functions, powers, and duties.

(b) As used in this act, the term "budget program" refers to recommendations as to the apportionment, to the allocation, and to the review of allotments of appropriated funds.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 309. If any provisions of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 310. (a) The first sentence of section 102 (a) and sections 1, 2, 307, 308, 309, and 310 shall take effect immediately upon the enactment of this act.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (a), the provisions of this act shall take effect on whichever of the following days is the earlier: The day after the day upon which the Secretary of Defense first appointed takes office, or the sixtieth day after the date of the enactment of this act.

SUCCESSION TO THE PRESIDENCY

SEC. 311. Paragraph (1) of subsection (d) of section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President in case of the removal, resignation, death, or inability both of the President and Vice President," approved July 18, 1947, is amended by striking out "Secretary of War" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Defense," and by striking out "Secretary of the Navy."

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to promote the national security by providing for a Secretary of Defense; for a National Military Establishment; for a Department of the Army, a Department of the Navy, and a Department of the Air Force; and for the coordination of the activities of the National Military Establishment with other departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, agree to the request of the House for a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. GURNEY, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. BYRD conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed showing the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROMOTION OF FOREIGN RELATIONS BY CERTAIN INTERCHANGES AND DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I am advised that after disposal of the unfinished business it is proposed to call the calendar. After the call of the calendar, in event Calendar No. 602, House bill 3342, is not passed on the call of the calendar, I should like to ask unanimous consent that it be made the unfinished business. House bill 3342 proposes to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promoting the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries, and by means of public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people, and its policies. It is otherwise known as the Mundt bill. I ask unanimous consent that that bill be made the unfinished business after completion of the call of the calendar, which, as I understand, is to be called when the unfinished business is disposed of.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, what is proposed by the Senator from New Jersey is a rather unorthodox way of having a bill considered. A motion to consider the bill would be in order after the unfinished business is disposed of. I feel compelled to object for the time being.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. SMITH. In view of the objection, I now serve notice, if I may, that upon completion of the call of the calendar I shall renew my request or make a motion.

INVESTIGATION OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE IN CONNECTION WITH ALLEGED ELECTION FRAUDS IN MISSOURI—MOTION TO DISCHARGE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The parliamentary situation is is follows: The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 150, to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from further consideration of Senate Resolution 116, to investigate the nonaction of the Department of Justice in connection with alleged irregularities in the Democratic primary election in the Fifth Missouri Congressional District on August 6, 1946.

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Myers
Baldwin	Hawkes	O'Conor
Ball	Hayden	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hill	Overton
Bricker	Hoey	Pepper
Bridges	Holland	Reed
Brooks	Ives	Revercomb
Buck	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kem	Smith
Cain	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capehart	Knowland	Stewart
Capper	Langer	Taft
Chavez	Lodge	Taylor
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McClellan	Thye
Donnell	McFarland	Tydings
Downey	McGrath	Umstead
Dworshak	McKellar	Vandenberg
Eastland	McMahon	Watkins
Ecton	Magnuson	Wherry
Ellender	Malone	White
Ferguson	Martin	Wiley
Flanders	Maybank	Williams
Fulbright	Millikin	Wilson
George	Moore	Young
Green	Morse	
Gurney	Murray	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, before I begin to speak on the pending question I desire to discuss for a short time, I wish to comment briefly upon some of the morning mail.

Last night the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and I participated in a radio forum. I thought it was the sanest, calmest, and, I might even add, most intelligent discussion, without partisanship or bias or bitterness, in which I ever engaged. I enjoyed it very much.

I have frequently referred to a tendency in this country, coming from certain extreme, isolationist, vicious sources, voices which had been stilled before the war, but which seem to me to be now becoming most clamorous again. As an example of what some people are saying, I desire to read a telegram which came to my desk this morning following what I thought, as I said, was a sane, careful, and reasonable presentation of certain problems of international affairs. The telegram is as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 19, 1947.*

CARL HATCH,

Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

What is this? Taxation without representation? Just where is it in the American Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, or Bill of Rights that states 16 European nations should get together and tell you internationalists-politicians in Washington how many billions they want you to take out of loyal Christian Americans' pay checks? Those of you who served Europe and Europeans should pick up your pay checks from them and go and live among them and be a part of them for you're certainly not a genuine American. If on the other hand you serve any European nation and treated them and betrayed them as you have loyal Christian Americans they would have hanged you to the nearest lam. post. Every politician in Washington who votes for the Frankfurter-Cohen-Rosenman-Roosevelt-Laski plot of "lend lease" and any other gifts, loans, or grants to Europe and Asia should be impeached forthwith and tried for high treason. For you have indeed betrayed us to our enemies. Anyone who votes for the Frankfurter-Cohen-Marshall plot should be treated as above stated. Anyone who voted for the "Hell's Kitchen" called United Nations should be treated as above prescribed. Are we any better off or safer since Roosevelt's war? I say as Joe Kennedy let the Communists have Europe. If on the other hand each European country will kill off all of her Communists and fellow travelers and give loyal Christian Americans the tools to kill off all aliens, foreign Communists, and fellow travelers in America I will give you the plan of an American, the "Douglas plan" for the reconstruction of a Christian America and Europe. "America First."

Mr. President, I merely read that telegram so I may publicly protest against vicious expressions of that kind which emanate from any person who claims to be a Christian.

Mr. President, again I must acknowledge a thrust, but one which I do not think is justified. I believe the St. Louis Post-Dispatch contains one of the finest editorial pages in the whole country. For the most part I am in accord with the editorials which I read in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. I read them as they come to my desk quite frequently and find that they contain much that is worth while and good. In the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 18, though, there appears an editorial commenting upon my remarks on the floor of the Senate the other day, in which it is said I was approaching a filibuster. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOLISH OBSTRUCTION IN THE SENATE

CARL HATCH, of New Mexico, has appeared in a new role, for him, in the Senate. He sponsored the act, which bears his name, for clean elections. He introduced a Federal elections bill after earlier Pendergast vote frauds. Yet he has now come close to filibustering against the resolution to investigate Department of Justice handling of the vote frauds in Kansas City a year ago. He has become even more of an obstacle in the way of the Kem resolution than Senators LANGER and MCCARRAN.

Senator KEM naturally is not averse to turning the Kansas City vote scandal into political capital. He knows that a senatorial investigation should help out the Republican cause. But however politically motivated he may be, our junior Senator is right. Such a degradation of the ballot should be turned to political capital by the opposition. That is one of the uses and values of the two-party system.

The argument that a senatorial investigation will duplicate the work of the Department of Justice does not stand up. For months Attorney General Clark's department was conspicuously uninterested in the frauds in the last Missouri primary. At the very time the Justice Department was doing nothing, the State investigation was engaged in spade work which led a State grand jury to conclude that Roger C. Slaughter was deprived of the nomination by fraudulent miscount of votes and other frauds. Indeed, it showed no interest until the theft of the evidence outraged the people.

Unpleasant though it may be for them, the Democrats should join in cleaning up this issue. We said last fall that their failure to come to grips with it would cost the President's party votes in Missouri. When Frank Briggs finally yielded to the prodding it was too late. The Kansas City frauds certainly were a factor in Senator KEM's large majority.

The longer this issue remains unsettled the nearer it comes to the 1948 Presidential campaign. It would seem that practical politicians like Harry Truman and Tom Clark would not need to have so elemental a fact pointed out to them.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, all I wish to say in regard to the matter is that, as I stated at the time, it was not my intention unduly to prolong the debate. I was discussing a subject which seemed to me to be of vast importance, a subject which the Congress must and should consider before the latter part of this week when adjournment day comes. So deeply am I convinced of the correctness of my position in this regard and on this subject that, even today, I shall now take a few minutes more to discuss again the same subject matter, but as I do this, Mr. President, I want it distinctly understood that in no sense am I endeavoring to delay a vote upon the resolution submitted by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and in order that I may not be charged with that which I do not intend, I shall for the first time since I have been a Member of the Senate, announce that I shall decline to yield to any Senator while I am discussing the subject. I do so because the other day the presentation of the remarks I had prepared would not have consumer more than 15 minutes at the outside, and most of the time which was consumed was time taken up with interruptions by other Senators. I am so deeply interested and concerned in this particular subject that I shall now discuss it and shall not yield unless some Senator has a matter of such importance that it must be immediately attended to.

Mr. President, let me say in the beginning and as I said on Thursday of last week, I realize full well that what I shall say today will not meet with approval of many of my colleagues, no matter on which side of the aisle they may sit. I know only too well the leadership has determined to end the first session of the Eightieth Congress this week. The adjournment will be final, and when we leave here it will be with the expectation of not returning until next January, when the new session begins. Notwithstanding the finality of the decision which has been reached and the apparent overwhelming support that decision has received both in and out of Congress, such decision is, to my mind, so wrong I must rise and once again voice my protest against it.

It makes no difference what the ensuing months may bring, whether good or bad, or whether the Congress be called

back in special session or not, my conclusion is and will remain the same. The Congress should not quit without fixing a definite date for its return, and that date should be early in the fall.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I cannot yield in view of the announcement I made at the beginning that I did not wish to be accused of filibustering, and that therefore I would wait until I finished my address, and then, if any Senator wished to comment upon the same matter, I should be glad to have him do so.

I repeat that the Congress should not quit without fixing a definite date for its return, and that date should be early in the coming fall.

The years since the end of the fighting war are swiftly passing. Too much time has already elapsed without victory. I say without victory, for to me victory is not won until at least some measure of the objectives for which we fought is achieved.

Mr. President, sometimes when gloomy thoughts arise as a result of the dismal state of world affairs, I think, each day takes us farther from the fruits of the victory the fighting forces won on the battlefields.

It is because I am so profoundly impressed by affairs all over the world and by the tremendous task before every nation if any of us are to survive, that I once again urge the Congress to place first things first.

The thing for the Congress to place first is the high and solemn obligation to be on the job, to discharge fully, completely, and expeditiously all of the many duties which are right now present within the confines of our respective legislative halls.

We do not have to wait for new developments to occur. We do not have to wait for world-shaking events to call us back to duty. The duties are already here. They appear in the Legislative Calendar on the desk of each of us. They appear in every committee of the Congress where there are pending, not acted upon, vital and important legislative proposals, some of which literally cry for attention.

Notwithstanding these highly important measures—and for some of them there are deadlines—I must again call attention to the fact that many of the routine appropriation bills have not yet received final action. True, these will have to be passed, and will be passed before we adjourn. But in nearly every one of these measures are items of great importance to the economy and welfare of the Nation. Concerning some of them there are sharp issues and differences of opinion. As is nearly always the case, vital changes will be made in the conferences, and in many respects almost new legislation which has never been debated or considered will be acted upon when the conference reports are considered. Under that procedure Members of both bodies will be denied the right to offer amendments or to vote separately upon what may well be new items. In the last few days, in this last week of the session we shall be asked to and will pass final determination upon legislation which has been months in the making and comes forth now only as a concession to the great haste and hurry to quit and go home.

Mr. President, regardless of the wish for early adjournment, and notwithstanding the need for rest and vacation, which I frankly admit every Member needs, I earnestly submit that it is positively wrong to cram even these unfinished appropriation bills into one short week, and force Senators to spend long hours on the floor in long day and night sessions. Such conditions are not conducive to good legislation at any time. Often they invite poor consideration, bad judgment, and produce wasteful, unwise, and downright harmful laws.

But it is not alone the things we may do in these closing days that may cause the greatest injury. It is leaving undone those things which ought to be done before we go home or before another session begins. In failure to act may lie the gravest danger, and in some instances it may do the greatest wrong.

Let me here and now make it abundantly clear that I am not making captious, carping, critical remarks about the present leadership of the Congress. There is ample criticism which could rightfully be lodged against the majority party for permitting this situation to occur, but that is not my purpose now. I am directing my criticism today at the system which prevails, which causes these situations to arise in nearly every session of the Congress, no matter which party is in power. Invariably it happens that the last days of a session find the Congress with much work unfinished. Those last days are the days when legislation is jammed through in the last minute rush to clear the calendar before adjournment. The condition this year in this respect is more extreme than I have ever seen it in the years I have been in the Senate. But the point I make does not concern the immediate situation so far as party responsibility is concerned. Some day I may discuss that subject, for it does present an appealing field in many respects, but that is not my purpose now.

The point which I wish to emphasize and stress with all the vigor I can is that the fault in our procedure lies in the fact that Congress, apparently has not realized and does not comprehend that the good old days, of short sessions, early adjournments and prolonged vacations are gone for good.

(At this point Mr. HATCH yielded to Mr. BROOKS, who submitted the conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill, and debate ensued, which appears in the RECORD at the conclusion of Mr. HATCH's remarks.)

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, when I was interrupted earlier in the day I was about to say that last week in my remarks I said—and I repeat now, and I shall continue to repeat—that the business of Congress is a year-round job. However, I have never said that it is a round-the-clock job.

In my former remarks on this subject I referred to an editorial from the Washington Post pointing to a list of bills which should receive the consideration of Congress and should be finally disposed of one way or the other before the Congress adjourns. Yesterday there appeared an editorial in the New York Times along similar lines. To support my position, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the entire editorial from the New York Times. It is entitled "Six Days To Go."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIX DAYS TO GO

Tomorrow Congress enters on what are scheduled to be the last 6 days of the present session. It has wasted much time since January. If it does what it ought to do it will have six busy days. We believe that it can and should do the following things:

1. It should complete action on the bill merging the armed services, which has already passed the Senate. Yesterday this seemed assured, as soon as differences in House and Senate bills were ironed out.

2. It should pass the Stratton bill, or the Senate bill of similar purpose, to admit to this country within the next 4 years 400,000 of Europe's displaced persons. This can be accomplished by adjusting, not expanding, the present quotas. The DP's are of various national origins, anti-Communist in their sympathies and equipped with skills we can use.

3. It should provide the full amount asked for American participation in the International Refugee Organization, $73,500,000; for the foreign-relief program, $350,000,000; for the Greek-Turkish program, $400,000,000; and for aid to civilians in the occupied portions of Germany, Japan, and Korea, $725,000,000 for 15 months. These are obligations of honor and humanity. They should not be whittled down.

4. It should provide the State Department with enough money to continue its cultural and information program. The Senate should complete action, already taken in the House, to give formal approval to this program.

5. It should appropriate the $250,000,000 asked by President Truman for flood control. The Missouri River alone this year has cost the Nation half a billion dollars. This waste should stop—and money must be spent to stop it.

6. It should find the time—it would not take long—to ratify our membership in the World Health Organization. The cost would be $2,000,000 this year, the benefits to humanity the world over incalculable. This can be done by joint resolution.

There are other things Congress ought to do, and could have done, but which stand small chance in the hurry of the last days. Congress ought to have provided for a standardized hemispheric defense—progress to date consists of action by a House committee. It should have passed the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill. It will not do so. Veterans and others can whistle for adequate new housing. It should have strengthened our defenses by passing a universal military training bill. It apparently will not do so at this time, despite approval of the measure yesterday by a House subcommittee. This should be one of the first obligations of the next session.

The Republican majorities have had their opportunity. So far the record is mediocre. They can improve it if they will.

Mr. HATCH. In that editorial are also listed many bills which should be acted upon before the Congress adjourns. I shall not discuss all of them today, but I wish to mention some which to neglect may produce grave, serious, and in one instance, almost inhumane consequences.

Mr. President, is it necessary to refer to the bills pending in both bodies which relate to displaced persons? Without any intended discourtesy, but with utmost frankness and strong belief, I say that Congress has no right to go home and enjoy a vacation until we have determined what course this country shall take with relation to these displaced persons.

Ah, Mr. President, I know full well how much controversy may be involved in these measures. I know that there is strong opposition from some sources to any action on these measures. There are some in Congress so opposed to participation on our part in any program for the relief of those unfortunate and distressed human beings that they would be glad to see the issue forever buried in the committees of the Congress, never to see the light of day or to emerge from committees.

The Congress should definitely make up its mind what part we are to play in receiving or not receiving into this country a certain number of those unfortunate human beings. If we do not intend to permit any of them to enter this country, in honesty we should say to other countries, those countries which we are even now urging to do their part in taking those people, that the United States has no room for them—no room, Mr. President, even as there was no room at a certain inn at Bethlehem 2,000 years ago. If such be the will of this Christian Nation, if we are to have no part in this program, then honor, integrity, and frankness demand that we shall so tell the other nations of the world.

Our position in this regard is untenable. It cannot be maintained anywhere. We urge other nations to receive those people, yet we make no provision to take any part of them ourselves.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Has the Senator emphasized the fact that at the present time in the American zone in Germany our Army is taking care of 600,000 of these people, and that if we do not do anything about it we shall have that responsibility, and that nothing has been done about it?

Mr. HATCH. I am glad the Senator mentioned that point. I expect to stress it later, because what the Senator says is absolutely true.

Mr. President, there is much misinformation spread about these people. It is most unfortunate that on subjects of this kind it is so easy to arouse prejudices and passions, and to excite people into wrong action and wrong courses. I have often heard it said—and I am ashamed to say that frequently it is said in the Halls of Congress—"They are nothing but Communists, nothing but Jews—hated, despised, unwanted spawn from the Old World."

Mr. President, these charges are absolutely false. The 1,000,000 displaced persons are the remainder of approximately 12,000,000 when the resettlement and repatriation program first began. They do not go home because they have no homes. They are Estonians, Lithuanians, and other nationals. The largest percentage are Poles. There are some Yugoslavs, Russians, Rumanians, and Hungarians. In general they are predominantly Catholic. I believe that not in excess of 25 percent of the number are Jews.

Half of them are women and children, among whom are many orphan children. I believe the number of orphan children is six or seven thousand.

If forcible repatriation is adopted, for which Russia has contended and the western democracies have opposed, death will await many of these. Peace and safety will await none. If the camps are closed, innocent men, women, and little children will be turned adrift in Germany, in our own zone, where we will continue to have them on our hands, for the most of them are in our zone of occupation. The only other alternatives we have are to continue to run the camps at our expense as we are and have been doing, or finally to join efforts to resettle these people in immigrant-receiving countries. It is this last program which we are trying to accomplish through the International Refugee Organization.

But in that program we as a receiving nation are not participating. That is to be determined by the pending legislation.

I might try to exaggerate the issue by claiming that unless we passed this legislation these homeless people would be thrown entirely upon the mercy of a selfish and cruel world. But that I do not think will happen. The humanity of American people will demand that the camps be kept open, and that these people receive the support we are now giving. With some help from other countries we are now carrying on and maintaining existing camps, and that we shall continue to do.

But the urgency of the legislation arises because of the entirely inconsistent position in which our country is placed in dealing with other countries and urging other countries to receive these people and relieve us of present responsibilities. Constantly I am told that as countries are approached and urged to accept some part of these immigrants the question is asked: What is your country doing?

That is the reason I urge that this legislation be acted upon before adjournment. We should make up our minds what course we shall follow and let the rest of the world know exactly what is that course. If we do not intend to accept them, let us say so forthrightly and then proceed as best we can with other plans. We cannot wash our hands of the problem. It is ours. In large part these people are in our laps now and our responsibility for them will continue.

If we cannot act before adjournment, and I admit the difficulties which are in the way, this problem of homeless human beings is of sufficient importance to bring us back early in the fall, that it may be dealt with frankly, honestly, and I hope with some degree of that humanity which has ever characterized America and her people.

But I do not want to talk only about big issues. There are numerous smaller ones. Some of the measures are or may be vital to some American citizens.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. May I inquire if the Senator will join me in expressing the hope that the other pieces of legislation on the calendar for which Oregon has been fighting will also pass without objection?

Mr. HATCH. I certainly join the Senator from Oregon in that hope. If those measures do not pass without objection, I hope the Congress will remain in session until the Senator from Oregon can move to take them up and that Congress will act on them before we go home.

Mr. MORSE. I may say to the Senator from New Mexico that I completely share his point of view regarding adjournment. I stated on the floor of the Senate a few weeks ago that I thought Congress ought to finish the people's business before taking a vacation.

Mr. HATCH. How many bills of this kind will be delayed no one knows but there are many, as there are other problems, some of which are listed in the Times editorial to which I referred and some are not. Constantly, there come to my desk letters and appeals about many things—housing, education, and problems relating to the veterans and the difficulties in which many of them find themselves today. As an example, only this morning I received a letter from a World War veteran who resides in New Mexico. This veteran writes as follows:

> I am a veteran of World War II, and since my discharge a year and a half ago, a resident of New Mexico. I am sure you are familiar with crowded living conditions of the Nation. Hobbs, of course, is no exception. I urge you to act vigorously in support of the veterans' housing program, which seems to be a congressional stepchild, brought into the open only when publicity is called for.
>
> More recently, Congress cut the funds appropriated to the RFC. This agency was then forced to renege on its promise to accept all GI loans made by the small banks over a certain maximum, the net result being that I cannot get a GI loan. A letter of eligibility is not much comfort when the banks don't make GI loans. Neither the Lea County State Bank of Hobbs, the Lovington National Bank, nor any other bank in this vicinity, to my knowledge, will make GI loans until the RFC will again take a certain percentage off their hands.

Along the same lines and on the same subject another letter arrived, not from a veteran but from one of the largest banks in the State of New Mexico. The letter from the president of this bank is most interesting, and I wish I had the time to give all the facts and figures recited therein. That I cannot do now, but I do want to quote from two paragraphs concerning the GI loans and a dependable market for such loans:

> We feel that we are entitled to a dependable market for these loans through some such Government lending agency as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is already set up for the purpose of handling these loans and can do so much more expeditiously than any new Government lending agency which might be created by Congress. A new agency would be obliged to start from the beginning,

and it would likely be several months before its various agencies in the different parts of the country would have suitable forms printed and be ready to purchase the offerings of loans that would be submitted to them.

I feel that I am speaking in behalf of all of the veterans in New Mexico as well as in the interest of all of the banks of the State, when I ask you as a United States Senator from our State to use your best influence with your associates for the purpose of again giving to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation not only the authority but the direction of Congress to furnish a dependable outlet for these GI home loans in the districts which they serve.

Matters such as these I am mentioning may seem to be minor and of not much importance. Perhaps so, but they are a part of the regular business and work of the Congress, which should be attended to and finished before we go home.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation went into the mortgage market in the early days of the Federal Housing Administration. At that time a subsidiary, the RFC Mortgage Company, was created for the purpose of creating a secondary market for mortgages on homes. The company acquired a great many mortgages at that time but today has disposed of practically all of them to private companies. It now has a very few of these mortgages left.

Last year the RFC was given authority to purchase mortgages on homes where the loans had been guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration under the terms of the GI bill of rights. The authority under which the RFC purchased these mortgages expired June 30. When the new law was passed extending the RFC for another year, it did not contain authority for purchase of these mortgages. Therefore, since June 30 RFC has been unable to purchase mortgages which were given as a result of the GI loans.

There is now pending in the Senate Senate bill 1543, a bill by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], amending the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act to give authority to the RFC to again provide a market for home loans guaranteed under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. This bill was reported favorably from the Committee on Banking and Currency on July 18. If it be not passed grave injustice may be done veterans. I hope no one objects when we have another calendar call.

During the day I have had opportunity to glance at newspapers from my State. In the Albuquerque Journal of July 18, appears a news story the headlines of which read: "Albuquerque banks cut off GI loans—Blame Congress for ending agency." This story relates to the matter I have just discussed and emphasizes the necessity of passing the Sparkman bill.

Several days ago the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and I introduced a measure which we were convinced would remove an injustice created by one provision of the Taft-Hartley bill. We had hoped action could be had on this bill before final adjournment. In the Christian Science Monitor of July 16 appears a front-page editorial entitled "A Threat to Free Speech." This editorial deals with the section of the Taft-Hartley bill at which our amendment strikes. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point of my remarks. But specifically, I want to call attention to one paragraph of the editorial which reads as follows:

But there is an even better route to follow. Senators GEORGE D. AIKEN (Republican), of Vermont, and CARL A. HATCH (Democrat), of New Mexico, have introduced an amendment to remove the ban on political "expenditures," although keeping it on "contributions." Senator ROBERT A. TAFT reportedly has reversed his previous stand and now supports the amendment, at least in part.

This amendment should be passed, and passed before Congress adjourns. A threat to free speech and a free press cannot be ignored. Congress furthermore can do much to quiet labor's fears, and to restore an atmosphere of good will by correcting its own error—quickly.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A THREAT TO FREE SPEECH

This newspaper supported passage of the Taft-Hartley Act because we felt that the time had come for establishing the principle of firmer regulation of management-labor relations. We have accepted this act, quite aware that it contains numerous defects, because we believe it sets up that principle with reasonable effectiveness and moderation, in fact, than once seemed possible in the climate of public and congressional indignation, and with more moderation than union labor's oppose-everything attitude had earned.

Some of the defects in the new law are beginning to emerge. We shall expect to battle for the correction of such injustices, as we see them, as vigorously as we urged the necessity of the legislation itself.

The first major fault to become a clear-cut issue involves the right of free speech.

The new law extends the Federal Corrupt Practices Act so that "any corporation whatever, or any labor organization" is now barred from making any "expenditure in connection with" any election, convention, or caucus having to do with the choice of President, Vice President, or Members of Congress.

This provision, seemingly, was no mere bungle in wording. Reports of the debate on the legislation reveal that its backers knew what it would do—that it would prohibit unions from making any political comment, or informing their members of the voting record of candidates except in a publication supported by its own profits. This would ban, presumably, pamphlets, extra copies of newspapers, and radio addresses, if paid for by union (or corporation) funds—perhaps even an expression of political opinion at a meeting if union funds paid for the hall.

The Department of Justice is of the opinion that this section might prohibit political news and comment in any newspaper or periodical which at that moment happened not to be making a profit but was operating on funds advanced by the corporation which owned it.

If any backers of the new labor law intended thus to protect themselves from union labor's retribution at the polls they did so at the risk of some very precious rights which all Americans share.

On advice of legal counsel, both the AFL and the CIO have deliberately violated this section of the law, so as to bring a test case promptly before the courts. That is one way—and a proper way—to clear up any doubts that the law impairs fundamental freedoms.

But there is an even better route to follow. Senators GEORGE D. AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, and CARL A. HATCH, Democrat, of New Mexico, have introduced an amendment to remove the ban on political expenditures, although keeping it on contributions. Senator ROBERT A. TAFT reportedly has reversed his previous stand and now supports the amendment, at least in part.

This amendment should be passed, and passed before Congress adjourns. A threat to free speech and a free press cannot be ignored. Congress furthermore can do much to quiet labor's fears, and to restore an atmosphere of good will by correcting its own error—quickly.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I want to say that I commend the Senator from New Mexico and those associated with him in his efforts, because what is now coming to be the general opinion regarding the vicious character of that provision of the Taft-Hartley Act was the point of view that some of us urged so earnestly in the Senate, but which, unfortunately, did not find a favorable response. I commend the Senator and those associated with him. The Taft-Hartley Act is working out just as many of us thought it would, as a recognized blow at free speech and freedom of the press in the United States.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from Florida will agree that Congress should take action on any measure which involves the freedom of the press or the freedom of speech before it takes a 5 months' vacation.

Mr. President, I see the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] on the floor. I am reminded that recently he has introduced a resolution calling for an investigation of the high cost of living. I am thinking about the high cost of living, about the constantly spiraling prices which are going higher and higher each day, cutting into the income and affecting the living of thousands of American citizens. What is Congress doing about the high cost of living, Mr. President? Congress is taking a vacation and going home for 5 months. The Senator's committee will report sometime in 1948, perhaps—too late, Mr. President, to do anything about inflation and the high cost of living.

I mention these things only because I am so deadly in earnest that the work of Congress is an all-the-year job. We have no right to lay down our duties and go home without fixing a definite time for our return in the fall.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In view of what the Senator has just said regarding the adjournment of Congress while a new increase in the cost of living is about to begin, I desire to inquire whether the Senator would be willing to consent to have inserted at the end of his remarks an article relative to an interview, which appeared in the Washington Post of this morning. The article is by Mr. Alfred Friendly, a member of the Washington Post's capable corps of writers, and he discusses the interview he had with Dr.

John D. Clark, a member of the board of economic advisers to the President, about the effect on the cost of living which the recent announcement of the coal operators about increasing the price of coal will have. I think that is altogether pertinent.

Mr. HATCH. I shall be delighted to have that done, and I ask unanimous consent for that purpose.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, other matters of even greater importance are pending. For instance, the Mundt bill dealing with our Foreign Information Service is of such vast importance that many people deem its passage absolutely necessary. If action on that bill should be delayed, the consequences could—and I think would—be most harmful. I understand, though, that it has been agreed to dispose of this bill, and that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] will present it to the Senate very shortly. I hope he may do so before this day is over.

But more important than anything I have yet mentioned is the international scene as it appears today. On other occasions, in the Senate and elsewhere, I have discussed something of the situation with which we are confronted in foreign relations. Many are the reasons why I firmly believe foreign affairs will require our return before another regular session of the Congress begins.

Last week when this contingency was mentioned, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. VANDENBERG] expressed his understanding that a special session of Congress would be called, if necessary, to consider all matters in connection with foreign affairs. I know that is the understanding; it is held by all responsible officials of Government. Even with that understanding and my certain knowledge that a special session will be called, if necessary, I am not satisfied. How can Congress think of taking a 5 months' vacation in the light of the critical world situation, which is not growing any brighter as the days go by? Such is entirely beyond my comprehension.

Do I overstress the situation? Am I unduly concerned? I hope I am. I would be most happy to know that my thoughts and my convictions as to the critical condition of world affairs are but figments of a reckless and unbridled imagination, without basis in fact or reason. But, try as I do to convince myself that I am wrong, that all is well with the world, I can find nowhere any such solace or comfort. The world is not right. It is wrong—wrong in nearly every direction we look. There is little to cheer, and much to dismay even the stoutest and bravest hearts. It is time all of us were perturbed and disturbed about world affairs to the point where we would entertain no thought of a protracted and a prolonged absence from official duties.

As one of the first men in the Senate to join in sponsoring a world organization, I entertain high hopes of what might be accomplished through such an organization devoted to principles of law, justice, and peace among all nations. The progress, however, which I had hoped might be made after war, has not been made.

The United Nations organization was formed, and it does possess all the possibilities and all the high hopes that many of us had ever dreamed it might possess. It needs only the genuine spirit of cooperation, confidence, and trust, to make it a complete success and to forever drive war, want, and fear from the world.

All of us recognized at all times the difficulties and obstacles which might arise; nevertheless, we had ardently hoped—and some had prayed—that obstructions might be minimized and that the nations could and would honestly work together to restore all that had been destroyed by the ravages of a cruel and senseless war. To that hope we must still cling. We must not surrender our faith in achieving the ultimate goal. We must hold fast to the belief that war can be eliminated. If we lose that faith we shall lose all hope for humanity, and shall foresee the collapse of civilization itself. That must not be the destiny of men or of the world.

But even as we desperately cling to this hope and faith, equally we dare not be blinded to events which are occurring throughout the world. The greatest wrong we could do ourselves or our country would be to deceive ourselves as to existing conditions. Let us be frank. The international structure of tranquillity, peace, and good will we sought to erect has not been built. Even the small beginning which was made is in grave danger of being torn down and destroyed.

The sharp division which has been brought into the broad, open light of day by the plan Secretary Marshall suggested, did not merely happen. It only revealed a division between nations and philosophies of government which has long been known to exist.

There are some who profess satisfaction that an open break between east and west has come. If such a break must come, perhaps it is well to have it out in the open; but I can entertain no feeling of satisfaction when I think of the world being divided into two camps. Even though the division might appear to be only along economic lines, any kind of a division of this nature will eventually bring complete disunity, politically and perhaps militarily. Divide the world along military and political lines, and only disaster awaits. The plain truth—one which we cannot escape and to which we must not close our eyes—is that if the world divides and clashes along political and economic lines, such antagonism and differences can well eventually produce clash of arms. Political and economic antagonisms must be eliminated if we are to have any hope for peace.

Let me add hastily, lest I be misunderstood, that what I have said is not altogether pessimism. I am not giving up in any sense of the word. Not for one moment do I concede the world situation to be hopeless. Even in the face of all that has gone on in recent days and weeks, I do not agree that the world is irrevocably divided.

Such permanent division can only be avoided by having all nations exercise the same degree of strength and good will to prevent such permanent division as those nations would use to conquer and destroy in case of actual war. The exercise of such strength and good will must not be delayed. The critical time is now. It is not January 1948. Moving world events look at no calendar. Affairs of nations do not run on schedule or according to any timetable. Certainly, they are not moving in keeping with a timetable arranged to suit the convenience of Members of Congress who are tired and who want a vacation for five long months—five long months in which the destiny of humanity may be shaped and forever molded.

Again I repeat, as I have said before on the floor of the Senate, that, with some reason, doubt and suspicion still exist as to America's intentions and her steadfastness of purpose. Many believe we shall not stay in Europe. Even at home there is too great a growing weariness of participation in world affairs. In the belief—and with some nations, in the hope—that America will withdraw, or that a domestic economic depression will occur at home, or that political rather than patriotic urges will sway our thinking and actions next year, some nations are counting strongly on the certain collapse of capitalism and free enterprise. The hope is that such will occur, and that communism can and will prevail not only in Europe and Asia but throughout all the world.

Adjournment of Congress now, with no thought of returning until the next regular session, will add strong support to such beliefs. It is my judgment that such will positively hinder and handicap the great work now being done by Secretary Marshall as he tries to give some assurance to the nations whose hopes and destinies are allied with our own. The appalling fear of those nations is that we may retreat and turn our backs to the Old World, by which course those friendly nations would be left to absolute domination from the outside.

Mr. President, the Marshall plan, or something akin to it, can be made to work. Notwithstanding differences which now exist even among the nations of western Europe, which differences can be worked out, some plan for the economic recovery of the nations of western Europe can be worked out and can be made effective. In helping those nations to help themselves—and that, basically, is the foundation of the Marshall plan—we are being cooperative and working together for the good of all, including our own country. In the rehabilitation and restoration of the economic stability of the Old World lies the hope of all nations, including those which do appear to be seeking the failure of that plan.

Mr. President, I have spoken earnestly of things which are mighty in prospect if they are done in the right way, but ominous in portent if they are done in the wrong way. The Congress should return early in the fall. It should take up its legislative work where it is being left off. Rested and refreshed, we should return and pass the needed legis-

lation for diplaced persons. Every human instinct within us cries that this be done. We should consider flood control, as the President has recommended. The raging waters of swollen streams are not curbed or restricted by congressional recesses or sessions. Tax reforms, revision of minimum wage laws and all the other matters of pressing domestic concern would much better be considered and disposed of in the fall than to plunge them into the political pots which boil so furiously, and often so destructively, in campaign years. But above and beyond these things, I must repeat, is the question of world relations, questions which pertain to and may determine the safety, happiness, and peace of all men everywhere. Decision on these vital issues cannot wait until after November 1948, as some signs rather strongly indicate may be in the minds of some people.

Frankly, I say that, to some extent, there are today within both political parties political winds which seem to be blowing from strange directions. Some of them appear to blow round and around, as do the tornadoes which come with such force in our southwestern areas, and leave only destruction and death behind. The twisting winds of political ambitions of either men or parties must not be prevailing winds in these years of destiny. They must not be prevailing winds in our foreign relations this year, next year, or any year.

To avoid any possibility of political consideration, the Congress should recognize its duty to return to work early in the coming fall, and then meet those big issues which will be ready at that time—and if they are not ready then, the Congress will be ready to meet them whenever they arrive.

EXHIBIT A

[From the Washington Post of July 21, 1947]

BUT IMPORTANT TO INFLATION—TRUMAN ADVISER CALLS BOOST IN COAL PRICES UNNECESSARY

(By Alfred Friendly)

The recent increase in coal prices, following the new wage contract with the United Mine Workers, is an "important but unnecessary" addition to inflation, John D. Clark, one of the three members of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, declared last night.

Clark said the increases in mine prices for coal was "much more" than was required immediately by the boost in miners' wages. If private management is as efficient as most people believe it to be, he added, "No price increase at all may be necessary."

Clark's views, ranging from disappointed to bitter, were made known in an interview with the Post yesterday, on the eve of President Truman's midyear economic report to the Congress. The report, prepared in large part from information supplied by his Economic Council, will deal with the coal cost situation as well as with other major economic developments and prospects.

Clark's principal contention yesterday was that the coal operators should have waited to change prices until they had given a fair test to the new wage contract and found out its real effect on costs.

"The President was thoroughly justified in making such a request for delay pending a fair test," Clark said.

He pointed out that for the first time in a long period there will be unrestrained private management operating the coal mines. This will provide entirely different conditions of operation from those which obtained during the past 4 years. That was a period of constant labor conflict and when the mines were in and out of Federal control five times, Clark argued.

"That period is not one which could provide a basis for accurate cost computations for the future," he asserted. "Now," he added, "controls have been removed, labor is content, and private management can show what it can do."

Clark, a former oil corporation president and dean of the University of Nebraska School of Business Administration, has made his own computation on what John L. Lewis' wage contract does to coal prices. For the small operator, he concludes, costs are raised about 25 cents a ton. For larger, more mechanized, and more efficient operators, he believes, no price increase at all appears to be called for.

But the coal operators, he pointed out, have already announced increases from 40 to 75 cents a ton. And the retailers have passed all of this increase on to the consumers and "then added a healthy additional profit for themselves."

Clark's computation of the added cost to the coal producers was based on this analysis of the new contract:

"All it does to the small operator's wage payments is to add $1.20 per day to the daily pay of each miner. If the average production in a mine is 6 tons per miner, and that is not an exceptional rate, this is an increased cost of 20 cents per ton.

"Add the extra 5 cents per ton for the welfare fund, and you have the total added cost of coal production in that mine. This assumes that the owner is no more efficient than an officer of the United States Navy in running his business enterprise."

The reference was to the Navy operation of coal mines for more than a year, when they had been seized by the Government.

Clark pleaded for steel operators not to follow the example of the coal-mine owners. They must decide, he said, whether the dubious increase in the cost of their fuels will compel them to add the cost of production of every manufacturer in the land by increasing the price of steel and steel products.

He pointed out that the steelmakers' decision appears to be slated for a directors' meeting which will also have before it figures on steel earnings for the first half of this year.

BAD TIME FOR INCREASE

"Perhaps they will speculate about the profit figures they will see in the future if inflation is fed instead of curbed and if the country is hurried into trouble," he said.

"This is a bad time to add to the forces of inflation," Clark warned. "Only last week the wholesale price index for manufactured goods hit a new postwar high."

Clark's views on the exaggerated price effect of the coal miners' wage increases will presumably be reflected in Mr. Truman's report, to be given the Congress today.

Another major item of discussion in the report, it was indicated by White House sources, is the foreign-aid program and its possible effect on the domestic economy.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

During the delivery of Mr. HATCH's speech,

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of submitting the conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois has just told me that he is very desirous of bringing up the conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill, and he asks me to yield for that purpose. As I am criticizing Congress for not performing its work expeditiously, I think I must yield, and I am glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois for that purpose.

Mr. BROOKS submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 5, 6, 16, 35, 37, 45, 48, and 53.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 4, 9, 10, 21, 22, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 44, 46, 47, 49, 52, 55, and 56, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment and at the end of the matter so restored insert ", except for the support of equitable transportation rates before Federal agencies concerned with such rates"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$145,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,143,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$503,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended as follows:

Page 18, line 18, of the engrossed copy of the bill, after the word "hereof," insert the following: "until June 30, 1949,".

Page 19, line 14, of the engrossed copy of the bill, after the word "transfer" and the period, insert the following: "The Secretary shall report annually to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives respecting the status and progress of agricultural research in Alaska and the advisability of resumption by the Territory of the operation of the experiment station under the land grant college Acts."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$315,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,466,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$745,350"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,972,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and proposed by said amendment insert ", to be available only for payment toward the purchase price of any lands acquired, including the cost of surveys in connection with such acquisition"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$16,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and proposed by said amendment insert ": *Provided further*, That allocations of funds for the fiscal years 1947 and 1948 for works of improvement on individual watersheds shall be in the respective amounts set forth in the Department's Budget justifications to the House Appropriations Committee and shall not be decreased except as may be necessary by reason of a decrease in the estimates of available prior year balances: *Provided further*, That not less than $500,000 of the funds hereby appropriated shall be allocated to the watersheds of the Upper Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio Rivers and their tributaries"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$856,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,048,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$21,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$44,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 17, 18, 19, 42, 43, 50, 54, 57, and 59.

C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
CHAN GURNEY,
CLYDE M. REED,
HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, is it proposed to dispose of the conference report now? Will it involve some discussion?

Mr. BROOKS. It will probably take half an hour or more.

Mr. HATCH. Suppose the Senator allows me to finsh. I shall be through very shortly. I shall conclude as quickly as I can, and then the conference report can be considered. I promise the Senator to speed up my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As the Chair understood, the Senator from New Mexico yielded to the Senator from Illinois to present the conference report.

Mr. HATCH. He did present the conference report. I thought I was to resume my address.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The conference report having been presented, it is a privileged matter. In the opinion of the Chair it is now for the Senator from Illinois to accede to the request of the Senator from New Mexico that he be permitted to resume.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from New Mexico how long it will take him to conclude his statement?

Mr. HATCH. The statement is longer than I had thought. It will require probably 20 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. Then I should prefer to proceed.

Mr. HATCH. Of course, the appropriation bill is important. I shall now, with the permission of the Senate, yield to the Senator from Illinois, and then I should like to resume the floor and conclude my remarks. I should like to have the continuity of my remarks preserved in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair believes the Senator from New Mexico can rely on that being done.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum in connection with the consideration of the conference report, because it is of vital importance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Myers
Baldwin	Hawkes	O'Conor
Ball	Hayden	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hill	Overton
Bricker	Hoey	Pepper
Bridges	Holland	Reed
Brooks	Ives	Revercomb
Buck	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kem	Smith
Cain	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capehart	Knowland	Stewart
Capper	Langer	Taft
Chavez	Lodge	Taylor
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McClellan	Thye
Donnell	McFarland	Tydings
Downey	McGrath	Umstead
Dworshak	McKellar	Vandenberg
Eastland	McMahon	Watkins
Ecton	Magnuson	Wherry
Ellender	Malone	White
Ferguson	Martin	Wiley
Flanders	Maybank	Williams
Fulbright	Millikin	Wilson
George	Moore	Young
Green	Morse	
Gurney	Murray	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. During the quorum call I have further explored the present situation. I find that it is necessary to have this bill returned to conference, and that probably some votes will be taken on special matters. Therefore, I have concluded that, with the permission of the Senate, I shall postpone my further remarks until this matter is disposed of.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I think I should outline, in the beginning, the exact situation which confronts the conferees on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. The conferees have agreed on a number of items. There are approximately 10 that are still in disagreement. After explaining them, I shall move that the Senate agree to the conference report; and then it will be my purpose to move that the Senate insist on its disagreement as to certain amendments, and request a further conference.

The items as to which there has been agreement amount to a reduction of $8,000,000 in the cash appropriations and $29,000,000 in authorizations.

The items which are still in grave controversy are those relative to meat inspection, soil conservation use payments, school lunches, tenant loans, and penalty mail. They are the principal items as to which there is still disagreement. As I explained when the bill was originally before the Senate, they were the items upon which we had long discussion and lengthy hearings in the committee.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the conference report, which includes the items to which we have thus far been able to agree.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 3601, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
July 18, 1947.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57 to the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 12 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment strike out "$258,000,000" and insert "228,000,000"; in line 18 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment strike out "$27,500,000" and insert "$22,000,000"; in line 43 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment strike out all after "farmers", down to and including "Secretary" in line 50.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the period, insert a colon, and the following: "*Provided*, That in expending the appropriation herein for 'Inspection and quarantine, Bureau of Animal Industry,' service shall be maintained at all stockyards having such service during the last quarter of the fiscal year 1947."

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 17, 18, 19, 43, 50, and 59 to said bill.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, Senate amendment No. 54 merely provides that—

Limitations on amounts to be expended for personal services under appropriations in this act shall not apply to lump-sum leave payments pursuant to the act of December 21, 1944 (Public Law 525).

The House further amended it as follows:

Provided, That in expending the appropriation herein for "Inspection and quarantine, Bureau of Animal Industry," service shall be maintained at all stockyards having such service during the last quarter of the fiscal year 1947.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 54.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, the first item the House took up related to meat inspection. The budget estimate for meat inspection was $11,140,000. The House reduced that to $5,000,000, a net reduction of $6,140,000; provided that the $5,000,000 should be used as a revolving fund, and that henceforth all meat inspection should be paid for by the packers themselves. The Senate restored the entire $11,140,000. The House thereafter considered the item again, and voted to sustain its previous action and to disagree with the Senate amendment.

I think a slight explanation of this item might be helpful. Meat inspection was established in the United States by law in 1906. That act originated in the Agricultural Committee. During the years, meat inspection has gradually increased in its importance. Before the war approximately 600 packers were availing themselves of the meat inspection. During the war the number increased to 940. There are approximately 12,000,000,000 pounds of meat slaughtered in the packing plants in the United States each year, and the cost of this inspection is approximately one-tenth of 1 cent a pound.

Last year and for some years previous, the packers asked for overtime work by the meat inspectors. The Federal Government did not pay for that, but the packers used the Federal Government inspectors and paid for their services. That amounted to approximately 30 percent, or $2,406,000, which was paid by the packers for the overtime expenses of the meat inspection.

The arguments in favor of continuing meat inspection are that it was established, pursuant to the recommendation of the Agricultural Committee, under a legislative act, that it was designed to benefit the health of the people of the United States, and that it should be continued at a cost to all the people of the United States.

On the other hand, it is said that 30 percent of the meat is not inspected, and that it has become quite a sales argument to have the Federal inspection stamp on the meat, and that having the packers pay the inspection fee will not in any way change the method of inspection, for all the inspectors will be continued as civil-service employees, with all their present rights, and will be paid by the Government, and will work for the Government, and the packers will pay the fees to be collected by the Government itself. We discussed this item rather fully in our committee, and the committee was rather of the mind that it should be retained.

Mr. President, I now move that the Senate further insist upon its disagreement with the House of Representatives on amendments 18 and 19, and request a further conference with the House thereon.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, the next item relates to soil-conservation use payments. That item was thoroughly explained, I think, when we considered the bill. I shall state it briefly again: The budget estimate was for $301,000,000 to carry out a soil-conservation use payment program which was specifically authorized in the appropriation bill for 1947. The House cut the item to $165,000,000, allowing only $150,000,000 for payment to farmers, and $15,000,000 for administrative expenses under the act. The Senate restored the payments in full. The Senate restored them by appropriating $258,000,000, and authorizing the Department of Agriculture to utilize $37,000,000, which now is in its possession. That would make $295,000,000. Two hundred and sixty-seven million dollars of it would go for the payments, and we reduced the administrative expenses to $27,500,000. The House has acted upon this item twice. In its consideration of the original bill, the House voted to adopt the action of the House committee by reducing the item to $165,000,000; and after the conference of the House conferees with the conferees on the part of the Senate, the House voted to maintain the position it had previously taken, and the House disagreed with the Senate's position. However, the House did more at that time. In its original action, the House not only reduced the $301,000,000 to $165,000,000 and reduced the payments for administrative expenses, but the House also eliminated any provision for a program for the year 1948. The Senate restored the full payments and voted $27,500,000 for administrative expenses, and authorized a $150,000,000 program for next year, with additional restrictions, namely, that the program and payments should be based upon need, that not more than a 15-percent change in the allocations to the various States could take place within that formula of need, and that no recipient could receive more than a $500 payment.

Under the present law the limit is $10,000. It was shown that the vast majority of those participating in the program received the smaller payments. Out of the 3,404,000 participants, 2,150,000 received $60 or less, and 596,000 received $100 or less. Eighty percent of the farmers of the country received not more than $100, and only 1.2 percent received more than $500.

If the amendment stands as the House has finally acted upon it, the payments are reduced. I shall state the parliamentary procedure so that Senators will understand how the action was arrived at.

The Senate provided for the $295,000,000 program and sent the bill back to the House in that form. The House voted to recede from their first position. Then promptly an amendment was offered to reduce the payments by $30,000,000, and the House eliminated the provision for the ensuing year, which would mean that instead of having $258,000,000 for payments, there would be $228,000,000, and instead of having $27,500,000 for administrative expenses, $22,000,000 would be allowed. There would be no program for 1948, and under the present program no one could receive more than $500.

Mr. President, this is a program which has been discussed rather fully, but for the purpose of speed I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, and request a further conference with the House thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Illinois would accept an amendment which would make certain that the Senate would insist on its

entire position in this matter, appropriate $27,500,000 for administrative expenses, the full amount for the 1947 program, and reinstate the $150,000,000 program for next year.

Mr. BROOKS. I think that is included in my motion. The original position which I asked to be sustained by my motion does include $27,500,000 for administrative expenses, and the program for next year calling for $150,000,000.

Mr. YOUNG. With that understanding, I shall not offer any further motion, but I should like to discuss the amendment for 5 minutes or less.

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, at this late day in the session, and with an appreciation of the importance of much legislation pending, I shall not in detail discuss the necessity for soil conservation, except to say that this program has made possible the tremendous production of farm commodities the Nation has witnessed in the last 4 or 5 years. I do not think I need tell the Members of the Senate that all agricultural programs are tied in with the conservation and land-use program. That includes crop insurance, price support, and other arrangements whereby the Department of Agriculture frequently is enabled to call on farmers to increase greatly certain crop acreages in order to get needed increases in production of certain commodities. For instance, in the last year the acreage sown to flax had to be stepped up very largely to meet the needs of the United States. At the present time there is a program to reduce potato acreage, and that program cannot be carried on successfully without the farmer-committeemen system we now have in connection with the conservation and land-use program.

Nor do I think I need tell the Senate that more than 16,000,000 acres of land not in crop production in 1939 now are in crop production, and are being cultivated by farmers and if we do not have a soil-conservation program which will retire these acres, a very bad soil-erosion situation will result. Soil fertility and the preservation of production resulting is a vital necessity both in time of war and peace. The farmers' tremendous production during this war had more to do with our victory than any other single factor, with the exception of the services rendered by the armed forces on the field of battle. It is to the benefit of the whole Nation that we look after soil conservation.

Without saying more in that regard, Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to a statement of principles, policies, and objectives of Republican Members of Congress adopted Wednesday, December 5, 1945, and shortly thereafter adopted unanimously by the Republican National Committee meeting in Chicago, December 8, 1945, a meeting at which Republican State chairmen and others were present.

I am happy to know that the Republican majority in Congress has followed faithfully these resolutions, particularly in regard to tax readjustment, labor legislation, bipartisan foreign policy, economy, and many other matters set out in this document. I think the Republican leaders in the Senate are to be congratulated for religiously following that program. I particularly commend the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]; the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

I find, at the end of this statement of principles and objectives, the following paragraph in regard to agriculture, which I think so far the House by their actions has failed to carry out. I do not think the Senate has failed, but I think the House has totally disregarded this statement, which reads:

> We have pledged stability of farm prices during the reconversion and readjustment periods. We will carry out those pledges. We will support sound, permanent proposals to give farmers expanding markets and their fair share of the national income. We reaffirm our long-standing support of soil and water conservation. We shall support measures designed to better rural living.

Mr. President, in my judgment, by totally eliminating the conservation and land-use program for next year, and by cutting $6,000,000 from the $37,000,000 appropriation for the soil conservation district service, I do not believe the majority in Congress is following out its statement of principles and its pledge to the American farmer.

It certainly cannot be argued that we are faithfully following our objectives and our statement in regard to soil conservation if we eliminate completely a program which has Nation-wide coverage, and at the same time eliminate $6,000,000 from the appropriation for the soil conservation district service, which does remarkable work, but does not cover the whole United States.

I am sure the Republican Members of Congress are going to remember this pledge. If we are to eliminate soil conservation, let us make that the issue in the next campaign. I wonder how many votes would be lost in agricultural areas by Republicans if we did make this an issue, and adopt it as our policy.

I might say that in my campaign last year I stood on these principles and statements adopted by the Republican Members of Congress, and the official organ of the Republican Party. I for one, am not going back on those principles and the promises I made to the public and particularly to the farmers of my State.

Let us fight this out along these lines if we have to remain in session another month.

Mr. YOUNG subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full statement of principles, policies, and objectives of the Republican Members of Congress, as adopted on December 5, 1945, be printed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I would say that I would object, if we were not rushed for time, because I do not often have an opportunity to hear read a good Republican document. Under the circumstances, I shall not object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES, POLICIES, AND OBJECTIVES OF REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OF CONGRESS—APPROVED BY THE REPUBLICANS OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AFTER CONSIDERATION AND CONFERENCE ACTION, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1945

Today's major domestic issue is between radicalism, regimentation, all-powerful bureaucracy, class exploitation, deficit spending, and machine politics, as against our belief in American freedom for the individual under just laws fairly administered for all, preservation of local home rule, efficiency, and pay-as-you-go economy in government, and the protection of the American way of life against either Fascist or Communist trends.

We believe that genuine social and economic progress can be achieved only on these American constitutional principles and it is our purpose to give our citizens this clean-cut choice.

In foreign affairs we shall continue to strive to avoid partisanship. But we shall also seek to avoid secrecy, inefficiency, and drift.

To these purposes we dedicate the following statement:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

We support the United Nations Organization for international peace. We look with particular hope to the General Assembly as the town meeting of the world wherein the organized conscience of mankind shall find effective expression in behalf of peace with justice.

We support the indispensable inter-American system as a regional part of the international organization.

We will engage in essential international relief as a humanitarian obligation and to prevent chaos through misery. We demand sound management and protection against exploitation in this connection. We will assist other nations to rehabilitate themselves under arrangements consistent with intelligent American self-interest and over-all limitations that shall not jeopardize our own economic recovery and stability.

We believe in fulfilling to the greatest possible degree our war pledges to small nations that they shall have the right to choose the form of government under which they will live and that sovereign rights and self-government shall be restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them. We deplore any question of these principles.

We will seek to find common policies with the other great powers. But we reject great-power domination of the world and the thesis that world peace requires us to endorse alien doctrines or to abandon efforts to seek justice for the weaker peoples of the world.

We advocate ultimate international agreements to stabilize military establishments. We demand open diplomacy, at home and abroad, and free communication throughout the world.

We consider that the maintenance of a strong, solvent, free America is the basis of our greatest contribution to world order.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

We stand for a well-trained and fully equipped Army, Navy, and Air Force adequate to meet any emergency under future conditions of warfare. It must be supported by the most modern scientific research, a strong industrial system, and adequate reserves of trained men with the best weapons and equipment.

DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

Government alone cannot feed the people, nor employ them, nor make the profits from which new enterprises and new jobs are born. Government can help its people to prosperity by lightening the burdens of debt and taxes,

laying down the rules of fair play, and protecting those whose own strength and resources are not sufficient to protect themselves.

We believe that equality of opportunity should be available to all, regardless of race, creed, or beginnings. Every individual should be afforded an opportunity to prosper according to his talents, his abilities, and his diligence, subject only to a like right for his neighbor.

We deplore the political tactics which have resulted in class consciousness and strife. We oppose those who would destroy us through the continuation of such strife and struggle.

Our tax burden must be equitably distributed. Taxes must be so imposed as to stimulate creative enterprise, not destroy it, and to afford the individual adequate purchasing power. Tax forms and taxpaying must be simplified. There must be an incentive for business to expand production and employment and for the individual to invest his savings in such expansion. There must be a fair return to both labor and investors if we are to have jobs for the workers, goods for the consumers, and adequate revenue for the Government.

The solvency of our Government must be assured. Outlay must be brought in line with income. The value of the dollar must be maintained.

Economy in Government spending must be achieved. Extravagant Government spending now advocated by the administration in every field can lead only to ruin. Programs involving expenditure of Federal funds should not be undertaken unless the justification therefor is clearly established.

Wartime limitations, restrictions, and controls must be removed. The instant a right or liberty can be returned to the people, it shall be returned. Neither the war nor any other excuse shall be justification for fastening regimentation permanently upon the American people.

Bureaucracy, with its thirst for power and self-perpetuation, must be drastically reduced. The number of Government employees must be cut to an efficient minimum.

We reaffirm our belief in the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively with employers as one of the cornerstones of competitive enterprise. The processes of such bargaining must be protected and strengthened if we are to have real jobs and prosperity for all.

For that purpose we believe that governmental decision must not be substituted for free agreement, but governmental machinery to promote peaceful settlement of disputes should be improved.

Demands by either side must be kept within the bounds of reason and fairness and both sides must recognize the rights of the general public.

The desired end of bargaining between management and men is a contract. Once that contract is made, it should and must be equally binding on both parties as to agreements made.

Free collective bargaining and contracts resulting therefrom must not be nullified or destroyed by resort on either side to willful violence or unlawful destruction of property.

We favor Federal aid to the extent necessary, to States and through States to their subdivisions, to assist them in affording subsistence, shelter, and medical care to their citizens who are unable to provide for themselves. Such aid, including unemployment compensation, must be based on State and local initiative, operation, and responsibility, without Federal bureaucratic interference. It must avoid socialization of the medical profession or any other activity. Federal aid must be in amounts which do not impose an unreasonable burden of taxation on the rest of the population who pay the bills.

We have pledged stability of farm prices during the reconversion and readjustment periods. We will carry out those pledges. We will support sound, permanent proposals to give farmers expanding markets and their fair share of the national income. We reaffirm our long-standing support of soil and water conservation. We shall support measures designed to better rural living.

A grateful Nation demands that those who fought in its defense, their widows and orphans, must never be forgotten. The best of medical care and rehabilitation, education, and training for all desiring it, and efficient assistance in securing homes, farms, businesses, and real jobs, must be provided for the veteran. Nothing in the Federal program should lessen the responsibility of each local community to provide for the return to civilian life of its gallant sons and daughters in a spirit of understanding helpfulness, and dignity.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House and insist on its amendment numbered 42.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to make a few observations on this issue, because I regard it as one of the most important questions the Congress will consider at this session.

I hope that when the vote is taken on this motion we will be allowed a record vote. If the motion of the Senator from Illinois does not deserve a record vote, there will be no question before the Senate at this session or any other session on which Members of Congress should go on record.

Mr. President, wrapped up in these amendments are two vital questions. The first is: Shall the Congress live up to its contracts; shall it carry through a program to which it has been obligated under a congressional mandate?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I do not like to interrupt him at the very beginning of his speech, but when he refers to two amendments, will he not explain exactly what the two amendments are, their relation to the budget estimates, their relation to the House action, and their relation to the Senate action?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall undertake to do that, but I desire to make a brief over-all statement.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am happy to yield.

Mr. THYE. I merely wish to comment on the conference committee report, and then to make a few brief remarks concerning appropriations, and if the Senator will yield for that purpose, I shall appreciate it very much.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to proceed with my remarks. I do not intend to speak at any great length.

Mr. THYE. I am seeking the floor to make a few brief remarks on the appropriations for agriculture. I merely wanted to let the Senator know what I had in mind.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope the Senator from Minnesota will do so. I should prefer to have him to do it in his own time.

Mr. THYE. I most certainly will, sir.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should prefer not to yield. Mr. President, the soil-conservation program has been in operation in one form and another since 1933. Each year the Congress makes an appropriation to provide payments to farmers, which payments compensate them in part for the expenditures they have made in carrying out soil-conserving practices on their farms. Back in the days of the processing taxes, the payments at times aggregated approximately $900,000,000. They were paid to farmers for terracing their lands, for contour plowing, for applying lime, phosphates, and other soil-enriching minerals, for planting leguminous crops and for devoting lands to proper uses. Payments have been made in small amounts for the planting of forests, for the reseeding of pastures, and for other practices which will preserve the most priceless asset the Nation possesses, namely, the fertility of the soil.

With the ruling by the Supreme Court invalidating the original processing taxes, the Congress enacted a law authorizing appropriations in the sum of $500,000,000 a year, in order that the program might continue. For some 8 or 9 years the Congress each year appropriated $500,000,000 to defray a part of the costs, and authorized for the succeeding year a program of soil conservation.

We are not dealing here, Mr. President, with a war-swollen agency. We have here an agency which took its reductions during the war. At the advent of war, the soil-conservation payments authorized for the year 1946 were reduced from $500,000,000 to $400,000,000; for 1947, in the 1946 bill, there was authorized $300,000,000. In 1946, when the authorization for 1947 was pending, in order that there could be no misunderstanding about the matter, the language of the authorization was framed in such a way as to impose a contractual obligation on the Secretary of Agriculture to promulgate a $300,000,000 soil-conservation program for the crop year 1947.

Mr. President, I wish to read the language which authorized the appropriation, which the other body seeks now to reduce:

Provided further, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1947 programs, amounting to $300,000,000, including administration, of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, under the act of February 29, 1936, as amended, and programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended.

Mr. President, in the past, this language had read "not to exceed" a certain amount. But in order that there could be no misunderstanding in the minds of farmers as to the scope of the program, knowing the mind of the Eightieth Congress as to what was intended, I wish to read the language that was cited on the floor of the House of Representatives handling the bill, Judge TARVER, of Georgia. On March 8, 1946, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD discloses this statement:

Mr. Chairman, I am presenting for the consideration of the Committee of the Whole the question to which I made reference a few months ago. That is, whether or not you are going to authorize for the crop year 1947

program, $300,000,000. I am presenting it in language which is so definite in character as to admit of no misconstruction. It is the time now to decide whether you want to reduce the 1947 crop-year program, not next year after the plans of the Department and those of State AAA authorities and the farmers have already been completed. If we want to reduce it, reduce it now and reject my amendment and offer some other amendment to indicate a lower figure.

Mr. President, with that statement by the chairman of the committee, the House, by a vote of more than 4 to 1, adopted a program of $300,000,000 in payments for 1947, and that amendment and that language was adopted by the Senate by unanimous vote. It is a firm commitment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I wonder if the Senator will permit me to ask three or four questions. I desire to get my thinking straight on what this conference report really contains. I am sorry that I do not have it clearly in mind now, apparently because the report I have as to what the committee has done is so shocking to me that I do not want to believe it, unless it comes from the lips of the Senator from Georgia, for whom I have the highest respect when it comes to the matter of farm practices.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I want to say to my good friend from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], I have followed very closely his activities as chairman of the committee, and I think he is to be commended for the work he has done in his endeavor to prevent an unjustifiable wrong, which I think has been done by the report which has come to the floor of the Senate. Before I put a question, may I make a brief remark to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], that mine is one vote that will never approve the conference report that has come back to the floor of the Senate, because I am not going to sell short either the farmers of America or the economy of this country, as I think we would be doing if we voted for this entirely unjustifiable conference report.

Now, my first question is this: Am I correctly informed that this report proposes to cut the school-lunch program back to the $45,000,000 originally allowed by the House?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the conference report does not reach the school-lunch amendment. It is still in disagreement. The Senate conferees refused to yield to the House on the $45,000,000, or the limitation which destroys the program in all but four or five States, and that item is still in disagreement. When the pending amendment shall have been disposed of, the school-lunch amendment will be the next in order, and the Senate will have an opportunity then to say whether they wish to reduce the program to $45,000,000, and to destroy it by the limitation that was imposed in the House.

Mr. MORSE. Since I am on my feet, and that point has been mentioned, let me say that I do not propose to economize at the expense of the health and the stomachs of the school children of America. If that happens to be the program of any group in the Congress, I am perfectly willing to take that issue to the election platforms of America in 1948.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will say that I share the Senator's view.

Mr. MORSE. I wanted to ask the Senator from Georgia a question in regard to the conservation program. Does the Senator from Georgia agree with me that all throughout the war we economized unnecessarily, but because of the exigencies of the war, on the soil-conservation program?

Mr. RUSSELL. There can be no question about that. The appropriations were reduced from $500,000,000 to $300,000,000 for soil conservation, and the $212,000,00 parity payment appropriations were eliminated entirely. The agricultural appropriation bill is the only major bill that comes before the Congress with any substantial reduction over the 1940 appropriations. In 1940 the Congress of the United States appropriated $1,650,000,000 for agriculture. The President's estimates for the present year were only $1,300,000,000, a reduction of $350,000,000, and the House of Representatives proceeded to cut $400,000,000 off of that. Involved in those cuts are the amendments which are now in disagreement.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Georgia agree with me that when we spend a dollar for preserving and revitalizing the soil of the farms of America we are bound in the decades to come to receive many dollars in return for every dollar we expend on a soil-conservation program?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the magnificent production of the American farmer in the war period answers the Senator's question. Without the soil conservation program, which has been practiced for some 10 years, it would have been impossible for the American farmer to produce the food and fiber which not only fed and clothed our people and our armies, but which kept our allies in the war at a time when they were about to be overcome. But bear in mind, Mr. President, the soil-conservation program suffered during the war period because we were mining our lands to produce the increased crops which were so necessary at that time. Instead of reducing the farm program at this time, if we really believe in soil conservation, as we tell Kiwanis Clubs and the members of other gatherings as we speak to them that we do, Congress would be justified in restoring the program back to $500,000,000, instead of cutting the program back to a paltry $150,000,000 for next year, as we have been compelled to do.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Georgia agree with me that the fertility of the American farms happens to be the most important line of defense we have from the standpoint of the security of the Nation?

Mr. RUSSELL. There can be no question about that, Mr. President. We may appropriate moneys with which to build airplanes, with which to construct tanks, and with which to provide all the impedimenta and implements of war without limit, but unless we have the food and the fiber with which to feed and clothe the men who operate the tanks and the airplanes, as well as the civilian workers behind them in the industries at home, it will avail us nothing.

All that is necessary to do, in order to find what happens to a nation which neglects to provide for maintenance of the fertility of its soil, is to read the histories of the great civilizations and nations of the past which neglected to maintain the fertility of their soil so as to provide for the feeding and the clothing of their people. Go to the lands which were so fertile back in Bible times, and there will be seen today only bare rocks and worn-out soils which will not produce a livelihood for anyone. Even the Garden of Eden, so vividly described in the Bible as a land which produced the greatest abundance of all things, is today the scene of utter desolation because the people who lived there did not protect their soil from erosion and destruction.

In the great Sahara Desert, cities have been uncovered proving that great civilizations once flourished there. But now the land is desolate and unproductive.

What happened to the great civilizations of Rome and Greece shows the results that ensue when peoples do not protect their soils and can therefore no longer provide the food and fiber necessary to their maintenance.

Mr. President, with that history so clearly before us, the Senate of the United States is now compelled to fight and quibble in order that any soil-protection program may be carried on for the next year. I have been amazed at the fact that the action of that other body, which stops the program completely for the next year, has not been more widely publicized. Newspapers which grow lyrical in their editorial columns respecting soil conservation have not mentioned in their news columns that the other body by two record votes have said there should be no soil-conservation program whatever next year.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Georgia for his answer to my question, and I am in complete agreement with him respecting the matter. I think it illustrates again two points that need to be driven home. One deals with the tax-reduction program which the Senator from Georgia and I opposed the other day. It illustrates again that the American farmers must appreciate the fact that the type of economy which is now attempted to be foisted upon them takes out of one pocket many more dollars than was attempted by politicians to put in another pocket by way of a tax-reduction program.

The second point it illustrates is the argument about the American farmer working so many days out of ten for the Government. Let me tell the American farmer now that if this type of a raid on his best long-time interest is permitted to be made, he will find that the Congress will have sold his economic interests short. I agree with the Senator from Georgia that it is time the Ameri-

can farmer should awaken to what is being done to him by the Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the sponsors of the action which would destroy the program in the future say that the farmers are not interested in the program. I point to the fact that every spokesman for every farm group in the country appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee and implored the Senate committee to extend the program into 1948. The American farmers would be up in arms if they realized what was about to be done to them by the action of the other body in stopping this program next year. I am somewhat amazed that the Senate has agreed to reduce the appropriation to the paltry sum of $150,000,000 for next year.

The farmers are now spending $3 for every one the Federal Government expends for soil-conservation purposes. Under the reduced appropriation for next year the farmers will be compelled to increase their share of the expenditures. Yet we are told that in the name of economy Congress is going to destroy a program which has been 12 or 13 years in the building and, on which billions of dollars have been spent. It is proposed that we strike down and destroy the county-committee system. If we do, it will cost untold sums over any economic loss of fertility of soil and reduction of production of food and fiber, when attempt is made at some later period to pick up the odds and ends and recreate a program which has been so effective in the past.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator made an observation a moment ago upon which I think we should dwell a little more at this time in the debate. As the Senator said, our fertile and rich land produced all the food and fiber which were so necessary during the war to provide for our soldiers and for the world, nevertheless at that very time, as the Senator well knows and as everyone else knows, the soil itself was being overworked, just as the machinery on the farm was being overworked. Yet now, at a time when that soil needs more attention than it has needed since the soil-conservation program went into effect, due to a spirit of false economy, in my opinion, on the part of the House of Representatives, we find that the House after 1948 wants no soil-conservation program at all, and even under the Senate provision the amount for such purpose is cut down to $150,000,000.

The Senator from Georgia is absolutely correct when he says that the farmers of the Nation want this kind of program. Why do they want this kind of program? Not only because of what they know soil conservation has done for these farms which were worn out in practically every State in the Union, but also because the Congress of the United States made a pledge to the farmers. The Congress of the United States made a contract with the American farmer last year, when we wrote into the bill the provision which the Senator so aptly described. It seems to me the present Congress, in the name of economy, is constantly violating the sanctity of contracts which we have embodied in the statute books. A classical example is what Congress did with respect to the appropriation on the aviation program, after having told the cities of the country that they could prepare to proceed with a 7-year program.

We heretofore told the farmers of America "You can get ready to proceed with a soil-conservation program as laid down by the Congress." We further said, "Mr. Farmer, you can depend upon that." But the next Congress comes along and repudiates an honest, solemn obligation and pledge to the American people.

Mr. President, if the executive branch of the Government were repudiating its pledges and obligations, we would find seven different committees investigating the executive branch of the Government and the reasons for the repudiation of those pledges; and yet Congress repudiates them time without number, without batting an eye.

Repeatedly on the floor of the Senate I have heard the argument about the sanctity of contracts. The Senator from Georgia knows that if this were an arrangement between two private individuals, one or the other would be in court day after tomorrow if a contract of this kind were repudiated.

I cannot understand a Republican Congress which would absolutely violate, with impunity, a solemn pledge which was made by the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. The Senator from Georgia has called our attention to the fact that in 1940 Congress appropriated $1,650,000,000 for the agricultural program.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. And that the budget estimate submitted to the Congress this year called for $1,200,000,000, but the House cut it down to $800,000,000, which was less than half of what was actually appropriated for the last year before the war.

The Senator also called attention to the fact that by a majority of 3 or 4 to 1 in the House—and I was one of those in the House at that time who voted with the majority—and by a unanimous vote in the Senate, we promised the farmers a $300,000,000 soil-conservation program for the fiscal year 1948. Will the Senator tell us how much the House wants to cut this amount below what the Senate has already approved for this work?

Mr. RUSSELL. In its final action on these amendments yesterday, as I understand, the House cut $30,000,000 from the Senate figure. That would mean that the farmers would have to take approximately a 15-percent reduction in the very important commitment which was made to them, on the basis of which thousands of farmers have already expended money, relying in good faith on the Government to pay them.

The House further amended the bill by limiting any payment which could be made under the 1947 program to $500 to any one individual and cut out and destroyed any soil-conservation program for 1948.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Let us get clear in our minds the amount of money which the Senator is asking the Senate to restore to the bill, or to insist upon as it goes back to conference with the House, which seeks to cut the appropriation below what the Senate allowed. How much is involved?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am urging the Senate to insist on its original amendment reported by the committee, which allowed an appropriation of $258,000,000, plus certain unexpended balances which were sufficient to pay every farmer every dollar that had been promised to him under the 1947 contracts, and which would have set up a measly program of $150,000,000 for the year 1948.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Then all the Senator is asking us to do is to live up to our definite commitments for this fiscal year, plus a very small amount to go forward into the next fiscal year for the continuation of this essential program.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Virginia has expressed the position of the Senate.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that Fred Brenckman, for many years the legislative agent of the National Grange, told me that if topsoil were worth only $1 a ton, the American farmers, through the floods of 1947, had already lost $800,000,000. If one were to try to purchase topsoil in Washington, I guarantee that he would not get any kind of topsoil for a dollar a ton.

Is it not a fact that last year we exported about 18,000,000 tons of food abroad?

Mr. RUSSELL. There has never been any nation in all history that has exported as much foodstuffs as our Nation has exported. All the nations of the world combined have never in any one year exported as much foodstuffs as we sent overseas during the past year.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Is it not true that in meeting the war demands and the post-war demands for food at home and abroad, our farmers, with less labor and with inadequate machinery, stepped up their production over the prewar figure from 30 to 35 percent?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is reflected by the record. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Is it not true that there are but three nations left in the world which have surplus food for export, namely, Canada, the United States, and Argentina?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know as to that. I suppose Australia probably has some food to export. She exports a good deal of mutton.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. She may export some meat. I am thinking principally of food grains.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Is it not a fact that since our farmers are now producing above our domestic needs with

respect to many commodities, and especially food grains, the export market, on an unprecedented scale, is preserving the present parity, or slightly above parity, prices for many farm products? For example, last year we exported 500,000,000 bushels of wheat, against the highest previous export of 200,000,000 bushels, and only 20,000,000 bushels in the early 1930's.

Mr. RUSSELL. That fact has undoubtedly contributed to the maintenance of farm prices.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. To a large extent, we are supporting that export market by loans and gifts. We all know that we cannot indefinitely support it on that basis. Is it not true, therefore, that the time will inevitably come when farm prices will drop; and if the pattern of the past, following World War I, should be followed, the farmer would be the first to be deflated? He was deflated in the latter part of 1920, after the other war, and he did not get out of the depression until 1940, 20 years later.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think it is an unbroken rule of economics, which has no exception in all recorded history, that the farmer is the last to benefit by rising prices and the first to feel the effects of any recession.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Is it not a fact that 30,000,000 people in the United States depend upon agriculture for their livelihood?

Mr. RUSSELL. Approximately.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Does not the general prosperity of our Nation reflect the prosperity of those 30,000,000 people who normally spend everything they get every year as they get it?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. If we deflate our agricultural industry, affecting 30,000,000 people who in one way or another are dependent upon agriculture, and if we sit by and see farm prices drop, shall we not then know that we have started into the next depression?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think there is no question about it. It has undoubtedly been the course of history that when the farmer does not prosper there gradually ensues a creeping paralysis which starts with the country banks and country merchants, and finally stops the smoke from pouring from the chimneys of our greatest industries.

Mr. President, if I may be permitted to proceed for only a few minutes, let me say that there is no question that the good faith of the Government of the United States is involved in paying every dollar which has been promised to the farmers on the 1947 contracts. It would be just as logical to say to a man who had built a ship that cost $10,000,000 that we would not pay more than seven-and-one-half millions of dollars, as it would be to pare down the farm payments for this year 25 percent. The farmers have already earned those payments in many cases. A farmer cannot adjust his crop to the vagaries of the House Appropriations Committee reporting a bill in May or June. He has to plan his crop in November and December of the preceding year. That was done with respect to these payments, and the farmers are entitled to fair treatment, and the Congress of the United States will dishonor itself if it does not make good on every dollar of appropriations.

The farmers mined their soil during the war. We lost more ground than was gained by our great struggle to rebuild the soil of the Nation. Yet it is proposed to tell the farmer that we shall have no program whatever next year and that we will not pay him what we promised him on the current year's program. The program next year means a great deal to the Nation. As I have stated, this appropriation is a paltry one—only $150,000,000 under the Senate provision which the other body refuses to accept.

The continuance of the program is important, because it keeps together the machinery which has proven so effective in protecting the farmer against surpluses, in seeing that he secures his commodity loans.

In every agricultural county in the United States there is a county committee which meets and works with the farmers on the program of agriculture for the county. If we do not have a program next year we will break the promise we made to the farmer that we would support his prices at a certain level. The program can be carried out only through the county committees. If we destroy the program for next year we shall practically ruin the loan program of 90 percent of parity on major products.

What does the program mean to the wheat farmer? It means a great deal, because freight cars are not available to the farmers in which to transport their wheat to the market and sell it immediately, and they are thus compelled to borrow money from the Commodity Credit Corporation to discharge their obligations pending the time when freight cars can be secured to transport the wheat to the markets. If we destroy this program, as is proposed by the other body, we shall have destroyed the entire loan program, the section 32 program, and all the other related programs.

This has been a very democratic program with a little "d." The farmers select the men who run the program at the county level. That has been the great strength of the program. During the war, when flax had to be produced in this country, we could have issued statements from Washington every day of the week urging the farmers to produce flax, and we would not have procured sufficient flax to fill a person's eye. But when we sent word to the county committees, and the members of the committees traveled about and saw the individual farmers, the farmers made a magnificent production of flax, which was an essential product, without which we could not have won the war.

The same statement applies to almost every other commodity. Yet, Mr. President, it is now proposed to tell the farmers, in spite of the war production, in spite of the fact that they had to mine their own soil and take from its fertility in order to produce the food and fiber needed, that Congress will reduce their payments for this year and do away with the program for next year.

We have dealt differently with industry. We had a reconversion program with regard to industry for which we generously provided. The American manufacturers of essentials for war purposes were paid generously and liberally on their contracts. While restoration of industry is important in reconversion, it is no more important than is soil conservation. The farmers of America deserve better treatment at the hands of the Congress than they have received.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The amount of money paid to industry was $6,500,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. It was a tremendous sum of money. I did not know the exact figures.

I wish to thank the Senator from North Dakota for his efforts in this matter, and to express my appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations for the motion which he had made.

I would regret, Mr. President, to see the farm program become involved in party politics. During the period in which it was my privilege to handle the agricultural appropriation bills on the floor of this body, I endeavored to separate the subject as far from partisan considerations as was humanly possible. If the farmers were to come to the committee offices next January and find them closed and find that the soil conservation program had been concluded, and that Congress had put an end to the section 32 funds, I have no doubt what the political reaction would be. However, this matter is too important to become involved in party politics.

I went over to the other House when they were voting the other day and was talking to a Representative who happened to be a Democrat. I said to him, "What are you going to do?" He said, "I am afraid I am going to win." I said, "Afraid you are going to win? I hope you will win." He said, "If the Republicans kill soil conservation, nullify the school-lunch program, and deny money to the veterans for farm loans, they will never beat me in the election." I do not want these subjects to become involved in partisan questions. I am delighted that there has been no partisanship on this side of the Chamber. We are looking to the welfare of agriculture as a whole, and I hope, Mr. President, that we shall determine to stand by the Senate's position on this question. Whether Congress shall adjourn this coming Saturday or the Saturday following, certainly keeping faith with the American farmers is more important than adjourning on a certain date. Assuredly, to maintain a program of soil conservation, to enable us to keep faith in the support program, and other issues, is more important than could possibly be our own personal convenience in getting home next Saturday night.

I hope that the vote on these amendments, Mr. President, will be unanimous,

that the Senate will stand by the Government's contracts for this year, and that the AAA offices throughout the Nation will be kept open in the year 1948.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, again I state that I commend the conference committee on its stand on some of the issues involved, and I ask them to continue to insist on the Senate provisions of the agricultural appropriation bill.

In the matter of meat inspection, if there is no appropriation for Federal meat inspection, the producer will pay the cost of such inspection. The packer will put the cost upon the producer, and the producer will pay for the inspection of the meat, which is to the benefit of the public in general. That should never be, because the producers constitute only a small percentage of the people of this Nation, and meat inspection is a benefit to the public in general.

Regarding the question of soil conservation, that, again, is a public responsibility. Every year we find a greater percentage of the people in the cities than we find on the farms or in the producing groups. When we consider the benefits, Mr. President, which the soil-conservation program has brought to the agricultural lands of the Nation, we must realize that it has been of benefit to all the people, rather than simply to a small producers' group. It will be found from the record that from 1938 through 1945 the application of limestone to the soil, which is a soil-building practice, is almost a necessity in many areas in order to get a good stand in legume seeding. The application of limestone was increased by 326 percent, and the use of fertilizer on grasses and legume crops was increased by 503 percent in those years. Field stripping, which is a soil-building practice in every sense, was increased by 854 percent in the years from 1938 to 1945. I repeat the years in order that the Senate may keep definitely in mind what has been accomplished under this particular type of program.

The appropriation for contour farming was increased 126 percent. The appropriation for construction of grass waterways to prevent erosion was increased 5,400 percent. The appropriation for the use of green manure for a cover crop, so to speak, was increased 65 percent. The appropriation for the construction of dams and ponds to avoid erosion and the gutting of fields by erosion was increased by 126 percent.

So, Mr. President, again I say that this particular type of program is a public benefit. It may be asked, "Do the cities have a responsibility to pay taxes to support such a program?" Mr. President, if we realize the tonnage of food which must be produced on the land in order to feed the people in cities the size of Washington, New York, Boston, and innumerable others which I could mention, then we commence to have an idea of what is being taken out of the soil in order to feed people who are not living on the farms. There is a public responsibility. Although some persons may say, "Yes; we pay in taxes for this program, but we receive nothing in return," and although I could refer to charts which were inserted in the RECORD within the last week, which would seem to indicate that cities such as Boston and New York which contributed their proportionate amounts got nothing in return, nevertheless they were paying for only a part of what they had depleted from the soil in order that food might be shipped to their people.

Soil conservation is a responsibility which we cannot shirk. When we contemplate appropriating not one dime for soil-conservation land use payments for the year 1948, I think we are making a very serious mistake. The Steagall amendment carries through 1948, and it provides for the price-support program for agriculture. There are other provisions, such as those relating to the Commodity Credit Corporation, which expire in the year 1948. Of course, studies must be made and a farm program must be developed between now and December 31, 1948. Nevertheless, in spite of the fact that those studies must be made and such a program must be formulated, I feel that we definitely owe to the large and vitally important group engaged in agricultural pursuits who are producing food for the people of this Nation, as well as food with which to fulfill the commitments we have made abroad, a continuation of the soil-conservation practices in the year 1948, until we have been able to develop and perfected a farm program which will carry on when the Steagall amendments and the other provisions which are a part of the present program expire.

In my opinion the soil-conservation practices are nonpolitical. They are beneficial not only to the people living on the land, but to the people who consume the food, no matter in what corner of the United States they may reside.

Although the chairman of the committee of conference, the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], has not referred to the Rural Electrification Administration in connection with this bill, I wish to say that this is another public service which has been of greater benefit to the people on the farms than almost any other measure the Congress has enacted. It may be said that we can reduce the appropriation by $25,000,000 this year, and still leave ample funds with which to carry on that work, but I think we shall make a most serious mistake if we take that attitude. Not a mile of line of rural electrification can be contracted for today for the same amount of money for which it could have been constructed 5 or 6 years ago, because the costs of both labor and material and equipment have increased greatly just as every other cost has increased. When we consider that in this Union there are States in which only 12 percent of the farms are electrified—such States as the Dakotas—and when we consider the fact that in some of the New England areas more than 90 percent of the rural homes are electrified—and I could refer to my own State of Minnesota, where in excess of 57 percent of the farms are electrified—nevertheless we must realize that all other farmers are equally anxious to have electricity on their farms.

Under the rural electrification program, it is provided that an association may borrow money from the Treasury and shall pay it back with interest. As a matter of fact, in most cases the money is paid back in advance of the due date. The entire record under the REA program shows that the transactions have been only book transactions by which the money is made available to associations, to enable them to engage in construction under this program, and then the associations immediately commence to pay back the money, with interest. Mr. President, it will be a serious mistake to cut this item for the REA $25,000,000. Certainly it will be a mistake if that cut is allowed to stand, because then we shall deny that safety measure, that convenience, the current and power which will increase the production of food. In the event that this money is not made available there will be a delay of another year before many of these associations will be able to proceed to complete their line development or their project development.

Mr. President, I am mindful of the fact that we need to economize, and I am equally mindful of the fact that it is difficult for the Appropriations Committee to draw the two ends together, when we are constantly urging that appropriations for this measure or that measure be increased. But this rural electrification item is most important, and I do not think a reduction of it will result in economy.

I wish to make brief mention of the school-lunch program. The appropriation for that purpose would correct the eating habits of many a youth, and would correct malnutrition insofar as the diet of school children is concerned. It is a safety measure, a safeguard, and a protection, as well as a correction of the eating habits of children who are improperly fed in their own homes.

So, Mr. President, I wish to say that I shall encourage and give whatever support I can to action designed to insist on maintaining the position the Senate has taken on this bill; and in whatever contacts I can make with Members of the House of Representatives who have refused to concur in the Senate's action on the Agricultural appropriation bill, I shall do all I can to persuade them to concur in the action of the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the matter before the Senate has been so ably discussed by the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from North Dakota, the Senator from Georgia, and the Senator from Minnesota that there seems to be little left to add to what they have said. Therefore, what I have to say I shall make very brief.

All life on this earth, the life of every human being, the life of every animal, the life of every bird, every fish, and every tree and plant, depends upon a thin layer of topsoil which spreads over the earth, which averages a little more than 8 inches in depth. As has been pointed out by the Senator from Georgia, the Nations which have neglected to care for their topsoil, which have let it deteriorate, which have let it become eroded and unproductive, have perished.

Mr. President, the United States has been generously endowed with this life-giving soil from which we all sprang. We have had what seemed to be unlimited millions of acres of soil on which to produce bountiful harvests, and we have produced such harvests, but we have not put back into the soil as much as we have taken out of it. Consequently, much of it has become so depleted and eroded that today it is almost valueless.

However, we were endowed not only with millions of acres of rich soil, but we were endowed also with the wisdom of seeing that we must maintain it if we were to continue as a strong nation. Therefore, some 10 years ago we started a program designed to maintain and improve our soil resources. That program has been so successful that during the war years, during the last 3 or 4 years, the farmers of the United States have been able to produce one-third more, in the way of food and fiber crops, than they produced from the years 1935 to 1939, when the program was getting under way.

Although we have made a splendid start in maintaining our soil resources, yet all this time we have probably not been keeping pace with the destructive elements which have been working upon the land. Today about 950,000,000 acres of land in the United States need attention if we do not desire to watch it go down the rivers, lose its fertility, and become valueless. That is what makes this program which has been so successful so far so essential for the future. We must continue it if we are to perpetuate ourselves and our Nation.

Mr. President, I cannot understand the mental processes of those who oppose the continuation of a program which is designed to prolong the existence of our lives, both as individuals and as a nation.

Our farm organizations recognize the situation as it is. So far as I know, every one of them is strongly in favor of this program. They know that it is necessary if we are to continue to maintain a strong agriculture in the United States, and if we cannot do that, we never in the world can maintain a strong nation. Both major political parties have recognized the necessity of the program, and both are on record as favoring it.

The work of soil conservation has been done particularly well in my own State of Vermont. It has been done so well, and so much of our poor land has been restored to a great degree of productivity, and the success of the program has been so apparent, that my own State legislature, in both houses, unanimously voted to memorialize Congress to continue the program to the full extent to which it had been carried on in the past.

So, Mr. President, I wish to add my word to those of other Senators who have urged that this most beneficial of all programs be continued. We cannot afford to give it up now, not only because of its importance to the security of our Nation, but because it is so necessary if we are to continue to do our part in bringing peace to all the rest of the world. We know that famine breeds unrest and warfare, and the more we can alleviate famine conditions through the production of our own land the safer the world will be so far as war and peace are concerned.

Mr. President, I cannot urge too strongly that the Senate approve by an overwhelming record vote the motion made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the arguments in behalf of insisting on the amendment regarding the soil-conservation program have been well and ably presented. I rise to associate myself with those who have presented the arguments, and who have so strongly stated the case for the continuance of our soil-conservation program. I rise as well to protest against the proposed action which would undermine and destroy this great soil-conservation activity.

Only Saturday evening the Washington Star carried an article by Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, who is the Chief of the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture. We of the Senate know Dr. Bennett. He has devoted his life to the cause of soil conservation. Perhaps no man in America speaks with greater authority on any subject than does Dr. Bennett on the subject of soil conservation, and what it means to the preservation of our Nation and of our American civilization.

Dr. Bennett's article was headed "The land won't wait. More comprehensive soil-conservation practices must be instituted without delay."

The land will not wait, Mr. President. Dr. Bennett says in the article:

> We cannot afford to postpone the safeguarding of our productive land against further disastrous inroads by erosion. To do so would be costly and exceedingly damaging to the Nation's economy and security.
>
> The land won't wait now, if we neglect it while we busy ourselves with other supposedly more important matters, any more than it waited during the 150 years or so before we started doing something to keep our topsoil from washing down to the sea or blowing halfway across the continent.

The land is not waiting, as Dr. Bennett has said. There are more acres of land in the United States today absolutely worthless, of no benefit to our Nation or its people, of no benefit for the production of food or fiber, than the entire acreage of the great State of South Carolina alone.

Dr. Bennett continues:

> Every year's delay in applying complete soil and water conservation treatment brings more ruinous damage to some of our land somewhere.

How true that is. How often we have seen a hillside where the water had washed small gullies, taking off most of the topsoil. We know that through the years that form of destruction has accelerated. Each year takes a larger percentage of the topsoil, until finally there is no topsoil, until we have left only the gullied, worthless hillside.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the same gentleman who furnished the facts that the Senator has been discussing for the last few minutes——

Mr. HILL. Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, the outstanding authority in the United States on the question of soil conservation.

Mr. MURRAY. Discussing the same subject in a previous article, this distinguished gentleman stated the following facts:

> Today there is left in the world, as well as I have been able to estimate it, only about 4,000,000,000 acres of immediately arable land. That land must feed more than 2,000,000,000 people, whose numbers are increasing at the rate of about 20,000,000 a year. The great bulk of our food comes from this land, as well as all of our wood, leather, wool, cotton, and various other vegetable fibers and oils. Nutritionists tell us it takes about 2½ acres of reasonably productive land, on the average, to provide each person with a minimum adequate diet. Some countries have less than that much now—some less than 1 acre per capita. Whole nations and civilizations in the past have perished because they misused their land.

He proceeds further to give the following facts:

> More than half of our farm land has been damaged by erosion—millions of acres of it ruined for further practical cultivation and other millions of acres almost as seriously affected. Soil-conservation surveys indicate that we have left only about 450,000,000 acres of good cropland in this country, and all but about 100,000,000 acres of this is subject to erosion. Moreover, some 80,000,000 acres of the 450,000,000 still needs clearing, drainage, irrigation, or other improvements to make it productive. Meanwhile, erosion likewise has been taking its soil from a vast acreage of our range and pasture lands.

He proceeds in this article, which appeared in the Washington Star of July 16, 1947, with an array of facts which are startling, proving conclusively what is being said here this afternoon, that the conservation of what remains of our shrinking agricultural lands is the most important problem before the Congress.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Montana for the contribution he has made. He has given the Senate the information from the article by Dr. Bennett which it was my intention to give to the Senate. I am delighted that the Senator from Montana has done so.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend, the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Alabama for his splendid statement about Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, who is a distinguished citizen of North Carolina. Our State is proud of the contribution which Dr. Bennett has made to the permanent welfare of the people of the United States. On June 26, I discussed on the Senate floor somewhat in detail reductions made in the agricultural appropriation bill by the House of Representatives. I now wish to thank the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the other members of the committee for their effective work in connec-

tion with this bill. I also wish to urge the Senate to stand firm in its efforts to preserve the integrity of Congress and to prevent the destruction of the farm program heretofore established. I wish to associate myself with the efforts and statements of the Senator from Alabama and all Members of the Senate who are vitally interested in this most important question.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate. The Senator from Montana has read very pertinent excerpts from the article by Dr. Bennett. I call attention merely to one paragraph in Dr. Bennett's article, in which he is speaking about the results of soil conservation, not only as protecting, preserving and maintaining the soil of the Nation, but as to helping the farmer to increase the production of food and fiber. Dr. Bennett says:

> Earlier, more than 9,000 representative farmers in all parts of the United States reported that conservation farming for 2 years or longer had increased their per acre yields of all major crops by almost 36 percent. These reporting farms totaled nearly 4,000,000 acres. Representative per acre increase included more than 39 percent for corn and nearly 25 percent for tobacco. The total acreages of the more soil-depleting row crops—

We know it is crops like corn, tobacco, and cotton that are so soil depleting—

> consistently were cut down in favor of grass and other protective crops, but the total production of such intertilled crops just as consistently increased. Meanwhile safer land use and better, diversified farming with more livestock and poultry comprised the most important gain of all.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend from Arkansas, because I know how deeply interested he is in this subject. I remember when he and I had the privilege of serving in the House of Representatives together that we waged a battle in the House, side by side, for soil conservation. I am delighted to yield to my friend from Arkansas. If he were not so young, I should say, the long-time friend of soil conservation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator. The Senator is discussing now amendment 42, which is in disagreement. I want to get a little information, if the Senator can give it to me, regarding the proposal to limit payments this year to an amount not to exceed $500 to any one individual. Is that still in the amendment?

Mr. HILL. As I understand, it is still in the amendment, and that amendment is to be voted upon. The Senate will have an opportunity to vote on it. I hope it will be a yea-and-nay vote and I hope it will be unanimously rejected. That is in the amendment, and, as the Senator knows, the provision in itself is a breach of faith. It is a violation of our promise. It is a breach of the contract with the farmers. One may not contract with another party and then, without consulting him and without obtaining his consent, change the contract, inserting a provision that was not in the contract originally agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is just the point I wanted to raise. If we are under contract for approximately $300,000,000, for which the Agriculture Department was instructed to plan the program this year, then we are certainly under obligation not to limit the benefits to any individual, unless notice or admonition was given of it at the time of the planning of this year's program. I have insisted we ought to keep faith with the farmers this year. If it is a program that we feel we can begin to reduce, then we should indicate on what basis the program ought to be planned for next year.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator allow me to interpose a moment?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct. We should keep faith, no matter what the cost. We are now beyond any question of cost.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The cost is limited by the program planned.

Mr. HILL. It is certainly limited by the program planned, to which we solemnly committed ourselves. We must keep faith. The Senator perhaps heard the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] call attention to the fact that the Government paid out—this same United States Government, now that proposes to breach its contract and to breach its faith—the United States Government paid out $6,500,000,000 to American industry, to protect and to save harmless American industry from losses as the result of reconversion following the war. We pay today $6,500,000,000 to American industry. If we were to spend $300,000,000 for the soil-conservation program the sum of $6,500,000,000 would carry on that program for more than 20 years. Yet we quibble, dawdle, and delay. We talk about breaching our contract now by failing to provide for the continuance for 1 year of the soil-conservation program.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to make the observation that I believe the program is one which should be reconsidered and reexamined from time to time. Having made the commitment, however, I cannot bring myself to break the contract, because it is a contract just as truly as any other Government contract which may have been executed. I shall vote, and I hope the final outcome will be to pay the farmers in full on the program as planned for the present year. Mr. President, I am anxious that the program be continued, even though it may be curtailed to the extent indicated by the Senate amendment, even to $150,000,000 for the next year. I do not think we ought to stop the program abruptly. It has done too much good to be stopped. It would be an unwise policy to do so. We are hoping, of course, that in a few years the farmers will be able to handle the matter alone, without Government assistance, but until then the program should not be wrecked.

I thank the Senator from Alabama for yielding to me.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I want to thank my friend, the Senator from Arkansas, for the contribution he has made. He has voiced the sentiments which I was trying to express, that there should be no breach of the promise we have made. We should keep faith with the farmers and carry out to the letter the soil-conservation program.

Mr. President, I have an article published in the Montgomery Advertiser, of Montgomery, Ala., telling of a survey which was made in Crenshaw County, Ala., and describing all the benefits to the farmers of the soil-conservation program. In addition to the many benefits to the land, the survey showed that for every dollar the Government put into the program the farmer received a return of about $16. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD, following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, to return for a moment, if I may, to the article written by Dr. Bennett, I call attention to one paragraph. We are speaking of the farmer today. We must not forget that what affects the farmer affects the economy of the whole community. It affects the economy and welfare of every man, woman, and child in the country. Dr. Bennett very aptly said:

> The typical American community—except for certain industrial centers—depends on the farms or ranches around it for its business prosperity. Such improved income as I have referred to means better living for the farmer and better business for manufacturers and merchants, bankers, doctors, lawyers, newspapers, labor, everybody. It means better schools and more support for teachers. And that chain of increased wealth likewise extends to increased tax revenues to Government.

In other words, Mr. President, we could not be dealing with any subject today more fundamental to the life of our Nation, or with any subject which more vitally affects the whole economy of all the people of the United States, than the question of agriculture and of the soil-conservation program.

Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate further except to say that today, through cropping, leaching, and erosion more than twice as much plant food is being taken out of the soil of the United States as is being put back. An individual who draws twice as much out of his bank account as he puts in will soon face bankruptcy. The trend in the country today is toward soil bankruptcy. In other words, if we continue to proceed as we are now in the removal of plant food from the soil of the United States we will face soil bankruptcy.

Mr. President, there are just two forces which destroy nations and civilization. One is an invading army. The other is the destruction of the soil. We are spending, as I believe we should be spending, billions of dollars for our national defense, in order to keep ourselves strong from a military standpoint. Surely we should spend what is relatively almost a pittance to maintain the fertility of our

soil and the strengthening of our national economy.

We talk much today about the atomic bomb, and we are frightened by the thought of the atomic bomb. We know that our Nation and our civilization could be destroyed by the atomic bomb. But, Mr. President, our Nation and our civilization will be destroyed just as surely, albeit a bit more slowly, if we do not preserve our soil. I protest this effort to destroy our soil-conservation program, it is a wasteful, a destructive effort, and I urge the Senate to stand fast by these amendments. I urge that a yea-and-nay vote be taken, and that the Senate vote unanimously to stand by the soil-conservation program.

EXHIBIT A

[From the Montgomery Advertiser of June 11, 1947]

CRENSHAW SOIL CONSERVATION RETURNS $16 FOR $1 TO UNITED STATES

(By Rachel Lightfoot)

LUVERNE, ALA., June 10.—Crenshaw County farmer committeemen, Willie L. Slaughter, chairman; Eustace E. Rhodes, vice chairman; and O. D. Martin, member, and PMA workers recently set out to answer the question: Are AAA soil-building payments to farmers a sound investment for the Government to make? Their purpose was to determine the return per dollar invested by the Government in each of the soil-building practices being carried out in the county.

Meeting with the farmer committeemen were: J. M. Sasser, country administrative officer; J. A. McLeod, county agent; J. K. Keller, Soil Conservation Service representative; and, M. L. Reddoch of FHA.

In making this analysis, both farmers and agricultural workers were consulted. The following things figured in evaluation of the Government's investment in conservation through AAA practices: Application per acre, price per ton of materials, yield per acre, increased yield per acre, experimental result figures, estimated life of results from practice, and what farmers said their results were.

Using these points to figure the value of the practices, the group obtained these soil-building values: Winter legumes, permanent pasture, and sericea lespedeza, $30 per acre; kudza, $25 an acre; 18 percent phosphate, $25 per ton; agricultural limestone, $15 per ton; basic slag, $20 per ton; 100 feet terraces, $3; and 100 feet of drainage ditches, $100.

In Crenshaw County, the PMA to date this year has spent $49,251.22 and farmers have spent $14,700 in establishing winter legumes, permanent pasture, sericea lespedeza and kudza; in applying agricultural limestone, basic slag and superphosphate; in constructing terraces and drainage ditches. Under PMA the cost of carrying out soil-building practices is shared jointly by the Government and the farmer.

The total value of these practices is estimated at $795,900. This, compared with a Government investment of $49,251.22, shows a return of $16 for every dollar the Government has invested in Crenshaw County this year.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I wish to add a word to the statements made by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and other Senators who have preceded me concerning the soil-conservation amendment. There are several amendments which are in disagreement between the Senate and the House conferees on the agricultural appropriation bill. As I understand, the amendment now under consideration is amendment No. 42, dealing with soil-conservation payments which apply to most of the 1947 crop-year program and to the 1948 crop-year program. There are other amendments to which I wish to refer while I am on my feet. One of them deals with the National School-Lunch Act, which, like the soil-conservation-payment amendment, is in disagreement between the House and Senate members of the conference committee, and another relates to the REA extension. I do not see the latter amendment on the list of those appearing at this point in the report. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois whether the Senate members of the conference committee receded respecting the REA appropriation.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I think I might explain that we receded on the $25,000,000 provision, but an explanation should be given to the Senate. It should be explained to the Senate that that was not a part of the Budget request for the loaning authority.

I read from the justification which was presented:

The appropriation of $25,000,000 is required in order to provide sufficient collateral to support the amount to be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, pursuant to section 3 (a) of the Rural Electrification Administration Act of 1936, as amended. That section provides that:

"No such loan shall be in an amount exceeding 85 percent of the principal amount outstanding of the obligations constituting the security therefor."

In accordance with this formula, the Rural Electrification Administration must pledge to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation collateral valued at $1,176.47 in order to borrow $1,000. At the end of the fiscal year 1948, assuming the advance of all funds authorized, it is estimated that the principal amount outstanding to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will be approximately $1,043,867,854. The collateral required to support the principal amount outstanding will be $1,228,079,829. The estimated collateral available at that time, assuming an appropriation of $25,000,000 for the fiscal year 1948, will be $1,238,291,432.

The House provided that they need not go to the RFC, but might borrow directly from the Treasury, and might put up only 100-percent collateral for whatever money they wanted to borrow. We have merely eliminated the $25,000,000, which was asked for collateral which was no longer needed. We did not reduce the loan authority for which the Budget Bureau asked.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the Senator for a very clear explanation. I am sorry that the committee receded on the $25,000,000 item. However, as I understand, the House receded on the administrative expense item, which was increased from $4,000,000 to $5,000,000.

Mr. BROOKS. The House receded on that question.

Mr. STEWART. I mention that, although it is not the particular amendment which is under consideration at the moment, because I wished to refer to it briefly in the few remarks I shall make. I understand that it will be before the Senate in a few minutes, after the soil-conservation amendment is considered and disposed of.

Mr. President, when the Senate Appropriations Committee restored the cut which the House Appropriations Committee had made in the estimates, particularly with respect to soil conservation, the REA, and the school-lunch program, I, like many other Members of this body, felt very much encouraged. The cut of those three budget estimates, namely, for soil conservation, the REA, and the school-lunch program, was deplored by many of us when the House Appropriations Committee made the cut. But when it was restored by the Senate Committee on Appropriations we felt hopeful that no further effort or fight would have to be made. We felt that the restoration would stay in the bill. So it is with a feeling of very keen disappointment that I learn that the House conferees refuse to agree to the Senate amendments and restore the cuts.

Before the Senate Appropriations Committee made its report, before it concluded its work on these three items, and while the question was still being considered by the committee, I listened with more than ordinary interest to a very fine, well-prepared, and well-thought-out speech which the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] delivered in this Chamber. It provoked a great deal of comment among his colleagues. In that speech he called for the restoration of all the money which had been cut from the budget estimate by the House committee. The Senate Committee on Appropriations, almost as if in response to his appeal, within a very short time thereafter restored the cut. So it was with a feeling of considerable disappointment that we learned that the House conferees had refused, upon further consideration at this late date in the present session of the Congress, to restore the cut.

Mr. President, we seem to find money for other purposes; indeed, we seem to find money for purposes which are almost fantastic. We appropriate it and see it expended. Yet we allow the budget estimate, which of itself was low enough, to be cut with respect to three of the most important items that could possibly be imagined, namely, soil conservation, the REA, and the school-lunch program. In the years that these programs have been in effect each has made an outstanding contribution to the advancement of the interests of the people of the country.

With respect to the soil-conservation amendment, which is under immediate consideration, the cut should be restored. From any standpoint of looking at the question, and however we express our view with respect to it, we cannot afford to let this cut stand. I do not say that merely by way of using a phrase. When I say we cannot afford it, I mean it emphatically. We cannot afford it for many reasons.

Throughout the past 15 years, during which one of the greatest farm-development programs that this or any other country ever saw has been in progress, we have seen farms all over the Nation reclaimed and saved. We have seen farms which produce the food which our Nation consumes or sells to other nations improved and made more and more

productive. We have seen wasteland reclaimed, and a new, fertile, productive topsoil placed thereon, as a carpet might be placed over a floor—a productive topsoil which produces, in response to man's efforts, more and more grain. During the past few years we have seen farming developed from an operation of drudgery to one which produces a reasonable amount of contentment and ease. We have seen farm income increased until farming has now become a business in which more and more people take an interest. A man must be encouraged in his efforts by being paid for the work which he does.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I desire to ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, in view of the fact that he comes from the TVA area and is quite familiar with the fertilizer situation, if it is not a fact that soil conservation is even more important at this time than ever before, because of the lack of fertilizer materials, particularly the lack of nitrates and other ingredients employed in the manufacture of fertilizer which have been used to help to build up farms in previous years?

Mr. STEWART. That is true. I was coming to that a little later on. I am glad the Senator interrupted me at this moment. I shall take only a few minutes, but I intended to mention that, for the reason that the production of fertilizer in this country is highly important. The importance of the use of fertilizer is something which this Nation is just now beginning to learn. We are becoming, so to speak, fertilizer-conscious. Nothing is more important than the use of scientifically prepared fertilizer. Realizing its importance, I joined in the introduction of a bill, together with a number of other Senators, which has for its purpose the setting up of a national soil-fertility program, based upon an experimentation of approximately 5 years.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is so well versed regarding the fertilizer situation that I should like to ask him to enlighten us regarding the nitrate situation. The Senator is well aware of the fact that there is a tremendous shortage of food throughout the world. A considerable quantity of the nitrates produced by TVA during the past year was bought by the Army and shipped overseas for the rebuilding of the countries with the rehabilitation of which America is charged. On the other hand, coming from a seaport city, I know that the enormous imports of Chilean nitrates have declined. Every effort was made this year, through the Maritime Commission and through representatives of the Chilean Nitrate Association, to increase the amount of nitrates, but in spite of that, and because of the increased acreage in this country, there has been a tremendous shortage in the Midwest. I hope the Senator, who is so well informed regarding the situation in the TVA, will speak more about that.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may proffer a unanimous-consent request and offer a resolution which I have already called to the attention of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business may be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate may proceed with the immediate consideration of the joint resolution which I send to the desk regarding the appointment of Robert Flemming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). The clerk will read the resolution.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if I may have permission, I will withdraw my request and the resolution which I have submitted.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire of the majority leader why he withdraws his request?

Mr. WHITE. Because I found that there was not unanimity of approval of my course of action.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator mean to say that someone is objecting to the appointment of Robert Fleming?

Mr. WHITE. No; but someone was not enthusiastic about the course of action which I have suggested.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, the statement of the Senator from South Carolina with reference to the shortage of nitrates throughout the country is correct; there has been a serious shortage. We have been shipping nitrates and other fertilizer materials, including phosphate rock, and so forth, to Europe, to Korea, to Spain, and possibly to China, and other foreign countries. Those countries at least have received shipments of fertilizer from the United States. Such shipments have produced a shortage here which has been very serious. It has been claimed that our shipments abroad have not been very much greater in amount than have shipments which have occurred in other years. Whether that is true I do not know, but in this country, there has been brought about a tremendous shortage, largely because of increased demands for fertilizer due to the fact that we have become fertilizer-conscious and are using it more and more all the time.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to say to the able Senator from Tennessee that the Appropriations Committee which is now considering the supplemental appropriation bill for relief to foreign countries in the matter of foodstuffs and other articles identified with them, has inserted a provision that wherever possible and practicable articles for foreign relief shall come from those of which there is a surplus in this country and shall be selected so as to aid wherever possible the national economy. While I do not mean to say that that will preclude the purchase of fertilizers which are badly needed here, it does give direction to the purchase of relief supplies for use abroad along lines which I know the Senator from Tennessee has in mind.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the Senator. I am glad to have that information. I hope it applies to fertilizer; and I take it that it will. At least the Senator says, as I understand, that the articles shipped abroad must be in surplus supply.

Mr. TYDINGS. No. We do not say "must," because it might be that if we drew it so tightly some article which is not in surplus would have to be included in the shipment, but it is provided that in furnishing these relief supplies they shall be selected so as to aid the national economy wherever possible and shall be taken from surpluses wherever possible and practicable. They could still select things which are in short supply, but they are directed not to do that if they can find any other way to serve the same purpose with articles that are not in short supply.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the Senator. That shows how the committee feels about it. I feel the same way, and I am sure most of the Members of the Senate feel that way. I have discussed the fertilizer shortage privately among Members of this body to such an extent that I feel that the report of the Senator from Maryland will be received with approval.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Whether we ship 1 ton of fertilizer or 100,000 tons, or none at all, it would still be in short supply because of the increased acreage the farmers undertook to cultivate in order to win the war and because, during the war period, they suffered from lack of new farm machinery and other essential things. So the point that the Senator and I are trying to make is that, regardless of whether fertilizer is shipped, now as never before the soil conservation program is needed, so that the cover crops, particularly those which contribute nitrogen to the soil, can be used to build up the soil.

Mr. STEWART. That is absolutely correct. The Senator never made a more nearly 100-percent correct statement in his life. We have increased the cultivated acreage in this country throughout the past few years. We have increased the use of fertilizer because of the educational program in connection with it which has been carried on, and we have therefore created a much larger demand for fertilizer than has ever before been known. The excuse for shipping fertilizer overseas, as I understand, is that it will enable farmers to produce more food over there. I do not know whether that idea is far-sighted. It might be well not only to keep and use the fertilizer here, and thus create an additional market for our own farmers and others who produce

the articles which we sell abroad, but also, Mr. President, to enable us to continue our long-range planning in the use of fertilizer. In the past few years we have learned more about the use of fertilizer than we have ever known before. During the committee hearings on the fertilizer bill, it was almost pathetic, to my mind, to hear the testimony of some persons who were opposed to the use of fertilizer because they thought that only rain and sunshine were needed to produce crops.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to call attention to the fact that during the war the farmers were asked by the Government, including the Department of Agriculture and various congressional committees, to plant additional acreage. Most of the crops they planted in accordance with that request were what we know as soil-depleting crops. That is correct; is it not?

Mr. STEWART. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. In other words, more tobacco, more cotton, and additional amounts of other soil-depleting crops were planted. Nevertheless, despite that fact, now an attempt is being made to do away with this service, at a time when it is both possible and necessary to plant peas and other nitrogen-restoring crops, cover crops, and others.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, the attempt to reduce the appropriation for the soil-conservation program is clear evidence of shortsightedness to an extent that to my mind is utterly appalling. In recent years we have learned many things about the use of fertilizer, things previously unknown by most of our people. In the first place, the farmers have learned of the need of fertilizer. In recent years many of the farmers have learned that if they use fertilizer they can increase the amount of crops they can grow on their farms. Moreover, they have learned that different types of fertilizer are adaptable to different types of soil, and that different types of fertilizer are necessary for different types of crops. One type of fertilizer, they have learned, will produce a minimum effect in a certain soil with a certain crop, while another type of fertilizer will produce a maximum effect under those circumstances. The farmers have also learned that different types of fertilizer will not only increase the amount of crops produced on a given acreage, but will actually accelerate the maturity of the crops, sometimes by 2 or 3 weeks.

Mr. President, think what we would have gained if adequate soil conservation had been practiced in the Middle West, where the recent floods have swept so much of the topsoil into the rivers, on a one-way trip to the sea. The damage done by those floods will cost more than the entire cost of the TVA It is evident that it is necessary to use certain types of fertilizer which accelerate the maturity of corn and other crops, for even after the raging floods swept much of the fine topsoil off the farms and down the Mississippi into the sea, in many cases it would have been possible to plant a crop and, with the use of the proper type of fertilizer, to have had the crop mature in time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Since the able Senator from Tennessee is discussing what the devastating floods have done to the Middle West, I think it only apropos that I rise to advise him briefly what I personally know of conditions in Illinois, Sangamon, and Mississippi River valleys, where I happen to live. As the Senator has well stated, the floods have already taken millions of tons of fine topsoil from some of the most fertile land in that section of the country, and have carried it into the rivers and down to the sea on a one-way trip, never to return. Had the Congress been farsighted and had the courage to have spent some money in the years gone by, practically all that topsoil could have been saved; and furthermore, it would have been possible to prevent the millions upon millions of dollars of damage which has been done to both crops and personal property belonging to the farmers in that section. Every year we have the same experience. Only a few years ago there was the great flood in the Ohio district. The Senator will well remember the creation of the Disaster Corporation, whereby the Congress immediately appropriated millions upon millions of dollars to take care of the damage that had been done as the result of those high floods. Yet we continue to piddle along, insofar as any protection from floods is concerned.

I do not know whether any Member of Congress yet has introduced proposed legislation to take care of the damage that has been caused by the floods this year, but no doubt such legislation will be introduced. If the farmers whose farms have been destroyed almost overnight because of an act of God are entitled to $100,000,000 of relief from the Congress, the Congress will appropriate it, with all convenient speed. If long ago men of courage and vision could have foreseen the future and then and there provided the money for the building of floodgates and dams, not only would we have saved the topsoil, but, in the long run, we would have saved millions and perhaps billions of dollars to the Government and to the people of the United States. But even today we do not profit by this sad experience, whenever anyone mentions a proposed river-control project, which may cost $250,000,000 or perhaps $500,000,000 in order to harness flood waters, to the end that they shall do no more damage, we immediately encounter opposition in the name of economy.

Mr. STEWART. No doubt such projects would have saved this year's crop, which probably already has been washed all the way to the Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. LUCAS. Certainly.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me once more?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. In view of the fact that we have been discussing the fertilizer situation and in view of the statement the Senator from Maryland made, I should like to read a letter which I have received from a former Government official, Mr. C. C. Smith, formerly connected with the Commodity Credit Corporation, and particularly concerned with European and Asiatic shipments, in connection with both the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Army. So I ask the Senator to yield to me long enough to permit me to read the letter into the RECORD at this point.

Mr. STEWART. I am glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. MAYBANK. I make this request because all Senators should read the letter, for Mr. Smith knows more about cotton, in my judgment, than does any other man.

Mr. Smith's letter reads as follows:

STAPLE COTTON COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION.

Greenwood, Miss., July 18, 1947.

The Honorable BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: I am writing you with reference to the supply of nitrogen fertilizer for the 1948 crop in the South. I am sure that you are aware of the fact that nitrogen fertilizer and side dressing material are short in South Carolina for the 1947 crop. I believe the following is constructive and offers a possible solution of reasonable nitrogen fertilizer and side dressing supplies for the 1948 crop.

The Army is operating four plants to produce ammonia. These plants are:

1. Cactus Ordnance Plant, Sunray, Tex.
2. Morgantown Ordnance Plant, Morgantown, W. Va.
3. Ohio River Ordnance Plant, Henderson, Ky.
4. Missouri Ordnance Plant, Louisiana, Mo.

I understand these four plants have a rated annual capacity of 407,700 tons of pure nitrogen, or the equivalent of of 1,220,000 tons of ammonium nitrate.

The Army has requirements of 840,000 tons of ammonium nitrate, or its equivalent, to send to Japan, Germany, and the occupied countries. I think the requirements for exports of nitrogen fertilizer to friendly countries amount to about the equivalent of 280,000 tons of ammonium nitrate. If the four plants above produce their rated capacity, they could supply ammonia equivalent to all the nitrogen requirements for this country. This would leave all the United States commercial production of ammonia, ammonium nitrate, synthetic nitrate of soda, etc., for the farmers of the United States.

We are informed that the following Army plants which can grain ammonium nitrate are not running, and we indicate the possible monthly production of ammonium nitrate of each:

	Tons ammonium nitrate per month
Kingsport, Tenn	11,500
Terre Haute, Ind	6,200
Milan, Tenn	5,000
Defense, Tex.; Doyline, La	33,700
Total	33,700

All these plants should be placed in production and run to capacity.

We understand the Defense, Tex., and Doyline, La., plants, now leased by Lion Oil Co. and producing ammonium nitrate, are being released shortly to the Army. Certainly these plants should be kept in maximum production by the Army. We understand also the Bureau of Mines has some experimental work at the Louisiana, Mo., ordnance plant, but that this plant can produce an additional 4,700 tons of ammonium nitrate per month.

I realize the Army may have labor troubles, tank-car troubles, etc. These can be overcome if there is a will to do so. It is possible that some of these plants may be higher in costs than others, but it is cheaper to ship fertilizer—even at a high price—and let the occupied areas use their own labor to produce the food than to ship the food from the United States. This may require an examination of the appropriations for producing fertilizer for the occupied areas. The friendly nations pay for the fertilizer, and while such nations want the fertilizer as cheaply as possible, they pay such price as is necessary for the Army to produce it.

If you do not insist that the Army run all these plants to capacity, this country will be short of nitrogen fertilizer for the 1948 crop. This will apply to the cotton, hybrid corn, fruit, vegetable and various other agricultural producers from nearly every part of the United States.

I know you will be very busy before the Congress adjourns late this month, but I do not believe that you can do anything that will be more helpful to the farmers of your State than to secure nitrogen fertilizer for the 1948 crop.

Mr. President, I am glad to see the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] in the Chamber, because I know he is interested in the question of nitrogen. I wanted to call this letter to the attention of the Senator from Tennessee and other Senators. There has been a shortage of nitrogen this year. There will be a shortage next year, and the only thing that can replace the nitrogen is the soil-conservation program. Farmers can perhaps plant some forms of crops which will place nitrogen in the soil.

I thank the Senator from Tennessee, and hope I have not taken too much of his time.

Mr. STEWART. I have enjoyed listening to the Senator read the letter, and to his remarks. I think he has made a fine contribution to the debate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has been discussing one of the most important questions before this country today and it will be discussed for many years to come, namely, the question of soil-fertility policy. I am wondering if the Senator is going to discuss briefly Senate bill 1251.

Mr. STEWART. Yes; I plan to do that. I stated at the outset I would possibly make some reference to it.

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad the Senator is going to do that, in view of the fact that the soil-fertility policy is before us. Soil conservation and the lack of proper fertilizers are involved in the amendment we are considering. I thought perhaps the Senator would discuss that bill.

What I wanted to mention about the bill, just briefly—and I cannot say whether or not I will support it—is the fact that men on both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans who are considered anything but liberal in their views toward the Government going into business, have agreed, under this bill, that the Government should go into the business, at least for a period of 5 years, of making fertilizer in a plant to be established at Mobile, Ala., at a cost to the Government of $10,000,000, and a cost of some ten or fifteen million dollars more to administer the program over the period involved.

Mr. President, to me that is most significant, because most of the Members of the Senate believe seriously in the theory of free enterprise and free economy. During the 14 years I have been a Member of the Senate and of the Congress I have heard my friends on the opposite side of the aisle make one argument after the other against the Government of the United States encroaching upon the system of free enterprise. They have constantly criticized the Government for that very thing. With some of the criticism I have agreed, but I undertake to say that within the short space of time I have been a Member of the Senate I have never seen a bill which goes as far in putting the Government of the United States into business in competition with free enterprise as does Senate bill 1251. I know the Senator from Tennessee is one of the authors of the bill and I am in no way reflecting on him, as being one of the authors, when I make this statement, but I think the Senator generally will agree with my statement.

It is perfectly obvious that those who seek to pass legislation of this kind are certainly reminding the American people of the lack of fertilizers in this country in quantities sufficient to maintain the fertility of the soils. The Senators go a long way, and, as I have said, I do not know whether I shall agree with them or not; I might, I might not, I am not sure about the situation, because, as I have said, the bill puts the Government into business for at least 5 years in a way which seems to me carries some serious objections. However, I do realize the necessity for having more of a program of this kind.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, in order to have discussion continue somewhat along the lines pursued by the Senator from Illinois, I shall now discuss the fertilizer bill, since the Senator from Illinois has referred to it.

Senate bill 1251, in which I join the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who introduced it in behalf of himself, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], myself, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Iowa, [Mr. WILSON], was introduced in May last. I was somewhat reluctant to participate in the introduction of the bill. It is a matter which has been discussed for a great many months, as the Senator himself knows. There was brought up, perhaps a year or two ago, very soon after the war ended, an idea similar to this, and so far as I was concerned I then had a natural feeling of restraint.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I may say to the able Senator from Tennessee that the late distinguished Senator from Alabama, Mr. Bankhead, and I introduced, nearly 2 years ago, practically the same bill as the one introduced at this session. Practically the same bill was introduced in the House by the then chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, Representative FLANNAGAN, of Virginia.

Mr. STEWART. I did not remember how far back the discussions had extended. I particularly recall the Senator's bill, which would have established a pilot plant at Mobile, Ala., as I recall. At any rate, I approached the idea with as much reluctance as anyone else who might feel that he disliked the thought of Government in business, as the Senator from Illinois has expressed it. There is not a Member of this body—and I say it deliberately and premeditatedly and upon considerable reflection throughout the past year—who dislikes the idea of Government in business more than I do. I dislike to see the Government encroach upon private business interests as much as any man in this body or elsewhere.

Mr. President, I was beginning to comment briefly on Senate bill 1251, and I had just said I very sincerely and earnestly feel that the Government has no right to enter the field of private business. I have said that repeatedly. I think possibly there are men in this body who will agree with me that the best evidence we have ever had of the total failure of the Government in its effort to engage in business arose out of certain of the acts and omissions of the recently deceased OPA. I have seen Government interference, as many other Senators have seen it, in that agency and in others, until I have become absolutely sick of the idea of Government ownership or Government management of any type of business. Yet, just the other day, I read an article in a local newspaper—other Senators no doubt read it—quoting one of the outstandingly active organizations, known as PAC, as having said that it may become necessary in the near future, from an economic standpoint, for the Government to consider the ownership or management of many industries. Since I am on the Senate floor, I shall, of course, refrain from saying exactly what I thought; but I can think what I thought, without being too obvious.

It was a shocking sort of statement to me. I hope the time will never come when we shall have to approach such a proposition as that with seriousness. I mention these things to emphasize the feeling I have when I consider that the time may come when the Government of the United States should embark upon business enterprises and own and operate the industries, and what not. So I say, in response to the suggestion of the Senator from Illinois, that the fertilizer bill might be an effort to get the Government into business, that I approached it with that same feeling. As I reasoned it, in the first place it is a 5-year program. What is its purpose? Its purpose is to educate farmers on the need and value of fertilizer, the need and value of building up the topsoil, which measures the wealth and the richness of this country as nothing else does. It is a matter of education, and nothing else.

Let me emphasize that by repeating a statement I have already made. It was rather pathetic, when certain witnesses appeared before the Agriculture Committee testifying on this particular bill, to hear them say that fertilizer was not essential to the growing of crops and the upbuilding of the land, that all that was needed was work and sunshine and rain. That is the viewpoint of many farmers in certain sections of the country. I will say to the Senator from Alabama that in his section and also in mine, we have been backward in the matter of developing the farm land as it should have been developed. The Senator from Alabama has seen in his State, as I have seen in the western portion of my State, land devoted to the raising of cotton year after year, until the soil has become so depleted that those who cultivate it are no longer able to obtain a livelihood from it. The Senator from South Carolina, whose State until a few years ago was one of the great cotton-producing States, has seen the result of the neglect of the land, until in recent years the pea crop outstrips the cotton crop in dollar value, if my memory serves me right. It has been necessary to get away from the continual planting of a single crop, as the result of which the richness of the soil is depleted until the land will not yield a livelihood to the farmer and to the tenants of the farm living upon the soil.

I remember that on one occasion since I have been in Congress, the Agriculture Department published a bulletin, within the last 7 or 8 years, in the prewar days, giving the total amount in dollars and cents received by the average farm family in different States of the Union. In the State of Alabama it was $85 a year. In my State of Tennessee it was about $90 a year. The Southern States, producing cotton as they have done in the past, year after year, producing one type of crop, have seen their soil become impoverished and carried away. They have seen it going on its one-way trip down the Mississippi River. We have come to appreciate the work done in the last few years in educating the farmers on how to conserve the soil and to build it up to a state of productivity of which we are proud, and to a degree of productivity which enables the farmer to support himself and his family.

As an illustration of the value of fertilizer, there was a community, in a county that is on the Alabama State line, whose soil had been completely worn away; its richness was gone, its productive value destroyed, as the result of continual plantings of cotton, peas, and corn. In that little community there lived about 60 families. They had worn out the soil by repeatedly using it for the same crop, but without the use of fertilizer. They had worn the soil to the point where it almost refused to respond. The bolls of cotton were small. The stalks puny. The return for the work put forth was hardly worth the effort, and finally many of the younger members of the families in the community moved away and sought work in the surrounding towns or in the industrial East. There 10 or 12 years ago, stood dilapidated houses and fallen-down fences.

Finally a forward-looking and well-instructed young farm demonstration agent happened to come to that county and became particularly attracted to this little community. He met some people there in whom he saw something and whom he liked, and he saw the immediate response from them when one day he began timidly to offer suggestions upon what might be done respecting farming. He taught the people the use of fertilizer. They built up their soil. They gave up the one-crop-a-year system. They may still grow some cotton there, but they grow all kinds of crops. The farmers built up the soil in the community and thereby built up the community itself. The soil now produces as abundantly as almost any soil in that section, and that represents pretty good production. The homes have been painted and the fences rebuilt. A church has been built. Everything seems to have taken on a new sparkle, and there is great enthusiasm and interest among the people. More than half the farmers of the community have paid income taxes within the past few years. That is one thing that the movement for free fertilizer did in my State.

Mr. President, I am not in favor of putting the Government into the fertilizer business or any other kind of business. I abhor such a thing. The bill provides for a 5-year plan. It provides for the building of a pilot plant at Mobile, Ala., which is in close proximity to the natural deposits of phosphate in Florida, and close to waterways on which it can be hauled by barge much more cheaply than by rail or otherwise. As I stated, it would be close to the natural deposits of phosphate of which it would make use. There might perhaps be another pilot plant built in the Middle West or at some other point. The program is purely an educational one. It provides that free demonstration may be had on not to exceed 2 percent of the farms in any one county. The farmers are to be selected by a local committee, through the university extension service of the land-grant colleges. No one is to profit by it. It is simply for taking the demonstration to these small farmers and letting them actually see how the program operates and see with their own eyes what the use of fertilizer will do when it is applied to corn, potatoes, cotton, or any other crop.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am glad to have heard the explanation given by the Senator from Tennessee of the program being carried on in the South. I was glad to hear his description of farming in the South. I think a great many people do not understand exactly how crops are grown. For example, some may think that cotton grows without any effort on the part of the cotton grower. If they were to study the growing of cotton in the South, they would find, as the Senator has told us, that many farmers in the South have tried to raise cotton year after year on the same piece of land, without rotating crops. The result has been that in a great many instances the farmers have been obliged to discontinue the production of cotton. The same is true of watermelons. Many Senators have bought watermelons. Some watermelons may look very good, but when they are cut open they are found to be lacking in sweetness. Why is that so? It is because the farmers have tried to grow watermelons on the same piece of land year after year, without any crop rotation. The farmers have now found that to grow the best watermelons other crops must be rotated on the land, because if watermelons only are grown on a piece of land, they will soon lack sweetness.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me on that point?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I should like to say to the Senator from South Carolina that I myself bought such a watermelon the other day, and am now glad to know what the trouble with it was.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If the watermelon was not sweet, it was probably due to the fact that there was no rotation of crops on the piece of land on which the watermelon was grown. Those who have bought watermelons which were sweet may know that the producer knew the proper way to produce watermelons. What is true of watermelons, of course, is true of all other crops. The provision of the bill we are now discussing does not, in my opinion, go far enough. The people of the United States have just begun to be educated along the lines of proper agriculture. If the program now in operation should be cut off, not only the farmers but the people of the Nation as a whole, will suffer.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me so I may ask the Senator from South Carolina a question?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that when a watermelon is grown on depleted soil, soil from which most of the top is gone, in which real plant food no longer exists, the melon not only lacks the sweetness which gives to it a delightful and delicious taste, but it lacks nutrition. It lacks the minerals which should be in the watermelon to give it food value for the proper growth and sustenance of the body. Is that not true?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is entirely correct.

Mr. HILL. The Senator knows that there are many doctors and scientists who believe that one reason why there is today such a rapid increase in many diseases is that our soil has been depleted of certain minerals, of certain plant food content, and therefore our bodies are not receiving the minerals, the food they need. As a result of the lack of proper plant food the human body develops certain diseases.

The people of Deaf County, Tex., have little or no caries in the teeth, no decay of their teeth. Why? Because the

soil of that county contains the minerals which when taken into the body prevent decay in teeth.

Mr. President, we know something about the remarkable mules raised in Missouri.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me so I may make a correction in the statement of the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I wish to say to the Senator from Alabama that the county in question is Deaf Smith County.

Mr. HILL. I am glad to be corrected. It is true, is it not, that the people of that county, by reason of the minerals contained in its soil, do not suffer from tooth decay?

Mr. O'DANIEL. That is true.

Mr. HILL. We know that Missouri has contributed much to the production of mules. We know what Kentucky has contributed in the way of fine horses. The State of Tennessee also produces fine mules and horses. The reason is the plant food contained in the soil of those States. That illustrates the need for the proper topsoil and the proper fertilizers which provide the needed minerals for animals and human beings. Does not the Senator from South Carolina agree that my statement is true?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is true, Mr. President.

Mr. HILL. So proper care of the soil is fundamental to the life and happiness of our Nation. Is that not true?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator's statements are entirely correct. To prove what it has meant to my State, in the past 10 or 15 years the farmers there have gradually gotten away from cotton, until today they make as much from tobacco as they did from cotton 10 years ago. Furthermore, the farmers of my State have engaged in peach growing. They have found that certain soil close to the Piedmont region of my State is well adapted for the production of the finest of peaches, firm peaches that can stand shipment. This is no reflection on the State of Georgia, but last year Spartanburg County, S. C., alone shipped almost the same number of carloads of peaches as were shipped by the entire State of Georgia.

I mention that fact to show the value of diversification. A study should be made of our soil. No one knows what can be done with it. It is there for us. God gave it to us. If we do not protect it, and if we permit it to be washed away, we shall suffer from such neglect.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for his very fine contribution. I also thank the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for his contributions and observations. He particularly pointed out that the finest horses in America, or anywhere on earth, are grown in Kentucky and Tennessee. That is by reason of the fact that we have limestone and bluegrass. The limestone produces the bluegrass, and the bluegrass, in turn, produces the best horses on the face of the earth. So Nature has shown us the way. Nature has given us an idea of what it means to put in to the soil fertilizer which has nutritive value.

The bill provides, among other things, for the establishment of a pilot plant at Mobile, Ala. It provides for a 5-year program. At the end of 5 years the pilot plant will be sold to private industry. That provision shows the good faith of those of us who sponsor the bill. We do not want the Government in business. If we can get the bill out of committee, I propose to offer an amendment further to clinch the purpose of keeping the Government out of business—fertilizer or otherwise. I propose to offer an amendment that if no private purchaser appears at the end of the 5-year period, when the plant is to be offered for sale, it shall be turned over to the War Department and held in stand-by condition, or used by that Department. A fertilizer plant can be converted into a munitions plant almost overnight.

The bill further provides that the United States Department of Agriculture shall be charged with the enforcement of its provisions. I do not see why all the private fertilizer concerns of the country are not 100 percent behind the bill. It is purely an educational program. At the end of 5 years there would be built up a fertilizer market which would be far beyond the ability of the fertilizer industry to supply.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator have any feeling that this kind of policy might eventually nationalize the fertilizer industry?

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator mean that it might lead to Government operation of the business?

Mr. LUCAS. I mean the Government taking it over completely.

Mr. STEWART. No. This sort of program could not be carried on by private industry. It could not be successfully carried on by the various States, because State programs would not be uniform. There is not enough money, incentive, or imagination in all the private fertilizer industry to conduct such a program. It is Nation-wide. It applies to every State in the Union.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the bill to which the Senator is referring would be a great boon to the fertilizer industry?

Mr. STEWART. A moment ago I made the remark that within 5 years' time the people would become so educated to the use of fertilizer that the private fertilizer industry would not be able to supply the demand.

Mr. HILL. Is not that shown by the fact that the fertilizer industry has had far greater sales of fertilizer in counties and sections where the TVA has demonstrated the value of high-grade fertilizers?

Mr. STEWART. Yes; that is undoubtedly so.

Mr. HILL. This demonstration has been carried out to show the great value to the owner of the farm of the use of high-grade fertilizer. All the other farmers living in the community, the section, or the State in which such demonstrations are carried on see the benefits. They see what happens as the result of the use of fertilizer, and naturally they are stimulated to buy fertilizer. The largest sales in the fertilizer industry have been in sections and counties where test demonstrations have been carried on.

Mr. STEWART. I have not seen any figures as to the sales of fertilizer in various sections of the country; but there is no question that this program is purely educational. The small farmer, who is himself unable to learn scientific methods of fertilization, can be educated in no better way than by conducting a demonstration almost at his front door, showing him year in and year out throughout the 5 years of the program what the value of fertilizer is when applied to his corn, wheat, potatoes, or whatever crop he grows. The result of this educational program would be to make the country fertilizer conscious to an extent never before known.

Dr. Bennett, the greatest soil conservationist in the country, says that each year sees 500,000 acres of land turned back to nature, turned back to become wilderness, because its top-soil is washed away by soil erosion, and because other things destroy its productive value.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am particularly impressed by Senate bill 1251, not only because of the number of Senators who are sponsoring it, but because it seeks to stop the rapid rate of depletion of soil fertility, which has been accelerated during wartime production, and for other reasons. The depletion of our soil gives me great concern, and causes me to feel alarmed. I am led to believe that perhaps there is something in this kind of a program when I see that the bill is sponsored by such able Senators as the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the majority whip [Mr. WHERRY], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and my good friend the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON]. Certainly it cannot be said that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is a flaming liberal who wants the Government to go into business. I do not believe that the majority whip, the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], could be charged with wanting the Government to go into business in competition with free enterprise.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator cannot charge me with it.

Mr. LUCAS. The distinguished chairman of the Agricultural Committee [Mr. CAPPER] cannot be charged with that sort of an idea. Neither could my friend from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] be charged with being a New Dealer. Neither could the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] be charged with it.

I do not think that even the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] could be charged with being a flaming liberal.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The name of my friend from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is on this bill. He is rated as one of the progressive Senators and has a wonderful record as a progressive. It might be said that he leans a little in that direction at times. But the amazing thing is to find as sponsors of the bill all these other Senators, who have, since they have been in the Senate, continually denounced, condemned, and criticized the Government of the United States for encroaching upon free enterprise and competing with the free economy of the country. The New Deal, so-called—whatever it may be; no one has ever explained it to me, but it has been much talked about—has been charged over and over again with attempting to regiment everyone and take over everything and finally become a dictatorship.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAPEHART. I was wondering whether the able Senator from Illinois was addressing his remarks to the able Senator from Tennessee or to the Presiding Officer of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is receiving the full benefit of the remarks.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Chair for agreeing with me. I think it is very kind of him to overrule——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is very magnanimous.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Chair for overruling the apparent point of order made by the Senator from Indiana.

I was merely making a statement. I do not see why my good friend from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] should be disturbed about this, because I am sure that if the sponsors of the bill had invited him——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Illinois will permit an interruption, let me say that the Senator can be heard much better if he faces the other way.

Mr. LUCAS. I recognize that, but apparently both the Chair and the Senator from Indiana heard me, judging by the remarks they have made. But I can return to my seat, where I belong, under strict parliamentary rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not hear what the Senator said.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, is that the reason the Chair refused to rule on the point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the idea.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that. The Chair apparently did not hear the Senator from Indiana, either.

I was talking about the distinguished Senators who are the sponsors of the fertilizer bill referred to by the Senator from Tennessee; and it may be that the Senator from Indiana feels a bit slighted because he was not invited to become a sponsor. He comes from a great agricultural section of Indiana. I am sure that if the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] had asked the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] to become one of the sponsors he would have joined in the introduction of the bill, because we of the Midwest need a great quantity of fertilizer to take care of our rich soil which is gradually being depleted and eroded away.

When I was interrupted by the Senator from Indiana, I think I had just spoken about the able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD]. I hope the Senator from Tennessee will not leave the Chamber.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I was only testing the acoustics.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator. I thought perhaps he was going to try to convince the Senator from Indiana that he ought to join in the sponsorship of the bill. If that is his mission, I shall be glad to yield what little time I have left for that purpose.

But, in all seriousness, Mr. President, undoubtedly the able Senators who have advocated a certain philosophy in past years must realize the vital importance of this kind of a bill or they would not have permitted their names to go on a measure which would put the Government of the United States for the next 5 years into direct competition with the fertilizer industry.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I must object to that statement. That could not possibly be true. The reason it could not possibly be true is because the demand is already 10 times as great as the output.

Mr. LUCAS. I may be incorrect about that, and the Senator from Tennessee may be right. The point I am making is this: If it does not put the Government into competition, it does, for the first time in my experience in Congress, and, so far as I know, in the Nation's history, provide for the Government's entering whole heartedly into a program to spend approximately $36,000,000 in such a program. That may be good business. I might eventually be in favor of this program, but at this time I am in doubt. I am only stressing the importance of it because of some of the individuals who are the sponsors of it. I am talking about the Republican Senators who have criticized over and over again any governmental activity competing with private enterprise. They are in the majority now, and are sponsors of this bill which the Senator is so ably discussing. That is the point I wanted to make. I thank the Senator for the time he has yielded to me. I might be with him in the final analysis if the bill is ever brought to a vote.

Mr. STEWART. I am glad to hear that. I think we can do a little missionary work with the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I always like to talk with missionaries.

Mr. STEWART. It is a missionary bill. It is for the purpose for reaching out and educating those persons who need to know about the value of fertilizer. The great State of Illinois has soil which is extremely high in productivity and in its ability to produce the great crops which are so essential to mankind. Perhaps the Senator's State does not need fertilizer as do those States which are farther South.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say to the able Senator from Tennessee that I do not take that position at all, because there is not an acre of farm land in America today which could not stand more fertilizer of some kind.

Mr. STEWART. That is just the point. I did not mean to interrupt the Senator, but that is one of the points in this fertilizer program. The use of fertilizer is becoming more and more of a scientific proposition. Different classes of soils require different classes of fertilizers. I am not speaking as an expert; I am speaking as one who has been advised by experts, those who know. There is no doubt that the great State of Illinois, like the great State of Indiana, and the great State of Iowa, and other States which we sometimes refer to as constituting the Nation's "bread basket," have some of the finest soil upon the face of the earth. Those States have attracted farmers from the South in years gone by. They have moved to those States. There are many farmers in Iowa who have gone there from Tennessee because of the fine natural richness of the soil in the State of Iowa. The same is true with respect to other States. There is a fertilizer for each type of soil that needs fertilizer at all; and that applies to practically all soils. There is a lesson to be learned, so the scientists tell us, by every man who sticks a plow into the soil for the purpose of producing foodstuffs for the Nation's use. That is why this bill was introduced. It proposes a national soil-fertility program. There are not sufficient private funds to establish such a program. It is a national responsibility. We put up to the farmers of the Nation the responsibility of seeing that they receive the benefit of scientific knowledge which is available and awaits only an opportunity to be carried to them. It has been stated that $8,000,000 or $9,000,000 would be required to construct a private fertilizer plant, and that $16,000,000 a year would be required to maintain this program. If I thought for a moment that it would put the Federal Government into the fertilizer business, in competition with private industry, I would not support the program. However, the fact is that every ton of fertilizer which would be manufactured by the proposed pilot plant and a dozen others like it, if we had them, would not scratch the surface, so far as the need for fertilizer throughout the Nation is concerned. Under this proposal, authority is also given for the purchase of fertilizer from private concerns, for the purpose of carrying on this educational program, which will carry the demonstrations of the use of fertilizer into every State of the Union, and eventually into every community—in short, carry it, if I may borrow a phrase from the other side of the aisle, to the

grass roots. Mr. President, I like that expression.

I was provoked by the Senator from Illinois into discussing for a little while the fertilizer program, the soil-fertility program provided by this bill. However, I rose to discuss a somewhat kindred subject, namely, whether we shall continue this year to pay the full amount provided in the agricultural appropriation bill, as recommended by the Senate committee for the soil-conservation program, and whether next year, indeed, we shall appropriate any money for that program. I wish to observe that it seems to me we are standing almost upon the threshold of becoming fertilizer conscious, conscious of the importance of maintaining the fertility of our soil; yet it is proposed to cripple the program which would carry out that development; it is proposed to cripple it by refusing to appropriate any money for it in 1948, and even to reduce the appropriation for this year.

A moment ago I quoted Dr. Bennett, who says that each year half a million acres of land go out of production because the topsoil washes away, and thereafter the soil will not produce. Under such circumstances, Mr. President, it will not even yield sufficient foodstuffs for a tenant family to live on, much less to sell at a profit.

Certainly we have a great responsibility to the farmers of America. Many years ago we embarked upon this soil-conservation program. To abandon it now, at a time when the whole world is crying for food, at a time when the breadbasket of the United States, the rich middle section of our country, has literally been gutted by floods and the rich productive portion of that land has been washed away, would be to give evidence of appalling and extreme shortsightedness. So I hope that will not be done. I hope every Member of the Senate will vote to instruct the conferees on the part of the Senate to remain steadfast in their insistence that this amount of money shall be appropriated for soil conservation for this year and next year.

ARMY REMOUNT STATIONS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, for a great many years the War Department has been engaged in raising horses, and has used former military reservations as the sites for that program. It is called the Remount Service. I think there have been four remount stations throughout the United States, one at Front Royal, Va.; one at Fort Reno, Okla.; one in Texas, as I recall; and one in either Colorado or Nebraska. The War Department has decided that it has no further use for horses as a major component of the armed services as the Army has become mechanized. So the War Department desires to get rid of these remount stations.

In the last Congress, I introduced a bill providing for the transfer of the Fort Reno military reservation, at that time a remount station, to the Department of Agriculture, and then to direct the Department of Agriculture to subdivide the land, which constitutes approximately 10,000 acres, into small tracts and thereafter to dispose of them to ex-servicemen, under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. During the last Congress the War Department was not willing to approve that bill, and was not certain, so it stated in its report, but that it would have further use for the Fort Reno military reservation, which at that time was a remount station.

But in the present Congress the War Department has gone on record as being through with these remount stations, and has recommended that the Congress enact legislation transferring to the Department of Agriculture the four remount stations, which formerly were military reservations.

The House of Representatives has passed a bill authorizing and directing such transfer. The House bill provides that the Department of Agriculture shall engage in a program of producing horses, not draft horses, but lightweight horses. As I construe the word "lightweight," it means, riding horses, show horses, polo ponies, jumping horses, race horses, palomino horses, as I believe they are called, and Shetland ponies.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am glad to yield.

Mr. THYE. How can we justify a program for the production of so-called saddle horses, and how can we justify placing that program under the Department of Agriculture, when we might well conduct experimental breeding and management projects in relation to draft horses, swine, and cattle? Personally, for the life of me, I cannot understand how we are justified in carrying on such a program under the Department of Agriculture, now that there is no longer a military need for the remount service.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I thank the Senator for his contribution. From his statement, I take it that he is opposed to this program. Naturally, from my statement one would be justified in concluding that I, likewise, am opposed to the program.

Mr. President, if it is desired to raise horses in Texas and to experiment with horses for riding purposes and for the purpose of supplying horses for hunt clubs, riding clubs, race horses, trotting horses, show horses, and Shetland ponies, I have no objection, but I do not want that done in my State. There is on the Fort Reno Military Reservation some good land, much of which is now planted to alfalfa. In an average favorable year, it produces from three to five cuttings a year. It is fine bottom land. In addition, there is some upland which is very fine for the production of wheat.

The land on this reservation is adjacent to a highly improved concrete road. At the present time the land is served with a water system, and likewise is served with a natural-gas system and with a high-power electric line. It is ideal for subdivision into small tracts for the benefit of ex-servicemen. In my State there are a large number of ex-servicemen who are disabled in one way or another. Already they have made application for small tracts of land on this reservation, where they can establish a home. For instance, they have applied for 5 acres or perhaps 10 acres, tracts sufficiently large to enable them to build a cottage, to have a garden, and perhaps to have a place to raise a few chickens and perhaps a cow.

They are receiving compensation, and on small tracts such as these, upon which they can obtain Federal loans, they can locate and establish homes in a subdivision ideally situated to serve that class of our unfortunate population.

In the House of Representatives, the Armed Services Committee reported the bill, which is known as the Case bill. As I have said, it proposed to authorize and direct the War Department to turn the four reservations over to the Agriculture Department. After the Armed Services Committee found that the War Department wanted to get rid of these reservations, and to turn them over to the Agriculture Department, the Armed Services Committee of the House recommended that the bill be referred to the House Committee on Agriculture for study and report. That was done, and the House Committee on Agriculture submitted a report.

I have no objection to the creation of these glorified ranches for the production of horses, but after listening to the eloquent address of the Senator from Tennessee, I am of the opinion that it would be a mistake to try to produce horses anywhere in the United States, or in the world, for that matter, outside the State of Tennessee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I will add Kentucky to my last remark.

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not rise in order to put in any claim for Kentucky. It speaks for itself; therefore it is not necessary for me to emphasize its prominence in the breeding industry. I admit frankly that I know nothing about the Fort Reno situation; I do not know enough about it to vote intelligently on whether it should be turned over to the Agricultural Department for horse breeding purposes, or divided up for agricultural purposes, but I was interested in the description the Senator from Oklahoma gave of the kind of horses which were to be produced there—polo horses, and various kinds of useless animals, according to the Senator's description. But having had some experience, over a long period of years, both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate in regard to the Remount Service, I wish to call attention to the fact that when we were appropriating money for the Remount Service, at the time of the complete mechanization of the Cavalry, it was for the purpose of encouraging the production of thoroughbred horses. Whether they were to be used for riding purposes in the cavalry, or whether they were to be used for the pulling of vehicles of war, such as cannon, or wagons, or whatever else they might be used for, the War Department found that it was advantageous to have produced a sort of a panel of thoroughbred horses, from which they

could select the horses which were to be in the Remount Service of the Cavalry.

I do not know whether it is correct, as the Senator has indicated, that this Remount Service or similar service would be used for the production of only light saddle horses or race horses. I doubt that very much. The Remount Service has not, as I understand, been designated or equipped for the producing of race horses. But I think that, from an agricultural standpoint and from any other standpoint, where the use of horse flesh is desirable, the thoroughbred horse has his place, and has had a place not only in the past in the Cavalry, but the thoroughbred horse has his place as a superior animal in any function which horses are expected to serve.

While, as I have said, I know nothing about this particular matter, I would not want the impression to be created that the thoroughbred horse, the production of which constituted the program of the remount service of the Army, is not a superior horse wherever you put him, whether you ride him or drive him, or hitch him to a wagon, or whether you hitch him to a gun, or cannon, or anything else. He is a superior animal, and he works well anywhere he is put. I know of no reason why the breed of horses should be deteriorated in this country merely because the remount service of the Army no longer exists or because the cavalry, as it used to be known, has been mechanized.

Mr. President, I wanted to make this differentiation.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I appreciate the suggestion made by the Senator from Kentucky, and I do not disagree with him in any particular, but I shall state the facts as reported by the War Department. In their report on the bill just mentioned the War Department states that the need for horses in military operations has virtually disappeared. Further on in the report the Department states that it cannot justify the expense of maintaining these four remount stations. It costs about $2,500,000 to maintain them. So the War Department is getting out of the horse-producing business and is turning the lands over to any other department that wants them and can get them from the Congress. The Senator from Kentucky made a rather light reference, as I understood, to the designation of the kind of horses to be produced by this new Federal activity.

The bill now being considered by the Senate recites that it is directed to the "improvement in the breeding of horses suited to the needs of the United States."

In the next line it defines the kind of horses to be produced, and this is the language used in the bill, "for use in fairs, shows, and other events, or otherwise." So, Mr. President, it is proposed to produce show horses, horses to be exhibited at fairs.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. As the Senator has just read, they are to be used as show animals at fairs and for exhibit. The fact of the matter is that now all kinds of breeds are shown in fairs and in exhibits. Insofar as developing a breed of horse is concerned, whether it be saddle or harness horses, any of the lighter breeds, it might be even a quarter horse, I say there is an ample number of breeders throughout the Nation, in addition to the experiment stations, in the various States, which are carrying on that type of breeding, or research, we will call it, or experimental work.

Again I would say that, in my opinion, a bill which would propose to transfer this activity from the military, or the Army, to the Department of Agriculture, and continue that expense, is not good legislation. I just read in one of our State papers that a man flew a mare from Egypt to the State of Minnesota, an animal that cost him $10,000. If he cared to do that and could afford to do it, and finds it profitable to do it—and I know the gentleman would not be so engaged unless it were profitable—for the life of me I cannot see that the Congress should appropriate any Federal funds to carry on such research or such activities in the breeding of one specific type of horse.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I again thank the Senator for his contribution. I repeat that I have no objection to the transfer of the reservations in the other States to the Department of Agriculture, if the Senators and the Representatives from those States want the transfers made for the purpose of producing race horses, riding horses, hunting horses, palominos, and Shetland ponies, but those are all light-weight horses; they are not draft horses. The bill provides the Department cannot go into the breeding of draft horses. They are producing horses for show purposes, or to be run in races.

If I were a cartoonist I would have a cartoon produced tomorrow morning showing Uncle Sam having a horse entered in the golden-cup race in New York, or perhaps at Pimlico, or some of the race courses around Washington. I would show Uncle Sam participating in all sorts of horse activities. That is what the bill provides.

Mr. President, I do not want that to happen in my State. In preference to the production of horses and taking care of horses, I would have the Government take care of ex-servicemen in the State of Oklahoma. As I have said, there is an ideal place there for a subdivision, a tract containing in the neighborhood of 10,000 acres of as good land as could be found in my State, already equipped with a water system, natural gas, and good roads. The land will produce alfalfa, wheat, corn, anything that will grow in Oklahoma. I want to see that land in my State turned over to the Agriculture Department, because this matter is handled by the Agriculture Department under the Farmers Home Administration, to subdivide the land into tracts of suitable size, and to make such tracts available to ex-servicemen not only of my State but of the country, for whom it would be an attractive place for a home. It would be something that would set a precedent to be followed by other States, in the way of taking care of disabled soldiers especially, as well as other soldiers.

The bill to which I refer was passed by the House, introduced in the Senate, referred to the Committee on the Armed Services, and was reported by that committee. It is now on the calendar. I had a bill pending before the same committee, which is related to the Fort Reno Reservation. The War Department reported that they had no objection to the transfer to the Agriculture Department; so they are out of the picture. The committee referred my bill to the Department of Justice, because the Department of Justice has, on a corner of this reservation, a modern Federal reformatory for youthful offenders. When the bill was referred to the Department of Justice, the Attorney General suggested he would like to have a little more land immediately adjacent to the Federal reformatory, to be added to the reformatory, so as to afford opportunity to the inmates of Fort Reno Reformatory to work out of doors and to produce something worth while. So I have no objection to the Department of Justice taking what land they want from the Fort Reno Reservation and adding it to the Fort Reno Reformatory.

The bill was then referred to the Agricultural Department, and at that time, a month ago, the Agricultural Department was in accord with the program. The original bill provided for the separation of the land or the dividing of the land into family sized units; of the better land, say, to give a soldier 80 acres; of the poorer land, to give him, perhaps, 120 or 160 acres. But when the bill finally went to the Department for a report, the Department suggested they should have a leeway to divide the land into still smaller units. So I took the two recommendations of the Department of Justice and the Department of Agriculture and embodied them in an amendment pertaining only to the Fort Reno Reservation, first, giving the land that the Department of Justice wants to the Department of Justice for the reformatory and, second, authorizing the Department of Agriculture to subdivide the tracts into smaller areas, so they could accommodate more soldiers.

I have discussed the matter with the Senator from Oregon, who reported the bill. On one or two occasions the bill has been called up, but passed over. I am trying to work out a program for the best interests of the country, but I think in my State the best interests of the country and the best interests of the public and of the ex-servicemen especially would be served by permitting them to subdivide the land for the use of veterans, instead of devoting the particular tract to the breeding of horses for a class of people who are able to buy their horses, or are able to go into that business themselves, if they want to.

Mr. President, at this point, in order to carry out the suggestion I have been trying to make, I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to introduce a simple Senate resolution. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point, in connection

with my remarks, and that it lie upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 155), submitted by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, was ordered to lie on the table, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is pending on the Senate Calendar H. R. 3484 (Calendar No. 365) being a bill proposing "to transfer the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture"; and

Whereas said bill proposes to transfer title to some four military reservations to the Department of Agriculture for the express purpose, as stated in the bill, the "improvement in the breeding of horses suited to the needs of the United States"; and

Whereas it is provided in said bill that the horses shall be used "in fairs, shows, and other events or otherwise"; and

Whereas the War Department in reporting on the said bill stated "that the need for horses in military operations had virtually disappeared", and, further, that the maintenance of the horse-breeding program has become an expense which they do not feel can be justified or defended"; and

Whereas the report submitted by the House on said bill states that the maintenance of said remount stations for horse-breeding purposes cost the Government in the 1947 fiscal year the sum of $2,177,225; and

Whereas the Agriculture Department reports that it will be necessary to have an annual appropriation of about $850,000 for the operation of the said Remount Service as provided in the said bill; and

Whereas after the Committee on the Armed Services in the House of Representatives had made a favorable report on the said bill (H. R. 3484), requested the House Committee on Agriculture to give consideration and to submit a report upon the program outlined in the said bill; and

Whereas there is now pending in the Senate Committee on Armed Services a bill (S. 718) proposing to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to transfer the Fort Reno Military Reservation, heretofore having been used as a remount station, to the Department of Agriculture, and, further, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to subdivide the land embraced within the said Fort Reno Military Reservation into proper sized units and to thereafter dispose of such land units to ex-servicemen under the provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (50 Stat. 522, 60 Stat. 1062); and

Whereas the Secretary of War reported to the Senate Committee on Armed Services that it had no objection to the enactment of the said bill (S. 718); and

Whereas the Department of Justice reported to said committee on the said bill (S. 718) that such Department was in need and desired to acquire a portion of the said Fort Reno military reservation for use in connection with the Federal reformatory now located and being operated on a portion of such reservation; and

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture reported on said bill (S. 718) urging an amendment to the effect that the lands instead of being divided into large tracts should be subdivided into small acreage lots to better accommodate disabled soldiers by making available an additional number of such home sites; and

Whereas when the said reports were submitted to the said Senate Committee on Armed Services such recommendations were embodied in a single amendment and such amendment, embracing the recommendations of the Department of Justice and the Secretary of Agriculture, is now pending in the Senate as an amendment to the said H. R. 3484; and

Whereas the Secretary of War having reported that the War Department has no further use for the lands embraced in the several military reservations and, further, in view of the fact that the Agriculture Department is to receive such lands and to make use of same: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate, That prior to the passage of said bill H. R. 3484, it be ordered referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture for consideration and report upon the advisability of entering upon a program for "the breeding and production of light horses for use in fairs, shows and other events or otherwise", which means the breeding and production of riding, polo, show, running, trotting and jumping horses for show and recreational purposes instead of using the land for homes and farms of ex-servicemen.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think it is proper at this point in the RECORD to file a reply to the statements made by the Senator from Oklahoma, because I think the point should be made that the Armed Services Committee, by unanimous vote, opposes the position taken by the Senator from Oklahoma in regard to his bill and, I think, for very adequate reasons. I think there is a great deal of misunderstanding in regard to the Remount Service and the program for transfer of it to the Department of Agriculture. I think the Senate should keep in mind the fact that the remount stations, or breeding farms, have been built up over the years, and there is a substantial Federal investment in the remount stations. There are a great many farmers, and, may I say, primarily farmers and stock raisers in this country, who have come to rely upon the program of the remount stations. As my file will disclose, these stock raisers throughout the country are very much concerned about the danger of a liquidation of this Government program. Of course, in essence what the Senator from Oklahoma is proposing is that insofar as the Oklahoma station is concerned it be liquidated. That station is the most important and the most substantial of all the remount stations in the country. The Senator speaks in regard to a veterans program. May I say that there are a great many veterans who are very much interested in the continuance of the remount service.

This is not, as I think it may have been intimated in certain remarks by the Senator from Oklahoma, this is not a program devised for recreational purposes or pleasure purposes primarily. These remount stations have been very instrumental in changing completely the quality and the type of the American stock horse. Of course, on all of the cattle ranges of the country the stock horse is still a very important working animal. The Federal Government, through this breeding program, has bred up and improved the quality of the American stock horse and light farm horse.

One of the principal functions of the remount service is not only the breeding experiments that are carried on in the stations themselves, but the loaning out of stallions to farmers in all sections of the country. Scattered throughout the country are the many Government remount stallions. I remember that it was a year or year and a half ago that the Senator from Tennessee and I were instrumental—in fact we took the initiative—in having brought to this country, when the time was appropriate, a considerable number of horses that were captured by the American Army, principally Arabian and German thoroughbreds. These horses of great value have been kept for the most part in the Front Royal Remount Station in the State of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. The stallions out of this group of imported horses are being scattered throughout the country to the various remount stations, and then to individual farmers who want to keep them on their farms for breeding purposes. So the issue presents itself as to whether we should dispense entirely with the remount service and liquidate the program, or whether the program should be transferred to the Department of Agriculture. Sometime ago negotiations were entered into between the Secretary of War and the Secretary of Agriculture. They worked out a program in a bill which was introduced in the Senate, and a companion bill, in the House. In the Senate bill, we have as cosponsors Senators, may I say, who are familiar with the contributions made by this service to American farmers—the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from North Daktota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and myself, introducing the bill. The Senators are well aware of the desires and demands of farmers and horsemen for continuation of this program.

Now, let the record be perfectly clear on this next point: At a time prior to an understanding that an attempt would be made to transfer the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture, and at a time when the Secretary of Agriculture was under the impression that the whole program was going to be liquidated, the Department of Agriculture wrote a letter to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] in regard to his bill. Agriculture Department officials pointed out to me in their letter, which might be interpreted as a then approval of the bill of the Senator from Oklahoma was written before the Department of Agriculture had entered into the negotiations for the transfer of the service. However it is now the position of the Department of Agriculture and the Secretary of Agriculture that they are opposed to the Senator's bill, because they very rightly take the position that if the transfer is to be made, then certainly the Department of Agriculture should not be denied the most important of all the remount stations, and the station which comes the nearest to being a self-sustaining station. The Oklahoma station is the largest and the most important of all the stations, and it is a station which produces an exceedingly large quantity of hay for the servicing of the remount program.

I want to make perfectly clear that when the Secretary of Agriculture first wrote to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate in regard to S. 718, the bill introduced by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], he did not give an unqualified indorsement of the bill. In fact his letter made very clear that he was not giving an endorsement of the bill when the Secretary of Agriculture stated as follows:

In view of the possibility of the transfer of this function to the Department of Agriculture, and since the Department has had no opportunity or occasion to survey the activity or to determine the scope of the program if the function should be transferred, we are unable at this time to make a definite recommendation regarding S. 718. However, it is known that the Fort Reno Reservation is an important unit in the Remount Service, and, we believe, its retention should be given serious consideration.

Later when it was decided that an attempt should be made to pass legislation which would transfer the Remount Service from the War Department to the Agriculture Department the officials at the Agriculture Department took the position, and rightly so, that if the Department of Agriculture was to assume the responsibility for the Remount Service, then all of the remount stations should be transferred to it, including the one at Fort Reno, Okla.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD at this point a copy of a letter addressed to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, by the Secretary of Agriculture, which letter makes clear that even when S. 718 was first presented to him for consideration and when it was then believed that the Remount Service might be liquidated the Secretary of Agriculture did not endorse S. 718.

There being no objection, the letter from Secretary of Agriculture Anderson was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 19, 1947.

Hon. CHAN GURNEY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in response to your request of March 3, 1947, for a report on S. 718, a bill to provide for the disposition of lands comprising the Fort Reno Military Reservation in Canadian County, Okla.

Section 1 of the bill directs the transfer of certain specified lands to the Secretary of Agriculture. Section 2 directs that all of the lands transferred, except the lands to be granted to the city of El Reno, Okla., under section 3, which are suitable for farming purposes, shall be divided into economic family-sized units of not more than 200 and not less than 80 acres, and sold in a manner consistent with the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended.

The lands comprising the Fort Reno Military Reservation are presently being operated as a remount service depot of the Army in the development of light horses for military purposes, being one of four such depots. These four depots, together with four area headquarters and a supervisory unit in Washington, comprise the present Army Remount Service.

As you are no doubt aware, there is no provision in the War Department 1948 budget for continuing the Army Remount Service, and there has been some discussion regarding the transfer of this Service to the Department of Agriculture for continuation as a horse breeding program as an aid to agriculture. In fact, bills (H. R. 2868 and S. 1034) were recently introduced to accomplish this.

In view of the possibility of the transfer of this function to the Department of Agriculture, and since the Department has had no opportunity or occasion to survey the activity or to determine the scope of the program if the function should be transferred, we are unable at this time to make a definite recommendation regarding S. 718. However, it is known that the Fort Reno reservation is an important unit in the remount service and, we believe, its retention should be given serious consideration.

In the event that your committee desires to give consideration to such bill at this time, we would like to suggest for your consideration the following matters:

As drafted, the provisions of the bill might make it impossible to sell any of the land described therein to disabled veterans in less than economic family-type units, whereas section 1 (c) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, provides, in part, that loans may be made for the acquisition of less than economic units "to veterans who have pensionable disabilities to enable such veterans to acquire, enlarge, repair, or improve farm units of sufficient size to meet the farming capabilities of such veterans and afford them income which, together with their pensions, will enable them to meet living and operating expenses and the amounts due on their loans."

Section 2 of the bil' contains direct authority for the sale of all lands transferred which are suitable for farming and which can be subdivided into economic family-sized units. Conceivably, some of the lands to which section 2 is applicable may not be suitable for farming or there may be some tracts of land which cannot properly be attached to the economic family-sized units established. Authority should be provided for the disposition of such odd tracts as cannot be disposed of under the pattern of the bill. There may be need for authority to sell some building salvage material separate from the land on which the buildings are located. Such authority is provided in section 43 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act with respect to the subdivision and sale of personal property and economic family-type farm-management units of lands formerly comprising the resettlement projects and projects for rural rehabilitation. Section 43 (d) of that act provides that real and personal property comprising such projects determined by the Secretary not to be suitable for use as family-type farms shall be disposed of at public or private sale at the best price obtainable for cash or for credit with at least 20 percent cash and the balance in five equal annual installments. It would also be helpful in the servicing of credit sales under the act if the other provisions of title IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, could be made applicable to these lands.

Section 1 (b) (2) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, defines a veteran for the purposes of that act as a person "who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during any war between the United States and any other nation, and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable." The Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, defines a veteran as "any person in the active military or naval services of the United States during the present war, or any person who served in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who has been discharged or released therefrom under honorable conditions." The bill provides for the preferential disposition of family-sized farms to veterans as defined in the Surplus Property Act for the period from the date of enactment of the bill to and including June 30, 1949. It would be simpler of administration if the definition of veterans in the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is used rather than the definition in the Surplus Property Act of 1944.

The foregoing suggestions could be accomplished by the revision of section 2 of the bill to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. All lands transferred pursuant to section 1 of this act, except that portion specified in section 3 of this act, shall be disposed of by the Secretary of Agriculture as expeditiously as possible in a manner consistent with the subject to the terms and conditions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (50 Stat. 522, 60 Stat. 1062), and otherwise administered in accordance with said act: *Provided*, That during the period from the date of the enactment of this act to and including June 30, 1949, all sales of such lands pursuant to the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, shall be only to veterans as defined in section 1 (b) (2) of said act."

Section 43 (b) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, which would be applicable under the foregoing language contains specific authority to make loans to the purchasers if appropriations are made therefor by Congress. The last sentence in section 2 of the bill would therefore be unnecessary.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Let me complete my statement and then I shall be glad to yield to my good friend from Minnesota.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the Department of Agriculture, as I understand, takes the position that we are here dealing with land in Oklahoma which from the standpoint of soil conservation can best be used for the purpose to which it is now being subjected. It should not be broken up into small farms. That part of it which is subject to cultivation can best be used, in the interest of soil conservation, for hay land. It would be a great mistake to cut this land up into small parcels to be used for general farming purposes because in a period of an exceedingly dry spell it would be very damaging to the soil to have it used for small-farming purposes.

If Members of the Senate will take the time to investigate this matter they will find that there are many people in Oklahoma who are familiar with the Fort Reno station who agree with officials in the Department of Agriculture that this land should not be broken up into small farms. Just today I received a letter from a very prominent community leader in El Reno, Okla., who is very much opposed to the attempt which is being made to break up the Fort Reno Remount Station into small farms. The following paragraphs are excerpts from this letter from a prominent citizen of El Reno, who, I am satisfied, is thoroughly familiar with the problems raised in S. 718. He writes as follows:

The local paper, the El Reno American, stated last week that you were investigating

the disposal of Fort Reno Remount Depot. It is gratifying to me that a man like yourself will investigate the merits of the case.

The fact is that nobody in this country who loves the soil or knows anything about farming wants this land plowed up. There are about a thousand acres already plowed which could be sold for $250 per acre. The rest, about 9,000 acres, is the finest native grass in this part of the country. It would be a crime against the future generations to plow up this land. It is sandy, we call it "sugary," and melts like sugar when there is no grass on it. The Government spends millions reclaiming land, and why turn more to waste and allow it to wash down the rivers?

Not more than 50 fair sized farms could be made out of it and not more than 20 farms that would afford a living compared to what a man has in town who draws $250 per month salary.

El Reno wanted the hospital building out there and the chamber of commerce asked Senator THOMAS to help them get it. He said he would provided they helped him parcel out the land to veterans.

If a deal could be made with the Agriculture Department whereby El Reno got the hospital and three or four residences and the Agriculture Department got the rest, it would be a wonderful thing for the future of farming and the future of this county.

I want to repeat Mr. President, that no confusion should be allowed to develop in this debate as to whether or not the Department of Agriculture does or does not approve of S. 718. I have been reliably informed by officials in the Department of Agriculture that they do not approve of S. 718 and one of the main reasons they do not approve of it is they agree that it would be a great mistake from the standpoint of soil conservation to plow up the thousands of acres of the Fort Reno Remount Station for general farm purposes.

Both the War Department and the Department of Agriculture initiated reports on S. 718 before the problem came up transferring the Remount Service. I have learned from each of them that originally there was no serious objection to the provisions of S. 718 if the Remount Service was to be liquidated. However, that was before the Department of Agriculture investigated the nature of the land which S. 718 sought to have transferred and turned into small farms for general farming. The Secretary of Agriculture indicated in his report on S. 718 that if the Remount Service were to be transferred to the Department of Agriculture it should come in its entirety. The Fort Reno depot is considered to be an important segment of the remount program, perhaps the most nearly self-sustaining unit in the program. Furthermore, if the Fort Reno station were liquidated as provided in S. 718, I am told there would be great difficulty in operating the breeding program in the Southwestern States. It seems to me that States from Kansas south probably offer the greater need and justification for a light horse breeding program. The Fort Reno station is thus nearly the most important station in the whole program.

While the two Departments concerned prepared qualified favorable reports on S. 718 before the remount transfer became a factor, both Departments now feel that if the remount program is to be continued it is essential that the four depots now maintained by the War Department be transferred to the Department of Agriculture. I understand further, that both Departments indicated this in their formal reports to the committee.

There might be some justification to cutting up this station into family sized farms if the land were suitable for such purposes. However, this land is better suited for pastures and livestock production than it is for plowland. In any event we know it is a good remount station and I feel you should have such a station in the Southwest if we continue this program.

As to the hospital site, I believe this could best be negotiated between the local officials and the Secretary of Agriculture. From my experience they are usually pretty cooperative in leasing or otherwise making available property which is not fully needed if some municipality or other governmental unit has a better use for the property. I have checked to see what the Department's attitude would be and I am assured that there is no reason why an agreement cannot be reached for the use of the hospital building by the city of El Reno. S. 718 is not needed to accomplish that objective.

I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the junior Senator from Oregon how we could justify the recommendation and the enactment of legislation which would transfer a strictly military activity, as the Remount Service was in the days of the cavalry and the artillery horse, to the Department of Agriculture, and then continue the experimental and the breeding activity in a light breed or a saddle-horse type of breed, when there are the other important breeds in the country, such as any of the draft breeds which might be mentioned, and when there is a great cattle industry, which is so important to the economy of our Nation?

Would we likewise be justified in setting up a breeding program which would be comparable in every detail with the various other types of horse breeds as well as the cattle breeds? I feel that if we are to conduct such an activity simply for the saddle type of horse we should extend it into the other breeds. That is my conviction.

I think we are trying to continue something which is a sort of a fad, and carry it on as a fad, and for the benefit of a few people. I love horses, and I ride, and I should enjoy being able to ride oftener, but I cannot see that we should continue this activity in the Department of Agriculture simply for the sake of those who are interested only in the saddle-horse type.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Minnesota is wrong on several points in connection with his remarks. In the first place, I think he is wrong when he takes the position that this has been primarily a military operation or a military service. It has not been that, I may say to the Senator from Minnesota, for a considerable number of years, because the cavalry has not played an important part in the American Army for a great many years. Most of the horses which have been developed under the Remount Service for a great many years have not gone into the Army at all. They have gone onto the ranches of the country, and they have been developed for farm use and developed for the benefit of the ranchers of the country. So we are not seeking to continue something which up until now has been solely a part of a military program. It has not been that for a great many years. In fact it never was solely a military service but a dual military and farm service. The Federal Government, acting through the Army, has decided for a good many years, that because of the investment we have in the program this service should be continued for the benefit of the farmers and the horsemen of the country.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. With respect to the remark made by the Senator from Oregon that this is a service which should be continued for the benefit of the rancher or the farmer, the fact of the matter is that the Remount Service was not known to very many farmers throughout the Nation except to those who happened to be near a remount station. When we were on our way to Mexico we had the good fortune of attending a conference at the King Ranch in Texas, and there we saw hundreds of mares with colts at their sides. The King Ranch has conducted a very extensive breeding research activity both as to the quarter horse and as to the harness horse, as well as the type of saddle horse that would be well adapted to the ranch country. In Arizona and other Western States there is extensive horse breeding, and the breeders have in no sense relied upon the Remount Service, as that was, to begin with, strictly a military operation and a military activity. As we swung from the horse to the mechanized military activity, the horse Remount Service continued to operate, but was the forgotten arm, it might be said, of the military activity until someone called attention to the fact that we were spending much money for the Remount Service when we no longer used the horse either for the cavalry or the artillery.

Mr. MORSE. I never like to argue over a question of fact, because facts are so easy to determine. I wish to point out that the Senator from Minnesota is simply wrong on his facts. For a great many years the Remount Service has located a great many stallions throughout the country on the farms of the country for breeding purposes in the farm communities. They have located those stallions, until only recently, at fees of $10. Recently the fees have been increased to $20. The Federal Government has made available to the farms of the country at those low fees blood lines that could not be made available to our farmers if they were dependent upon such private horse-breeding farms as the Senator from Minnesota has referred to. Why? Because on those farms the stud

fees run from $50 up to $500. The stallions are not available to the small farmer and the small rancher because of the high fees. So the Remount Service has been a dual-purpose service of making possible the development of half-breed cavalry horses, making such horses available to the Army when the Army needed them, and also making them available to the farmers of the country, as well as to the stockmen and horsemen of the country. That service has been of outstanding value to our horse breeders.

The fact that the Senator from Minnesota has not familiarized himself with the number of remount stallions which have been located throughout the country over the years, and the use made of them on the part of the farmers, of course, only raises a question of fact as to his knowledge as to whether or not this service has been of value to the farmer. All he has to do is to go into the record of the controversy and he will find the extreme use which the farmers and the stockmen throughout the country have made of the Remount Service. Let us consider, for example, the State of Oklahoma itself. I am sure the Senator from Oklahoma will find, if he goes among his horsemen, that his horsemen do not at all approve of the liquidation of this great horse-breeding program which the Government has carried on. Letters are beginning to be legion in opposition to this attempt, Mr. President, to liquidate the program.

The Senator from Oklahoma seems to be under the impression that the horsemen and farmers of his State who have and are making use of the Federal Remount Service do not object to his bill. I am satisfied that if he will make adequate inquiry he will find that right in his own State of Oklahoma there is a great deal of opposition to his bill.

He will also discover that in the entire Southwest there is a great deal of opposition to his bill because if the Fort Reno Remount Station is liquidated the horse-breeding industry in the entire Southwest will suffer from the liquidation of this very important remount station.

I can well understand why the Senator from Oklahoma may think that he is performing a service for the city of El Reno by his bill but the city of El Reno is not entitled to any special right in the Fort Reno Remount Station because it belongs to all the people of the country and it should be disposed of in the best interest of the entire country rather than in a manner which may meet the demands of some local group. The fact that the Senator from Oklahoma may not be interested in the continuation of a sound and much-needed horse-breeding program is my justification for the Senate of the United States turning over to a few citizens or to one city in Oklahoma a remount station which is of great importance to farmers and horse breeders in the entire western country and particularly to the farmers, ranchers, and horse breeders in the great Southwest.

I repeat that S. 718 is not necessary in order to secure for the city of El Reno and for the Department of Justice the reformatory and hospital sites which the Senator from Oklahoma seeks to accomplish in his bill. I am assured by officials in the Department of Agriculture that once the Fort Reno Remount Station is transferred to the Department of Agriculture satisfactory negotiations can be consummated between the Department of Justice and the Department of Agriculture in regard to this particular matter.

I submit such a course of action should be followed rather than permit complete liquidation of the Fort Reno Remount Station, which, obviously, is the intent and purpose of S. 718. From the standpoint of soil conservation alone the bill offered by the Senator from Oklahoma should be defeated because the record of this case shows that the land within the boundaries of the Fort Reno Remount Station is not suitable for the small farm use.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that I am in thorough sympathy and accord with all he has said about the importance of the remount stations. They have meant much to our farmers, and the Government has been putting the horses out, as the Senator said, for a fee of $10, thus improving the strain of horses. If turned over to the Department of Agriculture the horses would not be limited necessarily to cavalry horses or race horses. The Department could develop any breed of horses they thought would be for the good of the country.

Mr. President, I have never visited the remount station in Oklahoma, and am not prepared to challenge the statement of the Senator from Oregon that it is the finest one in the United States. Has the Senator from Oregon visited the remount station at Front Royal in Virginia?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; I have. My statement is that the Oklahoma station is the largest, has the greatest acreage, and is the nearest to being a self-sustaining station.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I shall not challenge that statement, but the Senator from Oregon will bear me out when I say that the station at Front Royal is well equipped, from the standpoint of stables and barns and housing facilities; and the 5,000 or more acres of bluegrass country there are very fine for horse-raising purposes.

Mr. MORSE. It is an excellent station.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I will say further to the Senator that last spring the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Anderson, visited the Front Royal depot; and after returning he told me that he was very favorably impressed, and that if that depot were turned over to him by the War Department he would take great pleasure in operating it. Am I to understand that the Department of Agriculture does not want to take over any of the remount stations?

Mr. MORSE. The Department of Agriculture wants to take over all of them. The Secretary of Agriculture takes the position, in opposition to the bill of the Senator from Oklahoma, that if the Remount Service is to be transferred to the Department of Agriculture it should be transferred to the Department in its entirety, and that we should not lop off, as the Senator's bill proposes to lop off, the most substantial station of the whole lot, and turn it over, under the Senator's bill, to certain groups in Oklahoma. The question is whether the Secretary of Agriculture should get all the stations and then work out with the Senator from Oklahoma and the Department of Justice—as he is sure can be done—an arrangement as to the use of some of the property by the Department of Justice for hospital and reformatory purposes.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I am not familiar with the situation in Oklahoma, but I want to tell the distinguished Senator from Oregon that we do not want the Front Royal station eliminated. We want that station continued, and we would welcome legislation which would make that possible.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the Senator from Virginia. I now yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. With respect to the demand for horses in my State, I think I am fairly familiar with conditions in my State. The farmers in Oklahoma, particularly those raising wheat, have discontinued the use of horses. They are using tractors and other mechanized equipment. It is very unusual to find a team of horses or mules in Oklahoma. As soon as the factories are permitted to produce sufficient quantities of mechanized equipment, horses and mules will be found to be still more scarce than they are at the present time.

However, there is a demand in Oklahoma for a certain type of horse. That is the type which cowboys use. We still have some ranches in my State, and the small horse is still used for cowboy riding purposes.

There is also quite a demand in my State for the breed of horses used in the rodeos. I am not in favor of commencing the production of rodeo horses and that character of horses in my State. Those who want that class of animals can procure them from Virginia or from Texas.

Mr. President, this issue did not arise until recently, when the Horse Breeders' Association located in the southwestern part of the United States heard about this bill. They decided that they wanted these lands preserved for the production of horses.

I have no objection to the program in Virginia or the program in Texas, or the program in Nebraska and Colorado, if those programs are desired in those sections. But, so far as the production of horses in my State is concerned, I want to take care of the ex-servicemen in the way they want to be taken care of.

If the Senator from Oregon will yield for one further statement, the Senator dwells upon facts, and I am sure that facts should be governing where they are applicable. During the war the War Department purchased a vast number of horses. It purchased approximately 15,000 and brought them to Fort Reno Military Reservation. Those horses

cost, on the average, $168 apiece. When the War Department was getting out of the horse-production business it had a big sale at Fort Reno, and sold 15,000 horses at an average price of $65. I am not for that kind of business management. If that is to be the activity of the Department of Agriculture, I do not want it to go into that kind of horse-production business.

Mr. MORSE. In reply to the Senator from Oklahoma, I wish to say that there is a demand for this station in his own State and throughout the Southwest. Mr. President, I was in the process of covering the points raised by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. He points out, and quite rightly so, that the Department of Agriculture does not carry on breeding experiments in connection with other animals, be they draft horses, cattle, swine, sheep, or what not. That is quite true. But we have no investment at stake in regard to long-established breeding programs in connection with such animals. However, we have a good many million dollars invested in this remount program, which has been built up historically over the years. The horsemen and farmers of the country have come to rely upon it. I do not think it is sound rebuttal to argue that because someone wants to continue a program in which we now have an investment, such a proposal should be opposed because we have never started a similar program in connection with other livestock.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I do not like to prolong the debate on the question of the Remount Service, but I know of several horse markets, and I happen to know the prices paid for ordinary good draft horses, which will indicate the interest there is in the horse-breeding program. In the past few years I have seen some well-matched young teams sold for $150. For that reason very few men are breeding any type of horse except a light harness horse or a saddle horse. If the Senator and I were to be governed by the investment feature, then we should have to continue the military part of the program and the two-ocean Navy because we happen to have an investment in them.

The Army activity in the Remount Service is a thing of the past, because the tank and the automobile have replaced that type of military activity. Therefore it has come to an end, so to speak. If we transfer it to the Department of Agriculture, we shall be looking for a use for that particular Service, rather than curtailing the activity, selling out, and taking what money there is in the property and the livestock.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think there are two obvious weaknesses in the argument advanced by the Senator from Minnesota. The first is that at no time was the Remount Service a program for the breeding of draft horses. It has always been a program for the breeding of saddle animals. Hence, his discussion of draft horses is irrelevant to this debate.

I think the second weakness in his argument is that he has quite overlooked the fact that there is still a great need for saddle horses. He is overlooking the fact that the program has always been a dual-purpose program—first, for the development of cavalry and artillery horses for the Army, and second, for the improvement of the saddle horse for the farmers. They are not pleasure horses. On a stock ranch good saddle horses are essential work animals.

The Senator from Oklahoma refers to the rodeos. The horses which are being developed in connection with our Remount Service are primarily working horses under the saddle for use on the stock ranches of the country. Cattle cannot be herded with tractors, jeeps, or automobiles. That job cannot be mechanized. We shall continue to need a large number of good stock horses so long as we have large ranches.

It seems to me that it is rather important, from the standpoint of preserving the blood lines of our best horses in this country, that we do not throw aside and cast away the great experimentation which has been carried on for many years by our Remount Service. For example, our Remount Service has preserved the blood lines of one of the greatest American breeds of horse—the Morgan horse. What are we to do with the Government-owned Morgan horse farm? Is it proposed to liquidate the Government-operated Morgan farm now located in Vermont?

We have a great deal of money invested in the development of the American Morgan horse. It has been done by the Government; and if it is not continued by the Government the program will be a loss.

Some years ago there was turned over to the Federal Government the Kellogg Arabian farm, which is a part of the Government horse-breeding program. In this country the Arabian horse has been developed to a higher degree than in Arabia itself, through the scientific breeding carried on by our Remount Service.

What are we going to do with it—liquidate it and throw it away? No. I say, Mr. President, we have an investment in the Remount Service which we should continue. The bill offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] should be defeated. The Remount Service should be transferred to the Department of Agriculture. I am assured by the Department of Agriculture that it can work out a satisfactory arrangement with the Department of Justice as to the reformatory. Thus let the Senator from Oklahoma and the Department of Justice work out through negotiations with the Department of Agriculture a transfer of that part of the Oklahoma station which is needed for the Department of Justice for hospital and reformatory purposes. But the remount station project itself ought to be kept intact in order to help to sustain and support the Remount Service.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have certain material on the Remount Service bill incorporated in the RECORD at the close of the remarks on the subject which I made a few minutes ago.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., May 20, 1947.

Hon. CHAN GURNEY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in reply to your request of April 3, 1947, for a report on S. 1034, which provides for the transfer of the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture, effective July 1, 1947.

This Department does not now provide breeding service for any species of farm animals, although animals occasionally are placed with cooperators, through State experiment stations, to obtain breeding data. Transfer of the Remount Service would constitute a precedent in this respect. Several other countries, however, maintain government studs for the improvement of horses as well as other livestock.

There is an increasing demand for light horses for use on farms and ranches and for recreational purposes, and it is desirable that there be a continuing program for the improvement of light horse breeds for such purposes. Such a program will also provide an additional source of income to farmers and ranchers.

The breeders with whom stallions are now placed are permitted to charge a breeding fee not to exceed $20 per service and retain all such fees as part of the cost of maintaining the stallions. It may be that any action to require the return to the Federal Government of any part of the breeding fees or of any increase in breeding fees authorized for the purpose might result in decreased breeding operations and decreased colt crop. Moreover, the costs of collecting and handling any such portions of fees might be prohibitive and the amount collected might be insignificant compared with losses to farmers in replacement of light horses for agricultural purposes. However, serious consideration will be given to possible means of making the program partially self-supporting.

In order to obviate possible difficulties in the administration of this program, it is suggested that the following language changes be made:

Line 6, page 2: Immediately following the words "United States" change the semicolon to a comma and strike the balance of section 2 and insert in lieu thereof, the following: "the acquisition by purchase in the open market, exchange, hire, or donation of breeding stock and necessary land, buildings, and facilities, the use of horses in the improvement of the supply of horses available in agriculture, the demonstration of the quality and usefulness of horses through participation in and lending for use in fairs, shows, and other events, or otherwise, the loan, sale, or hire of animals or animal products through such arrangements and subject to such fees as are deemed necessary by the Secretary to accomplish the purposes of this act, and, in carrying out such program, the Secretary is authorized to cooperate with public and private organizations and individuals under such rules and regulations as are deemed by him to be necessary." This change is required to enable this Department effectively to carry out the program contemplated by this act. The last sentence of the present section 2 is not necessary in view of the provisions of 3617, Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 484), which requires the deposit

of all receipts into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Line 18, page 2: Change "veterinarians in the Medical Corps" to "officers in the Veterinary Corps of the Medical Department." We understand this to be the proper name of the agency referred to.

Line 21, page 2: Strike the last sentence of section 3 and insert in lieu thereof: "Notwithstanding the limitations contained in existing laws, retired officer personnel of the War Department, if employed by the Department of Agriculture for the purposes of this act only, may receive in addition to their retired pay civilian salary to the extent that the total from both sources does not exceed the pay and allowances received by such persons in the permanent grade last held by them prior to retirement."

It is felt that the provision with regard to employment of retired personnel of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps is too far-reaching and should be limited to officers with experience in the Remount Service, who, of course, would come only from the War Department. The language of the bill, as introduced; and the suggested changes would merely authorize this Department to utilize such retired experienced officer personnel, probably not in excess of 12, as may be required to carry on the program in the Department of Agriculture. No special provision is required for retired enlisted personnel with experience in the Remount Service, as, under present law, they can be employed and receive both civil and military retirement pay.

If this activity is transferred to the Department of Agriculture it is estimated that an annual appropriation of about $850,000 would be required for its operation, including $628,000 for personal services and $222,000 for other objects. It is our understanding that the War Department estimates total costs of this activity for the fiscal year 1947 at $2,177,225, including $965,275 for civilian personnel, $448,000 for pay and allowances of military personnel, and $763,950 for other objects of expenditure.

Passage of the bill with suggested changes is recommended.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely,

N. E. DODD,
Acting Secretary.

AMERICAN REMOUNT ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., June 12, 1947.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: H. R. 3484, covering the transfer of the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture, a slightly revised version of Hon. FRANCIS CASE's original bill, H. R. 2864, and your own bill, S. 1034, was recently reported favorably by the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, with the concurrence of the House Agricultural Committee and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. It is believed the bill will pass the House shortly.

Knowing of your interest in the Army horse-breeding plan we venture to ask whether you could not find it possible to keep a watchful eye on the bill when it finally reaches the Senate so that it may not be unduly delayed in committee. The time is very short as action by both Houses of Congress must be completed before June 30, to prevent War Department liquidation of the Remount Service.

We feel certain that the many hundreds of breeders, large and small, in the State of Oregon, who for more than a quarter century have depended on remount sires for their supply of horse replacements, will gratefully appreciate any service you feel you can render them in connection with this matter.

Thanking you in advance, we are,

Cordially yours,

ALVORD A. CEDERWALD,
Secretary-Treasurer.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
GRAZING SERVICE,
Burns, Oreg., June 18, 1947.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing you for information as to the status of the Remount Service and as to what the organization may be if it is taken over by the Department of Agriculture.

My work here has given me an opportunity of knowing first hand the service that the Remount has rendered to our Oregon stockmen and I surely hope that your fine efforts to continue it will be successful. I went through Remount Training School under Col. E. G. Cullum in the First World War. He was later chief of the Remount Service and is now retired in New Mexico. I commanded the Three Hundred and Fortieth Field Remount Squadron and after the armistice sold many of the American horses to the Allies at the American embarkation center at Lemans.

* * * * *

Very truly yours,

KENNETH C. IKELER.

BURBANK, CALIF., *June 25, 1947.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

On behalf California State Horsemen's Association and our 15,000 individual members permit me to congratulate you upon approval your remount bill per your wire today, and it is our hope that adequate personnel will be provided to assure continuance of the breeding program enjoyed by the people for the past 25 years and now invaluable to the light-horse industry of the United States.

HAMILTON MCCOY,
President.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Walla Walla, Wash., April 23, 1947.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The agriculture committee of the Walla Walla Chamber of Commerce is extremely interested in the continuance of the remount program, and regrets that the Army has seen fit to announce its withdrawal from that field. We have been advised, however, that you and others have introduced a measure which provides for the continuance of the program under the direction of the Department of Agriculture, and we want you to know that we are in support of that program and hope that it will be successful. There are four remount stallions located in the Walla Walla Valley at the present time, and these have had a great deal to do with improving the stock of horses in this area.

If there is anything we can do to further your participation in this program, please feel free to contact us.

Respectfully yours,

ARTHUR COX,
Chairman, Agricultural Committee.

FRENCHGLEN, OREG.,
April 21, 1947.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I have been informed that there is a move under way whereby the Army Remount Service is to be discontinued. Heretofore, there was a proposal that they make a transfer from the Army to the Department of Agriculture and that the Department of Agriculture at this time seems to want to bypass the issue. This, as I understand it, would entirely eliminate the Army Remount Service, which, as I see it, would be entirely unfair to our horse breeders of America, due to two reasons:

It would have a tendency to eliminate the breeding of high-class horses, as we may date back to the time before this service was rendered by the Government and consider the type of horses that were being used both commercially and by the Army, as compared to the type of horses we have today.

Also, the expense the breeder has gone to in meeting the requirements of the Army Remount Service for the care of the stallions, together with the investment that the breeder would have in the right type of brood mares and his breeding plant. That he would have to carry on such an operation would certainly be very much of a disappointment as such breeders are depending largely on the continuation of this service.

At any rate, I personally think that the breeders should have a voice as to whether or not the interests they have in the matter should be entirely disposed of by an outright liquidation of the Army Remount Service.

Very truly yours,

J. B. FINE.

OREGON TRAIL ASSOCIATION,
Baker, Oreg., April 19, 1947.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: At the meeting of the Baker Cow Horse Association last evening, the directors went on record favoring the transfer of the Remount Service from the Army to the Department of Agriculture, as set forth in your speech before the Congress of the United States on April 2, 1947.

They are particularly anxious to see this service continued and would like very much to have a remount station established in Baker County.

They urge your continued support of Senate bill 1034 and also shall appreciate any assistance you might be able to give us in securing a remount station in this county.

Thanking you in advance, we are,

Yours truly,

BAKER COW HORSE ASSOCIATION,
W. A. GILDERSLEEVE, *President.*

UNITED STATES SENATE,
April 15, 1947.

Hon. CHAN GURNEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am writing to express my interest in S. 1034 to authorize transferring to the Department of Agriculture certain remount depots which the Army no longer needs.

For many years to come our farmers will need good horses and the production of thoroughbreds is likewise a valuable source of income to many farmers. The Department of Agriculture is peculiarly fitted to carry on essential research work in this field as well as to make available to farmers at reasonble prices some of the best blood lines in the country.

I hope therefore that your committee will favorably report S. 1034 at an early date in order that legislative action on the proposed transfer may be accomplished before July 1.

With best wishes, I am

Faithfully yours,

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *April 6, 1947.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Fifteen thousand members of California State Horseman's Association commends your stand championing cause of horse per January 27 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Fraternity of horsemen recognizes no State limit because you are a practical horseman and a champion of what the horse stands for. California horse people are looking to you for leadership in opposing any move to liquidate or impair operation of Army remount program as currently organized and operating. This program is vital to thousands of breeders, owners, and users in Western States. It must be continued. Your assistance and a report of your activities will be appreciated.

Capt. HAMILTON MCCOY,
President, Colifarnia State Horseman's Association, Burbank, Calif.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, that the Senate further insist upon its amendment, and request a further conference with the House thereon.

Mr. LUCAS obtained the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, some time ago, when the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] had the floor, he yielded to me and I had an opportunity to express my sentiments in opposition to the proposed reduction by the House of certain conservation payments. For the RECORD, Mr. President, I merely want to take the time of the Senate for a few moments to state that I am in such thorough accord with the position of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] with the agricultural appropriation bill that I wanted to call the attention of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] to the one thing above all others which I hope will not be overlooked, and that is the veterans' program under the so-called Bankhead-Jones law.

A little more than 2 weeks ago, Mr. President, the RFC extension bill was before the Senate, and it was necessary for the conferees of the Senate on both sides of the aisle to give in most reluctantly to those of the House in the matter of abolishing RFC financing of second mortgages in connection with the purchasing of homes by veterans. I might say to the Senator from Illinois that the record will show that a great many of those mortgages were discounted by the smaller banks throughout the rural sections, thus making it possible, by utilizing those funds, for veterans to obtain homes. The Senate had to give in to the House conferees in the abolishment of that section of the RFC Act, or there would have been no RFC at all on July 1. So I sincerely hope, in view of the fact that the agricultural appropriation bill is rather indefinite in time, that the Senator from Illinois and the other distinguished Senators will not give in to the provision of the House bill which prohibits the financing of farm mortgages and farm homes under what is known as the Bankhead-Jones Act.

I also wish to join with other able Senators in the hope that the school-lunch program will be continued, as has been so ably urged by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and other Senators. I hope we shall have a record vote on these three all-important questions, which mean so much to the rural life of America.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have been in the Congress approximately 12½ years. During that time I have been a member of the Agricultural Committee either of the House of Representatives or of the Senate. Coming directly from the heart of what we call the Corn Belt section of Illinois, it must be obvious to anyone that I would be tremendously interested in any program affecting agriculture. As the owner of farm lands in that section of my State I have from the very beginning taken a keen interest in the program of soil conservation which was given to us in the early days of the Roosevelt administration.

Mr. President, to me it is utterly unbelievable that in view of what history shows with respect to the natural erosion of land, as well as accelerated erosion through the advance of civilization, either branch of the Congress of the United States should utterly fail to recognize the possibilities and the dangers that lie ahead in soil erosion by failing to provide anything in the way of soil-conservation payments for the year 1948. It is said by some Members of the Congress, and other persons, that, because of the fact that the farmers of the Nation are financially better off than they have ever been before in their entire history, they do not want this kind of a program.

This program should not be considered in the light of the AAA program. This soil-conservation program means exactly what it says. Under this program we shall not be paying the American farmer for doing nothing.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wish to ask the Senator a question. When he said the farmer is better off, I assume the Senator means the farmer is better off to the extent of a few dollars. But his land is not better off.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. His machinery is not better off.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct, and I thank him for correcting me, if I left the wrong impression. I mean to say that today the farmers of the United States have more money deposited in the banks and they have more cash on hand than they have had at any time in the history of agriculture, notwithstanding the taxes and other high costs the farmers have to pay.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thoroughly agree with the Senator; but at the same time the farmer cannot convert those dollars into fertilizer, material, farm machinery, or any of the other things which will be needed for the future farms and are the future farmers of America. That is what I understood the Senator to talk about, in discussing the program for 1948.

Mr. LUCAS. Precisely so. However, I am discussing the soil-conservation program as a whole. I state with considerable emphasis that I cannot understand how Members of Congress who are thoroughly acquainted with the soil-conservation program and with the history of land utilization before the inception of that program can even consider writing off the soil-conservation program for 1948.

I repeat what I said a moment ago, namely, that the argument has been made that many farmers in the United States are opposed to the soil-conservation program. One of the reasons which is stated is that many of the farmers have their land in proper condition for maximum production, and consequently they believe that the soil-conservation program will result in the Government's paying to them money which they should not rightfully receive. I wish to refute that argument with facts which come from a reliable source. They come from a farm survey which was taken in various congressional districts in the United States. The distinguished chairman of the House of Representatives Appropriations Committee, Representative TABER, has a number of farmers in his congressional district. The agency which made the survey sent to Mr. TABER's district 267 cards. One hundred and forty-seven cards were returned, which is 55 percent of the total amount sent out.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. When we are discussing this bill on the floor of the Senate, if we are to undertake to discuss certain Members of the House of Representatives, I think the Senate is entitled to know who made the survey and whether it is the same survey which Mr. TABER said was made by the Limestone Association.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. BROOKS. Is it the same one?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes. I was going to tell the Senate who made the survey. I presume it is a correct survey. If it is not, and if Mr. TABER has answered it in any way or if anyone else wishes to answer, I suppose that will be done. I do not know any member of the Limestone Association.

Mr. BROOKS. I may say that this matter has already been discussed in considerable detail in the proceedings and debates in the House of Representatives.

Mr. LUCAS. I did not follow the debates in the House, and I do not know about that. Perhaps there are other Senators who have not read that part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. So regardless of that I shall present the matter at this time.

As I have said, 267 cards were mailed, and 147 were returned. Out of the 147 returned, it was shown that 8.1 percent of the farmers recommended the

discontinuance of the program, 4.8 percent recommended the Budget Bureau cut, and 87.1 percent of the farmers recommended the continuation of the program without any cut.

Into the district of my good Republican friend EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois, 413 cards were sent; 48 percent were returned, 2.4 percent of the farmers recommended the discontinuance of the program, 4.4 percent recommended the Budget Bureau cut, 93.2 percent recommended the continuation of the program without any cut.

In Representative AUGUST H. ANDRESEN's district in Minnesota the number of cards mailed was 463; the number of cards returned, 221, or 47.5 percent of those that were sent out. Of the farmers recommending discontinuance of the program, the chart shows 3½ percent; farmers recommending the Bureau of the Budget's cut, 3.6 percent; and the farmers recommending continuation of the program without any cut whatever, 93.3 percent.

The survey was made by the National Agricultural Limestone Association, Inc., and it was sent, I presume, to every Member of the Senate. I am not sufficiently familiar with the organization to vouch for it. Obviously they are in the business of selling limestone, and therefore they would like to see this program continued. But I doubt very much that any national organization would risk its reputation by sending out information of this kind to United States Senators unless it was authentic information.

In addition to the poll I have quoted I can speak personally about the matter, because I have heard from and talked with a good many farmers in my section of the country about the program. I also interrogated farmers who appeared before the Agriculture Committee recently on other matters, about this very thing. The farmers of the Nation, irrespective of their wealth, irrespective of how they may feel about other matters, have given me to understand that they entered into the program in good faith, and when under the law of the land enacted by the Congress, they understood that the soil-conservation program would continue through 1947 and 1948, they made plans accordingly on their respective farms throughout the Nation. They are expecting Uncle Sam to live up to that obligation. To me that is the most important thing of all, because if the people of the United States, the agricultural population, interested in soil conservation, lose confidence in the Congress of the United States by reason of its failure to carry out a solemn pledge, enacted into law, I can think of nothing worse, because free government can continue only as long as the people have confidence in their representatives. What is needed in these trying times is more faith in the Congress of the United States. The door should always remain open so as to admit greater confidence by the people of the country in the Senate and House of Representatives. To accept the House version of soil conservation is absolutely impossible.

Mr. President, as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture I helped write the soil-conservation program. I was a Member of the House of Representatives when it was passed. It is an important program. It is a program that under no circumstances can be discontinued—the action of the House of Representatives to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. President, I desire to discuss briefly the history of the purposes and accomplishments of the agricultural-conservation program. I go into the history of the program, because I see a movement in this Republican Congress to discontinue for all time to come the soil-conservation program and the Soil Conservation Service.

The basic legislation authorizing the agricultural-conservation program is contained in the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act approved February 29, 1936. The purposes of this act as stated in section 7 thereof are, first, preservation and improvement of soil fertility; second, promotion of the economic use and conservation of land; third, diminution of exploitation and wasteful and unscientific use of national soil resources; fourth, the protection of rivers and harbors against the results of soil erosion in aid of maintaining the navigability of waters and water courses and in aid of flood control; and, fifth, reestablishment, at as rapid a rate as the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be practicable and in the general public interest, of the ratio between the purchasing power of the net income per person on farms and that of the income per person not on farms that prevailed during the 5-year period August 1909 to July 1914, inclusive, as determined from statistics available in the United States Department of Agriculture, and the maintenance of such ratio.

Mr. President, what surprises me is that the men in the Congress of the United States who represented agricultural districts, men who should have been interested in soil conservation, totally failed to offer any constructive legislation to protect the lands of the country from erosion, through the advance of civilization and through natural forces, prior to 1936. It seems unbelievable, when we are fully aware of what is happening every day and when we know what has happened to nations in the past, that the statesmen of yesterday would have failed to recognize the potential power of human destruction in soil erosion.

Mr. President, the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act was amended by the Agricultural Adjustment Act in 1938. Section 2 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 contains a statement on the policy of Congress with respect to the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. This statement is as follows:

> It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to continue the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, for the purpose of conserving national resources, preventing the wasteful use of soil fertility, and of preserving, maintaining, and rebuilding the farm and ranch land resources in the national public interest; to accomplish these purposes through the encouragement of soil-building and soil-conserving crops and practices; to assist in the marketing of agricultural commodities for domestic consumption and for export; and to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, and rice to the extent necessary to provide an orderly, adequate, and balanced flow of such commodities in interstate and foreign commerce through storage of reserve supplies, loans, and marketing quotas, assisting farmers to obtain, insofar as practicable, parity prices for such commodities and parity of income, and assisting consumers to obtain an adequate and steady supply of such commodities at fair prices.

Since 1936 the agricultural-conservation program has been in effect in all 48 States. During these years the program has been instrumental in obtaining a tremendous increase in conservation farming. The use of lime has increased from 5,000,000 tons in 1938 to 21,000,000 tons in 1945, a gain of 300 percent.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator has been discussing the conservation program. I merely wish to state that the figures respecting lime, as read by the Senator, are eminently correct. The program which has been carried out is appreciated by the farmers, particularly of the Southeast. The distribution of lime through the conservation program has so greatly improved their lands that I do not believe words could describe the beneficial effects to the lands in the entire Southeast, which have always been so short of lime.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for his valuable contribution.

The use of phosphate and potash on cover crops, pastures, and grass and legume seedings increased from 400,000 tons in 1938 to 2,400,000 tons in 1945, a gain of 500 percent. Green manure crops to add organic matter to the soil and cover crops to prevent erosion and leaching increased from 11,000,000 acres in 1938 to 18,000,000 acres in 1945, a gain of 64 percent. Contour farming, one of the most effective methods of controlling erosion on sloping land, increased from 4,500,000 acres in 1938 to 10,000,000 acres in 1945, a gain of 126 percent. The teaching of farmers how to farm sloping land so as to keep the land from eroding, is one of the most constructive acts which have been accomplished under the soil-conservation program.

Field strip cropping to prevent wind erosion increased from 711,000 acres in 1938 to 6,000,000 acres in 1945, a gain of 755 percent. The building of stock ponds for range livestock in order to bring about better management of range resources increased from 41,000,000 cubic yards in 1938 to 93,000,000 cubic yards in 1945, a gain of 125 percent.

Mr. President, I have a table showing the extent of certain practices carried out under the agricultural-conservation program for the years 1936 through 1945; also a statement showing, by program

years and fiscal years, the funds available for the agricultural-conservation program. I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated at this point in the RECORD the tables, which afford much explanation of the program.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Selected soil-building and range-building practices carried out, United States 1936–45 agricultural conservation programs

Practice	Unit	Program year									
		1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945
Application of materials:											
Liming materials (basis standard ground limestone)	1,000 tons	3,720	5,026	5,026	5,795	12,008	13,530	18,972	19,030	28,848	21,338
Do	1,000 acres	2,219	3,284	3,481	4,141	7,696	8,283	10,765	11,182	13,844	11,570
Phosphate materials (basis 20 percent P_2O_5)	1,000 tons	203	401	397	510	749	909	1,073	1,873	1,949	2,401
Do	1,000 acres	1,468	2,570	2,993	3,837	5,746	7,077	8,092	17,063	14,957	19,606
Mulching	1,000 tons	43	153	335	221	332	278	272	342	205	216
Do	1,000 acres	19	66	144	93	134	115	118	206	138	121
Potash (basis 50 percent K_2O)	1,000 tons	43	62	12	8	9	13	34	82	----------	119
Do	1,000 acres	504	833	390	226	296	323	906	3,802	----------	5,496
Gypsum (basis 18 percent sulfur)	1,000 tons	(1)	3	19	27	62	69	94	99	298	594
Do	1,000 acres	1	14	96	138	266	413	246	641	724	631
Green manure and cover crops	do	5,773	8,010	11,143	11,627	12,664	14,494	17,343	25,322	22,948	18,970
Erosion control and pasture improvement:											
Terracing	1,000 lineal feet	292	294	392	355	292	240	224	306	460	280
Do	1,000 acres	729	1,139	1,552	1,446	1,141	1,099	899	1,092	1,723	991
Spreader terraces	1,000 lineal feet	1,900	3,253	7,776	8,149	20,175	6,289	2,448	1,100	(2)	(2)
Contour ridging pasture land	do	----------	19,957	58,687	48,072	20,273	17,633	4,019	5,542	(3)	(3)
Contour listing or furrowing	1,000 acres	1,293	4,754	2,207	4,054	7,814	7,414	8,075	9,811	10,361	2,323
Contour seeding small grain crops	do	----------	----------	990	989	1,113	1,701	1,473	2,362	4,837	7,068
Contour farming intertilled crops	do	----------	64	4,549	6,088	7,847	8,151	9,681	12,249	13,171	10,214
Strip cropping	do	(1)	575	711	4,577	5,748	6,194	8,404	7,047	6,533	6,351
Reseeding pasture and range land:											
By deferred grazing	do	37	12,938	32,582	28,957	28,767	20,374	19,395	8,351	6,308	6,360
Artificial	1,000 pounds seed	----------	195	10,366	22,796	18,132	12,847	10,138	15,822	30,465	32,982
Seeding permanent pasture mixtures	1,000 acres	1,806	(4)	(4)	1,030	1,940	1,713	1,489	1,526	1,626	1,507
Protecting summer fallow	do	3,585	9,546	7,489	8,807	7,417	8,066	14,105	10,670	12,325	14,032
Establishment of fireguards	1,000 lineal feet	566	13,094	18,274	17,721	27,092	38,873	59,804	79,022	62,600	43,092
Development of natural watering places	1,000 cubic feet material moved	----------	----------	653	912	1,442	1,082	609	97	493	630
Dams and reservoirs	1,000 cubic yards	5,230	31,383	41,632	49,919	64,663	52,095	43,865	49,110	127,273	94,658
Drilling or digging wells	1,000 lineal feet	130	166	865	990	1,104	805	792	911	1,371	1,391
Forestry practices:											
Planting trees	1,000 acres	36	44	61	62	145	79	61	43	----------	(5)
Maintaining trees	do	----------	7	236	846	394	379	177	108	----------	33
Improving trees	do	----------	46	48	70	105	66	69	35	----------	(1)
Other practices, harvesting legume and grass seed:											
Acreage	do	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	3,119	6,356	4,108
Production	1,000 pounds	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	145	109
Grazing land management	1,000 acres	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	81,192	70,780	81,432

[1] Less than 500.
[2] Included with terracing.
[3] Included with contour listing or furrowing.
[4] Included under a seed classification not shown here.
[5] Acreage not available in all States.

Source: Field Service Branch, February 1947.

Agricultural conservation program

Program years Fiscal years	1936 1937	1937 1938	1938 1939	1939 1940	1940 1941	1941 1942	1942 1943	1943 1944	1944 1945	1945 1946	1946 1947	1947 1948
Payments (program year):												(Budget)
Allotment payments	$314,072,000	$217,762,000	$351,723,000	$381,872,000	$827,881,000	$334,234,000	$219,218,000	$224,709,000				
Practice payments	60,732,000	90,791,000	93,919,000	117,078,000	116,008,000	123,960,000	168,364,000	215,242,000	$281,367,000	$220,462,000	$267,200,000	$267,200,000
Special payments	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	12,500,000	33,061,000	12,500,000	----------
Total payments	374,804,000	308,553,000	445,642,000	498,950,000	443,889,000	458,194,000	387,582,000	439,951,000	293,867,000	253,523,000	279,700,000	267,200,000
Operating expenses (fiscal year):												
County associations	5,699,858	28,867,853	34,853,054	32,382,496	25,599,149	29,448,356	31,862,896	17,510,850	16,300,000	17,519,505	20,039,088	24,489,088
National and State	18,825,649	15,082,360	12,552,966	10,926,626	11,048,315	10,987,500	9,784,100	8,821,377	7,949,968	7,352,864	8,871,868	9,095,868
Total operating expenses	24,525,507	43,950,213	47,406,020	43,309,122	36,647,464	40,435,856	41,646,996	26,332,227	24,249,968	24,872,369	28,910,956	33,584,956
Transfers, allotments, and adjustments	+40,670,493	+77,496,787	−4,048,020	+17,290,878	−14,954,961	+758,815	+20,771,004	−66,283,227	−15,616,968	+77,202,631	+5,635,044	+935,044
Total appropriations	440,000,000	430,000,000	489,000,000	559,550,000	465,581,503	499,388,671	450,000,000	400,000,000	302,500,000	355,598,000	314,246,000	301,720,000

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I shall not speak longer on the soil-conservation program. I should like to close with this admonition—I, for one, shall never agree to any kind of a conference report which does away with soil conservation for 1948. One hundred and fifty million dollars is a small amount to keep soil conservation in existence for that year. Certainly if we yield to the House on this important conference, soil conservation is a dead issue. It will remain so as long as the Republicans are in control of both Houses of Congress.

As I said in the beginning, it is simply impossible for me to understand why the Republican-controlled House could for economic reasons—which are false from the foundation up—let the farmers of the Nation down on this soil-conservation program. I am sure the Senate will honor the pledge we made to them in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

THREATENED STRIKE OF SOUTHERN PACIFIC LOCOMOTIVE ENGINEERS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate of the United States and of the country what I believe to be a very critical situation which now is brewing on the Pacific coast. I refer to the threatened strike of the Southern Pacific Railway locomotive engineers, which is scheduled to take place tonight at 6 o'clock Pacific coast time.

In order to give some of the background of this matter, I wish to read into the RECORD a few telegrams which I have received, and which I think show the urgency of the situation.

The first telegram reads as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *July 20, 1947.*
Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Strike of Southern Pacific engineers at critical point in harvesting season would present serious threat to stability of western agriculture, industry, and trade. Loss of perishable crops at this time would adversely affect the economy of this area for the next year or longer. We urge that every means be used to foster peaceful settlement of differences.

C. S. BEESEMYER,
President, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

The next telegram is as follows:

ALHAMBRA, CALIF., *July 21, 1947.*
Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Senate Offices, Washington, D. C.:

Alhambra Chamber of Commerce wishes to call your attention to the pending strike of engineers on the Southern Pacific Co. Pacific lines called for 6 p. m. July 21. Request you do all in your power to avert, as this strike will be most disastrous to the economy of southern California as well as all of California in general.

WOODY WADE,
Manager, Alhambra Chamber of Commerce.

The next telegram is as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *July 19, 1947.*
Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Southern Pacific strike Monday, July 21, will seriously curtail operations of hundreds of our member dealers throughout State. Urgently ask your cooperation in obtaining President Truman's intervention to avoid strike.

RALPH A. BROWN,
Managing Director, Retail Furniture Association of California.

The next telegram reads as follows:

WHITTIER, CALIF., *July 19, 1947.*
Hon. Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Senate Office Building,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

You are earnestly urged to do everything possible to prevent the threatened Southern Pacific Railroad strike planned for Monday, July 21. You are fully familiar with the disastrous loss such a strike will entail on our farmers especially, who depend on railroad transportation for removing perishable crops from California.

Very respectfully,
WHITTIER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

The next telegram comes from the president of the University of Santa Clara:

SANTA CLARA, CALIF., *July 19, 1947.*
Hon. WILLIAM KNOWLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge that you take steps to avert Southern Pacific strike scheduled for Monday evening.

W. C. GIANERA, S. J.,
President, University of Santa Clara.

The next telegram reads as follows:

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *July 19, 1947.*
Senators WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND and
SHERIDAN DOWNEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Threatened strike of Southern Pacific engineers would be major calamity to California's perishable crops of fruits and vegetables Respectfully urge you to do everything possible to avert disruption of service.

LONG BEACH CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

The next telegram comes from the chancelor of the University of Southern California, one of our leading universities:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *July 19, 1947.*
Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Senate Chambers, Washington, D. C.:

Urgently request you to use your influence to avert pending Southern Pacific strike. Results will be disastrous in this area.

R. B. VON KLEINSMID, *Chancelor.*

The next telegram comes from the Growers Service Co.:

FRESNO, CALIF., *July 19, 1947.*
Hon. Senator W. KNOWLAND,
Washington, D. C.:

If proposed strike of Southern Pacific Railroad employees materializes, this valley will not only suffer serious financial losses but public in general will be deprived of lowest price fresh fruits produced in this valley past several years. Peaches now ripening on trees; other commodities ready for harvest. Any action by railroad employees to stop movement of these commodities will definitely cause chaos in this valley. We respectfully urge use your good influence to avert strike, but if strike is not averted, then certainly fresh fruits should have same consideration as milk, hospital supplies, etc. Your personal attention would be appreciated by the signers of this telegram, together with the entire population of San Joaquin Valley.

GROWERS SERVICE CO.

I have received a large number of additional telegrams of a like nature.

Mr. President, in order to give a little of the background of this matter, I wish to read into the RECORD two other telegrams:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *July 18, 1947.*
Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Upon behalf of our membership who pack approximately 80 percent of the canned fruits and vegetables produced in California, we respectfully urge that you and the emergency Mediation Board, which we understand has been today appointed by the President to handle the impending strike of engineers on the Southern Pacific Railroad and subsidiary lines, do everything possible to prevent any interruption of service.

A railroad strike at this time would result in the loss of a tremendous quantity of fresh fruits and vegetables entailing not only great financial loss to thousands of growers and processors but destroying much-needed foodstuffs. Trucks are not available in sufficient number to move the fresh fruits and vegetables to the canneries, as well as the necessary cans, sugar, box shook, and other materials essential to the production of the canned pack. This matter is of vital importance to the canning industry, which is the third largest in the State of California.

CANNERS LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA,
M. A. CLEVENGER,
Executive Vice President.

Mr. President, I have a copy of a telegram which was sent to the members of the Oregon Delegation by Mr. E. T. Mercier, of the Southern Pacific Lines. He says:

Your telegram July 20 regarding threatened strike against Southern Pacific-Pacific Lines by locomotive engineers. President Truman created emergency board on Friday, July 18, and Southern Pacific immediately announced it would cooperate fully with the board in its inquiries and its efforts to settle this dispute. Under Railway Labor Act it is provided there shall be no strike for 60 days after appointment of emergency board, yet the Engineers Brotherhood still threatens to strike at 6 p. m. today.

All main points at issue were passed upon by the emergency board created by President Roosevelt in 1945 and Southern Pacific accepted that board's recommendations in their entirety. But the Engineers Brotherhood rejected the recommendations and has continued to do so. Southern Pacific at all times has been ready to meet with Brotherhood officials and to make every reasonable attempt to arrange a just settlement. We are still ready to do so and have been in actual daily conferences with the mediator now here and have given him every possible cooperation in his efforts to effect a settlement. Will continue to exert our best efforts to avert the strike. Prior to setting of present strike date, Southern Pacific in effort to do everything it could to avoid strike and consequent great loss to western agriculture and business, offered further concessions to the Engineers, going far beyond the recommendations of the first emergency board, but the Brotherhood officials have remained obdurate. Their attitude is "all or else."

A. T. MERCIER.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield at that point?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wonder if the Senator from California would allow me to have inserted at this point the telegrams the Oregon delegation sent yesterday to President Truman and to Mr. Douglass, Chairman of the National Mediation Board, and to Mr. Alvanley Johnston, president of the Locomotive Engineers, and to the president of the Southern Pacific Lines?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should be delighted to have them inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad the Senator has put into the RECORD information on this subject. The telegrams from the Oregon delegation make perfectly clear to the officials of the Railroad Brotherhood that it is the opinion of the Oregon delegation that there is absolutely no justification whatever for a strike at this time, so long as peaceful procedures are available to the parties to the dispute for the settlement of the dispute. Therefore, as the Senator will see from the telegrams which he has authorized me to have inserted at this point in the RECORD, we asked President Truman to call upon the parties to the dispute to accept either the appointment of an emergency board under the provisions of the Railway Labor Act or to accept the appointment of an arbitrator whose decision would be final and binding.

We point out further in our telegrams to the President and to the Railroad Brotherhoods, and the other persons named, that a strike on the Southern Pacific at this time not only would be devastating to the economic life of the Senator's State of California, to Oregon, and to the whole Pacific area, but likewise, if it were allowed to continue for only a few days, would have a very disastrous effect on the economy of the whole country. It is our position that there certainly is no justification for the parties not following the procedures of the Railway Labor Act.

Let me say, as the Senator from California knows, my position in this instance is the consistent position I have always taken in labor disputes. I shall never condone resort to strike action

when peaceful procedures are available to labor for the settlement of their disputes. I am glad to join with the Senator from California in a protest against this threatened strike.

I am glad to say, that I was informally told, only a few minutes ago by the White House that the White House does propose, if it has not already done so, to inform the parties that it stands ready to appoint an emergency board, in return for which it has the right to expect a pledge from the parties that they will carry out the real purpose and intent of an emergency board once it is set up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am glad to consent to the contribution by the Senator from Oregon, and thank him for his remarks.

There being no objection the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 20, 1947.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.:

We of the congressional delegation from the State of Oregon are greatly disturbed over reports being received today by telegraph from Oregon and in the press and over the radio of a threatened strike of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers on the Southern Pacific Railroad system scheduled for tomorrow night. We respectfully beseech you to call upon the officials of both the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and the Southern Pacific Railroad to agree to a settlement of this dispute by either one of two peaceful procedures authorized by existing law, namely, the appointment by you of an emergency board in accordance with the provisions of the Railway Labor Act or the appointment by you of an arbitrator subject to the understanding upon the part of the parties to the dispute that the arbitrator's decision should be final and binding. We have sent a wire today to Alvanley Johnston, grand chief of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, making clear to him that in our opinion a strike of the Locomotive Engineers would be inexcusable and decidedly against the best interest of both the public and workers involved. We need not tell you of the seriousness of this threatened strike to the economic life of the Pacific coast and eventually to the entire Nation. We believe that if you will make perfectly clear to the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers that you are willing to appoint either an emergency board or an arbitrator for the peaceful settlement of this dispute, their common sense will tell them that such a solution should be accepted. If this strike should come off as scheduled you may be sure that we as Members of the Congress will stand ready to cooperate in whatever way we can with the administration in bringing an end to the strike because on the basis of such information as we possess we do not believe that it is necessary to resort to strike action in order to obtain a fair and equitable settlement of this dispute.

Respectfully yours,

CORDON.
MORSE.
ANGELL.
ELLSWORTH.
NORBLAD.

JULY 20, 1947.

Hon. FRANK P. DOUGLASS,
Chairman, National Mediation Board,
Washington, D. C.:

We of the congressional delegation from the State of Oregon have sent the following wires today to President Truman and to Alvanley Johnston, grand chief of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers: To President Truman quote: We of the congressional delegation from the State of Oregon are greatly disturbed over reports being received today by telegraph from Oregon and in the press and over the radio of a threatened strike of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers on the Southern Pacific Railroad System scheduled for tomorrow night. We respectfully beseech you to call upon the officials of both the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and the Southern Pacific Railroad to agree to a settlement of this dispute by either one of two peaceful procedures authorized by existing law, namely, the appointment by you of an emergency board in accordance with the provisions of the Railway Labor Act or the appointment by you of an arbitrator subject to the understanding upon the part of the parties to the dispute that the arbitrator's decision should be final and binding. We have sent a wire today to Alvanley Johnston, Grand Chief of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers making clear to him that in our opinion a strike of the locomotive engineers would be inexcusable and decidedly against the best interest of both the public and workers involved. We need not tell you of the seriousness of this threatened strike to the economic life of the Pacific coast and eventually to the entire Nation. We believe that if you will make perfectly clear to the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers that you are willing to appoint either an emergency board or an arbitrator for the peaceful settlement of this dispute their common sense will tell them that such a solution should be accepted. If this strike should come off as scheduled you may be sure that we as Members of the Congress will stand ready to cooperate in whatever way we can with the administration in bringing an end to the strike because on the basis of such information as we possess we do not believe that it is necessary to resort to strike action in order to obtain a fair and equitable settlement of this dispute. Respectfully yours. Unquote.

To Alvaney Johnston quote: We of the congressional delegation from Oregon are greatly disturbed over the telegraphic newspaper and radio reports today of a threatened strike of the engineers on the Southern Pacific Railroad scheduled for tomorrow night. It is our opinion that such a strike would not only be against the best public interest but also against the best interest of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and organized labor generally. This is no time for resorting to economic action, we care not what the provocation. Our experience with labor problems in the railroad industry convinces us that there is adequate mediation and arbitration machinery and procedures available to you for a peaceful and orderly settlement of this dispute without resorting to strike action. Domestic economic conditions in this country with their many international implications make it absolutely unthinkable to us that you would call a railroad strike at this time. We are wiring President Truman today urging that he offer to both parties in this dispute to appoint either an emergency board under the Railway Labor Act or if the parties prefer an arbitrator to settle this case by the rules of reason rather than by the unnecessary and inexcusable use under the circumstances of strike action. We are sure that we need not argue with you our friendly interest in the legitimate rights of organized labor. However, when organized labor, be it the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers or any other group, resorts to economic action without exhausting in the first instance all of the peaceful procedures available to them under existing law and reason then we shall always protest such action in the interest of the public welfare. We are also sure that it is unnecessary for us to tell you that we have a high regard for your qualities of industrial statesmanship and for the service that you have rendered the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers over the years in advancing their economic welfare. Therefore, we strongly urge you not to bring discredit upon your fine record by resorting to strike action in this case, especially when we think it is perfectly clear to all concerned, including the public, that here is a case that can and should be settled by the orderly procedures of mediation or arbitration. A strike on the Southern Pacific Railroad at this time would have devastating effect on the entire economic life of the west coast and if prolonged for even a few days would do great injury to the entire economy of the country. Hence, we sincerely hope that you will accept any offer that is made to you by officials of Government acting within their authority to settle this case without resort to strike action. Unquote.

We respectfully urge that the National Mediation Board make an announcement at once to the American public as to the issues involved in this case and as to the steps which the Board has taken in giving to the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers an opportunity to accept peaceful procedures for the settlement of this dispute. We are convinced that as soon as the American people understand what the National Mediation Board has already done in an endeavor to avoid this strike public opinion will make clear immediately that it disapproves of the strike action. Here is a case in which we think the spotlight of publicity should be focussed in an endeavor to get both parties to the dispute to see upon reflection that they owe it to the public as well as to themselves to call off the threatened strike by accepting peaceful procedures under the Railway Labor Act for its settlement.

Regards.

CORDON.
MORSE.
ANGELL.
ELLSWORTH.
NORBLAD.

JULY 20, 1947.

Mr. ALVANEY JOHNSTON,
Grand Chief, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Engineers Building,
Cleveland, Ohio:

Mr. P. O. PETERSON,
President, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Southern Pacific Railway Co., San Francisco, Calif.:

We of the congressional delegation from Oregon are greatly disturbed over the telegraphic, newspaper, and radio reports today of a threatened strike of the engineers on the Southern Pacific Railroad scheduled for tomorrow night. It is our opinion that such a strike would not only be against the best public interest but also against the best interest of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and organized labor generally. This is no time for resorting to economic action, we care not what the provocation. Our experience with labor problems in the railroad industry convinces us that there is adequate mediation and arbitration machinery and procedures available to you for a peaceful and orderly settlement of this dispute without resorting to strike action. Domestic economic conditions in this country with their many international implications make it absolutely unthinkable to us that you would call a railroad strike at this time. We are wiring President Truman today urging that he offer to both parties in this dispute to appoint either an emergency board under the Railway Labor Act or if the parties prefer an arbitrator to settle this case by the rules of reason rather than by the unnecessary and inexcusable use under the circumstances of strike action. We are sure that we need not argue with you our friendly interest in the legitimate rights of organized

labor. However, when organized labor, be it the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers or any other group, resorts to economic action without exhausting in the first instance all of the peaceful procedures available to them under existing law and reason then we shall always protest such action in the interest of the public welfare. We are also sure that it is unnecessary for us to tell you that we have a high regard for your qualities of industrial statesmanship and for the service that you have rendered the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers over the years in advancing their economic welfare. Therefore, we strongly urge you not to bring discredit upon your fine record by resorting to strike action in this case, especially when we think it is perfectly clear to all concerned, including the public, that here is a case that can and should be settled by the orderly procedures of mediation or arbitration. A strike on the Southern Pacific Railroad at this time would have devastating effect on the entire economic life of the west coast and if prolonged for even a few days would do great injury to the entire economy of the country. Hence, we sincerely hope that you will accept any offer that is made to you by officials of Government acting within their authority to settle this case without resort to strike action.

Regards,

CORDON.
MORSE.
ANGELL.
ELLSWORTH.
NORBLAD.

JULY 20, 1947.

Mr. A. T. MERCIER,
President, Southern Pacific Railway Co., San Francisco, Calif.:

We, the congressional delegation from Oregon, are greatly disturbed over telegraphic, newspaper, and radio reports today of a threatened strike of the engineers on the Southern Pacific Railroad scheduled for tomorrow night. It is our opinion that such a strike would not only be against the best public interest but also against the best interests of the locomotive engineers, organized labor generally, and the Southern Pacific Railway Co. and management in general. Our experience with labor problems and the railroad industry convinces us that there is adequate mediation and arbitration procedures available to you both for a peaceful and orderly settlement of this dispute without resorting to strike action. You, as representative of management, have a grave responsibility to urge upon the brotherhood cooperative action in seeking a peaceful solution to this problem which will not imperil the standing of both, resulting in incalculable loss to those upon whom both depend for their livelihood and profits. We are wiring President Truman today urging that he offer to both parties in this dispute to appoint either an emergency board under the Railway Labor Act or, if the parties prefer, an arbitrator to settle this case by the rules of reason. A strike on the Southern Pacific Railroad at this time would have a devastating effect on the entire economic life of the west coast, and if prolonged for even a few days would do great injury to the entire economy of the country. Hence, we sincerely hope that you will accept any offer that is made to you by officials of Government, acting within their authority to settle this case without resort to strike action. Regards.

CORDON.
MORSE.
ANGELL.
ELLSWORTH.
NORBLAD.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, this matter is of vital importance, not only to my State of California, to the State of the Senator from Oregon, and to the State of Washington, but to the entire western area of the United States, which is served by the Southern Pacific lines, one of the large railroad systems of the country.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator will permit me to conclude my statement, it will not take me more than a few minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. I think this is a very important matter, because I have been receiving telegrams in regard to the situation, so apparently it is affecting the Middle West. I am glad the Senator from California is making his statement.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to say that this afternoon the President of the United States appointed a board, consisting of Col. Grady Lewis, of Washington, D. C.; Leverett Douglas, of Oklahoma City, and Paul A. Dodd, of the University of California.

I was informed also a few minutes ago in a telephone conversation to the Pacific coast that a Mr. Hobart, who is the assistant grand chief, I believe, of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, came out of a meeting which is now in progress in the city of San Francisco, and is reported to have said—I hope he is not quoted correctly—"that it would not make any difference what action the President took, they were going ahead with the strike."

Mr. President, I say that no man and no group of men have the right to strangle the economic life of any State or any region, or of the United States. I consider such a strike a matter of absolute irresponsibility on the part of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. It seems to me that they are showing themselves as being unmindful of the responsibility which is in their hands.

I have said before on the floor of the Senate, and I shall say it again, that people, be they in Government, be they in business, or be they in labor organizations, who exercise vast power, must also recognize the fact that with power must go responsibility. Certainly in this case, if the brotherhood carries through with its threat to close down the railway lines, to bring disaster to agriculture and industry on the Pacific coast, it would not be showing a sense of responsibility, but, rather, it would be showing a great sense of irresponsibility.

I say on the floor of the Senate at this time that if this threat to close down the railroads on the Pacific coast is carried out at 6 o'clock Pacific time, which will be 5 hours from now, I shall do all I can to have the Senate and the Congress delay adjournment. If there are loopholes in the Railway Labor Act which permit this type of irresponsibility, that act should be modified before the Members of Congress return to their homes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to join with the Senator from California in his protest against any strike on the Southern Pacific lines. That road also crosses the State of New Mexico.

It happens that in my State the farmers are ready to engage in harvesting the largest wheat crop the State has ever had. There is a dire shortage of railroad facilities of every kind. As a consequence of that shortage, wheat is being piled on the ground in some of the counties and areas crossed by the Southern Pacific.

I shall not delay the Senate in commenting upon the situation brought to the attention of the Senate by the Senator from California, except to say to him that his attitude in desiring to have Congress remain in session until it can pass legislation which may be greatly needed in the crisis which may arise, only points up remarks I was making earlier in the day, and which I hope to complete sometime before another day.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and further insist on its amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish merely to occupy a few moments to express my views in regard to the pending motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] in regard to the soil-conservation program. I had some experience as a young man on a farm in the matter of wastage of soil, and in addition to my own experience I have devoted some time to the study of the effects of soil erosion in the United States.

Of course, we all know that in the early history of our country, when there was plenty of land, no thought was given to the preservation of the soil or to its reclamation, because it was unnecessary. Our forefathers moved in on the Atlantic seaboard, cleared up a strip of ground, and wore it out, and then moved farther west, cleared up some more land, and wore it out, and moved on again, because there was plenty of new soil to which they could move.

A few years ago I happened to be in New Hampshire for about a month, and I drove around over that beautiful State. It was tragic and pathetic to see the number of abandoned farms that could be found in New Hampshire. I recognize that the soil conditions in New Hampshire and in many other sections of New England, render it difficult for farmers to make much money out of the cultivation of the soil because of the rugged character of the territory, because of the rocks which it is impossible to move. It was frequently desirable to move away and even leave a lovely house unoccupied rather than to remain in it and try to make a living off that soil. I saw many beautiful homes which had been abandoned for years, the yards grown up in weeds and underbrush and vegetation, hiding even the windows, the panes of most of which had been knocked out or had disappeared. I came very near buying one of those abandoned farms in New Hampshire. The house had not been lived in for 7 years. I stood on the front porch of that lovely house and counted seven beautiful lakes in the surrounding territory. I had an ambition to buy it and perhaps spend a summer up there occasionally. It was very cheap, but I could not afford it; and it is a good thing that I did not buy it. But I was very

greatly impressed with the utter wastage of soil, even in rugged New Hampshire. I understand that many of those farms have been bought by people in the cities, and that they have been improved as summer homes. Some of the farms have been returned to cultivation.

Mr. President, we are now confronted with the problem not only of preserving the soil we have left, but of reclaiming the fertility of much of the soil on many farms which has gone to waste. I was raised on a farm in the Ohio Valley. My father was what we call a woodsman, in a sense. I have often said rather facetiously—but there is more truth than poetry in it—that he counted the winter entirely lost that did not see him clear off 12 acres or more of new ground. It frequently fell to my lot, as soon as I could hold the plow handles, to help break up the new ground in the spring and cultivate it.

I remember, when I was about 12 years of age, that my father and I and the rest of us boys—I being the oldest—cleared off 12 acres of new ground, broke it up in the spring, burned our beds for tobacco, and cultivated it. Later we moved away from that place. Years later I drove by that little farm. The 12 acres which we had cleared in my boyhood had washed out in gullies, through soil erosion, neglect, and waste, until the house in which we lived could be buried in the gullies which had washed out over a period of 25 or 30 years. That was only a duplication of what had happened elsewhere in the country.

I have often said—and I do not think it can be denied—that even looking at it only from the standpoint of our own people, forgetting any requirement to help feed mankind outside the United States and looking at it purely from the standpoint of our own domestic welfare, as our population increases—and it is increasing and will continue to increase over the years until we shall have 200,000,000 or 300,000,000 people in the United States—each acre of land must support more people than it supported the year before. That is an inevitable, automatic result.

Our problem is now not only one of preserving what soil we have, but of reclaiming the ground from which the soil has been washed, by fertilization, by reforestation, and by whatever other methods we may adopt, in order to bring back into cultivation millions of wasted acres which were worn out and abandoned, and which must now help support the American people by the growth of crops.

I live in the Ohio Valley. Every year we see millions of acres of rich soil washed down from the hillsides into the little creeks, out into the rivers, and then into the Ohio and Mississippi and on down into the Gulf, carrying rich topsoil which can never be recovered.

Last year I passed by the little 12-acre tract which I mentioned a moment ago, which has now been reclaimed under the process of reclamation, under the intelligent treatment which has been brought about by the Soil Conservation Service. I saw that little tract of land, which in a quarter of a century had wasted away and worn out into gullies, reclaimed for cultivation. It is now a lovely pasture for cattle, hogs, and other stock. That would not have been done and could not have been done if it had not been for the inauguration of the soil-conservation program. I am satisfied that the same thing has been done on hundreds of thousands of farms and acres throughout the United States.

So, looking at it from the standpoint even of our own country alone, we cannot afford to abandon the soil conservation program. We cannot afford to continue to allow our soil to wash out into the creeks and rivers and down into the ocean. We cannot afford to hand down to generations yet to come land so impoverished so that they cannot make a living upon it. It would be nothing less than criminal for us to do so, because our people must live here. They must live upon the soil. Out of the ground must come what man eats. Therefore I deplore any effort on the part of anyone to reduce the activities of the Soil Conservation Service, to abandon it either next year, the year following, or 10 years from now, because we have not yet begun to reclaim all the soil that has been worn out and wasted during the time in which we have engaged in that wasteful process in the United States.

Mr. President, there is no more new soil. There is no more virgin soil to which our people can move after having worn out a farm. There may be some land in the West that can be brought into cultivation by irrigation and reclamation; and I am interested in that process. But, by and large, new virgin soil, as it was known in this country 50 or 100 years ago, no longer exists.

The soil conservation program has two phases. One is to preserve the soil we now have, and the other is to reclaim the fertility of the soil which has been wasted. Individual farmers cannot do that without encouragement, guidance, and assistance from the Government. The Government program has been of invaluable assistance to the agricultural regions and the agricultural processes of our country. I hope we may be so convinced of the wisdom of this process, in our own defense, in defense of our own people, and in behalf of future generations, that we shall not only not abandon the program, but shall improve it and expand it, if necessary, in order that we may have a rich country, fertile in all its regions, productive of the things the American people wish for themselves, and things which they wish to produce for the markets of the world.

For that reason, among others I could state, I shall support with enthusiasm the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] to oppose the House amendment to the soil conservation program. When the time comes for a vote I shall join in the request for a yea-and-nay vote, so that the American farmer and the American people may know where each of us stands on this important conservation program which has been inaugurated by the Government of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 42, and further insist upon its amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I was about to suggest the absence of a quorum, but I shall withhold the suggestion long enough for the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to request the yeas and nays.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if we can obtain an order for the yeas and nays and then have a quorum call, I think we can soon reach a vote. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Morse
Baldwin	Hatch	Murray
Ball	Hawkes	Myers
Barkley	Hill	O'Conor
Brewster	Hoey	O'Daniel
Bricker	Holland	O'Mahoney
Brooks	Ives	Pepper
Buck	Jenner	Revercomb
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Kem	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kilgore	Smith
Capper	Knowland	Sparkman
Chavez	Langer	Stewart
Connally	Lodge	Taft
Cooper	Lucas	Taylor
Donnell	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	McFarland	Thye
Eastland	McGrath	Umstead
Ecton	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	McMahon	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wherry
Flanders	Malone	White
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
George	Maybank	Wilson
Green	Millikin	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 42, and further insist upon its amendment. On this question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent. The Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Wyoming, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family. If present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] are detained on official committee business. Both Senators, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are unavoidably detained. The Senator from South Dakota, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. The Senator from Kansas is necessarily absent. If present and voting, he would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who are necessarily absent, would vote "yea," if present.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], who is detained on official committee business, would vote "yea," if present.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, and who has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], would vote "yea," if present.

The result was announced—yeas 81, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—81

Aiken	Gurney	Morse
Baldwin	Hatch	Murray
Ball	Hawkes	Myers
Bark'ey	Hill	O'Conor
Brewster	Hoey	O'Daniel
Bricker	Holland	O'Mahoney
Brooks	Ives	Pepper
Buck	Jenner	Revercomb
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Kem	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kilgore	Smith
Capper	Knowland	Sparkman
Chavez	Langer	Stewart
Connally	Lodge	Taft
Cooper	Lucas	Taylor
Donnell	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	McFarland	Thye
Eastland	McGrath	Umstead
Ecton	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	McMahon	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wherry
Flanders	Malone	White
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
George	Maybank	Wilson
Green	Millikin	Young

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—14

Bridges	McCarthy	Tobey
Bushfield	Moore	Tydings
Cordon	Overton	Wagner
Hayden	Reed	Williams
Hickenlooper	Robertson, Wyo.	

So Mr. BROOKS' motion was agreed to.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show that immediately previous to the vote just recorded, I was absent from the Chamber on committee business and was unable to return to the Chamber in response to the bill, until after the vote had been concluded. Had I been able to return in time to vote, my vote would have been "yea."

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, the next amendments relate to the National School-Lunch Act. One of them is amendment No. 43. The bill as originally passed by the House reduced the school-lunch appropriation from the budget estimate of $75,000,000 to $45,000,000. The budget estimate was restored by the Senate committee. The other amendment is on page 81, amendment numbered 59. It reestablishes the program with this important feature: The House language not only reduced the amount from $75,000,000 to $45,000,000, but it also provided that the States could not use as matching funds the money that is paid for the lunches by the children themselves. There are only a few States which thus far have provided sufficient money to be able to participate in this program. The Senate felt that the States should be allowed to continue to use as matching funds the money which is paid for the lunches by the school children.

The situation is this: After the House voted to reduce the amount from $75,000,000 to $45,000,000, and further provided that the money paid for the lunches by the school children could not be used as matching funds, the Senate voted to restore the amount to $75,000,000, and further provided that the money paid by the children for the lunches could be used as matching funds.

In the conference, the conferees on the part of the Senate and the conferees on the part of the House were unable to reach agreement. The House has voted on the question twice—first, when it reduced the amount and struck out the provision about using for matching purposes the money paid by the children; and since our conference the House has voted again on this question.

So, Mr. President, I move that the Senate further insist upon its amendments numbered 43 and 59.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to make a very brief statement in support of the motion which has been made by the Senator from Illinois.

The language of the bill as passed by the House not only repeals the affirmative legislation enacted by the last Congress but effectively destroys school-lunch program in all but four or five States. As a matter of fact, only one State legislature has appropriated sufficient funds for State purposes to match those Federal funds. Senators may be surprised to hear that it is the State of Utah. I know I was surprised to find that the State of Utah was the only State the legislature of which has appropriated sufficient funds to match the Federal legislations. I congratulate the Senators from Utah on that action.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia is happy that the State of Utah has appropriated the money; is he not?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am, and I congratulate the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The action thus taken by the State of Utah is thoroughly consistent with the proper action; is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. And it is the proper thing to do; is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course it is.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Then why is the Senator surprised that the State of Utah has done it?

Mr. RUSSELL. It was not because I was unaware of the magnificent educational program in the State of Utah, which probably is unmatched by that of any other State. From the kindergartens up to the colleges, the State of Utah devotes a larger proportion of its income to education than does probably any other Western State. But having heard that the States of New York and Illinois have long made substantial appropriations for education, I would have assumed that those States also would have appropriated such matching funds. I commend and congratulate the people of the great State of Utah for the interest they have maintained in all phases of a program for the education of their children.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I also call attention to the fact that the law provides that the maintenance of the lunch program is to be eventually turned over to the States, which will have to contribute $3 to $1 contributed by the Federal Government. Only one State is in position to do that at this time, because the legislatures have not taken the action which the House provision would require.

I hope that the Senate will vote strongly in favor of the school-lunch program and the soil-conservation program. One has only to follow the work of the school-lunch program, as it has been my privilege to do, to realize the great good which has resulted from it. If everyone could see the little children with their gums falling away from their teeth, their eyes out of order, their thyroid glands upset, and see how one meal a day has brought about such wonderful changes in these little people of ours, there would be no opposition to the program, which is one of the most worth-while that has been undertaken in recent years.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I would not have the RECORD show that only Utah is in position to match the funds, because there are four or five other States which have the funds, but they were not made available by the legislatures.

The House proviso would effectively kill the program. I do not think any of the legislatures will be meeting before school assembles in September, indeed, I do not think any of them will be in session until next January. As the Senator from Vermont has stated, under the basic legislation State contributions to match the fund are stepped up until they will amount to $3 for each Federal dollar in 1952. This program should not be disrupted at this date.

Mr. President, I was in a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations this afternoon when the subcommittee made a recommendation for foreign relief. I realize our responsibility to the nations overseas, but I think we have come to a sorry pass if we quibble about appropriating funds for a soil-conservation program amounting to $150,000,000 a year, when we are sending overseas nearly three times that much to build up the soils of other countries, many of which were our enemies in the war, and when we are talking about denying the children of America funds for a lunch program when we are appropriating millions of dollars to feed the children in the other countries. We should keep pace with the other countries of the world, and I hope the vote on the motion will be unanimous.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, last year it was my privilege to coauthor the so-called national school-lunch bill with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. Among some of the reasons advanced for the enactment of the bill was that the school-lunch program was not on a permanent basis, but was

carried on at the time by virtue of certain language placed each year in the Agricultural appropriation bill, which permitted the expenditure of a certain sum for that purpose. Because of that method of approach many States did not participate in the program. They feared that the program would be cut off at almost any time and they did not feel disposed to undertake the task.

Now that we have a permanent law on the statutes books which details a sensible and workable plan, it strikes me that if at this time the Senate should refuse to appropriate $75,000,000, as has been advocated by this body, it would, in my opinion, mean the death knell of the school-lunch program.

To my way of thinking it is a slow method of killing the school-lunch program. It would be more appropriate and more honorable for the opponents of the program to ask for a repeal of the law. Unless we go forward and appropriate at least as much funds as we have in the past, it will again put fear in those States which are desirous of developing this most meritorious program. I am very hopeful the Senate will stand behind its guns and insist the full sum of $75,000,000 be provided.

Mr. President, I believe it a loss of the Senate's time to further engage in debate on the issue involved. The Senate lost about 4 hours of precious time this afternoon in debating soil conservation. When the vote was taken there was not a single vote against the motion to insist on the Senate's version of what should be done in that field. The school-lunch program is here to stay and rather than take a step backward, I am willing to go forward and appropriate such sums as may be necessary to give opportunity for the full development of the plan as envisioned by the authors of the present law. Today about one-third of the children in our schools have lunches made available to them at a reasonable price. The House measure would reduce the appropriation to a mere pittance and many schools that have been engaged in this worthy cause would be compelled to curtail or even to discontinue the program and such course should not be permitted to take place. I am looking forward to the time when all of our schools shall be helped to provide hot lunches for all children, not on a free basis, but commensurate with ability to pay.

Mr. President, I repeat, let us sustain our position by voting "yea" on the pending motion.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I should like to say a very few words in regard to the question which is before the Senate.

I come from a State where the program has been in effect. It started during the war and has been built up and has worked efficiently and economically. The industrial States contribute much to the financing, but do not get so many benefits from the agricultural program. The program under consideration is one which is of value to the young people as they come along and will make for a better country in the long run. I hope the Senate will stand fast.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] that the Senate further insist on its amendments Nos. 43 and 59.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent. The Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Wyoming, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family. If present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official committee business. If present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. The Senator from Kansas, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who are necessarily absent, would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, and who has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], would vote "yea" if present.

The result was announced—yeas 81, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—81

Aiken	Gurney	Morse
Baldwin	Hatch	Murray
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Myers
Brewster	Hill	O'Conor
Bricker	Hoey	O'Daniel
Brooks	Holland	O'Mahoney
Buck	Ives	Overton
Bushfield	Jenner	Pepper
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Capehart	Kem	Russell
Capper	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Chavez	Knowland	Smith
Connally	Langer	Sparkman
Cooper	Lodge	Stewart
Cordon	Lucas	Taylor
Donnell	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	McFarland	Thye
Eastland	McGrath	Umstead
Ecton	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	McMahon	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wherry
Flanders	Malone	White
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
George	Maybank	Wilson
Green	Millikin	Young

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—14

Ball	McCarthy	Tobey
Bridges	Moore	Tydings
Byrd	Reed	Wagner
Hawkes	Robertson, Wyo.	Williams
Hayden	Taft	

So Mr. BROOKS' motion was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, there is one more amendment, which is No. 50. It has to do with tenant loans under the Farmers Home Administration. The budget estimate was $35,000,000. The House eliminated it entirely. Two record votes have been taken on it in the House. It was disapproved each time. First, when the bill was sent to the Senate with nothing provided for tenant loans, the Senate inserted $20,000,000. It was impossible to reach an agreement with the House. The bill was taken back to the House, and it sustained its previous action. My motion is that the Senate further insist on its disagreement as to amendment No. 50.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois, that the Senate insist upon its attitude in respect to amendment 50.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I dislike to take the time of the Senate, but I think the RECORD ought to show certain details of this matter. I hope the motion made by the Senator from Illinois will prevail. This item has probably more widespread and general support, or as much support as any other item which came before the committee. The representatives of the American Legion appeared before the committee and expressed an especial interest in this amendment. At the present time more than 41,000 veterans have appealed to the Farmers Home Administration for funds to help them buy farms. Due to the provisions of the law, requiring that the standard of the loans be fixed on what would be a return from the farm sufficient to carry it in normal years, and not under the present inflated value, it is not possible to make the loans, even though the money be available. The pittance the Senate put in the bill, of $20,000,000, will enable only 2,300 veterans to buy farms next year—less than one veteran for each agricultural county of the Nation. Bear in mind that the banks will make many of these loans.

When we passed the bill the other day which prevented the banks from discounting paper of this nature with the RFC, the only recourse for veterans to obtain the $20,000,000 provided by the Senate represented the only recourse for veterans to obtain funds with which to buy a farm. Mr. President, we should not do veterans with a farming background the disservice of forcing them to seek to enter a line of business—and borrow money under the GI bill in order to do so—with which they are not acquainted. The Senate amendment is supported by all the farm organizations and by the veterans organizations. While the amount is inadequate, the door should not be slammed completely in the face of veterans who might wish to borrow money with which to buy farms. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], on which the yeas and nays have again been requested.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent. The Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Wyoming, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family. If present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official committee business. If present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. The Senator from Kansas, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who are necessarily absent, would vote "yea," if present.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, and who has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], would vote "yea," if present.

The result was announced—yeas 84, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—84

Aiken	Gurney	Morse
Baldwin	Hatch	Murray
Ball	Hawkes	Myers
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Brewster	Hill	O'Daniel
Bricker	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Brooks	Holland	Overton
Buck	Ives	Pepper
Bushfield	Jenner	Revercomb
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Capehart	Kem	Saltonstall
Capper	Kilgore	Smith
Chavez	Knowland	Sparkman
Connally	Langer	Stewart
Cooper	Lodge	Taft
Cordon	Lucas	Taylor
Donnell	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	McFarland	Thye
Eastland	McGrath	Umstead
Ecton	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	McMahon	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wherry
Flanders	Malone	White
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
George	Maybank	Wilson
Green	Millikin	Young

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—11

Bridges	Moore	Tydings
Byrd	Reed	Wagner
Hayden	Robertson, Wyo.	Williams
McCarthy	Tobey	

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, there is just one more amendment, amendment No. 1, dealing with penalty mail. There is a matter of $300,000 difference between the House and Senate, and it will ultimately be decided when final agreement is reached.

I now move that the Senate further insist on its amendment No. 1, and request a further conference with the House on all the amendments still in disagreement, and that the Chair appoint the same conferees on the part of the Senate as were previously appointed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois that the Senate insist upon its amendment No. 1, request a conference with the House on all amendments still in disagreement, and that the Chair appoint on the part of the Senate the same conferees who were previously appointed.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. BROOKS, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. REED, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. TYDINGS conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

REFUND OF TAXES ILLEGALLY PAID BY INDIAN CITIZENS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WATKINS submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 981) to amend section 2 of the act of January 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 21), relating to the refund of taxes illegally paid by Indian citizens, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 2 and agree to the same.

ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
ZALES N. ECTON,
CARL A. HATCH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

RICHARD J. WELCH,
WESLEY A. D'EWART,
ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 323. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to allow credits to and relieve certain disbursing and certifying officers of the War and Navy Departments in the settlement of certain accounts;

S. 512. An act to extend provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to the Virgin Islands;

S. 616. An act to authorize the creation of a game refuge in the Francis Marion National Forest in the State of South Carolina;

S. 753. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to defer the collection of certain irrigation construction charges against lands under the Flathead Indian irrigation project;

S. 1180. An act to authorize the issuance of a special series of commemorative stamps in honor of Gold Star Mothers;

S. 1220. An act to transfer jurisdiction of certain lands comprising a portion of Acadia National Park, Maine, from the Department of the Interior to the Department of the Navy, and for other purposes;

S. 1262. An act to provide a central authority for standardizing geographic names for the purpose of eliminating duplication in standardizing such names among the Federal departments, and for other purposes;

S. 1348. An act to provide for the addition of certain revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands to the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project, in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes;

S. 1497. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of cottonseed and cottonseed products, and for other purposes," approved August 7, 1916; and

S. 1515. An act to make surplus property available for the alleviation of damage caused by flood or other catastrophe.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3123) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; that the House receded to its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 17, 34, 41, 68, 85, 101, 105, 114, 124, 130, 151, and 152 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 16, 18, 39, 78, 104, 171, 176, 177, and 179 to the bill, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14) favoring a fair representation of American small businessmen on policy-making bodies created by Executive appointment.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1508. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance," approved March 9, 1945 (59 Stat. 33);

H. R. 3961. An act to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to Spanish-American War and Civil War veterans and their dependents; and

H. R. 4017. An act to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide that bonds issued under such act shall be redeemable at any time after September 1, 1947, to permit settlement and compensation under such act to be made in cash, and for other purposes.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3 OF 1947

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House concurrent resolution 51, dealing with Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio has moved that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House concurrent resolution 51, dealing with the Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947. The clerk will state the concurrent resolution for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 51) that the Congress does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. 3 of May 27, 1947, trans-

mitted to Congress by the President on the 27th day of May 1947.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator wish to speak on the motion to consider? If so, the Chair will say that the motion is not debatable.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to ask the Senator from Ohio a question, if I may.

Mr. TAFT. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to ask the Senator from Ohio if it is the plan, after we take up Reorganization Plan No. 3 for consideration, to proceed then with the veterans' legislation pending on the calendar?

Mr. TAFT. The intention was to call the calendar next after consideration of Reorganization Plan No. 3, and thereafter take up the veterans' legislation.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Ohio if he expects to continue debate on the reorganization plan this evening?

Mr. TAFT. No. It is the intention to recess after the concurrent resolution is made the unfinished business.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have no objection to the motion. I should like to be recognized after the action has been taken on the motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will have to say to the Senator from New Mexico that under the terms of the Reorganization Act, when consideration of a reorganization plan is begun, the time from then on for 10 hours is divided equally between the proponents and opponents of the plan.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, under the existing circumstances I desire to propose a unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. Earlier in the day, after I had begun an address which was, as I thought, of some importance, I yielded the floor with the understanding that when the conference report had been acted upon I might continue with the remarks I had begun.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to resume my speech, and that the time I consume shall not be charged to the time devoted to debate on the reorganization plan.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that the Senator from New Mexico has accurately stated the situation, and that he is not only entitled to the floor after action is taken on the motion of the Senator from Ohio, but that he was promised the floor.

Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 51.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate meets tomorrow debate on the Reorganization Plan No. 3 be further limited to 4 hours, and that the time be evenly divided between the proponents and the opponents of the plan.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not think that is really sufficient time. I do not insist on the full 10 hours, but I do not think a total of 4 hours, with 2 hours on each side, is quite adequate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the motion to limit time is in order, and I shall discuss the matter further with the Senator, and we can agree about it in the morning.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time on the Reorganization Plan No. 3 will not start until tomorrow.

The Senator from New Mexico is recognized by unanimous consent.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the hour is late and Senators want to go home. I do not desire to keep them here, but at the same time I dislike to deliver a speech in installments, part on one day and part on the following day, and I think probably, because the business of the Senate is going to be pushed and crowded tomorrow, I should go ahead and conclude my remarks now as quickly as I can, and Senators will not be compelled to listen to me tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Could the Senator give to the waiting Senators any indication as to how long the Senator is likely to speak?

Mr. HATCH. I do not think I shall speak more than 20 minutes, and if any Senator has any business he wants to have taken up I shall be glad to yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, it is my purpose, at the conclusion of the consideration of the resolution relating to Reorganization Plan No. 3, to ask unanimous consent that the calendar be called.

Mr. HATCH. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHITE. That would give an opportunity for the Senator to make his address tomorrow. I shall not object if the Senator is insistent.

Mr. HATCH. I think I had better proceed now.

(Mr. HATCH resumed and concluded the speech begun by him earlier in the day. His entire speech appears consecutively at the appropriate place in today's RECORD.)

THE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, some while back I undertook to give notice of the desire of the majority, and I put it in the form of a request, that there should be a call of the calendar tomorrow at the conclusion of the consideration of Reorganization Plan No. 3. I give that notice now.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is also the understanding of the majority leader, is it not, that after the call of the calendar the Senate will proceed to take up the veterans' legislation ready for consideration?

Mr. KEM. Mr. President——

Mr. WHITE. I had no understanding about that. I myself do not object to it, but I know of no such understanding.

Mr. MORSE. I merely wanted the record clear. Let the reporter's record speak for itself, but I think that is what the leadership is planning on.

Mr. WHITE. If the record is clear, I hope and believe the understanding will be carried out.

KANSAS CITY ELECTION FRAUDS

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I do not wish my presence in the Chamber at this time to carry with it the implication that I have agreed to any of these things. Indeed, Mr. President, I should be somewhat less than candid if I did not say that I am very much disappointed today that there has been no discussion of the matter which has been for some time the unfinished business of the Senate, namely, the resolution to investigate the inaction of the Department of Justice in connection with the Kansas City vote frauds.

In that connection, I have received a large amount of editorial comment from newspapers throughout the country. I shall not take the time to insert many of these editorials in the RECORD. However, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two editorials as samples of the general line: First, an editorial entitled "Why Not Investigate?" published in the Washington Evening Star of July 18, 1947, and second, an editorial entitled "Justice Department's Kansas City Brush White?" published in the Tampa, Fla., Daily Times of July 17, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of July 18, 1947]

WHY NOT INVESTIGATE?

The question before the Senate in its consideration of the Kansas City vote fraud is whether there should be a full-fledged investigation of the Department of Justice for alleged dereliction of duty.

It is not proposed to investigate the fraud, which occurred last August in the Democratic primary in Missouri's Fifth Congressional District. A county grand jury already has concluded that former Representative Slaughter, to encompass whose defeat President Truman enlisted the aid of the Pendergast machine, was robbed of the election by crooked tactics. A Federal grand jury, very belatedly called into session, is inquiring into possible violations of Federal law, and up to this time has returned five indictments.

So there is no reason for the Senate to investigate the election as such. What it is concerned with, and what it should be concerned with, is the role played by the Department of Justice in this affair.

It is the duty of this Department to see to it that the Federal laws are faithfully enforced. Some time ago, when complaints began to come in, the Attorney General instructed the Federal Bureau of Investigation to make a preliminary investigation. In fact, the FBI was instructed specifically to interview four Kansas City election commissioners and two reporters for the Kansas City Star. In other words, the scope of the investigation was sharply restricted, and the FBI was careful to point this out in its report.

On the basis of this restricted investigation the Attorney General concluded that there had been no Federal violation, and on last January 6 the case was ordered closed. That this was a very questionable assumption is

best indicated by the fact that the five indictments have already been returned by the tardily convened Federal grand jury.

It also is a matter of record that, despite the undeniably restricted scope of the investigation, the Attorney General, on last January 27, wrote Senator KEM, of Missouri, that the FBI, at his direction, had "conducted a full investigation into the charges of fraud in this primary."

In any event, after consideration of these circumstances, Senator KEM has come to two conclusions, and has stated them on the floor of the Senate. One is that the letters he received from the Attorney General "constitute a misrepresentation of known facts to a Member of the Senate in answer to an official inquiry." The other is that the Attorney General "limited the scope of the (original FBI) inquiry to a field in which no evidence of conspiracy could be detected, and then closed the files because no evidence of conspiracy was found."

These are only charges. But they are very grave charges, bearing, as they do, upon the good name of an official in whom it is essential that the public have the highest confidence.

It is true that the Senate Judiciary Committee, dividing along party lines, with Republican Senator LANGER lining up with the Democrats, has recommended against further investigation. But neither this committee, nor its subcommittee, has made a full investigation.

Yet here is a case which, if dropped now, is certain to leave an aftermath of doubt with respect to the integrity of some of our highest political institutions. It also involves the reputation of an Attorney General who has shown himself in many difficult cases to be a man of high integrity. In the light of all these circumstances, the Star believes that there should be a full investigation, and hopes that Attorney General Clark will be found among those insisting upon it.

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Daily Times of July 17, 1947]

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT'S KANSAS CITY BRUSH WHITE?

Was the direction by the Justice Department of a 1946 Kansas City election probe a whitewash?

That is what Missouri Republican Senator KEM would like to know. He has asked the Senate to investigate the way in which the Justice Department handled the affair despite the fact that the Judiciary Committee voted Monday to forget about the whole thing for the time being.

The investigation Mr. KEM would like to know more about was based upon the 1946 primaries in which Enos Axtell, backed by the personal blessing of President Truman, won the nomination for Representative from the Fifth Congressional District of Missouri over the incumbent and bitter administration critic Roger C. Slaughter.

Mr. Truman personally entered the campaign and the revived Pendergast machine, once largely responsible for Mr. Truman's successes, lined up solidly behind Axtell. What caused Senator KEM and other Missourians to lift their eyebrows was the manner in which four key Kansas City wards responded to Mr. Axtell's plea for the nomination. So impressed were these wards, located in the heart of the Pendergast stronghold, that they provided the Truman protege with 12,104 votes as compared to 2,072 for Slaughter, a difference sufficient to swing the scales of victory in Axtell's favor.

What followed then happened fast. The city council requested an inquiry by the Justice Department. A grand jury went to work, indicting 71 persons for election irregularities involving false returns, miscounted ballots, vote buying, and a number of other practices outside the law. It finally came out with the flat statement that Slaughter was deprived of the nomination by a fraudulent miscount of votes and other types of fraud.

The Justice Department and Attorney General Tom Clark moved in on the situation but, strangely enough, moved out again almost as quickly, saying there was a lack of evidence. Three weeks later, May 28, the grand jury lost its evidence, the vault in which the ballots were placed having been blown open and the ballots and other vital records removed.

In the face of this evidence, the American people would like to know, too, whether the Justice Department carried along the whitewash brush when it went to Kansas City.

RECESS

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 22, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 21 (legislative day of July 16), 1947:

UNITED NATIONS

The following-named persons to be representatives of the United States of America to the second session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to be held in New York, N. Y., beginning September 16, 1947:

Warren R. Austin, of Vermont.

Herschel V. Johnson, of North Carolina.

Mrs. Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, of New York.

John Foster Dulles, of New York.

The following-named persons to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the second session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to be held in New York, N. Y., beginning September 16, 1947:

Charles Fahy, of New Mexico.

Willard L. Thorp, of Connecticut.

Francis B. Sayre, of the District of Columbia.

Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois.

Virginia C. Gildersleeve, of New York.

COUNSELOR, DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Charles E. Bohlen, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Counselor of the Department of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John Carter Vincent, of Georgia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Switzerland.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

Senior dental surgeon to be dental director (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel):

William O. Boss

Dental surgeon to be temporary senior dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel):

George E. Waterman

Assistant surgeon to be temporary senior assistant surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of captain):

Martin M. Cummings

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JULY 21, 1947

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, whose resources of grace are abundantly adequate for all our needs, we pray that each day we may yield ourselves in glad obedience to the sovereignty of Thy divine will.

May we confidently believe that Thou art the Lord God omnipotent and commit our baffled minds and burdened hearts to the discipline and guidance of Thy spirit.

Grant that our President, our Speaker, and all who share in the difficult task of ministering to a confused and bewildered generation may be richly endowed with the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, July 19, 1947, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3961. An act to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to Spanish-American War and Civil War veterans and their dependents; and

H. R. 4017. An act to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide that bonds issued under such act shall be redeemable at any time after September 1, 1947, to permit settlement and compensation under such act to be made in cash, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1391. An act to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; and

S. 1394. An act to provide increased subsistence allowance to veterans pursuing certain courses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes tomorrow and for 20 minutes on Thursday, after the legislative program and the special orders heretofore entered for those days.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes on Thursday following the legislative business of the day and the

special orders heretofore granted for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO COMMITTEE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may sit during general debate during sessions of the House for the next 3 days.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Star.

THE CAPITOL TELEPHONE OPERATORS ARE APPRECIATED

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for the period of a minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, before this session of the Eightieth Congress adjourns, I want to pay tribute to the telephone operators here at the Capitol, the most efficient operators to be found anywhere.

In the hurry and scurry of everyday life here in the Congress, we are prone to overlook those who are most helpful to us in the rush of our work.

At times we are inclined to be a bit gruff and sharp when we pick up the telephone and do not get an immediate response. But, I must say, the operators are always patient, considerate, and courteous at all times, and their fine work is to be commended.

I know the Members are most appreciative and grateful for the fine service that has been rendered.

THE THREATENED WESTERN RAILROAD STRIKE

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I hope throughout the day our Government may find some way to ward off the strike of the railroads in the Western States. I know of no other one thing facing us that is so heartbreaking to the farmers and businessmen as this strike proposed to be called the latter part of the day in the Western States.

Millions of tons of foodstuffs will rot in the ground or on the railroad tracks because the cars will not move to the markets of the Eastern States or wherever the markets may be.

I hope if any Member during the day can think of any ways or means that might be helpful in preventing this strike that he will get in touch with the officials working to that end here. It will be appreciated by everybody.

THE THREATENED WESTERN RAILROAD STRIKE

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, following the gentleman from California and seconding his request, I do hope something can be done to avert the strike of engineers which I understand has been called on the Southern Pacific Lines for today. Perhaps it cannot legally be called for 30 days. Such a strike if it eventuates will mean a tremendous loss this summer to a vast portion of the Pacific Southwest because of the fact that right now is the season for the shipping of perishable garden truck and foodstuffs. Thousands of tons, thousands of carloads of melons, cantaloups, and other produce are awaiting shipment. The Southern Pacific is the only rail line servicing many parts of the great Pacific Southwest.

Another factor of extreme importance is the fact that the farmers in that section of the country depend on Diesel oil to run the engines to generate electricity for operating the irrigation pumps. This oil has to be transported by rail. Such transportation is about as vital now as during a war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one two letters and an editorial.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Ernest Marks.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article written by himself entitled "The Marshall Plan."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by that great Democrat from Indiana, Sam Pettengill, on The Key to Next Year's Campaign, which refers to the veto of the tax bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

THE TRUMAN DOCTRINE

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago the propagandists of the administration heralded to the world the Truman doctrine. They said it would go down in history alongside the Monroe Doctrine. Where is it today? Dead and forgotten.

It died because it was simply another plan by which American millions were scattered to the world.

Now comes the Marshall plan. When this plan was first enunciated I thought it was a sensible plan. They said it would require affirmative and positive efforts on the part of the European nations to rebuild themselves before we would hand out our free American millions. Apparently, this was simply a selling point. They now want us to come forward with $25,000,000,000 in the next 4 or 5 years. At the same time the President refuses to give any consideration to the request of nearly 50,000,000 American taxpayers who have asked a slight reduction in their burdensome taxes.

The President misjudges the American mind. I have a post card from a typical American who says:

> My roof has been leaking 3 years. I keep a wash boiler in the attic to catch the rain. If the Knutson bill is passed I can take the cost of a new roof off of my income. Otherwise I cannot afford a new roof.

This man is neither isolationist nor internationalist.

Mr. Speaker, the American people will not agree to the Marshall plan while the President thwarts the will of the people as expressed by two-thirds of their representatives in Congress.

THE FEPC IN NEW YORK—WHITE AMERICANS BETRAYED—GOVERNOR DEWEY SPEAKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include excerpts from an address I made in this House on February 13, and also an address I made in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I feel like exclaiming well, well, well, well, will miracles never cease to happen.

Governor Dewey, of New York, told the people and the fish in Yellowstone National Park, where he went fishing on yesterday, that he did not think he would have been elected last November by such a large margin "if these Communists had not been supporting the other side."

Did those Reds not stay bought after he signed the FEPC bill for them with 21 different pens and gave a pen to almost every leading Communist agitator in New York?

Did they run out on him after he had stacked the FEPC Commission to suit them?

Mr. Speaker, did they turn on him after he had signed the FEPC bill that drove the businessmen of New York underground in order to try to get away from its vicious provisions?

Did they run out on him after he had signed this bill and appointed their ilk on the commission to formulate regulations to harass the businessmen in New York?

Were they not satisfied when he so arranged things that no enterprise would go to New York to start a new business?

Were they not satisfied when he drove business back into Pennsylvania, Ohio, and other States?

Why in the world did they run out on Governor Dewey so quickly?

Have they forgotten his Red speech at Seattle?

Have they forgotten his radical speech in California during the last campaign?

Have they forgotten his attack on the white people of the South in his West Virginia speech?

Did they forget all these services before election day?

Surely not.

If they had I would feel like exclaiming in the words of Shakespeare: "Ingratitude, thou marble-hearted fiend."

Mr. RICH. No wonder he wanted to send them to Montana.

Mr. RANKIN. But he has them around his neck in New York.

Ah, Mr. Speaker, in order for every Member of the House to understand just what a service he rendered to these Red elements when he signed the so-called FEPC bill, I am reinserting an address which I delivered in the House on February 13, 1947, setting out the regulations under which the business interests of New York are now being harassed under the so-called FEPC Act.

And then to show what this monstrosity did to the people of the country during its existence here in Washington, under Executive order, I am reinserting an address which I delivered in the House on July 12, 1945. They read as follows:

THE FEPC IN NEW YORK—WHITE AMERICANS BETRAYED

(Speech of Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, February 13, 1947)

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I arise to discuss a measure introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] for the re-creation of the now defunct FEPC, or the so-called Fair Employment Practice Committee.

I believe Mr. DIRKSEN made a speech for such a measure in the last Congress, which reminded me of the colored preacher who told his congregation that he was "goin' to preach to you an ole 'postolic injunction, 'Take no heed of what you shall say.'"

It would certainly take a genius to reconcile that speech of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and this FEPC bill he has introduced with his recent speech against communism, especially since that FEPC is the chief plank in the Communist platform.

It is the most dangerous piece of communistic legislation with which this country has ever been threatened in all its history. I am going to show what it would do to the people of Illinois by pointing out what it is doing to the people of New York, where this vicious measure was written into the laws of that State without consulting the people who are suffering under it.

All these bills contain the same old bunk about making it a crime to discriminate in employment because of "race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry," and so forth.

Before Mr. DIRKSEN attempts to ram this monstrosity down the throats of the people of Illinois, and all the other States, I suggest he do as they did in California, let the people of Illinois vote on it. That is what they did in California in the last election, and it was defeated by a majority in every single individual county in California.

Now let us see what such a measure is doing to the people of the State of New York.

A man from New York said to me this morning, "You know this measure is being operated in New York simply by failure to operate it." The other night there were two men from New York in a taxicab here in Washington driven by a man who works here on the Hill. They got into an argument. One of them said, "I told you this FEPC would ruin the State of New York if they ever put it on the statute books." The other one said, "I did not think so. I thought it was a humanitarian measure. But I now see my mistake."

Then the other man said, "Here is what it has done to me. I own a good home," I believe he said, "out on Riverside Drive, and I also own a house next to it which I bought for my own protection. I had a friend living in the other house, but his business took him to another section of the country and he had to vacate. Like a fool, I put up a sign 'For rent,' thinking that someone in the community whom I could afford to rent it to would apply. Somebody put a colored fellow up to come and apply for it and the court now says I must let him have it."

I bring this to you for what it is worth. I understand the Communists in New York are demanding that the same rule be applied to rooms or apartments for rent.

But I want to read you some of the regulations that are now being imposed upon the people of the State of New York under this vicious law. Businessmen from New York tell me that the way they are getting around this measure is by operating through employment agencies, because no intelligent businessman would go to a State with that kind of law on its statute books and attempt to establish a new business or a new enterprise, especially with the regulations or rulings under it which I am now going to read to you.

Remember they put this measure on the ticket in California and the people voted on it in the last election; and it lost in every single individual county in California. It was beaten in the entire State by about 3 to 1.

You simply destroy business with a measure like this. That is what the FEPC did here. Men have gone out of business all over the country in the last few years because of the persecution that was carried on by this outfit here in Washington, the personnel of which I shall insert later on.

A few people are going around urging us to pass it as a national law, to put everybody else in the same predicament. These people who are carrying on this racial agitation are using the Negro as a smoke screen. They do not give a tinker's dam about the Negro. They are not trying to help the Negro. They are doing them more harm than anybody has in the last 50 years, and the decent law-abiding Negroes know it.

But let me show you what they have done in New York, and let me give you some of the regulations or rulings, as they are called, and ask you if you would like to have them in your State. I want to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] how he would like to have them in Illinois, or how you would like to have them in Ohio, Indiana, Pennsylvania, or in Missouri, or in any other State in the Union.

Here are the regulations, or rulings, issued by the State of New York. They are headed: "State of New York Executive Department. State Commission Against Discrimination. Rulings."

Here are the rulings.

I want to show you some things you cannot ask in the State of New York when you go to employ a man.

Remember that State has no gas, coal, or oil, and very little water power. The rest of the country does not have to go to New York or to any other State to get what it needs in the years to come. The American people in every section of this country are in a position now to take care of themselves. You put this measure on in one State after another and you will simply penalize those States beyond reason, and when they ask you to pass it for the whole United States and put it on the entire American people, after the fiasco they have made of it here in Washington in the last few years, it is simply unthinkable to a man who knows what he is doing and has the interest of the people of the country at heart.

Here are some of the things you cannot do under the law of New York:

"UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES BEFORE HIRING ANYBODY"

Those words are written in capitals. Here is the first unlawful practice:

"Inquiry into the original name of the applicant for employment, whose name has been changed by court proceedings or otherwise."

If you inquire as to his name or what his name used to be you violate the law. You commit an unlawful practice. For instance, that this man who writes for PM who calls himself I. F. Stone. His name was Isadore Feinstein, as Cordell Hull once pointed out. Suppose he comes to you asking for employment and you ask him that question. Then you will have committed an awful act.

Here is the next one:

It would be unlawful practice to make "Inquiry into the birthplace of the applicant for employment, the birthplace of his parents, spouse, or other close relative."

How would you like that in Iowa, Illinois, Texas, or Nebraska? In California I know you do not like it, because you have just voted on it.

Here is the next "unlawful practice":

"Requirement that the applicant for employment produce a birth certificate or baptismal certificate."

That would be an unlawful practice under this FEPC Act in New York.

I was surprised to see Governor Dewey get his mustache in the wringer on this proposition. I do not see how he is ever going to get loose from it.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. What about this requirement during the war that every person employed in certain industries had to prove that he was born here before he could get a job?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly. If we had had this law all over the country then, the Japs would have had a spy at the elbow of every man in a key position; so would the Germans, and so would every other enemy country.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his timely suggestion.

It is an unlawful practice in New York, under this law, to make "Inquiry into the religious denomination of an applicant for employment, his religious affiliations, his church, parish, pastor, or religious holidays observed. Inquiry into whether an applicant for employment is an atheist."

Inquiry into whether an applicant for employment is an atheist is forbidden, although you may be publishing literature for the Methodist Church, the Baptist Church, or any other denomination.

Another thing, an applicant for employment—and I am reading from the rules laid down by this Commission:

"An applicant for employment may not be told that this is a Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish organization."

In other words, if you are in the business of publishing religious literature you cannot even give him that information under this law which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr.

DIRKSEN] now proposes for the whole country, including Illinois.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"An applicant for employment may not be told that the following holidays will be observed by the firm and no others, naming the holidays; e. g., Decoration Day and July the Fourth, etc."

You cannot tell them under the laws, rulings, and regulations of the State of New York that they may observe the Fourth of July.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"An applicant for employment may not be told that employees are required to work Rosh Hashana and Yom Kippur."

Frankly, I did not know there were any such days until the last few years.

Another thing, it is an unlawful practice under this New York law to make "inquiry into the complexion of an applicant for employment."

Inquire into his complexion and you are likely to get yourself tangled up with the law of the State of New York.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"Requirement that an applicant for employment annex a photograph."

That would be an unlawful employment practice. You are not supposed to know how he looks.

Remember, this is not in Russia, but in New York.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. And yet the State Department in order to grant a visa requires a photograph of the person to be presented with his application.

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly, and they ought to do so. Much as I respect the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], I certainly would not want to employ him unless I knew how he looked. If I had never seen him, I would certainly want to see his picture.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"Inquiry whether an applicant for employment is a naturalized or native-born citizen; the date when the applicant acquired citizenship; whether the applicant's parents or spouse are naturalized or native-born citizens of the United States; the date when such parents or spouse acquired citizenship."

You cannot inquire into those questions under this FEPC law in New York.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"Requirement that an applicant for employment produce his naturalization papers or first papers."

He may lie to you and tell you that he is a naturalized citizen, but you cannot ask to see his papers.

Another unlawful practice in New York is to "inquire into the lineage of an applicant for employment, his ancestry, or national origin."

You remember a few years ago the Dallas News inserted an advertisement for a colored janitor, and this FEPC outfit down the street, ordered them to take it out, said it was an unlawful practice.

One member of this FEPC outfit here in Washington went into the office of Swift & Co. in Chicago. This FEPC man asked them: "How many Negroes do you have on your board of directors?"

The answer was "None."

Then the FEPC man asked him: "Why haven't you?"

That was the FEPC down here in Washington a few years ago before it died because a few radicals could not browbeat Congress into perpetuating it.

But it is now in force in the State of New York.

Here is another unlawful practice under the New York law:

"Inquiry into the location of places of business of relatives of an applicant for employment."

It is an unlawful practice to make "inquiry into the place of residence of the parents, spouse, or other close relatives of an applicant for employment."

I am reading from the records at Albany.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"Inquiry into the maiden name of the wife of a male applicant for employment and/or inquiry into the maiden name of the mother of a male or female applicant for employment."

The other day we had the Eislers down here. One of them has been shown to be representing the Comintern, according to his sister's testimony. He has a brother out in California, who seems to be poisoning the public mind through the moving-picture industry. He tries to defend his brother and refers to this woman as "my former sister." If you wanted to employ any of them and check the name of at least one of them as given here, you could not inquire into those names at all—if you are trying to do business in the State of New York—even though one of them has a half dozen aliases. You could not even ask where they came from or when they got here or when they changed their names.

Here is another unlawful practice, in New York:

"Inquiry into the general military experience of an applicant for employment."

I wish every ex-serviceman could read that, and the next one.

Here it is. It is an unlawful practice to make "inquiry into the whereabouts of an applicant for employment during the First World War, i. e., during the period from 1914 to 1919."

In other words, inquiry as to his whereabouts in the period from 1914 to 1919 is forbidden as an unlawful practice in the State of New York.

Is that what you want in Colorado? Is that what you want in Massachusetts?

Mr. GIFFORD. We have it.

Mr. RANKIN. Get rid of it, and we will help you.

Is that what you want in Kansas, in Ohio, and in other States?

Let your States vote on it. Michigan is going to vote on it right away. If you will tell the people of Michigan the whole truth, let them know the whole truth about this monstrosity, I will guarantee you they will beat it worse than they did in California.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"Inquiry into the organizations of which an applicant for employment is a member, including organizations the name or character of which indicates the religion, race, or national origin of its members."

I presume, if they should ask me if I am a member of the Masonic lodge, I could have them jerked up and brought before this inquisition board or probably prosecuted at various places throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I am not criticizing the people of New York. I have long since learned in going from one State to another that real Americans are about the same everywhere. I believe if they had a vote on it the people of New York would beat it, just as they did in California.

They are having a vote on it in Michigan because a little minority group has been attempting to browbeat the Legislature of Michigan into passing it. I dare say when it goes on the ballot in Michigan and the people of Michigan understand what it means they will defeat it more thoroughly than they did in California. The same thing would happen in probably every other State in the Union.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman tell us what the penalties are in New York?

Mr. RANKIN. In addition to being harassed to death with orders and directives to cease, desist, rehire, and so forth, there is a punishment provided of "imprisonment in a penitentiary or county jail for not more than 1 year or by fine of not more than $500, or by both."

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to remind the gentleman that we have that law in Massachusetts.

Mr. RANKIN. I was afraid of that.

Mr. GIFFORD. I was thoroughly amazed when I looked into it; I had not learned what the rules were. But, perhaps we carried it too far. I am so sorry, and I have been, and I am not in favor of this, I can assure the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I know the gentleman is not, and I am sure the people of Massachusetts would not favor it if they had a vote on it.

Mr. GIFFORD. Employers always inquire and must know whether you come from a respectable family or not. They are so careful. Perhaps they overdid it. But I think a man ought to be able to find out whether he came from a respectable family.

Mr. RANKIN. There are a great many questions that should be asked, which are forbidden under this law.

Mr. Speaker, in order to give the new Members an idea of what a mess this FEPC was here in Washington during its existence under Executive order, I insert a speech I made on this subject in 1945.

It reads as follows:

"FEPC A BETRAYAL OF WHITE AMERICANS

"(Speech of Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, July 12, 1945)

"Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the passage of a law at this time legalizing this so-called FEPC would be a betrayal of the white people of the country. If every individual in the United States could understand just what it means, there would be such a roar of protest coming from every State in this Union that it would never see the light of day.

"If every Member of Congress would 'screw his courage to the sticking place' and vote his convictions on this so-called FEPC, it would not get 50 votes out of the entire membership of 435.

"It is a most dangerous and brazen attempt to fasten upon the white people of America the worst system of control by alien or minority racial groups that has been known since the crucifixion.

"When I read the names of the personnel of this outfit you will understand what I mean.

"To sanctify this organization by law would give the lie to everything we have told our American boys they were fighting for. Instead of coming back to liberty, freedom, and democracy, they would find themselves sold into this bondage, herded, humiliated, and regimented by alien influences directed by a foreign comintern representing the deadly doctrine of Karl Marx that is based upon hatred for Christianity and for everything that is based on Christian principles.

"It is a manifestation in legislative form of that infidelity that has closed thousands of Christian churches in Europe and been responsible for the murder of untold millions of Christian human beings.

"This measure is not directed altogether at the white people of the South. If it were, you folks in the North would not have so much ground for alarm. We in the South know how to combat subversive elements. As Henry Grady once said, we wrested the South from such domination 'when Federal drum beats rolled nearer and Federal bayonets hedged closer to the ballot box of the

South than it ever will again in this Republic.'

"But you people in the North have not had that training, and this FEPC is likely to bring grief, strife, hatred, race riots, and chaos in your northern cities if this vicious agency is perpetuated and sanctioned by your votes.

"Do not forget that the returning servicemen know what this thing means, and they are going to call you to account next year—beginning with the primary. They are not going to wait until the general election.

"Do not forget that every businessman, every farmer, every professional man, and every other independent individual whose blood glows with the instinct of American liberty, is going to join these men, and those other patriotic forces that are fighting to save American institutions for which these boys have been fighting and dying upon every battlefield in the world.

"If every man and every woman in the United States could just read the list of individuals that compose the personnel of this crazy FEPC, and its subdivisions throughout the country, I dare say there would not be enough of you left who vote for it, even if nominated in the primaries next year, to form a corporal's guard.

"For your information, and for the information of the American people generally, I am going to read you the official personnel as it exists today. Remember, this list is taken from the official record. This is the group that wants to nose into and control every business in the United States. Remember, they can search the files and records of every business establishment in America where some disgruntled individual is willing to trump up a charge of discrimination. They can drag them all over the country and try them, and in that way destroy any ordinary business concern.

"The next thing they are going to try to do is get control of your schools and force their communistic henchmen into the schools and teach your children their subversive doctrines.

"Read these lists carefully, which, as I said, are taken from the official records here in Washington, and you will see that not 1 out of 10 on these rolls is a white Gentile American.

"Here is the official list:

"Committee on Fair Employment Practice, Washington, D. C., Office of the Chairman

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Ross, Malcolm	Chairman	White	$8,000
Johnson, George M.	Deputy Chairman.	Colored	8,000
Hubbard, Maceo	Hearings examiner.	do	5,600
Bloch, Emanuel	do	White	5,600
Copper, Evelyn	do	do	5,600
Berking, Max	Assistant to Chairman.	do	3,800
Alexander, Dorothy	Secretary to Chairman.	Colored	2,600
Clifton, J. Jeanne	Secretary to Deputy.	do	2,000
Brooks, Mary	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Banting, Myra	do	White	1,800

"You will note that in this office of the chairman, consisting of 10 people, there are 5 Negroes and 5 white people, most of whom have foreign names. One of the whites is a stenographer who receives the smallest salary of anyone on the list.

"Remember that the members of this group preside over the destiny of every business enterprise in America, and are using their assumed powers to harass white Americans out of business.

"This is the organization Members of Congress are being asked to perpetuate by the passage of this bill.

"FIELD OPERATIONS

"Here is the Division of Field Operations:

"Field operations

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Maslow, Will	Chief	White	$6,500
Mitchell, Clarence	Principal fair-practice examiner.	Colored	5,600
Davidson, Eugene	do	do	5,600
Beall, W. Hayes	Senior fair-practice examiner.	White	4,600
Mercer, Inez	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Rogers, Eleanor	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800
Saito, Otome	do	Japanese-American.	1,800
Thompson, Mildred	do	Colored	1,800
Cornick, Emma	do	do	1,620

"You will note that it consists of nine people—five Negroes, one Japanese, and three others—two of whom have records of affiliations with Communist-front organizations, according to the reports of the Dies committee.

"Imagine this group going about over the country riding herd on the white American businessmen of the Nation, telling them whom they shall employ, whom they shall promote, and with whom they may associate.

"It would be interesting, and probably enlightening, to check up on these people and see how many of them are native-born Americans.

"Members of Congress had better do this now, before they get caught in this trap, because this question of un-American activities is going to be an issue in every congressional district next year, beginning with the primaries.

"The people are not going to wait until the general election for someone who holds a commission as a result of the pernicious activities of Sidney Hillman and his gang to wrap the party cloak about him and shout to the people of his district that 'I am a Republican' or 'I am a Democrat.'

"More than 2,000,000 young men have already been discharged in this war, and they are organizing now to try to save America for Americans. They are going to read your records, and they are likely to ask you some very embarrassing questions when you get home.

"REVIEW AND ANALYSIS DIVISION

"Now look at this list and see who reviews all these records of racial discrimination when they come to Washington, and you will understand how the editor of the Dallas News felt and how other white gentiles feel, including Cecil B. DeMille, the great American movie producer, when they are harassed out of business.

"Here is the list:

"Review and Analysis Division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Davis, John A	Chief	Colored	$5,600
Lawson, Marjorie	Research analyst.	do	3,800
Golightly, Cornelius	Compliance analyst.	do	3,200
Hemphill, India	do	do	2,600
Coan, Carol	do	White	2,600
Davis, Joy P	do	Colored	2,600
Hoffman, Celia	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800
Spaulding, Joan	do	Colored	1,800

"You will note that it consists of six Negroes and two white people, one of whom is named Carol Coan and the other Celia Hoffman, a white stenographer receiving the lowest salary on the list.

"Now, if you sign the petition to bring out this bill or vote for this monstrosity, do not forget that when you get home those white American businessmen who help to sustain this Nation in time of peace and whose sons are fighting its battles in time of war are going to want to ask you some questions that you may not be able to answer.

"LEGAL DIVISION

"But if you want a real laugh, look at this Legal Division.

"Legal Division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Reeves, Frank D	Attorney	Colored	$4,600
Stickgold, Simon	do	White	4,600
Gordon, Jernevive	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800

"You will note that this so-called Legal Division consists of two Negroes and a Simon Stickgold.

"INFORMATION DIVISION

"Now we come to the Information Division. If you want information about this outfit, write to this Division:

"Information Division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Bourne, St. Clair	Information specialist.	Colored	$3,200
Whiting, Margaret	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800

"You will note that it consists of two Negroes, one registered as an information specialist and the other as a clerk-stenographer.

"BUDGET AND ADMINISTRATION

"Now we come to the Budget and Administration Division. This Division not only makes up the budget but administers the regulations. Here is the list:

"Budget and Administration

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Jones, Theodore	Chief	Colored	$5,600
Jeter, Sinclair	Assistant administrative officer.	do	3,200
Baker, Vivian D	Clerk-stenographer.	do	2,000
Jackson, Rosales A	Clerk-typist	do	1,620
Paynter, Minnie A	do	do	1,620
Hollomon, Irving	Clerk	do	1,440
Selby, Ralph B	Chief, fiscal	do	2,600
Ross, Sylvia B	Voucher auditor	do	2,000
Nelson, Otelia	Accounting clerk	do	1,620
Carpenter, Elizabeth	do	do	1,620
Brent, Pearl T	do	do	1,620

"This outfit, which is composed of 11 Negroes and no whites at all, not only makes up the budget for financing this aggregation, but it seems to have the power of administration. I hope you will read this list to your white businessmen, farmers, and ex-servicemen at home when you get back and ask for renomination in the primaries next year.

"MAIL AND FILES DIVISION

"Now, here are the ones that have control of the mails and filing system:

"Mail and Files

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Douglas, Lela	Chief, Mail and Files.	Colored	$3,000
Welch, Selena	Docket clerk	do	1,800
Gamble, Jessie	File clerk	do	1,620
Phillips, Rose	do	do	1,440
Reed, Charles	Messenger	do	1,380
Mitchell, Regina	File clerk	do	1,440

"You will note that this division is composed entirely of Negroes—six Negroes, and no whites at all. I wonder why they discriminated against the white race in setting up these two powerful branches of this most dangerous agency?

"REGIONAL OFFICE, NEW YORK

"Now, let us turn to the regional offices and see who is going to harass the business people back in the States. Here is the list for the State of New York:

"Regional office, New York

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Lawson, Edward H.	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Jones, Madison S.	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Jones, Robert G	do	do	3,800
Donovan, Daniel R	do	White	3,800
Irish, Miriam	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	2,000
Asepha, Tillie	do	White	1,620
Schwartz, Sonia	do	do	1,620

"This is the list that is going to help Governor Dewey harass the white American businessmen of the Empire State. You will note that it is composed of four Negroes and three white people. Please read the names of the three white people and see if you can figure out their antecedents.

"Businessmen of New York are going to have a hard time after this war without having all this communistic conglomeration to deal with, to say nothing of the one which Governor Dewey and his political henchmen have now heaped upon them.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, PHILADELPHIA

"Now, let us turn to Philadelphia, the birthplace of the Constitution—the City of Brotherly Love. At the risk of causing glorious old Benjamin Franklin to turn over in his grave, I read you the list:

"Regional office, Philadelphia

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Fleming, G. James	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Greenblatt Mildred	Fair-practice examiner.	White	3,800
Manly, Milo A	do	Colored	3,800
Risk, Samuel R	do	White	3,800
Grinnage, Willard	do	Colored	3,200
Gorgas, Helen	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Klinger, Karyl	do	White	1,800
Brown, Grayce	do	Colored	1,440

"You will note that it is composed of eight individuals—five Negroes and three whites, Mildred Greenblatt, Samuel R. Risk, and Karyl Klinger.

"Don't you know there will be some brotherly love when that crowd gets going on the businessmen of the Philadelphia area?

"REGIONAL OFFICE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

"Now, here is the regional office in Washington, D. C., the Nation's Capital, where there has been so much persecution of white gentiles in the last few years. Here is the list:

"Regional office, Washington, D. C.

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Evans, Joseph	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Houston, Theophilus.	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,200
Kahn, Alice	do	White	2,600
Chisolm, Ruby	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800
Urback, Dorothy	do	do	1,620

"You will note it consists of four Negroes and Alice Kahn. Just what chance a white gentile will have with this group is entirely problematical, to say the least of it.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, CLEVELAND

"Now, let us move out where the West begins and take a look. Here is the list in the Cleveland regional office:

"Regional office, Cleveland

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
McKnight, William.	Regional director.	Colored	$4,600
Abbott, Olcott R	Fair-practice examiner.	White	3,800
Glore, Lethia	do	Colored	3,200
Kelley, Berniza	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,620
Wasem, Edna	do	White	1,800

"You will note that this group is composed of three Negroes and two whites, Olcott R. Abbott and Edna Wasem.

"Don't you know the white people of Cleveland will enjoy being dominated by them?

"CINCINNATI REGIONAL OFFICE

"Cincinnati seems to be largely under the jurisdiction of the Cleveland office since it only has two people:

"Cincinnati

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
James, Harold	Fair-practice examiner.	White	$4,600
----------	Clerk-stenographer.	----------	1,800

"DETROIT REGIONAL OFFICE

"Now let us move on to Detroit, Mich. Here is the regional office for Detroit:

"Detroit

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Swan, Edward	Examiner in charge.	Colored	$4,600
Sese, Doris K	Clerk-stenographer.	Japanese-American.	1,620

"You will note that it is composed of one Negro and one Japanese. I know the businessmen of Detroit are grateful for this consideration.

"I should like to hear some of the comments they will make to you gentleman from Detroit when you get home next summer, if you support this vicious measure.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, CHICAGO

"Here is the list of the regional office in the Windy City;

"Regional office, Chicago

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Henderson, Elner	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Gibson, Harry H. C.	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Schultz, Joy	do	White	3,800
Williams, Le Roy	do	Colored	3,200
Zeidman, Penny	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800
Ingram, Marguerite S.	do	Colored	1,620

"You will note it is composed of four Negroes, Joy Schultz, and Penny Zeidman. I am told that a representative of this group went into the office of Swift & Co. and asked how many Negro members they had on their board of directors. The answer was, 'We have no Negro members on our board of directors.' Then the question came back, 'Why haven't you?' This just shows what this supergovernmental set-up is driving at. They want to communize America and destroy everything which our glorious ancestors have left us and for which our boys are now fighting and dying all over the world.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, ATLANTA

"Here is a list of the Atlanta office:

"Regional office, Atlanta

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Dodge, Witherspoon.	Regional director.	White	$4,600
Hope, John	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,800
McKay, George D	do	White	3,200
Chubb, Sally	Clerk-stenographer.	do	2,000
Ingram, Thelma	do	Colored	1,800

"You will note that it consists of two Negroes and three whites; the most important post in this office, that of examiner, is held by a Negro. I wonder how the people of Georgia enjoy the domination of this group. I may have more to say about them later.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, KANSAS CITY

"Here is the list of the Kansas City office:

"Regional office, Kansas City

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Hoglund, Roy A	Regional director.	White	$5,600
Ormabee, Eugene	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Jones, Mildred	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,620
Schlien, Helene G	do	White	1,620

"You will note that this office force consists of three whites and one Negro. You can read the lists of whites yourself and then judge how many of them really represent the people of that area.

"ST. LOUIS REGIONAL OFFICE

"Here is the list of the regional office at St. Louis:

"St. Louis

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Theodore Brown	Examiner in charge.	Colored	$3,800
Morris Levine	Examiner	White	3,200
Armatha Jackson	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,620

"You will notice that it consists of two Negroes and Morris Levine. Just how they came to select these particular individuals to preside over the destiny of the white businessmen of the great State of Missouri I cannot understand.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, DALLAS, TEX.

"The members of the regional office at Dallas are as follows:

"Regional office, Dallas

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Castenada, Carlos	Regional director.	White	$4,600
(Vacancy)	Fair-practice examiner.	----------	3,200
Gutleben, Willetta	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800

"You will note there is one vacancy. Last year that position was held by a Negro, namely, Roy V. Williams. The other two members, Carlos Castenada, the regional director, and Willetta Gutleben seem to be in charge of the office at the present time. This

is the regional office that attacked the Dallas News last year for carrying an advertisement for a Negro janitor. This fellow Castenada, the director, held the same position that he holds now. If this set-up is made permanent, then I presume the rest of the white American businessmen in Texas may expect to be harassed just as the Dallas News was.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, NEW ORLEANS

"The regional office at New Orleans consists of the following members:

"Regional office, New Orleans

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Ellinger, W. Don	Regional director.	White	$3,800
Morton, James H.	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,200
Ronning, Evelyn	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800

"You will note that there are two whites and one Negro in this office. As the Negro is the fair-practice examiner, just what the decent people of Louisiana may expect at the hands of this outfit is something to contemplate.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, SAN FRANCISCO

"The San Francisco office consists of the following individuals:

"Regional office, San Francisco

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Kingman, Harry L.	Regional director.	White	$5,600
Rutledge, Edward	Fair-practice examiner.	do	4,600
Ross, Bernard	do	do	3,800
Seymour, Virginia	Administrative assistant.	do	2,000
Mazen, Jewel	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800

"This is the only office we have found yet that consists entirely of white (?) people. Just what the background of each one of them is I am unable to say.

"LOS ANGELES REGIONAL OFFICE

"The Los Angeles regional office consists of the following:

"Los Angeles

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Hunt, A. Bruce	Hearings examiner.	White	$5,600
Brown, Robert E.	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,600
Lopez, Ignacio	do	White	3,800
Velter, Vera G.	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Lerna, Marie	do	do	1,620

"You will note that there are four whites and one Negro in this office, the Negro being the fair-practice examiner. I do not know what consideration the white businessmen of the Los Angeles area are receiving at the hands of this group, but from what I can hear there is considerable gnashing of teeth over the situation.

"Mr. Chairman, this FEPC is a supergovernment of commissars, with more power for evil than any other agency that has ever been created in this country. If Congress should ratify it and make it the law of the land, then we will have sacrified and destroyed that sacred freedom for which our brave men are now fighting and dying on every battlefront in the world.

"We have no right to pass such a drastic, revolutionary measure that literally changes our way of life, as well as our form of government, while these boys are away from home in uniform, fighting to sustain American institutions.

"As I said before, we are going to carry this battle against such un-American activities into every congressional district in the United States next year, in the primary, so that no one can crawl behind the party cloak and claim immunity at the hands of any segment of our people.

"This is a battle for the survival of free constitutional government, for the survival of the American way of life, for the survival of free enterprise, for the survival of American liberty itself.

"It is a battle to save America for Americans."

POLL TAXES

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously, a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 125]

Andresen, August H.	Fuller	Lodge
Angell	Gallagher	Ludlow
Bell	Gary	McGarvey
Bennett, Mich.	Gifford	Macy
Bland	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mason
Bloom	Hall, Leonard W.	Merrow
Boggs, La.	Hart	Miller, Conn.
Boykin	Hartley	Mitchell
Bulwinkle	Hays	Morgan
Case, N. J.	Hébert	Murray, Tenn.
Case, S. Dak.	Hendricks	O'Hara
Chiperfield	Jarman	Pfeifer
Clements	Jenkins, Pa.	Powell
Clippinger	Johnson, Tex.	Richards
Cole, Mo.	Jonkman	Sadowski
Coudert	Kee	Sarbacher
Courtney	Kelley	Sheppard
Dingell	Kennedy	Smith, Ohio
Domengeaux	Landis	Thomas, N. J.
Eaton	Lesinski	Vinson
Fellows	Lewis	Zimmerman
Flannagan		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 367 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 204, nays 47.

So the motion was agreed to.

POLL TAXES

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, is not and shall not be deemed a qualification of voters or electors voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for said officers, within the meaning of the Constitution, but is and shall be deemed an interference with the manner of holding primaries and other elections for said national officers and a tax upon the right or privilege of voting for said national officers.

SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for any State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision to prevent any person from voting or registering to vote in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, on the ground that such person has not paid a poll tax, and any such requirement shall be invalid and void insofar as it purports to disqualify any person otherwise qualified to vote in such primary or other election. No State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision shall levy a poll tax or any other tax on the right or privilege of voting in such primary or other election, and any such tax shall be invalid and void insofar as it purports to disqualify any person otherwise qualified from voting at such primary or other election.

SEC. 3. It shall be unlawful for any State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision to interfere with the manner of selecting persons for national office by requiring the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting or registering to vote in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, and any such requirement shall be invalid and void.

SEC. 4. It shall be unlawful for any person, whether or not acting under the cover of authority of the laws of any State or subdivision thereof, to require the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting or registering to vote in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against the bill that it violates the Constitution of the United States and that the Congress has no right to pass such legislation, and I should like to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Mississippi briefly on the point of order.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in the trying days through which we are passing, to bring up a bill of this kind, in a cheap political gesture to try to override the Constitution of the United States, is certainly reminiscent of Nero's fiddling while Rome burned.

Just remember that this is just the opening wedge to interfere with the election laws in every State in the Union.

Today every effort is being made to destroy the Constitution by the people who hate our form of government. Let us see what section 2 of the Constitution provides:

The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States—

Not by the Congress, but by the people of the several States. Section 2 further provides—

and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

This proposed law flies right in the face of that provision of the Constitution, just as the so-called Federal ballot did 2 years ago, against which I successfully led the fight in this House to protect your States and mine from such an invasion as this you provide here.

You attempt to provide one method for electing Members of Congress and one qualification for voters for Members of Congress and the Senate, whereas the Constitution of the United States states, "and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

This is not a new question. If you will go back to the nineties you will find that when the Constitution of my State was before the Senate, when the Senate contained some of the ablest minds that body has ever had, Senator James F. George of my State took the election laws of every State in the Union and analyzed them and showed where those who opposed recognizing the Constitution of Mississippi were planting dynamite under the State governments throughout the country.

There is not a man in this House who votes for this law, and who can read the Constitution of the United States, who does not know that he is voting right in the face of that Constitution.

Oh, I get this Communist propaganda every day from the CIO-PAC, that fought me in the primary and went out and gathered money from the Reds in New York and sent it into my district for that purpose. Of course, they are for this measure. It is one of the planks in the Communist platform.

The same Reds who gathered money and sent it into your districts to fight you with want to get rid of this Constitution entirely. Do you want to uphold the Constitution or do you just want to make a feeble gesture that will make you look ridiculous in the eyes of the people of the United States from now on?

If you are going to change any law, the thing you should do would be to adopt an amendment to the Constitution, and not attempt in this way to override that sacred document, that today Americans are praying to God we do not permit our enemies to destroy. As I said, this is but the opening wedge. There will be other laws to follow. I saw the danger 2 years ago when they attempted to take over your election machinery, and I led the fight here, the hardest fight they ever had since I have been in Congress, and won it, to hold the election machinery in the hands of the people of the various States.

Now, you come in with this vicious measure, right in the face of the Constitution, Mr. Speaker, and I submit that the Congress under the Constitution has no right to consider a bill which would destroy that or any other provision of the Constitution.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this bill is not legally before the House, and that my point of order should be sustained.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule. The bill is properly before the House. It is not within the jurisdiction of the Chair to determine what is constitutional and what is not constitutional. The point of order is overruled.

Is a second demanded?

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on seconding the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill as read.

The Speaker appointed as tellers the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAMBLE] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT].

The House divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 133, noes 70.

So a second was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GAMBLE] is recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PICKETT) there were—ayes 42, noes 261.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. GAMBLE and Mr. PICKETT.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 51, noes 149.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, on that, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 85, nays 299, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 126]

YEAS—85

Abernethy	Fisher	Patman
Allen, La.	Flannagan	Peden
Almond	Folger	Peterson
Andrews, Ala.	Gary	Pickett
Barden	Gathings	Poage
Bates, Ky.	Gossett	Preston
Battle	Grant, Ala.	Price, Fla.
Beckworth	Gregory	Rains
Bonner	Hardy	Rankin
Brooks	Harris	Richards
Brown, Ga.	Harrison	Riley
Bryson	Hobbs	Rivers
Bulwinkle	Jarman	Rogers, Fla.
Burleson	Jones, Ala.	Sikes
Camp	Jones, N. C.	Smith, Va.
Chapman	Kerr	Stanley
Colmer	Kilday	Teague
Combs	Lanham	Trimble
Cooley	Larcade	West
Cooper	Lucas	Wheeler
Cox	Lyle	Whitten
Cravens	Mahon	Whittington
Davis, Ga.	Manasco	Williams
Davis, Tenn.	Mills	Wilson, Tex.
Dorn	Morrison	Winstead
Doughton	Murray, Tenn.	Wood
Drewry	Norrell	Worley
Durham	Pace	
Evins	Passman	

NAYS—299

Albert	Andresen,	Bakewell
Allen, Calif.	August H.	Banta
Allen, Ill.	Andrews, N. Y.	Barrett
Andersen,	Arends	Bates, Mass.
H. Carl	Arnold	Beall
Anderson, Calif.	Auchincloss	Bender
Bennett, Mich.	Hall,	Muhlenberg
Bennett, Mo.	Leonard W.	Mundt
Bishop	Halleck	Murdock
Blackney	Hand	Murray, Wis.
Blatnik	Harless, Ariz.	Nixon
Boggs, Del.	Harness, Ind.	Nodar
Boggs, La.	Havenner	Norblad
Bolton	Hedrick	Norton
Bradley	Heffernan	O'Brien
Bramblett	Hendricks	O'Konski
Brehm	Herter	O'Toole
Brophy	Heselton	Owens
Brown, Ohio	Hess	Patterson
Buchanan	Hill	Philbin
Buck	Hinshaw	Phillips, Calif.
Buckley	Hoeven	Phillips, Tenn.
Buffett	Hoffman	Ploeser
Burke	Holifield	Plumley
Busbey	Holmes	Potts
Butler	Hope	Poulson
Byrne, N. Y.	Horan	Price, Ill.
Byrnes, Wis.	Howell	Priest
Canfield	Huber	Rabin
Cannon	Hull	Ramey
Carroll	Jackson, Calif.	Rayfiel
Carson	Jackson, Wash.	Redden
Case, N. J.	Javits	Reed, Ill.
Case, S. Dak.	Jenison	Reed, N. Y.
Celler	Jenkins, Ohio	Rees
Chadwick	Jennings	Reeves
Chelf	Jensen	Rich
Chenoweth	Johnson, Calif.	Richlman
Church	Johnson, Ill.	Rizley
Clark	Johnson, Ind.	Robertson
Clason	Johnson, Okla.	Robsion
Clevenger	Jones, Wash.	Rockwell
Coffin	Jonkman	Rogers, Mass.
Cole, Kans.	Judd	Rohrbough
Cole, N. Y.	Karsten, Mo.	Rooney
Corbett	Kean	Ross
Cotton	Kearney	Russell
Coudert	Kearns	Sabath
Crosser	Keating	Sadlak
Crow	Keefe	St. George
Cunningham	Kefauver	Sanborn
Curtis	Kennedy	Sasscer
Dague	Keogh	Schwabe, Mo.
Davis, Wis.	Kersten, Wis.	Schwabe, Okla.
Dawson, Ill.	Kilburn	Scoblick
Dawson, Utah	King	Scott, Hardie
Deane	Kirwan	Scott,
Delaney	Klein	Hugh D., Jr.
Devitt	Knutson	Scrivner
D'Ewart	Kunkel	Seely-Brown
Dirksen	Landis	Shafer
Dolliver	Lane	Short
Dondero	Latham	Simpson, Ill.
Donohue	Lea	Simpson, Pa.
Douglas	LeCompte	Smathers
Eberharter	LeFevre	Smith, Kans.
Elliott	Lemke	Smith, Maine
Ellis	Lesinski	Smith, Wis.
Ellsworth	Lodge	Snyder
Elsaesser	Love	Somers
Elston	Lusk	Spence
Engel, Mich.	Lynch	Springer
Engle, Calif.	McConnell	Stefan
Fallon	McCormack	Stevenson
Feighan	McCowen	Stigler
Fellows	McDonough	Stockman
Fenton	McDowell	Stratton
Fernandez	McGregor	Sundstrom
Fletcher	McMahon	Taber
Fogarty	McMillen, Ill.	Talle
Foote	Mack	Taylor
Forand	MacKinnon	Thomas, N. J.
Fulton	Madden	Thomas, Tex.
Gamble	Maloney	Tibbott
Gavin	Mansfield	Tollefson
Gearhart	Marcantonio	Towe
Gillette	Martin, Iowa	Twyman
Gillie	Mathews	Vail
Goff	Meade, Ky.	Vorys
Goodwin	Meade, Md.	Vursell
Gordon	Merrow	Wadsworth
Gore	Meyer	Walter
Gorski	Michener	Weichel
Graham	Miller, Calif.	Welch
Grant, Ind.	Miller, Conn.	Wigglesworth
Griffiths	Miller, Md.	Wilson, Ind.
Gross	Miller, Nebr.	Wolcott
Gwinn, N. Y.	Monroney	Wolverton
Gwynne, Iowa	Morgan	Woodruff
Hagen	Morris	Youngblood
Hale	Morton	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—46

Angell	Courtney	Hall,
Bell	Crawford	Edwin Arthur
Bland	Dingell	Hart
Bloom	Domengeaux	Hartley
Boykin	Eaton	Hays
Chiperfield	Fuller	Hébert
Clements	Gallagher	Jenkins, Pa.
Clippinger	Gifford	Johnson, Tex.
Cole, Mo.	Granger	Jones, Ohio

Kee	Mason	Sarbacher
Kelley	Mitchell	Sheppard
Lewis	O'Hara	Smith, Ohio
Ludlow	Pfeifer	Thomason
McGarvey	Powell	Van Zandt
McMillan, S. C.	Rayburn	Vinson
Macy	Sadowski	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. McGarvey against.
Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Gallagher against.
Mr. Domengeaux for, with Mr. Gifford against.
Mr. Bland for, with Mr. Dingell against.
Mr. Johnson of Texas for, with Mr. Hart against.
Mr. McMillan of South Carolina for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.
Mr. Bell for, with Mr. Sarbacher against.
Mr. Courtney for, with Mr. Kelley against.
Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Sadowski against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Angell with Mr. Thomason.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Granger.
Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Clements.
Mr. Cole of Missouri with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Eaton with Mr. Hays.
Mr. Macy with Mr. Kee.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Bloom.
Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Ludlow.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GAMBLE] is recognized.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I notice there is a message here from the President. Do we not receive them when they come in?

The SPEAKER. The Chair was about to suspend for a moment to receive a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on July 18, 1947, the President approved and signed a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3493. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 233. Joint resolution authorizing the President to approve the trusteeship agreement for the Territory of the Pacific Islands.

POLL TAXES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's point of order is dilatory. That is obvious to all Members.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, this bill makes unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers. It has been debated and passed by the House on three occasions on roll-call votes—to wit, in the Seventy-seventh, the Seventy-eighth, and the Seventy-ninth Congresses.

It has never been passed in the other body.

The bill has been debated at such length that I do not believe it will be necessary to go into it in detail. It merely makes unlawful certain practices in poll-tax States, as the title of the bill states. For several weeks the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration has held hearings on the bills H. R. 29, 7, 66, 225, 230, 779, and 1435, which were considered jointly by the subcommittee. H. R. 29, as I have stated, makes unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary, general, or other election for national officers.

The Subcommittee on Elections reported H. R. 29 favorably to the Committee on House Administration, which committee favorably reported the bill to the House and a majority of the Members concurred in the report.

The proponents and opponents of the measure have been fully heard, many of whom are Members of the Eightieth Congress.

I hope that the bill will be enacted by the House.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am not persuaded this morning that anything I say will change a single vote or convince a single Member of this House of the error of his ways if he now intends to support this bill. There are a few things in connection with this transaction, though, the Members of the House are entitled to know about as some evidence of the justification we have had this morning for displaying to the membership here that we do not intend to be run over roughshod in the passage of a piece of legislation which is as unconstitutional as anything that has ever been offered in this House.

The hearings on this bill started on July 1. They continued at proper times and intervals for several days, and several witnesses were heard, most of them being for the bill. There were 11 witnesses who testified for it and 19 statements introduced in behalf of the measure. In the course of that time, and in deference to some of those, who for convenience sake could not attend the hearings from day to day and testify in opposition to it, there were two witnesses who testified against the bill prior to the date of July 14 and 15. On July 14 and 15 only 3 of the 15 Members of the House who had expressed a desire to do so had an opportunity to appear against the bill. Now, on July 13 it became necessary for me to go to Texas on a matter that I thought was an honor to be designated to attend. On Friday before that there was no indication of any character that the hearings were going to be closed. I received a telegram in New Orleans on Monday night, July 14, while en route to Texas, advising me that the subcommittee on that date had voted to close the hearings on July 15.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman tell the House why he was gone? Is it not a fact that he was accompanying Judge Mansfield's remains to the State of Texas?

Mr. PICKETT. Yes; that is true. I was designated as one of those to attend the funeral of Judge Mansfield in Texas.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The hearings were closed on Monday, July 14, were they not?

Mr. PICKETT. The hearings were actually closed on Tuesday, July 15.

Mr. ABERNETHY. And at that time the gentleman, who is the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, was attending the funeral of our deceased colleague, Judge Mansfield, in Texas.

Mr. PICKETT. Correct.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is that the kind of treatment and consideration that our Republican friends deal out in your committee?

Mr. PICKETT. Well, that is the kind of treatment we got in this instance. Now, then, immediately upon receiving notice that the hearings were going to close I dispatched a telegram to one of the officials of this House requesting that the hearings be continued at least until I could get back here and make my own statement before that subcommittee in opposition to this bill. When I got back here, on Wednesday morning, July 16, I found that the hearings had been closed, as scheduled, the day before, and we proceeded to consider this matter in executive session of the full committee. Although incidental matters were taken up first, a motion was made to bring this bill out, and when it was properly seconded I got the floor to speak in opposition to it before the full committee. Right in the middle of my statement in opposition to this bill a motion for the previous question was made, and I could not proceed one word further in speaking in opposition to it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he received a telegram while in New Orleans en route to the funeral of Judge Mansfield to the effect that the hearings would be closed while the gentleman was away?

Mr. PICKETT. Correct.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Would the gentleman inform the House who dispatched that telegram?

Mr. PICKETT. A member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Did the gentleman wire back and ask that the hearings be continued further?

Mr. PICKETT. I did. I wired the Speaker of the House.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Did the gentleman receive a reply to that?

Mr. PICKETT. I did not. The reply received came from the committee when I attended that next meeting, July 16, and found out that the hearings had been closed.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Would the gentleman make those telegrams a part of the RECORD?

Mr. PICKETT. I will be happy to do so if it is of importance to the gentleman from Mississippi or any other Member of the House. The gentleman is speaking of the telegram I received from the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON]?

Mr. ABERNETHY. The series of telegrams.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent——

The SPEAKER. The Chair will refuse to entertain any unanimous-consent requests until after the vote on this bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. That is the most unusual ruling that I have ever heard of, to shut us off——

The SPEAKER. That is the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. RANKIN. From putting material in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is perfectly willing to have the material put in the RECORD, and the gentleman should so put the request immediately after the vote.

The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself five additional minutes.

There are just one or two things I want to say further, that I tried every day from Wednesday, July 16, to find out when this bill was going to be brought up, and under what circumstances, and I could not find out until after the bells had rung this morning. Many of you gentlemen who want to vote for this piece of legislation and who are going to vote for it agree with me on the law of the proposition and on the unconstitutionality of it. I know that to be true. I think that nearly every lawyer in this House who is worthy of his name, title, and hire knows that this is not a constitutional proposal for Congress to pass. I cite the case of Breedlove against Suttles, decided by the United States Supreme Court, as authority for my contention. Likewise I cite the case of Pirtle against Brown, which followed the Breedlove case. In the latter case, Pirtle against Brown, writ of certiorari was denied by the Supreme Court of the United States after the Classic case, which so many of you want to rely on as authority for the constitutionality of this legislation, was decided. You do not have any constitutional basis upon which to pass this legislation in the House.

I care not who they be; there may be some misguided zealots who prefer this legislation and think it is constitutional and proper. I do not decry the sincerity of any man who does, but I say that at least 60 or 65 percent of the membership here know it is not proper legislation and know it is not constitutional legislation, yet you are going to vote for it for political purposes, whether it be party politics or personal politics.

Under leave to extend my remarks at the point in the RECORD where I spoke in opposition to H. R. 29, I desire to make this further statement.

This bill was considered in the House under a motion to suspend the rules. The result was that the only time to debate the bill was 40 minutes which the rules of the House allow under such a motion. The RECORD reveals that I demanded a second to the motion to suspend the rules in order to insure that half of the 40 minutes would be in control of the opponents of the bill. Twenty minutes of time is entirely inadequate in which to discuss with reasonable clarity any phase of a piece of legislation of such import as H. R. 29, even if one Member took all of the time. Notwithstanding, I endeavored to make a brief statement outlining the circumstances under which the bill was heard, considered, and reported out of committee express my opposition to the bill and have time remaining for other Members opposed to the measure to voice their convictions.

I think a further clarification of the circumstances surrounding the lack of careful consideration of the measure would be enlightening. Hearings were held on July 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, and 15. Eleven persons appeared and testified for the bill, and 19 statements endorsing it were inserted in the record of the hearings at the request of the persons tendering them. Only five witnesses were able to appear and testify in opposition to the bill. Those five included a gentleman from New York, a gentleman from Baltimore, and three Members of Congress.

It is my recollection that only one of the persons appearing to testify in behalf of the bill attempted to justify the constitutionality of the proposal by citation of any court decisions to sustain his contentions. To demonstrate how little heed should be paid to his judgment on such a question and demonstrate his almost hysterical viewpoint on the subject, I quote the following testimony he gave:

I found from the statistics that the State of Virginia, that gave this Nation its freedom and led the fight for democracy in the world, now occupies the position that we are the forty-second from the top in education; that is, we have more illiteracy and ignorance than any other States except those below us—there are six of them.

When I found out the State of Virginia was the fifth State from the top in tuberculosis and leads the Nation in syphilis, and leads the Nation in turn-downs of prospective inductees in the last war, and, according to the FBI report, we lead the Nation in major crimes, I made an examination to find out what was wrong with the State of Virginia.

I concluded it was predicated upon the poll tax.

Mr. PICKETT. Would the gentleman yield?

Do you mean to say all of these things that you find in the statistics about Virginia that are bad are a direct result of the poll tax?

A careful analysis of the statement by our colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] would demonstrate clearly to any fair-minded person the unconstitutionality of the bill H. R. 29, and I refer those interested to Mr. HOBBS' statement in the hearings on the bill when they become available.

It was my purpose, had I been accorded an opportunity to do so, to have presented an argument against the constitutionality of congressional legislation to abrogate the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting. In my opinion, it is entirely for the citizens of the seven States who now require a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting to pass on that matter as a State question. It is not a matter that the Congress ought to act upon even if it had the constitutional right to do so.

I wish to call to the attention of those interested that the majority report to accompany H. R. 29 wholly fails to touch on the question. I dispute the statements contained in that report that "The proponents and opponents of the measure have been fully heard, many of whom are Members of the Eightieth Congress," and refer to the statement hereinabove made relative to that matter. A copy of the majority report is as follows:

POLL TAXES

Mr. GAMBLE, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted the following report:

The Committee on House Administration, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

GENERAL STATEMENT

For several weeks the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration has held hearings on the bills H. R. 29, H. R. 7, H. R. 66, H. R. 225, H. R. 230, H. R. 779, and H. R. 1435, which were considered jointly by the subcommittee. H. R. 29 makes unlawful the requirement of the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or a general or other elections for national officers. The committee, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon and recommends that the bill do pass.

The Subcommittee on Elections, to which H. R. 29 was referred by the Committee on House Administration, reported it favorably to the full Committee on House Administration, the majority of whom have concurred in this report. The proponents and opponents of the measure have been fully heard, many of whom are Members of the Eightieth Congress.

A copy of the minority views follows:

POLL TAXES

Mr. PICKETT, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted the following minority views:

We, the undersigned members of the Committee on House Administration, are opposed to the passage of H. R. 29.

Legislation making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers is unconstitutional.

Article I, section 2, of the Constitution states:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States, and the Electors in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

In construing that section we have only to look to the intent of the framers of the Constitution and the court decisions to resolve the question.

The Madison papers reveal that different contentions were made in the Constitutional Convention in respect to a constitutional requirement for qualifications of electors. One proposal was that a uniform qualification be prescribed in the Constitution itself and the right of suffrage be vested in freeholders only; and the proponents of this limitation on franchise objected to making the question of qualifications dependent on the will

of the States. A second proposal was that the power to prescribe qualifications of electors be vested in Congress itself. A third proposal was that the Constitution should prescribe a uniform rule of qualifications for electors in all the States and that they be the qualifications such as the respective States prescribed for their own people. Those first two propositions were opposed by members who argued that the right of suffrage was a tender point and strongly guarded by most of the State constitutions; that any change of the existing systems in the several States by the National Constitution might result in its disapproval. It was also noted that a disagreeable situation might arise if electors of the State legislatures and Congress were not the same. The proposals that the right of a suffrage be vested in freeholders or the power to prescribe the qualifications be vested in Congress were rejected, and questions of property as well as other qualifications were left to the States as contended by the proponents of the third proposal. Mr. Hamilton, in the Federalist, wrote:

"To have reduced the different qualifications in the different States to one uniform rule, would probably have been as dissatisfactory to some of the States as it would have been difficult to the Convention. The provision made by the Convention appears, therefore, to be the best that lay within their option. It must be satisfactory to every State; because it is conformable to the standard already established, or which may be established, by the State itself."

It appears conclusive, therefore, that it was the intention of the founders of this Government under its present Constitution to leave it to the several States to prescribe the qualifications requisite to the exercise of the voting privilege.

In our study of the constitutionality of Federal legislation to abolish the poll tax we have discovered no case, nor have we been cited to one, in which the Supreme Court of the United States has sustained the proposition that Congress has a right to legislate on the subject. On the contrary, there are two cases directly in point which sustain the proposition that the States have the right to levy and collect a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting. The case of *Breedlove* v. *Suttles*, originating in the State of Georgia, was decided by the United States Supreme Court in 1937 and is reported in 302 United States, 277. In that case the complaining party sought to be registered for voting for Federal and State officers at primary and general elections. He was admittedly qualified except for the fact he had neither made poll-tax returns nor paid any poll taxes and had not registered to vote because a receipt for poll taxes and an oath that he had paid them are prerequisites to registration. Mr. Justice Butler, speaking for the Court, wrote as follows:

"Payment as a prerequisite is not required for the purpose of denying or abridging the privilege of voting. It does not limit the tax to electors; aliens are not there permitted to vote, but the tax is laid upon them, if within the defined class. It is not laid upon persons 60 or more years old, whether electors or not. Exaction of payment before registration undoubtedly serves to aid collection from electors desiring to vote, but that use of the State's power is not prevented by the Federal Constitution." [Citing cases.]

Again, Justice Butler wrote:

"To make payment of poll taxes a prerequisite of voting is not to deny any privilege or immunity protected by the fourteenth amendment. Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States but is conferred by the State, and, save as restrained by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments and other provisions of the Federal Constitution, the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate." [Citing cases.]

Further, the Justice wrote:

"The privileges and immunities protected are only those that arise from the Constitution and laws of the United States and not those that spring from other sources." [Citing cases.]

In the concluding paragraph of the opinion these words are used:

"The payment of poll taxes as a prerequisite to voting is a familiar and reasonable regulation long enforced in many States and for more than a century in Georgia. That measure reasonably may be deemed essential to that form of levy. Imposition without enforcement would be futile. Power to levy and power to collect are equally necessary. And, by the exaction of payment before registration, the right to vote is neither denied nor abridged on account of sex. It is fanciful to suggest that the Georgia law is a mere disguise under which to deny or abridge the right of men to vote on account of their sex."

The case of *Pirtle* v. *Brown*, reported in 118 Federal, second series, by the Circuit Court of Appeals, Sixth Circuit, decided in 1941, followed the principles of law in the Breedlove case. A writ of certiorari was denied by the United States Supreme Court. In that case the complaining party possessed all of the qualifications required by the laws of Tennessee to entitled him to vote at a special election to fill a vacancy in the House of Representatives of the United States, except that he had not paid his poll tax. For that reason, the election judges declined to allow him to vote. The opinion states:

"The question is, whether the constitution and statutes of Tennessee, which make the payment of a poll tax a condition precedent to the right to vote for Members of Congress, are repugnant to any provisions of the Constitution of the United States."

From the Court's opinion denying the complaining party the relief sought, we quote:

"But, in any event, we are not dealing with the question whether the payment of poll tax as a prerequisite to voting violates some natural right or fancied political right. The inquiry is, whether such provision denied any privileges or immunities protected by the Federal Constitution. We have already seen that article I, section 2, of the Constitution of the United States guarantees to the elector for Members of Congress no other privileges than those accorded him by the State as an elector for the most numerous branch of the State legislature. But appellant goes beyond this. He urges that the quoted provision of article IV, section 1, of the Constitution of Tennessee, and section 2027 of the code violates the "privileges and immunities" clause of the fourteenth amendment; that his right to vote for a Member of Congress is not taxable, regardless of whether the amount tax imposed is trifling or substantial. We need not labor the point. It has been conclusively decided against appellant in *Breedlove* v. *Suttles*, * * *." [Referring to volume and page.]

And the Court there proceeded to quote the language of the Breedlove case as hereinabove set forth.

No case directly in point has subsequently been decided by the Supreme Court. Some of the proponents of Federal legislation on the poll-tax qustion claim that the decision in *United States* v. *Classic* (313 U. S., p. 299) sustains their position. It is obviously not such a decision. The language of the opinion used in support of such a contention is nothing but dictum. Certainly, the point at issue in the Classic case was not at all the same as the point at issue in the Breedlove and Pirtle cases.

In view of the above-cited authorities, it would be but to belabor the point to proceed further with references to the numerous authorities which sustain our position in opposition to H. R. 29. To argue any other issues that may be raised by the proponents of H. R. 29 would be but to compound the confusion with which they seek to surround the question. We reiterate our unalterable opposition to Federal legislation to abolish the poll tax as an unwarranted assumption of legislative power not granted in the Constitution.

TOM PICKETT.
THOS. B. STANLEY.
BURR P. HARRISON.
OTTO E. PASSMAN.
OMAR BURLESON.
JOHN BELL WILLIAMS.

In addition to the fact that complete hearings were not held on the bill, the statement of the majority in its report to the contrary notwithstanding, those of us opposed to H. R. 29 were not able, because of a premature closing of the hearings, to interrogate some of the witnesses who testified for the bill, despite the fact that in each instance where it was anticipated we would desire to do so we requested that privilege and the committee agreed it should be ours.

The RECORD reveals the necessity for my absence from the subcommittee hearings on July 14 and 15 and the reason therefor. At this point I insert a copy of the telegram received by me in New Orleans on the night of July 14 from the gentleman from Virginia, Congressman HARRISON, a member of the subcommittee, advising me the subcommittee had that day voted to close the hearings. It is as follows:

Hon. TOM PICKETT,
Member of Congress With Congressional Delegation Mansfield Funeral, Care Conductor, Train No. 36, Southern Railway, Arriving 8:25 Central Standard Time New Orleans:

Committee voted today to close poll-tax hearings tomorrow. Full committee acts Wednesday. I protested because your absence. GAMBLE said MARTIN directs closing anyway. If you wish to be heard before hearings closed, suggest protest to GAMBLE or MARTIN.

BURR P. HARRISON,
Member of Congress.

At this point I insert a copy of the telegram to the Speaker of the House which I sent that night in response to the one received from the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON]:

Hon. JOSEPH MARTIN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Been advised hearings anti-poll-tax bill be closed Tuesday and full committee action scheduled for Wednesday per your instructions. Had expected to testify along with other congressional witnesses. Heretofore assured that courtesy be extended. Will return to Washington by plane immediately after Mansfield services arriving Wednesday morning. I appeal to your sense of fairness to cause Chairman GAMBLE to accord us a hearing.

TOM PICKETT,
Member of Congress.

Obviously, no such haste was required to report the bill out of subcommittee in my absence as was indicated by the committee's action in doing so, despite the fact that the reason for my absence was known and the fact that I was to be

back in Washington the next morning after the hearings were closed was made know to the leadership of the House. Neither was there any necessity for such haste in reporting the bill out of the full committee as was indicated by the committee's action in adopting the previous question at the time I was addressing myself on the unconstitutionality of H. R. 29 in its only executive session on the subject, that session lasting less than an hour.

There is no justification for the leadership of the majority party failing to disclose the date and manner it expected to bring H. R. 29 to the floor for consideration. There is no justification in the face of the fact that I inquired daily, beginning Wednesday, July 16, for that information. There is no justification for the leadership of the majority party to decline to divulge to me that it was the intention of that leadership to make H. R. 29 the first order of business on today and let it take precedence over the Consent Calendar, which was scheduled first. I was on the floor of the House from the time it commenced the session and inquired of the majority leader what plan he proposed to pursue and it was my understanding from him the Consent Calendar would be called first. My conversation with him on that subject took place not less than 10 minutes before the bill was called up and the motion to suspend the rules was made.

The hearings are not yet printed and available to the membership for study.

An Associated Press dispatch appearing in the New York Times and other daily papers on June 25, 1947, may reveal part of the reason why tactics as above outlined have been pursued in securing passage of this unconstitutional bill. I quote from part of that dispatch:

> Republicans traditionally have gone along with the idea of outlawing payment of poll taxes as a requirement for voting in Federal elections.
>
> But Representative GERALD W. LANDIS, a Republican of Indiana, said there was something else behind the plan now.
>
> "Since some of the Southerners opposed us on taxes, the idea is to put 'em on the spot," he explained. "And if the Senate had not overridden the labor bill veto we would have got out an antilynching bill."

Whether the gentleman from Indiana, Representative LANDIS, was speaking for the Republican leadership in the House is for him and the leadership to say. To say the least I have never seen any retraction or denial of that statement on the part of Representative LANDIS nor has he advised me to the contrary of his lack of authenticity as a spokesman for the leadership though we serve on the subcommittee handling the bill. He comes from the same State, Indiana, as the majority leader Mr. HALLECK, and evidently has a better opportunity to know the leadership's viewpoint than those of us who are members of the Democratic Party.

Obviously the entire dealings with anti-poll-tax legislation indicate it is conceived and inspired in the political minds of those who seek the favor of persons who spend so much time attending to other people's business they don't have time enough to keep their own house in order. The whole proceeding has been conducted in such a manner that it is parallel with the type of justice to be expected if some judge on the bench told a person charged with crime he was going to be tried, found guilty, and sentenced without the right to testify in his own defense until after sentence had been passed upon him.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE], chairman of the committee.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, this measure or a similar measure has been before the House three times in my service in the House of Representatives and has passed three times by an overwhelming vote. The question of the constitutionality of this bill is open to debate, I will grant that, but there are able lawyers who feel that the Congress of the United States has a right under the Constitution to have something to say about the qualifications of voters. As for myself, I am ready and willing to resolve any doubt about the constitutionality of the bill for the sake of extending suffrage to citizens of the United States from one end of the country to the other. This bill has been so thoroughly debated that there is nothing I can add to this discussion.

Mr. Speaker, may I submit a parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LECOMPTE. How much debate is there on this motion?

The SPEAKER. 40 minutes on the motion, 20 minutes on a side.

Mr. LECOMPTE. After the motion to suspend is voted on, is there then additional time?

The SPEAKER. The vote on the motion to suspend is the final vote on the bill.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, is it in order to submit a unanimous-consent request to extend the time?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will not entertain any unanimous-consent requests until after the vote.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Less than 2 years ago when the gentleman's State was threatened along with every other State—of course, this is just an attack on a few States, the cheapest politics I have ever seen played——

Mr. LECOMPTE. Has the gentleman ever heard of this bill's being considered in the House before?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. May I say to the gentleman that 2 years ago when his State was threatened I led the fight here to keep them from taking the election machinery of Iowa and turning it over to a national organization. Now, when just a few of the Southern States are affected, the gentleman joins the very crowd that was fighting him before, to try to embarrass or harass the people in these Southern States.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The bill to which the gentleman refers was not poll tax legislation at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman has just stated that this bill had received long debate. I want the gentleman to tell this Congress the truth about this thing, that it received less than a half-hour of debate in the full Committee on House Administration. Is that not right?

Mr. LECOMPTE. It had a good many days of consideration by the Subcommittee on Elections and about 40 minutes in the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yet the Committee on House Administration met and considered for a solid week the printing of a little two-bit document called Fascism in Action, did it not?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have 2 hours on this bill, but my Republican friends have seen fit to deprive us of our right to debate this attack on our constitutional rights. This is the cheapest piece of political demagoguery and chicanery that has ever been perpetrated on the people of America. To bring this bill out for purely political reasons and to cram it down the throats of the southern poll-tax States is nothing in the world but cheap demagoguery, and I want to tell you that your action today proves that the South does not have any monopoly on demogogs or demagoguery.

I want to show you that this is a political move on the part of the majority party. I want to ask the distinguished majority leader a question. On June 24 in the Times-Herald in Washington there was printed an item by the Associated Press, the headline of which is as follows: "Republicans push anti-poll-tax bill."

I will read the article to you:

> Partly to get even with southern Democrats who helped kill their tax bill, the Republican leadership today crammed an anti-poll-tax bill onto the House schedule for passage this session. * * *
>
> * * * * * *
>
> Republicans traditionally have gone along with the idea of outlawing payment of poll taxes as a requirement for voting in Federal elections.
>
> But Representative LANDIS, Republican, of Indiana, said there is something else behind the plan now.
>
> "Since some of the southerners opposed us on taxes, the idea is to put 'em on the spot," he told newsman. "And if the Senate had not overridden the labor bill veto we probably would have got out an antilynching bill."

I would like for the majority leader to tell me whether the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] was speaking for the majority party in saying that this bill was being brought up for the sole purpose of exacting revenge on the

southern Democrats who helped sustain the tax-bill veto.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to respond to that question. Certainly, there has been no motive such as that in my mind and none in the mind of the Speaker, I am sure, and none in the minds of any of those frequently referred to as the leadership on this side. I do not know whether the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] made that statement or not, but so far as I am concerned, it has been generally recognized that there was a strong probability that this measure would be called up in this session of the Congress. Many Members on the gentleman's side of the aisle knew and understood that. As a matter of fact, I stated to numerous of my Democratic friends from the South a long time ago that this bill would undoubtedly come up. As has been pointed out, when the gentleman's party was in control of the House of Representatives, three times this measure was before the House and adopted. I say unequivocally and definitely that this is not a move in retaliation against anyone from the South.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If that is the case, I hope the gentleman will take time on his side to explain the reasons for the railroading of this bill in the fashion that it is being crammed down the throats of the people of the South.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I want the RECORD to show that I was not allowed to address the House further, due to time limits which had been forced upon us through the decision of the majority leadership to bring this monstrosity to the floor under a suspension of the rules of this House. Now, in order to further decry for the RECORD the lynching that is being handed the South today, it becomes necessary for me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, although they will not be read by the Members until after their crime against the Constitution will have been committed by the action which they will take today.

As I stated before, this is the cheapest act of political bamboozling and chicanery ever perpetrated on the good people of America. This is an attempt by Republicans and a few Members masquerading as Democrats to destroy the only genuine element of Jeffersonian democracy remaining in this great Nation of ours. If the Membership of this House would vote their convictions rather than in the interest of political expediency, this insult to our Constitution would not receive 10 votes.

It is a sad state of affairs when pinks and off-shade renegades and crackpots such as Henry Wallace, Clark Foreman, and Walter White can coerce the membership of the most powerful and intelligent deliberative body on the face of the earth into becoming a monkey on a string for their political whims and fancies. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am getting sick and tired of having such enemies of our democratic way of life dictating the policies of the American Government, and I promise this Congress that it will live to see the day when it will wish that it had never heard of the Southern Conference of Human Welfare, the Civil Rights Congress, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and the rest of these communistic barnacles which have attached themselves to our Democratic ship of state.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, southerners are getting sick and tired of having themselves and their country maligned, abused, and attacked by these hatemongers who give birth to such monstrous legislation as that presented to the House today.

It was never intended by the founding fathers of our country that the Federal Government should ever control the elections in the several States. This is stated clearly in the Constitution of the United States, in words and language which can be understood by any child with as many as 3 years of grade school. By the passage of this bill, you will be maliciously tampering with the rights which were delegated to the several States by our Constitution, and I warn you that you are treading on dangerous ground.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Today, Mr. Speaker, we will vote on H. R. 29, my proposed legislation to abolish the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting in Federal elections. This is one of the gravest moral issues before this body. It is an issue for the people of the seven poll-tax States of the South. It is an issue for the Nation. It is an issue with international significance.

The poll tax violates the Constitution of the United States. It disfranchises 10,000,000 of our citizens—Negro and white alike. The people of the seven poll-tax States are disfranchised, but the entire Nation suffers from this denial of democratic elections.

The poll tax, as it exists in seven Southern States today, is not a tax as we ordinarily understand the term. It was not imposed—and is not collected—as a source of revenue. It is a device for disfranchising voters. The tax varies from $1 to $2 a year. In some States it is cumulative. In Alabama a man of 45 who has never voted must pay $36 in order to cast his first ballot. In other States, the maximum is $5 or $6. In most instances, funds derived from the tax go into school funds—which would be a laudable use if it were really collected as a substantial source of revenue. But it is not. While State laws vary, there is little machinery and practically no effort used to collect the tax. In fact, in Virginia, small percentage of school budgets are derived from these funds as the law prohibits enforcement of collection for 3 years. As the teachers of Alabama pointed out a year ago, in a plea for abolition of the poll tax in their State, tax not tied to the vote and really collected would provide far greater support for schools. They pointed out, too—and this is of even greater significance to my mind—that it is futile to teach children the responsibilities of citizenship when their parents are kept from the ballot box by a tax.

The poll tax as a precondition to voting is not a relic of colonial days. By the middle of the last century free manhood suffrage was the rule in this country. Only one State, Georgia, and Georgia abolished the tax in 1945, retained a tax on the vote until recent times. In all the States where it exists today, the poll tax was imposed in the late nineties and the early nineteen hundreds to limit the vote. The reason is clear. There was a depression in the nineties. The farmers and other low-paid workers were hard hit. A new interest in elections, on the part of the majority of the citizens in politics, arose as they sought to elect men to office who would help them. This was a threat to the established power of the few who since reconstruction days had considered it their responsibility, and theirs alone, to govern. A tax on the vote was their answer.

That the intent of the revised constitutions and election laws of those days was disfranchisement is clearly shown in the proceedings of constitutional conventions. Disfranchisement was not aimed at the Negroes alone. As a delegate to the Virginia Convention of 1901 said—and I quote:

> There is a mass of vicious and incapable whites which must be debarred from the suffrage. The chief objection which I have heard to this system is that, along with many stupid and vicious whites, some worthy and good citizens will be disfranchised. This is doubtless true.

Another delegate to this convention, a man later very prominent in national life, said—and I quote:

> The chief purpose of this convention is to amend the suffrage clause of the existing constitution. It does not require such prescience to foretell that the alterations which we shall make will not apply to all persons and classes without distinction. We were sent here to make distinctions. We expect to make distinctions. We will make distinctions.

These conventions accomplished their purpose. In 1900, in Virginia, in the last free Presidential election, 266,000 persons voted. In 1904, in the first poll-tax election, the vote was cut to 136,000, an immediate drop of 49 percent, almost one-half.

Today, in the 7 poll-tax States, some 10,000,000 are disfranchised, 7 white persons to 3 Negroes. In the Presidential elections of 1944, 10 percent of the potential voters voted in the 7 poll-tax States, as against 49 percent in the free-vote States. In the congressional elections of 1946, the figures are 5 percent for the poll-tax States, as compared with 33 percent for the free-voting States.

Mr. Speaker, where four out of five citizens in the poll-tax States are kept from voting for their choice for President of the United States by a tax on the vote, can we, as a nation, boast of democratic elections? This denial of basic rights to any American is the concern of every American. Every instinct for justice and political decency cries out against the existence of such a situation in any part of the United States. In an even more practical way, this is an issue for the entire Nation. My distinguished colleagues from the poll-tax States are elected by small and restricted electorates. Yet they are national representatives. They legislate, not for their

particular States but for the people of the whole country.

The Truman administration makes much of its insistence that countries in far corners of the world hold free and democratic elections. I object to the hypocrisy of this demand when millions of our own citizens are taxed away from the polls.

The world is not blind to the gap between our pretensions abroad and our practices at home.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. That motion is not in order. Under the precedents, a motion to adjourn is not in order until the final vote upon the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. BENDER. There are few who dare publicly to defend the poll-tax system today. Yet they oppose the legislation for which I am speaking today. They say the States imposed this vote tax and the States should be allowed to repeal it. But how can people without access to the ballot box elect State officials who will help them regain the vote? How can the disfranchised change laws or amend constitutions?

Then, too, the opponents of this legislation advance the argument that it is unconstitutional. The truth is that the poll tax itself is a direct violation of the Constitution.

I must point out that this body has three times passed such a bill by an overwhelmingly favorable vote. Surely my colleagues on those occasions recognized the clear constitutionality of the bill they were voting for. I know that the Committee on House Administration and its Subcommittee on Elections, which this month reported the bill favorably to us after extensive hearings, had heard the constitutional question discussed in detail and were convinced of the validity of the arguments that the bill is constitutional. The Committee on the Judiciary of the other body, made up solely of lawyers, has three times studied this bill and each time reported—I quote—"The committee has reached the conclusion that the proposed legislation is constitutional and should be enacted into law."

A few years ago a group of 10 constitutional lawyers—a majority of them born in or residents of the poll-tax States—issued a joint report testifying to the clear constitutionality of this bill. These distinguished men are George Gordon Battle, a leading southern member of the New York bar; Walton Hamilton, professor of constitutional law at Yale Law School; Myres McDougal, also of Yale Law School; Leon Greene, dean of Northwestern University Law School; Robert K. Wettach and M. T. Van Hecke, dean and ex-dean of the Law School of the University of North Carolina; Lloyd K. Garrison, ex-dean of the Law School of the University of Wisconsin; Charles Bunn, also of Wisconsin Law School; Walter Gellhorn of Columbia University Law School; and Edwin Borchard of Yale. Briefly, they pointed out that article IV, section 4, of the Constitution provides that "the United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican form of Government."

Can a Republican form of Government exist when the majority of citizens are denied the right to participate in affairs of government because they are poor? The fourteenth amendment, section 1, provides that—

> No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States.

The poll tax, where it must be paid before a citizen can vote in Federal elections, directly violates the fourteenth amendment. Third, article I, section 4:

> The times, places, and manners of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof, but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations.

James Madison, father of the Constitution, describes the purpose of this section:

> Should the people of any State by any means be deprived of the right of suffrage, it was judged proper that it be remedied by the general government.

Those who care to claim the anti-poll-tax bill is unconstitutional rely on article I, section 2 of the Constitution:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen * * * by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

The poll tax is not a qualification for voting. It is a restriction on the right to vote. A qualification fits a person to exercise a function.

In the words of Justice Robert Jackson, of the United States Supreme Court:

> We should say now, and in no uncertain terms, that a man's mere property status, without more, cannot be used by a State to test, qualify, or limit his rights as a citizen of the United States.

Two things, then, stand out clearly about the Constitution and the poll tax. The poll tax itself is a direct violation of the Constitution, and the Congress has the clear-cut authority to abolish the poll tax in Federal elections.

Mr. Speaker, I read a newspaper story the other day in which this bill was referred to as the perennial anti-poll-tax bill. It is only too true that this legislature has been an issue in the Congress since 1939. I have worked on its behalf since then, since my first term in this body. Perhaps the reporter who dismissed the issue with his slighting word "perennial" can take lightly the fact that 10,000,000 American citizens are disfranchised by a tax on the vote. I cannot do so—and I feel sure that the overwhelming majority of the Members of this body cannot do so. I will continue to fight for the right of all Americans to vote without payment of a tax until the Congress of the United States will put an end to this shameful situation so far as it is in our power to do so, that is for Federal elections. I firmly believe that the Eightieth Congress will enact this legislation, that we will have the honor of passing the perennial anti-poll-tax bill. I appeal to my colleagues, the gentleman on both sides of the aisle, to support it today, to vote to restore the constitutionally guaranteed right of representative government to all citizens of the United States.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, if all the pressure from the radicals, minority groups, the Communists, the CIO, and the trouble makers were taken from this measure there would not be enough patriotic American citizens sponsoring it to justify 10 minutes' consideration in a subcommittee, and none whatsoever on the floor of the House.

I was surprised to hear the majority leader refer to the fact that this measure had passed the House during the last two or three Congresses. That was in the heyday of New Dealism when Henry Wallace was in his prime. I say to you that if we have reached the time in this country when the leadership of both parties outside and inside this Congress must listen to the radicals, to the rabble rousers, to the do-gooders, and to the communistic leaders in order to carry on what they consider the programs that will appeal to that group in order to maintain position in high places, then this country is gone, and you know, and I know it.

I am one of those Democrats who wants to get away from the heyday of the New Dealism when such measures as this thrived. I believe the people of the country in their mandate of last fall looked a little bit to a Republican Party that would respect State rights and respect the Constitution of the United States, but with such activity as this I am afraid their hopes are dim. This is legislation that will stir race hatred. Many unpatriotic Americans stir this type of legislation.

I say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] that the State of Ohio and other States where this legislation has so much support should end its own discriminations before it tries to set the other fellow's house in order.

No one, white or colored, with reputation from the seven poll-tax States has asked for this legislation.

I regret that the limited time will not permit fair discussion of this bill.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I believe every Member knows exactly how I feel about this legislation. I have spoken on it several times when it has been before the House and I feel today as I have always felt, and as every real American feels—that it is absolutely against every ideal of democracy to compel a citizen of this country to pay a tax for the privilege of voting. It would seem to me really a joke on our much-publicized discussion of democracy that here, in what we claim to be a free country, a citizen must pay for the right to vote. It is the most undemocratic law that has ever been adopted in a free country. Until we make it possible for every American citizen to cast his or her vote for the

people they want to represent them, let us not attempt to correct the abuses in the other parts of the world. These citizens are entitled to vote whether or not they have the money to pay poll taxes. Whether we come from the North, South, East, or West, we are all citizens of a great country—a country which is now looked upon for leadership in a war-torn world—a country which is spending billions of dollars to help free other countries of the world held in bondage—and so, my colleagues, this is no time to preach one doctrine and practice another. Let us pass this bill today and prove to the world that we do believe in democracy by practicing it and by removing the shackles from people who have been denied the privilege of voting because they were too poor to pay a poll tax. Let the 7 poll-tax States join the other 41 and prove to the world that we do believe in and practice democracy.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire at this time if I may revise and extend my remarks?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will not receive any requests until after the bill is passed; then he will be very glad to have Members request unanimous consent to extend their remarks.

Mr. PICKETT. But, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will not receive any requests until after this bill is passed.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], a member of the committee.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, in these closing days of this session of Congress, it seems a sad commentary that many important legislative matters should be shelved to make way for the bill now under consideration.

The distinguished majority leader the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has just reminded the House that the Democrats have several times passed an anti-poll-tax bill and that now we are displeased because the Republicans are doing the same thing. Yes, it is true; the Democrats have done so but I am not at all proud of it. I am not surprised at a certain element on our side of the aisle being for this measure, and that they have been all along. They are the ones who will impose upon the poll-tax States and the South generally, to appease the radical minorities in their districts who are constantly bringing pressure upon them, just such ill-advised legislation as this. But I am sorely disappointed in the Republicans; that great conservative party which has always been for State's rights. Here we find them today ramming through and running rough-shod along with this element on the Democratic side, telling us in the poll-tax States what we must do with our poll-tax system. If the Republicans were really for State's rights, this measure would not be up here today. We know, of course, you are going to pass it over us. We can only raise our voices in protest. I sincerely believe that if a private poll were taken among the Members of this House, the majority would be opposed to this sort of political inquisition under which we are put. I believe you know in your hearts that the question of constitutional right, insofar as qualifications for voting in the various States are concerned, is not the question to be debated here. Neither is it a matter to be argued on the merits for or against the poll-tax system. Plainly and simply it is a matter of we in the poll-tax States running our own business, and you of the other 41 States running yours. As for my own delegation from Texas, I do not think you will ever hear of any of us trying to tell someone of another State how to conduct your affairs, and by the same token we resent your trying to tell us how to conduct ours.

There are a lot of do-gooders, crusaders and champions of causes who would like to hold themselves up as martyrs to a cause, and their voices are loudest in this discussion. Constitutionally right or not, meritorious or not, it is just plain none of your business to tell us who can and who cannot vote in Texas. I am not unmindful that we have considerable sentiment in the State against the poll tax, and if it is dirty linen, we will take care of it ourselves. If I were the strongest advocate in the State for the abolition of the poll-tax system, I would still vote against it here in this Congress for the reasons I have stated. And I say again that I am sorely disappointed in the actions of the majority party for joining the element in my own party to force down our throats this bill, which is the height of all demagoguery in this session of Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, again today the House is perpetrating a lynching. The proponents of this infamous measure constitute the mob that is lynching the law of the land. The Constitution which each of us has sworn to uphold and maintain, repeated decisions of the Supreme Court, and the treatises on the subject by every outstanding author, including Story, Brightly, Cooley, Morse, and Pomeroy have all been trampled into the dust of hate and demagoguery.

Universal suffrage has never existed anywhere in the history of the world. Every sovereignty has fixed its own qualifications prerequisite to the privilege of the exercise of the elective franchise. The poll tax is one of these qualifications; age, residence, property ownership, and registration are some of the others most common. That the poll tax is a qualification made a prerequisite to the privilege of voting by some sovereignties is too clear for argument. Section 178 of the Constitution of Alabama, for instance, reads, in its pertinent part, as follows:

> To entitle a person to vote in any election by the people he shall have * * * paid all poll taxes.

Whether or not there should be a poll tax may be debatable, but not in this forum except on the question of submitting a constitutional amendment to the States for ratification. The fixing, vel non, of such a requirement is exclusively for each State to determine for itself. There never has been a Federal election; nor a Federal vote. All elections have been and are State elections, and only those who have qualified under State law are eligible to vote therein.

The exclusive right of a State to fix the qualifications prerequisite to the privilege of voting is well recognized and established:

DISTINGUISHED TEXT WRITERS

"Among the absolute, unqualified rights of the States is that of regulating the elective franchise; it is the foundation of State authority; the most important political function exercised by the people in their sovereign capacity." Whilst "the right of the people to participate in the legislature is the best security of liberty and foundation of all free government," yet it is subordinate to the higher power of regulating the qualifications of the electors and the elected. The original power of the people in their aggregate political capacity, is delegated in the form of suffrage to such persons as they deem proper for the safety of the commonwealth; Brightly Election Cases (*Anderson* v. *Baker*, 32, 33, 34, 23 Maryland 531).

Story, treating of this subject, says:

Every constitution of government in these United States has assumed, as a fundamental principle, the right of the people of the States to alter, abolish, and modify the form of its own government according to the sovereign pleasure of the people. In fact, the people of each State have gone much further and settled a far more critical question by deciding who shall be the voters entitled to approve and reject the constitution framed by a delegated body under their direction. (1 Story Constitution, ch. 9, sec. 581.)

From this it will be seen how little, even in the most free of republican governments, any abstract right of suffrage, or any original and indefeasible privilege, has been recognized in practice (ibid). In no two of these State constitutions will it be found that the qualifications of the voters are settled upon the same uniform basis, so that we have the most abundant proofs that among a free and enlightened people convened for the purpose of establishing their own forms of government and the rights of their own voters the question as to the due regulation of the qualifications has been deemed a matter of mere State policy, and varied to meet the wants, to suit the prejudices, and to foster the interests of the majority.

The exclusive right of the several States to regulate the exercise of the elective franchise and to prescribe the qualifications of voters was never questioned, nor attempted to be interfered with, until the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States was forced upon unwilling communities (the States then lately in rebellion) by the military power of the General Government, and thus made a part of our organic law; a necessary sequence, perhaps, of the Civil War, but nonetheless a radical change in the established theory of our Government. (Brightly Election Cases, author's note, pp. 42, 43.)

The right to vote is not of necessity connected with citizenship. The rights of the citizen are civil rights, such as liberty of person and of conscience, the right to acquire and possess property, all of which are distinguishable from the political privilege of suffrage.

The history of the country shows that there is no foundation in fact for the view that the right of suffrage is one of the "privileges or immunities of citizens." (McCrary Elections, p. 3.)

"The right to vote is not vested, it is purely conventional, and may be enlarged or re-

stricted, granted or withheld, at pleasure, and without fault."

In *Blair* v. *Ridgely* (41 Mo. 161), the question at issue arose out of the provision of article II, section 3 of the constitution of 1865 of the State of Missouri. By this section it was provided that no person should be deemed a qualified voter who had ever been in armed hostility to the United States, or to the government of the State of Missouri; that every person should, at the time of offering to vote, take an oath that he was not within the inhibition of this section, and that any person declining to take such oath should not be allowed to vote. The plaintiff at an election held in the city of St. Louis on November 7, 1865, offered to vote, but refused to take the oath prescribed by the constitution. His vote being rejected, he brought his action against the judges of the election for damages. The case was taken to the Supreme Court of Missouri, where it was argued exhaustively, and with much learning, by eminent counsel, and the argument is to be found in full in the Reports of the Supreme Court of Missouri, volume 41. It was contended by the plaintiff that the section of the constitution in question was in violation of the Constitution of the United States, being a bill of attainder and an ex post facto law within the meaning of that instrument, and, in consequence, null and void. But the court held against this contention, drawing the distinction between laws passed to punish for offenses in order to prevent their repetition and laws passed to protect the public franchises and privileges from abuse by falling into unworthy hands. It is said by the court that—

"The State may not pass laws in the form or with the effect of bills of attainder, ex post facto laws, or laws impairing the obligation of contracts. It may and has full power to pass laws, restrictive and exclusive, for the preservation or promotion of the common interests as political or social emergencies may from time to time require, though in certain instances disabilities may directly flow in consequence. It should never be forgotten that the State is organized for the public weal as well as for individual purposes, and while it may not disregard the safeguards that are thrown around the citizen, for his protection by the Constitution, it cannot neglect to perform and do what is for the public good."

It was argued in *Blair* v. *Ridgely* that the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Cummings* v. *Missouri* (4 Wall. 277), where it was held that this section of the Missouri Constitution, so far as it provided an oath to be taken by preachers, was in the nature of pains and penalties, and consequently void, was decisive of the Blair case. But the distinction between the right to practice a profession or follow a calling and the right to vote is clearly stated in the opinion of Judge Wagner, as follows:

"The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Cummings case proceeds on the idea that the right to pursue a calling or profession is a natural and inalienable right and that a law precluding a person from practicing his calling or profession on account of past conduct is inflicting a penalty, and therefore void. There are certain rights which inhere in and attach to the person, and of which he cannot be deprived except by forfeiture for crime, whereof he must be first tried and convicted according to due process of law. These are termed natural or absolute rights. * * * But is the right to vote or to exercise the privilege of the elective franchise a right either natural, absolute, or vested? It is certain that in a state of nature, disconnected with government, no person has or can enjoy it. That the privilege of participating in the elective franchise in this free and enlightened country is an important and interesting one is most true. But we are not aware that it has ever been held or adjudged to be a vested interest in any individual.

"Suffrage in the United States not being a vested right, it results that persons who have enjoyed and exercised the privilege, and who have been qualified electors, may be entirely disfranchised and deprived of the privilege by constitutional provision, and such persons are entirely without a remedy at law." (McCrary, Elections, p. 9.)

"The whole subject of the regulation of elections, including the prescribing of qualifications for suffrage, is left by the National Constitution to the several States, except as it is provided by that instrument that the electors for Representatives in Congress shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, and as the fifteenth amendment forbids denying to citizens the right to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. Participation in the elective franchise is a privilege rather than a right, and it is granted or denied on grounds of general policy, the prevailing view being that it should be as general as possible consistent with the public safety." (Cooley's Constitutional Limitations, 8th ed., Carrington, vol. 2.)

Also, the following treatises are to the same effect:

Morse, Citizenship, section 3.

Pomeroy, Constitutional Law, section 535.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Article I, section 2:

The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Article I, section 4:

The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

Article I, section 8, clause 18:

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER COURTS

To make payment of poll taxes a prerequisite of voting is not to deny any privilege or immunity protected by the fourteenth amendment. Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States, but is conferred by the State, and, save as restrained by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments and other provisions of the Federal Constitution, the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate. The privileges and immunities protected are only those that arise from the Constitution and laws of the United States and not those that spring from other sources. *Breedlove* v. *Suttles* (302 U. S. 277, 283); *Pirtle* v. *Brown* (118 Fed. 2d 218, certiorari denied by Supreme Court, 62 Sup. Ct. Rep. 64); *Huber* v. *Reiley* (53 Penn. St. 112); *Minor* v. *Happersett* (21 Wall. U. S. 162, 170); *United States* v. *Reese* (92 U. S. 214, 217, 218); *United States* v. *Cruikshank* (92 U. S. 542); *McPherson* v. *Blackner* (146 U. S. 1, 38, 39); *Anderson* v. *Baker* (23 Md. 531); *Ex parte Yarborough* (110 U. S. 631, 664, 665); *Blair* v. *Ridgely* (41 Mo. 63); *Guinn* v. *United States* (238 U. S. 347, 362, L. R. A. 1916 A. 1134); *Ex parte Stratton* (1 W. Va. 305); *Kring* v. *Missouri* (107 U. S. 221); *Hamilton* v. *Regents* (293 U. S. 245, 261); *Washington* v. *State* (75 Ala. 582).

The proponents of this measure rely for support of their contention almost exclusively upon the case of *United States* v. *Classic et al.* (313 U. S. 299). They contend very artfully that this case justifies the Congress in the enactment of the Geyer bill but they do not mention the fact that the Classic case was a criminal prosecution against commissioners of elections for willfully altering and falsely counting and certifying the ballots of voters cast in a primary election for a Representative in Congress, among others. Based on article I, section 2, of the Federal Constitution, quoted supra, the majority decision of the Supreme Court holds:

Obviously included within the right to choose, secured by the Constitution, is the right of qualified voters within a State to cast their ballots and have them counted at congressional elections.

We concede the soundness of this holding.

The majority opinion further holds: That since by law in Louisiana, primaries are made an integral part of the procedure for the possible choice of Congressmen and since in Louisiana the nomination resulting from the primary is equivalent to election, the criminal statute covers interference with the right to vote and have the votes honestly counted and certified, in primaries as well as in general elections.

Mr. Justice Douglas, with Justices Black and Murphy, dissented as to primaries. The dissenting opinion is powerful, if not unanswerable in the particular case. We leave the members of the Supreme Court to their quarrel on this point as it is not germane in the consideration of the Geyer bill.

Neither the majority nor minority of the Supreme Court question congressional power to protect by appropriate legislation the right secured by the Constitution to a vote and an honest count and certification. They agree that this is assured by article I, section 2, quoted supra, with article I, section 8, clause 18, which gives Congress the power—

to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any department or officer thereof.

It may be questioned whether or not the right to vote and to an honest count is a power vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any department or officer thereof. This question, however, has no bearing upon our instant inquiry. The vital question of law pertinent to the debate of the constitutionality, vel non, of the Geyer bill is, not whether Congress has constitutional power to pass a criminal law, to punish interference with the right of a qualified voter to vote and to have an honest count, but has Congress the constitutional power to pass a law usurping the admittedly exclusive power of a State to prescribe the qualifications of its qualified voters?

No matter what interpretation they may seek to put on the Classic case, no

matter how critical they may be of the Breedlove case, the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, sixth circuit, in the case of *Pirtle* v. *Brown et al.* (118 Fed. Rep., second series, p. 218), followed the Breedlove decision, quoted from it, and cited it approvingly, and the Supreme Court denied certiorari, thereby refusing to upset the decision in the Pirtle case, after the decision by the Supreme Court in the Classic case had been handed down (62d Supreme Court Rept., p. 64).

So the Supreme Court, since its decision in the Classic case was handed down has refused to review the decision in the Pirtle case, which was handed down after the decision in the Classic case and which agrees fully with the holding in the Breedlove decision.

The Breedlove and Pirtle cases were both poll-tax cases. The Classic case had nothing to do with the poll-tax question. The sole question in the Classic case was:

May State election officials steal ballots cast by duly qualified voters for a candidate for Congress in a State primary election, in violation of a Federal criminal statute condemning all such rascality, without being subject to prosecution and punishment by the Federal Government?

The Supreme Court held: That the right granted the Federal Government by article I, section 2, of the Federal Constitution, to have its Congressmen chosen in a State election, meant the right to have them honestly chosen; and that the right granted the Federal Government by article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Federal Constitution, "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof," authorized the making of the law violated by Classic and his partners in crime. In other words, the Classic case dealt not with who was a qualified voter under Louisiana law, but with the right to have an honest count of the ballots of admittedly qualified voters.

The United States of America was created by the Thirteen Crown Colonies. It existed long before the Constitution. As far as external sovereignty in international affairs was concerned, it was a sovereign Nation. It functioned through the Continental Congress composed of delegates from the Thirteen Colonies. The Colonies became free and independent States by virtue of the Declaration of Independence, in the making of which they united, and which was validated by force of arms. Each State was sovereign, supreme, free, and independent except as they, in the exercise of their sovereignty, banded themselves together and delegated by their own free will and accord, certain of the powers of their sovereignty to the limited union they agreed upon and formed. This union, according to the Articles of Confederation, was to be perpetual and in international affairs was given sovereignty. It had no power whatsoever in domestic affairs. It could not even levy taxes for its own support, being dependent upon contributions made by the States. The sum total of all domestic sovereignty was in the respective States and has been diminished from time to time only as the absolutely sovereign States saw fit to make further delegations of parts of their sovereign power. After becoming convinced that the union existing before and under the Articles of Confederation was impracticable, the Constitution was ordained and established "in order to form a more perfect union." The Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *U. S.* v. *Curtiss-Wright Export Corp. et al.* (299 U. S. 304, 315) says:

> The broad statement that the Federal Government can exercise no powers except those specifically enumerated in the Constitution, and such implied powers as are necessary and proper to carry into effect the enumerated powers, is categorically true only in respect of our internal affairs. In that field, the primary purpose of the Constitution was to carve from the general mass of legislature powers then possessed by the States such portions as it was thought desirable to vest in the Federal Government, leaving those not included in the enumeration still in the States.

There never has been a Federal election held nor a Federal vote cast. The States existed before the Federal Government. They created it. They gave it life and such limited powers as it possesses. The power to hold elections and to authorize people to vote was never delegated to the Federal Government. It has always been and remains in each State.

In the Constitution of the United States, however, the States—absolutely sovereign in this field as well as in all domestic affairs—changed the form of their Federal Government and provided in article I, section 2:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

In 1913 the seventeenth amendment became a part of the Constitution of the United States, providing for the election of Senators in exactly the same way. But both Senators and Representatives were to be elected, not by the people of the United States nor by the votes of persons authorized to vote by the United States, but "by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature," fixed by the State.

When the States in convention assembled agreed to undertake to hold elections for the Federal Government, the way it was to be done was merely by admitting candidates for Federal office into the regular State elections. All elections are State elections. They always have been, are now, and should so continue. In agreeing to admit candidates for Federal office to State elections, the States did not stipulate what qualifications they would fix as prerequisite to the privilege of voting. They did not limit themselves. They did not confer any right whatever upon their Federal Government except that its candidates could run in their elections and be voted on by the voters of the States—those who had been given the franchise of suffrage in each State by the law of the State. But in assuming this obligation they gave this pledge:

> And the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

In other words, wrote the States, we pledge you that as our guest in our political homes you will be treated as well as we treat members of our own political family; we will give you the best we have, judged by the same standards and safeguards we have erected for our own safety. But we will use for you only the same servants we employ for ourselves, and we do not agree to make you master, nor to employ more nor different servants because of this hospitality we cordially extend you.

The principle dominating this field of thought is that the law guarantees every citizen the right to be justly governed, but not the privilege of being one of the Governors.

We are perfectly familiar with the distinction sought to be drawn by the supporters of this measure between qualifications and conditions. In the last analysis, however, this seems to be a distinction without a difference. Whether the requirements fixed by the law of a State as prerequisites to the privilege of voting be conditions or qualifications is unessential. Whatever they may be called, the State alone has the right to fix them. The Federal Government has no such right. We are, of course, also familiar with section 4 of article I of the Constitution of the United States, the pertinent part of which reads as follows:

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

While this does delegate to Congress a certain veto power, it is only as to regulations prescribed by a State as to "the times, places, and manner of holding elections." It has nothing whatever to do with the paramount right of a State to fix conditions or qualifications prerequisite to the privilege of voting. It has to do exclusively with the "how" of the election, not with the "who" of the electors.

You may say that a poll-tax requirement is unfair and unwise, but you have no vestige of authority or right to outlaw the poll tax by statute as here proposed.

The caste system of India may be all wrong and indefensible, but the Congress of the United States has no power to change it. We have just as much power over India as we have over Alabama.

England may, in our judgment, be foolish in keeping her King, but no one would suggest that we have any semblance of power to fire their King, yet we have even less power over Alebama or any other State of this Union than we have over England. The reason is plain. We are oath-bound to respect the sovereignty of every State of the United States, whereas we took no such oath with respect to England.

Germany's treatment of the Jews is barbarous, but no one of us has ever sponsored a measure here to stop this

rape of right, this inhuman murder of law, realizing that, so far as this Congress could legislate, Germany's internal affairs were Germany's business and not ours.

I want to call your attention to the propaganda which has been flooding the Capitol of late, much of which has come to my desk, issued by organizations that are supporting this measure, calling attention to the fact that there is no race question presented here because more white are disenfranchised by the poll tax than colored people. Whether that be true or not makes no difference. There certainly is no distinction made, and no discrimination is practiced or possible under any of the poll-tax statutes or constitutional provisions.

May I read to you what the Constitution of Alabama says on that subject, contained in section 178 of the Constitution of Alabama?

To entitle a person to vote in any election of the people he shall have—

Then deleting the provisions as to age, residence, and registration—

paid all poll taxes.

Could any words be devised or used which would more clearly evidence the fact that that is a primary qualification fixed for all who would vote by the Constitution of Alabama?

It is a requirement of a condition precedent to the privilege of voting. I maintain that there are no words that would have evidenced such an intent more clearly. So it is that if we are to comply with our oaths of office, if we are to uphold and maintain the Constitution of the United States, as we have sworn to do, we cannot thus impinge upon the sovereignty of the State of Alabama.

This bill would override and violate the sovereignty of those States which have seen fit in their wisdom to adopt the poll tax as one of the prerequisites to the privilege of voting in elections held in and by those States.

But not only is the poll tax requirement a qualification made a prerequisite to the privilege of voting, it is also a fair and reasonable test.

There can be no escape from the conclusion that this refers not to the "how" of the election but to the "who" of the electors. It certainly has nothing whatever to do with the time, nor place, nor manner of holding any election. It certainly provides a reasonable test of qualification in that its payment is left purely voluntary and all money received, without deduction of any fees or other costs, goes to the public schools. So the poll-tax requirement tests a citizen's interest in the financial support of the public schools of his State and also tests his interest in obtaining for himself the franchise of suffrage. One really desiring to vote, one who would take an interest in voting, one who would take the trouble to post himself upon the merits or demerits of candidates and issues, has never minded and will never mind paying $1.50 a year in order to qualify as an elector. If one desiring to vote values the privilege of voting less than $1.50 a year, it is doubtful if he could be a good elector. Therefore, since section 4 of article I of the Federal Constitution is the only grant of power to Congress over suffrage and elections, Congress has no power at all to pass a law overriding this requirement of State law. This was the holding of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Breedlove case and again in the Pirtle case.

I invite your particular and special attention to those passages of Washington's Farewell Address wherein he expressed his parental solicitude for the future of the Nation of which he was father:

That your Union and brotherly affection may be perpetuated.

And this primary injunction:

The unity of government which constitutes you one people is also now dear to you. It is justly so, for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence, the support of your tranquility at home, your peace abroad, of your safety, of your prosperity in every shape, of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that from different causes, and from different quarters, much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed, it is of infinite moment that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national Union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it, accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity, watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety, discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can in any event be abandoned, and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

The mighty mind of our first President, as he let it run down the long years of the future, saw clearly that from time to time there would be legislation proposed and administrative policies considered which would tend toward disintegration of the unity which he conceived to be and which we all must admit is essential to the preservation of our form of government, the dual system of government, the States supreme in their realm of internal affairs, the Federal Government supreme in its exclusive sphere of international affairs.

No one can deny that the South has taken its rightful place and performed well its full part in every foreign war which this country has waged. In the War of the Revolution the blood of Southern patriots reddened the soil of New England and wrote thereby a plea against sectionalism. The ragged heroes who followed Washington across the Delaware and to Valley Forge were Americans all. There was no sectional partisanship among the boys who fought at Chapultepec nor San Jacinto. The forces of the Republic in our war with Spain were not clad in blue or gray, but in the uniform of the Nation. The boys who sleep on San Juan Hill or in the trenches around Santiago were from every part of the Union.

Those men who gave the last full measure of devotion in France in World War I and their buddies who, thank God, came back to live among us, were Americans—not northerners nor southerners nor easterners nor westerners.

The same thing is equally true in this desperate struggle for survival in which we are now engaged. Every one of those wars of the Republic has been nonsectional, and united we stood, fought, and won.

More than a year before the Declaration of Independence was adopted by the Continental Congress at Philadelphia, a similar declaration of independence was adopted by a convention which met in Charlotte, N. C. It is known as the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence. From a pamphlet preserved in the Library of Congress we learn:

Therefore on the sd. 19th May 1775 the sd. committee met in Charlotte Town (2 men from each company) vested with all powers these their constituents had or conceived they had.

After a short conference about their suffering brethren beseiged and suffering every hardship in Boston and the American blood running in Lexington, the electrical fire flew into every breast.

These men of the South felt keenly the afflictions of their brethren in Boston, and the news of the American blood running in Lexington caused the electrical fire to fly into every breast. Would that we were so closely knit in bonds of brotherhood and sympathetic regard today. The ground that we have lost in this respect may be regained but not without mutual respect and confidence.

Every one of those hardy pioneers loved his fellows engaged in the common struggle to build here "a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." We have a rich, common heritage from these founding fathers. There is much to love in the citizens of every part of our great Nation. We may look on this and be drawn closer together. We may look on the devisive elements and become hostile camps. The future is in our hands today to mar or to make. The South asks and will have no part in the local problems of other sections. We have full confidence in our brethren that they will work out their own difficulties wisely and well. We may consider the things that will make us one or the things which divide. My plea is not made as a southerner nor as the Representative of a great district of Alabama, but as a humble citizen of this great Republic. I plead with you, my colleagues, and with all who have ears to hear, that we set ourselves against consideration of those things which tend to divide us and give our best thought to those things which unite.

I am appealing to the membership of this House to think on these things. There is no reason why we should adopt the unconstitutional, statutory way when we have a perfect right to submit a constitutional amendment which might do legitimately what the proponents of this heinous bill want done. I beg of you, whether you support the objective of this bill or not, that it be defeated, because it is illegitimate, and its passage would assassinate interstate comity. I beg of you to think on these things and be on

your guard lest plausible arguments, artfully advanced, should sway your better judgment.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the genleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the leadership is determined that the anti-poll tax bill must pass this House again today, and in view of the further fact that the old game of politics must be played, I suspect that if I had 1 month instead of 1 minute to argue against the passage of this bill the time would be insufficient. For everyone must realize, even the new membership of this body, that regardless of the arguments that are made against the bill, and regardless of the provisions of the bill, because of the political appeal that the bill has to those residing north of Messrs. Mason and Dixon's line, that nothing I or anyone residing oelow that line could say would do any good.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken in opposition to this bill, and opposed it vigorously every time it has come to the floor, and for that matter long before it got to the floor. I have opposed it, not because I live in the South, but because I regard it as unwise and unconstitutional. As I have pointed out on previous occasions, if the Federal Government can say to my State that it cannot require the payment of a poll tax as a requisite to the right to vote, the Federal Government can also say to your State that it cannot require a voter to even register before he votes.

If you can constitutionally pass this anti-poll-tax bill today, you can also pass one tomorrow providing for universal suffrage. Yes, you can pass a bill requiring the States to permit the infants in the arms of their mothers to exercise the right of franchise.

It is most unfortunate that so many of the membership of this body will yield to political expediency. I realize that there are a few enthusiastic "do-gooders"—those who would reform the world and who sincerely believe in this type of legislation. But you and I both know that political expediency is the vehicle upon which this bill is riding to passage today. Otherwise, why the rush to railroad it through at this stage of the session. Is there anyone who will rise from his seat now and say that this bill has one chance in a million of passing at the present session of Congress? You know, and I know, that over in the other body where the right of free and extended debate exists the leadership will not even attempt to present it at this session.

Yes, there is another class who favors this bill. Every Communist in the country is back of it. They are always appealing to the Negro segment of our population. Everyone familiar with the Communist movement in this country knows that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, we all know that this bill is conceived in sin and brought forth in iniquity. It is another form of Southern baiting and we are getting awfully tired in the South of being kicked around by the Democratic National Committee and the Republicans. The left wingers and right wingers are now joined together to kick the middle of the roaders around. I am going to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech on the electoral college; but for the electoral college neither party would have to get down on its bellys in an effort to try to get the minority votes from the pivotal States. We all know, as a matter of fact that that is what the Republicans are now doing in this bill. I want to ask all of you, although it is very immodest to make such a request, to read the speech I am going to put in the Appendix, and join with me in the next session of the Congress to try to get rid of this anomalous thing called the electoral college, and then the gentlemen of Congress can vote their conscience and not their political apprehensions.

Those of us who oppose this bill are not defending the poll tax. We are simply defending constitutional government and proper State sovereignty. If this bill ever becomes law, it will largely destroy the ballot box as an institution of self-government, and will mark a tremendous advance of Federal bureaucracy into the local affairs of the States.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

NERO FIDDLES WHILE ROME BURNS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] overlooked the fact that the very crowd that is trying to ram this legislation through Congress also rammed the FEPC bill through the Legislature of the State of New Jersey. If she could read the letters coming to me from New Jersey protesting that monstrosity, she might change her mind. Unless that vicious measure is repealed, it will drive industries out of New Jersey.

The Legislatures of Pennsylvania and other States refused to be dragged into this trap, but turned the FEPC down cold.

I want to say to the Members on the other side, and to everyone on this side who will vote for this unconstitutional measure, that you are not helping anybody, but you are "commending this poison chalice to your own lips." This gang that is out to destroy the Constitution of the United States is not going to stop with this. They are going to demand the passage of other similar bills.

They are here in Washington demanding now, that you pass a national FEPC act.

By the passage of this crazy measure you will simply be carrying out the program of that unseen hand that has been so pronounced in this country under the evil guidance of Gerhard Eisler and other Communist leaders who are planning a Negro soviet in the Southern States, which, if it succeeds, would mean the murder of practically every white man in the area and the raping of untold thousands of white women.

The supporters of this vicious measure would not only destroy the Constitution of the United States in order to play up to a radical minority, but they duplicate that ancient example of irresponsibility in which Nero fiddled while Rome burned.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield half a minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the echo of the last shot in World War II had hardly died away before this Congress found itself very busy appropriating billions to feed, clothe, and rehabilitate the peoples of those countries which had vowed to destroy us. We find ourselves still making those appropriations. Compare that, Mr. Speaker, with the treatment administered to a bleeding South at the close of the War Between the States. There was no UNRRA then. Oh, no! There were no Federal funds to feed and clothe the starving thousands of conquered Dixie. Instead you sent your carpet baggers to pillage our country and usurp our State governments, who, incidentally wrote the poll tax into many of our State constitutions.

For one unsound reason or another you have been kicking us around ever since. Throughout all these years, you have used the South as the object of your cheap political demagoguery.

Why all of this haste? Why circumvent the Rules Committee? Why close the hearings while the ranking Democratic member of the Committee on House Administration was attending a funeral? Why bring up the bill in such a manner that amendment is denied and debate so limited? What has happened to free speech in the House of Representatives? We get only a minute, or a half minute, to debate an important constitutional question. Why is it necessary to gag debate? Cheap political demagoguery, that is the answer. The whole thing is a cheap political demagogic appeal to a few Negro constituents, parlor pinks, left-wingers, and radicals.

It makes me sick at my stomach.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Is it possible at this time to make any kind of an arrangement, in accordance with the rules of the House and the ruling of the Chair, to provide that certain Members over here on this piece of legislation, who want to speak in opposition to it, and who have had no opportunity under the 20 minutes to which this side of the discussion was limited, to get it into the RECORD at this point?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will be delighted to entertain that request after the vote is taken; to have it extended at this point in the RECORD.

The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I had half a minute remaining when I propounded the parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The parliamentary inquiry was included in the gentleman's time, according to the rules.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, another parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The Chair, out of the generosity of his heart, in view of the fact that the gentleman had only 30

seconds left, will entertain the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PICKETT. I thank the Speaker for the offer made. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to find out if it was at all possible at any time under the rules of this House to get enough time to speak on it, either in the House or in the committee, which I never had the opportunity to do for a year. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the House why I am in favor of this legislation. I think it is the unfinished business of this generation. Liberty is always unfinished business. Equality is always unfinished business. So, quite aside from some of the remarks, intemperate and otherwise, that have been made here, one of the great responsibilities and one of the great objectives of the Republican Party since its birth has been equality and freedom. So, this is the unfinished job.

We made three endeavors before, once in 1942, once in 1943, and once in 1945 to have this legislation engrossed upon the statute books. The vote was not less than 251 in favor of this legislation on every occasion.

What may happen in another body is no concern of ours, because we have a responsibility to discharge. There is only one question before the House, and that question is, Does the Congress of the United States in a Federal election involving the President, the Vice President, Senators, and Representatives, have the power to prohibit a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting? My answer to that is "Yes," and I think there are two good and substantial reasons for it.

I freely admit all the things that have been brought up in connection with the Constitution with respect to this matter. For instance, in article I, section 4, as to the time, place, and manner of holding elections; and what appears in section 2 of the fourteenth amendment regarding the reduction of representation, which has never been done by Congress. I freely admit what is in the seventeenth amendment with respect to qualifications. I admit freely that the fifteenth amendment does not of itself confer the right of suffrage. I am quite conversant, I think, with section 4 of article I of the Constitution with respect to the qualifications of electors, and that is the question that is involved here, and over the years it has been thoroughly confused.

Granting that a State can impose a qualification, two questions arise: First, can Congress undo it, and second, what is a qualification? Certainly Congress can undo it, because in article I, section 4, after it confers the right upon the States to determine the time, place, and manner of elections, there is a semicolon in that article, and then this language:

> Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

That is the only limitation upon the Congress. As I read the Constitution, not one section at a time but in its entirety, seeking to relate every provision that is there, I am persuaded that Congress has this power.

Let me add at this point, that every Member of this body and every Member of the Senate must be his own constitutional lawyer. If it were not so, how could one ever test out the constitutionality of a proceeding in the high tribunal? It is for me as a Representative of the people to determine what I think is constitutional, and if those men in their wisdom over in that white marble structure across the plaza determine that I am wrong, I must abide by their judgment. But I must read it for myself, in its entirety. As I read it, I believe the Congress has the power where a Federal function and where Federal officials are involved to determine this matter.

The second question is the question of qualification. The States have the power to fix qualifications. What is a qualification? I can understand age as a qualification, because age involves the maturity of judgment of a person. In Georgia they say you are old enough and mature enough when you are 18. In my State they say 21. But I can understand it.

I can understand literacy as a qualification, the capacity to read and write and understand the responsibilities of a citizen. I can understand citizenship as a qualification, because it goes to the heart of fealty and allegiance to the country. I can understand residence as a qualification, because there the interest of any State or Commonwealth is involved. But I cannot understand how you can include in the term "qualification" the imposition of a $1, $2, or $5 tax as a prerequisite for voting.

If you grant that that can be done, then you can impose a tax of $200 or $300 or $5,000, and you can disfranchise almost everybody in the electorate in any of the States in the Union. That was never my contemplation of a document that had upon it the seal of approval of the people more than 150 years ago. So when we examine into those two propositions: Does the Congress have the power? I think it does have the power under article I, section 4, of the Constitution. Is the poll tax a qualification? In my judgment, it is a restriction and not a qualification. It was designed in the first instance to restrict the right of suffrage. It had behind it a design to shrink the electorate in order to achieve a certain result. And so the answer is: We have the power; the poll tax is not a qualification within the contemplation of the framers of the Constitution or of the Constitution itself.

Mr. Speaker, would it not be a dreadful thing in keeping a rendevous with liberty and equality that we could say to a man in seven States of the Union today: "You shall have the privilege of fighting for your country. You shall have the privilege of dying for your country on some foreign battlefield, but you shall not have the right or the privilege to vote for the Congressman who voted for the declaration of war which carried you abroad, and you shall not have the right to vote for the President of the United States who signed that declaration of war, unless you first pay a poll tax.

Mr. Speaker, what an awful thing that would be. This is the unfinished business of this generation.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, the hardy perennial of American politics is the poll-tax issue. It is the recurring weed in the legislative garden. Each year it springs up full blown on the House Calendar, timed to fill the gap between the end of the Japanese beetle invasion and the beginning of the ragweed and hay fever season. It is, and has been for some time, more of an irritant than a menace.

The proponents of the anti-poll-tax measures repeat their annual inanities. In their arguments we find much that is new and much that is true. Unfortunately, the things that are true are not new, and the things that are new are not true.

The poll-tax-abolition issue is now so old and so familiar that any comment must of necessity be a rehash of what has been said again and again. We recognize the fact that there are a great many fine persons in and out of Congress, in the South as well as in the North, who sincerely believe that the poll tax should be abolished. But there are also others not so sincere. Some of the most active spokesmen against the poll tax are people who are not now and never will be sincere Americans. I am referring here to the members of the American Communist Party, in which poll-tax abolition is one of the principal platforms.

The strongest advocates of the anti-poll tax legislation are the Communist and Socialist Parties, and the radicals and left-wingers of both the Democratic and Republican Parties. The most outspoken groups are the CIO Political Action Committee and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. There are more Communists in these groups than all other groups of people in this country. For years the Communist Party has been preying upon the Negroes of the country, under the false appeal that it is trying to be of assistance to them. The Communists care not one whit for Negro welfare; they care only about spreading their vicious ideologies. They have a poor estimation of the Negro's fundamental common sense when they attempt to enlist him in un-American causes.

Disregarding the Communist Party, however, there remain a number of compelling reasons why Congress should not enact anti-poll-tax legislation. The chief concern of all Americans should be the sovereign right of the States to set up their own election machinery. We cannot on one hand proclaim our desire for democratic government and with the other hand abridge the fundamental rights of our States. It was distinctly the theory of the founding fathers, whose wisdom and prescience have been demonstrated throughout the history of this comparatively young country, that the electors in our democracy, our experiment in government in which was planned a reversal of autocracy, must be responsible and enlightened individuals.

Use of the poll tax, it must be remembered, falls into more than one category. It was first used to extend the right to vote, and secondly its purposes has been that of a guarantee of possession of qualifications deemed necessary in a democracy if that democracy, or the new theory of government by consent of the governed, were to prevail.

The poll tax is a contributing factor to the proposal that the decision of the elector must be in the best interest of the country and the community, and as a matter of fact that is exactly the manner in which the poll tax has worked out. Where the poll tax has been found to work a hardship or an injustice upon any group of our people, it has been and will continue to be abolished by the action of the States themselves.

Listen to the language of our Constitution, as found in article 1, section 2:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

This basic right of the States to determine their own voting qualifications was reaffirmed when our Federal Constitution was amended to permit the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people. Thus we have today two similar provisions in our Constitution providing that the qualifications of electors or those who vote for Congressmen and United States Senators shall be fixed by the States. The provisions are specific and subject to no other interpretation.

Our courts have handed down numerous decisions supporting the Constitutional authority of the States to fix qualifications for voting. In the case of the United States against Cruikshank, the court declared—

> That the fifteenth amendment does not confer the right to vote. That is the prerogative of the State laws. It only confers the right not to be excluded from voting by reason of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, and this is all the right that Congress can enforce * * *. The State may establish any other conditions and discriminations it pleases, whether as to age, property, education, or anything else.

In an opinion rendered by Supreme Court Justice Butler in 1937, it is stated:

> Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States but is conferred by the State; save as restrained by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments and other provisions of the Federal Constitution, the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate.

If Congress can prohibit to the States a given qualification of electors at a Federal election, it may equally prescribe affirmative qualifications. The poll tax has never prevented anyone from voting who was qualified to exercise the franchise, and it has raised the level of political practices. Poll-tax opponents point to isolated cases of errors and mistakes, but these do not overcome the principles involved in States' rights and the enlightened action of the electors.

The poll tax may or may not be a wise provision. It may have outlived its usefulness. It may be time to eliminate it entirely as a requisite for voting. I shall not debate this issue. But I shall resist, with all my force, the attempt on the part of the Federal Government to reach into the separate States in which the poll tax now prevails and dictate its abolition. I am seriously concerned about the constitutional right of the State of South Carolina to prescribe its own qualifications for the privilege of voting in its primaries. If legislative action on the part of Congress can do away with the poll-tax requirement in South Carolina primaries, it can also wipe away the educational qualifications for the privilege of voting in that State. It is only a step from there to the abolishment altogether of the requirement of registration.

If the poll tax is to be eliminated, the way to do it is through State action. There remain today only seven States in which the poll tax exists. In all seven, sentiment against it is increasing. Georgia ended the poll tax in 1945; Florida ended it in 1937; Louisiana in 1934. It is absurd for the Federal Government to step into a situation which is already well on the way toward being settled in true democratic fashion. If Congress has a right to dictate conditions in an exclusive State function, such as the poll tax, it may dictate as respects every other voting requirement. When a Congressman from Ohio introduces a measure to end the poll tax as a requirement for voting in South Carolina, he by that act asserts that Congress may likewise end any voting requirement that Ohio may have. And this applies to every Congressman from every State in the Union.

For several years we have watched as the States have lost to the Federal Government many of their most precious powers. The abridgment of States' rights cuts to the very heart of the existence of a State as a unit of government. Our citizens are showing rightful concern lest their rights and functions be reduced, and the pending measure merely serves to intensify that concern.

I hold that we cannot, in the name of individual liberty, trample on our sacred Constitution merely to appease certain pressure groups who are backing such pernicious legislation as H. R. 29.

This bill has absolutely no merit in the light of the Constitution, and no merit in the further light of court interpretation. It constitutes a high-handed encroachment of States' rights, and its enactment would tend to shatter our national unity at a time of grave national crisis. It is a reincarnation of the carpet-bagger spirit and would bear similar fruit in bitterness, hatred, animosity, and disunity. Our State governments are sufficiently enlightened and sufficiently responsive to the democratic urges of their citizens to take action without Federal interference. H. R. 29 is an invasion of States' rights. The time to halt that invasion is now, and in this fight I call upon all those who believe in individual rights and the rights of the States; we must preserve the way of life that is precious to us and to the world.

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Speaker, the subject matter of H. R. 29, entitled "a bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers," has been before the Congress for many years. Much has been said concerning it and much discussion has resulted. To this time legislation of this nature has not been passed, for the Congress has seen the inherent danger to our form of constitutional government if such legislation should be enacted.

I shall not discuss the subject further than a few remarks concerning the danger to our political institutions, and the unconstitutionality of the proposed legislation. After all is said, the first approach to legislation should be to apply the test of its conformity to the Constitution of the United States. If any proposed legislation be unconstitutional there is no need to go further into its merits or demerits. There are many other objections to the bill, but I have spoken of these at other times and will only refer you to these discussions if you should desire to ascertain my views on other phases of the subject.

As to its constitutionality, the interpretation of the constitutional provisions is not very abstruse. Anyone with a knowledge of proper interpretation of the expressions of the English language can determine it for himself. Its interpretation does not depend upon a profound acquaintance with constitutional law.

Section 2 of article I of the Constitution of the United States reads:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Take, for illustration, the State of Virginia. Virginia, through the people of the State, adopted a constitution which prescribes as one of the qualifications of electors who desired to vote for members of the House of Delegates of Virginia—"the most numerous branch of the State legislature"—that electors "shall as a prerequisite to the right to vote pay, at least 6 months prior to the election, all State poll taxes assessed or assessable against him, under this constitution, during the 3 years next preceding that in which he offers to vote."

The payment of poll taxes therefore is one of the qualifications requisite for electors "of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." It therefore follows that the electors for Members of Congress shall be the said electors as herein defined. This seems to me to be a clear and logical interpretation of the words used in the Constitution of the United States and the constitution of Virginia.

The interpretation of this language was discussed in the Constitutional Convention when the United States Constitution was adopted. The remarks of Alexander Hamilton, of New York, one of the leading minds of that Convention, have come down to us and state clearly the thought of that Convention. Alexander Hamilton said:

> The first view to be taken of this part of the Government relates to the qualifications of the electors and the elected.
>
> Those of the former are to be the same with those of the electors of the most numerous

branch of the State legislatures. The definition of the right of suffrage is very justly regarded as a fundamental article of republican government. It was incumbent on the Convention, therefore, to define and establish this right in the Constitution. To have left it open for the occasional regulation of the Congress would have been improper for the reason just mentioned. To have submitted it to the legislative discretion of the States would have been improper for the same reason; and for the additional reason that it would have rendered too dependent on the State governments that branch of the Federal Government which ought to be dependent on the people alone. To have reduced the different qualifications in the different States to one uniform rule would probably have been as dissatisfactory to some of the States as it would have been difficult to the Convention. The provision made by the Convention appears, therefore, to be the best that lay within their option. It must be satisfactory to every State, because it is conformable to the standard already established, or which may be established, by the State itself.

Note two of the sentences of Hamilton's statement:

The definition of the right of suffrage is very justly regarded as a fundamental article of republican government. It was incumbent on the Convention, therefore, to define and establish this right in the Constitution.

Reference has been made by some to article I, section 4, reading as follows:

The times, places, and manner of holding elections shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof, but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations.

It has been suggested that the payment of a poll tax comes within the meaning of the word "manner" in said section. To state it shows its asurdity, for the qualifications of an elector could not by any stretch of the imagination be construed as a manner of holding elections.

Probably reference should be made also to article X of the Constitution of the United States reading:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

The fundamental principle uppermost in the minds of the members of the Constitutional Convention was that there should be no interference by the Federal Government in the rights of the respective States. So, article X was added to the Constitution to make assurance doubly sure. The regulation of the suffrage was fundamental to the existence of the States and they not only retained it in their own hands by section 2 of article I but they supplemented it with article X. The qualifications of electors certainly were not delegated to the Federal Government and hence were reserved. Suffrage control was the one thing the States would not surrender then, nor now.

There is a principle involved in this legislation, however, which affects not only the poll-tax States, but the right of every State to manage its own internal affairs. It is the essential of good government under our form of government, that the people shall decide by their vote what kind of government they want. Therefore it is essential that each State should control the suffrage of its citizens, and this power is necessary to its existence as a democratic form of government within itself. If such power should be referred to Congress, then the several States could be interfered with at any time by the varying views and opinions of the Representatives from all of the States, who might change their opinion from time to time. No State, so far as suffrage is concerned, could have a stable form of government. This is the reason, of course, why the Constitution provides that each State shall decide this all-important question for itself. Virtually, the entire construction of government depends upon the suffrage of the people. Therefore the passage of such a bill as this, in principle, would affect not only the seven States which have the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting, but would affect every State in the Union. Further, if the control of the internal affairs of a State is lodged in Congress in the method proposed by this bill and became a part of our form of government, the smaller States would be definitely within the power of the larger States. That would result eventually in the smaller States ganging up on the larger States and interfering with the State autonomy of same. It would not seem necessary to extend a further discussion of this matter, for everyone can see for himself what a dangerous principle is being advocated, a principle that might cause untold trouble in the future in a great many ways. If anyone be interested in pursuing this subject, I will refer him to a fuller discussion by me on the floor of the House on May 25, 1943, giving illustrations and examples as to the possible working out of such a principle.

It is noticed that the language of this bill is that it shall be unlawful for a State to require the payment of a poll tax for voting or registering to vote in certain specified elections. As said above this applies to all the States, not only those that have poll taxes, but those that do not have such taxes. It applies to every State, for if it can be made unlawful to make the payment of a poll tax a qualification for voting, it can also make unlawful other qualifications of other States besides the few poll-tax States. This distinction was well brought out by Mr. Mark Sullivan in which he said:

And—here is the menace to all the States—if Congress can forbid one qualification, it can forbid any other qualification. By forbidding the poll tax as a qualification, Congress would set up a precedent and principle by which some future Congress could, if it chooses, forbid qualifications about residence and citizenship. If the Council of State Governments, if the 48 State Governors, and all the other persons and organizations concerned about loss of State functions have vigilance in proportion to their earnestness, if they have energy to act in behalf of what they believe—they will take steps at once against House Resolution No. 7.

This is the form in which the matter was presented at that time. He also commented on the lack of understanding of the effect—on all the States and on the structure of American Government of the passage of such legislation by the Congress.

In discussing the constitutionality of such a bill as H. R. 29, there is no intention on my part to claim that the same result could not be obtained in a constitutional manner instead of in an unconstitutional way, mainly by a constitutional amendment as the Constitution itself prescribes the way in which changes can be made in the Constitution. If such action be taken in a constitutional manner as prescribed by the Constitution, then the question of unconstitutionality as to the lack of power in Congress to pass such an amendment to the Constitution would not apply. There are other objections to the bill, however, which would apply, but I merely wish to refer to the unconstitutionality of the method that is now being used in this bill.

Also the question of suffrage qualifications may be passed upon by the several States as they please, as the Supreme Court said in the Breedlove case of 1937:

The privilege of voting is not derived from the United States, but is conferred by the State, and save as restrained by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments and other provisions of the Federal Constitution, the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate.

This procedure is now being followed in some States and is, of course, the proper approach to the question.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say I oppose the bill (H. R. 29) which is now before the House. In the time I have been in Congress I have opposed each time similar legislation.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, since the bill to outlaw poll taxes comes up under suspension of the rules, and only 20 minutes is allowed the proponents of the measure, a very brief statement will have to suffice. Hardly more is necessary, since the overwhelming majority of the people are persuaded that this act of justice is long overdue. In a democracy the payment of a fee for the privilege of voting is unthinkable. If the tax can legally be $1, it can just as readily be $1,000, and if this were permitted, we could have the franchise confined only to the rich.

It is high time that Congress assert its right to regulate Federal elections in this particular in the seven Southern States which still insist upon a poll tax.

I call attention to the excellent speech of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] which not only is convincing as to the propriety of this action, but also of the constitutional right of the House to take it. I trust that the resolution will pass by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 29 provides that the requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting shall not be deemed a qualification of voters or electors. Yet the proponents of this measure argue that the qualification of an elector under the Constitution is not involved.

On October 13, 1942, I opposed this proposed legislation on the floor of this House.

Voting statistics and percentage comparisons are interesting, but they have not the slightest bearing upon the fundamental issue involved in the discussion of this so-called poll-tax controversy.

Most of the States would not be directly affected by the passage of this proposed measure, but all of the people are directly concerned in the preservation of constitutional government, and one of the effective ways to destroy it is to pass legislation which is directly repugnant to our Constitution.

I assume it is agreed that if a Representative in Congress believes that a proposed statute is clearly contrary to the terms of our fundamental law, it is his duty to oppose it.

My opinion is that an authorizing constitutional amendment must be ratified by the States before this bill can become law.

The United States Constitution provides that the qualifications of those who vote for Members of Congress are prescribed by the States. Only the time, place, and manner of holding elections are under Federal supervision.

"Electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature" are the words of article I, section 2, and the seventeenth amendment.

This whole controversy hinges primarily on what these few words mean. Their meaning seems clear.

"Time and habit have done as much to interpret the Constitution as all the learned decisions of the Supreme Court."

Since the adoption of our Federal Constitution, the people of the States have assumed that the State had the exclusive right to prescribe the qualifications of those who would vote for membership in Congress, except when the Federal Constitution otherwise specifically provides, and by common consent of the legislatures, legal departments, and attorneys general of the several States, they have not only passed statutes covering this question as applicable to the election of their own officers and Members of Congress, but have in many instances incorporated the qualifications in their State constitutions.

The Congress of the United States has recognized this exclusive jurisdiction of the States, until introduction of H. R. 29.

In 1869 when it was thought wise and necessary to legislate regarding discrimination because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, and again, in 1919 when the people demanded that citizens of the United States should not be denied the right to vote on account of sex, if the Fortieth and Sixty-sixth Congresses had used the methods adopted by the proponents of this pending measure, they would have used the simple expedient of introducing a bill in Congress. Instead, however, with the constitutional provisions before them, they proposed to the legislatures of the several States constitutional amendments, to be ratified by the necessary number of States, and to be known as amendment 15 and amendment 19, respectively.

It is significant that through the years, the States and the Congress have assumed this to be true, viz: that the question of qualifications occupied a field which the Federal Government could not invade without specific constitutional sanction.

Hamilton and Jefferson, in the Federalist, ask this question and answer it:

> Who are to be the electors of the Federal Representatives? They are to be the same who exercise the right in every State of electing the corresponding branch of the legislature of the State.

The Supreme Court has spoken:

> Save as restrained by the XV and XIX amendments and other provisions of the Federal Constitution, the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate.

Time and habit have placed their stamp of approval upon this construction.

Where is there room for controversy?

Washington speaks to us in these words:

> If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the Constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this in one instance may be the instrument for good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives is indulging in the most ridiculous fiasco which I have witnessed since becoming a Member of Congress.

The poll-tax issue is being brought up so late in this session of Congress that it is absolutely impossible for the bill to go through the normal processes which are necessary for it to become law.

The Republican leadership of the House says H. R. 29 should become Federal law although they know there is not enough time for it to become law.

This is indeed a gallant stand.

The poll-tax issue involving only seven States is being brought before the House today by the Republican leadership at a time when Congress is loaded down with national and international issues which are crying for attention.

Some Democrats are protesting through certain delaying actions which are allowed to the minority under the rules of the House. All told, Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives of the United States is grossly wasting its time during this last rush week of this session and during a most critical period of our history.

Personally, I would prefer that my State require certain minimum educational yardsticks as qualification for voting in lieu of the poll tax. It would be good to have more voters and more qualified voters. Such qualifications are required in other States and I believe they are sensible.

However, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is strictly unconstitutional for us to pass national legislation controlling the several States' electoral laws. I believe the solution to this question should be left up to the respective legislatures of the seven States involved.

Irrespective of the merits of H. R. 29, Mr. Speaker, the presentation of this bill today, without proper consideration and without adequate time for it to become law, is a political sham on the part of the Republican leadership in an effort to pick up liberal votes. My negative vote is a vigorous protest against such a political sham as we are witnessing today.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the payment of a poll tax is not a requirement for voting in any election in my State now. However, I am opposed to the pending bill for the following reasons: First, I believe it is contrary to the Constitution; and, second, it is a matter for the States and not one for the Federal Government.

The power to hold an election and to determine the qualifications of a voter was never delegated to any branch of the Federal Government. It remains in the respective States, guaranteed by the Constitution. I have stated once before on this floor, when this same question was being considered, that regardless of whether it is right or wrong to require payment of poll tax as a prerequisite for voting, the matter is purely one for the States to determine. Why, at this late date, do you want to take away from the States the power over suffrage which for years has been recognized as belonging to the States of the Union?

The proper and only way for Congress to do away with the poll tax is by the submission of a constitutional amendment to the people and let the people themselves make the decision. In my opinion, if the pending bill becomes a law and is heard by the Supreme Court, the Court will rule, in effect, that to accomplish what the bill seeks to do will have to be done by constitutional amendment.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I bitterly oppose the enactment of this bill. When I became a Member of Congress, I subscribed to an oath that I would defend the Constitution of the United States. After taking that oath, I have never knowingly voted for legislation presented to this House during my service here, the provisions of which were unconstitutional.

Article I, section 2 of the Constitution of the United States, provides as follows: "The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." There is no getting away from the fact that the question of the qualifications of electors is a State function solely and exclusively. This bill to outlaw the poll tax violates the rights of the several States. Congress can protect the manner of holding elections in which Members of the House of Representatives and of the Senate are being voted upon but the States themselves must and shall prescribe the qualifications of the voters. The qualifications of voters are expressly reserved to the States. Such qualifications are among the powers not delegated to the United States and are, therefore, reserved to the States themselves or to the people, under the tenth amendment to the Constitution. Members of the House of Representatives or of the United States Senate should not violate their oaths of office to uphold the Constitution by supporting an unconstitutional bill. The Federal Government did not create the States of the Union. This Government is the creature of the several States. You have but to read

the debates of the Constitutional Convention to realize the extent that the delegates concerned themselves in preserving the powers and prerogatives of the States and in limiting the powers of the Central Government.

It is apparently of great concern to certain people and groups in other sections of the country to pass Federal laws affecting States to the south of them and south of the Mason and Dixon's line. We in the South have no apologies to make to any other section of the country. We are well able to look after our own affairs without dictation from other sections of the country. We have grown and prospered decade after decade. We will continue to do so. Time and time again proposals have been presented to this body in which it is attempted to reform somebody else's State. Apparently some people are mighty happy when these proposals come along which undertake to regulate other people's businesses, affairs, and politics. When we in the State of Arkansas desire to eliminate the poll tax as a qualification for voting, we will do so ourselves in the manner prescribed by law. Many States have already taken action to abolish the poll tax as a voting qualification. North Carolina has abolished it. Florida and Louisiana have abolished it, and other States of the South are considering such action. Leave us alone. We are well able to handle our own affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that this bill will be voted down.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bill H. R. 29, called the poll-tax bill. We have not had a poll tax as a requirement for voting in a good many years in Louisiana. But, Mr. Speaker, I have consistently opposed this legislation, and I now oppose it, notwithstanding the fact that we have no poll tax in Louisiana. My chief reason for doing so is that I regard this purely as a State matter and not a matter for the Federal Government to legislate upon. I think the matter of fixing the qualifications of voters is purely a State function and I think it is a dangerous precedent for the Federal Government to undertake to fix voting qualifications in the various States. Mr. Speaker, I know full well what is behind this bill and I know that practically all members of this House will vote for this bill with the exception of Southern Democrats. I know that Southern Democrats are very much in the minority on this question. Everyone here knows that this bill is going to pass today in this House. The majority is all set for that to happen. Everybody knows that the statements which we Southern Democrats are making here today are not going to change the results, but nevertheless I want to voice my protest against this bill because this bill is an effort to further destroy the rights of the States and to further encroach upon the powers, prerogatives, and privileges of the several States of the Union.

Mr. Speaker, the said fact about this whole thing is that this bill is purely political. If it were not for the politics involved in this question, this bill would have never reached the floor of this House. It would have never come out of the committee. There would be few Members to raise their voices in an effort to disturb the peace and tranquility in the South and to infringe upon the rights of the States in this manner except for politics. Yes; the matter of political expediency is behind the whole thing. It is simply a question of courting the votes of minority groups in this country.

While there are undoubtedly some groups of good and well-meaning citizens unfortunately supporting this legislation, because they are uninformed and do not understand the serious implications involved, it is a significant fact that every single radical and communistic group in this land is whooping it up for this legislation. This latter fact alone, it seems to me, ought to be sufficient cause and warning for the Members of this House to stop and think about what they are doing this day. But, Mr. Speaker, instead of this legislation having the serious and searching deliberation of this body, we find this bill being brought here today under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, which means that no amendments whatsoever can even be offered on the floor and also it limits the total time for the consideration of this assault upon the Constitution of the United States to a total of 40 minutes. Think of it! Here to have a bill which strikes at the very foundation principle of the right of every State to fix the qualifications of voters in that State and we have this bill rammed down our throats in 40 minutes. Well, as I said, I know you have the votes to do it, but I am raising my voice and will give my vote in protest against that. In doing so, Mr. Speaker, I am not defending the imposition of a poll tax at all. As I said, many years ago we abolished the poll tax in Louisiana and most of the other States have done likewise. But I am defending the right of a State to fix the qualifications of the voters in that State. If this bill should ever become law, you can certainly look forward to attempts by certain groups in this country to push through other legislation to further curtail and take away the rights of the States to regulate the qualifications of their own citizens to exercise the right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, there are other reasons for opposing this legislation which I could advance, if I had an opportunity. I deplore the action which is being taken here today. This bill represents a part of the concerted drive which has been going on in this country to break down the rights of the States and to weaken our national Constitution. The day this bill becomes the law of the land will mark, in my opinion, one of the greatest assaults in history upon the people in the several States to control their own affairs.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad commentary on Republican leadership that this bill, which is recognized by most attorneys to be unconstitutional, is brought up at this time and in this way. It merely indicates to the country the futility of a Republican administration and leads our people to know what might be expected, should we ever have a Republican President as well as a Republican-dominated Congress.

This is July 21. The law requires adjournment by July 31 and it is planned to adjourn on July 26. More than half of the appropriation bills, all of which should have been enacted before the commencement of the fiscal year on July 1, have not become law, the Republican-controlled Congress having been unable to enact them, although nearly one-twelfth of the fiscal year has passed. Such a condition has never heretofore existed during my 11 years as a Member of this body. We are meeting at 10 in the morning and remaining in session until late each afternoon. Despite this industry much important legislation must go over. Yes; many items which cause the importance of this attack on the South to fade into insignificance by comparison. As illustrative of the ability of our Republican friends to select a program, they bring up this unconstitutional anti-poll-tax bill under these circumstances and under suspension of the rules instead of one of these important matters, and for what purpose?

As my colleagues know, since this legislation applies to only seven Southern States, it has heretofore been generally regarded as a desire on the part of certain people in and out of Congress to interfere in the internal affairs of these Southern States and attend to our business for us. Of course, there has also been a certain amount of demagogic appeal to the Negro vote. In this case, however, references have occurred in the press quoting Majority Leader HALLECK and another gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS], which indicated that this and other antisouthern legislation would be brought up because of the well-nigh unanimous vote of southern Members to sustain the President's veto of the tax bill. These votes were conscientiously cast for what we then thought and still believe to be the best interest of our country. In fact, it is difficult for us to realize how a realistic approach to the matter can produce any other conclusion. Even so, it appears that this legislation was brought up today, without any warning and without southern members of the committee from whence it came even being able to ascertain when it would be brought up, purely as a matter of spite which, if true, certainly reflects no credit on the Republican leadership of the House.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I want to say for the RECORD that I am opposed to any form of anti-poll-tax legislation, including the measure now before this Congress. I am convinced beyond a shadow of a doubt that such legislation is wholly unconstitutional, I believe one of my colleagues has said that such legislation has already been declared unconstitutional about 14 times, and I think it a waste of time—and a waste of the taxpayers' money—to uselessly argue and take time to pass more anti-poll-tax legislation which in the end will, if it does not meet rebuff in the Senate, be classed as unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States. The matter of elections has been, and I hope always will be, a matter of States' rights, and I see no reason to attempt further encroachment on something the various States

hold sacred. It is not a matter for this or any other Congress.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 29, now under consideration by the House, would make unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

It is indeed unfortunate that the leadership of the Eightieth Congress delayed the consideration of this legislation until the last week before adjournment. This is only one of the important pieces of legislation which can be classified as unfinished business. Much-needed housing legislation, full employment, minimum wage, price control, antilynching, FEPC, flood control and river development, public health, and education are other important and necessary legislative problems which this Congress should have considered and passed during its 7-month session.

The anti-poll-tax legislation is highly necessary at this time because it will give the franchise to almost 10,000,000 citizens of our country of all races.

The enactment of this legislation is more necessary and essential today than at any time in our history. By reason of the recent war, our Government has assumed the leadership of the world. Our democracy must radiate practical examples of liberty and freedom for all the world to copy. If we are to spread democracy abroad, the finest and most effective way to bring that about is to encourage the spread of democracy at home.

We could well emulate Australia in practicing true democracy. In that great country, there is a poll tax, but it is a poll tax in reverse. The citizen who pays the tax is the citizen who fails to discharge patriotic duty of voting. If a poll tax existed at all in relation to the right to vote, it should be inflicted as a penalty for not voting and applied to every man and woman in America of voting age.

In this critical period of world history, our Congress should now and forever unshackle, as far as we are able, unfair, unfortunate, and unpatriotic restrictions and give to all people of our country, in the very fullest degree, the right to vote.

The passage of this legislation will give to over 10,000,000 people the right and the privilege to vote without paying a poll tax. It will free from this handicap and limitation, approximately 7,000,000 white citizens and 3,000,000 citizens of the Negro race. Moreover, it will stimulate an interest in government. It will make for better citizenship. It will bring about more intense representation on the part of elected officials. By giving this great segment of our population the right to vote, it will eventually bring about legislation that will improve housing conditions, health, education, employment, and other progress which will improve the American way of life.

Millions of persons today cannot vote on these important issues, and by reason of the poll tax, they are not receiving the representation to which they are justly entitled.

We must remember that these 10,000,000 disfranchised citizens were not barred from wearing the uniform of their country and offering their lives to preserve liberty and freedom, not only in this country, but throughout the entire globe. It occurs to me that if a man has the right and privilege of baring his breast for his country in battle, he merits the right to cast his ballot for the men and women who will represent him in his national government.

Let us today pass this anti-poll-tax legislation and give to a great segment of our own people the right to full, free, and complete citizenship, within the confines of their own country; and that will be the most effective message of democracy that we can send out to the other nations of the world. It will inform them that we not only stand for democracy abroad, but we are practicing it at home.

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, the phrase "without regard to race, color, or creed" has been used and expressed so often that it virtually is considered the breath of our Constitution and the spirit of the freedoms and liberties protected by it.

The fight for freedom is a never-ending fight. We have only recently won the greatest battle for freedom in the history of the world in World War II. We only have freedom when we have free elections.

The purpose of H. R. 29, making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary, is an endeavor to maintain free elections in this country.

Those who oppose this bill offer constitutional objections. However, I have heard no objections in principle to this bill. The reason is, of course, that there cannot be any valid or fundamental objections to the principle which will guarantee the right to vote to every American. There is certainly no one who can defend the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to the right to vote.

Let us look briefly at the constitutional objections.

The minority report of the committee refers to only one passage of the Constitution, article I, section 2, which provides as follows:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen, every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

However, the poll tax is not a qualification for voting. It is a restriction on the right to vote.

No reference is made, however, in the minority report to the all-important thirteenth amendment to the Constitution, which states:

> The right of the citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State, on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Could any language be more clear?

The Constitution also says:

> The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government (art. II, sec. 4).

A republican government is one with majority rule. In the poll-tax States a majority is disenfranchised. Can a republican government exist when a large number of citizens are denied the right to participate in affairs of government because they are poor?

When we eliminate all of the specious arguments against this bill, it is practically obvious that those who are in favor of the poll tax wish to control their elections by denying the right to vote to the poor class of people, and particularly to the Negroes. The power to tax is the power to destroy. The imposition of a poll tax is not only an abuse of the power to destroy, it is destruction itself.

Opponents of this measure have called it political demagoguery. On the contrary, I contend that it is political immorality to deny to any American citizen who has the necessary qualifications the right to vote. It is a concerted effort to reduce the number of people who are allowed to vote for the President and for their Representatives in Congress. This is un-American.

Those who oppose this measure have not had the temerity to say that the colored people cannot vote, but that is actually what they are trying to accomplish. Let us not deal in subterfuge, and let us not try to do indirectly what we have not got the courage to do directly.

I was interested in noting the decision of United States District Judge J. Waties Waring within the last couple of weeks, which guaranteed to Negroes the right to vote in the State Democratic primary in South Carolina. According to news accounts, attorneys presenting the case contended that a certain Democratic Club in South Carolina was a private club and that only white Democrats were entitled to membership and consequently privileged to participate in the primary elections of its party. But the court held otherwise. In my opinion, this decision portends a favorable decision on the constitutionality of the poll-tax question if and when it comes before the Federal courts for a decision.

The poor white people, the tenant farmers, the share croppers, as well as the Negroes fought in the last war to preserve democracy. Certainly if they were eligible for the draft and so willingly made sacrifices for their country, they should be entitled to have a voice in its government.

I had the privilege of serving in the United States Navy during World War II. While in the Marianas Islands, I was particularly impressed with the work of a Negro Seabee Battalion. They exhibited courage, organization, and character, which was a credit to their race. Certainly after seeing what they did for their country, I would be a hypocrite if I should now cast my vote to deny them the right to participate in a small way in their own Government.

Recently the United States saw fit to deny relief expenditures to certain countries in Europe because those nations had failed to hold free elections in a democratic manner.

Not many weeks ago we debated whether or not sums appropriated for relief could be spent in Poland. The charge was made that Poland was now a Communist-dominated country, and that free elections were no longer held in that nation.

Within the past few days I read a news article in a local paper which eminated from Budapest. It described how the Communists in Hungary had rigged the election laws so that only Communists could vote and they could vote as often as they pleased.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when we refer to free democratic elections, I think that we have four basic principles in mind, namely: that there is a choice offered, secrecy of the ballot, freedom from intimidation, and universal suffrage by all persons of voting age. The last principle is just as basic as any of the other three. If any one of these principles be absent, then the election is not a free election in the democratic tradition.

The inconsistency of our position in accusing other nations of not having free and democratic elections, while we simultaneously allow seven of our States to practice selective disenfranchisement, is obvious and merits the criticism which other nations are so quick to make. How can we as Americans in good faith preach democracy to the world and spend billions of dollars to further the cause of democracy when we have not put our own house in order? Do we desire to stand convicted in the eyes of the world of cynicism and duplicity? Shall we be cast in the role of the Janus-faced demagogue who views with disfavor practices by others which partake of an entirely different nature wher. indulged in at home? If we cannot make democracy work at home we might as well save the billions we are spending trying to make it work abroad.

Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the Americans who are disenfranchised in seven of our States by a legal subterfuge, and as one who believes that this Nation cannot continue to be part democratic and part poll tax, any more than it could be half slave and half free, I appeal with all the earnestness at my command to my colleagues here to vote favorably on this most important bill, that we may hold our heads up to all men as a nation which not only preaches, but also practices, democracy.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, I favor H. R. 29, the so-called anti-poll-tax bill, and I am supporting the motion to suspend the rules of the House and pass this bill. We passed similar bills in the House in the Seventy-seventh, Seventy-eighth, and Seventy-ninth Congresses, and it is my conviction that approximately three out of every four Members of the House favor this bill and will vote for it.

This bill makes it unlawful to require the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or final election for national offices. In other words, a person otherwise qualified to vote for President, Vice President, Senator, or Member of the House of Representatives shall not be required to pay a poll tax in order to qualify such person to vote for these national officials, and it shall be unlawful for any State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision to prevent any person from voting or registering to vote in any primary or other election for national offices on the ground that such person has not paid a poll tax, and any such requirement shall be invalid and void insofar as it purports to disqualify any person otherwise qualified to vote in such primary or other election. In other words, no State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision shall levy a poll tax or any other tax on the right or privilege of voting in such primary or other election, and any such tax shall be invalid and void insofar as it purports to disqualify any such person otherwise qualified from voting. It further provides that it will be unlawful for any State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision to interfere with the manner of selecting persons for national office by requiring the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting or registering to vote in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, and it further provides that it will be unlawful for any person, whether or not acting under the cover of authority of the laws of any State or subdivision thereof, to require the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting or registering to vote in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, Senator, or Representative.

For some years we did have eight poll-tax States. The Georgia Legislature, under Governor Arnall, repealed the Georgia poll-tax law, and there are now only seven States. It is contended that these poll-tax laws are necesssary to provide revenues for schools and other purposes. Kentucky has a poll-tax law. Some of us pay as many as three different poll taxes—State, county, and city poll taxes—but these poll taxes have nothing to do with the registration or voting of our citizens. The State, counties, and cities can enforce these collections from the personal and real property owned by the taxpayer.

Much evidence has been submitted for the RECORD over a period of years that in the poll-tax States very little effort is made to collect these so-called poll taxes. In fact, some States we were told, the paying of these poll taxes and qualifying them to vote was discouraged. Believing in a republican form of government, as I do, where the people select their officers and where the officers should be the servants and not the masters of the people, and also believing participation generally by the citizens of this country in their Federal, State, county, and municipal governments is essential to the perpetuation of this free country, I think citizens should be encouraged to take an active part in their government by voting, and for those who are qualified to vote this participation should be made as easy as is practicable considering the sacredness of the ballot. Barriers should not be set up to discourage or make it difficult for honest, law-abiding citizens to participate in their government and in the selection of their public servants.

In my own district and State we find the people generally taking an active part in the final election in selecting their public officials. They are not hindered but are encouraged to do so. While I had no opposition last year in the final election, yet I received more votes than were cast in some of these poll-tax States. The imposition of a poll-tax program was set up in parts of our country beginning in 1890, and we need but to review the election results in the poll-tax States and the non-poll-tax States to observe the interest in the one group and the lack of interest in the other in the elections. In some poll-tax States the number of votes cast in the final election was 10 percent of the persons who should have the right to vote, while the Nation as a whole about 50 percent participation in the election. This is not a very healthy sign in a democracy.

Our friends in these poll-tax States claim for themselves the right to have representation in the House of Representatives based on the population of their respective States. On that basis they have several times as many representatives as a State with like population, but there are only about one-tenth of the people voting. The poll tax is not a hardship merely on the 3,000,000 colored people in these poll-tax States but also a hardship on the 6,000,000 to 7,000,000 poor white people. Our friends in the poll-tax States should be willing to grant the same opportunities to vote to the poor people as is granted to the poor people in the other States or be willing to reduce their representation proportionately in the House of Representatives and the electoral college.

I believe the removal of the poll-tax requirement will be helpful to these States rather than hurtful. The lack of a poll-tax requirement has been helpful rather than hurtful to the people of Kentucky, in my opinion.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I made a number of speeches in the Seventy-seventh Congress, in the Seventy-eighth Congress, and in the Seventy-ninth Congress in opposition to similar and identical bills. On June 12, 1945, I spoke in opposition to H. R. 7 in the Seventy-ninth Congress, which is identical with the bill under consideration. I can do no better than repeating substantially word for word the arguments that I made in opposition to that bill, which is identical with the bill now pending. It is generally conceded that voting is a State function and that the qualifications of voters are to be prescribed by the States. The argument of those who assert that the Supreme Court as now constituted will hold this or any other legislation valid regardless of the Constitution carries with it its own refutation on the very face of the argument. As to the constitutionality of this bill, I assert that I believe every Member of this body will vote in accordance with his or her oath of office. In 1937, in the Breedlove case, the constitutionality of the poll tax as a qualification for voting was upheld. The Classic case has been cited. That case was decided by the Supreme Court as now substantially constituted. It did not involve the matter of poll taxes. That case involved the matter of the integrity of the voting in Louisiana and the protection of the citizen in his right to vote. Therefore it is not in point. Following the Classic case, the Supreme Court of the United States as substantially now constituted in the case of

Purtle against Brown refused certiorari in a case involving the payment of poll tax as a qualification for voting.

If there are two classes of people in the United States that are more interested, if possible, in the integrity of the Constitution than any other classes it is the Negro and the poor people. As a member of the bar, I often invoked the Constitution in behalf of my clients, black and poor. I assert that this bill is unconstitutional; that no language has been cited from the Constitution or the decisions of courts that would justify the provisions of this bill.

Reference was made to article IV, section 4, guaranteeing a republican form of government. That article and that section has been construed time after time by the Supreme Court of the United States in the matter of elections, and that is generally confined to fraud and corruption. It is necessary to provide a republican form of government that the States which, for more than a hundred years, at the time that provision was adopted, required the payment not only of poll taxes but of property taxes, should be upheld in their rights and protected in their rights. There is a new South. That is the South of Grady of Georgia; that is the South of Lamar of Mississippi; that is the South of tolerance, with our eyes toward the future. Give us a chance. Poll taxes are being eliminated in the South by the States. If there is one statement that was made this morning more accurate than another it was the statement of the colored Member from New York that the elimination of poll taxes in the South has not conferred, and will not confer, franchise upon the Negro. North Carolina has abolished the poll tax qualification. Florida has abolished it. Louisiana has abolished it. An amendment is now being submitted by Georgia. Give the South a chance to solve our own race problems. They will not be solved by force or compulsion.

As has been well said in this debate, it is not a question as to the policy that will be pursued in the South, but it is a question whether or not the Congress of the United States shall interfere and intervene and deprive the States of their rights. Some are never so happy as when they are undertaking to regulate other people's lives, other people's businesses, and other people's politics. The matter of the elimination of the poll tax in the South as a requisite for voting will be retarded by those who insist upon the passage of a bill similar to the one now pending. It will not provide franchise for those for whom it is intended to provide. Whatever may be said of Mississippi, we have eliminated the poll tax in our primary elections, for the soldiers in the service. Whatever may be said of Mississippi we have gradually improved and liberalized our voting laws. I had a neighbor some 15 years ago who owed about $20,000 in taxes which he was unable to pay and he was not permitted to vote. The poorest man in the State voted by the payment of a $2 poll tax. It is the problem of the States. It is the function of the States. Mississippi has repealed all taxes except the poll tax for voting. The States will solve the problem in their own time. Those who advocate the passage of this bill in order to liberalize the ballot and franchise will defeat the very purpose that they have in mind. There are rights for the States. There are Federal functions. Rights of the States exist in war as they exist in peace. The right to vote has never been declared by the Supreme Court of the United States in all the cases, a matter for the States. There is not any language that has been thus far cited, or that can be found, that could lead a thoughtful man or a good lawyer to the conclusion that the Supreme Court would other than void any act of Congress that undertook to regulate the franchise of the States. Volumes of decisions of the Supreme Court are filled with decisions that hold similar acts of Congress invalid, passed during the tragic days of the reconstruction. If the States can be entrusted with the lives and the property of the people, surely the States can be entrusted with the matter of franchise.

It is generally agreed that suffrage is not a matter of right but a privilege to be conferred by the States.

In Federal elections qualifications of voters for Members of Congress are found in article I, section 2, of the Constitution. They are the qualifications for the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. Those qualifications are to be prescribed by the State.

However, it is argued that under article I, section 4, relating to the power to regulate the time and place and manner of choosing Senators and Representatives, the Congress reserved the power under the term regulation, to prescribe qualifications.

The complete answer is that for 123 years Congress never undertook to exercise any such power. It thus admitted that it had no such power. Moreover, it must follow that Congress has no such power as to voters for Representatives.

Among the qualifications for voting are sex, residence, age, and taxes, including poll taxes. It has been said that under the Classic case for the first time the Supreme Court of the United States has indicated that it will go into the matter of the qualifications of voters. That case involved a primary election on the facts in that case. That case decided that under the necessary and proper clauses of the Constitution guaranteeing a republican form of government, the Federal Government would protect a citizen in the exercise of his right to vote for Representative.

I call attention to this language in the Classic case:

> Obviously included within the right to choose secured by the Constitution is the right of qualified voters within a State to cast their ballots, and have them counted in congressional elections.

There was no question of the qualifications of voters involved. It was a question there whether a man who is qualified would be permitted to cast his vote.

The Supreme Court has decided that State poll taxes are not unconstitutional. In 1937 the Supreme Court of the United States in the Breedlove case upheld the validity of a statute requiring the payment of a poll tax to vote in a Federal election. After the Classic case the Supreme Court, as substantially constituted at present, in the Pirtle case, involving the poll tax in a Federal election refused a writ of certiorari, thus upholding the doctrine in the Breedlove case, to wit, that the qualifications of voters in senatorial and congressional elections is a matter for the States.

The bill admits that poll taxes are a qualification, and under the guise of denominating the payment of a poll tax a hindrance, the advocates of the pending bill are hard pressed to declare that payment of taxes, that sex, that age are in the same category as fraud, intimidation, and corruption. The bill under consideration undertakes to say that that which has been deemed to be a qualification from time immemorial, to wit, the payment of a poll tax, shall not be a qualification.

The bill under consideration will not accomplish its purpose. In the so-called eight poll tax States there are other qualifications for voting. These remain.

The qualifications for voting in 8 of the States are proscribed in the pending bill. If Congress can proscribe, then Congress can prescribe. If Congress can proscribe poll taxes in 8 of the States, then Congress can prescribe qualifications in all of the 48 States. The function of the States with respect to suffrage would thus be abolished.

If we believe that the bill is unconstitutional we should oppose it. We can not salve our conscience by saying that we will pass it on to the Supreme Court. Moreover, the Congress of the United States has held that only by constitutional amendment can qualifications of voters be changed. Sex was abolished as a qualification by the nineteenth amendment, and the payment of poll taxes as a qualification for voting can only be abolished by an amendment to the Constitution.

Heretofore Congress has never undertaken to restrict or limit qualifications except by a constitutional amendment. The fifteenth amendment provides that the right to vote shall not be denied or abridged on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. The nineteenth amendment prescribes that the right to vote shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex.

We make sorry spectacles of ourselves when we ignore the question of constitutionality. Poll taxes like sex as a qualification for voting can only be abolished, I repeat, by an amendment to the Constitution.

I call attention to the fact that the proponents have not attempted to submit any authorities in support of the validity of the bill. I opposed the rule, and I oppose the bill. I am gladly giving my reasons for my opposition. I shall confine myself to a discussion of the bill and shall undertake to demonstrate beyond a doubt that suffrage is a State function.

I shall call attention to the pertinent constitutional provisions, including provisions respecting Senators, Representatives, and Presidential electors. I shall show that qualifications can only be

changed by constitutional amendment, as was done by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments. I shall show that the Classic case did not involve the qualification of voters. I shall emphasize that registration for voting is required in many States and that a small vote is no reason for the passage of the bill. I shall show in reason and upon authority that voting is a State privilege and that legislation changing or abolishing the qualification of voters is not permissible under the Constitution.

I shall undertake to demonstrate that under the Constitution the qualification of voters for Senators and Representatives is in the States and that the anti-poll-tax bill is in violation of the right accorded to the States by the Federal Constitution. I shall further demonstrate that the poll tax is universally recognized as a qualification and that Congress is without power to provide that it shall not be required as a requisite for voting.

I. SUFFRAGE A STATE FUNCTION

The whole subject of the regulation of elections, including the prescribing of qualifications for suffrage, is left by the National Constitution to the several States, except as it is provided by that instrument that the electors for Representatives in Congress shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, and as the fifteenth amendment forbids denying to citizens the right to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Participation in the elective franchise is a privilege rather than a right, and it is granted or denied on the grounds of public policy. (Cooley's Constitutional Limitations, 8th ed., vol. 2, p. 1360.)

Suffrage is not a universal right but is a privilege to be extended or denied by the States. (Story's Commentaries on the Constitution, vol. 1, 5th ed., secs. 579-584.)

The privilege to vote is generally derived from the States. The right is not conferred but is protected by the Federal Constitution. The fourteenth amendment does not have the effect of conferring such rights.

Subject to the limitation contained in the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution, the power to fix qualifications of the voters is vested in the States. (Mr. McCrary's American Law of Elections, sec. 1.)

The right of suffrage is not a natural right, nor is it an absolute unqualified personal right. (Mr. McCrary, sec. 3.)

The elective franchise is not a right, privilege, or immunity incident to citizenship, the Constitution left to the States the qualification of voters. (Paine Law of Elections, secs. 76 and 78.)

At the time of the adoption of the Constitution, all of the Thirteen Original States not only prescribed qualifications for voting, but they were jealous of the exclusive rights of the States as to suffrage. The qualifications, while similar, were by no means uniform. Among those generally required in the Thirteen Original States, as well as among the States today, are citizenship, residence, age, in some States the payment of taxes, and in many States, registration.

There was much debate in the Constitutional Convention as to the qualifications of the electors for Members of Congress. The members of the convention could not agree upon uniform qualifications for voters for Representatives in Congress and the matter of qualifications was, therefore, left to the States with the restriction that Members of Congress should have the same qualifications required for those voting for Members of the most numerous branch of the legislature.

The Constitution provided for the election of Members of Congress, and while the qualifications of electors was left to the States, Congress was given the power of making or altering the regulations as to the time, place, and manner of the election of Representatives and Senators, with no power to change the places of choosing Senators. Such power was essential to enable Congress to function or to exist, or to exercise the powers that had been conferred upon it.

A compromise was adopted at the convention. The supreme power of the States in suffrage was recognized by Congress, and to guarantee that the qualified electors would be protected in their voting and Congress was given power to alter or change the time, place, and manner of elections.

II. CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

Article I, section 2, is as follows:

The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

There is common consent and agreement that the States have the right to prescribe the qualifications requisite for electors of Members of Congress, but it is maintained that the poll tax is not a qualification but a regulation.

Article I, section 4, is as follows:

The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

By some it is maintained that poll taxes are a restriction or condition or regulation and not a qualification. It is maintained, therefore, that Congress may eliminate poll taxes. It is asserted by others that poll taxes are a pernicious activity and that they may be eliminated by act of Congress under the guise of preventing pernicious political activity. Statutes preventing pernicious activities have been approved by Congress under section 4 in congressional elections, under the necessary and proper clause, and under the constitutional guaranty of a republican form of government.

Article I, section 8, clause 18, is—

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers.

Article IV, section 4, provides, among other things:

The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government.

There is a difference between fraud, corruption, ballot-box stuffing, and other pernicious practices and the qualifications of electors. Among the oldest of the qualifications in the mother countries and in the Colonies was ownership of property and payment of taxes. Tax and property qualifications obtained in varying degrees in all of the Colonies at the time of the adoption of the Constitution. The poll tax is probably the oldest of all taxes. Like many other taxes it may not be popular and it may be restrictive. Taxes, whether property taxes or poll taxes, have been the cause of uprisings and of revolutions. The poll tax or head tax was the cause of a peasant uprising in England under Wat Tyler in 1381, and taxation without representation was largely responsible for the Revolution.

It is a prostitution of language to say that a qualification of taxes, whether property or poll, shall not be declared to be a pernicious political activity. Fraud, intimidation, corruption, ballot-box stuffing are crimes. Taxes may be onerous—they may be unpopular—but they are not in the same category with pernicious political activities. The proponents are hard pressed when they now ask Congress to declare a tax that has obtained through the centuries to be a pernicious political activity. No better proof could be desired of the weakness and invalidity of the anti-poll-tax bill.

The Constitution was not only mindful of the rights of the States with respect to suffrage, and not only recognized these rights, but it recognized the rights of the State legislatures. The language in article I, section 4, "except as to the places of choosing Senators" is unique.

The Constitution left to the State legislatures the places for their meetings. The rights of the States were again safeguarded. (Story, vol. 1, sec. 828.)

The language giving to Congress the power to make or alter such regulations does not seem to have attracted much attention or to have encountered any opposition during the Convention, but the provision was assailed in the State conventions, and a majority of the Original Thirteen States tentatively proposed amendments to the effect that the Congress would not be authorized to make regulations unless the States failed or refused to provide the qualifications of electors or for the elections. It was finally agreed that Congress should have the regulation as provided in section 4 to provide for its preservation. The debates on this section are most informative.

Neither the members of the Convention nor the Thirteen States in their ratifying conventions purported to take away entirely the alterative power of Congress, but proposed to restrict it to cases where a State neglected, refused, or was disabled to exercise the power of regulating elections. (Story, vol. 1, sec. 827.)

Mr. Madison, in commenting on article I, section 4, said, and I quote:

To give the National Legislature a power not only to alter the provisions of the States but to make regulations in case the States should fail or refuse altogether. (Fifth Elliot's Debates, 402.)

Madison's reasoning is easily explained. The States would not have ratified the Constitution if it had not been generally understood that the qualifications of electors would be the function of the States. In the Federalist, Hamilton said that the propriety of the

clause in question rested—and I quote—"upon the evidence of the plain proposition that every government should contain in itself the means of its own preservation."

In the ratifying conventions, as I have stated, a majority of the States proposed to limit the action of Congress to cases of neglect or refusal, but that proposal was abandoned upon the ground that there would be no occasion for congressional interference so long as the States performed their duty.

In the Virginia convention, Madison, who had kept a record of the debates in the Constitutional Convention, advocated the ratification of the Constitution. Alexander Hamilton, who really favored a more centralized government, is responsible for the ratification of the Constitution by New York. In all of the conventions, section 4 of article I was assailed. It was most bitterly attacked. Hamilton's interpretation leaves no room for doubt. I quote from him:

> Its authority would be expressly restricted to the regulation of the times, the places, and the manner of elections. The qualifications of the persons who may choose or be chosen, as has been remarked upon other occasions, are defined and fixed in the Constitution and are unalterable by the legislature. (The Federalist, LIX, LI.)
>
> The history of the times indicates beyond reasonable doubt that if the Constitution makers had claimed for this section the broad regulation for which some now contend, the Constitution would never have been ratified. (Story on the Constitution, vol. 1, sec. 814, et seq.)

As Justice Field in his dissenting opinion pointed out in *Ex parte Clark* (100 U. S., p. 418), and I quote:

> And the regulations as to the manner of holding them cannot extend beyond the designation of the mode in which the will of the voters shall be expressed and ascertained.

Again I quote from the same page:

> The power does not authorize Congress to determine who shall participate in the elections or what shall be the qualifications of voters. These are matters not pertaining to or involved in the manner of holding the election, and their regulation rests exclusively with the States. The only restriction upon them with respect to these matters is found in the provision that the electors of Representatives in Congress shall have the qualifications required for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, and the provision relating to the suffrage of the colored race. And whatever regulations Congress may prescribe as to the manner of holding the elections for Representatives must be so framed as to leave the election of State officers free.

The language employed in section 4 is simple and easy to understand. I quote from Chief Justice Fuller, in *McPherson* v. *Blacker* (146 U. S., p. 27):

> The framers of the Constitution employed words in their natural sense and, where they are plain and clear, resort to collateral aids to interpretation is unnecessary and cannot be indulged in to narrow or enlarge the text; but where there is ambiguity or doubt or where two views may well be entertained, contemporaneous and subsequent practical construction are entitled to the greatest weight.

In all the 153 years of the history of the United States, Congress has never previously undertaken by statute to prescribe the qualifications of voters for Senators and Representatives. The seventeenth amendment provides for the election of Senators, but the same language with respect to the qualifications of electors that obtains in article I, section 2, is found in amendment XVII. I quote from amendment XVII:

> The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

There is a difference between manner and qualifications. Constitutional authority given to the legislature to prescribe the time and manner does not include the power to determine what shall constitute a legal voter (*Livesly* v. *Litchfield* (83d Pac. 142; 47 Oreg. 248); 114 American State Repts. 920; Words and Phrases, vol. 26, p. 358).

Under article I, section 4, Congress has the right to make either new regulations or add to or modify State regulations—*Ex parte Seybold* (100 U. S., p. 371). This involved the enforcement acts passed May 31, 1870—Sixteenth United States Reports, page 144—and amended on July 14, 1870—Sixteenth United States Reports, page 254—and again amended on June 10, 1872—Seventeenth United States Reports, page 347. These acts relate to elections of Members of Congress and were passed to secure purity of elections and the right of citizens to vote without molestation.

Following the ratification of the Constitution, there was no effort on the part of Congress to regulate time, place, and manner of elections until 1842. Some States elected their Representatives in Congress by districts and others from the State at large. Some nominated by districts and elected all Members from the State at large. But uniformity with respect to elections was desired, and the act of 1842 (5 Stat., p. 491) provided for the election of Members of Congress by districts. It was not until after the War Between the States and after the ratification of the fifteenth amendment that Congress undertook to pass regulations with respect to the time, places, and manner of electing Representatives. Congress had provided immediately following the War Between the States for uniformity of date as to the election of Senators (14 Stat., p. 243). I may remark in passing that after passing the seventeenth amendment Congress passed a temporary law that expired in 3 years for the election of Senators (38 Stat., p. 384). But when passions were high following the War Between the States, with freedom for former slaves, the enforcement acts were passed to prevent fraud, corruption, ballot-box stuffing, and intimidation in connection with congressional elections. Temporarily the landmarks of the fathers were forgotten. There was strife, and finally, on February 8, 1894 (28 Stat. 36), the enforcement acts were practically repealed, and Congress again left to the States, as it had for 80 years previous to the passage of the acts, not only the qualifications of voters for Members of Congress but the times, places, and manner of elections. Human nature is very much the same. The results in the Southern States were not what the advocates of the enforcement acts anticipated. There was reflex action. The same rules obtained in all of the States, and there was undesirable interference and intimidation with elections in other States than in the South, all of which resulted in the repeal of the enforcement acts, except the conspiracy sections, which remain.

These acts were based upon section 4 of article I. There was never any attempt to eliminate taxes, either poll or property, as all agreed Congress had no power to prevent the States levying taxes. There was never any attempt on the part of the Congress, when passions ran high following the War Between the States, to prescribe qualifications for voters in congressional elections. The whole purpose was to guarantee that the legal and qualified voters in the several States should be protected in their right to vote. In its fundamental sense the privilege of suffrage is derived from the States, but the right of voting for Members of Congress is also found in the Constitution. Electors owe their right to vote to the Constitution, but the qualifications must be prescribed by the State (*Ex parte Yarbrough* (100 U. S. 651); American Jurisprudence, vol. 18, p. 210).

No one disputes now that in State elections a poll tax may be required before the citizen can vote. While the requirement has been abandoned in many States, poll taxes and property taxes still remain, and these taxes obtain under the heading of qualifications. (American Jurisprudence, 1938, vol. 18, pp. 212, 226, 227, and 228.) I may remark in passing that literacy, and the ability to read or understand the Constitution, are among the qualifications in many States, including Massachusetts and New York. If Congress can eliminate the qualification of the poll-tax requirement, it can eliminate the qualification of literacy, on the educational qualifications.

Under section 4 of article I, Congress may make regulations as to the conduct of elections or may supplement the State regulations. It may impose additional penalties. Our legislative history from 1870 shows that except for a period of about 24 years it was the policy to leave regulations to the States for the first 80 years of the history of the Republic *U. S.* v. *Mosely* (238 U. S., p. 383); *U. S.* v. *Gradwell* (243 U. S., p. 476); American Jurisprudence, volume 18, page 187.

The enforcement acts following the War Between the States confined themselves to elections for Members of Congress. There was no reference to Presidential electors and there was a reason why Presidential electors were not included within the terms of the statute. The justification for the enforcement statutes was the regulation authorized by section 4 of article I. There was no such regulation authorized with respect to Presidential electors.

III. PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS

Article II, section 1, provides, and I quote:

> Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in Congress; but no Senator or Representative, or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States, shall be appointed an elector.

The legislature appoints the electors. It may appoint them directly, as was done in the early history of the country, or it may provide for their election. The State legislature is vested with the power of appointment or election. It is significant that Congress was not authorized to make or change the regulations with respect to the appointment of electors. Congress was authorized to determine the time of choosing the electors and the day on which they shall give their votes, which day shall be the same throughout the United States (art: II, sec. 4). Congress has passed an act to provide for the time of choosing electors. All of the States complied, including the State of Maine, but Congress did not undertake to regulate the manner of the election of Presidential electors. It did not undertake to supervise such elections. No such power is given to Congress with respect to electors. Hence, I repeat, the enforcement acts following the War Between the States made no reference to Presidential or Vice Presidential elections, or the elections of Presidential and Vice Presidential electors. Under the Constitution the legislature of each State directed the manner of appointment of Presidential electors. It is significant that in the Constitution the power to regulate the appointment or election of Presidential electors is not given to Congress (*In re Green* (134 U. S. 377)). The legislatures have exclusive power to direct the manner of Presidential elections (*McPherson* v. *Blacker* (146 U. S., p. 1)). I quote from the opinion by Chief Justice Fuller, on page 38:

> The fifteenth amendment exempted citizens of the United States from discrimination in the exercise of the elective franchise on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. The right to vote in the States comes from the States, but the right of exemption from the prohibited discrimination comes from the United States. The first has not been granted or secured by the Constitution of the United States, but the last has been (*U. S.* v. *Cruikshank* (92 U. S. 542); *U. S.* v. *Reese* (92 U. S. 214)).

As I have stated, in 1866 Congress provided for a uniform time for the election of Senators by the legislature—Statutes at Large 14, page 243. But it is significant that Congress, in passing the statute for congressional elections, recognized the right of the States, and the act of Congress fixing the time for the election of Representatives distinctly provided that it did not apply to any State whereby under the constitution State officials were elected at another time. Hence it is that Maine, where under the constitution State officials are elected in September, still elects her Senators and her Representatives during the month of September. The act of 1875—Eighteenth Statutes, page 400—provided for a uniform time for the election of Representatives, but exceptions were made that enable Maine, because of the constitutional September election, to elect Senators and Representatives at a different time from any other State in the Union. However, in Maine, because the Constitution authorizes Congress to provide a certain day for Presidential electors, Maine still votes for Presidential electors in November.

The bill embraces not only senatorial and congressional elections but elections for Presidential electors. The same may be said of the Hatch acts, the orginal of which was passed in 1939.

A statute was passed in 1907 preventing contributions by corporations in elections of Presidential electors, as a pernicious political activity. The acts of 1910, 1911, 1912, and 1913 were confined to pernicious political activities in senatorial and congressional elections. The Corrupt Practices Act of February 28, 1925, which repealed practically all of the prior acts, applied to expenditures and practices in connection with the election of Senators and Representatives, but it also prohibited contributions in connection with any election of Presidential electors.

Presidential elections are authorized, as are the election of Representatives in Congress, by the Constitution. There is the power of regulating the time, place, and manner of the elections of Representatives and Senators, but no power for regulating the time, place, and manner of elections of Presidential electors, under article I, section 8, clause 18, and I quote:

> To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

Congress thus has a right to protect and safeguard from fraud and corruption the election of Senators and Representatives as well as Presidential electors, but the power in Presidential electors does not come from the power of regulation, as in the case under article I, section 4, which is limited to Senators and Representatives.

If the advocates of the bill who assert that poll taxes are regulations are correct, then I maintain that Congress is without authority to provide for the elimination of poll taxes in the election of Presidential electors. The argument that a poll tax is a condition, a restriction, or a regulation and not a qualification falls to the ground, for if it be sound then the bill is unconstitutional in undertaking to regulate the election of Presidential electors. On the other hand, if Congress has a right to pass legislation to prohibit and prevent pernicious activities in congressional and Presidential elections, section 4, article I, is not applicable or the source of power. If the power of regulation for congressional elections is derived from section 4, then there is no power of regulation for Presidential elections.

IV. NINETEENTH AMENDMENT

It is universally agreed that the States can prescribe qualifications for voting. Women were qualified in some States. In other States they were disqualified. It would be just as logical to have maintained that Congress could have passed an act prohibiting disqualification on account of sex, and call it pernicious political activity as it is to say that Congress can denounce the payment of poll taxes as a political activity. It took a constitutional amendment to enfranchise women. It will take a constitutional amendment to eliminate the poll tax. Congress cannot change the qualification of voters in the States. The advocates of the pending bill limit the poll tax to Federal officials. They deny that the poll tax is a qualification. This is a mere ruse. The fact is that when the Constitution was adopted all of the States had property or tax qualifications for voters. It was a qualification and not a manner at the time the Constitution was adopted, and it is a qualification still.

If Congress has the right to strike down a qualification for voting prescribed by the State, then it is in the power of Congress to impose additional qualifications for voting for Members of Congress. If Congress has the right to restrict, it has the right to broaden. Article I, section 2, provides that the States shall prescribe the qualifications. If Congress now attempts to say that persons not qualified to vote under the State's laws may vote for Members of Congress, it would be equally in violation of the fundamental law. The bill is unconstitutional in dealing with qualifications under the guise of pernicious activity.

V. POLL TAX A STATE QUALIFICATION

Poll taxes as qualifications for voting have been upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States (*Breedlove* v. *Suttles* (302 U. S. 277)). In *Pirtle* v. *Brown* (118 Fed. 2, 218) certiorari was denied by the Supreme Court (62 Sup. Ct. Rept. 64, 314 U. S. 621). The privilege of voting in the State is conferred upon the State except as the same is limited by the fifteenth and the nineteenth amendments of the Federal Constitution. The State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate.

VI. CLASSIC CASE

The proponents of the bill rely upon the recent case of *United States* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 299). This case, however, is not in point. It does not involve the qualification of voters. It is a criminal prosecution to prevent a conspiracy to deprive a citizen of Louisiana from voting in a congressional election. In Louisiana the primaries elect the choice. The State conducts and pays the cost of the primary elections. The primary election was involved in the Classic case. The Court held in the Classic case that a citizen had a right to be protected in having his ballot cast and counted in a primary election for representative in the State of Louisiana under the facts in that case. It is sometimes loosely said that the Classic case is authority for the passage of the pending bill. I quote from the opinion of the court, from page 315 of the superior State court in that case:

> While, in a loose sense, the right to vote for representatives in Congress is sometimes spoken of as a right derived from the States (see *Minor* v. *Happersett* (21 Wall. 162, 170), *United States* v. *Reese* (92 U. S. 214, 217–218), *McPherson* v. *Blacker* (146 U. S. 1, 38–39), *Breedlove* v. *Suttles* (302 U. S. 277, 283)), this statement is true only in the sense that the States are authorized by the Constitution to legislate on the subject as provided by section 2, of article I, to the extent that Congress has not restricted State action by the exercise of its powers to regulate elections under section 4, and its more general power

under article I, section 8, clause 18, of the Constitution "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers." (See *Ex parte Siebold* (100 U. S. 371), *Ex parte Yarbrough*, supra (663, 664), *Swafford* v. *Templeton* (185 U. S. 487), *Wiley* v. *Sinkler* (179 U. S. 58, 64).)

Obviously included within the right to choose, secured by the Constitution, is the right of qualified voters within a State to cast their ballots and have them counted at congressional elections. This court has consistently held that this is a right secured by the Constitution (*Ex parte Yarbrough*, supra; *Wiley* v. *Sinkler*, supra; *Swafford* v. *Templeton*, supra; *United States* v. *Mosley*, supra; see *Ex parte Siebold*, supra; In re *Coy* (127 U. S. 731); *Logan* v. *United States* (144 U. S. 263)). And since the constitutional command is without restriction or limitation, the right, unlike those guaranteed by the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments, is secured against the action of individuals as well as of States (*Ex parte Yarbrough*, supra; *Logan* v. *United States*, supra).

The Court was passing upon the legality of a prosecution for conspiracy to prevent a citizen voting in a congressional election. The qualifications of the voter were not involved. It was admitted. There is no justification in the language quoted from the Classic case for the pending bill. The right to vote is derived from the States. The right to vote for a Member of Congress is guaranteed by the Federal Constitution, but the qualifications of electors is prescribed by the State. I call attention to the fact that the rights of qualified voters were under consideration. As stated, the right of qualified voters within a State to cast their ballots and have them counted at congressional elections was involved. The fact that then Chief Justice Stone spoke, as I have quoted, in the Classic case of the rights of qualified voters to be protected shows conclusively that while any statement as to qualifications of voters would have been obiter dicta in that case, nevertheless the opinion in expressed terms referred to qualified voters. Qualified voters are the voters qualified by the States.

VII. QUALIFICATIONS OF VOTERS FOR THE STATES

The Supreme Court of the United States in the Breedlove case, decided in 1937, held that the payment of a poll tax as a requirement or qualification for voting in elections for Representatives is not in violation of the Federal Constitution and is within the power of the State. The Court, as now constituted, in the Pirtle case denied a writ of certorari, and thus affirmed the doctrine announced in the Breedlove case.

The bill is really "fishing" legislation. The evident purpose is to undertake to secure favorable consideration before the Supreme Court as now constituted.

Some advocates of the bills have asserted that no State constitutions provide the collection of poll taxes as a qualification for voting. They are in error. The constitutions of Mississippi and Alabama, as well as the constitutions of the other States where poll taxes are now required, provide that poll taxes shall be a prerequisite and a qualification. The payment of taxes was a qualification obtained when the Constitution was adopted. They now obtain in the constitutions of at least eight of the States. The wisdom of the poll tax is for the States to decide. The question is whether Congress has the power to change or modify by adding to or taking from the qualifications prescribed by the States. The champions of the antipoll tax are experimenting with the courts and with the Constitution.

Hearings were conducted by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate on the Pepper bill. A subcommittee submitted an unfavorable report. Senator O'MAHONEY, chairman of the subcommittee, introduced Senate Joint Resolution 164 on October 5, 1942, proposing a constitutional amendment forbidding the collection of any tax or property qualification by the States. It is thus admitted that poll taxes cannot be abolished by Congress and that an amendment to the Federal Constitution is necessary to prohibit the States from prescribing the payment of poll taxes as a prerequisite to voting.

The Federal Constitution provides that the State shall determine the qualifications for voters in Federal as well as in State elections. Poll taxes now obtain in 32 States, but in only 8 of the States are they required as a prerequisite for voting. Congress is now asked to denounce as a pernicious political activity the payment of poll taxe as a qualification which such taxes have been prescribed as qualifications for voters from time immemorial. They are among the oldest of all taxes. The contention that poll taxes are a regulation or a restriction or a condition is a mere play upon words. They are qualifications in the constitutions and in the statutes in the States where they are required. They are denominated as qualifications by Story, Cooley, and by all the leading authorities on the Constitution and elections. The requirements may be regrettable, but unconstitutional action is no remedy for the alleged evil. It would be much wiser to rely upon the people to repeal without compulsion from the Federal authorities. The States were jealous of Federal constitutional encroachment at the time of the adoption of the Constitution. The States are still jealous of the rights reserved to them and the threat of unconstitutional encroachment is likely to hinder rather than promote the elimination of poll-tax requirements. At all events, the only remedy is to amend the Federal Constitution as was done in the case of the women's suffrage amendment to the Constitution.

Congress should set the example. No legislation in violation of the fundamental law of the land, no matter what the alleged excuse may be, should be passed by Congress. The people will have little regard for the statesmanship of Congress if Congress itself treats the Constitution as a scrap of paper. The refinement and the alleged distinctions in view of the plain language of the Constitution as to qualifications, including the payment of poll taxes, are distinctions without difference. If Congress can take from the qualifications of voters in Federal elections, it can add to such qualifications. Clearly there is no authority for such procedure under the Federal Constitution.

VIII. THE SMALL VOTE

Proponents of the bill refer to the small votes in general elections in the eight Southern States where poll-tax requirements still obtain. In Mississippi and the other Southern States the contests are settled in the primary elections. There are no contests in the general elections. In the primaries there are bitter contests. It is as difficult for a candidate to be nominated in a primary as it is for a candidate to be nominated and then elected in many other States. There are bitter contests in the primaries, but generally the primaries are decisive. The votes in the general elections are mere formalities. It is the primary vote that counts.

The number of voters participating in the primary elections in Mississippi and other States, where the poll tax obtains, compares favorably with the participation in primary elections in the States where there is no poll tax. Again, the percentage of qualified voters participating in primary elections in States like Mississippi compares favorably with the number participating in other Southern States like North Carolina and Louisiana, where there are no poll-tax requirements.

The poll tax does not discriminate against the Negro. The Supreme Court would not have upheld it if such had been the case. All are treated alike. Under the constitution of Mississippi voters were required not only to pay their poll tax but to pay all of their taxes before they are permitted to vote, prior to a constitutional amentment adopted in 1934, which only requires now the payment of poll taxes. Under the amendment, Mississippi passed in 1935 a statute requiring only poll taxes to vote. The remedy to eliminate poll taxes, however, is not with the Federal Government. It is a State function. Mississippi has provided that the payment only of a poll tax is requisite to vote in a primary election and that no poll tax shall be required of the man in the armed services.

Small votes, unfortunately, obtain not only in the South but in other parts of the country. This is regrettable, but, after all, democracy will be better promoted by an informed and enlightened franchise than by a numerous franchise. Intelligent voters in small numbers can be more helpful than ignorant voters in large numbers. Informed voters are more important than numerous voters.

Again, indifference in elections obtains not only in the South but, as I have suggested, in other parts of the country. In 1942 generally not more than one-third of the registered voters throughout the country participated in the primary elections. It is estimated that there are 42,191,179 registered voters and that 14,937,346 voted. The percentage of those who did vote is around 33⅓ percent. It varied in several States.

There are a number of factors responsible for the small vote:

First. There are always fewer votes than in Presidential contests. If it be said that voters in the World War II are apathetic, so were they in the World War I. Then again, the absence of acute issues in many States is responsible.

Second. Millions of voters are away from home in the Army and in the Navy, and millions of voters will not stop working in munitions plants to vote.

Third. There has been much migration of defense workers from one State to another.

Fourth. Long hours of work in war factories tend to keep voters away from the polls.

The Southern States to date have made a far better showing than have been made in many States. Texas, Georgia, South Carolina, and Tennessee stand at the top, with percentages of the registered voters participating in the elections ranging in these Southern States from 59 to 82 percent.

It is easy to charge. It is difficult to prove. With the latest information available, a larger percentage of voters have participated in the primary elections in the South than any other part of the country.

IX. REGISTRATION IS REQUIRED

There are other requirements in addition to age, residence, and the payment of taxes in Mississippi, as well as in other States. Under the Constitution the voter must be able to read or write the Constitution or to understand the Constitution when it is read to him. A literacy test obtains as it does in Massachusetts and many other States. If the Negro does not qualify it is not because of the poll tax. It is primarily because of the literacy test, and the literacy test applies to both whites and blacks. Educational qualifications not only obtain in Mississippi, but in practically all of the States of the Union. I do not recall an exception.

In Mississippi and other States registration is a qualification. The Supreme Court of the United States has recognized that registration is a qualification (*Wiley* v. *Sinkler*, 179 U. S., pp. 58, 62, and 64). Whether registration is a qualification or not, it was required and the requirement was upheld. It does not change the requirement by calling it a condition or a regulation. The distinction is without difference. They are all prerequisites to voting, and prerequisites of all kinds are generally qualifications.

X. REASONABLE CONCLUSION

While there have been divided courts and decisions with dissenting opinions, in many of the cases in the Supreme Court of the United States involving pernicious political activities under the enforcement acts first passed in 1870 and the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, the question of the constitutionality of the poll tax in Federal elections has never been passed upon by the Court. No Federal statute preventing the payment of poll taxes has ever been passed, but the decisions of the Court, in all of the cases involving pernicious political activities and regulating the time, places, and manner of conducting senatorial and congressional elections, lead to the inevitable conclusion that the intent of the founding fathers was to leave the qualifications of senatorial and congressional electors with the State, with the power in Congress to make or alter regulations with respect to the time, places, and manner of elections so as to prevent pernicious political activities, in order that the Senators and Representatives, President and Vice President might be honestly elected and that the voters might be protected. The inevitable conclusion is that Congress is without power to prescribe or to abolish any qualification of electors for Senators and Representatives and for Presidential and Vice Presidential electors.

The anti-poll-tax bill is in violation of the rights of the States, vigorously asserted at the time of the adoption of the Constitution and upheld by the Congress for 153 years. The right to vote in a congressional election for Senators and Representatives and Presidential electors is guaranteed by the Federal Constitution. If such a right is secured by the Constitution, Congress can protect the manner of holding the election, but the States must prescribe the qualification of the voters.

It has been said that a right may exist although it has not been exercised. The answer is, however, that acquiescence for more than a century and a half means consent. The States claim the right to prescribe qualifications. The Federal Constitution gave the States the right. Congress has assented by refusal to undertake for a century and a half to prescribe qualifications.

XI. NOT PERMISSIBLE UNDER THE CONSTITUTION

The qualifications of voters are reserved to the States. They are among the powers not delegated to the United States and reserved to the States under the tenth amendment. Members of Congress cannot violate their oath to uphold the Constitution by voting for an unconstitutional bill.

The bill embraces elections for President and Vice President. No persons have a right to vote for President and Vice President. If Congress assumes the power to supervise elections, at least Congress should use accurate language. It is true that similar language is used in the Hatch Acts, but I hold no brief for the Hatch Acts. Mistakes and errors should not be repeated. The remedy is to eliminate them.

As I have pointed out, Presidential electors are not national officers.

> They are no more officers or agents of the United States than are the members of the State legislatures when acting as electors (Green, 134, U. S. 379).

As I have pointed out, the power and jurisdiction of the States as to the qualifications of Presidential electors are exclusive (*McPherson* v. *Blacker* (146 U. S. 35)). The inclusion in the bill of Presidential electors or elections for President and Vice President is without constitutional authority.

The bill declares that the payment of poll taxes is detrimental to the integrity of the ballot. There is no proof of such a claim. It charges the States where poll taxes are required with fraud. It convicts them of corruption without a trial. It has not been shown that they are evil, but as most of that evil is possible under them (*Williams* v. *Mississippi*, (170 U. S. 213)).

Does Congress have jurisdiction to convict States of fraud? If the State laws operate as a fraud on the United States, the courts have ample jurisdiction. They are authorized to apply the remedy. But the Supreme Court of the United States, in the Breedlove case, has upheld the power of the States to levy poll taxes. Congress would be thus in the position of convicting the Southern States and the court of last appeal of fraud by providing that poll-tax requirements are detrimental of the ballot. It is admitted that poll taxes obtained for 153 years, but it is asserted that conditions have changed and that Congress will be justified in providing that poll taxes are an interference. If they are—if they result in fraud—Congress has ample power under section 4 to regulate the manner of the election. The remedy is not to deprive the States of their rights respecting qualifications.

With the poll tax, the United States has existed and prospered for 153 years and has become the richest and most powerful Nation in the world. The poll tax is not impeding or destroying. The poll-tax States have a better government than they had preceding the poll tax.

The Federal Government has no power to prevent the levy of taxes by the States, and especially taxes for the promotion of public education.

If poll taxes are unconstitutional, if they have violated any rights of citizens, rich or poor, white or black, the Supreme Court of the United States would have so held. The right to vote for Senators and Representatives is derived from the Constitution, but the qualifications of voters are for the States.

The Constitution protects the right to vote only of those who are qualified under the State laws. If he is qualified, his right to vote in congressional elections will be protected. The Classic case so holds.

It is asserted that the poll tax is not a qualification and that it has nothing to do with the capacity of the voter to vote. It has as much to do with his qualifications as residence and as sex. These are among the universally admitted qualifications. At least it was the case with respect to sex before the nineteenth amendment.

The word "qualification" is thus defined by Webster:

> A condition precedent that must be complied with for the attainment of a status, the perfection of a right, etc., * * * as the qualification of citizenship.

A "qualified voter" is defined as:

> One who possesses certain specific qualifications for voting, especially as to citizenship, age, and residence, and sometimes also as to literacy and the ownership of property.

In the constitutional and ratification debates, Alexander Hamilton used the expression in connection with suffrage "prescribing qualifications of property." In the Yarbrough case the Court said:

> It adopts the qualification of those furnished as the qualification of its own electors for Members of Congress.

The Supreme Court has repeatedly held that the States have the right to prescribe who may vote.

The word "qualification" with respect to suffrage both before and after the formation of our Government and continuously down to the present date has been

used in the sense of defining the persons who were entitled to vote. The word was so interpreted by the members of the Constitutional Convention. They used the term "the right of suffrage." They used it in connection with the qualification of electors, as it finally appeared in section 2 of article I, and the interpretation of qualifications of voters has persisted to the present time. Volume 29, Corpus Juris Secundum, 1941, in the article on elections and under qualifications of voters includes—section 29, page 51—property, payment of taxes, and, at page 52, the payment of poll taxes. The same thing is true of 18 American Jurisprudence. Among other qualifications, it includes "poll and other taxes." In Story, Cooley, and other works on the Constitution taxes appear among the qualifications. They appear among the qualifications in State constitutions, including the eight Southern States, where poll taxes obtain. They appear among qualifications in all of the leading textbooks on elections.

The States have the power to tax. Congress has no veto over the power of the States to tax. Congress has no power to interfere with the collection of State taxes. The repeal of the poll tax would be a prohibition of the collection of such taxes.

When the Constitution was adopted each state possessed unlimited power over suffrage and generally prescribed qualifications, including property and taxes (*Miner* v. *Happersett* (88 U. S. 162)):

> Whether the requirements to be met in each State be termed "qualifications of electors" or be referred to by any other term, the State possessed and exercised the unlimited power over suffrage and the granting of the privilege of voting.

In adopting the Federal Constitution the States did not grant to Congress any of their powers over suffrage. They did, however, in article I, section 2, limit their own power over suffrage requirements for Senators and Representatives. If the payment of a tax as a prerequisite of the right of suffrage is a qualification, then the State must prescribe the same for both Senators and Representatives and members of the State legislature. Under the inherent power of suffrage, if the poll tax is not a qualification, then the States have the power to require the payment of the tax for Senators and Representatives without requiring it of those voting for members of their legislatures. The power of the States to impose conditions or requirements for suffrage, other than qualifications, is in no way restricted by either section 2 or any other provision of the Constitution as originally adopted. The absolute power of the States over suffrage, except as it is restricted by article I, section 2, and the fifteenth amendment, has been repeatedly upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States.

In the case of Breedlove against Suttles, the privilege of voting is not derived from the United States, but it is conferred by the State. The right of voting is guaranteed by the Constitution to qualified voters. Congress has no power to regulate or interfere with the exercise by the States of their power to prescribe suffrage requirements or other power to levy and collect a poll tax.

The power of suffrage is in the States (*Guinn* v. *United States* (238 U. S. 362)):

> The States have the exclusive power to determine the manner of choosing its electors to vote for President or Vice President of the United States, and confers no power on Congress whatsoever to regulate on the subject.

For this reason the bill is invalid. Under the second clause of article II, the legislature appoints the electors. No power of supervision or regulation is given to Congress. Under the fourth clause, Congress can fix the time of meeting. It has no other power (*McPherson* v. *Blacker* (146 U. S. 1)).

Under article I, section 2, and the seventeenth amendment, the States have the exclusive power to prescribe the qualifications of electors of Members of the Senate and of the House. As I have stated, power under section 2 of article I was a restriction upon the powers of the States. The States had these powers. They reserved them. The Constitution never conferred any power except that of regulating the time, places, and manner of elections upon Congress.

As I have stated, the proponents of the bill undertake to discredit Breedlove against Suttles, and particularly the following language of that decision:

> Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States, but it is conferred by the State and save as restrained by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments and other provisions of the Federal Constitution the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate.

The right to vote is based upon article I, section 2, but the proponents overlook the distinction between privilege and right. The suffrage laws of the State determine those who are privileged to vote. The Constitution of the United States protects the right of those who are privileged in the exercise of that privilege—*Ex parte Yarbrough* (110 U. S. 651).

The Classic case, so often and so much relied upon by the advocates of the bill, recognizes the distinction between the right to vote by qualified voters and by those disqualified under the suffrage laws of the States. That case did not involve the question of the power of suffrage. Qualifications were not involved. The question was whether the Constitution extended protection to qualified voters.

The Breedlove case was decided in 1937. The Court, as now constituted, decided the Pirtle case in 1941. The supreme courts of numerous States sustained the validity of the poll-tax qualification. No decision has ever struck it down. American Law Reports, annotated, volume 139, page 572, states:

> The courts are unanimous in holding that failure to pay a valid poll tax if imposed as a condition of voting has the effect of disqualifying and rendering his voting invalid.

Innumerable decisions from many States of the Union are cited in support of the announcement.

As shown by the statements of the framers of the Constitution, by the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, and by the decisions of the highest courts of the States, by the actions of Congress, and the actions of States with respect to constitutional amendments, the States reserved full and unlimited powers to prescribe who may vote at all elections except as restricted by the provision that the qualifications to vote for Senators and Representatives should not be different from those prescribed for voters of the most popular branch of the State legislature. The fact that Congress has never undertaken to interfere with the qualifications of voters except by constitutional amendment is conclusive that Congress is without authority to modify or repeal State qualifications for voting. It took the fifteenth amendment to prohibit the denial of the right to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. It took the nineteenth amendment to prohibit such denial on account of sex. It will take a constitutional amendment to prohibit the payment of a poll tax as a qualification for voting in senatorial or congressional elections.

XII. FEDERAL AND STATE RIGHTS

The United States is but an aggregate of all the States in the Union. What exalted patriotism do Members of Congress possess that is not possessed by the members of the State legislatures? What virtues has Congress, not possessed by the citizens of the States? Who will say that the Congress of the United States is more interested in the welfare and representation of the State of New York than the citizens and the Legislature of New York? By what right does the Congress of the United States assume that the public interest will be better promoted by the assertion of a Federal right to control Federal elections than by the assertion of the guaranteed right of control in the States?

The old landmarks are often the best. Even if Congress possessed the power to regulate and prescribe qualifications in congressional elections—which I deny—it is a power that should be exercised only as a last resort to preserve the Government. We have had enough centralization. The States are closer to the people than Congress. In peace and in war there are functions for the States. The Federal Government should not encroach upon these functions. The States pass laws for the descent and distribution of property. They possess the power of life and death over the citizens in the exercise of their police powers. They protect the citizen in the enjoyment of life and property. Such protection is guaranteed by the States. Are these rights and privileges less sacred than the right of voting or the privilege of franchise? The States that have the power of life and death are wisely trusted to provide with the qualifications of voters.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, the result of the vote on this bill is, of course, obvious before it is taken. I simply want to make a brief statement of my position. Without intending to criticize those who may take a different view, this bill seems to me so clearly unconstitutional I can see little room for argument. Section 2 of article 1 of the Constitution plainly and unequivocally states that "The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors

of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." Therefore, the Constitution not only fails to confer upon the Federal Government the power of determining the qualifications of voters but it goes farther and specifically and unequivocally confers such power upon the States.

I shall, therefore, not further discuss the obvious unconstitutionality of the bill, but shall undertake to point out, briefly, one underlying fundamental reason why the framers of our Constitution saw fit to confer upon the States exclusive control of the ballot. The framers of our Constitution greatly feared centralizing too much power in the Federal Government. They went at great length to devise a framework of government which would insure against any possibility of a dictatorship ever arising in this country. Three great bulwarks against such possibility were as follows:

First. Public, free education was left to the States, thereby making it impossible that any dictator could ever indoctrinate the youth as Hitler did in Germany.

Second. The system of criminal law insofar as it is related to the activities of the citizens—the declaring of what acts of a citizen should be a crime and the punishment therefor was left to the States. Hence the national authorities can never establish a control of our people by the methods of the gestapo.

A third great safeguard was the placing exclusively under the authority of the States the control of the ballot. Without such control no dictator can ever dominate the Nation against the will of the people.

The pending bill would strike directly at the third great safeguard above mentioned. For if Congress can by statute, limit the authority of the States to prescribe the qualifications of the electors as is proposed in the pending bill then future Congresses can place added restrictions without apparent let or hindrance until the Federal Government shall have established full and complete control of the ballot.

I think it is most unfortunate that considerations of partianship and sectionalism have been allowed to obscure this vital issue.

If we in this Congress should exercise more restraint and patience this question of poll taxes would take care of itself in due course without an attempt such as this to do violence to one of the great fundamental principles of our organic law. Within the last few years the States of Louisiana, North Carolina, and Florida have amended their laws so as to eliminate the payment of poll taxes as a qualification for voting. The State of Tennessee attempted to abolish her poll tax but through a technicality the law was held invalid, but, no doubt, that State shortly will find means of abolishing the poll tax. Only seven States now levy a poll tax as a prerequisite to vote and in most of these the tax is so small as to interpose little restraint upon voting. For example, in my State, the poll tax is only $1.75, most of which goes to the public-school fund. It is not cumulative. So this matter is rapidly adjusting itself through action of the States. But the sponsors of this measure are unwilling to await these orderly constitutional processes and seem determined to force this bill through the House regardless of its obvious unconstitutionality. As a consequence I cannot do otherwise under my oath, as I understand it, than oppose this bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, the determination of the House Republican leadership to bring this bill up under the suspension of rule whereby there is only 20 minutes of debate to the side is as close to a lynching of the Constitution of the United States as I can conceive. Here we have a bill, that in my mind, certainly is in violation of the Constitution of the United States. Many eminent lawyers agree with that view. If we admit that there are others of an opposite view, certainly such a serious question should not be brought up here before Members of Congress who have sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States with 40 minutes of debate as to whether in voting for this bill the Member is violating his oath of office. Yet it is said that both parties have brought up this measure at various times. They have and if we don't mind the desire and willingness of certain leadership of both parties to blind themselves to the Constitution in their desire to appeal to various minority groups in their efforts to control and win national elections is going to ruin this Nation.

That the facts concerning the poll tax may be considered by those who read this RECORD, for there is consideration to be had here today, I repeat what I have said on this question heretofore.

Let us see about the poll tax in Mississippi. The poll tax was not passed for the purpose of keeping anybody from voting. In 1890, when it was first adopted, you people do not realize the poverty you had left in Mississippi. We had nothing which we could tax. Much of the property had been destroyed or gone into the hands of the scalawags and carpetbaggers who had come down there and ravished our land, taking away our wealth. We had to pass a poll tax, and every other type of tax, in order to raise the revenue to run that government.

The poll tax is levied on everyone, whether or not he ever votes. The only requirement in regard to voting is this: In order to vote a man must have paid that poll tax by the 1st of February of the year in which he offers to vote. Why did we do that? To keep the negro from voting? No; to keep some irresponsible, crooked politician from coming along just before the election and paying poll taxes in order to control votes. That is the reason for it.

You who have gone astray should come back and realize that we have not done and do not do what you have been led to believe.

When we were taken in as Members of this Congress we subscribed to an oath to support the Constitution of the United States. Each of you did that. How in the name of God can you shut your eyes to the Constitution and say, "I will leave it up to the Supreme Court?" I say to you that if you have studied the question and are in doubt, perhaps you have some reason to leave it to the Supreme Court, but if you shut your eyes and pay no attention to whether or not it is constitutional and then follow that course, you are liable to vote for some other law which will do just as much to your section as we think you are doing to the State governments in this Nation. There will be those among you, I know, who think that you may rise above the Constitution of the United States. There is just as much chance for the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] or the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] to rise above Hamilton and Jefferson, the framers of the Constitution, as there is for the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] to contribute more to our war effort than his colleague Joseph Stalin.

From the propaganda which reaches my office from certain labor unions, and politicians in sections far removed from my State, most of whom have never been there, it appears to me that these folks are trying to use this so-called crusade against the seven Southern States not to improve the lot of the Negro in the South but to add to the Negro membership of their labor unions in the North and East, to appeal to the Negro vote in those sections, in other words to exploit him, to use him for their own purpose. They are not friends of the Negro of the South, nor really of the Nation. I know that those very persons come from sections where by the use of zoning ordinances, and limitations on building permits, they discriminate more against the Negro than has been thought of in the South. They do not like the Negro; they do not live with them, they do not permit the Negro to live in the white residential districts. Most of them are for Negroes in the abstract, but do not want anything to do with them personally, and privately will tell you so.

If it were truly the purpose of those behind this bill to benefit the Negro of the South, I can assure you that the approach here cannot and will not have that effect. There are some things which cannot be done by any law. The heart and mind of a people cannot be changed by law nor by force. Hitler tried this in Europe and we know it did not work. The Negro leaders sponsoring this measure are not interested in political equality; what they want is social equality, or rather social intermingling—and you know it. Today the Negro of the South can place his social life on the highest plane he may desire. We, of the white race, merely believe in and demand that he may go his way and that we may go ours. We will have no part of social intermingling in the South.

I tell you this shall not take place in the South. After the Civil War you turned loose in our midst hundreds of thousands of ex-slaves, wholly untrained in citizenship; then without perhaps intending to you sent sufficient carpetbaggers and sorry white men to make use of their votes and to exploit them and our country. Only in recent years has all this feeling engendered in our people completely died down.

We do not have now the racial strife which exists in Washington, Baltimore, Detroit, or Chicago. To be sure, we prevent the Negro from forcing himself into the white man's home, his place of worship and public places and accommodations which are limited to white trade. At the same time we provide separate accommodations for the Negro. What you do not see is that we protect the Negro from being disturbed by the white people of our section in his places of worship, in his home, and in public places which are exclusively for Negroes.

In Mound Bayou, Miss., an exclusively Negro town, we have a splendid example of how the Negro can get along if left to himself and that is what is desired by the southern Negro. His social standards and life there compare favorably with that of any other race. The Negro has his own schools, officers, and social life, unmolested by white social reformers. The people of the town are happy, the section prosperous. The Negro of the South has come far since the War Between the States.

We have taxed ourselves greatly and now spend a much larger percentage of our State's income on education of the Negroes than any State from which come you fellows who intend to reform the South. There are two Negro colleges in my own district and many others in the State. We are spending more on the protection of the Negro's health and to improve his living conditions in proportion to our ability than any other section of the Nation. The Negro of the South is in better shape financially and economically than ever before.

To be candid, at this time we do not want the Negro to control our politics and our Government any more than the people of Detroit would want the Negro section of the city to select the officers of the entire city. We had a taste of that through the dark years following the Civil War. We know the scum, both white and black, that were selected and ruled our country. It has taken many years for us to recover from that blight and to overcome the antagonisms which were developed.

We will not have social intermingling. The white people of the South want separate accommodations and separate social life. The Negro of the South wants his separate accommodations and social life. We believe he should have them free from the meddling of white exploiters. Frankly, we expect to see that the two races remain segregated for the good of both. To force us to do otherwise would lead to civil strife the like of which has never before been seen.

If the agitators of this question continue their present tactics you shall have all the Negroes in the North. Then the Harlem district of New York will furnish the officers for that city. The Negro city of Detroit will control Michigan politics, and the Negroes of Chicago will furnish the officers for the State of Illinois. Then, when it is too late, you will learn what we learned during the terrible days of reconstruction.

If you are opposed to discrimination, why is it you have not voted to abolish the discriminatory freight rates which have been a hold-back to the South since the beginning of our Nation's transportation began? If you want to help the Negro of the South, why have you opposed aid to education in the South? Why have you excluded the Negro from living in white residential sections of your cities? Why is it that you do not have him in your homes and working for you in your offices? You may help him in any way you like, but you shall not cause our great Nation to be referred to as that great mongrel nation of the Western Hemisphere except over the opposition of the entire Southland, both white and black.

I shall not go at length into the constitutional question involved for I learned last year that such discourse is wasted breath. Those of us who are opposed to this measure know it is unconstitutional. Those who support it are not interested, apparently, in whether it is constitutional or not, believing that they have a Supreme Court which will find it so. When this bill was before us last session, full, and to me unanswerable, briefs were filed showing this act to be unconstitutional. These briefs appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September and November 1942. I shall not repeat them here, but earnestly request those conscientious Members of this House who signed the discharge petition bringing this measure designed to disunite the people of the South from the Nation and to reach out the tentacles of an ever-growing central government so as to take away the last vestige of State government, to read those briefs.

Suffice it to say here, that prior to the adoption of the Federal Constitution, the country was composed of free and equal sovereign States loosely bound together by a confederation. When the Constitutional Convention was held these sovereign States surrendered to the National Government as the central government certain rights and powers deemed by them necessary for the operation of the Federal Government, all of which are enumerated. All other powers were reserved to the States. Thus we have a Federal Government, intended by the States to have limited powers and considered a Government of limited powers for 150 years. And, in regard to the franchise, held to be limited by the Congress no later than 1920, for then, when women were first permitted to vote, such change was brought about by amendment to the Federal Constitution, ratified by the States, and not as here suggested by act of Congress. In other words, the statesmen of that period did not for one moment believe that the Federal Government could remove the restrictive qualifications fixed by the States which prohibited women from voting, except by constitutional amendment as authorized under the Federal Constitution.

The provisions of the Federal Constitution, article I, section 2, are as follows:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States; and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Certainly, there is nothing in that provision which provides for its change by action of the Congress. That provision fixes the requirement for electors voting for Members of the House of Representatives. The writers of the Federal Constitution knew and accepted the fact that the various States fixed the qualifications for electors voting for the most numerous branch of their State legislature and the Federal Constitution by adopting such requirements as may be fixed by each State as the requirements for electors voting in national elections, can be changed only by amendment of the Federal Constitution.

This matter has been passed on many times by the Supreme Court of the United States and in each instance the Court has in no way stated that article I, section 2, can be changed except by amendment to the Constitution.

Voting has always been a privilege rather than a right. The right to vote comes from the grant of the privilege. We find this clearly stated in the case of *Breedlove* v. *Suttles* (302 U. S. 277), as follows:

> To make payment of poll taxes a prerequisite for voting is not to deny any privilege or immunity protected by the fourteenth amendment. Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States, but is conferred by the State, and save as restrained by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments and other provisions of the Federal Constitution, the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate.

I call your attention further to the fact that when article I, section 2, was incorporated in the Federal Constitution, all States restricted the privilege of voting. That provision of the Federal Constitution was adopted with full knowledge that such restrictions were being exercised by the States, most of which had property qualifications, poll tax, and various educational requirements which must be met before the privilege of voting could be granted.

By amendments Nos. 14, 15, and 19, to the Federal Constitution, it was declared that State qualifications prerequisite for voting based on race, color, previous condition of servitude, and sex must no longer deny or abridge the right of citizens to vote. There, also, we find that it was recognized that the proper approach was by constitutional amendment.

So, in the present case, if the proponents of this measure want to get rid of the poll tax in the seven Southern States, the proper course is to have the Constitution amended so as to provide that payment of a poll tax shall not deny or abridge the right of a citizen to vote.

Today, with our boys fighting on the battle fronts of the world, with a greater percentage of those boys coming from the South than from any other section, at a time when above any other we need the united efforts of all our citizens, this bill is brought out to stir up the people of my section. Many of the group, particularly of the Democrats, who signed the discharge petition which brought this matter up, are the very ones who represent districts dominated by labor unions, and this fact, together with the propaganda with which they flood our offices, leads one to the belief that the

bill to some extent is aimed at the independent Members of Congress from the South who have consistently stood for the outlawing of strikes in war industries in time of war. I am advised that some Members signed this discharge petition to get even with Members from the South who voted for the Hobbs bill prohibiting highway robbery in the name of labor unions. It is all wrong to require the payment of $2 for the privilege of voting, but all right with such Members of the House to require the payment of $50 to a labor union for the privilege of working.

The right-thinking Members would do well to spend their time in correcting the ills with which certain labor union leaders have beset our war effort and leave alone matters of the kind involved in this bill, at least until we have won this terrible war in which our Nation is engaged.

The Representative from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON], former chairman of the Labor Committee in the House, several years ago inserted a table in the RECORD supposedly showing that we had very little vote in Mississippi because of the poll tax. The figures she cited are those of the general election in November. Why, in the general elections we have no contest. Our election is the Democratic primary. The only time we have Republican opposition to the Democratic nominee is when the few Republicans in the State believe that party may get into power and they want to control the patronage. We actually have not enough Republicans to furnish postmasters when that party is in power.

The gentlewoman from New Jersey, Representative NORTON, in her statement, cited the fact that in her own district, which incidentally is that of "Boss" Hague, that out of a total population of 271,807 there were cast 131,654 votes. I shall not repeat here the newspaper stories which have appeared about the elections in that district. From all accounts, we still have a more uncontrolled free use of the ballot in my district in a poll-tax State than they have in Jersey City. I have heard the gentlewoman from New Jersey say on this floor that she was not worried about elections; that she had been told she could stay here as long as she liked. That could never happen in my State. Those of us from the South are not designated for office. We run for office because we want to. If we are elected it is because we get a majority of uncontrolled, individual votes from the people of the district. One certain way for defeat would be to try to have anyone or any organization dictate the choice of a Representative in Congress. I do not profess to know of my own knowledge, but most of the charges of rotten politics about which I read in the newspapers is to be found where there is a large Negro, or foreign population of the kind which would not have enough interest in their Government to pay a $2 poll tax for the privilege of voting. As to Jersey City, I do not know, but doubtless the facts are known to the Republicans here who are helping the Democrats from such sections to reform the politics of the South.

I say to you more is involved in this bill than the racial question. The very bedrock upon which our Nation was founded is involved. If the Federal Government can control the qualifications of electors and thus control elections, the State and the last vestige of State government is gone.

I say to you it is a serious matter to us. It is a serious matter to you, whether you realize it or not. You have seen the Federal Government, through pressure, gradually usurp practically every function of State government. By grants of money on condition, through the use of judicial construction, through the OPA, the WPA, and in every other conceivable way, your States are losing control to a Federal Government with its board of economists, theoretical experts, long-haired dreamers and college professors who have infested its departments and who cling on like leeches. I hate to believe that they and their actions are approved. I hate to believe you Members of this House are willing to tie another stone around the neck of State government, already having a struggle to exist. Do you not know that if by act of Congress you can remove the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting, that by the same token the Congress can pass restrictive provisions and some group interested in continued control of the Nation will do just that.

The governing body of the county in my State is the board of supervisors, some members of which have held to the belief that they can run the affairs of the county better than the citizenship. Some years ago I served in the State legislature of my State. I found there members who believed that they could run the counties better than any board of supervisors and the affairs of municipalities better than its officers, because they felt they knew more about it and the local officers could not be trusted. Since coming here to Congress I find that it is the idea and belief of many Members of Congress and of all appointed officials of the Federal Government that they know it all, that the State government cannot be trusted and that control had better be vested in the Federal Government, where the Federal departments can run the affairs of our people.

Frankly, I find that people differ very little. Each thinks his crowd can do better than any other. My State legislative body showed me little that would lead me to believe that they would in any way be an improvement over the local officers in running the affairs of our cities and counties, but frankly convinced me to the opposite. So it is here with all due deference to this House of Representatives and the various departments of the Federal Government. You have not shown me anything to indicate that the country will be better off run from Washington. Rather have I been further convinced that local government is the best. I am sold to the belief that local self-government, the people at home, without dictation from on high, will save the country, if given the opportunity. Not only in this instance of meddling with State control of elections are you interfering, but you are permitting it to be done every day. I hope the strong Members of this House, real Americans who believe in the original American form of government, who believe in the days when the Constitution meant something—and there are many—will wake up and force the return of the Government to the people. You can take a forward step along that line by voting against this bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 290, nays 112, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 127]

YEAS—290

Allen, Calif.	Elsaesser	Knutson
Allen, Ill.	Elston	Kunkel
Andersen, H. Carl	Engel, Mich.	Landis
	Engle, Calif.	Lane
Anderson, Calif.	Fallon	Latham
Andresen, August H.	Feighan	LeCompte
	Fenton	LeFevre
Andrews, N. Y.	Fernandez	Lemke
Angell	Fletcher	Lesinski
Arends	Fogarty	Lewis
Arnold	Foote	Lodge
Auchincloss	Forand	Love
Bakewell	Fulton	Lynch
Banta	Gallagher	McConnell
Barrett	Gamble	McCormack
Bates, Mass.	Gavin	McCowen
Beall	Gearhart	McDonough
Bender	Gillette	McDowell
Bennett, Mich.	Gillie	McGregor
Bennett, Mo.	Goff	McMahon
Bishop	Goodwin	McMillen, Ill.
Blackney	Gordon	Mack
Blatnik	Gore	MacKinnon
Bloom	Gorski	Madden
Boggs, Del.	Graham	Maloney
Bolton	Granger	Mansfield
Bradley	Grant, Ind.	Marcantonio
Bramblett	Griffiths	Martin, Iowa
Brehm	Gross	Mathews
Brophy	Gwinn, N. Y.	Meade, Ky.
Brown, Ohio	Gwynne, Iowa	Meade, Md.
Buchanan	Hagen	Merrow
Buck	Hall, Leonard W.	Meyer
Buckley		Michener
Buffett	Halleck	Miller, Calif.
Burke	Hand	Miller, Conn.
Busbey	Harless, Ariz.	Miller, Md.
Butler	Harness, Ind.	Miller, Nebr.
Byrne, N. Y.	Hart	Mitchell
Canfield	Havenner	Monroney
Cannon	Hedrick	Morgan
Carroll	Heffernan	Morton
Carson	Herter	Muhlenberg
Case, N. J.	Heselton	Mundt
Case, S. Dak.	Hess	Murdock
Celler	Hill	Murray, Wis.
Chadwick	Hinshaw	Nixon
Chelf	Hoeven	Nodar
Chenoweth	Holifield	Norblad
Chiperfield	Holmes	Norton
Church	Hope	O'Brien
Clason	Horan	O'Konski
Clevenger	Howell	O'Toole
Coffin	Huber	Owens
Cole, Kans.	Hull	Patterson
Cole, N. Y.	Jackson, Calif.	Philbin
Corbett	Jackson, Wash.	Phillips, Calif.
Cotton	Javits	Phillips, Tenn.
Coudert	Jenison	Ploeser
Crawford	Jenkins, Ohio	Plumley
Crosser	Jennings	Potts
Crow	Johnson, Calif.	Poulson
Cunningham	Johnson, Ind.	Price, Ill.
Curtis	Johnson, Okla.	Priest
Dague	Jones, Ohio	Rabin
Davis, Wis.	Jones, Wash.	Ramey
Dawson, Ill.	Jonkman	Rayfiel
Dawson, Utah	Judd	Reed, Ill.
Delaney	Karsten, Mo.	Rees
Devitt	Kean	Reeves
D'Ewart	Kearney	Richlman
Dingell	Kearns	Robertson
Dirksen	Keating	Robsion
Dolliver	Keefe	Rockwell
Dondero	Kefauver	Rogers, Mass.
Donohue	Kennedy	Rohrbough
Douglas	Keogh	Rooney
Eaton	Kersten, Wis.	Ross
Eberharter	King	Russell
Elliott	Kirwan	Sabath
Ellis	Klein	Sadlak

Sadowski	Smith, Maine	Tollefson
St. George	Smith, Wis.	Towe
Sanborn	Snyder	Twyman
Sarbacher	Somers	Vail
Sasscer	Spence	Van Zandt
Schwabe, Mo.	Springer	Vorys
Scoblick	Stefan	Vursell
Scott, Hardie	Stevenson	Walter
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Stigler	Weichel
Scrivner	Stockman	Welch
Seely-Brown	Stratton	Wigglesworth
Shafer	Sundstrom	Wilson, Ind.
Sheppard	Talle	Wolcott
Simpson, Ill.	Taylor	Wolverton
Simpson, Pa.	Thomas, N. J.	Woodruff
Smith, Kans.	Thomas, Tex.	Youngblood
	Tibbott	Zimmerman

NAYS—112

Abernethy	Fisher	Peden
Albert	Flannagan	Peterson
Allen, La.	Folger	Pickett
Almond	Gary	Poage
Andrews, Ala.	Gathings	Preston
Barden	Gossett	Price, Fla.
Bates, Ky.	Grant, Ala.	Rains
Battle	Gregory	Rankin
Beckworth	Hale	Rayburn
Bell	Hardy	Redden
Boggs, La.	Harris	Reed, N. Y.
Bonner	Harrison	Rich
Boykin	Hendricks	Richards
Brooks	Hobbs	Riley
Brown, Ga.	Hoffman	Rivers
Bryson	Jarman	Rizley
Bulwinkle	Jensen	Rogers, Fla.
Burleson	Johnson, Ill.	Schwabe, Okla.
Byrnes, Wis.	Jones, Ala.	Short
Camp	Jones, N. C.	Sikes
Chapman	Kerr	Smathers
Clark	Kilburn	Smith, Va.
Colmer	Kilday	Stanley
Combs	Lanham	Taber
Cooley	Larcade	Teague
Cooper	Lucas	Trimble
Cox	Lyle	Wadsworth
Cravens	McMillan, S. C.	West
Davis, Ga.	Mahon	Wheeler
Davis, Tenn.	Manasco	Whitten
Deane	Mills	Whittington
Domengeaux	Morris	Williams
Dorn	Morrison	Wilson, Tex.
Doughton	Murray, Tenn.	Winstead
Drewry	Norrell	Wood
Durham	Pace	Worley
Evins	Passman	
Fellows	Patman	

NOT VOTING—28

Bland	Hartley	McGarvey
Clements	Hays	Macy
Clippinger	Hébert	Mason
Cole, Mo.	Jenkins, Pa.	O'Hara
Courtney	Johnson, Tex.	Pfeifer
Ellsworth	Kee	Powell
Fuller	Kelley	Smith, Ohio
Gifford	Lea	Thomason
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Ludlow	Vinson
	Lusk	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Kelley and Mr. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Vinson against.

Mr. Macy and Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Hays against.

Mr. McGarvey and Mr. Fuller for, with Mr. Johnson of Texas against.

Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania and Mr. Hartley for, with Mr. Bland against.

Mr. Cole of Missouri and Mr. Gifford for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Mason and Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall for, with Mr. Courtney against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Ellsworth with Mr. Clements.
Mr. O'Hara with Mrs. Lusk.
Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Lea.
Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Kee.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PICKETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks on H. R. 29 and include therein certain extraneous matter.

GENERAL LEAVE TO REVISE AND EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the bill may have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the request made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT] for Members to extend their remarks preceding the roll call all Members who may wish to extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

STUDY OF INTERNAL REVENUE LAWS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 293, Rept. No. 1014), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Ways and Means, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to continue its full and complete investigation and study of the need for amendment and revision of the internal revenue laws.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings, as it deems necessary.

STUDIES RELATING TO AGRICULTURE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 298, Rept. No. 1015), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct studies, investigations, and to inquire into any matter within its jurisdiction, including but not limited to the study of long-range problems affecting agriculture and forestry; the study of the operation and effectiveness of measures taken pursuant to Public Law 8, Eightieth Congress, to control foot-and-mouth disease or rinderpest; to study and make investigations into the existence and causes of shortages and surpluses of food and other agricultural commodities; to study the current and prospective demand for food and other agricultural commodities at home and abroad, and the effect thereof upon domestic agriculture.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the Committee on Agriculture, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to make such inspections or investigations, to take such testimony, and to use any governmental facility without reimbursement, as it deems necessary.

SEC. 3. The committee shall issue such reports as it deems desirable, including reports to the House of Representatives, with recommendations for legislation or otherwise.

NAVY SCHOOL AT MONTEREY, CALIF.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 318, Rept. No. 1016), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1341) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GOSSETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HAYS (at the request of Mr. TRIMBLE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include two editorials from the Brooklyn Eagle.

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include excerpts.

Mr. REEVES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

THE LATE HONORABLE ROBERT L. OWEN

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I announce the death of one of Oklahoma's first United States Senators, Senator Robert Latham Owen. He passed away last Saturday morning at 5 a. m. Funeral services will be held this afternoon at Gawler's Funeral Home at 2:30 p. m., and tomorrow his body will be taken to Lynchburg, Va.

Senator Owen was one of our most brilliant men, and was largely responsible for the Federal Reserve and Child Labor Acts. He served for many years as chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

Born in Lynchburg, Va., the son of Robert L. Owen, president of the Virginia & Tennessee Railroad, and Narcissa Chisholm, a Cherokee Indian, he attended Washington and Lee University. In 1887 he went to the Cherokee National Indian Territory, where he taught in a Cherokee male seminary and later edited the Cherokee Nation, an Indian publication.

He established the First National Bank of Muskogee, which is in my district, and served as its president for 10 years, and at his death was one of the directors.

In 1920 he was proposed as a Democratic candidate for President, but later withdrew his name. He served as a Democratic Senator from Oklahoma from 1907 to 1925.

For the past several years he was known as the father of the global alphabet. He hoped to establish the 37-letter alphabet of dashes, curves, and cues to break down the world's language barriers.

His wife died last year. He is survived by a daughter, Mrs. Dorothea Whittemore. I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Whittemore on the death of this great man—her father and my friend.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, my State of Oklahoma was saddened last Saturday by the announcement of the death of one of her most illustrous sons, the Honorable Robert Latham Owen.

Robert L. Owen, of Indian and Scotch-Irish descent, was born in Lynchburg, Va., in 1856. He received his education in Lynchburg, Baltimore, and at Washington and Lee.

Toward the end of the century he moved to the Indian Territory, where he taught in the Cherokee Orphan Asylum in what is now the State of Oklahoma. Later he entered the practice of law and became prominently identified in banking and industrial circles. In 1890, he founded the First National Bank of Muskogee and served as president of that institution for 10 years.

In 1892, 15 years before Oklahoma became a State, Robert L. Owen organized the first Democratic Party in the Indian Territory. His interest in the political affairs of his State and Nation remained steadfast throughout the years.

The year Oklahoma received her sovereignty and became the forty-sixth State in the Union, 1907, Robert L. Owen was the unanimous choice of both houses of the Oklahoma Legislature to represent the new State as one of her two Members of the United States Senate, a position he held with distinction for 21 years.

It can truly be said of Robert L. Owen that during the 21 years he served in the United States Senate he was indeed a giant and took his place among the great statesmen of that period. Senator Owen's achievements as a Member of the United States Senate were outstanding. He secured the establishment of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency in 1913 and served as its first chairman. He was perhaps best known for his part in coauthoring the Federal Reserve System with the Honorable Carter Glass, of Virginia, who was at that time chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives. Senator Owen was also coauthor of the Farm Loan Act.

During his declining years the Oklahoma statesman turned his thoughts and efforts toward world peace and devoted most of his time to perfecting what he called the global alphabet.

At a recent luncheon given in his honor by the members of the Oklahoma congressional delegation, the Senator explained his global alphabet in detail and expressed the belief that widespread usage of this alphabet by all countries would bring about a better understanding in the world brotherhood of man and that it would be a means of preventing future wars.

I remember at the conclusion of the luncheon, when I was talking with Senator Owen about his authoring the Federal Reserve System, he said:

> Yes; that was a truly great work and probably a great milestone in my career, but the really great monument to me in the years to come will be my part in perfecting the global alphabet.

Senator Owen was president emeritus of the National Popular Government League, a life member of the Elks, and a Thirty-second Degree Mason.

The people of Oklahoma feel that in the passing of this great man, who reached such a position of trust and honor that many votes were cast in his behalf for the Democratic nomination for President of the United States at the San Francisco Convention in 1920, that they have truly lost one of their greatest sons.

Mr. PEDEN. Mr. Speaker, on July 19, 1947, the career of a distinguished Oklahoman came to a close. Former Senator Robert Latham Owen died, after an illness of several weeks. This Nation lost one of its outstanding and most useful citizens.

Vigorous and hard working to the last, the former Senator earned and held the respect and admiration of all who knew or came in contact with him.

In 1907, the statehood year for Oklahoma, he was elected to the United States Senate by the unanimous vote of both Houses of the State Legislature, with every member present and every member voting. That, in itself, indicates the esteem with which he was held by his fellow Oklahomans. That he continued to be held in this same high regard by the people whom he represented, was indicated by the overwhelming plurality which he received on his two succeeding reelections to that office in 1912 and 1918. His term of service in the Senate expired in 1925, when he retired to enter the private practice of law.

His service to the Nation did not cease with his retirement to private life, however, and possibly his most ardent efforts toward universal fellowship and understanding came during the last 22 years of his life. An accomplished linguist, he worked for several years on the creation of a global alphabet consisting of 33 symbols, representing various phonetic sounds. He was president of the World Language Foundation, and through his work on this project, had expanded his contacts and endeavors until they were universal in score.

During his 18 years as a Member of the United States Senate, Senator Owen led the fight for much constructive legislation. He was responsible, in a large measure, for the Federal Reserve Act, the Farm Loan Act, the Child Labor Act, and, in 1908, he led the contest for direct election of Senators.

A fitting tribute to this statesman is contained in the remarks of Hon. T. P. Gore, who served with Senator Owen as the other of the first two Senators from Oklahoma. In addressing the Oklahoma delegation at a luncheon in honor of Senator Owen, on February 3, 1945, Senator Gore paid this tribute:

> Senator Owen's fingerprints will be found on all the great measures that were passed during his tenure in the Senate. They were years crowded with service. I remember in reading the autobiography of John Morley, the great English statesman, that he closed a summary of his career with this remark: "I said things that made a difference." That is about the highest claim he could have made. That is about the highest tribute that one man can pay to another. It means that such a man was a living force, that he was an effective force, that he exerted an influence, that to some extent he changed the course of human events, that to some extent he changed the current of history.
>
> It is a still higher tribute to say that such changes improved the state of human affairs, accelerated the pace of progress, and contributed to the sum total of human well-being and human happiness. Owen as well as Morley said and did things that made a difference. No man as active as Senator Owen in the furtherance of his views could entirely escape opposition, but I believe that none of his opponents ever challenged either his sincerity or his ability. Ability is a gift, sincerity is a virtue. Owen has both.

Mr. Speaker, the life of this great Oklahoman and statesman will serve as an inspiration to all who may learn of his unselfish service to the Nation and the world. Until his death, he was actively at work for a world at peace. Our challenge today is that his untiring efforts and devotion to peace will not have been in vain.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have just recently learned of the death of my

good friend and fellow Oklahoman, former United States Senator Robert Latham Owen, of the State of Oklahoma. The State of Oklahoma and the whole country, also, have lost a noble, sincere, loyal, and patriotic servant. Senator Owen served his State and his country with singular devotion and intelligence for many years. All the time he was a Member of the United States Senate, which was from Statehood until 1925, he gave unstintedly of his great energies to the best interests of the people of his State and of the whole Nation; and the people of the State of Oklahoma, whom he so well represented, are as one in their mourning the loss of such an able and dependable public servant. He was in fact a statesman of the very first order.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues from Oklahoma in deeply regretting the death of a great Oklahoman and a great American, the Honorable Robert L. Owen. Senator Owen was one of Oklahoma's first and most distinguished United States Senators. He represented our State in the United States Senate for 18 years. His outstanding service as a legislator is well known to most of the Members of this House.

Senator Owen was a scholar, a statesman, and, above all else, a friend to man. In his early youth he manifested great interest in foreign affairs and in the study of foreign languages as a means of bridging the gap between people of different tongues. By the time he had finished college he had mastered five foreign languages, fluency in which he retained to the date of his death. It was his interest in mankind which prompted this devotion to the study for foreign languages. It was his interest in mankind which caused him to leave his native State of Virginia and help open the frontiers of my own beloved Oklahoma. It was his interest in mankind that attracted his attention to public affairs and caused him to seek a seat in the United States Senate. It was his interest in mankind which on his retirement from the Senate caused him to work for a quarter of a century on the preparation of a global alphabet as an avenue to the study of foreign languages and the consequent mutual understanding between men of all races and all tongues.

Senator Owen lived to be 91 years of age. His keen mind retained its brilliance and his generous soul retained its love to the very last. Only a few days ago, after Senator Owen had been moved to the hospital where he died, he called my office to inquire as to the status of the Educational Exchange Act. His interest in humanity was consistent to the end. Those of us who knew him and who were fortunate enough to receive his counsel are filled with grief over the departure of a great man and a loyal friend. Still, somehow, we cannot but rejoice over the fullness of the life he lived. We are sure in our hearts that the magnitude of his deeds in this world will bring glory to his soul in the Great Beyond.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I join the other Members of the Oklahoma delegation in expressing the great loss, not only to our State, but to the Nation in the passing of a great statesman, ex-Senator Robert L. Owen.

No man in Oklahoma's history has so distinguished himself in carving a lasting record of constructive work for the State as Senator Owen has done. From his entrance into the Senate in 1907 until he left it for voluntary retirement in 1925, his was a record of great constructive achievement for the Nation as well as for his State.

His great contribution to the Nation as the original exponent of the Federal Reserve System, with all of its banking and credit reform, will long be remembered in the history of this Nation. Although he was never accorded his due credit for this great reform, it was his original idea and effort that did most to bring about its enactment.

The long record of legislative history is filled with his constructive contributions to his Nation as one of America's most distinguished and learned sons.

His retirement from the Senate did not dim his always energetic interest in public affairs. He was a welcome and helpful witness countless times before the Senate and House committees, studying important national and international subjects. His special studies were often printed as House and Senate documents, so great was the Members' respect for his learning and experience.

Even in his last years, well over 90 in age, his energy was boundless.

With a vision that world peace could not be possible with its inhabitants divided by a multiplicity of languages, he launched his global alphabet. This great work has attracted the attention of the world's linguists, and he spent his own money and time in hope of seeing this contribution to world peace, through making English the world language, launched. Several books dealing with the global alphabet in many languages were published at his own expense, and his constant effort to receive world acceptance of the idea was his great final ambition.

The world will miss the genius of Robert L. Owen, but his past work in behalf of all the people will live in their hearts.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—ECONOMIC REPORT (H. DOC. NO. 409)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report and ordered printed with illustrations:

The Honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

The Honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIRS: I am presenting herewith a mid-year economic report to the Congress. This is supplementary to the Economic Report of the President of January 8, 1947, and is transmitted in accordance with section 3 (b) of the Employment Act of 1946.

In preparing this report I have had the advice and assistance of the Council of Economic Advisers, members of the Cabinet, and heads of independent agencies.

Respectfully,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 21, 1947.*

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

UNIFORMITY OF GEOGRAPHIC NOMENCLATURE IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The Clerk called the first bill on the calendar (H. R. 1555) to promote uniformity of geographic nomenclature in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, hereinafter called the Secretary, shall provide for uniformity in geographic nomenclature and orthography throughout the Federal Government. In the exercise of his powers under this act the Secretary shall consult with the Board on Geographical Names established by this act. He may exercise his powers through such officials as he may designate.

SEC. 2. In carrying out the purposes of this act, the Secretary shall decide the standard names, their orthography and areal application, whether theretofore in use or proposed for use, of geographic features and places in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and in areas not under the recognized sovereignty of another nation; and in areas under the recognized sovereignty of another nation he shall determine the official forms of the names, their orthography and application, of geographic features, places, and political divisions, for the use of this Government; and he may hereafter change such names or the orthography or application of such names; and he shall decide all other questions of geographic nomenclature which may arise in the Federal Government.

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall cause such studies and investigations to be made and such records to be kept as may be necessary or desirable in carrying out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 4. There is hereby established a Board on Geographical Names, hereinafter called the Board. The membership of the Board shall include one representative from each of the Federal agencies administratively determined by the Secretary to be a principal map-making agency, at least one representative from each of the Departments of State, War, Navy, Post Office, Interior, Agriculture, and Commerce, and one representative each from the Government Printing Office, the Library of Congress, and such other Federal agencies and non-Federal organizations as the Secretary, upon recommendation of the Board, shall from time to time find desirable. The Federal Government members of the Board shall be appointed by the respective heads of the departments or independent agencies they represent and all other members shall be appointed by the Secretary. Each member shall be appointed for a 2-year term but may be reappointed to successive terms. The members of the Board shall serve without compensation. The Board shall nominate a Chairman to be appointed by the Secretary.

SEC. 5. The Board may, at its discretion, review any matters of geographic nomenclature and the findings of the Board, subject to the approval of the Secretary, shall be followed. In addition, the Board may make such further recommendations to the Secretary as it may deem desirable to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 6. For the guidance of the Federal Government, the Secretary shall publish from time to time and in such form as will carry out the purposes of this act, decisions with respect to geographic names and principles of geographic nomenclature and orthography, and may revise and amend the same as found necessary. The Secretary

shall also furnish such additional information with respect to geographic names as will assist in carrying out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 7. With respect to a geographic name the pertinent decisions and principles issued by the Secretary shall be standard for all material published by the Federal Government.

SEC. 8. The intention of the Secretary to render decisions on standard names or their orthography or areal application shall be communicated to the Board 30 calendar days in advance of such decisions, and his intention to render determinations on all other matters of geographic nomenclature shall be communicated to the Board 90 calendar days in advance of such determinations: *Provided, however*, That upon approval of any name or other matter of geographical nomenclature by the Board the periods stated in this section shall be deemed to have expired.

SEC. 9. Nothing in this act shall be construed as applying to the naming of the offices or establishments of any Federal agency.

SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the Secretary of the Interior, hereinafter called the Secretary, conjointly with the Board on Geographic Names, as hereinafter provided, shall provide for uniformity in geographic nomenclature and orthography throughout the Federal Government. The Secretary may exercise his functions through such officials as he may designate, except that such authority as relates to the final approval or review of actions of the Board on Geographic Names shall be exercised by him or his Under or Assistant Secretaries.

"SEC. 2. There is hereby established a Board on Geographic Names, hereinafter called the Board. The membership of the Board shall include one representative from each of the Departments of State, War, Navy, Post Office, Interior, Agriculture, and Commerce, and from the Government Printing Office, and the Library of Congress. The Board may also include representatives from such Federal agencies as the Secretary, upon recommendation of the Board, shall from time to time find desirable, even though these agencies are in the departments otherwise represented on the Board. The members of the Board shall be appointed by the respective heads of the departmeints or independent agencies that they represent. Each member shall be appointed for a 2-year term but may be reappointed to successive terms. The members of the Board shall serve without additional compensation. The Board shall nominate a Chairman to be appointed by the Secretary, and shall establish such working committees as are found desirable.

"SEC. 3. The Board, subject to the approval of the Secretary, shall formulate principles, policies, and procedures to be followed with reference to both domestic and foreign geographic names; and shall decide the standard names and their orthography for official use. The principles, policies, and procedures formulated hereunder shall be designed to serve the interests of the Federal Government and the general public, to enlist the effective cooperation of the Federal departments and agencies most concerned, and to give full consideration to the specific interests of particular Federal and State agencies. Action may be taken by the Secretary in any matter wherein the Board does not act within a reasonable time. The Board may make such recommendations to the Secretary as it finds appropriate in connection with this act.

"SEC. 4. The Secretary shall cause such studies and investigations to be made and such records to be kept as may be necessary or desirable in carrying out the purposes of this act, and he shall provide a place of meeting and staff assistance to the Board. The staff shall be responsible to the Secretary, who shall prescribe its relations to the Board and the committees of the Board. The Secretary may establish, from time to time, upon recommendation of the Board, advisory committees of United States citizens who are recognized experts in their respective fields to assist in the solution of special problems arising under this act.

"SEC. 5. For the guidance of the Federal Government, the Secretary shall promulgate in the name of the Board, from time to time and in such form as will carry out the purposes of this act, decisions with respect to geographic names and principles of geographic nomenclature and orthography. The Secretary shall also furnish such additional information with respect to geographic names as will assist in carrying out the purposes of this act.

"SEC. 6. With respect to geographic names the pertinent decisions and principles issued by the Secretary shall be standard for all material published by the Federal Government. The United States Board on Geographical Names in the Department of the Interior, created by Executive order, is hereby abolished, and the duties of said board are transferred to the Board herein created, and all departments, bureaus, and agencies of the Federal Government shall refer all geographic names and problems to the said Board for the purpose of eliminating duplication of work, personnel, and authority.

"SEC. 7. Nothing in this act shall be construed as applying to the naming of the offices or establishments of any Federal agency.

"SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I understand a similar Senate bill (S. 1262) is on the Speaker's table. I ask unanimous consent to substitute the Senate bill for the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, hereinafter called the Secretary, conjointly with the Board of Geographic Names, as hereinafter provided, shall provide for uniformity in geographic nomenclature and orthography throughout the Federal Government. The Secretary may exercise his functions through such officials as he may designate, except that such authority as relates to the final approval or review of actions of the Board on Geographic Names shall be exercised by him, or his Under or Assistant Secretaries.

SEC. 2. There is hereby established a Board on Geographic Names, hereinafter called the Board. The membership of the Board shall include one representative from each of the Departments of State, War, Navy, Post Office, Interior, Agriculture, and Commerce, and from the Government Printing Office, and the Library of Congress. The Board may also include representatives from such Federal agencies as the Secretary, upon recommendation of the Board, shall from time to time find desirable, even though these agencies are in the departments otherwise represented on the Board. The members of the Board shall be appointed by the respective heads of the departments or independent agencies that they represent. Each member shall be appointed for a 2-year term but may be reappointed to successive terms. The members of the Board shall serve without additional compensation. The Board shall nominate a chairman to be appointed by the Secretary, and shall establish such working committees as are found desirable.

SEC. 3. The Board, subject to the approval of the Secretary, shall formulate principles, policies, and procedures to be followed with reference to both domestic and foreign geographic names; and shall decide the standard names and their orthography for official use. The principles, policies, and procedures formulated hereunder shall be designed to serve the interests of the Federal Government and the general public, to enlist the effective cooperation of the Federal departments and agencies most concerned, and to give full consideration to the specific interests of particular Federal and State agencies. Action may be taken by the Secretary in any matter wherein the Board does not act within a reasonable time. The Board may make such recommendations to the Secretary as it finds appropriate in connection with this act.

SEC. 4. The Secretary shall cause such studies and investigations to be made and such records to be kept as may be necessary or desirable in carrying out the purposes of this act, and he shall provide a place of meeting and staff assistance to the Board. The staff shall be responsible to the Secretary, who shall prescribe its relations to the Board and the committees of the Board. The Secretary may establish from time to time, upon recommendation of the Board, advisory committees of United States citizens who are recognized experts in their respective fields to assist in the solution of special problems arising under this act.

SEC. 5. For the guidance of the Federal Government, the Secretary shall promulgate in the name of the Board, from time to time and in such form as will carry out the purposes of this act, decisions with respect to geographic names and principles of geographic nomenclature and orthography. The Secretary shall also furnish such additional information with respect to geographic names as will assist in carrying out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 6. With respect to geographic names, the pertinent decisions and principles issued by the Secretary shall be standard for all material published by the Federal Government. The United States Board on Geographical Names in the Department of the Interior created by Executive order, is hereby abolished, and the duties of said Board are transferred to the Board herein created, and all departments, bureaus, and agencies of the Federal Government shall refer all geographic names and problems to the said Board for the purpose of eliminating duplication of work, personnel, and authority.

SEC. 7. Nothing in this act shall be construed as applying to the naming of the offices or establishments of any Federal agency.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 1555) was laid on the table.

PENALTY FOR ENTERING NATIONAL FORESTS UNLAWFULLY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1826) making it a petty offense to enter any national-forest land while it is closed to the public.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know what this bill is and what kind of notice the Department is supposed to give the public before a man could be arrested for going on to public land.

Mr. HOPE. This bill is very much desired by the Forest Service for protection against forest fires. It is occasionally necessary at certain times of the year, when the fire hazard is great, to close a national forest against the entry of the public.

There is already a provision which provides a penalty for an individual who trespasses on the national forests. That is a pretty severe penalty. This calls for a lesser penalty. A case brought under the present law must be tried in the United States District Court upon information filed by the United States District Attorney, and the penalty is out of line with the size of the crime, you might say, because many of these people are perhaps just petty trespassers. But there ought to be some way that they can be kept out when there is a fire hazard.

The purpose of this bill is to make it a petty offense, so that if these people do trespass they can be brought before a United States commissioner and fined a smaller amount than provided in the present law.

Mr. RICH. Let me ask this question: Suppose a State forest were dry and some fishermen should go into the forest without seeing any sign that told them this was Federal land or that it was posted against entry; suppose they went in there to fish or camp, what would the penalty be?

Mr. HOPE. Let me say in the first place that it does not apply to State land; it applies to the national forests.

Mr. RICH. But the national forest is the same thing.

Mr. HOPE. The penalty provided under this bill is a fine of not to exceed $500 or imprisonment not to exceed 6 months in jail. That is the maximum, the gentleman understands.

Mr. RICH. That means that if some individual were going through the forest and did not notice any signs posting the forest against entry showing that the Interior Department or the Department of Agriculture said they were not permitted on these lands; that if the individual, not knowing the lands were posted, not seeing signs, entered them and was caught, he could be put in jail for 6 months and fined $500?

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman understands that is the maximum penalty that could be imposed. Such an individual certainly would have the defense that the land was not posted. It seems to me that would be a defense.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. The trespass must be knowing and willful upon the part of the individual.

Mr. HOPE. That is the person, of course, whom it was intended to cover.

Mr. RICH. It seems to me this is a pretty strong bill and that it may do more damage than good.

Mr. HOPE. I hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania will not object because it is very important in the interest of conservation that there be some method by which the Forest Service can act in these matters. As I said before they can now arrest a man, but the present law carries a much higher penalty.

Mr. RICH. If a man did not intend to enter the forest and set a fire yet you are going to jail him and fine him just because you are afraid he might for some reason set a fire. While I do not want any fires set in the national forest, I do not want them to burn, it seems to me you are going too far in this legislation. It ought to be stopped.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman understands that a closure order is put into effect only when there is grave danger of fire. The Forest Service wants people to use the national forests, but there are certain times and periods of severe drouth when the public should be kept out of certain areas of the national forests.

Mr. RICH. And all of these western States want this legislation, do they?

Mr. HOPE. No; the States are not asking for it; the Forest Service is asking for it to protect the forests.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman from Kansas, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, agree that it is the intent of the law that it apply only to willful trespass?

Mr. HOPE. I am sure that is the way it will be applied. I cannot construe the law because the law speaks for itself. I would not want to mislead the gentleman by saying that it would have to be a willful trespass. It is the intention to keep off those who are willful trespassers. Undoubtedly if a person went on these by mistake that would be a defense.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If a man unintentionally happened to step on national forest land, or if he cut across a mountain or valley to save a long walk around or if he had proper business on forest ground to see some cattle, for instance, would the gentleman want to say that he would automatically be liable to be charged with an offense and subjected to fine and imprisonment?

Mr. HOPE. I am not sure he would not be.

Mr. KEARNEY. I believe under the penalty statutes, in order to get a conviction it would have to be willful. If a man violates the law it must be a willful violation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In view of the discussion on that I would like to have it clear. I did not intend to raise any question but in view of what has been said it should be clear that it is not here intended to make it illegal if a man happens to step on some national forest property without having gotten permission from a national forest official.

Mr. HOPE. I am sure, and I believe the gentleman is sure, that the law would not be applied that way.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. With that understanding, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have two or three national forests in my district and this concerns me. Unless you put specifically in the law that the trespasser knowingly and willingly violates the rules and regulations I think I shall be constrained to object.

Mr. HOPE. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. SHORT. Any person who innocently is found in a national forest, unwittingly and without malice aforethought, certainly should not be subjected to fine and imprisonment unless he has willfully violated the law.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman understands that there is on the statute books at the present time a law with a much more severe penalty than is provided here; so that whether this act is passed or not the other would be in effect.

Mr. SHORT. Under those circumstances I withdraw my objection, and will run the risk of taking the lesser evil.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whoever, without lawful authority or permission, shall go upon any national-forest land while it is closed to the public by or under authority of a regulation of the Secretary of Agriculture made pursuant to law shall be fined not more than $500, or imprisoned without hard labor for not more than 6 months, or both: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to limit the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture under other law to otherwise provide for regulating the occupancy and use of national-forest lands and lands administered by the Forest Service.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VACANCY IN OFFICE OF DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1436) to repeal the prohibition against the filling of a vacancy in the office of district judge in the southern district of New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

MINIMUM ALLOWANCE PAYABLE FOR REHABILITATION IN SERVICE-CONNECTED CASES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3308) to increase the minimum allowance payable for rehabilitation in service-connected cases.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

FISH HATCHERY AT ROGERS CITY, MICH.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 210) to establish rearing ponds and fish hatchery at or near Rogers City, Mich.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

FISH HATCHERY AT ST. IGNACE, MICH.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 214) to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery at or near St. Ignace, Mich.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

FISH HATCHERY AT CHARLEVOIX, MICH.

The Clerk called the bill H. R. 215) to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery at or near Charlevoix, Mich.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

FISH HATCHERY AT THE ANNA RIVER, MICH.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 216) to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery at the Anna River, Mich.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3106) to reenact and amend the Organic Act of the United States Geological Survey by incorporating therein substantive provisions confirming the exercise of long-continued duties and functions and by redefining their geographic scope.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MacKINNON. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

PROMOTING CERTAIN MINING ON UNITED STATES LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3022) to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, sodium, oil shale, gas, and sulfur on lands acquired by the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration?

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the chairman of the subcommittee explain this bill to determine whether or not it affects tidelands; the oil situation on the coastal waters of the United States.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I might say to the gentleman that I have an amendment prepared which will except tidelands from the provisions of this bill. I shall offer that amendment at the proper time.

Mr. CARROLL. Would the gentleman explain to the Members of this body what this bill does?

Mr. BARRETT. The Department of the Interior presently has jurisdiction over all of our public domain for mineral-leasing purposes. They have had a very satisfactory leasing system under the Leasing Act of 1920, as amended. Under the Reorganization Act, that Department handles mineral leases on all Federal lands. The purpose of this bill is to provide that all acquired lands of the United States shall be leased under the same conditions that presently applies to the public domain. That system has worked well and a uniform system will be of great help to those applying for these leases. I understand there are about 150,000,000 acres of acquired lands scattered throughout the United States. This bill applies only to those lands. In many States of the West the oil industry finds one set of regulations on applications for oil and gas leases applies to public domain lands and an entirely different set of regulations applies to acquired lands even though the lands are the same in every respect and in many cases are adjoining.

Mr. CARROLL. Then the amendment the gentleman proposes now specifically exempts the tide oil lands in the coastal areas?

Mr. BARRETT. That is right.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. May I ask the gentleman if he knows whether or not the Department of Agriculture objects to this bill?

Mr. BARRETT. I might say that a representative of the Department of Agriculture appeared before our committee and raised some objections to the provisions of this bill. However, the Department of the Interior is very much in favor of the bill because it would facilitate the administration of their work. The gentleman well knows, as I said, that under the Executive order of the President the jurisdiction of leasing these lands presently lies in the Department of the Interior and not in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I might ask the gentleman who now has the power to lease these lands?

Mr. BARRETT. The power to lease these lands rests exclusively with the Department of the Interior. In order to place the authority and responsibility for executing oil and gas leases and other mineral leases in the hands of one department of Government the President under the Reorganization Act transferred authority for that purpose to the Interior Department on all lands belonging to the United States.

However, the Department of the Interior leases the lands not under the rules and regulations of its own department but rather under the regulations of the department that formerly had jurisdiction of the lands before the transfer. This has caused considerable confusion and the purpose of this bill is simply to provide uniformity.

Mr. CELLER. Does the gentleman think a bill as important as this, which even would require, in the gentleman's opinion, an amendment to avoid any conflict with the recent Supreme Court decision with reference to tidelands, should be considered without a considerable degree of debate? It is too important to be considered on the Consent Calendar, is it not?

Mr. BARRETT. I might say to my colleague that the committee considered the bill carefully and reported it out unanimously. It has been on the floor before. The question of the tidelands has been discussed and debated, and the amendment affecting the tidelands has been accepted by the States that are interested in the matter.

Mr. CARROLL. May I say to the gentleman from New York that I sat as a member of the committee and discussed the implications of this matter. As the gentleman from Wyoming has indicated, it is a transfer from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Interior for the purpose of developing some of the resources of the West.

Mr. CELLER. May I ask whether the Department of the Interior has given wholehearted approval to this bill?

Mr. BARRETT. Indeed it has.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, if there are no further questions on this point, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOBBS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Three objections are required to strike the bill from the calendar.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CELLER. I object, Mr. Speaker.

MARKETING AGREEMENTS AND ORDERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 452) to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act relating to marketing agreements and orders.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, is further amended as follows:

By adding at the end of section 2 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 7, sec. 602) the following:

"(3) Through the exercise of the powers conferred upon the Secretary of Agriculture under this title, to establish and maintain such minimum standards of quality and maturity and such grading and inspection requirements for agricultural commodities or the products thereof, other than milk and its products, in interstate commerce as will

effectuate such orderly marketing of such agricultural commodities as will be in the public interest."

SEC. 2. Section 8c (6), as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 7, sec. 608c (6)), is amended to read as follows:

"(6) In the case of agricultural commodities and the products thereof, other than milk and its products, orders issued pursuant to this section shall contain one or more of the following terms and conditions, and (except as provided in subsection (7)) no others:

"(A) Limiting, or providing methods for the limitation of, the total quantity of any such commodity or product, or of any grade, size, or quality thereof, produced during any specified period or periods, which may be marketed in or transported to any or all markets in the current of interstate or foreign commerce or so as directly to burden, obstruct, or affect interstate or foreign commerce in such commodity or product thereof, during any specified period or periods by all handlers thereof.

"(B) Allotting, or providing methods for allotting, the amount of such commodity or product, or any grade, size, or quality thereof, which each handler may purchase from or handle on behalf of any and all producers thereof, during any specified period or periods, under a uniform rule based upon the amounts sold by such producers in such prior period as the Secretary determines to be representative, or upon the current quantities available for sale by such producers, or both, to the end that the total quantity thereof to be purchased, or handled during any specified period or periods shall be apportioned equitably among producers.

"(C) Allotting, or providing methods for allotting, the amount of any such commodity or product, or any grade, size, or quantity thereof, which each handler may market in or transport to any or all markets in the current of interstate or foreign commerce or so as directly to burden, obstruct, or affect interstate or foreign commerce in such commodity or product thereof, under a uniform rule based upon the amounts which each such handler has available for current shipment, or upon the amounts shipped by each such handler in such prior period as the Secretary determines to be representative, or both, to the end that the total quantity of such commodity or product, or any grade, size, or quality thereof, to be marketed in or transported to any or all markets in the current of interstate or foreign commerce or so as directly to burden, obstruct, or affect interstate or foreign commerce in such commodity or product thereof, during any specified period or periods shall be equitably apportioned among all of the handlers thereof.

"(D) Determining, or providing methods for determining, the existence and extent of the surplus of any such commodity or product, or of any grade, size, or quality thereof, and providing for the control and disposition of such surplus, and for equalizing the burden of such surplus elimination or control among the producers and handlers thereof.

"(E) Establishing or providing for the establishment of reserve pools of any such commodity or product, or of any grade, size, or quality thereof, and providing for the equitable distribution of the net return derived from the sale thereof among the persons beneficially interested therein.

"(F) Requiring or providing for the requirement of inspection of any such commodity or product produced during specified periods and marketed by handlers.

"(G) In the case of hops and their products, in addition to, or in lieu of, the foregoing terms and conditions, orders may contain one or more of the following:

"(i) Limiting, or providing methods for the limitation of, the total quantity thereof, or of any grade, type, or variety thereof, produced during any specified period or periods, which all handlers may handle in the current of or so as directly to burden, obstruct, or affect interstate or foreign commerce in hops or any product thereof.

"(ii) Apportioning, or providing methods for apportioning, the total quantity of hops of the production of the then current calendar year permitted to be handled equitably among all producers in the production area to which the order applies upon the basis of one or more or a combination of the following: The total quantity of hops available or estimated will become available for market by each producer from his production during such period; the normal production of the acreage of hops operated by each producer during such period upon the basis of the number of acres of hops in production, and the average yield of that acreage during such period, as the Secretary determines to be representative, with adjustments determined by the Secretary to be proper for age of plantings or abnormal conditions affecting yield; such normal production or historical record of any acreage for which data as to yield of hops are not available or which had no yield during such period shall be determined by the Secretary on the basis of the yields of other acreage of hops of similar characteristics as to productivity, subject to adjustment as just provided for.

"(iii) Allotting, or providing methods for allotting, the quantity of hops which any handler may handle so that the allotment fixed for that handler shall be limited to the quantity of hops apportioned under preceding section (ii) to each respective producer of hops; such allotment shall constitute an allotment fixed for that handler within the meaning of subsection (5) of section 8a of this title (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 7, sec. 608a)."

SEC. 3. Section 10 (b) (2) (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 7, sec. 610 (b) (2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) (i) Each order relating to milk and its products issued by the Secretary under this title shall provide that each handler subject thereto shall pay to any authority or agency established under such order such handler's pro rata share (as approved by the Secretary) of such expenses as the Secretary may find will necessarily be incurred by such authority or agency, during any period specified by him, for the maintenance and functioning of such authority or agency, other than expenses incurred in receiving, handling, holding, or disposing of any quantity of milk or products thereof received, handled, held, or disposed of by such authority or agency for the benefit or account of persons other than handlers subject to such order. The pro rata share of the expenses payable by a cooperative association of producers shall be computed on the basis of the quantity of milk or product thereof covered by such order which is distributed, processed, or shipped by such cooperative association of producers.

"(ii) Each order relating to any other commodity or product issued by the Secretary under this title shall provide that each handler subject thereto shall pay to any authority or agency established under such order such handler's pro rata share (as approved by the Secretary) of such expenses as the Secretary may find are reasonable and are likely to be incurred by such authority or agency, during any period specified by him, for such purposes as the Secretary may, pursuant to such order, determine to be appropriate, and for the maintenance and functioning of such authority or agency, other than expenses incurred in receiving, handling, holding, or disposing of any quantity of a commodity received, handled, held, or disposed of by such authority or agency for the benefit or account of persons other than handlers subject to such order. The pro rata share of the expenses payable by a cooperative association of producers shall be computed on the basis of the quantity of the agricultural commodity or product thereof covered by such order which is distributed, processed, or shipped by such cooperative association of producers. The payment of assessments for the maintenance and functioning of such authority or agency, as provided for herein, may be required under a marketing agreement or marketing order throughout the period the marketing agreement or order is in effect and irrespective of whether particular provisions thereof are suspended or become inoperative.

"(iii) Any authority or agency established under an order may maintain in its own name, or in the name of its members, a suit against any handler subject to an order for the collection of such handler's pro rata share of expenses. The several district courts of the United States are hereby vested with jurisdiction to entertain such suits regardless of the amount in controversy."

SEC. 4. Section 8c (2) (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 7, sec. 608c (2)) is amended by inserting a colon in lieu of the period at the end thereof and by adding the following: "*Provided*, That, in addition to the commodities specified, orders may be issued pursuant to the provisions of this section with respect to other agricultural commodities or the products of such commodities or to any regional or market classification thereof if (A) the Secretary determines that the issuance of an order with respect to any such commodity or product would more effectively advance the interests of the producers thereof, pursuant to the declared policy, and (B) a majority of the producers of such commodity or product, who, during a representative period determined by the Secretary, have been engaged, within the production area specified by the Secretary in the production for market of the commodity specified, or who, during such representative period, have been engaged in the production of such commodity for sale in the marketing area specified by the Secretary, voting in a referendum conducted by the Secretary, approve or favor the application of the provisions of section 8c to such commodity or product. Subsection (12) shall be applicable to any such referendum."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 3, strike out "or the products thereof" and insert "enumerated in section 8c (2)."

Page 2, line 11, strike out lines 11 to 15 inclusive, and insert the following:

"(6) In the case of fruits (including pecans and walnuts but not including apples, other than apples produced in the States of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, and not including fruits, other than olives, for canning) and their products, tobacco and its products, vegetables (not including vegetables, other than asparagus, for canning) and their products, soybeans and their products, hops and their products, honeybees, and naval stores as included in the Naval Stores Act and standards established thereunder (including refined or partially refined oleoresin), orders issued pursuant to this section shall contain one or more of the following terms and conditions, and (except as provided in subsection (7)) no others."

Page 8, line 22, strike out all of section 4.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOFF:

Insert the words "or freezing" immediately after the word "canning" in lines 19 and 21 on page 2.

On page 8, following line 21, insert a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 4. Section 8c (2) (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 7, sec. 608c (2)) is amended by in-

serting the words 'or freezing' immediately after the word 'canning' wherever said word 'canning' appears in said section."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AIR-MAIL DELIVERY BY GOVERNMENT-OWNED TRUCKS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2583) requiring all mails consigned to an airport from a post office or branch, or from an airport to a post office or branch, within a radius of 35 miles of the city in which there has been established a Government-owned vehicle service to be delivered by Government-owned motor vehicles.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BUCK, Mr. RICH, and Mr. KEAN objected.

COAST GUARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 72) to increase the number of authorized aviation stations operated by the Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows

Be it enacted, etc., That the sixth paragraph under the heading "Coast Guard" of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes," approved August 29, 1916 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 14, sec. 29), is amended to read as follows:

"For the purpose of saving life and property along the coasts of the United States and at sea contiguous thereto, and to assist in the national defense, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to establish, equip, and maintain aviation stations, not exceeding fifteen in number, at such points on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Great Lakes, as he may deem advisable, and to detail for aviation duty in connection therewith officers and enlisted men of the United States Coast Guard. At five of these stations there may be instituted schools for the purpose of special instruction in aeronautics, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to employ such expert instructors in aeronautics and such assistant instructors also skilled in aeronautics as he may deem necessary, and to fix the compensation of each such instructor and assistant instructor at a rate not in excess of the rate of the aggregate pay of a commander in the Coast Guard who receives additional pay under the provisions of section 18 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, for participation in regular and frequent aerial flights."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 10, after the words "coasts of", insert the words "and in the interior of."

Page 1, line 10, after the words "United States", insert the words "and its possessions."

Page 1, line 10, after the words "and at sea", insert a comma and strike out the words "contiguous thereto."

Page 2, line 2, after the words "at such points" add the words "in the United States and its possessions."

Page 2, beginning on line 2, strike out the words "on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Great Lakes."

Page 2, line 5, after the word "duty", insert the words "and instruction."

Page 2, beginning on line 6, after the words "United States Coast Guard", strike out all the remainder of the bill.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVERSION OF CERTAIN NAVAL VESSELS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3315) to authorize the conversion of certain naval vessels.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the Navy is most anxious to have this work proceed on the conversion of these ships. If this bill is passed over without prejudice, it will probably have to go over to the next session of Congress. Plans are being prepared at the present time for the construction and conversion of these 16 vessels. There will be no additional appropriation required. The money is available in the fund called Construction of Ships, and there will be no additional appropriation required for the work. The Armed Services Committee brings this bill before the House today with a unanimous vote. It authorizes the conversion of certain naval vessels. The bill would grant to the Secretary of the Navy authority to embark upon a program of ship conversion without limitation of expenditures on any one vessel, but within the total sum appropriated for the purpose.

Under existing law—the act of July 18, 1935—the total expenditures for repairs and alterations of a single naval vessel may not exceed $450,000 for any 18 consecutive months, provided that the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to complete such work as may exceed the above limit, provided that appropriated funds are available, and provided further that he report the circumstances to the Congress at the next regular session. In addition, under article 37 of the act of August 2, 1946, the Secretary of the Navy is "authorized in time of war and until the end of the first fiscal year thereafter to exceed the statutory limit on repairs and alterations of vessels whenever he deems it necessary."

H. R. 3315, A BILL TO AUTHORIZE CONVERSION OF CERTAIN NAVAL VESSELS

The development of devices for incorporation on naval vessels to meet the demands of naval warfare which resulted from World War II experience, and the development of the vessels themselves are continuing at a rapid rate. The necessity for exercising with these new devices and for extensive training in their use is urgent and will not wait for the building of new ships in which to install them. The Navy already has a large number of ships, many of which, with modification, can be used to apply these new developments.

The conversion work for which this bill gives legislative authority partakes of the nature of shipbuilding. Under the authority of this bill, the Navy can undertake work at a cost in excess of the existing expenditure limitation which has been suspended by other legislation, but which will again become effective upon removal of the war powers. These conversions can be undertaken only when funds are provided by the Congress after approval of the work by the President and report to the Congress. Although the bill provides that the President shall cause the Secretary of the Navy to report such contemplated conversions to the Congress, it would not be necessary to obtain legislative authority in each case.

Under the provisions of this bill the Navy will be in a position to gain the advantage of experience with newly developed devices and operating techniques in the minimum elapsed time. Considering the current rapid pace of scientific and engineering developments and the necessity for equal rapidity in developing the techniques of their employment, it is considered that this legislative authority, which in one bill saves the time of many hearings, is essential to progress. In announcing its intentions to the Congress, as provided in the bill, the Navy will be prepared to discuss and justify the undertaking of prospective conversions together with the costs involved and can do this without delay which would necessarily result from separate legislative action in the case of each vessel.

Illustrative of the types of conversion for which this bill creates legislative authority are the conversions before Congress covered under Navy Department appropriation bill for 1948 under the heading "Construction of ships." Conversions requested under this heading include:

(A) Nine 2,100-ton destroyers for conversion to fast destroyer escorts. The development abroad of submarines capable of operating submerged at high speed has made it mandatory that we develop devices and techniques to combat them and gain practical experience in the use of these devices.

(B) Two fleet-type World War II submarines for conversion to the carrying of troops. Nations of both sides of the conflict made successful use of submarines for landing small parties of troops through waters not controlled by them. The situations which gave rise to this requirement are usual in warfare. The Navy considers it essential that the full capabilities of this type of operation and of the capacity of submarines to implement it be developed at least on a prototype basis, which this is.

(C) One fleet-type World War II submarine for conversion to a cargo carrier. This conversion is an extension of experience gained in the war and constitutes a necessary supporting element for the troop carrier as well as a means to provide support for friendly forces in otherwise occupied territory.

(D) One fleet-type World War II submarine for conversion to frigid zone picket duty. The necessity for picket ships capable of concealment was amply demonstrated off Okinawa where the destroyers assigned on picket station suffered heavy casualties. This conversion will amplify the limited experience already gained in the use of submarines for specialized picket work by such special devices as are or may be developed to suit them for the work in frigid zone conditions.

All of the above conversions of submarines are somewhat experimental in character. It is expected that exercise and training in them will not only advance the special techniques involved but will show the way toward further improvements in the devices which they carry.

(E) One landing ship dock and one attack cargo vessel for conversion to the requirements of frigid zone service. Many lessons have been learned as to the special requirements that must be fulfilled by ships and their equipment in the rigorous cold weather experienced during recent expeditions into such waters. The purpose of these conversions is to apply these lessons, and through further exercise in polar waters, to prove and extend them.

H. R. 3115 was considered by a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee and after complete hearings, some in open session and some in executive session, the bill was unanimously reported to the full committee, where it met approval and a recommendation for early consideration by the House. I trust the bill will pass the House without a dissenting vote.

Mr. KEAN. May I say to the gentleman from Ohio that this authorization is for $55,000,000, and it would greatly embarrass the Members on the objectors' committee in the future if we let a bill go through on the Consent Calendar which provides for an authorization of $55,000,000, and we could not very well object to a bill going through containing $5,000,000 or $10,000,000.

I agree with the gentleman so far as the objectives of the bill are concerned. I hope the gentleman may be able to take the matter up so that it can be brought up under suspension of the rules and thus be passed right away.

Mr. HESS. It is true that this is an authorization, but if the gentleman will read the hearings he will find in answer to a question which I propounded that the money is available. The testimony is as follows:

Mr. HESS. At the present time, as I understand it then, with this fund of IRNV you could convert ships or construct new ships; is that correct?

Admiral MILLS. That is correct, sir.

Mr. HESS. There is no additional appropriation necessary, the funds have been appropriated for that purpose?

Admiral MILLS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HESS. Authorization is necessary, however?

Admiral MILLS. That is correct, sir. It is necessary in connection with this new appropriation.

Therefore, the funds are available.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESS. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is it not correct that an authorization is necessary to the extent that the present law limits the amount of money spent on the alteration of vessels to $450,000?

Mr. HESS. That is correct. That is the limit within an 18-month period.

Mr. COLE of New York. And an authorization is necessary to exceed that amount, whether it is $55,000,000 or whatever it may be. That is the only authorization that is necessary, and that is the only authorization that this bill carries.

Mr. HESS. That is correct. That is the only authorization contained herein.

Mr. COLE of New York. The authorization carried in this bill permits the Navy to exceed the $450,000 present limitation.

Mr. HESS. If the Navy saw fit, however, under another act, they could proceed to convert these ships without coming to Congress for an authorization, providing that it could be done prior to the end of the emergency.

Mr. COLE of New York. So the net result of this bill is not an authorization for $55,000,000? The effect of the authorization is to remove the $450,000 limitation, which was imposed by Congress in 1935 in the midst of a period of economy.

Mr. HESS. That is correct.

Mr. KEAN. This provides for no ceiling at all?

Mr. COLE of New York. That is the net effect of this bill so far as alterations by way of conversion of vessels is concerned.

Mr. KEAN. In that case, Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps that it would not embarrass us and, therefore, I feel justified in withdrawing my unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object what do you expect to do with the vessels after they are reconditioned?

Mr. HESS. They are to be used in the naval service. There are to be 16 vessels converted. Two submarines are to be converted into troop-carrying ships, one into a cargo-carrying ship. Two landing ship docks are to be converted to polar service ships. One attack transport is to be converted into a polar service ship, and one submarine is to be converted to a polar picket, and nine destroyers are to be converted to antisubmarine vessels.

Mr. RICH. I was interested in finding out whether we were going to recondition a lot of merchant ships and then give them away to some foreign country.

Mr. HESS. No; these ships are not merchant ships. These are combatant ships.

Mr. RICH. If they were, I would not permit this to go through.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of improving the military characteristics of combatant and auxiliary vessels of the United States Navy, the President of the United State is hereby authorized to convert such vessels as he may consider best suited for the purposes of national defense without limitation on expenditures for any one vessel within the total sum appropriated for the purpose.

With the following committee amendment:

Insert at the end end of the bill "*Provided*, That prior to converting vessels pursuant to authority contained in this act the President shall cause the Secretary of the Navy to report such conversions to Congress: *Provided further*, That no conversion allowed herein shall be such as to place a converted vessel in a type or category different from its original type or category."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLLECTION AND PUBLICATION OF STATISTICAL INFORMATION BY THE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1821) to provide for the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN]?

There was no objection.

TO AUTHORIZE LEASES OF REAL OR PERSONAL PROPERTY BY THE WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3471) to authorize leases of real or personal property by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill involves property worth hundreds of millions of dollars. It was not so long ago that Congress passed the Surplus Property Act which had a bearing upon the property covered by this bill. This bill therefore reverses the national public policy.

In view of the facts I have stated, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] is asking that the bill be passed over without prejudice. I may say to the membership that this bill has the unanimous approval of 33 men on the Armed Services Committee, who studied the matter carefully. It is true that it contravenes, to some extent, the

Surplus Property Act, but by permitting the Army and Navy to lease these stand-by plants of various descriptions, particularly having to do with machine tools, it will save the Government a great many millions of dollars in leases, which otherwise will become dump plants.

As far as I am concerned, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] is the only Member I have heard who has raised any objection. We can ask to suspend the rules and pass the bill, but rather than have it passed over without prejudice, I shall object.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I reserve the objection and I yield.

Mr. SHAFFR. Mr. Speaker, the Government simply wants to lease 77 plants, which we have to keep in our possession in case of another emergency. Together with these, there are 92,000 items of tool machinery that are now in war assets and can be sold at any time to any nation if bids are received, and bids are being received. It is very important that this bill be passed. Now, the gentleman says it contravenes the Surplus Property Act. The Surplus Property Administration had representatives at all of the hearings that were held on this bill, and not one objection was offered and not a bit of testimony was offered from the Surplus Property Administration. However, since that time they find that they do want a couple of amendments, and I have agreed, if this bill is passed by the House, to take their amendments in the Senate bill.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. We have invested $750,000,000 in synthetic-rubber plants alone. We do not want to scuttle all of these wartime plants. Some of them will be continued in operation by the Government. Others will be kept in a stand-by condition, for use in case of emergency. The purpose of this legislation is really to prevent the Army and Navy from declaring surplus many of these plants, and many of these machine tools that are very difficult to secure, and to sell them for 10 cents on the dollar. This legislation is to protect the American taxpayers and to insure the safety and security of our Nation. I do hope that my good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] will not object to its immediate consideration.

Mr. BUCK. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, outside of the Committee on the Armed Services I doubt if 10 Members of the House have read the bill or seen the report. I, therefore, object to its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

SETTLEMENT OF DAMAGE CLAIMS RESULTING FROM EXPLOSIONS AT PORT CHICAGO, CALIF., ON JUNE 17, 1944

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 669) to provide a method of paying subrogation claims arising out of insurance payments for damages sustained as the result of explosions at Port Chicago, Calif., on June 17, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think the bill should be explained. I want to know what it is proposed to do, why special legislation is needed to settle claims resulting from this explosion different from claims resulting from any explosion.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. The Navy is not permitted to pay more than $1,000 under general law. Many of the claims involved here call for the payment of more than that amount. They have all been investigated and a complete report on each claim has been made by the Navy. As a result of legislation passed in previous Congresses we have already paid a lot of claimants as approved by that report in amounts up to $3,000. This would allow the payment of claims not so paid but favorably reported in the same investigation including some subrogated claims.

Mr. RICH. Would any claim be for an amount over $3,000?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Yes; all these claims would be over that amount, but they have already been presented and have been investigated by the Navy and appear in the same report.

Mr. RICH. Why should we make any difference in the case of these claims? Why should they not go through the courts?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. These claims have already been carefully investigated.

Mr. RICH. Who made the investigation?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Qualified officers of the Navy pursuant to authorization by an act of Congress for the purpose of determining the validity and amounts to be allowed.

Mr. RICH. Does not the law under the new set-up require that they go through the courts?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. No; this is not the sort of case where they would go through the courts. They were investigated by the Navy.

Mr. RICH. What is the total amount of all the claims?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. There are two types of claims: One, those which have been insured; and, two, those which have not; and those which have not been paid would amount altogether as covered by this bill to around $1,350,000.

Mr. RICH. How about these claims over $3,000 that are now covered by a bonding company? Has the bonding company been required to pay the amounts for which premiums were paid at the time they issued the insurance?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. The claims included in this bill perhaps would include claims that are insured of persons suffering loss as well as those not insured, and to the extent of the contracts between the insurance company and the claims, some insurance companies may recover some of that.

Mr. RICH. We had an occasion in the Sergeant at Arms office where some moneys were taken from the office and the officer was bonded; yet a bill was passed the other night by unanimous consent with regard to that matter. We did not know anything about it, we did not know it was being called up. We do not want to have the same situation arise with respect to these claims and let the bonding companies get away.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. These cases have all been investigated very carefully and very thoroughly by the Navy Department. In some instances the insurance companies may be subjugated to the original claimants, especially where the companies may have paid the claimants.

Mr. RICH. Has this been considered by a committee of the House?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Yes; by the Subcommittee on Claims of the Judiciary Committee and reported favorably.

Mr. RICH. Unanimously reported?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Without objection.

Mr. RICH. That is too bad.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in addition to the claims arising out of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif., on June 17, 1944, which the Secretary of the Navy was authorized to pay under the act of September 8, 1944 (Public Law No. 423, 78th Cong.), the Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to make a thorough investigation of the merits of those claims (hereinafter called subrogation claims) against the United States by persons who, as insurers, have paid insurance claims for property damage, death, or personal injuries, alleged to have been caused by such explosions, if such subrogated claims are submitted to the Department of the Navy in writing within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. The appropriations for the Naval Establishment for the fiscal year 1947 shall be available for payment, and payment is hereby authorized, upon approval of the Secretary of the Navy or his designate, of subrogation claims referred to in section 1 hereof arising out of payment of insurance claims (a) for disability or death resulting from personal injury sustained by persons not then members of tthe armed forces or civilian employees of the United States: *Provided*, That settlement shall not aggregate in excess of $5,000 with respect to the disability or death of any one person nor shall any such settlement be made in amounts which would not be allowable, or in respect of insurance beneficiaries who would not be eligible, under the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, if the disabled or deceased person were an employee of the United States; or (b) for property loss or damage: *Provided*, That settlement shall not be made in excess of $5,000 in respect of injury to any one building or structure.

SEC. 3. Any settlement made under the provisions of section 2 hereof shall be in full settlement of all such subrogation claims against the Government of the United States.

SEC. 4. In connection with any settlement authorized by section 2 hereof, the Secretary may require assignment to the United States of any right of action against third parties arising from the death, injury, or property damage with respect to which such settlement is made.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Navy shall transmit to the Congress each subrogation claim submitted to the Navy Department in accordance with section 1 hereof not settled by him, with supporting papers and a report

of his finding of facts and recommendations thereon and also a report of each subrogation claim settled and paid by him pursuant to section 2 hereof. Such reports shall contain a brief statement of the character and justice of each claim so transmitted or settled, the amount claimed, and the amount found due.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, after the enacting clause, strike out the remainder of the bill, and insert in lieu thereof: "That for the purpose of effecting the settlement of all claims against the United States resulting from the explosions which occurred at the Naval Ammunition Depot at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944, which have not been settled by the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, in full settlement of all such claims, the respective sums found to be due in the report of the Secretary of the Navy to Congress dated September 13, 1945, and entitled "Summary of Reports of the Secretary of the Navy to Congress of the United States pursuant to Public Law 423, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, of claims resulting from the explosion which occurred at the Naval Ammunition Depot, Port Chicago, Calif."; and claims not filed within the limitation established by said Public Law 423 but which are filed within 6 months after the date of the approval of this act are authorized hereof in the respective amounts found to be due by the Secretary of the Navy: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide a method of paying all unsettled claims for damages sustained as a result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 14, 1944, in the amounts found to be due by the Secretary of the Navy."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING ESTABLISHMENT OF A NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL AT MONTEREY, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1314) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, a rule has been granted for the consideration of this bill. I therefore ask that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF CERTAIN SYNTHETIC FUEL DEMONSTRATION PLANTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2161) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil, shales, agricultural and forestry products, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes," approved April 5, 1944 (58 Stat. 190).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

RESTRICTIONS ON PROPERTY OF INDIANS WHO SERVED IN THE ARMED FORCES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1113) to provide for the removal of restrictions on property of Indians who served in the armed forces.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is one of two similar bills on the general subject matter reported by the Committee on Public Lands. This bill relates to all Indians who served in the armed forces. As amended by the committee, it permits all Indians to have their legal restrictions removed by following a legal procedure. Later on in the calendar is a similar bill relating to the Osage Indians. I wonder if this bill is approved whether it will be necessary to have the other one passed?

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration now, H. R. 1113, as amended, is entirely different from the scope of the bill dealing with the Osage Indians in Oklahoma referred to by the gentleman and which appears as H. R. 3325, page 48 of the Consent Calendar for today. That bill, following the usual custom of dealing with the Osage Indians, is special legislation permitting the Osage Indians who were in the armed forces and who are now veterans to come under the general GI bill of rights and borrow money. It is a removal of restriction and applies only to the Osage and to no other Indians in the United States.

Mr. COLE of New York. May I inquire if the gentleman is familiar with H. R. 1113 which is now before the House?

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. COLE of New York. And the provisions of that bill do not cover the situation in relation to the Osage Indians?

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. No; it does not.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed, upon application by any Indian who shall have served honorably in the armed forces of the United States in time of war, to remove all restrictions upon the lands, interests in lands, funds, or other property of such Indian, and, if such lands or interests in lands are held by the United States in trust for such Indian, to issue an unrestricted patent in fee therefor. No lands or other property with respect to which restrictions are removed or a patent in fee issued pursuant to this act shall be liable to the satisfaction of any debt contracted prior to such removal of restrictions or issuance of patent.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That any Indian who is a citizen of the United States and who wishes to be freed of the disabilities and limitations specially applicable to Indians may, upon reaching the age of 21, apply to any naturalization court for the area in which he resides for a 'writ of competency.' The court shall set a hearing date not less than 30 days nor more than 60 days from the day it receives the application; and notify the head of the local, county, or parish governmental unit; the local welfare department; the superintendent of the applicant's tribe or the Commissioner of Indian Affairs; the head or representative of its governing body; and any other persons the court considers appropriate.

"SEC. 2. At the hearing the court shall examine the applicant and permit the persons who were notified to give information helpful to the court in determining the applicant's competency. In determining competency, the court shall consider significant factors bearing upon the applicant's moral and intellectual qualifications and his ability to manage his own affairs. If the court finds the applicant competent, it shall issue a 'writ of competency,' freeing him of all disabilities and limitations specially applicable to Indians; and the recipient shall no longer be entitled to share any of the benefits or gratuitous service extended to Indians by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. In the event the court denies a 'writ of competency,' the applicant may file a new application 1 year following the date of denial.

"SEC. 3. When presented with a 'writ of competency,' the Secretary of the Interior shall take the steps necessary to give the applicant full ownership and control of the money and property held in trust for him by the Secretary; issuing, in the case of land, appropriate patents in fee, provided the Secretary may make such provisions as he deems necessary to insure repayment of money loaned to the applicant by the Federal Government or the tribe.

"SEC. 4. After receiving a 'writ of competency,' the applicant shall continue on the tribal rolls as a member of the tribe until he and the tribe agree to a full settlement of (a) the applicant's claims against the tribe and tribal property and (b) the claims of the tribe against the applicant and his property.

"SEC. 5. Any Indian born after the date this act is enacted who is a citizen of the United States, and any child of a parent or parents who have been issued 'writs of competency' shall, upon reaching the age of 21, be free of all disabilities and limitations specially applicable to Indians: *Provided*, That no 'writ of competency' shall be issued under this section if the Commissioner of Indian Affairs files an objection with the court."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment, which I sent to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota to the committee amendment: Page 3, line 20, strike out "Any Indian born after the date this act is enacted who is a citizen of the United States, and."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, this amendment would strike from the bill the part which makes an Indian child born after the date of this act automatically an unrestricted citizen

and gives him the same rights as the other Indians have to apply for full-fledged citizenship; it leaves the provisions which make automatic full rights for the children of emancipated parents.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. You are not trying to include Indians that are not covered under this act?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No. As a matter of fact it works in the other direction.

Mr. RICH. The fact is that we used to have about 30,000 Indians and we were trying to have them self-sustaining. Now we have four times as many Indians in the last 10 years as we ever had and it is costing 10 times more than it was supposed to cost in about 1933. It seems to me about time that we get these Indians to be American citizens.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is exactly what this bill seeks to do. Of course, the gentleman is referring to certain policies of the Indian Office. He is not referring to any policy of mine. For, let me say that the gentleman from South Dakota, speaking, has introduced bills of this kind in the last three Congresses. In fact, I think those who know the history of this legislation will bear me out when I say that my bills, H. R. 5115, of the Seventy-eighth Congress, H. R. 3710, of the Seventy-ninth Congress, and H. R. 2958, of this Eightieth Congress, each of which was described as an emancipation act, have had a great deal to do with developing the features embodied in this bill which has come from the committee headed by the very able gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I fail to get the meaning and the effect of the gentleman's amendment. Will the gentleman explain it again?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Section 5 of the bill, I might say, as it was reported in the committee amendment, automatically makes any child born after the enacment of this act free and unrestricted, regardless of the status of his parents. The general terms of the bill would make it possible for Indians to apply to naturalization courts and get unrestricted rights as citizens to handle their property and to manage their own affairs. The Office of Indian Affairs has been opposed to the enactment of the bill. The last time it was called on the Consent Calendar it was objected to by the gentleman from New York, who explained to me later that he did so because of the opposition of the Indian Office. My understanding is that opposition was particularly strong against the language in section 5, which said that every Indian child born tomorrow or later should automatically have full citizenship. So I am merely seeking to eliminate certain language in an effort to avoid further objections to passage of the bill today. Striking out this language would leave the children of nonemancipated parents with the same rights that every other Indian would have under the bill, to let them go to court and apply when they become 21. My amendment leaves in automatic, full citizenship for the children of emancipated parents.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, under existing law, an Indian has to apply for citizenship?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Under existing law he does not even have the right to apply.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman not think it is about time in the history of the United States that a full-blooded Indian is entitled to citizenship?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I certainly do and that has been the purpose of the successive emancipation bills which I have introduced; I only regret that it was not until we got a Republican Congress that we could get a bill out of committee on the subject. This bill, I should add, has the support of gentlemen on both sides of the aisle, Republican and Democrat, and did in committee.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I will say that in Minnesota they vote.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. They do in South Dakota, too, may I say to the gentleman.

Mr. KNUTSON. Under the act of 1924.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. They vote in South Dakota.

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. KNUTSON. I just made the observation that Indians can vote in Minnesota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This bill does not deal with the question of suffrage. That became a matter for the States to handle after President Coolidge signed the original act for basic citizenship.

Mr. KNUTSON. There are so many down East who think that because they have part Indian blood that they are Indians. Now, in South Dakota, more particularly in Minnesota and Wisconsin and Michigan we have no more Indian trace.

Mr. McCORMACK. They are Americans.

Mr. KNUTSON. They are Americans, and they fill all the positions that full-blooded Caucasians do.

Mr. McCORMACK. The only thing that concerns me is this: As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it will require children born of parents of the Indian race to go through the steps now, under existing law, to become complete citizens of the United States; is that correct?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No, not under existing law. This bill seeks to make a road for full citizenship for those who want it. That is what the bill as a whole does. The bill, if it become law, would give them that right which they do not now have.

Mr. McCORMACK. The thought enters my mind that we are all descendants of somebody who came from abroad, except the Indians. I do not know how far back they go. They are the only ones, it seems to me, that have the unadulterated right to say that they are not aliens; no matter how far back.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman's logic is admirable. I wish he might have voiced it on this subject in the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses when he was majority leader. I wish he would now address it to the Secretary of the Department of the Interior and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs who have consistently refused to accept that point of view. I hope he will voice it to the President if we are successful in sending this bill to the White House for signature. This bill represents the furthest that we have been able to travel in the direction of making natural-born American Indians unrestricted citizens; to have the right to become full-fledged citizens.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the gentleman recognizes the point of my inquiry, and that is, if they are not citizens now, I am wondering who has a better right to full citizenship.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No one. I might say that an Indian who served in both World War I and World War II asked me the question, "How many wars do we have to help the United States win before we can have the simple right to become full-fledged citizens, the right that our former enemies would have if they came over here and applied for naturalization?"

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman's amendment provide for that?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. My amendment deals with the children born after the date of this act. The bill itself goes to the problem that the gentleman has raised.

Mr. McCORMACK. Are those born after the date of the enactment of this bill automatically citizens, under the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No. The first sections of the bill give to the Indians the right to apply before a naturalization court to establish their entitlement and their qualifications for unrestricted citizenship. Section 5 of the committee amendment originally proposed that the children of Indians who establish their right in naturalization court should automatically become full-fledged citizens and be issued writs of competency when they became 21. That is in the bill and would not be changed by the amendment; in fact I think I suggested that provision when the committee was working on the bill. I pointed out that when the parent became an unrestricted citizen, that he had been adjudged competent and very properly should replace the Government as guardian of his minor child. Later there was put in that section the language that any Indian born after the date this act is enacted would automatically become a citizen. Personally I had no objection to it. There was some objection to that, however, on the ground that some of these would be the children of Indian parents who themselves had not established their competency and whose children ought not to become citizens automatically but should have the same right to apply that the others had. That, I understood was a basic objection of the Indian office to the bill

and was largely responsible for the objection to the bill when it was called on the calendar 2 weeks ago. My amendment leaves it up to the individual Indian to make his election, unless his parents have already settled the matter. I am not arguing for it; I merely am trying to get the bill passed without objection since this may be our last chance before Congress adjourns.

Mr. McCORMACK. Take the case of a child born in the United States of parents who are not citizens. The child is a constitutional citizen of the United States, even though the parents are not naturalized citizens.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes. Of course, that goes to a different matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. There are new Members of the House from States that have Indian populations who are interested in the amendment. I do not know why I should take the burden, but I wanted to call attention to the fact that I consider those of the Indian race about as good Americans as we have. Certainly some day in the very near future, if not now, children born of Indian parents should have all the rights of full-fledged American citizens.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. They certainly should. I am very happy to have the gentleman say that so definitely and positively. This bill moves in that direction. In my judgment the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] and the members on his committee on both sides of the aisle deserve appreciation and praise for the patient hearings they held and for the thoughtful efforts they put into the writing of this emancipation bill. If it passes and becomes law it will become a red-letter day in the history of the American Indian who has so well demonstrated his loyalty and bravery and his entitlement to full citizenship in the United States.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time to tell you that less than a month ago I spent several days on the Navajo Reservation in Arizona. I found 60,000 Navajos there and less than 40,000 of whom can speak the English language. I found that only 5,000 of some 20,000 school-age children are going to school and not even the least bit of an attempt is being made to educate them. Those people are practically starving to death and some will starve to death next winter. One of the major reasons for their present plight is that they have not been allowed to become citizens of the United States. I see no reason why those people who are born here cannot be citizens, just as much so as anyone born here of parents who came from abroad.

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MacKINNON. Is it not a fact, however, that the Navajo Indians stand in a position entirely different from that of any other Indians in America by virtue of the fact that they never signed a treaty with the Government?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. They signed a treaty in 1868. Among many other things the Government of the United States guaranteed 1 teacher for every 30 students, and to this day our Government has never fulfilled that treaty.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If you could send them abroad and have them classified as displaced persons, we would take care of them.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Almost 4,000 of them served in the Army of the United States, and they fought and died for our country, yet they are not permitted to be citizens to this day.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. LEMKE. I wish to inform the House that the amendment will do just the opposite of what this House wants.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. That is right. This amendment will keep those people from becoming citizens unless they apply. They should be citizens if they are born here, regardless of the citizenship of their parents.

Mr. LEMKE. How many children born today are fit for citizenship? They will be fit for citizenship at the age of 21, if you vote down the amendment.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. The boys and girls born on the reservation should become citizens, and they will not be subjected to the embarrassment they have been subjected to, and they will not starve. Some 60,000 are crowded on a reservation that cannot adequately support more than 10,000.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As far as I am personally concerned, I would have gone further than this bill would go.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I wish to thank the gentleman from South Dakota. The Bureau of Indian Affairs apparently wants to keep the Indians under subjection as long as they can. The time has come when the Indians can be made useful citizens of the United States.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I will submit a unanimous-consent request to withdraw the amendment, because I personally would go further than that. I thought it would aid the passage of the bill.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. If the gentleman does not want this amendment, it is perfectly all right with me for him to withdraw it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRAINERD WAR DEAD NATIONAL MEMORIAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3614) to provide for the establishment of the Brainerd War Dead National Memorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, this bill is opposed by the Battle Monuments Commission on the ground that it would set a precedent. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I can well understand the fear that some Members may have that this bill may establish a precedent. I would like to make a brief statement in which I believe I can convince the House that it would not do so.

It merely permits the people of Brainerd to erect a monument to be turned over to the Battle Monuments Commission to commemorate the exceptionally heroic exploits by the members of Battery A, One Hundred and Ninety-fourth Armored Tank Battalion, formerly a unit in the Minnesota National Guard.

I may say that Battery A was the first mechanized unit ever sent abroad in this or any other war. The city of Brainerd wishes to give suitable recognition to those who made the supreme sacrifice at that time, also to the survivors who for four long years underwent the horrors of Japanese prisons. Two-thirds of that outfit lost their lives in the bloody battle of Bataan, and those who returned home came back from captivity broken in body and in spirit. The city of Brainerd has a larger percentage of Gold Star Mothers than any other community in the country. It is my understanding, Brainerd also has more war widows for its size than any other community in the country.

Certainly, it would be most fitting for the Congress to give approval to this measure so that we might give this little bit of recognition to the memory of those who went forth from Crow Wing County never to return.

We do not have a single Federal battle monument in the State of Minnesota. The First Minnesota Regiment saved the day at Gettysburg. It came out with the greatest percentage of casualties of any regiment that fought in the entire Civil War—80 percent. We do not have a Federal monument to them save at Gettysburg. The Government has not erected a monument to those men of the First Minnesota Regiment which turned Pickett back at Gettysburg three times and came out with less than 30 percent of their enrollment. Is it not about time we give a small meed of recognition to such outstanding examples of bravery and sacrifice?

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to my good friend from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say to the gentleman from New York that the committee considered this bill very carefully. They heard the Battle Monuments Commission. The committee reported this bill unanimously. The bill merely provides that the city of Brainerd and other cities nearby, may

donate the land and buildings, in order to honor their war dead. I do not see why any Member of this House should object to this bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. Was the action of the committee unanimous?

Mr. BARRETT. The action of the committee was unanimous. There is no appropriation whatsoever involved in this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SHASTA NATIONAL FOREST

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3175) to add certain public and other lands to the Shasta National Forest, Calif.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, subject to any valid claim or entry now existing and hereafter legally maintained, and for the purposes of protecting, improving, and utilizing their forests, watershed, recreational and other resources, all lands of the United States within the following-described areas are hereby added to and made parts of the Shasta National Forest and hereafter shall be subject to all laws and regulations applicable to the national forests: Section 31, township 36 north, range 4 west; sections 11 to 16, inclusive, 20 to 29, inclusive, 33 to 36, inclusive, township 36 north, range 5 west; sections 5 to 9, inclusive, 16 to 21, inclusive, 29 to 32, inclusive, township 35 north, range 3 west; all township 35 north, range 4 west; sections 1 to 4, inclusive, 9 to 17, inclusive, 20 to 29, inclusive, 31, 33 to 36, inclusive, township 35 north, range 5 west; sections 35, 36, township 35 north, range 6 west; sections 26 to 34, inclusive, township 34 north, range 2 west; sections 5 to 11, inclusive, 13 t 36, inclusive, township 34 north, range 3 west; all township 34 north, range 4 west; all township 34 north, range 5 west; sections 1, 2, 3, 10 to 14, inclusive, 23 to 26, inclusive, 35, 36, township 34 north, range 6 west; sections 4 to 7, inclusive, township 33 north, range 2 west; sections 1 to 17, inclusive, township 33 north, range 3 west; sections 1 to 12, inclusive, township 33 north, range 4 west; sections 1 to 18, inclusive, township 33 north, range 5 west; sections 1 to 4, inclusive, 9 to 14, inclusive, township 33 north, range 6 west; all Mount Diablo base and meridian: *Provided*, That lands within the flow lines of reservoirs operated or maintained as parts of the Central Valley reclamation project or otherwise occupied and used for the operation of said project shall continue to be administered by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior.

SEC. 2. The provisions of the Forest Exchange Act of March 20, 1922, as amended (42 Stat. 465; U. S. C., title 16, secs. 485, 486), are hereby made applicable to the areas described herein.

SEC. 3. This act shall become effective July 1, 1948.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 1, insert "range 3 west; sections 7 to 36, inclusive, township 36 north."

Page 2, line 14, strike out "36" and insert "26."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL INDUCEMENTS TO PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS IN THE UNITED STATES MILITARY, NAVAL, AND PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3851) to provided additional inducements to physicians and surgeons to make a career of the United States military, naval, and public health services, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING POWERS OF THE PRESIDENT UNDER TITLE III OF THE SECOND WAR POWERS ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3152) to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended and extended, shall continue in effect for the purpose of allocating the use of transportation equipment and facilities by rail carriers to and including June 30, 1948.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "June 30" and insert "January 31."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1005) to amend the Act of June 28, 1935, authorizing participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to make a brief statement with reference to the Interparliamentary Union, and to state that there seems to be a small clique or coterie of Members of the House and Senate who consistently go to the sessions of the Interparliamentary Union, and the rank and file of the Members of the House apparently have no such privilege.

I asked those in charge the terms and conditions of the Members who went to the sessions of the Interparliamentary Union recently held in Egypt. I was told that I would be informed suitably prior to the journey to Egypt. I registered a complaint that I was never informed. Then a few Members went, and no Member in general was asked to go. I think that is wrong and it is a misappropriation of the funds of the House, if every Member seeking to go does not have an opportunity to present his credentials.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. What the gentleman is stating is absolutely true. The time has come when the cards should be laid on the table.

Mr. CELLER. I am laying the cards on the table. For that reason I would like to have some explanation by those Members in the House with authority to speak with reference to the Interparliamentary Union. Unless I get some information, I shall object.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. If everybody is permitted to go to this Interparliamentary Union without any authorization from Members of Congress, I think you ought to object to it.

Mr. CELLER. Every Member does not care to go. There will be probably 10 or 15 Members who desire to go and they should be privileged to go, if there is such a thing as the Interparliamentary Union—and there is such a thing—and if we so desire we should be privileged to attend with other Members of other parliaments of the world and thrash out various world problems.

Mr. RICH. You have asked for information.

Mr. CELLER. And nobody has given as yet suitable information to me, and unless they do give it to me I shall object.

I was willing to go to Egypt and if necessary would have paid my own expenses. But I and nearly all Members were kept uninformed and in the dark.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. For the information of the gentleman and the Members of the House, a meeting was called by former vice president of the Interparliamentary Union, Senator BARKLEY.

Mr. CELLER. Where and when was that meeting?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee the gentleman from New Jersey, Dr. EATON, made an announcement on the floor and it was placed in the RECORD, as to when that meeting was to be held. The meeting was held and delegates to the meeting were elected.

Mr. CELLER. Who elected the members to the Interparliamentary Union? the chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey, Dr. EATON?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Every Member of the House and Senate are automatically members of the Interparliamentary Union. They were given notice to attend.

Mr. CELLER. Of course, if any announcement was made very few could have been present because the whole business was shrouded in mystery. Why was not an invitation extended to each Member instead of holding a meeting with a chosen few present?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. It is my understanding that the Members to go as delegates are selected and were selected

at the last session of Congress by the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House.

Mr. CELLER. What were the qualifications of the Members thus selected by the President pro tempore and by the Speaker? Have not all of us sufficient qualifications?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The only qualifications are that they be a Member of either body.

Mr. CELLER. I sought to go but was denied the privilege. I persisted in trying to get the necessary information, but got no invitation. I was not in the so-called esoteric circle.

Mr. RICH. They refused to let the gentleman go?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

EXTENDING VETERANS' PREFERENCE BENEFITS TO WIDOWED MOTHERS OF CERTAIN EX-SERVICEMEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1426) to extend veterans' preference benefits to widowed mothers of certain ex-servicemen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. This bill gives privileges that are already enjoyed by the widows of veterans to the widowed mothers of ex-servicemen. It gives them a civil-service preference of 10 points.

Mr. RICH. The gentlewoman means it is intended to extend that preference to mothers?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Widowed mothers only, mothers who might be dependent on the son. It gives them this preference to enter the civil service.

Mr. RICH. The ones now in the civil service or those who take examinations?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Yes; those who seek to come in.

Mr. RICH. They are to be given 10 points preference?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. But they must be widows.

Mr. RICH. It seems to me this is of such importance that it should be fully discussed on the floor of the House and not be passed by unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a semicolon and the following: "and (5) widowed mothers (if they have not remarried and were widows at the time of the death or disability of their ex-serviceman son)—

"(A) of deceased ex-servicemen who lost their lives while on active duty in any branch of the armed forces of the United States during any war, or in any campaign or expedition (for which a campaign badge has been authorized); or

"(B) of service-connected permanently and totally disabled ex-servicemen,

if said ex-serviceman was separated from such armed forces under honorable conditions."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2 after line 6 insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 2. Section 3 of the Veterans' Preferance Act of 1944 is amended by striking out 'and (3),' after the second comma in the first sentence, and inserting the following: '(3), and (5),'."

On page 2 after line 6 insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 3. Section 10 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 is amended by striking out 'and (3)' and inserting '(3), and (5).'"

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJUDICATION OF CERTAIN CLAIMS RESULTING FROM THE EVACUATION OF CERTAIN JAPANESE UNDER MILITARY ORDERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3999) to authorize the Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims resulting from evacuation of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is no doubt a meritorious bill, yet it could cost $360,000,000. I therefore ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL AID IN FISH RESTORATION AND MANAGEMENT PROJECTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1693) to provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish restoration and management projects, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

DOMESTIC MINERAL DEVELOPMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1602) to establish within the Department of the Interior a National Minerals Resources Division, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is now under consideration in the House. I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

RECOGNITION OF SERVICES OF EMPLOYEES ENGAGED IN CONSTRUCTION OF PANAMA CANAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2273) to amend the act of May 29, 1944, providing for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, this bill would involve the United States Government in a continuing obligation of about $300,000 a year. I therefore ask that the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AMENDING PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1020) to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation by the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, this bill amends the act passed a year ago to help in the rehabilitation of the Philippines. Among other things it set up a War Damage Commission to receive, process, and settle claims from individuals and firms for damages incurred during the war. Without assistance in rehabilitation, our 50 years' investment in the Philippines cannot be preserved.

The bill does three simple things. First, it amends the act so that the American personnel who are sent out on the War Damage Commission and will be there for the life of the commission, 4 more years, can accumulate annual leave up to a total of 90 days. That puts them on a par with Government employees in this country. There are not as many inducements to take such leave over there or places to go as employees here have. It is not fair to deny them the privilege of accumulating leave up to 90 days which they can spend here, if they wish, when they eventually come back to this country.

Second, it allows the commission to use the facilities of the Government of the Republic of the Philippines, which has replaced the Commonwealth of the Philippines which existed at the time the bill was passed.

Third, it increases the amount of the $400,000,000 authorization already enacted last year that may be used for administrative expenses. At the time the bill was prepared by the Committee on Insular Affairs 1 percent was allowed for administrative expenses, for examining the claims and so forth. At that time some of us thought it was too small to do a careful job but that is all they asked for. Now the claims are coming in in a flood and the Commission has asked for 4 percent of the total or $16,000,000 for administrative expenses. The

Senate passed the bill in that form but our committee thought there was no justification now for such an amount and cut the figure down to $8,400,000. It does not increase the total amount of money appropriated, it increases the percentage of the total that may be used by the Commission in processing claims in order to reduce to the minimum any fraud or improper expenditures.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is that roughly 2 percent?

Mr. JUDD. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

OVERTIME FOR SUPERVISORS IN POSTAL SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3075) to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the classification and compensation of employees of the postal service, so as to provide proper recompense in the form of compensatory time for overtime performed by supervisors.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act known as Public Law 134, Seventy-ninth Congress, entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, is amended as follows:

Section 3 is amended as follows:

"SEC. 3. When the needs of the service require employees to perform service on Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays, they shall be allowed compensatory time for such service on one day within five working days next succeeding the Saturday or Sunday and within 30 days next succeeding the holiday: *Provided*, That the Postmaster General may, if the exigencies of the service require, authorize the payment of overtime to employees other than supervisory employees whose base salaries are more than $3,600 per annum for services performed on Saturdays, Sundays, and Christmas Day during the month of December in lieu of compensatory time: *Provided further*, That supervisory employees shall be allowed compensatory time for services performed in excess of 8 hours per day, and those whose base salaries are more than $3,600 per annum shall be allowed compensatory time for services performed on Saturdays, Sundays, and on Christmas Day during the month of December within 180 days from the days such service was performed: *And provided further*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to employees of the railway mail service and the air-mail service, post-office inspectors, rural carriers, traveling mechanicians, examiners of equipment and supplies, clerks in third-class post offices, and employees paid on an hourly basis."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

SCHICK GENERAL HOSPITAL

The Clerk called House Concurrent Resolution 54.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

COMMUNIST PARTY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3623) to provide that members of the Communist Party shall be ineligible for veterans' benefits, and for other purposes.

Messrs. MARCANTONIO, CELLER, and KLEIN objected.

CITY OF EL PASO, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 489) for the relief of the city of El Paso, Tex.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the city of El Paso, Tex., the sum of $3,293.95. Such sum represents the amount of a judgment (plus interest and costs) rendered against the city of El Paso, in the case of Francisco Mendoza et al. against city of El Paso, Forty-first District Court, El Paso County, No. 53430, for damages on account of the death on June 9, 1943, of Lionides Rodolfo Mendoza, as a result of falling from a temporary walk on the Park Street Bridge over the Franklin Canal. Such canal and the bridges thereover are owned by the United States, and such temporary walk was constructed and was being maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation in connection with repair work which the United States was performing on such bridge, and not by the city of El Paso.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, after line 8, insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING COMPTROLLER GENERAL TO ALLOW CREDITS AND RELIEVE CERTAIN DISBURSING AND CERTIFYING OFFICERS OF THE WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1466) authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to allow credits to and relieve certain disbursing and certifying officers of the War and Navy Departments in the settlement of certain accounts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, there is on the Speaker's desk a similar Senate bill, S. 323, and I ask unanimous consent that this be substituted in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized, through such officer as he may designate, and within 2 years from the passage of this act, (a) to relieve disbursing and certifying officers, including special disbursing agents of the War and Navy Departments, from accountability or responsibility for losses, occuring between September 8, 1939, to July 1, 1945, of funds, or of accounts, papers, records, vouchers, or data pertaining to said funds, for which said officers or agents were accountable or responsible and (b) to allow credits, in the settlement of accounts of said officers or agents, for payments made in good faith on public account during said period, notwithstanding failure to comply with the requirements of existing law or regulations pursuant thereto: *Provided*, That in cases of losses or payments involving more than $2,500 the Comptroller General shall exercise the authority herein only upon the written recommendation of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, which recommendation shall be concurred in by the Attorney General if the amount exceeds $10,000 and which recommendation shall also set forth the facts relative to such loss or payment and shall state that such transaction, expenditure, loss, or payment appears to be free from fraud or collusion and incurred or made in good faith: *Provided further*, That the Comptroller General in all cases shall certify that such transaction, expenditure, loss, or payment appears to be free from fraud and collusion and incurred or made in good faith.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill (H. R. 1466) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPANDING FOREST USE IN ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1809) to facilitate the use and occupancy of national-forest lands, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture why the committee thought it desirable to propose a committee amendment to restrict this bill to Alaska?

Mr. HOPE. I might say to the gentleman that there was some opposition in the committee to the extension of this legislation to the national forests generally. There was no objection to the extension in Alaska, and the committee reported the bill with the amendment with the idea, I think, that in another year we may go into this entire question. But, there was a special case made out so far as Alaska was concerned.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to speak in opposition to the committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

AMENDING FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4071) to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LANDIS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

CONVEYING CERTAIN LAND TO MONTGOMERY COUNTY, PA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3862) to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to grant and convey to Montgomery County, Pa., a certain parcel of land of the United States in Norristown Borough, Montgomery County, Pa., for the purpose of erecting an additional annex to the present courthouse.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized to sell and convey to Montgomery County, Pa., at a purchase price of not less than 50 percent of the appraised value of the land as determined by the Federal Works Agency, a certain parcel of land, hereinafter described, which is a part of the property of the United States of America, upon which the Norristown post office is erected, said parcel of land to be held and used by the county of Montgomery for the purpose of erecting an additional annex to the present courthouse.

The aforesaid parcel of land is situated in Norristown Borough, Montgomery County, Pa., bounded and described in accordance with a plan and survey thereof, prepared for Montgomery County by Warren F. Cressman, county engineer, a registered professional engineer, February 12, 1924, and approved by the Board of Commissioners of Montgomery County, September 17, 1945, as follows to wit:

Beginning at a point on the northeasterly side of Penn Street (40 feet wide) at the distance of three hundred and fifty-two feet and ten and three-quarters inches northwestwardly from the northwesterly side of De Kalb Street (66 feet wide), said point being a corner in the property line of the United States of America post-office property and county of Montgomery property; thence extending along said property line north twenty-nine degrees eight minutes east one hundred and nine feet and one-half inch to a point, a corner of the above-mentioned properties and property of the Reformed Church of the Ascension; thence extending along the property line of the United States of America and the Reformed Church of the Ascension south sixty-one degrees ten minutes east eighteen feet and six and one-quarter inches to a point, a corner of the United States of America property and property of the Reformed Church of the Ascension; thence extending through the property of the United States of America south twenty-eight degrees forty-eight minutes west one hundred and nine feet and three-quarters of an inch to a point in the northeasterly side of the aforesaid Penn Street, the aforesaid line being a continuation of the property line of the Reformed Church of the Ascension property and property of the United States of America; thence along the said northeasterly side of Penn Street north sixty-one degrees seven minutes west nineteen feet and one and three-quarters inches to the place of beginning; containing two thousand and fifty-four square feet of land, more or less.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPOSING OF CERTAIN OBSOLETE COMBAT MATERIALS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 774) to amend an act to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to make certain disposition of condemned ordnance, guns, projectiles, and other condemned material in their respective Departments.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to make certain disposition of condemned ordnance, guns, and cannonballs in their respective Departments," approved May 22, 1896, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Treasury are each hereby authorized, in their discretion, to loan or give to soldiers' monument associations, posts of the Grand Army of the Republic, posts of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, posts of the American Legion, and other recognized war-veteran associations, State museums, and incorporated museums operated and maintained for educational purposes only, whose charter denies them the right to operate for profit, municipal corporations, and posts of the Sons of Veterans Reserve, condemned or obsolete ordnance, guns, projectiles, books, manuscripts, works of art, drawings, plans, models, and other condemned or obsolete material which may not be needed in the service of either of said Departments.

"Such loan or gift shall be made subject to rules and regulations covering the same in each Department, and the Government shall be at no expense in connection with any such loan or gift."

SEC. 2. All acts or parts of acts in conflict with this act are hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 11, strike out "ordnance, guns, projectiles" and insert "combat material."

Page 2, line 12, strike out "plans, models, and other condemned or obsolete material" and insert "plans and models."

Page 2, line 19, strike out lines 19 and 20 and insert:

"SEC. 2. The act of May 22, 1896, as amended, shall not be construed as altering, amending, or repealing the provisions of any other law under authority of which the President, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Treasury may dispose of Government material."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARCELS OF PUBLIC DOMAIN WHICH MAY BE SOLD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3971) to amend section 2455 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to increase the size of isolated or disconnected tracts or parcels of the public domain which may be sold, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the chairman of the subcommittee explain the purposes of this bill.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, this bill merely enlarges the acreage of isolated tracts that may be sold by the Department of the Interior. It merely involves those separate and distinct isolated tracts scattered throughout the West, that the Department of the Interior is very anxious to dispose of and to sell in the same manner as provided by existing law.

Mr. CARROLL. And this bill has the approval of the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. BARRETT. It has.

Mr. CARROLL. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FULTON. I object, Mr. Speaker.

TRANSFERRING SURPLUS REAL PROPERTY TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3703) to authorize transfer of surplus real property to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior for consolidation of Federal holdings within areas administered by the National Park Service.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any Federal ownings or disposal agency is authorized with the approval of the President of the United States, to transfer surplus real property or interest therein to the Department of the Interior without reimbursement or transfer of funds, having an aggregate appraised value not to exceed $500,000, upon determination by the Secretary of the Interior that it is in the Federal interest to consolidate such Federal holdings within areas administered by the National Park Service.

SEC. 2. Any real property or interest therein transferred pursuant to section 1 of this act shall become a part of the area with which it is consolidated and shall be subject to all the laws and regulations applicable thereto. The authorization conferred by this act, unless extended by Congress, shall expire July 1, 1952.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out line 3 and insert, "That any Federal agency administering real property surplus to its needs, or any other Federal agency or instrumentality holding such property for disposal only, is authorized."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITION OF CERTAIN OREGON LANDS, SILVER CREEK PROJECT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3684) to provide for the addition of certain revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands to the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project, in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 1348, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to carry out the purposes of the act of June 6, 1942 (56 Stat. 326; 16 U. S. C., secs. 459r–459t), relating to the disposition of recreational demonstration areas, and to effectuate

the transfer to the State of Oregon, pursuant to that act, of the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project, the following-described revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands shall hereafter be administered as a part of the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project and shall be subject to all of the provisions of the aforesaid act of June 6, 1942:

WILLAMETTE MERIDIAN

Township 8 south, range 1 east:
Section 13, east half southeast quarter and southeast quarter northeast quarter;
Section 25, all;
Section 35, north half northeast quarter northeast quarter and north half south half northeast quarter northeast quarter;
Township 8 south, range 2 east:
Section 17, south half southwest quarter and northwest quarter southwest quarter;
Section 19, lots 3, 4, and northeast quarter;
Section 29, west half; and
Section 31, north half;
comprising one thousand seven hundred and ninety-one and ninety-three one-hundredths acres.

SEC. 2. The following-described lands also shall become a part of the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project and shall be subject to the provisions of the act of June 6, 1942, upon acquisition of title thereto by the Oregon and California Revested Lands Administration:

WILLAMETTE MERIDIAN

Township 8 south, range 1 east: Section 36, northeast quarter, northwest quarter north half southeast quarter northwest quarter, north half south half southeast quarter northwest quarter, north half northwest quarter northwest quarter, and north half south half northwest quarter northwest quarter; comprising two hundred and sixty acres.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 3684) was laid on the table.

UNRESTRICTED DEEDS FOR ALASKA TOWN-SITE LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3503) to permit the issuance of unrestricted deeds for town-site lands held by Alaska natives, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the trustee or trustees to whom a patent has been issued for a town site surveyed pursuant to section 11 of the act of March 3, 1891 (26 Stat. 1095), or section 3 of the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 629), upon a finding by the Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative (a) that any Alaska native who claims and occupies a tract of land within such town site is competent to manage his own affairs and has petitioned the Secretary or his authorized representative for an unrestricted deed, or (b) that any such native has renounced, in such written form as the Secretary shall prescribe, any claim to membership in any native tribe, band, or community and any claim to special services from the Federal Government by reason of his being an Alaska native, shall issue to such native an unrestricted deed, and thereafter all restrictions as to sale, encumbrance, or taxation of said lands shall be removed, but said land shall not be liable to the satisfaction of any debt, except obligations owed the Federal Government, contracted prior to the issuing of such deed.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of all Federal laws, treaties, orders, and regulations pertaining to Indian affairs, or to the natives of Alaska as such, any Alaska native who has filed a relinquishment as provided in the preceding section shall, thereafter, be considered a non-Indian and a non-native, and shall be treated as removed from the operation of any restrictive provisions, special services, or other disabilities or privileges peculiarly applicable to Indians or natives of Alaska; and any person whose status as an Alaska native or Indian under Federal law has been so terminated shall not be eligible to reestablish such status for purposes of Federal surveillance or subsidy as an Alaska native or Indian, by reason of native blood, subsequent inheritance of restricted native lands, subsequent admission to membership in any native tribe, band, or community, or for any other reason.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PENSACOLA NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3416) to provide for the establishment of the Pensacola National Monument.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to acquire on behalf of the United States, by transfer, gift, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, the following parcels of land, together with any improvements thereon, now located in the harbor defenses of Pensacola on lands owned by the War Department, in Escambia County, State of Florida:

(1) Old Fort San Carlos and Old Fort Barrancas (approximate area 4 acres).

(2) Old Fort Redoubt (approximate area 4 acres).

(3) Old Fort Pickens (approximate area 5 acres).

SEC. 2. The property acquired under the provisions of section 1 of this act shall constitute the Pensacola National Monument, which is hereby established and set apart for the preservation of historical associations connected with Pensacola and its harbor defenses.

The Director of the National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall have supervision, management, and control of such national monument, and shall restore, maintain, and preserve it in a suitable and enduring manner which, in his judgment, will provide for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of the United States.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to maintain either in an existing structure acquired under the provisions of section 1 of this act or in a building constructed by him for the purpose a museum for relics and records pertaining to Pensacola and its harbor defenses and for other articles of national and patriotic interest, and to accept on behalf of the United States, for installation in such museum, articles which may be offered as additions to the museum.

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "Florida" insert ", not needed by either the War or Navy Department."

Page 2, line 4, after the word "act" insert "shall be held by the Secretary of the Interior pending determination by the said Secretary as to its national significance for national monument purposes. In the event that the said Secretary shall determine it to be in the national interest the area, upon the publication of a secretarial order in the Federal Register,"

Page 2, line 5, after the comma following the word "Monument", strike out the words "which is hereby established and."

Page 2, line 23, change "SEC. 4" to "SEC. 5," and insert a new section 4, as follows:

"In the event that the said Secretary shall determine that the area would be more suitably administered as a State historical park, the said Secretary is hereby authorized to transfer title to the land, and jurisdiction of the area, to the State of Florida: *Provided*, That the State shall perpetually maintain the area for State historical park use. In the event that the State shall ever abolish the historical park, or attempt to alienate the lands, title shall revert to the United States."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3218) to authorize an emergency fund for the Bureau of Reclamation to assure the continuous operation of its irrigation and power systems.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. I object, Mr. Speaker.

APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN UNITED STATES COMMISSIONERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2645) to provide that appointments of United States commissioners for the Isle Royale, Hawaii, Mammoth Cave, and Olympic National Parks shall be made by the United States district courts without the recommendation and approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 5 of the act entitled "An act to accept the cession by the State of Michigan of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Isle Royale National Park, and for other purposes," approved March 6, 1942 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, title 16, sec. 408m), is amended by striking out "upon the recommendation and approval of the Secretary of the Interior of a qualified candidate."

SEC. 2. The first paragraph of section 6 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the exercise of sole and exclusive jurisdiction by the United States over the Hawaii National Park in the Terrtiory of Hawaii, and for other purposes," approved April 19, 1930, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 16, sec. 395e), is amended by striking out "upon the recommendation and approval of the Secretary of the Interior of a qualified candidate."

SEC. 3. The first sentence of section 5 of the act entitled "An act to accept the cession by the Commonwealth of Kentucky of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Mammoth Cave National Park; to authorize the acquisition of additional lands for the park in accordance with the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 635); to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the development of a proper entrance road to the park; and for other purposes," approved June 5, 1942 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, title 16, sec. 404c-5), is amended by striking out "Upon the recommendation and approval of the Secretary of the Interior of a qualified candidate, the" and inserting in lieu thereof "The."

SEC. 4. The first sentence of section 5 of the act entitled "An act to accept the cession by the State of Washington of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within

the Olympic National Park, and for other purposes," approved March 6, 1942 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, title 16, sec. 256d), is amended by striking out "Upon the recommendation and approval of the Secretary of the Interior of a qualified candidate, the" and inserting in lieu thereof "The."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESEARCH LABORATORY IN NORTH DAKOTA LIGNITE REGION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2453) to provide for the establishment and operation of a research laboratory in the North Dakota lignite-consuming region for investigation of the mining, preparation, and utilization of lignite, for the development of new uses and markets, for improvement of health and safety in mining; and for a comprehensive study of the region to aid in the solution of its economic problems and to make its natural and human resources of maximum usefulness in the reconversion period and time of peace.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to have some explanation of this bill. It seems to me it is a pretty good program, and we ought to have it explained.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. LEMKE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, it was clearly shown before my committee that we will soon be at the end of our petroleum reserves, and this bill will help to get synthetic petroleum from rock shale and lignite, and many other materials that are at present very scarce and are needed for national defense. I therefore object to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. RICH. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, is authorized and directed to establish, equip, and maintain a research laboratory in the lignite-consuming region of North Dakota to conduct researches and investigations on the mining, preparation, and utilization of lignite coal and to develop new scientific, chemical, and technical uses and new and extended markets and outlets for lignite coal and its products. Such laboratory shall be planned as a center for information and assistance in matters pertaining to conserving resources for national defense and security; to the more efficient mining, preparation, and utilization of lignite coal; and pertaining to safety, health, and sanitation in mining operations and other matters relating to problems of the lignite industry.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this act the Secretary, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, is authorized to acquire land and interests therein, and to accept in the name of the United States donations of any property, real or personal, and to utilize voluntary or uncompensated services at such laboratory. The Secretary is authorized and directed to cooperate with other departments or agencies of the Federal Government, States, and State agencies and institutions, counties, municipalities, business or other organizations, corporations, associations, universities, scientific societies, and individuals, upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe.

SEC. 3. The Secretary, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, shall make a report to Congress at the beginning of each regular session of the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to, the laboratory established under this act.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, may, in his discretion, create and establish an advisory committee composed of not more than six members to exercise consultative functions, when required by the Secretary, in connection with the administration of this act. The said committee shall be composed of representatives of lignite coal-mine owners, of representatives of lignite coal-mine workers and the public in equal number. The members of said committee shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior without regard to the civil-service laws.

SEC. 5. In order to carry out the purposes of this act there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of (a) $750,000 for the erection and equipment of a building or buildings, including plumbing, lighting, heating, general service, and experimental equipment and apparatus, the necessary roads, walks, and ground improvement, and land for the site of the building if no land is donated; and (b) $250,000 annually for the maintenance and operation of the experimental station, including personal services, supplies, equipment, and expenses of travel and subsistence.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a research laboratory in the North Dakota lignite-consuming region for investigation of the mining, preparation, and utilization of lignite, for the development of new uses and markets, for improvement of health and safety in mining; and for a comprehensive study of the possibilities for increased utilization of the lignite resources of the region to aid in the solution of its economic problems and to make its natural and human resources of maximum usefulness in the reconversion period and time of peace."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAMMOTH CAVE NATIONAL PARK, KY.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2096) to amend section 11 of the act approved June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 317), relating to Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second paragraph of section 11 of the act approved June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 317, 319; 16 U. S. C., sec. 404c–11), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"In order to provide for acquisition of property on behalf of the United States, in accordance with the provisions of this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of not to exceed $350,000. Any of the funds appropriated pursuant to the provisions hereof which are not needed to acquire property as authorized by this section may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, be used to acquire lands and interests in lands required for the development of a proper and suitable entrance road to Mammoth Cave National Park, as authorized in section 12 of this act: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for road development or construction until after all the lands within the maximum boundaries as authorized by the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 635), have been acquired by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 7, after "this", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert the following: "act. The funds heretofore deposited in the Treasury under special fund receipt account 146664 shall, upon the passage of this act, be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER PARKWAY SURVEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1710) to authorize the survey of a proposed Mississippi River Parkway for the purpose of determining the feasibility of such a national parkway, and for other purposes.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I say to my colleague that the committee went into this particular bill carefully and reported it out unanimously with an amendment, however, reducing the amount of the authorization by $100,000. The clerk in writing up the report inadvertently did not include the amendments and reduce the amount mentioned by $100,000. In view of the amendment and in view of the fact this is purely a survey which would enable them to go ahead in an orderly way and coordinate other activities, would the gentleman withdraw his request and permit the bill to be considered at this time? Colleagues on both sides of the House have asked me to introduce the bill. I have no personal interest in this and am acting merely as a servant of the committee.

Mr. BUCK. Can the gentleman tell us what the cost of the survey is?

Mr. PETERSON. We have an amendment which I have sent to the Clerk's desk reducing the amount to a maximum of $150,000. It is not to exceed that. We anticipate that it will be even less than that, but this will enable the highway departments of the various States and the various Government departments to coordinate their activities. As I say, I am purely a servant of the committee. Colleagues on both sides of the House have asked me to introduce the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK]?

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I object.

INDIAN LIQUOR LAWS IN MINNESOTA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1049) to repeal certain acts of Congress, known as Indian liquor laws, in certain parts of Minnesota.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have an explanation of this bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, we are told that when the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock, the first thing they did was to fall on their knees and thank Providence for their safe deliverance. Then, they turned around and fell on the Indians.

I want to say to my friend from Kansas that we do not have any Indians left, as we understand the term, in Minnesota, except on what is known as the Red Lake Reservation, which would not be affected by this legislation. Under existing law, for instance, E. L. Rogers, a graduate of the University of Minnesota, and county attorney of Cass County, could not go in to buy a glass of beer because he has a strain of Indian blood. There is no such thing as a full-blooded Indian left in Minnesota, not even on the Red Lake Reservation. My authority for that statement is the Indian Bureau. The Indians were pretty well bleached out during the logging days, and we feel it is time to treat them as whites. I hope that the gentleman from Kansas will not object to consideration of the bill.

There is another point. The Indians have some very valuable lake shore property in that area, and I am sure the gentleman from Kansas has seen some of our beautiful lakes. It is impossible for them to lease or rent those lands to anyone for tourist resorts because, under the law, it would not be lawful for the lessee to sell even beer.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. REES. If this is such wonderful legislation as the gentleman seems to think, although he has not explained it yet, why does it just apply to Minnesota? Why not make it Nation-wide if it is such a good thing?

Mr. KNUTSON. Because as you go farther west, we have more and more preponderance of Indian blood. You see, up in our country the Indians are named McDonald, Schwartz, Olson, Casey, Le Due, and so forth. My Indian name is Give-we-Zance but I have long since discarded it as it is no good on legal documents, nor helpful in campaigns as my brethren have long since outgrown Indian terms and tribal customs. In any event, it is about time we began to treat them as white people. Our Indians are very much humiliated over being classified as incompetents. I say "Indians." Of course, that is what they are under the present practice; but these Americans resent very much being treated as an inferior race. They contributed more troops per capita in World War I and World War II than any other class. Why, they were even fighting for the preservation of the Union back in the sixties. Yet we keep on treating them as though they live in tepees and wigwams and wear moccasins and blankets. Among them we find locomotive engineers, farmers, mechanics, some are lawyers and doctors; they are about everything that the white man is. Once in a while one of them even robs a bank. I mention that to show that he is thoroughly civilized.

Mr. REES. I agree the Indian has not had a fair deal, as he is entitled to. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] suggested that we ought to see that he is given his rights for citizenship. I am in accord with his views. I think, however, we should take that up with the Department of the Interior. But I do not understand that the gentleman has made a case on legislation that seems of such great importance to him. If it is, he should get a rule and bring this bill in under a rule.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is of no personal importance to me, because I have no Indian blood in my veins. I am Nordic. I assume the gentleman is a Nordic. You know the Nordics love to regulate everybody and everything. That is their one failing. If a Nordic cannot handle liquor, he does not want anyone else to have it. I will admit I have to fight against myself continually, because I want to regulate everybody and everything. I used to think I would like to regulate the President, but in the last few days I have come to the conclusion that is too big a job for me. But I hope the gentleman will not offer objection to the present consideration of the measure. It is high time we give this belated justice to a fine people whom we have despoiled, and kept in involuntary confinement all too long.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I have the very highest respect for the gentleman, and with great reluctance I am going to ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter, in the State of Minnesota, section 2139, United States Revised Statutes, as amended by the act of June 15, 1938 (52 Stat. 696), now 25 United States Code 241, shall apply only to persons and transactions on the Indian reservations.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "on the Indian reservations" and insert "within the Indian country, which term shall include any Indian allotment while the title to the same shall be held in trust by the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPOSAL OF MATERIALS ON PUBLIC LANDS OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1185) to provide for the disposal of materials on the public lands of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have an explanation of what this bill provides.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of sand, stone, gravel, yucca, and several other materials from the public domain under the same rules and regulations that have been in effect for quite some time. Under the committee amendment, some other items have been added to the bill.

Mr. HOBBS. That is what I am interested in. What are those additional items and what is the whole thing about?

Mr. BARRETT. I may say they are yucca, manzanita, mesquite, cactus, and common clay. Most of these are peculiar to the Southwestern States and particularly Arizona and New Mexico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, may dispose of materials including sand, stone, gravel, and timber or other forest products, on public lands of the United States, if the disposal of such materials (1) is not otherwise expressly authorized by law, including the United States mining laws, (2) is not expressly prohibited by laws of the United States, and (3) would not be detrimental to the public interest. Such materials may be disposed of only in accordance with the provisions of this act and upon the payment of adequate compensation therefor, to be determined by the Secretary. Where the lands have been withdrawn in aid of a function of a Federal department or agency other than the Department of the Interior or of a State, Territory, county, municipality, water district, or other local governmental subdivision or agency, the Secretary of the Interior may make disposals under this act only with the consent of such Federal department or agency or of such State, Territory, or local governmental unit. Nothing in this act shall be construed to apply to lands in any national forest, national park, or national monument or to any Indian lands, or lands set aside or held for the use or benefit of Indians, including lands over which jurisdiction has been transferred to the Department of the Interior by Executive order for the use of Indians.

SEC. 2. Where the appraised value of the material exceeds $1,000, it shall be disposed of by the Secretary to the highest responsible qualified bidder by competitive bidding and publication of notice of the proposed disposal once each week for a period of at least 30 days in a newspaper of general circulation in the county in which the material is located. Where the appraised value of the material is $1,000 or less, it may be disposed of by the Secretary upon such notice and in such manner as he may prescribe.

SEC. 3. All moneys received from the disposal of materials under this act shall be disposed of in the same manner as moneys received from the sale of public lands.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "including", insert: "but not limited to."

Page 1, line 5, after the word "gravel", insert "yucca, manzanita, mesquite, cactus, common clay."

Page 2, line 5, insert *"Provided, however,* That, to the extent not otherwise authorized by law, the Secretary is authorized in his discretion to permit any Federal, State, or Territorial agency, unit, or subdivision, including municipalities, or any person, or any association or corporation not organized for profit, to take and remove, without charge, materials and resources subject to this act, for use other than for commercial or industrial purposes or resale."

Page 3, line 5, after the word "of", strike out "at least 30 days" and insert "four consecutive weeks."

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART]?

There was no objection.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, S. 1185 is a bill to provide for the disposal of materials on the public lands of the United States. These are the so-called unreserved public lands that are not included in National Parks, monuments, or reservations of any kind and for which there is now no legislative authority to dispose of such materials as sand, stone, gravel, and timber or other forest products.

During the emergency period, authority was granted by the Second War Powers Act to the Secretary of the Interior to make disposals of such materials in such manner as he deemed fit. Cutting rights to the valuable timber on these lands were sold on competitive bid to timber operators who harvested the mature timber on the lands in accordance with the specifications laid down by the Department. With no damage being done to the lands, the timber was cut and manufactured into lumber—timber which would have become overmature and decadent if allowed to stand.

With the expiration of the Second War Powers Act, the authority to dispose of these materials also expired. The Department of Interior now has many requests for cutting rights which are being held pending authorizing legislation.

It is estimated that there is a total of three and a half to five million acres of commercially productive forest land included in these small tracts of public land, with a potential yield of 6,000,000,000 feet. The value of this timber is approximated at twenty to twenty-five thousand dollars.

We have the assurance of the Department of Interior that all cutting of timber on this land will be on a scientific basis and will benefit the growth and yield of these forest stands.

This legislation interferes in no way with any existing regulation concerning public lands. There are 56 applications on file now with the Department of Interior for cuting rights to these timber tracts. If granted, it would mean a revenue to the Federal Government, provide badly needed lumber, and prevent needless waste of a resource.

Passage of S. 1185 will provide the Department with the statutory authorization to approve these sales and others.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill to those engaged in the lumber industry in the West and is important also from the standpoint of lumber conservation. At the present time there is no authorization for the Department of the Interior to sell timber and timber products on the public domain. Such authority did exist during the war under a temporary act which expired when the President proclaimed the cessation of hostilities on December 31, 1946. That act proved to be useful. Many tracts of public domain are scattered throughout the West, often intermingled with private timber holdings and Forest Service lands. These areas cannot be economically harvested unless harvested in conjunction with other adjacent areas. Unless the Secretary of the Interior has the authority to sell the timber it becomes overripe, falls down, and becomes a fire menace. This is a condition which certainly should not exist during the desperate lumber shortage this country is now facing. In addition, it is the practice of the Interior Department to require that any cutting on these public domain lands be done according to sustained-yield practices where that is practicable. I am glad to see the favorable action of the Congress on this bill before adjournment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, when Calendar No. 301 was before us a few minutes ago, a gentleman asked concerning the items which the committee had added and included in the bill. I would like to speak regarding one of those items which is a little-known product of the southwestern deserts likely to have great commercial value in the not-far-distant future. I am referring now to yucca, or Spanish bayonet, of which there are several varieties. Included under the general name of yucca is bear grass and several other kindred types of desert vegetation. This bill, H. R. 4079, would amend the Taylor Grazing Act in such a way as to permit the Secretary of Interior to sell that desert product whenever it is in demand or found to have commercial value.

Yucca is an interesting plant growing over a large area in the Pacific Southwest. It thrives on scant rainfall and does best at certain altitudes, but is quite generally found in parts of Arizona, Nevada, New Mexico, and west Texas. It is thought that it might be cultivated and produced more abundantly than in its wild state in the semiarid regions. The plant furnishes many useful products and may prove in coming years to be a valuable resource in the far southwest.

The leaves of yucca produce a high grade of hard fiber from which rope or binder twine may be made. Beargrass yields a soft fiber suitable for twine or even for burlap cloth. These things we have long imported from abroad, but they may be found growing in abundance in the Pacific Southwest, needing only American ingenuity to increase their supply and devise means of handling them in mass production at low cost. Apparently a recent invention enables the extraction of the fiber mechanically in mass production and at relatively low cost. Such being the case, only improved methods of harvesting the foliage and also possibly making the crop grow more abundantly is required now to produce a new American industry. The passage of this act today will make it possible to harvest this foliage where its growth is suitable for such, and that is a long step in making it commercially feasible.

This amazing desert plant, yucca, produces many byproducts, in addition to fiber, and it may well be that some of its byproducts will be found to be more valuable than its main product. In any event, Mr. Speaker, this bill today has great significance, and I am glad to support it on the floor of the House, just as I did in committee consideration.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEFERMENT OF CERTAIN IRRIGATION CONSTRUCTION CHARGES AGAINST LANDS UNDER THE FLATHEAD INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 753) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to defer the collection of certain irrigation construction charges against lands under the Flathead Indian irrigation project.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, a similar bill has been passed by the Senate. The purpose of both bills is to adjust certain accounts of the Flathead Indian Reservation. The Department is not yet ready to file justifications. The Senate bill extends the present status of those accounts until such time as the Indian Bureau can investigate them and report on them.

Mr. RICH. Does the Department of the Interior approve the bill?

Mr. D'EWART. The Department of the Interior does approve the bill.

Mr. RICH. The bill does not forego the collection of fees that should be paid eventually?

Mr. D'EWART. No; we are just leaving the situation as it is. Nothing is changed. It is only to give us an opportunity to get the justifications we need to perfect the claims.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any provisions of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and adjust irrigation charges on irrigation lands within projects on Indian reservations, and for other purposes," ap-

proved June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1803), the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to defer the collection of irrigation construction charges on the Flathead Indian irrigation project until January 1, 1949.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 13 (a) OF THE SURPLUS PROPERTY ACT OF 1944, AS AMENDED

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2239) to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (1) of section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by striking out subparagraph (C) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(C) Surplus property suitable for use in training and maintaining any civilian component of the armed forces may be sold or leased to the States, their political subdivisions, or tax-supported instrumentalities.

"(D) In fixing the sale or lease value of property to be disposed of under subparagraph (A), subparagraph (B), or subparagraph (C) of this paragraph, the Administrator shall take into consideration any benefit which has accrued or may accrue to the United States from the use of such property by any State, political subdivision, instrumentality, or institution."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "is", insert "hereby."

Page 1, line 4, beginning with the word "striking", strike out remainder of language of the bill, and insert the following:

"(3) Surplus property available and suitable for use in training and maintaining any civilian component of the armed forces may be disposed of to States, their political subdivisions or tax-supported instrumentalities, subject to such terms and conditions as the Administrator determines to be necessary to properly protect the interests of the United States. Such disposals shall be without monetary consideration, provided that the Government shall be reimbursed for such costs incident to the disposal of the property as the Administrator may deem proper, including the expense of removal of any machinery, equipment, or personal property not transferred as a part of such disposal."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRESUMPTION OF SERVICE CONNECTION FOR CHRONIC AND TROPICAL DISEASES OF VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3889) to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), parts I and II, as amended, to establish a presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill may be very good, but there is nothing in the report from the Veterans' Administration showing their position on the bill and no estimate of the cost. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

AMENDING RECLAMATION PROJECT ACT OF 1939

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2873) to amend certain provisions of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 2873, amends, first, the provisions of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, which specify the standards or feasibility which the Secretary must meet in authorizing a new project without coming to Congress for specific legislation, and, second, the provisions controlling the application of the power and other revenue which the Secretary receives from the project after it is built.

These provisions are found respectively in section I of the pending bill, which amends section 9 (a) of the 1939 act, and in section 2, which amends section 9 (c) of that act.

I direct the attention of the House to a new and dangerous provision at page 8, line 21. This is the authority given the Secretary to fix power rates on a 78-year authorization basis; that is, at such a level that it will take 78 years to repay the taxpayers' interest with 2½ percent interest. The period specified in the existing law is 50 years. Fifty years is also the period specified in the Boulder Canyon Project Act.

Seventy-eight years is too long a period. It is about the time from President Grant to President Truman. A project starting to pay out in 1947 would still be in debt in the year 2024.

Moreover, this period starts running all over again as to each new feature, such as a generator, which may be added to the project, and commences when that feature becomes revenue producing. The entire project may not pay out, consequently, for as much as 100 years.

The bill itself assumes that power contracts for periods as long as 78 years cannot be obtained. At page 8, line 15, the Secretary is given authority to make power leases or power sales contracts for a period of 50 years only. Yet in such a contract he can fix the rate, not to pay out the investment during the life of the contract, but 28 years after that contract has expired.

The 50-year repayment period in the existing law corresponds to the maximum life of bonds normally issued to finance power projects. I know of no Federal bonds having maturities of 78 years and doubt if any are now outstanding with maturities even approaching 50 years. The interest rate, fixed in this bill, 2½ percent, may be justified as approximating, or perhaps exceeding, the rate which the Government would have to pay on long-term bonds, but as no one has any intention of issuing 78-year bonds, it is foolish to prolong and delay to that extent the recovery of the money the Government will invest in these projects.

This period of 78 years allowed for the retirement of the power investment should be compared with the period of 50 years allowed by section 9 (d) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 for repayment of the irrigation investment, made up of a 10-year development period and a 40-year repayment period.

So far as I can find, this figure of 78 years is pulled out of the air. There is nothing in the committee report to explain it. This figure does not appear in any of the previous drafts of this bill. It appears, for the first time, after the hearings were ceased, and offering no explanation whatsoever. So far as I am advised, the figure of 78 years does not appear in any of the hearings on the bill, was not justified by any testimony, and its effect on the financing of particular projects has been given no study whatever by the committee.

The whole subject of power policies is of too much importance to be the subject of piecemeal legislation hastily enacted. The Boulder Canyon Project Act, which set a 50-year amortization period, was debated at length in four sessions of Congress. This bill, without a word of explanation, extends that period for new projects by 28 years, or over 50 percent, and, moreover, delegates to the Secretary the authority to commit the United States to investment of unlimited millions of dollars by an administrative finding that he probably can return the Government's power investment in that time, even though it is admitted that the longest sale contract he can expect to get is 50 years.

At the threshold of the atomic age, with the virtual certainty that energy will be generated on a large scale by atomic plants before this 78-year period has more than a third run its course, this is manifestly no time to extend the 50-year period now appearing in the law.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] may extend his own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] objected to the consideration of this bill on the Consent Calendar. I would like to feel that his objection was made without prejudice to the bill itself, with the possible exception of the 78-year-repayment period. It is only that a bill of this far-reaching importance should not pass without comment or discussion, thus suggesting to the other body, to which it would then go, that all its provisions meet with the approval, without reservation, of every Member of this House.

That is not the case. This has been a highly controversial subject for years. I think the gentleman from Colorado

[Mr. ROCKWELL], as chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], as chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, both deserve great credit for getting the controversy to a point where it is so nearly settled. I was a member of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation for 4 years, and I know the troubles we had with this problem. We worked on one bill, a year ago, for more than 6 weeks, and then reached no agreement. This bill, in its present form, still gives me deep concern. The existing law requires power features of reclamation projects to repay their cost within 50 years. This period was set in the act which authorized the Hoover Dam project, and was embodied in general law by the Reclamation Project Act of 1939.

The bill under consideration, when it was introduced, proposed to extend this period to 67 years. That was considered too long a time in the 1946 hearings already referred to above. I am informed that, after the end of extended committee hearings and discussions this year, a proposal was made and accepted by the committee that the period of repayment be lengthened to 78 years.

This period seems to me excessive and unsound. The period of 50 years, established by existing law, is in my opinion long enough.

Seventy-eight years, Mr. Speaker, is one-half the life of this Republic. Think, Mr. Speaker, of the scientific and industrial changes which have occurred in the 78 years just past. Seventy-eight years ago Ulysses S. Grant was entering upon his first term as President of the United States and James G. Blaine was the Speaker of this House. I call your attention to the fact that in 1869 there was not a single electric-power plant operating in the world.

But there are today in operation in the United States laboratories producing atomic energy. It takes no prophet to see that, perhaps as soon as 25 years, or at the latest, 50 years, cheaper atomic energy is likely to supersede hydroelectric plants as a source of commercial power. I am reliably informed that men responsible for great electric-power undertakings are, this very day, giving sober and thoughtful study to the question, how far in the future they should make financial commitments for their agencies. I am fully convinced that men who are responsible for the integrity of the Government's investments in power plants should have as much concern for the safety of the taxpayers' money as men who are engaged in the power business have for the future of their organizations.

I believe that 78 years is an unsound length of time. I think that 50 years should be the limit. I want to see this bill go through, but I want the 78 changed to 50. I want the interest component provisions to become law. I want the RECORD to show that this is the intention and desire of a large number of the Members of this House. That can only come about through an opportunity to discuss the bill on the floor before it is acted upon, and before it goes to the committee in the other body to which it will be referred for consideration and action there.

CERTAIN LANDS OF ACADIA NATIONAL PARK, MAINE, TRANSFERRED TO THE NAVY DEPARTMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3371) to transfer jurisdiction of certain lands comprising a portion of Acadia National Park, Maine, from the Department of the Interior to the Department of the Navy, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar bill (S. 1220) may be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That control and jurisdiction over the following-described lands now comprising a portion of the Acadia National Park, in the State of Maine, are hereby transferred from the Department of the Interior to the Department of the Navy: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall retain the right to approve the design of the buildings and structures to be placed thereon.

All that certain tract or parcel of land on Big Moose Island, Winter Harbor, Maine, which is bounded southerly and easterly by a chain link-security fence, and northerly and westerly by the waters of Pond Island Cove and Frenchman Bay, and which is more particularly described as beginning at a point on the shore at the high-water mark of Frenchman Bay on the southwesterly side of Big Moose Island, so-called, thence following the chain-link security fence as now erected by the three following courses and distances: North no degrees five minutes west nine hundred and fifty-three feet; thence north thirty degrees twenty-four minutes east one hundred and fifty-seven and seven-tenths feet; thence south eighty-nine degrees nine minutes east one thousand four hundred and fifty-five and three-tenths feet to a point and angle in the said security fence which bears north thirty-four degrees fifty-four minutes west and is fifty feet distant at right angles from a point in the center line of the National Park Service road known as the Big Moose Island Road; thence turning to the left and following the said security fence in a general northerly direction but everywhere parallel with and fifty feet distant from the center line of the said Big Moose Island Road three thousand five hundred feet more or less to the high-water mark on the shore of Pond Island Cove; thence in a generally westerly and southerly direction but everywhere following the high-water mark of Pond Island Cove and Frenchman Bay seven thousand four hundred and seventy feet more or less to the place of beginning; except that portion thereof, containing twenty-five and ninety-six one-hundredths acres, which was transferred to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Navy pursuant to the act of August 24, 1935 (ch. 644, 49 Stat. 795); the lands herein described containing one hundred and fifty-one and eighty-six one-hundredths acres after excluding the excepted portion.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to retransfer jurisdiction over the property described in section 1 of this act to the Secretary of the Interior in the event such property hereafter becomes surplus to the needs of the Department of the Navy, in which event it again shall become a part of Acadia National Park.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill and a motion to reconsider were laid on the table.

TO PROVIDE FACILITIES FOR TREATMENT OF TUBERCULOUS INDIANS IN MONTANA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2783) authorizing an appropriation for the construction, extension, and improvement of a State tuberculosis sanatorium at Galen, Mont., to provide facilities for the treatment of tuberculous Indians in Montana.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,500,000 for the purpose of cooperating with the State of Montana for the construction, extension, and improvement of a tuberculosis sanatorium at Galen, Powell County, Mont., to provide and make available, whenever required, for tuberculous Indians not less than 100 additional beds: *Provided*, That the expenditure of any moneys authorized to be appropriated hereunder shall be subject to the condition that the proper authorities of the said State of Montana shall promptly take necessary steps under the laws of the State of Montana to provide additional funds required to complete the construction, extension, and improvement, including regulation equipment, of the said sanatorium and shall submit proof of compliance with this provision to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs: *Provided further*, That plans and specifications for the construction, extension, and improvement of the said sanatorium first shall be furnished by the State authorities, without cost to the United States, to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for approval by him before any moneys appropriated pursuant to this authorization may be expended, and that upon compliance with this provision actual work shall proceed under the direction of the State officials and payment for such work in place shall be made monthly on vouchers properly certified by local officials of the Indian Service to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, whose determination and approval of the proper amount chargeable to any appropriation authorized hereunder shall be final and sufficient for such payment thereof: *Provided further*, That the said sanatorium so constructed, extended, and improved shall be maintained by the State of Montana and shall be available to all the Indian population of said State: *Provided further*, That the Commissioner of Indian Affairs will reimburse the State of Montana for the care and treatment of such tuberculous Indians who may be admitted to the sanatorium under the provisions of the Johnson-O'Malley Act, at rates not in excess of the average annual per diem cost of operation for the entire sanatorium: *And provided further*, That the Commissioner of Indian Affairs shall prescribe regulations covering the admission and care of Indian patients and that the standards of treatment afforded Indians in said sanatorium shall be equal to those for any other patient admitted to the sanatorium; the State of Montana by accepting the funds authorized to be appropriated hereby agrees to be bound by the regulations thus prescribed by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 7, strike out the word "Powell" and insert in lieu thereof the words "Deer Lodge."

On page 2, line 9, strike out the colon and the word "*Provided*" and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon.

On page 2, strike out all of lines 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, all of line 16 to and including the word "provision", and insert in lieu thereof the word "whereupon" and a comma.

On page 2, line 19, strike out the words "local officials of the Indian Service" and insert in lieu thereof the words "State officials."

On page 3, line 7, strike out the colon and insert in lieu thereof a period, strike out the balance of line 7 and all of lines 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RATES OF PENSION TO VETERANS OF INDIAN WARS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4055) to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to veterans of Indian wars and the dependents of such veterans.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

TAYLOR GRAZING ACT OF JUNE 28, 1934

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4079) to amend the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), as amended June 26, 1946 (49 Stat. 1976).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of what this bill does?

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, this bill changes the distribution of fees from that part of the public domain that is leased out by the Department of the Interior for grazing purposes. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the Appropriations Committee of this House has objected each year for the last 4 or 5 years because of the fact that under existing law the fees paid into the Treasury of the United States are insufficient to offset the cost of administration. This bill attempts to correct and will correct that situation.

Under existing law and under the fees in force prior to May 1 of this year $200,000 was paid into the Treasury of the United States to offset an appropriation of several times that amount. Under this bill there will be paid into the Treasury over $800,000 which will offset appropriations of about that amount of money. That is the sole purpose of the bill.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdrawn my reservation of objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, are there any other provisions in the bill relative to increasing the rates?

Mr. BARRETT. I may say to the gentleman that the fees were increased 60 percent on the first day of May this year.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The only provisions are the provisions the gentleman has referred to?

Mr. BARRETT. That is generally correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 3 of the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1270; 43 U. S. C., sec. 315b), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to issue or cause to be issued permits to graze livestock on such grazing districts to such bona fide settlers, residents, and other stock owners as under his rules and regulations are entitled to participate in the use of the range, upon the payment annually of reasonable fees in each case to be fixed or determined from time to time, and in fixing the amount of such fees the Secretary of the Interior shall take into account the extent to which such districts yield public benefits over and above those accruing to the users of the forage resources for livestock purposes. Such fees shall consist of a grazing fee for the use of the range and a range-improvement fee, which, when appropriated by the Congress, shall be available until expended solely for the construction, purchase, or maintenance of range improvements. Grazing permits shall be issued only to citizens of the United States or to those who have filed the necessary declarations of intention to become such, as required by the naturalization laws, and to groups, associations, or corporations authorized to conduct business under the laws of the State in which the grazing district is located."

SEC. 2. Section 10 of the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1273), as amended June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1978; 43 U. S. C., sec. 315i), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Except as provided in sections 9 and 11 hereof, all moneys received under the authority of this act shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, but the following proportions of the moneys so received shall be distributed as follows: (a) 12½ percent of the moneys collected as grazing fees under section 3 of this act during any fiscal year shall be paid at the end thereof by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State in which the grazing districts producing such moneys are situated, to be expended as the State legislature of such State may prescribe for the benefit of the county or counties in which the grazing districts producing such moneys are situated: *Provided*, That if any grazing district is in more than one State or county, the distributive share to each from the proceeds of said district shall be proportional to its area in said district; (b) 25 percent of all moneys collected under section 15 of this act during any fiscal year when appropriated by the Congress, shall be available until expended solely for the construction, purchase, or maintenance of range improvements; and 50 percent of all moneys collected under section 15 of this act during any fiscal year shall be paid at the end thereof by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State in which the lands producing such moneys are located, to be expended as the State legislature of such State may prescribe for the benefit of the county or counties in which the lands producing such moneys are located: *Provided*, That if any leased tract is in more than one State or county, the distributive share to each from the proceeds of said leased tract shall be proportional to its area in said leased tract."

SEC. 3. The first two sentences of section 11 of the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1273), are hereby amended to read as follows:

"That when appropriated by Congress, 33⅓ percent of all grazing fees received from each grazing district on Indian lands ceded to the United States for disposition under the public-land laws during any fiscal year shall be paid at the end thereof by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State in which said lands are situated, to be expended as the State legislature may prescribe for the benefit of public schools and public roads of the county or counties in which such grazing lands are situated. And the remaining 66⅔ percent of all grazing fees received from such grazing lands shall be deposited to the credit of the Indians pending final disposition under applicable laws, treaties, or agreements."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARKER RIVER NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE (MASS.)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4108) to reduce in area the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge in Essex County, Mass., and for other purposes.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

COLLECTION AND PUBLISHING OF STATISTICS OF COTTONSEED AND COTTONSEED PRODUCTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4109) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of cottonseed and cottonseed products, and for other purposes," approved August 7, 1916.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know whether this is going to be another census?

Mr. HESS. No. There is a census being taken at the present time, that is not mandatory, of these various oils, so that the census is not complete. This makes it mandatory so they may take a census of soybean and other oils for the benefit of the industry so that the industry will know about the production of these various oils.

Mr. RICH. What is the cost?

Mr. HESS. Twenty-five thousand dollars.

Mr. RICH. That is a lot of money.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill, S. 1497, be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of cottonseed and cottonseed products, and for other purposes," approved August 7, 1916 (39 Stat. 436; U. S. C., title 13, secs. 81 to 84, inclusive), is amended to read as follows:

"That (a) the Director of the Census is authorized and directed to collect, collate, and publish monthly statistics concerning—

"(1) the quantities of (A) cottonseed, soybeans, peanuts, flaxseed, corn germs, copra, sesame seed, babassu nuts and kernels, and other oilseeds, nuts, and kernels received, crushed, and on hand at oil mills; (B) crude and refined oils, cakes, and meals, and other primary products, by type or kind, of the above-mentioned seeds, nuts, and kernels manufactured, shipped out, and on hand at oil mills and processing establishments; (C) crude and refined vegetable oils, by type or kind, used by class of product and held by manufacturers of vegetable shortening, margarine, soap, and other principal products using large quantities of vegetable oils; (D) crude and refined vegetables oils, by type or kind, held in warehouses and in transit to consuming establishments;

"(2) the quantities, by types or kinds, of (A) animal fats and oils and greases produced; (B) animal fats and oils and greases shipped and held by producers; (C) animal fats and oils and greases, fish and marine mammal oils used by class of product and held by manufacturers of shortening, margarine, soap, and other principal products which require the use of large quantities of animal fats and oils and greases, fish and marine mammal oils; (D) animal fats and oils and greases, fish and marine mammal oils held in warehouses, cold storage, and in transit to consuming establishments.

"(b) Nothing in this section shall be construed to require the Director to collect, more frequently than he deems necessary to provide reliable statistical reports, information from any person who produces, holds, or consumes fats and oils in inconsequential quantities.

"SEC. 2. The inquiries, and the number, form, and subvisions thereof for the censuses and surveys provided for in this act, shall be determined by the Director of the Census with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce.

"SEC. 3. All information furnished to the Bureau of the Census by any individual establishment under the provisions of this act shall be considered as strictly confidential and shall be used only for the statistical purposes for which it is furnished, and shall not be used for any other purpose. Any employee of the Bureau of the Census who without the written authority of the Director of the Census, shall publish or communicate any information given into his possession by reason of his employment under the provisions of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

"SEC. 4. It shall be the duty of each owner, official, agent, or person in charge of any mill, or of any manufacturing or wholesale establishment or warehouse, or cold-storage establishment, engaged in the activities set forth in subsection (a) of section 1, and when requested by the Director of the Census or by an employee of the Bureau of the Census acting under instructions of said Director, to answer correctly, to the best of his ability, all questions of the census schedules submitted to him under the provisions of this act. Any owner, official, agent, or person in charge of any mill, or of any manufacturing or wholesale establishment or warehouse, or cold-storage establishment, engaged in the activities set forth in subsection (a) of section 1, and who shall refuse or willfully neglect to answer any questions of the census schedules submitted to him under the provisions of this act or shall willfully answer any such questions falsely shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $1,000. The request of the Director of the Census may be made by registered mail, by telegraph, by visiting representative, or by one or more of these, and if made by registered mail or by telegraph the return receipt therefor shall be prima facie evidence of an official request.

"SEC. 5. The Director of the Census shall not by this act be restricted or limited from collecting and publishing under the general authority of the Bureau such statistics on fats and oils or products thereof not specifically herein required as is deemed to be in the public interest.

"SEC. 6. Statistics now required under existing Federal law to be collected by any other Federal department or agency in a manner comparable both as to form and period of time to the collection of statistics provided for herein shall not be collected by the Director of the Census under the authority of this act: *Provided*, That immediately upon his request, the Director of the Census shall have access to any such statistics and shall include them in the publication required herein."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill (H. R. 4109) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR NATIONAL CEMETERY IN EVERY STATE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1109) to provide for one national cemetery in every State and Territory and such other national cemeteries in the States and Territories as may be needed for the burial of war veterans and certain other persons as provided for in section 281, title 24, United States Code, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FULTON. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment? I would like to have the author of this bill explain it. As I understand there is not a national cemetery in every State, but there will be nine national cemeteries chosen in strategic spots and located rather equidistant all over the United States.

Mr. FULTON. While I have every respect for the opinion of the gentleman from Missouri and his able views on the subject, I nevertheless object to national cemeteries, but will withhold my objection until it is explained.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman going to object anyway?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I object, Mr. Speaker. I think the gentleman from Missouri is talking about an entirely different bill.

Mr. SHORT. That is the information I wanted earlier.

Mr. FULTON. I want my objection noted.

REDUCING AREA OF GILA FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1597) to relocate the boundaries and reduce the area of the Gila Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the author explain what it is going to cost the Federal Government in taking over these lands.

Mr. MURDOCK. An authorization in the bill is for $380,000, which will more than cover the three items of expense shown in the Secretary's letter of approval. Some of this land which is to be taken over has reverted to the desert, but some of it has been taken over by Yuma County for taxes. These farms were prosperous a few years ago, but they depended upon wells for water which became salty. Then there are two districts that have facilities which have been appraised by the Bureau of Reclamation at the amounts indicated, so that the cost of these will be borne at first by the Government and, of course, that will be repayable when the land is irrigated and furnished for settlers. These settlers will be veterans as they have preference by law.

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman will remember, when I was on the Committee on Appropriations and serving on the subcommittee of the Department of the Interior, I objected then strenuously to taking over all this Gila Valley agricultural center down in your State, and I did not want you to take it over, but you tried to take over the whole State. Now, you come back, and you want us to release it and pay $377,448. I certainly would be anything but consistent to permit this bill to go through. I could not do that. I objected to you at the time you took it over, but you wanted it then. Now you have got it, and I think you ought to keep it.

Mr. MURDOCK. I hope the gentleman will let me make an explanation. This bill provides for a much better project than the original project. It will be much smaller in size, will cost less to complete, and will require less water. I hope the gentleman will consider these things.

Mr. RICH. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I greatly regret that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has objected to my bill, H. R. 1597, pertaining to the Gila reclamation project. I feel sure when the gentleman has given this further study that he will remove his objection and permit it to pass the House under unanimous consent, as it has already passed the Senate under unanimous consent. I notice that the Members who have given closest study to this bill raised no objection. I recall also that after extensive hearings the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the House Public Lands Committee, on July 12, reported the bill to the main committee without a dissenting vote. I would like to remind my colleagues, and especially the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that the Public Lands Committee of the House, on July 14, reported this bill without a dissenting vote. It is recognized by all of this committee that it is a meritorious measure and should be adopted at this session.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] does not think well of the original Gila project. Apparently he thought we were including too much land

10 or 12 years ago and that some of it was not good land for reclaiming. Now 10 years ago I enthusiastically supported the original Gila reclamation project which was made to include 150,000 acres in Yuma County, Ariz., lying near the city of Yuma. Most of the project as originally planned was up on the Yuma Mesa, stretching away toward the mountains to the east and southeast. True, that mesa land was sandy and considered by some not good soil. I have always had faith in that land and would like to own some of it myself, if there were sufficient water supply, but I recognize—and we all must recognize—that the rich alluvial bottom lands along the river are better lands than the sandy mesa lands. Therefore, this bill would change the boundaries and include the bottom lands.

In 1937, when the Gila project was authorized, these rich bottom lands were being farmed and were highly productive and prosperous. There was no thought then of including them within the Gila project, and their owners did not ask to be included, because they had their own water supply from wells and their own irrigation system, developed through private enterprise. They had borrowed money and organized on an extensive scale. They built nice farm homes and had modern school buildings and churches, but alas—a thing which they could not foresee happened.

Their wells ceased to give good water and furnished only such salty water that humans and animals could not drink it and plants could not grow in it. Various irrigation projects, some privately owned and some developed by the Government, had deprived these farmers along the lower Gila of their good water. This caused many farms to revert to the desert, and many of these farms were sold for taxes. The soil was as good as ever, needing only water, sweet water instead of the foul water which the wells now produced. A few miles to the west is the Colorado River, carrying millions of acre-feet of water right past Yuma to the Gulf of California. Their salvation depends upon getting some river water.

Now the purpose of this bill is to change the boundary lines of the original Gila project, eliminating some of the higher and poorer lands on the mesa and including these rich farm lands now distressed in lieu thereof. This bill would eliminate 114,000 acres of mesa land and include instead 75,000 acres of bottom land. The neighboring State of California has watched this problem with jealous eyes, since there is only a limited supply of water. But even the most alert California water authority agrees that it is better to give up 114,000 acres of land on the mesa and include instead 75,000 acres of the alluvial bottom lands which have already been farmed. Only shortage of water prevents our adding the 75,000 acres of bottom lands without eliminating any on the mesa. I understand that none of Arizona's neighbors are offering opposition to this bill in its present form. Therefore, I trust that another opportunity may present itself for the passage of the bill at this session.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania is interested in the cost, and rightfully so. This bill will call for a smaller expenditure to complete the project than would the original project require for completion. In another financial sense, this bill would mean much more in dollars and cents to the United States Treasury, besides costing less for the development by the Bureau of Reclamation. Let it not be forgotten that every dollar the Government spends on this, as on other reclamation projects, is reimbursable and is returned eventually to the Treasury. But in a still more significant sense, this Gila project, in either its old or its new form, offers opportunity, in fact the last chance, to utilize waters of the Colorado River before they leave our borders to flow to Mexico and the Gulf of California. It is conservative to say that one acre-foot of water placed on the land through irrigation any place in the Pacific Southwest, in the valleys of southern Arizona, southern California, or southern New Mexico, will produce annually $20 in cash crop. For every million acre-feet of water we permit to go unused past the city of Yuma each year, we are throwing away $20,000,000 in value, which is not an unimportant item to be considered here. The worst way to save money for the Government that I know of is to oppose this bill.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to address a question to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL] who is chairman of the Subcommittee of the House Public Lands Committee which had this bill in charge. I wish to direct his attention to the following language in the committee report—Report No. 910 on H. R. 1597, page 3:

> These provisions are for the sole purpose of fixing the maximum acreage of the project and shall not be construed as interpreting, affecting, or modifying any interstate compact or contract with the United States for the use of Colorado River water or any Federal or State statute limiting or defining the right to use Colorado River water of or in any State.
>
> It is the intent of the committee that nothing in this bill is to be construed as affecting the rights of the States of Arizona or California as to the use of the amount of water in the lower Colorado River Basin, that each State is entitled to under the existing compact, contracts, or law. The committee feels the dispute between these two States on the lower Colorado River Basin should be determined and settled by agreement between the two States or by court decision because the dispute between these two States jeopardizes and will delay the possibility of prompt development of any further projects for diversion of water from the main stream of the Colorado River in the lower Colorado River Basin.
>
> Therefore, the committee recommends that immediate settlement of this dispute by compact or arbitration be made, or that the Attorney General of the United States promptly institute an action in the United States Supreme Court against the States of the lower basin, and any other necessary parties, requiring them to assert and have determined their claims and rights to the use of the waters of the Colorado River system available for use in the lower Colorado River Basin.

I requested the committee to make this statement of policy because of the pendency of the central Arizona project bills, H. R. 1616 and S. 1175. In view of the importance of the language of the committee report, I will appreciate it if the gentleman from Colorado will make a statement for the record of the intent of the committee with respect to this legislation.

Mr. ROCKWELL. The report which you have just read was adopted by our Irrigation and Reclamation Committee. It seemed to our committee that the Santa Fe compact granted beyond reasonable doubt the right of the State of Arizona to the amount of water specified in the present bill. The State of California apparently agreed. It does appear, however, that there should be a further determination of the amount of Colorado River water available not only to Arizona but to California before our committee acts upon future reclamation project in either State.

GENERAL WELFARE OF KLAMATH INDIANS IN OREGON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2502) to provide for the general welfare and advancement of the Klamath Indians in Oregon.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

PERMIT MINING LOCATIONS, HARNEY NATIONAL FOREST

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2867) to permit, subject to certain conditions, mining locations under the mining laws of the United States within that portion of the Harney National Forest, designated as a game sanctuary, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, could we have an explanation of this bill as to whether this is not just the taking over of our national forests for commercial usage.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No; it is not. It is what has been done for 9 years under the policy established by the Department of Agriculture. Last fall somebody decided that maybe the Secretary of Agriculture in 1933 had not been on sound ground from a legal standpoint. So this is a bill which in effect legalizes what has been done for the last 9 years, under which an important amount of mica was produced for national defense during the war, I may say to the gentleman.

It sets up additional conditions or requirements, over those which normally apply in a national forest, for the removal of ores from that part of the Harney National Forest which is a game sanctuary. It specifically prohibits the taking of timber or the pollution of streams; it even prohibits the erection of

mills or doing anything which would interfere with the propagation of wildlife. And, finally, it prohibits the issuance of a mining patent to any part of the sanctuary area whereas mining locations in other parts of national forests, of course, can be patented. It also prohibits even the removal of ore or any mining operations within 600 feet of a highway, following the conditions in that respect which were laid down when the original policy in this forest was established in 1938 by the Secretary of Agriculture upon the basis of a resolution adopted by the Custer State Park Board and others who were interested in conservation as well as in mining. The area is not large, I may say; it is a sort of adjunct to the State park in which no mining at all is permitted.

The bill was reported on favorably by both the Department of the Interior and Department of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture very positively recommended enactment of the bill; the Secretary of the Interior said he had no objection to its passage, recognizing that a special situation existed with respect to this particular area. The tract, the gentleman understands, is in a national forest which is administered by the Department of Agriculture although the mining laws are administered by the Department of the Interior. That is the reason for reports by both Departments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FULTON. I object, Mr. Speaker.

JACKSON HOLE NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1330) to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument as created by Presidential Proclamation No. 2578, dated March 15, 1943, and to restore the lands belonging to the United States within the exterior boundaries of said monument to the same status held immediately prior to the issuance of said proclamation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FULTON, Mr. MARCANTONIO, and Mr. HUBER objected.

UTILIZATION OF CERTAIN WAR DEPARTMENT-OWNED MILITARY REAL PROPERTY AS NATIONAL CEMETERIES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 272) to provide for the utilization of surplus War Department-owned military real property as national cemeteries, when feasible.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BARRETT. Will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. KEAN. I withhold the objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BARRETT. May I say to the gentleman that the War Department is in a terrible predicament at the present time. That Department certainly needs this legislation. There are but few tracts that could qualify under this law.

Mr. KEAN. If the War Department and the people who wrote the bill would limit the number of cemeteries, we might consider it, but under this bill there is no limit to the number of cemeteries the Secretary of War can build.

Mr. BARRETT. The report shows that they propose to use but five additional cemetery sites, and all of them are on surplus property of the United States and located in the highly populated States.

Mr. KEAN. That is what the former Secretary of War wants to do, but we have a new Secretary now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

OSAGE INDIANS WHO SERVED IN WORLD WAR II

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3325) to enable Osage Indians who served in World War II to obtain loans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of section 6 of the act approved February 27, 1925 (43 Stat. 1008), as amended by section 5 of the act approved March 2, 1929 (45 Stat. 1478), which make invalid contracts of debt entered into by certain members of the Osage Tribe of Indians, shall not apply to any debt contracted pursuant to title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 by any member of such tribe who, by reason of his service in the armed forces of the United States during World War II, is eligible for the benefits of such title III; and any other member of the Osage Tribe upon attaining the age of 21 years may contract a valid debt without approval of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That the Osage lands and funds and any other property which has heretofore or which may hereafter be held in trust or under supervision of the United States for such Osage Indians not having a certificate of competency shall not be subject to forced sale to satisfy any debt or obligation contracted or incurred prior to the issuance of a certificate of competency.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 10 after "to", insert "lien, levy, attachment, or."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PEANUT MARKETING QUOTAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4124) to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CARROLL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. PACE. The Secretary of Agriculture under the authority of the Agricultural Adjustment Act has proclaimed peanut marketing quotas for the 1948 crop. Under the present law the penalty for excess production of peanuts is 3 cents per pound. This bill changes the penalty to 50 percent of the support price, as is now provided in the case of wheat, cotton, and corn.

Second, it defines the marketing quota as the actual production on the allotted acreage. The present law provides for either the actual production or the normal yield. This change is necessary because throughout the war no records have been kept on yields. Therefore, there could be no way of testing the normal yield requirement.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Does this have the unanimous approval of the gentleman's committee?

Mr. PACE. It does. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] is author of the bill and it carries the recommendation of the Department of Agriculture. They regard these changes as necessary to effectively carry out the program in 1948.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 358 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (U. S. C., title 7, sec. 1358), is amended by striking the last sentence of subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The amount of the marketing quota for each farm shall be the actual production of the farm acreage allotment, and no peanuts shall be marketed under the quota for any farm other than peanuts actually produced on the farm."

SEC. 2. Section 359 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (U. S. C., title 7, sec. 1359), is amended as follows:

(1) By changing the first sentence of subsection (a) to read as follows: "The marketing of any peanuts in excess of the marketing quota for the farm on which such peanuts are produced, or the marketing of peanuts from any farm for which no acreage allotment was determined, shall be subject to a penalty at a rate equal to 50 percent of the basic rate of the loan (calculated to the nearest tenth of a cent) for farm marketing quota peanuts for the marketing year August 1–July 31).

(2) By striking out the last sentence of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Peanuts produced in a calendar year in which marketing quotas are in effect for the marketing year beginning therein shall be subject to such quotas even though the peanuts are marketed prior to the date on which such marketing year begins. If any producer falsely identifies or fails to account for the disposition of any peanuts, an amount of peanuts equal to the normal yield of the number of acres harvested in excess of the farm acreage allotment shall be deemed to have been marketed in excess of the marketing quota for the farm, and the penalty in respect thereof shall be paid and remitted by the producer. If any amount of peanuts produced on one farm is falsely identified by a representation that such peanuts were produced on another farm, the acreage allotments next established for both such farms shall be reduced by that percentage which such amount was of the respective farm marketing quotas, except that such reduction for any such farm shall not be made if the Secretary through the local committees finds that no person connected with such farm caused, aided, or acquiesced in such marketing; and if proof of the disposition of any amount of peanuts is not furnished as required by the Secretary, the acreage allotment next established for the farm on which such peanuts are produced shall be reduced by a percentage similarly computed.

(3) By striking subsection (b) and redesignating subsections (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g), as subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f), respectively.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FORT SUMNER IRRIGATION DISTRICT, N. MEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3834) to authorize a project for the rehabilitation of certain works of the Fort Sumner irrigation district in New Mexico, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of providing water for the irrigation of approximately 6,500 acres of arid lands on the Pecos River in New Mexico, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to rehabilitate, operate, and maintain in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) the irrigation system of the Fort Sumner irrigation district of New Mexico and to construct all necessary works incidental thereto: *Provided*, That the project shall not be initiated until contracts satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior shall have been executed with—

(a) An irrigation or conservancy district, satisfactory in form and powers to the Secretary and embracing the lands of the project as determined by him, obligating the district, among other things, (i) to repay to the United States without interest the cost of rehabilitating and constructing the project, the terms to be such as will secure repayment as rapidly as, in the judgment of the Secretary, the district can reasonably be expected to make repayment and, in any event, within the useful life of the project; (ii) to pay for or otherwise provide adequate operation and maintenance, including replacements, of the project works during the period of the contract; and (iii) to furnish the Secretary with such control over and access to project works which are owned by or within the control of the district as he may require in order to safeguard the investment of the United States in the project; and

(b) The holder or holders of at least 90 percent of the outstanding general obligation bonds of the Fort Sumner irrigation district providing for such refinancing or cancellation of those bonds and scheduling of payments of principal and interest called for thereby as the Secretary believes necessary in order to insure fulfillment of the obligations required under (a) above.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MISSION POINT LIGHTHOUSE RESERVATION, GRAND TRAVERSE COUNTY, MICH.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3619) relating to the sale of the Mission Point Lighthouse Reservation, Grand Traverse County, Mich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 or of any other law, the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to sell all that tract or parcel of land lying in lots 1 and 2 of section 23, township 30 north, range 10 west, in the county of Grand Traverse and State of Michigan, containing five and thirty-eight one-hundredths acres of land, more or less, together with all buildings, structures, and improvements thereon (known as the Mission Point Lighthouse Reservation), in the manner and subject to the terms and conditions provided in the act entitled "An act to authorize the sale of Federal buildings," approved August 26, 1935 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 40, sec. 345b).

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after "sell", insert "for use as a public park."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETIREMENT OF REGULAR ARMY PERSONNEL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2744) to provide for the selection for elimination and retirement of officers of the Regular Army, for the equalization of retirement benefits for members of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to explain what this bill does and would appreciate it if the gentleman would withhold his request.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is going to cost $6,000,000 and establishes a very important policy. I do not think it ought to be on the Consent Calendar. It involves $6,000,000 and perhaps a great deal more.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration was given exhaustive hearings in the Seventy-eighth Congress. Also it does not involve a cost of $6,000,000 a year till 1957. The cost in 1948 will be about $1,500,000.

Mr. KEAN. If the gentleman will pardon an interruption, that is a very good reason why the bill should also have the exhaustive attention of the House and not be considered on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, if I may explain the bill, you may agree that it could properly be passed by consent. We had very exhaustive hearings on the bill in this Congress. The bill passed the last Congress in almost the identical form, by a unanimous vote. The cost of this bill to which the gentleman objects is estimated at $1,500,000 a year starting in 1948 and going up to $6,500,000 in 10 years.

The bill provides briefly for a plan to eliminate incompetent and inefficient Regular Army officers. That is a problem that the War Department has been struggling with for 27 years. We think we have a good solution for that problem, a solution which will make money for the Government.

The second part of the bill provides for a retirement plan for the Regular Army, raising the present retirement from 15 years to a minimum of 20 years and providing for 2½ percent of the pay of the rank of the individual at the time of retirement, but not more than 75 percent of the pay of the rank at retirement.

The third part of the bill is the important part, in view of the explosive and dangerous conditions in which we find ourselves today. We provide a general plan of retirement for the Reserve components of the Army and Navy. That is something that has never been done before, and we believe it will provide the reserves which will keep America ready for trouble at any time. This is a plan to allow us later to reduce our Regular Army Establishment. This will provide for nominal amounts of retirement pay at the time the man reaches the age of 60 years, providing that he has a minimum of 20 years of service in the Reserve component, at least three of which have been in active service.

It is a very important bill. It is a bill that has had considerable thought, and exhaustive hearings have been held on it. It was recommended by every single group in our country that is interested in national defense.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Does not the gentleman believe that by the very nature of this bill and its importance that it ought to be discussed fully by the membership of this body?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It means putting the bill over to next winter and delaying the matter 6 months.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN]?

There was no objection.

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3043) to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote the orderly development and use of the lands and interests therein acquired by the United States in connection with the Crab Orchard Creek project and the Illinois ordnance plant in Williamson, Jackson, and Union Counties, Ill., consistent with the needs of agriculture, industry, recreation, and wildlife conservation, all of the interests of the United States in and to such lands are hereby transferred to the Secretary of the Interior for administration, development, and disposition, in accordance with the provisions of this act.

SEC. 2. All of the lands transferred to the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to the provisions of this act, first shall be classified by him with a view to determining, in cooperation with Federal, State, and public or private agencies and organizations, the most beneficial use that may be made thereof to carry out the purposes of this act, and thereafter such lands as may be properly utilized for the development of agricultural, industrial, and related purposes shall be sold or otherwise disposed of at such times and under such terms and conditions, including exchange as authorized by section 302 of the act of June 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 381; 16 U. S. C. 715d–1), as are deemed to be in the best interests of the United States and consistent with the purposes of this act. All lands not sold or otherwise diposed of shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, through the Fish and Wildlife Service, as a wildlife management area in accordance with and subject to the provisions of, the act of August 14, 1946, and acts supplementary thereto and amendatory thereof.

SEC. 3. All moneys received by the Secretary of the Interior from the sale or other disposition of lands in accordance with the provisions of this act, shall be credited to the then current appropriations for the

administration of wildlife refuges and shall remain available until expended for the administration, maintenance, and development of such of the lands as are made available by this act for administration as a wildlife management area.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 8, after the words "purposes of this act", strike out the remainder of section 2 and insert in lieu thereof the words "including the development of wildlife conservation, agricultural, recreational, industrial, and related purposes. Such lands as have been or may hereafter be determined to be chiefly valuable for industrial purposes shall be leased for such purposes at such times and under such terms and conditions as are consistent with the general purposes of section 2 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, and with the purposes of this act. Except to the extent otherwise provided in this act, all lands herein transferred shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior through the Fish and Wildlife Service in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 14, 1946 (Public Law 732, 79th Cong.) and acts supplementary thereto and amendatory thereof for the conservation of wildlife, and for the development of the agricultural, recreational, industrial, and related purposes specified in this act."

Page 2, line 23, strike out the words "sale or other disposition of lands," and insert in lieu thereof the words "lease of lands chiefly valuable for industrial purposes."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York: Page 3, line 12, the period at the end of section 2, as reported by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, is changed to a colon, and the following is added: "*Provided*, That no jurisdiction shall be exercised by the Secretary of the Interior over that portion of such lands and the improvements thereon which are now utilized by the War Department directly or indirectly until such time as it is determined by the Secretary of War that utilization of such portions of such lands and the improvements thereon directly or indirectly by the War Department is no longer required: *Provided further*, That, subsequent to the determination referred to in the preceding proviso, the lands and improvements mentioned therein shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, and any lease or other disposition thereof shall be made subject to such terms, conditions, restrictions, and reservations imposed by the Secretary of War as will, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, be adequate to assure the continued availability for war-production purposes of such lands and improvements."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York: On page 3, line 13, strike out all of section 3.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORT PRICE FOR MILK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3370) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of milk at not less than $3.10 per hundred pounds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, this involves a question of policy, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think in fairness at least the committee ought to know what the bill provides.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. This does not change policy at all.

Mr. KEAN. It puts milk in with all of the other things.

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; it does not. Milk already comes under the terms of the Steagall amendment. Any commodity where the Secretary of Agriculture has asked the farmers to expand their production for war purposes comes under the Steagall amendment, and the support price is 90 percent of that parity. All we ask in this case is that the Secretary of Agriculture set parity on milk so that a support price can be determined. The price of milk at the present time is above what the support price would be anyway. So this is merely for future use, compelling the Secretary of Agriculture to take such action as he is supposed to take under the Steagall amendment, and has never taken. It does not change any policy at all. It merely reaffirms the policy which has been in existence for 3 or 4 years.

Mr. KEAN. How much will this bill increase the cost of milk to the children in my district?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Not a cent.

Mr. KEAN. Who is going to benefit, then?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The farmer is going to benefit from knowing exactly what the support price of milk really is, and the farmer will know whether he should produce milk or not.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am sure there is nothing in this bill that should be objected to. The original bill set $3.10, because, in April, when I put the bill in the hopper, that was 90 percent of parity for milk. I was not trying to get 100 percent or 150 percent, like some crops have. Since that date the committee, in its wisdom, has changed the bill as introduced by me, and I agreed to the substitute. The chairman, the gentleman from Michigan, the Honorable JESSE WOLCOTT, and the Banking and Currency Committee voted this bill out without a dissenting vote. It does not fix the price in dollars and cents, but it sets up the formula that is in the present law. In April 1947 the support price on milk was not being put into effect according to the law of the land. That is, milk was not bringing the farmer 90 percent of parity guaranteed by law. Milk prices were in a nose dive in April. Since that time conditions in this country have changed so that at the present time 90 percent of parity would be some $3.40 to $3.50. It has nothing to do with the cost of living. I am not trying to get one cent out of anyone except what the law of the United States says. I want it to apply to milk just the same as to the rest of the commodities, and remember that milk is over 20 percent of American agriculture.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HERTER. Do I understand the amended bill no longer fixes the price at $3.10, but at 90 percent of parity?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentleman is right. Three dollars and ten cents was 90 percent of parity the day it was introduced. The formula set up now is only in keeping with the present law.

Mr. HERTER. Then the price that is set here is not according to the Steagall amendment, which was not less than 90 percent of parity?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. This bill states the support price is "not less than 90 percent of parity" which is the law.

Mr. HERTER. It may be a variable, 90 percent of parity, or anything above that?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentleman is correct. The law says "not less than 90 percent of parity" but does not fix the floor at 90 percent of parity.

Mr. HERTER. Is that what the gentleman would agree is the proper formula?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. For general purposes; but the gentleman is not going to be led into a discussion of any other particular crop or farm product.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. How does this change existing laws?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. It does not change it.

Mr. JAVITS. Then what is the need for it?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. It is needed to see that the law is properly administered. Anyone who has been a Member of this House many years knows that the Steagall amendment was the greatest piece of agricultural legislation passed by this Congress in 20 years. We heard a lot about agriculture last week. However, under the Steagall amendment the farmer gets cash on the barrelhead the day he gets the check for the product he sells. The law was passed as brought out by the Banking and Currency Committee but it has not been properly followed. One reason we do not have pork today is because the Steagall amendment was not followed in 1943 and 1944. Hog numbers dropped from over 80,000,000 to 56,000,000 the past 4 years. The Steagall amendment was a part of the first OPA Act. Later, by the LaFollette-Taft amendment to the Commodity Credit Corporation, the life of this Corporation was extended. This LaFollette-Taft amendment insisted that the law on supporting these prices at not less than 90 percent of parity be fulfilled. During those days they allowed the packers of this country to buy light hogs for 50 and 60 percent of parity and then sell the products of those hogs as if they were from hogs they had paid 13 cents for. That was the basis on which they paid the packers the subsidy. This does not

increase the cost of living 1 cent. It merely requires them to conform to the law.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. The effect of the bill in brief is to require the Secretary of Agriculture to announce in advance the support price in accordance with law and to require that the support price as announced shall last for a period of 3 months.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I gladly yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Can the gentleman assure me that if this bill is passed it will cause no higher support prices than now obtain under existing law? I am very much concerned about people in cities who buy milk in bottles that are suffering now from the high cost of living. I want to know if we pass this bill, categorically, if it will increase the price of milk?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. My personal opinion is that it will be following the law. It should not increase the cost to the consumer one cent, and it will give the producers the assurance that the Congress of the United States meant what it said when it passed this Steagall amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It will simply assure to the consumers that there will be sufficient production to assure them food in the future. Without knowing that he is going to get a reasonable support price the farmer may not be interested in producing certain commodities and you will find a shortage. You are apt to have a milk famine in this country.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I wish to say to the gentleman from Minnesota that I have appreciated his counsel in connection with this legislation. I know he realized the discrimination to which certain milk producers were being subjected.

Mr. JAVITS. Will it increase the present price for milk?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. No. Milk prices may go up for other reasons, or they may go down, but this bill will not cause an increase in the price of milk.

Mr. JAVITS. The answer is "No"?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The answer is "No, that it should not"; and it will insure a plentiful supply of milk in the cities some day when you otherwise might not be able to get it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the secretary of Agriculture shall use the funds available to him for carrying out the purposes of section 4 (a) of the act entitled "An act to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes", approved July 1, 1941, as amended (relating to supporting the prices of nonbasic agricultural commodities), so as to support, until and including December 31, 1948, a price for the producer of milk for manufacturing purposes of not less than $3.10 per hundred pounds, at the farm, with appropriate, use, location, and seasonal differentials.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof: "That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to announce the support price for all milk produced in the United States until December 31, 1948. The announced support price shall be for a period of 3 months or 6 months. The announced support price shall be 'at not less than 90 percent of parity' and shall include all milk regardless of its ultimate use. The Secretary of Agriculture is directed to make this announcement within 60 days after the effective date of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of milk at not less than 90 percent of parity."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF BANKHEAD-JONES AND SOIL CONSERVATION ACTS TO VIRGIN ISLANDS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 512) to extend provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to the Virgin Islands.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the following sections of title IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, except insofar as they affect title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, are hereby amended as follows:

(a) Subsection (b) of section 41 is amended to read: "The Secretary may administer his power and duties under this act through such area finance, State, and local offices in the United States and in the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii and in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands as he determines to be necessary: *Provided*, That existing regional offices shall be liquidated on or before June 30, 1947. The Secretary may authorize one office to serve the area composed of two or more States (Territories or Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands) if he determines that the volume of business in the area is not sufficient to justify separate State offices."

(b) Section 54 is amended to read: "The provisions of this act shall extend to the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii and to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. In the case of Alaska and Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, the term 'county' as used in this act shall be deemed synonymous with 'Territory,' or any subdivision thereof as may be designated by the Secretary, and payments under section 33 of this act shall be made to the Governor of the Territory or to the fiscal agent of such subdivision."

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (49 Stat. 1151), is amended to read as follows: "This act shall apply to the United States, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and the possession of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and, as used in this act, the term 'State' includes Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands."

SEC. 3. All acts or parts of acts in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE PLANT QUARANTINE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 338) to amend the Plant Quarantine Act approved August 20, 1912, as amended, by adding thereto a new section.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Plant Quarantine Act approved August 20, 1912, as amended, be amended by adding thereto a new section, as follows:

"SEC. —. In order to protect American agriculture, horticulture, and forestry from injurious insect pests and plant diseases new to or not widely prevalent or distributed within and throughout the United States the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to limit entry of nursery stock and bulbs from foreign countries to that needed for propagation purposes, under such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary, including the requirement, if necessary, that such nursery stock and bulbs be grown under postentry quarantine by or under the supervision of the United States Department of Agriculture for the purpose of determining whether imported nursey stock or bulbs may be infested or infected with plant pests not discernible by port-of-entry inspection and provided that if imported nursey stock or bulbs are found to be infested or infected with such plant pests, he is authorized to prescribe remedial measures as he may deem necessary to prevent the spread thereof."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out the words "adding thereto a new section" and insert in lieu thereof the words "substituting a colon for the period at the end of section 1, and by adding thereto a new proviso."

Page 1, line 6, strike out all of lines 6, 7, and 8, and the first five words of line 9, and insert in lieu thereof the words "*And Provided further*, That."

Page 1, line 10, strike out the words "and bulbs."

Page 1, line 11, strike out the words "to that needed for propagation purposes."

Page 2, line 3, strike out the words "and bulbs."

Page 2, line 6, strike out the words "or bulbs."

Page 2, line 8, strike out the words "or bulbs are" and insert in lieu thereof the word "is."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Plant Quarantine Act approved August 20, 1912, as amended, by adding a new proviso to section 1."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYING A PART OF SANTA ROSA ISLAND, FLA., TO ESCAMBIA COUNTY, FLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3417) to provide for the conveyance to Escambia County, State of Florida, of a portion of Santa Rosa Island which is under the jurisdiction of the War Department.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to donate and convey to Escambia County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., lying in township 3 south, ranges 29 west and 30 west, which is under the jurisdiction of the War Department, excepting Old Fort Pickens and that part of Fort Pickens and Santa Rosa Island between Old Fort Pickens and Coast Guard station which shall be designated by the Secretary of War for harbor defense purposes.

SEC. 2. The property acquired pursuant to section 1 shall be retained by the said Escambia County and be used by it for such purposes as it shall deem to be in the public interest or be leased by it from time to time in whole or in part or parts to such persons and for such purposes as it shall deem to be in the public interest and upon such terms and conditions as it shall fix and always to be subject to regulation by said county whether leased or not leased but never to be otherwise disposed of or conveyed by it: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall prevent the said county from conveying said property back to the Federal Government or to the State of Florida or any agency thereof.

With the following committee amendment:

Delete section 1 and substitute therefor the following new section:

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to donate and convey to Escambia County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Fort Pickens Military Reservation, lying in township 3 south, ranges 29 and 30 west, Santa Rosa Island, Fla., determined by the Secretary of War to be surplus to the needs of the War Department, excepting that portion of the reservation known as Old Fort Pickens."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYING PART OF SANTA ROSA ISLAND, FLA., TO OKALOOSA COUNTY, FLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3735) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., extending 1 mile east from Brooks Bridge on United States Highway 98 near the town of Fort Walton, Fla., and 2 miles west from said bridge, and to that part of Santa Rosa Island which lies east of the new channel at East Pass, said property being under the jurisdiction of the War Department.

SEC. 2. The property herein described shall be retained by the said Okaloosa County and shall be used by it for such purposes as it shall deem to be in the public interest or be leased by it from time to time in whole or in part or parts to such persons and for such purposes as it shall deem to be in the public interest and upon such terms and conditions as it shall fix and always would be subject to regulation by said county whether leased or not leased, but never to be otherwise disposed of or conveyed by it: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall prevent the said county from conveying the said property back to the Federal Government or to the State of Florida or any agency thereof.

SEC. 3. It is herein provided that the above-described lands are subject to valid existing rights, including those arising out of a lease granted to the Island Amusement Co. by Escambia County, Fla., on September 10, 1929, and subsequently modified.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, for public recreational purposes, and subject to the further limitations and restrictions, hereinafter enumerated, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., extending 1 mile east from Brooks Bridge on United States Highway No. 98 near the town of Fort Walton, Fla., except for a strip of land 600 feet wide (300 feet east and 300 feet west from center line of road leading to radar site "Dick") extending from Highway No. 98 to the mean low water level of the Gulf of Mexico, and 2 miles west from said bridge, and to that part of Santa Rosa Island which lies east of the new channel at East Pass (consisting of two small islands), said property being under the jurisdiction of the War Department. The deed of conveyance of said property by the Federal Government will contain the following limitations and restrictions:

"a. That said property shall be used only for public recreational purposes.

"b. That climb-proof, chain-link fences 8 feet in height, with three strands of barbed-wire (three barbs) at the top, together with necessary gates, be constructed by and at the expense of Okaloosa County, its successors or assigns, one at the westerly limit of area conveyed, and a second surrounding the immediate area of radar site "Dick."

"c. That the Federal Government reserves the free right of ingress and egress in, on, and over the above-described property to other Federal Government property.

"d. That the Federal Government reserves an avigation easement in perpetuity, prohibiting the erection of any structure or obstacle in excess of 75 feet above mean low-water level within the area to be conveyed.

"e. That in the event of a national emergency the United States of America, acting through the Secretary of War, shall have the right to take over from Okaloosa County, its successors or assigns, complete control and operation of the property herein described for such use and for such length of time as the emergency shall require, in the discretion of the Secretary of War; without rental or other charge as far as Okaloosa County is concerned but subject to all valid existing private rights in and to the said property or any part or parts thereof: *Provided*, That just compensation shall be given to the owners, lessees, or other persons interested for the taking of control or operation of, or rights in, improvements of said property.

"f. That cost of any surveys that will be necessary in connection with the conveyance of said land shall be borne by the county of Okaloosa, its successors or assigns.

"g. The public recreational purposes provided for herein shall include the erection and operation by private persons, for profit, of houses, hotels, restaurants, cafes, bathhouses, casinos, night clubs, and other enterprises and usages usual to beach resorts and resort housing developments.

"SEC. 2. The property herein described shall be retained by the said Okaloosa County and shall be used by it only for such public recreational purposes as it shall deem to be in the public interest or be leased by it from time to time, in whole or in part or parts to such persons and only for such public recreational purposes as it shall deem to be in the public interest and upon such terms and conditions as it shall fix and always to be subject to regulation by said county whether leased or not leased, but never to be otherwise disposed of or conveyed by it: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall prevent the said county from conveying the said property back to the Federal Government, or, subject to the limitations and restrictions hereinbefore indicated, to the State or Florida or any agency thereof; any such conveyance to be subject to all valid rights of third parties then existing or outstanding.

"SEC. 3. In the event that the land conveyed pursuant to this act shall be used for any purpose other than for public recreational purposes as herein defined, or shall cease to be used for such purposes, title to said land shall revert to the United States. The county of Okaloosa shall be obligated to require compliance with all of the other restrictions and limitations enumerated in this act. And the said county shall, in all its leases of the said property, or part, or parts thereof, provide that in the event of a failure on the part of the lessee or lessees, heirs, successors, or assigns, to comply with such restrictions and limitations, all the rights, titles, and interests of such noncomplying lessee or lessees, heirs, successors, or assigns shall be forfeited, and shall revert to the county of Okaloosa to be held subject to the terms and provisions of this act.

"SEC. 4. It is herein provided that the above-described lands are subject to valid existing rights, including those arising out of a lease granted to the Island Amusement Co. by Escambia County, Fla., on September 10, 1929, and subsequently modified."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3632) to extend the time within which applications may be made to the Railroad Retirement Board for certain refunds from the Unemployment Trust Fund.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for refunds to railroad employees in certain cases, so as to place the various States on an equal basis, under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, with respect to contributions of employees," approved August 2, 1946 (Public Law 599, 79th Cong.), is hereby amended by striking out "12 months" and inserting in lieu thereof "2 years."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPRESENTATION OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESSMEN

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 14.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Whereas the 3,650,000 small business concerns in the United States are owned and operated, on the average, by two and one-half persons, or a total of 9,125,000 persons, constituting 92 percent of our entire economy; and

Whereas these concerns employ about 65 percent of all commercial and industrial wage earners and produce about 45 percent of our entire output of commodities: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress recognize the valid claim of the small businessmen of America to equal representation as an entity, with labor, agriculture, and other groups, on those Government commissions, boards, committees, or other agencies in which the interests of the American economy may be affected; and that the President of the United States, the members of the Cabinet, and other officers of the Government be, and hereby are, respectfully urged to accord the small businessmen of America representation on such Government agencies, including particularly policy-making bodies created by Executive appointment.

The Senate concurrent resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESEARCH INTO BASIC LAWS AND PRINCIPLES RELATING TO AGRICULTURE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4110) to amend title I of the act entitled "An act to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work and the more complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges," approved June 29, 1935 (the Bankhead-Jones Act).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 11 of title I of the act entitled "An act to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work and the more complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges," approved June 29, 1935 (the Bankhead-Jones Act), which was added by Public Law 733, Seventy-ninth Congress, is amended by striking out the words "authorized to be" wherever they appear in that section.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE TO THE SAN ANTONIO MEDICAL FOUNDATION OF PORTION OF SAN ANTONIO ARSENAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2964) providing for the conveyance to the regents of the University of Texas of that portion of the San Antonio Arsenal determined to be surplus to the needs of the War Department.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim dee to the regents of the University of Texas that portion of land constituting the San Antonio Arsenal, together with the buildings and other improvements thereto, and the rights and appurtenances thereto belonging or appertaining, determined by him to be surplus to the requirements of the War Department.

SEC. 2. Such conveyance shall contain a provision that said property be used for the establishment and operation of a school or branch school of medicine and other public and educational purposes; and the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to permit the city of San Antonio to provide such streets through said property as may be agreed upon by him and the city of San Antonio to be reasonable and necessary.

SEC. 3. Such conveyance shall contain the further provision that whenever the Congress of the United States shall declare a state of war or other national emergency to exist, upon the determination by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy that the property so conveyed is useful or necessary for military or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have a right to reenter upon such property and use the same or any part thereof for the duration of such state of war or other national emergency.

SEC. 4. Such conveyance shall contain the further provision that if the regents of the University of Texas shall, at any time, cease to use the property so conveyed for public purposes, title thereto shall revert to the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, lines 4 and 5, delete the words "regents of the University of Texas" and substitute in lieu thereof the words "San Antonio Medical Foundation."

On page 1, line 5, preceding the word "that", insert the words "without compensation."

On page 2, following the semicolon in line 3, delete the remainder of the section ending on line 7 and substitute in lieu thereof the following: and the Secretary of War may, in his discretion, permit the city of San Antonio to provide such streets through that portion of the property as is not declared surplus, as may be agreed upon by him and the city of San Antonio to be reasonable and necessary."

On page 2, line 15, following the word "right", insert the words "without compensation."

On page 2, line 19, delete the words "regents of the University of Texas" and substitute in lieu thereof the words "San Antonio Medical Foundation."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill providing for the conveyance to the San Antonio Medical Foundation of that portion of the San Antonio Arsenal determined to be surplus to the needs of the War Department."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN EXPENDITURES FROM APPROPRIATIONS OF ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3870) to authorize certain expenditures from the appropriation of Saint Elizabeths Hospital, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Security Administrator is authorized to admit to St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia, for care and treatment, beneficiaries of the Bureau of Employees' Compensation (in the Federal Security Agency) and, upon application of the Secretary of the Interior, beneficiaries of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The cost of such care and treatment shall be paid for by the Bureau of Employees' Compensation and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, respectively.

SEC. 2. Any executive department of the Federal Government (including any agency, independent establishment, or wholly owned instrumentality thereof, and including the District of Columbia) requiring St. Elizabeths Hospital to care for patients for whom such department is responsible, shall, except to the extent that the expense of such care is authorized to be paid from appropriations to the hospital for the care of patients, pay by check to the Superintendent of the hospital, upon his request, either in advance or by way of reimbursement at the end of each calendar month or calendar quarter, such amounts as the Superintendent calculates to be due for such care on the basis of a per diem rate approved by the Bureau of the Budget. Proper adjustments of amounts which have been paid in advance on the basis of the calculations made by the Superintendent under this section shall be made monthly or quarterly, as may be agreed upon by the Superintendent of the hospital and the executive department concerned.

SEC. 3. All sums paid to the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital for the care of patients shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the appropriation for the care of patients at the hospital for the year in which such care is provided.

SEC. 4. The Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital is authorized to operate and maintain at the hospital necessary facilities for feeding employees and others (at not less than cost, as determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Federal Security Administrator), and the proceeds from such operation shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the appropriation for the operation of St. Elizabeths Hospital.

SEC. 5. Appropriations for the care of persons in St. Elizabeths Hospital shall be available for expenditure for furnishing, repairing, and cleaning such wearing apparel as may be prescribed by the Superintendent of the hospital, for use by employees in the performance of their official duties; reimbursing employees, subject to regulations of the Federal Security Administrator, for the cost of repairing or replacing their personal belongings damaged or destroyed by patients while such employees are engaged in the performance of their official duties; expenses incurred in pursuing, identifying, and returning patients who escape from the hospital or from the custody of any employee, including rewards for the capture of such patients; expenses incurred in ascertaining the residence of patients whose care is not, or whose care is no longer, authorized at the hospital, and in returning such patients to their places of residence; expenses incurred in the removal of patients to their friends; and repairs and improvements to the buildings and grounds of the hospital.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after "treatment", strike out "beneficiaries of the Bureau of Employees' Compensation (in the Federal Security Agency) and."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "the Bureau of Employees' Compensation and" in line 10, after "Affairs", strike out the comma.

Page 1, line 11, strike out "respectively."

Page 2, line 8, strike out "the Superintendent" and insert "St. Elizabeths Hospital."

Page 2, line 9, strike out the words "of the hospital," and in the same line strike out the word "his" and insert "the Superintendent's".

Page 2, line 13, strike out "Proper adjust-" and strike out all of lines 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and insert:

"Bills rendered by the Superintendent on the basis of such calculations shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of payment; but proper adjustment of amounts which have been paid in advance on the basis of such calculations shall be made monthly or quarterly, as may be agreed upon by the Superintendent of the hospital and the executive department concerned."

Page 3, line 2, strike out "in accordance with regulations" and in line 3, strike out "prescribed."

Page 3, line 23, strike out the words "repairs and" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "repairs, replacements, and minor."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GOLD STAR LAPEL BUTTONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1544) to provide appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the armed forces who lost their lives in the armed services of the United States in World War II.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, acting jointly, shall formulate and fix the size, design, and composition of a lapel button (to be known as the "gold star lapel button") suitable as a means of identification for widows and parents of members of the armed forces of the United States who lost their lives in the armed services of the United States in World War II. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall procure for their respective departments such number of gold star lapel buttons as shall be necessary to effect distribution of such buttons in accordance with the provisions of this act.

SEC. 2. (a) Upon application to the Department of War or the Department of the Navy, as the case may be, one such gold star lapel button shall be furnished, without cost, to the widow and to each of the parents of a member of the armed forces of the United States who lost his life in the armed services of the United States in World War II.

(b) In addition to the gold star lapel button furnished in subsection (a) of this section, gold star lapel buttons shall also be furnished, upon application and the payment of an amount sufficient to cover the cost of manufacture and distribution, to the next of kin of any such deceased person, not hereinbefore designated. No such lapel button shall be sold to any person who has been furnished a lapel button under subsection (a), and not more than one button shall be sold to any one person.

(c) Gold star lapel buttons shall be distributed in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed jointly by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy.

SEC. 3. As used in this act, (a) the term "widow" shall include widower; (b) the term "parents" shall include mother, father, stepmother, stepfather, mother through adoption, and father through adoption; (c) the term "next of kin" shall include only children, brothers, sisters, half brothers, and half sisters; and (d) the term "children" shall include stepchildren and children through adoption.

SEC. 4. Whoever shall (1) wear, display on his person, or otherwise use as an insignia, any gold star lapel button issued to another person under the provisions of this act; (2) falsely make, forge, or counterfeit, or cause or procure to be falsely made, forged, or counterfeited, or aid in falsely making, forging, or counterfeiting any lapel button issued under this act; or (3) sell or bring into the United States, or any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, from any foreign place, or have in his possession, any such false, forged, or counterfeited lapel button, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

SEC. 5. Such sums are hereby authorized to be appropriated as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL PERMANENT MAJOR GENERALS AND BRIGADIER GENERALS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2993) to authorize the appointment of certain additional permanent major generals and brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army, and for other purposes.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill is for Regular officers who were imprisoned at Corregidor with General Wainwright and who would have received these promotions had they not been there. I do not believe the gentleman desires to object.

Mr. CARROLL. How many are there?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. There are about 12 in the bill. A similar bill went through last year and many of them were taken care of.

Mr. CARROLL. Under similar circumstances?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request and object to consideration of the bill.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, Col. William P. Morse, for whom we seek promotion to brigadier general, has an outstanding record of fine service to his country. This promotion is richly deserved, and it is long overdue.

Colonel Morse began his active military career in 1917 when the National Guard unit of Miles City, Mont., was incorporated into the United States Army and sent to France under his command. He was then a captain, and when war ended he had been promoted to major. He elected to remain in the Regular Army, accepting a permanent commission as first lieutenant. During the years of peace he was admitted to the Army War College as the first man to be admitted who was not a graduate of the United States Military Academy.

When World War II began Morse was a permanent colonel in the Infantry. He held an assignment in the Philippines and was there when war began. He commanded a division in that campaign—the command of a brigadier general. Twice during the Philippine engagement General Wainwright recommended Colonel Morse for promotion to brigadier general. Apparently the recommendation never got through to Washington because of the chaotic condition of communications from that beleaguered battleground.

Colonel Morse went into captivity with General Wainwright and suffered all the horrors of the Japanese prison camps for 39 months. He was rescued along with General Wainwright and, after spending many months in the hospital, has returned to active duty with the Army and is now senior officer of the Army Retiring Board at McCornack General Hospital in California.

Over a period of 10 years prior to World War II, Colonel Morse had an efficiency rating 6.2. Seven is perfect.

When the war ended and General Wainwright had recovered from the effects of his captivity, he recommended Colonel Morse for promotion to brigadier general. This recommendation was concurred in by Major General Sharp, now deceased. Unfortunately, no action was taken, for Colonel Morse's name did not appear on the promotion list. His name was again missing when, during the last session of Congress, a bill was considered and passed by both Houses, though it failed of enactment, to promote certain officers who had been imprisoned with General Wainwright. This bill was amended to include the name of Col. Kearie L. Berry, but Colonel Morse was apparently forgotten. The records of Colonel Berry and Colonel Morse are substantially the same, except that Colonel Morse had the higher efficiency rating.

It should be remembered that all of the officers who performed service in the Philippine campaign similar to that of Colonel Morse, and who were fortunate enough to have their recommendations for promotion forwarded to Washington prior to the surrender, were given permanent promotions. Colonel Morse certainly deserves similar consideration.

AUTHORIZING CITY OF PIERRE, S. DAK., TO TRANSFER FARM ISLAND TO THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3874) to authorize the city of Pierre, S. Dak., to transfer Farm Island to the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the transfer from the city of Pierre, S. Dak., to the Department of Game, Fish, and Parks of the State of South Dakota, of all or any part of the right, title, and interest of the said city of Pierre in and to Farm Island, an island in the Missouri River in Hughes County, S. Dak., which was granted by the United States to said city of Pierre by section 21 of the act entitled "An act to divide a portion of the reservation of the Sioux Nation of Indians in Dakota into separate reservations and to secure the relinquishment of the Indian title to the remainder, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1889 (25 Stat. 896), in accordance with Resolution No. 376 of the city of Pierre, S. Dak., adopted by the board of city commissioners of said city on July 2, 1946, by which said commissioners did resolve as follows:

"Be it resolved by the city of Pierre, S. Dak., That the city of Pierre, S. Dak., hereby transfers, assigns, and gives all of its right, title, and interest in and to Farm Island, Hughes County, S. Dak., an island in the Missouri River, to the Department of Game, Fish, and Parks of the State of South Dakota, on the condition that the said Farm Island shall be used by the Commission of Game, Fish, and Parks for such purposes as are now or may hereinafter be authorized by the laws of the State of South Dakota, exclusive of said

Commission's right to sell the property of the said Department of Game, Fish, and Parks: *Provided*, That this assignment, transfer, and gift shall in no way disturb or alter the rights of the Sunshine Chapter of the Izaak Walton League, the Boy Scouts of America, and the Girl Scouts of America, to the several tracts on said Farm Island now occupied by said organizations by virtue of license, lease, or otherwise from the said city of Pierre: *Provided further*, That this assignment, transfer, and gift is subject to the consent, acceptance, confirmation, and acquiescence of the Congress of the United States of America.";

and in accordance with the resolution of the State Game, Fish, and Parks Commission of the State of South Dakota, dated December 10, 1946, by which said commission did resolve as follows:

"Whereas the city of Pierre, S. Dak., transferred, signed, and gave all of its right, title, and interest in and to Farm Island, Hughes County, S. Dak., an island in the Missouri River, to the Department of Game, Fish, and Parks of the State of South Dakota, on the condition that the said Farm Island shall be used by the game, fish, and parks commission for such purposes as are now or may hereinafter be authorized by the laws of the State of South Dakota, exclusive of said commission's right to sell the property of the Department of Game, Fish, and Parks of the State of South Dakota:

"*Be it resolved, by the Game, Fish, and Parks Commission of the State of South Dakota*, That the assignment, transfer, and gift by the city of Pierre, S. Dak., of its interest in Farm Island to the Department of Game, Fish, and Parks as evidenced by Resolution No. 376 adopted by the Board of City Commissioners of said city of Pierre on July 2, 1946, be, and the same is hereby, accepted;

"*Be it further resolved*, That the acceptance of said assignment shall in no way disturb or alter the rights of the Sunshine Chapter of the Izaak Walton League of America, the Boy Scouts of America, and the Girl Scouts of America, to the several tracts of said Farm Island now occupied by said organizations by virtue of license, lease, or otherwise, from the city of Pierre: *Provided further*, That the acceptance of this assignment, transfer, and gift is subject to the consent, acceptance, confirmation, and acquiescence of the Congress of the United States of America."; *Provided*, That said transfer shall be on the express condition that said Farm Island shall be used only for such purposes as are now or may hereinafter be authorized by the laws of the State of South Dakota, exclusive of said commission's right to sell the property of said Department of Game, Fish, and Parks of the State of South Dakota, and upon the failure of said condition the said island shall revert to the United States, to be disposed of by future legislation only."

SEC. 2. The proviso in section 1 and sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the act of August 16, 1937 (50 Stat. 648), as amended by the act of June 17, 1940 (54 Stat. 540), are hereby repealed, and exclusive civil, criminal, and administrative jurisdiction of the said Farm Island shall be in the State of South Dakota on and after the passage and approval of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 4, line 12, after the word "America" and before the colon insert a period followed by quotation marks.

Page 4, line 15, strike out the word "hereinafter" and insert the word "hereafter."

Page 4, line 21, strike the quotation marks at the end of the line.

Page 5, line 1, after the word "shall", insert "continue to."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELATING TO COMPENSATION OF ALASKA COMMISSIONERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3973) relating to the compensation of commissioners for the Territory of Alaska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions relating to fees earned by commissioners for the Territory of Alaska of section 11 of the act of June 6, 1900, entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 48, sec. 116), each such commissioner shall pay to the clerk of the proper division of the court only so much of the aggregate net fees earned during the calendar year by such commissioner as exceeds the sum of $5,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING LOANS FOR INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2622) to authorize loans for Indians, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, or his designated representative, is hereby authorized, under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, to make loans from the revolving fund established pursuant to the acts of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), and June 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 1967), to tribes, bands, groups, and individual Indians, not otherwise eligible for loans under the said act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "28" and insert "26."

At the end of the bill insert "*Provided*, That no portion of these funds shall be loaned to Indians of less than one-quarter Indian blood."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CROW TRIBE TO MANAGE THEIR RESTRICTED LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1317) to give to members of the Crow Tribe the power to manage and assume charge of their restricted lands, for their own use or for lease purposes, while such lands remain under trust patents.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, except as otherwise provided in this act, members of the Crow Tribe of Indians of Montana shall have power to use, lease, or otherwise manage their allotted lands and the allotted lands of their minor children, and to receive and manage the income therefrom, without supervision by any officer or agency of the United States.

SEC. 2. The allotted lands of members of such tribe who have been adjudged incompetent by a court or who are orphan minors shall be managed to the best interests of such members, jointly by the officer of the United States in charge of the Crow Indian Reservation and the next of kin of such persons.

SEC. 3. (a) No lease of lands for grazing or farming purposes shall be made under the authority of this act for a period longer than 5 years, except that irrigable lands under the Big Horn unit of the Crow Indian irrigation project may be leased for farming purposes for a period not exceeding 10 years.

(b) All leases of lands for farming or grazing purposes made under the authority of this act shall be recorded for public inspection at the Crow Indian Agency office.

SEC. 4. In any case in which, by reason of the number of heirs, the division of income from inherited allotted lands of members of the Crow Tribe is impracticable or involves unwarranted expense, such heirs shall be authorized to sell such lands and to receive the proceeds of such sale, but in any such sale preference shall be given to prospective purchasers who are members of such tribe. Upon any such sale, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey legal title to such lands to the purchaser thereof.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, any Indian who is the owner of an allotment or of other trust or restricted land under the jurisdiction of the Crow Indian Agency in Montana, after filing notice of intention with the superintendent or other officer in charge of the Crow Indian Reservation, may lease without restriction, and collect the rentals therefrom, except as specified in this act, any part of his allotment for farming or grazing purposes: *Provided, however*, That this authority shall not extend to any Crow Indian who has pledged the income from such land or has executed a power of attorney or other authorization for the leasing of such lands and the application of the income therefrom in consideration of a loan from the Crow Tribe of Indians or the United States: *And provided further*, That the provisions of this act shall not repeal or modify any of the provisions of the act of June 25, 1946 (Public Law 441, 79th Cong., 2d sess.).

"SEC. 2. Lands or interest in lands belonging to more than one Indian through inheritance or otherwise may be leased by the holder or holders of a majority in interest, but any such lease shall provide that the holders of any interest therein shall receive their proportionate share of the total compensation. Leases of inherited and devised allotments or other restricted lands may be made by the superintendent when (a) the heirs or devisees of the deceased owners have not been determined, (b) when the land is not being used by any of the heirs or devisees and the heirs have not been able within a 30-day period to agree upon a lease, and (c) when there exist claims for indebtedness against the land allowed by the Secretary of the Interior.

"SEC. 3. Lands or interests in lands belonging to minors or to persons non compos mentis may be leased or permitted by the parent, legal guardian, or natural guardian.

"SEC. 4. All leases and permits authorized by this act shall be made on forms approved by a majority vote of the Crow Tribal Council, and shall be effective and valid only after they have been recorded at the Crow Indian Agency.

"SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed with the consent and approval by a majority vote of the Crow Tribal Council to make rules and regulations for the purpose of conservation, including the operation and management of grazing units on the principle of sustained yield, the limitation of the number of livestock to the

estimated carrying capacity of the designated range units, the full utilization of the range, the prevention of soil erosion, and like purposes. To carry out these purposes, the Secretary of the Interior, or any officer designated by him, is hereby authorized and directed to establish on the Crow Indian Reservation land use districts, zones, or units: *Provided*, That 65 percent in acreage of the Indian landholders within such district, zone, or unit shall consent in writing to the establishment thereof for a specific term not to exceed 10 years. All leases or permits within any such district, zone, or unit authorized by this act shall specify the district, zone, or unit in which the leased or permitted lands are located, and no such lease or permit within any district, zone, or unit shall be valid for any purpose or use except as authorized in the designation of the district, zone, or unit.

"SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Interior or his designated representatives, after the establishing of any such district, zone, or unit, is authorized and directed to issue permits on range units with the consent of the majority of landowners in interest in such district, zone, or unit, after public advertising for competitive bidding. The permittee shall make payment of grazing fees direct to landowners who are authorized to receive direct payments by this act. If any Indian owners of lands or interests in land shall fail or refuse to authorize the issuance of a permit on his land to the successful bidder, the permittee shall pay to the Superintendent of the Crow Indian Agency for the credit of the landowner grazing fees at the rate established for the unit by a vote of the majority of the Indian landholders within said district, zone, or unit: *Provided*, That nothing contained herein shall preclude an Indian landowner within such district, zone, or unit from using his own land and supplementing thereto by leaving additional lands for all grazing purposes.

"SEC. 7. No lease or permit authorized by this act shall be made for a longer term than 5 years.

"SEC. 8. All leases made pursuant to the provisions of this act shall not be transferable or subject to assignment or subleasing, except with the consent of the Indian lessee. No permit made pursuant hereto shall be transferable or subject to assignment without the consent of a majority of the Indian landowners within the area covered by the permit sought to be transferred or assigned.

"SEC. 9. All leases under this act shall be recorded at the Crow Indian Agency, and shall be subject to public inspection during the regular hours of the said agency."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERTIFICATES TO CERTAIN OSAGE INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3326) to provide for the granting of certificates of competency to certain members of the Osage Indian Tribe in Oklahoma, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior shall issue a certificate of competency to each member of the Osage Tribe of less than one-half Indian blood heretofore or hereafter attaining the age of 21 years, and shall thereupon pay and deliver to such member, or to his legal guardian if such member has been declared incompetent by a court of competent jurisdiction, all money, property, and funds theretofore accrued or hereafter accruing to the individual credit of such member, and all payments to the legal guardian of such member may be expended without the approval of the superintendent of the Osage Agency: *Provided*, That all restrictions against alienation of the property of every kind and character, except headright shares or interests in the Osage tribal mineral estate, of members of the Osage Tribe who now have, or may hereafter receive, a certificate of competency, are hereby removed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "Interior", insert "upon request of the Indian."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECLAIMING LANDS BY DRAINAGE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3538) to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to investigate and report on projects for reclaiming lands by drainage.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN PARTS OF ALASKA BY VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4059) to provide for the settlement of certain parts of Alaska by war veterans.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the national interest requires the settlement and development of Alaska in order to make possible the full utilization of its resources and to further the national security by providing in the area a firm foundation of permanent residents. The national interest also requires that land be made available to veterans who desire to undertake the development of virgin territory in order to secure land for themselves and their families and that such undertakings be encouraged to an extent commensurate with their value to the Nation. Because of the remoteness and climatic conditions of Alaska, settlement there involves greater expenses, financial risks, and physical hardships than does settlement in other parts of the United States. Large-scale settlement of the Territory requires a greater inducement to the pioneer settlement than exists at present. This act is designated to provide the necessary inducement in the form of enlarged homesteads, while making certain that there will be a minimum of Government interference in the development of the land. This act shall be cited as the "Alaska Veterans' Homesteading Act of 1947."

TITLE I—DEFINITIONS

SEC. 101. As used in this act, the term "veteran" means any person who served in the armed forces of the United States during any war between the United States and any other nation, and who has been discharged or released therefrom under any conditions other than dishonorable.

TITLE II—AREA

SEC. 201. (a) Except for public lands excluded under subsection (b), public lands in the following parts of the Territory of Alaska shall be made available for settlement by veterans, notwithstanding any provision of law or regulation to the contrary.

(1) That part of the Territory of Alaska known as the Panhandle, lying south of latitude sixty degrees, thirty minutes north, and east of longitude one hundred and forty-one degrees west.

(2) That part of continental Alaska lying south of latitude sixty-three degrees north, and east of longitude one hundred and fifty-four degrees west, and south of latitude sixty-two degrees north, and longitude one hundred and sixty-seven degrees thirty minutes west.

(3) Such islands, not including Unalaska and Umnak, as lie within two hundred miles offshore of the continental area designated in paragraph (2).

(4) Areas on either side of the Alaska Highway for a distance of thirty miles.

(5) Areas on either side of the Richardson Highway in South Central Alaska, from latitude 63 degrees north to its junction with the Alaska Highway at the village of Big Delta, for a distance of thirty miles.

(6) Areas on either side of the Alaska Railroad from latitude sixty-three degrees north to Fairbanks, Alaska, for a distance of thirty miles.

(b) The following public lands, as existing on June 1, 1947, in the Territory of Alaska, are excluded from settlement under this act:

(1) National parks and monuments.

(2) Military and naval installations.

(3) Town sites.

(4) Patented lands.

(5) Certain areas already designated in detail as reserves of spruce timber necessary for national defense.

(6) Areas set apart for the support of an agricultural and mechanical college (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 48, secs. 353, 354, and 354a).

(7) The Annette Island reservation for Metlakahtla Indians.

(8) Lands embraced in a coal, oil, or gas lease.

(9) Administrative sites.

(10) Airfields.

(11) Cemeteries and land reserved for cemeteries.

(12) Areas classified in aid of legislation.

(13) Land reserved for the Veterans' Administration, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Bureau of Customs, the Public Health Service, and the Alaska Road Commission.

(14) Lands reserved for the support of common schools.

(15) Lands reserved for flood and fire control, and for lighthouse, dock, and power purposes.

(16) Reservations for fish and wildlife preservation.

(17) Native reservations.

(18) Lands set aside for springs, water supply, and water-supply protection.

(19) Lands whose title is controlled and protected by title V.

TITLE III—HOMESTEAD PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. (a) That there is hereby created the Veterans' Alaska Homestead Claim which shall be not less than 320 acres, and may be of any size up to and including 1,920 acres; such size being determined by the Secretary of the Interior, taking into account the type of land, location, and various uses therefor in order that the claim shall be a unit sufficient to support a family of seven on an American standard of living: *Provided, however*, That if such claim is timberland that not more than one-tenth of such timber shall be cleared, and that the remainder be maintained on a sustained-yield basis.

(b) Such homestead claims, for the convenience of the veteran, shall be classified and designated as agricultural, fur farming, grazing, timber, or mixed agricultural, fur farming, grazing, and timber, and may be located on islands, as well on the mainland. Each such homestead shall be of a potentiality, or a composite potentiality, to support such family on such a standard.

SEC. 302. (a) To make final proof of claim, a veteran must have actually resided upon the land for 3 years: *Provided*, That each day of active duty in the armed forces served by a veteran shall, up to and including 2 years,

be accepted in full satisfaction of the residence requirement for such 2 years. Any veteran otherwise eligible, who shall have been discharged on account of wounds received or disability incurred in the line of duty, shall be credited with 2 years constructive service for purposes of this subsection.

(b) To make final proof a veteran must satisfy the Secretary of the Interior, or his duly authorized agents, that the following conditions have been met:

(1) That such claim has a habitable dwelling suitable for year-round occupancy.

(2) That the veteran is and has been living upon the land, pursuant to the terms of this act, and holds same for his own beneficial interest.

(3) That he is deriving some part of his income, or an amount equivalent to some part of an income necessary to live on such land, from the claim.

SEC. 303. (a) Upon final proof of claim by a veteran, the Secretary of the Interior shall, on behalf of the United States, issue a patent to the land comprising such claim. Such patent shall be issued under the following express conditions:

(1) That during a 5-year period which begins with the date on which the patent is issued, no part of the land covered by such patent shall be alienated except by devise, descent, tax sale, or transfer authorized under section 2288 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 43, sec. 174).

(2) That during such 5-year period no part of the land covered by such patent shall be leased, except in the following instances:

(A) To a person qualified to a claim under this act.

(B) To a person, as tenant, who shall live on the land for the bona fide purposes of making a livelihood from such land.

(C) To anyone, where there is express consent by the Secretary of the Interior, it being the intent of Congress that any lease so approved will be for the further development of the resources and to encourage settlement.

(3) That the forestry practices of the Department of Agriculture requiring that all timberland, be maintained on a sustained-yield basis, shall be continued in perpetuity: *Provided, however,* That the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, except a portion of the patented land from the sustained-yield perpetuity clause, when in his judgment such action will not endanger the Alaskan forests.

(4) Upon judicial determination that any of the conditions of subsection (3) has been broken, the United States shall have the right to reenter that part of the claim with respect to which the condition was broken.

SEC. 304. Nothing in this act shall be held to restrict the right of the United States to exercise eminent domain over any claims however fully perfected.

TITLE IV—ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to cause to be made comprehensive surveys of the lands made available for the veterans' homesteads by section 201: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this subsection shall prevent a veteran from entering upon land available for settlement under the provisions of this Act prior to the surveying of such land.

(b) Lands in the following areas shall be among the first to be surveyed and made available for veteran settlement in the order to be determined by the Secretary of the Interior: (1) The Portland Canal-Cape Fox-Duke Island area; (2) the Kenai Peninsula; (3) the area along the Alaska highway; (4) the Cholmondeley Sound, Moira Sound, and Kasaan areas of Prince of Wales Island; (5) Kodiak Island; (6) the area along the Richardson Highway; (7) the Cleveland Peninsula; (8) the area along the Alaska Railroad; (9) the area in the vicinity of Lisianski Inlet; (10) Afognak Island; (11) the Craig area of Prince of Wales Island; (12) the area in the vicinity of Prince William Sound; (13 Etolin Island; (14) the area in the vicinity of Tenakee Inlet and Peril Strait; (15) the Alaska Peninsula east of longitude 158 degrees west; and (16) such areas along the lower reaches of the Tanana River as may be recommended by the General Land Office of the Department of the Interior.

(c) The normal practice of limiting entry to claims in rectangular shape shall be followed where practicable, except that whenever in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior it becomes advisable to depart from this procedure in the interest of giving the veterans claim access to water for transportation, agricultural, domestic, or other purposes, or because of the configuration of the terrain, the boundary and form of claims under this act may be adjusted for the individual veteran to provide such access to water.

SEC. 402. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to provide necessary personnel and prescribe rules and regulations to carry this act into effect, it being the intent of Congress to develop the natural resources, encourage land settlement in Alaska, and discourage speculation in public lands.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to furnish to qualified veterans, at cost, copies of the results of the surveys made.

(c) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to utilize the Fish and Wildlife Service to establish a system of registering those trap lines which originate on land on which entries have been made, or patents issued, pursuant to this act.

TITLE V—REGISTRY OF TITLE

SEC. 501. Nothing in this act shall be held to authorize the making of an entry by any person upon land (a) listed by the Bureau of Land Management as in occupancy under this or some other homestead provision of law; (b) listed by the appropriate United States commissioner as occupied, pending ripening of title; and (c) listed as owned and registered under the provisions of an act of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska entitled "An act to require declaration of the ownership of land, to impose a penalty for noncompliance, and to dispose of the proceeds of such penalties," approved March 24, 1945.

SEC. 502. Upon completion of entry and passage of title from the United States to the veteran, the veteran shall comply with the provisions of such territorial act of March 24, 1945.

TITLE VI—LOANS

SEC. 601. Upon application by any veteran who has made homestead entry under the provisions of this act, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may make to such veteran such a loan or loans as will be guaranteed under the provisions of title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended.

SEC. 602. Notwithstanding the requirement of title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, that certain real-estate loans be secured by a first lien on the realty, such requirement shall be satisfied in the case of any loan made pursuant to section 601 in respect of land on which entry has been made pursuant to the provisions of this act if the loan is secured by a lien on the improvements on such land and by a lien on the personalty of the veteran to the extent legal and practicable.

TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 701. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall, upon the request of the Secretary of the Interior, inform such Secretary whether or not any person who has made application for a claim or has stated in writing his intention to make such application qualifies as a veteran under the provisions of section 101.

SEC. 702. (a) Nothing in this act (other than the provisions of sec. 501) shall prevent any person qualified under the provisions of any other homestead laws from (1) making entry, (2) making final proof, or (3) receiving a patent with respect to any public land made available for settlement by section 201, upon compliance with such other law.

(b) Any veteran who, pursuant to the provisions of some other homestead law, has made or shall make entry, or has received or shall receive a patent, with respect to land in any part of the Territory of Alaska in which public land is made available for settlement by section 201 shall, upon compliance with the provisions of this act, be entitled to make entry upon and, upon final proof, to receive patent to, such additional public land in the vicinity of his original claim as will not, when added to the acreage of such original claim, exceed the relevant maximum acreage established in section 301.

SEC. 703. The first sentence of section 500 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by striking out "incurred in service in line of duty, shall be eligible for the benefits of this title" and inserting in lieu thereof "incurred in service in line of duty, and any person who is a veteran within the definition contained in section 101 of the Alaska Veterans Homestead Act of 1947 and who has made homestead entry under the provisions of such act, shall be eligible for the benefits of this title."

SEC. 704. In the disposal under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, of all (a) surplus property located in the Territory of Alaska and (b) surplus boats and other floating equipment located in the Seattle area, the disposal agencies shall grant preference over all other disposals under such act to veterans who have made entry under this act, upon presentation of satisfactory evidence that any such veteran, or group of veterans, purchasing any such property will use it in connection with his homestead or their homesteads, or otherwise to assist in the settlement of the Territory of Alaska.

SEC. 705. In the event of the death of a veteran before patent is issued, his heirs or devisees shall succeed to the same rights that he would have had, had he lived. Acceptance of such rights shall constitute an agreement on the part of the heir or devisee to meet the tract and shall render the heir or devisee liable to the same extent as the veteran.

SEC. 706. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, from time to time, such sums as are necessary for the surveys and for the efficient carrying out of the provisions of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 6, strike out "designated" and insert "designed."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERAN AND CAREER-SERVICE EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 739) to provide for the protection of veterans and career-service employees in connection with reductions in force in the Federal service.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act shall be cited as the "Reduction in Federal Personnel Act of 1947."

SEC. 2. Whenever reductions in personnel, reductions in grade, or demotions are necessary in any Federal agency, employees shall be released, reduced, or demoted on an agency-wide basis in accordance with Civil Service Commission regulations which shall give effect to the following categories in the order listed: First, to military preference; second, to tenure of employment; third, to length of total Federal service; and, fourth, to efficiency ratings: *Provided*, That in carrying out the provisions of this act tenure of employment shall mean and be administered so that employees holding temporary appointments will be the first to be released; next to be released, reduced, or demoted will be employees with war-service appointments; next, permanent employees who have been transferred or promoted under war-service regulations effective March 17, 1942; next will be employees with probational-indefinite appointments; and next in order to be released, reduced, or demoted will be probational and permanent employees: *Provided further*, That regardless of the above categories veterans-preference employees shall be retained in any Federal agency over all other employees: *Provided further*, That employees having equal standing in any of the above categories shall be released upon the basis of their relative standing in the next lower category: *Provided further*, That the length of time spent in active service in the armed forces of the United States of each such Federal employee shall be credited in computing total length of Federal service: *Provided further*, That in any reduction in Federal personnel basis of satisfactory or unsatisfactory ratings: *And provided further*, That when any or all of the functions of any agency, or part of agency, are transferred to, or when any agency, or part of agency, is replaced by some agency, or agencies, all veteran-preference and career-service employees in the function or functions transferred or in the agency, or part of agency, which is replaced by some agency shall first be transferred to the replacing agency, or agencies, for employment in positions for which they are qualified before such agency or agencies shall appoint employees from any other source for such positions.

SEC. 3. Section 12 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 390), is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That section 12 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 (Public Law 359, 78th Cong.), is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 12. In any reduction in personnel, including reductions resulting from budgetary limitations or administrative reorganizations in any civilian service of any Federal agency, competing employees shall be released in accordance with Civil Service Commission regulations which shall give due effect to tenure of employment, military preference, length of service, and efficiency ratings: *Provided*, That the length of time spent in active service in the armed forces of the United States of each such employee shall be credited in computing length of total service: *Provided further*, That equal credit shall be given efficiency ratings of "good" or better except that preference employees whose efficiency ratings are "good" or better shall be retained in preference to all other competing employees and that preference employees whose efficiency ratings are below "good" shall be retained in preference to competing nonpreference employees who have equal or lower efficiency ratings: *Provided further*, That no employee having permanent civil-service status shall be released in any such reduction in personnel as long as there is a war-service employee retained within such agency in a position for which such status employee is qualified by meeting the qualifying standards prescribed by the Civil Service Commission for such position, and that transfers effected under this proviso shall be deemed to be at the convenience of the employee: *And provided further*, That when any or all of the functions of any agency are transferred to, or when any agency is replaced by, some other agency, or agencies, all preference employees in the function or functions transferred or in the agency which is replaced by some other agency, shall first be transferred to the replacing agency, or agencies, for employment in positions for which they are qualified, before such agency, or agencies, shall appoint additional employees from any other source for such positions.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CANADIAN VESSELS TO SERVICE HYDER, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1238) to permit vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and points in the continental United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 46, sec. 883), vessels of foreign registry shall be permitted to transport products of, and supplies and equipment for, the Riverside Mine at Hyder, Alaska, between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in the United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "permitted", insert "until June 30, 1948."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TOLL BRIDGE ACROSS THE RIO GRANDE AT OR NEAR RIO GRANDE CITY, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2776) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Bt it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex., authorized to be built by Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives and assigns, by an act of Congress approved July 31, 1946, is hereby extended 1 year from July 31, 1946.

SEC. 2. The right of alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "1946" and insert "1947."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE ST. LAWRENCE RIVER AT OR NEAR OGDENSBURG, N. Y.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3332) creating the St. Lawrence Bridge Commission and authorizing said Commission and its successors to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to facilitate international commerce, the St. Lawrence Bridge Commission (hereinafter created, and hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") and its successors and assigns, be, and are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the St. Lawrence River at or near the city of Ogdensburg, N. Y., at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act, and subject to the approval of the proper authorities in the Dominion of Canada. For like purposes said Commission and its successors and assigns are hereby authorized to purchase, maintain, and operate all or any ferries across the St. Lawrence River within 5 miles of the location which shall be selected for said bridge, subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act, and subject to the approval of the proper authorities in the Dominion of Canada.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the Commission and its successors and assigns all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use such real estate and other property in the State of New York as may be needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State of New York, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation of private property for public purposes in such State; and the Commission and its successors and assigns may exercise in the Dominion of Canada all rights, powers, and authority which shall be granted or permitted to the Commission by the proper authorities of the Dominion of Canada or of the Province of Ontario, including the entering upon lands and acquiring, condemning, occupying, possessing, and using such real estate and other property in the Dominion of Canada as may be needed for such location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge.

SEC. 3. The Commission and its successors and assigns are hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge and such ferry or ferries in accordance with the provisions of this act.

SEC. 4. The Commission and its successors and assigns are hereby authorized to provide for the payment of the cost of the bridge and its approaches and the ferry or ferries and the necessary lands, easements, and appurtenances thereto by an issue or issues of negotiable bonds of the Commission, bearing interest at not more than 6 percent per annum, the principal and interest of which bonds and any premium to be paid for retirement thereof before maturity shall be payable solely from the sinking fund provided in accordance with this act. Such bonds may be registerable as to principal alone or both principal and interest, shall be in such form not inconsistent with this act, shall mature at such time or times not exceeding 40 years from their respective

dates, shall be in such denominations, shall be executed in such manner and be payable in such medium and at such place or places as the Commission may determine. The Commission may repurchase and may reserve the right to redeem all or any of said bonds before maturity in such manner and at such price or prices, not exceeding 105 and accrued interest, as may be fixed by the Commission prior to the issuance of the bonds. The Commission may enter into an agreement with any bank or trust company in the United States as trustee having the power to make such agreement, setting forth the duties of the Commission in respect of the construction, maintenance, operation, repair, and insurance of the bridge and/or the ferry or ferries, the conservation and application of all funds, the safeguarding of moneys on hand or on deposit, and the rights and remedies of said trustee and the holders of the bonds, restricting the individual right of action of the bondholders as is customary in trust agreements respecting bonds of corporations. Such trust agreements may contain such provisions for protecting and enforcing the rights and remedies of the trustee and the bondholders as may be reasonable and proper and not inconsistent with the law and also provisions for approval by the original purchasers of the bonds of the employment of consulting engineers and of the security given by the bridge contractors and by any bank or trust company in which the proceeds of bonds or of bridge or ferry tolls or other moneys of the Commission shall be deposited, and may provide that no contract for construction shall be made without the approval of the consulting engineers. The bridge constructed under the authority of this act shall be deemed to be an instrumentality for international commerce authorized by the Government of the United States, and said bridge and ferry or ferries and the bonds issued in connection therewith and the income derived therefrom shall be exempt from all Federal, State, municipal, and local taxation. Said bonds shall be sold in such manner and at such time or times and at such price as the Commission may determine, but no such sale shall be made at a price so low as to require the payment of more than 6-percent interest on the money received therefor, computed with relation to the absolute maturity of the bonds in accordance with standard tables of bond values, and the face amount thereof shall be so calculated as to produce, at the price of their sale, the cost of the bridge and its approaches, and the land, easements, and appurtenances used in connection therewith and, in the event the ferry or ferries are to be acquired, also the cost of such ferry or ferries and the lands, easements, and appurtenances used in connection therewith. The cost of the bridge and ferry or ferries shall be deemed to include interest during construction of the bridge, and for 12 months thereafter, and all engineering, legal, architectural, traffic surveying, and other expenses incident to the construction of the bridge or the acquisition of the ferry or ferries, and the acquisition of the necessary property, and incident to the financing thereof, including the cost of acquiring existing franchises, rights, plans, and works of and relating to the bridge, now owned by any person, firm, or corporation, and the cost of purchasing all or any part of the shares of stock of any such corporate owner if, in the judgment of the Commission, such purchases should be found expedient. If the proceeds of the bonds issued shall exceed the cost as finally determined, the excess shall be placed in the sinking fund hereinafter provided. Prior to the preparation of definitive bonds the Commission may, under like restrictions, issue temporary bonds or interim certificates with or without coupons of any denomination whatsoever, exchangeable for definitive bonds when such bonds have been executed and are available for delivery.

SEC. 5. In fixing the rates of toll to be charged for the use of such bridge the same shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of depreciating, maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to pay the principal and interest of such bonds as the same shall fall due and the redemption or repurchase price of all or any thereof redeemed or repurchased before maturity as herein provided. All tolls and other revenues from said bridge are hereby pledged to such uses and to the application thereof hereinafter in this section required. After payment or provision for payment therefrom of all such cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating and the reservation of an amount of money estimated to be sufficient for the same purpose, the remainder of tolls collected shall be placed in the sinking fund, at intervals to be determined by the Commission prior to the issuance of the bonds. An accurate record of the cost of the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested. The Commission shall classify in a reasonable way all traffic over the bridge, so that the tolls shall be so fixed and adjusted by it as to be uniform in the application thereof to all traffic falling within any such reasonable class, regardless of the status or character of any person, firm, or corporation participating in such traffic, and shall prevent all use of such bridge for traffic except upon payment of the tolls so fixed and adjusted. No toll shall be charged officials or employees of the Commission or of the Governments of the United States or Canada while in the discharge of their duties.

SEC. 6. Nothing herein contained shall require the Commission or its successors to maintain or operate any ferry or ferries purchased hereunder, but in the discretion of the Commission or its successors any ferry or ferries so purchased, with the appurtenances and property thereto connected and belonging, may be sold or otherwise disposed of or may be abandoned and/or dismantled whenever in the judgment of the Commission or its successors it may seem expedient so to do. The Commission and its successors may fix such rates of toll for the use of such ferry or ferries as it may deem proper, subject to the same conditions as are hereinabove required as to tolls for traffic over the bridge. All tolls collected for the use of the ferry or ferries and the proceeds of any sale or disposition of any ferry or ferries shall be used, so far as may be necessary, to pay the cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and any residue thereof shall be paid into the sinking fund hereinabove provided for bonds. An accurate record of the cost of purchasing the ferry or ferries, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 7. After payment of the bonds and interest, or after a sinking fund sufficient for such payment shall have been provided and shall be held for that purpose, the Commission shall deliver deeds or other suitable instruments of conveyance of the interest of the Commission in and to the bridge, that part within the United States to the State of New York or any municipality or agency thereof as may be authorized by or pursuant to law to accept the same (hereinafter referred to as the "United States interests") and that part within Canada to the Dominion of Canada or to such Province, municipality, or agency thereof as may be authorized by or pursuant to law to accept the same (hereinafter referred to as the "Canadian interests"), under the conditions that the bridge shall thereafter be free of tolls and be properly maintained, operated, and repaired by the United States interests and the Canadian interests, as may be agreed upon; but if either the United States interests or the Canadian interests shall not be authorized to accept or shall not accept the same under such conditions, then the bridge shall continue to be owned, maintained, operated, and repaired by the Commission, and the rates of tolls shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operation of the bridge and its approaches under economical management, until such time as both the United States interests and the Canadian interests shall be authorized to accept and shall accept such conveyance under such conditions. If at the time of such conveyance the Commission or its successors shall not have disposed of such ferry or ferries, the same shall be disposed of by sale as soon as practicable, at such price and upon such terms as the Commission or its successors may determine, but in making any such sale preference shall be given to the Canadian interests and thereafter to the United States interests before any sale except to such respective interests.

SEC. 8. For the purpose of carrying into effect the objects stated in this act there is hereby created the St. Lawrence Bridge Commission, and by that name, style, and title said body shall have perpetual succession; may contract and be contracted with, sue and be sued, implead and be impleaded, complain and defend in all courts of law and equity; may make and have a common seal; may purchase or otherwise acquire and hold or dispose of real estate and other property; may accept and receive donations or gifts of money or other property and apply same to the purposes of this act; and shall have and possess all powers necessary, convenient, or proper for carrying into effect the objects stated in this act.

The Commission shall consist of nine members appointed by the Governor of New York. The members of the Commission first appointed shall continue in office for terms expiring on July 1, 1950; July 1, 1951; July 1, 1952; July 1, 1953; July 1, 1954; July 1, 1955; July 1, 1956; July 1, 1957; and July 1, 1958, respectively, the term of each such member to be designated by the Governor, and until their respective successors shall be duly appointed and qualified. One of the members so appointed by the Governor shall be recommended to the Governor by the Department of Public Works of the State of New York. The successor of each such member shall be appointed for a term of 8 years, except that any person appointed to fill a vacancy shall be appointed to serve only for the unexpired term, and a member of the Commission shall be eligible for reappointment. The membership of the Commission shall always include one member appointed by the Governor upon the recommendation of the Department of Public Works of the State of New York. Each member of the Commission and their respective successors shall qualify by giving such bond as may be fixed by the Commissioner of Public Roads, conditioned for the faithful performance of all duties required by this act. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from its members, and may establish rules and regulations for the government of its own business. Five members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

SEC. 9. The Commission shall have no capital stock or shares of interest or participation, and all revenues and receipts therefrom shall be applied to the purposes specified in this act. The members of the Commission shall be entitled to a per diem compensation for their services of $20 for each day actually spent in the business of the Commission, but the maximum compensation of the Chairman in any year shall

not exceed $6,000 and of each other member shall not exceed $4,000. The members of the Commission shall also be entitled to receive traveling expense allowance of 10 cents a mile for each mile actually traveled on the business of the Commission. The Commission may employ a secretary, treasurer, engineers, attorneys, and such other experts, assistants, and employees as they may deem necessary, who shall be entitled to receive such compensation as the Commission may determine. All salaries and expenses shall be paid solely from the funds provided under the authority of this act. After all bonds and interest thereon shall have been paid and all other obligations of the Commission paid or discharged, or provision for all such payment shall have been made as hereinbefore provided, and after the bridge shall have been conveyed to the United States interests and the Canadian interests as herein provided, and any ferry or ferries shall have been sold, the Commission shall be dissolved and shall cease to have any further existence by an order of the Commissioner of Public Roads made upon his own initiative or upon application of the Commission or any member or members thereof, but only after a public hearing in the city of Ogdensburg, notice of the time and place of which hearing and the purpose thereof shall have been published once, at least 30 days before the date thereof, in a newspaper published in the city of Ogdensburg, N. Y., and a newspaper published in Prescott, Ontario. At the time of such dissolution all moneys in the hands of or to the credit of the Commission shall be divided into two equal parts, one of which shall be paid to said United States interests and the other to said Canadian interests.

SEC. 10. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to authorize or permit the Commission or any member thereof to create any obligation or incur any liability other than such obligations and liabilities as are dischargeable solely from funds provided by this act. No obligation created or liability incurred pursuant to this act shall be an obligation or liability of any member or members of the Commission, but shall be chargeable solely to the funds herein provided, nor shall any indebtedness created pursuant to this act be an indebtedness of the United States.

SEC. 11. The times for commencing and completing of the construction of the bridge authorized by this act shall be 4 and 7 years, respectively, from the date of the approval hereof.

SEC. 12. All provisions of this act may be enforced, or the violation thereof prevented by mandamus, injunction, or other appropriate remedy brought by the attorney general for the State of New York, the United States district attorney for the district in which the bridge may be located in part, or by the solicitor general of the Dominion of Canada in any court having competent jurisdiction of the subject matter and the parties.

SEC. 13. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAM ACROSS THE SUSQUEHANNA RIVER, PA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3334) granting the consent of Congress to Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Susquehanna River.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman will withold his objection for a moment. The utility company in Pennsylvania seeks to construct a very low dam across the Susquehanna River in order to impound certain waters they need in their steam heating plant. The bill has the complete approval of the Army engineers and the other interested Government agencies. The dam, when constructed, will permit the use by the steam power plant, to which it would be an adjunct, of about 1,000,000 tons of anthracite coal which is produced in that part of the State. All of the money is provided locally and by the private utility company. I am very hopeful that they can proceed with construction in the immediate future. I respectfully suggest that the gentleman withdraw his request.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., its successors or assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Susquehanna River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, approximately 1½ miles below the Sunbury Bridge Co. toll bridge, in Upper Augusta Township, Northumberland County and Monroe Township, Snyder County, Pa.: *Provided*, That the work shall not be commenced until the plans therefor have been submitted to and approved by the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, and by the Secretary of War: *Provided further*, That this act shall not be construed to authorize the use of such dam to develop water power or generate hydroelectric energy.

SEC. 2. The authority granted by this act shall cease and be null and void, unless actual construction of the dam hereby authorized is commenced within 2 years and completed within 5 years from the date of enactment of this act: *Provided*, That from and after 30 days' notice from the Federal Power Commission, or other authorized agency of the United States, to said Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., its successors or assigns, that desirable water-power development will be interfered with by the existence of said dam, and said company, or its successors or assigns, shall alter the dam, without expense to the United States, so as to remove said interference and, upon failure to do so within a reasonable time, the authority hereby granted to construct, maintain, and operate said dam shall terminate and be at an end; and any grantee or licensee of the United States, proposing to develop a power project at or near said dam, shall have authority to remove, submerge, or utilize said dam, under such conditions as said Commission or other agency may determine, but such conditions shall not include compensation for the removal, submergence, or utilization of said dam.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 3, after "dam" insert a colon and the following: "*And provided further*, That the Pennsylvania Power and Light Co., its successors or assigns, shall hold and save the United States free from all claims for damage which may be sustained by the dam herein authorized, or damage sustained by the appurtenances of the said dam by reason of operations by the United States for flood control, the preservation or improvement of navigation, or for other purposes."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania: That wherever in H. R. 3334 and the title thereto the word "and" appears in the name "Pennsylvania Power and Light Co." the word "and" be stricken and the symbol "&" be inserted.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Granting the consent of Congress to Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Susquehanna River."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERTAIN PAYMENTS TO NONPROCESSING SLAUGHTERERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3738) to amend Public Law 88, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved June 23, 1945.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Public Law 88, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved June 23, 1945, is amended by adding a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. Any person, firm, partnership, or corporation who, prior to the issuance of amendment No. 1, dated July 5, 1945, with effective date July 15, 1945, and amendment No. 2, dated July 11, 1945, with effective date July 22, 1945, respectively, to Directive No. 56 of the Office of Economic Stabilization (said amendments being the same in substance as amendments numbered 7 and 8, respectively, of the Livestock Slaughter Payment Regulation No. 3 of the Defense Supplies of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation), was held not qualified to receive extra compensation payments as nonprocessing slaughterers; but who upon issuance of the above amendments to the Directive 56 of the Office of Economic Stabilization became qualified and eligible, or was declared or determined qualified and eligible by the Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization to receive such extra compensation payments as nonprocessing slaughterers from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or such other Government agency as may have jurisdiction thereof, for such period of time prior to the issuance of said amendments, as such person, firm, partnership, or corporation would have been entitled to receive if said amendments 4 and 2 of said Directive 56 and said amendments 7 and 8 of said regulation 3 had been effective retroactively to amendment 2 to regulation 3 dated October 26, 1943. And the said Reconstruction Finance Corporation or such other Government agency with jurisdiction to make subsidy payments is hereby authorized and directed to pay such retroactive subsidy payments to such claimants as qualify under this act, as amended."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, beginning in line 6, strike out the remainder of the bill and insert the following:

"SEC. 3. Any person who, after the issuance of amendment No. 1 (dated July 5, 1945) or amendment No. 2 (dated July 11, 1945) to Directive No. 56 of the Director of Economic Stabilization, and pursuant to the authority thereof, became qualified and eligible, or was declared or determined by such Director to have the necessary qualifications for eligibility, to receive extra compensation payments as a nonprocessing slaughterer (such person previously having been held not qualified to receive extra compensation payments as a nonprocessing slaughterer), shall be entitled to receive such extra compensation payments for such period of time prior to July 23, 1945, as such person would have been entitled to receive if such Directive No. 56, and amendments Nos. 1 and 2 thereto, and any such determination by such Director, had become effective November 1, 1943. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make the extra compensation payments which any person is entitled to receive pursuant to this section. As used in this section the term 'person' includes an individual, firm, partnership, or corporation."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS PROCUREMENT ACT OF 1947

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4010) to authorize any agency of the United States Government to furnish or to procure and furnish materials, supplies, and equipment to public international organizations on a reimbursable basis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "International Organizations Procurement Act of 1947."

SEC. 2. When used in this act—

(1) The term "Government agency" means any department, independent establishment, or other agency of the Government of the United States, or any corporation wholly by the Government of the United States.

(2) The term "international organization" means any public international organization entitled to enjoy, in whole or in part, the privileges, exemptions, and immunities authorized by and in accordance with the International Organizations Immunities Act (59 Stat. 669).

SEC. 3. Until the expiration of 4 years from the date of enactment hereof, any Government agency may, upon the request of any international organization and its agreement to pay the cost and expenses thereof by advancement of funds or reimbursement, furnish or may procure and furnish materials, supplies, and equipment to such international organizations: *Provided*, That, to the extent deemed necessary and appropriate by the Government agency concerned, such international organization indicates its actual needs for and intended use of such materials, supplies, and equipment: *Provided further*, That when reimbursement is made, it shall be credited either to the appropriation, fund, or account utilized in incurring the obligation, or to the appropriate appropriation, fund, or account which is current at the time of such reimbursement.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out paragraph (1), section 2, and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) The term 'international organization' means any public international organization having its headquarters in the United States and entitled to enjoy, in whole or in part, the privileges, exemptions, and immunities authorized by and in accordance with the International Organizations Immunities Act (59 Stat. 669)."

Page 2, line 1, strike out paragraph (2), section 2, and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) The term 'administrative supplies' means materials, supplies, and equipment used in housekeeping, maintenance, and office operations."

Page 2, line 6, strike out section 3 and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 3. Until July 1, 1948, the Treasury Department and the United States Government Printing Office, may, upon the request of any international organization and upon its agreement to pay the costs and expenses thereof by advancement of funds or by reimbursement, or by both, furnish, or procure and furnish to such international organization administrative supplies: *Provided*, That to the extent found by the Treasury Department or the United States Government Printing Office, respectively, to be necessary and appropriate in order to protect the interests of the United States Government in having access to sufficient supplies for its own needs, such international organization shall be required to indicate its needs and the intended use of such administrative supplies before they shall be furnished, or procured and furnished, to such international organization: *Provided further*, That when reimbursement is made, it shall be credited either to the appropriation, fund, or account utilized in incurring the obligation, or to the appropriation, fund, or account utilized in incurring the obligation, or to the appropriate appropriation, fund, or account which is current at the time of such reimbursement."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Treasury Department and the United States Government Printing Office to furnish, or to procure and furnish, administrative materials, supplies, and equipment to public international organizations on a reimbursable basis."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL POSITIONS IN WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4084) to authorize the creation of additional positions in the professional and scientific service in the War and Navy Departments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CARROLL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to have an explanation of this bill.

Mr. REES. This bill comes to the House from our committee at the request of the Army and Navy. They say they are unable to secure the scientists they need in the service for the salaries now being paid. May I say that the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is one of those who has been opposed to breaking the $10,000 ceiling, but the Army and Navy both made a showing to the committee indicating to us that this legislation is necessary if they are going to have the kind of trained scientists they need at the present time. They tell us there is more and more demand for scientific assistants in the Army and Navy.

Mr. CARROLL. My concern is not how much they pay these men but how much the military is going to be taking over the scientists. This restricts them to a certain number?

Mr. REES. Yes, 45 is the limit. The salary will not be more than $15,000 to any one of them.

Mr. CARROLL. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for, within the War Department, not more than 30 positions, and the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for, within the Naval Establishment, not more than 15 positions in the professional and scientific service, each such position being established to effectuate those research and development functions relating to the national defense, military and naval medicine, and any and all other activities of the War Department or Naval Establishment which require the services of specially qualified scientific or professional personnel: *Provided*, That the rates of compensation for positions established pursuant to the provisions of this act shall not be less than $10,000 per annum nor more than $15,000 per annum, and shall be subject to the approval of the Civil Service Commission.

SEC. 2. Positions created pursuant to this act shall be included in the classified civil service of the United States, but appointments to such positions shall be made without competitive examination upon approval of the proposed appointee's qualifications by the Civil Service Commission or such officers or agents as it may designate for this purpose.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, shall submit to the Congress, not later than December 31 of each year, a report setting forth the number of positions established pursuant to this act in their respective departments during that calendar year, and the name, rate of compensation, and description of the qualifications of each incumbent, together with a statement of the functions performed by each. In any instance where the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy may consider full public report on these items detrimental to the national security, he is authorized to omit such items from his annual report and, in lieu thereof, to present such information in executive sessions of such committees of the Senate and House of Representatives as the presiding officers of those bodies shall designate.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INSTITUTE OF INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4168) to provide for the reincorporation of the

Institute of Inter-American Affairs, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER], I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

CARIBBEAN COMMISSION

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 231) providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Caribbean Commission and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas representatives of the Governments of the French Republic, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America signed "An agreement for the establishment of the Caribbean Commission" in Washington on October 30, 1946, which agreement continued and extended the international cooperative arrangements initiated in 1942 between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States; and

Whereas the purpose of the Caribbean Commission is to encourage and strengthen international cooperation in promoting the economic and social welfare and advancement of the non-self-governing territories in the Caribbean area, whose economic and social development is of vital interest to the security of the United States, in accordance with the principles set forth in chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby authorized to accept membership for the United States in the Caribbean Commission, created by "An agreement for the establishment of the Caribbean Commission," signed in Washington on October 30, 1946, by representatives of the Governments of the French Republic, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America, and to appoint the United States Commissioners, and their alternates, thereto.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not more than $142,000 annually—

(a) For the payment by the United States of its proportionate share of the expenses of the Commission and its auxiliary and subsidiary bodies, pursuant to article XV of the "agreement for the establishment of the Caribbean Commission"; and

(b) For the payment of all necessary expenses incident to participation by the United States in the activities of the Commission, including salaries of the United States Commissioners, their alternates, appropriate staff, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; personal services in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of Public Law 600, Seventy-ninth Congress; hire of passenger motor vehicles and other local transportation; printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111), and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; and such other expenses as the Secretary of State finds necessary to participation by the United States in the activities of the Commission: *Provided*, That the provision of section 6 of the act of July 30, 1946 (Public Law 565, 79th Cong.), and regulations thereunder, applicable to expenses incurred pursuant to that act shall be applicable to and expenses incurred pursuant to this paragraph (b).

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOUTH PACIFIC COMMISSION

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 232) providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas delegates representing the Governments of Australia, the French Republic, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, New Zealand, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America attended the South Seas Conference held at Canberra, Australia, and signed an "Agreement Establishing the South Pacific Commission" on February 6, 1947 and

Whereas the purpose of the South Pacific Commission is to encourage and strengthen international cooperation in promoting the economic and social welfare and advancement of the non-self-governing territories in the South Pacific in accordance with the principles set forth in chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations, thereby contributing to the maintenance of international peace and security: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby authorized to accept membership for the United States in the South Pacific Commission, created by the Agreement Establishing the South Pacific Commission, signed on February 6, 1947, at Canberra, Australia, by delegates representing the Governments of Australia, the French Republic, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, New Zealand, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America, and to appoint the United States Commissioners, and their alternates, thereto.

SEC. 2. When used in this joint resolution—

(1) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of State;

(2) the term "Government agency" means any department, independent establishment, or other agency of the Government of the United States, or any corporation wholly owned by the Government of the United States and

(3) the term "Commission" means the South Pacific Commission.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not more than $20,000 annually—

(a) For the payment by the United States of its proportionate share of the expenses of the Commission and its auxiliary and subsidiary bodies, as set forth in article 14 of the Agreement Establishing the South Pacific Commission.

(b) For the payment of all necessary expenses incident to participation by the United States in the activities of the Commission, including salaries of the United States Commissioners, their alternates, and appropriate staff, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; personal services in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of Public Law 600, Seventy-ninth Congress under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light and cost-of-living allowances to persons temporarily stationed abroad; hire of passenger motor vehicles and other local transportation; printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111), and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended and such other expenses as the Secretary of State finds necessary to participation by the United States in the activities of the Commission: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 6 of the act of July 30, 1946 (Public Law 565, 79th Cong.), and regulations thereunder, applicable to expenses incurred pursuant to that act shall be applicable to any expenses incurred pursuant to this paragraph (b).

SEC. 4. The Secretary is authorized, when the Commission is desirous of obtaining the services of a person having special scientific or other technical or professional qualifications, from time to time to detail, or authorize the detail of, for temporary service to or in cooperation with the Commission, any person in the employ or service of the Government of the United States who has such qualifications, with the approval of the Government agency in which such person is employed or serving, under the same conditions as those governing the detail of officers and employees of the United States Government to the government of another country in accordance with the provisions of the act of May 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 442), as amended, except that the authority vested in the President under that act shall be vested in the Secretary for the purpose of carrying out this section.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SURPLUS AIRPORTS AND AIRPORT FACILITIES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 364) to expedite the disposition of Government surplus airports, airport facilities, and equipment and to assure their disposition in such manner as will best encourage and foster the development of civilian aviation and preserve for national defense purposes a strong, efficient, and properly maintained Nationwide system of public airports, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (c) of section 13 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 765), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) No harbor or port terminal, including necessary operating equipment, shall be otherwise disposed of until it has first been offered, under regulations to be prescribed by the Administrator, for sale or lease to the State, political subdivision thereof, and any municipality, in which it is situated, and to all municipalities in the vicinity thereof."

SEC. 2. Section 13 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 765), as amended, is hereby amended by adding a new subsection (g) reading as follows:

"(g) (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, any disposal agency designated pursuant to this act may, with the approval of the Administrator, convey or dispose of to any State, political subdivision, municipality, or tax-supported institution, without monetary consideration to the United States, but subject to the terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions hereinafter provided for, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any surplus real or personal property (exclusive of property the highest and best use of which is determined by the Ad-

ministrator to be industrial and which shall be so classified for disposal without regard to the provisions of this subsection) which, in the determination of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, is essential, suitable, or desirable for the development, improvement, operation, or maintenance of a public airport as defined in the Federal Airport Act (60 Stat. 170) or reasonably necessary to fulfill the immediate and foreseeable future requirements of the grantee for the development, improvement, operation, or maintenance of a public airport, including property needed to develop sources of revenue from nonaviation businesses at a public airport.

"(2) Except as provided in paragraph (3) hereof, all property disposed of under the authority of this subsection shall be disposed of on and subject to the following terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions:

"(A) No property disposed of under the authority of this subsection shall be used, leased, sold, salvaged, or disposed of by the grantee or transferee for other than airport purposes without the written consent of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, which consent shall be granted only if the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics determines that the property can be used, leased, sold, salvaged, or disposed of for other than airport purposes without materially and adversely affecting the development, improvement, operation, or maintenance of the airport at which such property is located: *Provided*, That no structures disposed of hereunder shall be used as an industrial plant, factory, or similar facility within the meaning of section 23 of this act, unless the public agency receiving title to such structures shall pay to the United States such sum as the Administrator shall determine to be a fair consideration for the removal of the restriction imposed by this proviso.

"(B) All property transferred for airport purposes shall be used and maintained for the use and benefit of the public, without unjust discrimination.

"(C) No exclusive right for the use of the airport at which the property disposed of is located shall be vested (either directly or indirectly) in any person or persons to the exclusion of others in the same class. For the purpose of this condition, an exclusive right is defined to mean—

"(1) any exclusive right to use the airport for conducting any particular aeronautical activity requiring operation of aircraft;

"(2) any exclusive right to engage in the sale or supplying of aircraft, aircraft accessories, equipment, or supplies (excluding the sale of gasoline and oil), or aircraft services necessary for the operation of aircraft (including the maintenance and repair of aircraft, aircraft engines, propellers, and appliances).

"(D) The grantee shall, insofar as it is within its powers, adequately clear and protect the aerial approaches to the airport by removing, lowering, relocating, marking, or lighting or otherwise mitigating existing airport hazards and by preventing the establishment or creation of future airport hazards.

"(E) During any national emergency declared by the President or by the Congress, the United States shall have the right to make exclusive or nonexclusive use and have exclusive or nonexclusive control and possession, without charge, of the airport at which the surplus property is located or used, or of such portion thereof as it may desire: *Provided, however*, That the United States shall be responsible for the entire cost of maintaining such part of the airport as it may use exclusively, or over which it may have exclusive possession and control, during the period of such use, possession, or control, and shall be obligated to contribute a reasonable share, commensurate with the use made by it, of the cost of maintenance of such property as it may use nonexclusively or over which it may have nonexclusive control and possession: *Provided further*, That the United States shall pay a fair rental for its use, control, or possession, exclusively or nonexclusively, of any improvements to the airport made without United States aid.

"(F) The United States shall at all times have the right to make nonexclusive use of the landing area of the airport at which the surplus property is located or used, without charge: *Provided, however*, That such use may be limited as may be determined at any time by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to be necessary to prevent undue interference with use by other authorized aircraft: *Provided further*, That the United States shall be obligated to pay for damages caused by such use, or if its use of the landing area is substantial, to contribute a reasonable share of the cost of maintaining and operating the landing area, commensurate with the use made by it.

"(G) Any public agency accepting a conveyance or transfer of surplus property under the provisions of this subsection shall release the United States from any and all liability it may be under for restoration or other damages under any lease or other agreement covering the use by the United States of any airport, or part thereof, owned, controlled, or operated by the public agency upon which, adjacent to which, or in connection with which, the surplus property was located or used: *Provided*, That no such release shall be construed as depriving the public agency of any right it may otherwise have to receive reimbursement under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act for the necessary rehabilitation or repair of public airports heretofore or hereafter substantially damaged by any Federal agency.

"(H) In the event that any of the terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions upon or subject to which the property is disposed of is not met, observed, or complied with, all of the property so disposed of or any portion thereof, shall, at the option of the United States, revert to the United States in its then existing condition.

"(3) In making any disposition of surplus property under this subsection (g), the disposal agency is authorized, upon the request of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, the Secretary of War, or the Secretary of the Navy, to omit from the instruments of disposal any of the terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions required by paragraph (2) hereof, and to include any additional terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions, if the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, the Secretary of War, or the Secretary of the Navy determines that such omission or inclusion is necessary to protect or advance the interests of the United States in civil aviation or for national defense.

"(4) The Administrator of Civil Aeronautics shall have the sole responsibility for determining and enforcing compliance with the terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions upon or subject to which surplus property is disposed of pursuant to this subsection.

"(5) All surplus property within the purview of this subsection which is not disposed of pursuant hereto shall be disposed of as provided elsewhere in this act or other applicable Federal statute.

"(6) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (f) of this section and subsection (c) of section 18, the disposal of surplus property under this subsection, which is determined by the Administrator to be available for the purposes enumerated in this subsection, shall be given priority immediately following transfers to other Government agencies under section 12."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 7, line 21, strike out "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(e)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLEVIATION OF FLOOD DAMAGE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1515) to make surplus property available for the alleviation of damage caused by flood or other catastrophe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the War Assets Administration shall, whenever the President shall determine it to be necessary or appropriate because of flood or other catastrophe, transfer, without reimbursement, to the Federal Works Agency such articles of personal property, which have been declared surplus under the provisions of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 765), as amended, as in the judgment of the Federal Works Administrator and the War Assets Administrator can be presently utilized in alleviating damage, hardship, and suffering caused by such flood or other catastrophe.

SEC. 2. The Federal Work Administrator is authorized to loan or transfer, with or without monetary consideration and upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, to States and local governments situated in any area struck by any flood or catastrophe, any property transferred to the Federal Works Agency for such purposes pursuant to the provisions of this act. All receipts from such transfer shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 3. In carrying out the provisions of this act the Federal Works Administrator is authorized to utilize, and act through, any other Federal agency or any State or local government and he may utilize, without reimbursement therefor, such officers and employees of any such agency or State or local government as may be found necessary in carrying out the purpose of this act. In order to facilitate carrying out the purposes of this act, other Federal agencies shall cooperate with the Federal Works Agency and the War Assets Administration to the fullest extent consistent with the objective of this act.

SEC. 4. To carry out the provisions of this act, including administrative expenses in connection therewith, any funds available to the Federal Works Administrator or Agency for use in connection with the transfer of surplus or other excess property, under Public Law 697, Seventy-ninth Congress, are hereby made available; and for such purpose there is authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be necessary therefor.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS' HOSPITAL AT BIRTHPLACE OF BOOKER T. WASHINGTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3814) to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital for Negro veterans at the birthplace of Booker T. Washington in Franklin County, Va.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill is opposed by the Veterans' Administration. It would cost $5,000,000. I believe that probably a hospital for colored veterans is a very good thing, but I do not think we should

pass the bill on the Consent Calendar, inasmuch as it involves a large amount of money and is contrary to all the rules governing consideration of bills on the Consent Calendar.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I discussed the matter with General Hawley. His original objection was that it was not near enough to medical centers. Then I believe he felt it was near enough and that there was a very large load of colored patients in West Virginia, some 50,000, and a great many nearby.

This hospital would fill a very great need. It would release doctors and provide more beds in other hospitals.

Mr. KEAN. It does not say so in the report. If General Hawley has withdrawn his opposition, he should so indicate in the report by a letter. But, even so, it will cost $5,000,000, and it is contrary to the rules of the committee of objectors.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. As the gentleman knows, there are always certain sums set aside for hospitals. I think this is a little different from considering another bill which would involve $5,000,000. It is simply a question of time when that money would be spent.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, we cannot let our feelings or sentiments affect our judgment in these matters. I would be very glad to see the hospital built to provide for the veterans, but I must ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

TRANSFER OF REAL PROPERTY FOR WILDLIFE CONSERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4018) authorizing the transfer of certain real property for wildlife, or other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That, upon request, real property which is under the jurisdiction or control of a Federal agency and no longer required by such agency, (1) can be utilized for wildlife conservation, recreation, forestry, or educational purposes by the agency of the State, political subdivision thereof, or exercising administration over the State wherein the real property lies or by the Secretary of the Interior; and (2) is chiefly valuable for use for any such purpose, and which, in the determination of the War Assets Administrator, is available for such use may, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, be transferred without reimbursement or transfer of funds (with or without improvements as determined by said Administrator) by the Federal agency having jurisdiction or control of the property to (a) such State political subdivision agency if the management thereof for the conservation of wildlife relates to other than migratory birds, or to recreation, forestry, or educational projects or programs, or (b) to the Secretary of the Interior if the real property has particular value in carrying out the national migratory bird management or national park program. Any such transfer to other than the United States shall be subject to the condition that the property shall continue to be used for wildlife conservation or other of the above-stated purposes and in the event it is no longer used for such purposes title thereto shall revert to the United States.

SEC. 2. Whenever any real property is transferred pursuant to this act, the War Assets Administrator shall make and have published in the Federal Register an appropriate order, which may be revised from time to time in like manner, designating for which of the purposes specified in section 1 of this act the property so transferred shall be used.

SEC. 3. A statement of the acreage and value of such property as may have been transferred pursuant to this act during the preceding fiscal year shall be annually prepared by the War Assets Administrator and shall be included in the annual budget transmitted to the Congress

SEC. 4. All oil, gas, and mineral rights shall revert back to the owner of the property or properties of record immediately prior to Government acquisition, provided such rights were actively reserved prior thereto.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the comma and the words "recreation, forestry, or educational."

Page 1, line 7, strike out the comma and the words "political subdivision thereof, or."

Page 1 line 8, after the words "administration over the", add the words "wildlife resources of the."

Page 2, line 6, strike out the words "political subdivision."

Page 2, line 8, after the word "birds", strike out the words "or to recreation, forestry, or educational projects or programs."

Page 2, line 11, after the word "management", strike out the words "or national park."

Page 2, line 13, after the words "subject to the", add the words "reservation by the United States of all oil, gas, and mineral rights, and to the."

Page 2, line 16, after the words "for such purpose", add the words "or in the event it is needed for national defense purposes."

Page 3, line 5, strike out all of section 4.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE DREDGE "AJAX"

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4229) to provide that the Canadian-built dredge *Ajax* and certain other dredging equipment owned by a United States corporation be documented under the laws of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the author of the bill explain it?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in 1942, the Puget Sound Bridge & Dredging Co. was engaged in certain naval work for the Navy Department in Alaska. In the course of their work they lost a dredge. The Navy Department requested them to obtain immediate replacement. The only place they could obtain replacement was in Canada. Since that time a waiver has been obtained under the War Powers Act for the registration of the vessels, but with the expiration of the War Powers Act, they have been unable to use the dredge because a foreign-built vessel cannot be documented under the laws of the United States.

This bill would permit such documentation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It does not require any appropriation or any expenditure?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Oh, none whatever. It merely authorizes them to register this vesesl.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Director of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation is authorized and directed to document under the laws of the United States the Canadian-built dredge *Ajax* and the Canadian-built dump scows *D. S. 135290*, *D. S. 135291*, *D. S. 308*, and *D. S. 310*, which are owned by the Puget Sound Towboat Co., a subsidiary of the Puget Sound Bridge & Dredging Co., in order that such vessels may continue to operate within the United States without violating the restrictions of the navigation laws on dredging operations and coastwise transportation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCIS MARION NATIONAL FOREST

The Clerk called the bill (S. 616) to authorize the creation of a game refuge in the Francis Marion National Forest in the State of South Carolina.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of providing breeding places for game animals and birds and for the protection and administration of game animals and birds, and fish, the President of the United States is hereby authorized, upon the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture, to establish by public proclamation certain specified federally owned areas within the Francis Marion National Forest as game sanctuaries and refuges.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture shall execute the provisions of this act, and he is hereby authorized to prescribe all general rules and regulations for the administration of such game sanctuaries and refuges, and violation of such rules and regulations shall be punished by fine of not more than $500 or imprisonment for not more than 6 months or both.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMEMORATIVE STAMPS IN HONOR OF GOLD STAR MOTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1180) to authorize the issuance of a special series of commemorative stamps in honor of Gold Star Mothers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to prepare for issuance at as early a date as practicable, a special series of 3-cent postage stamps, of such design as he shall prescribe, in honor and commemoration of Gold Star Mothers.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF BLACK BASS AND OTHER GAME FISH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 682) to regulate the interstate transportation of black bass and other game fish, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to regulate the interstate transportation of black bass, and for other purposes," approved May 20, 1926, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"That when used in this act the word 'person' includes company, partnership, corporation, association, and common carrier, and the term 'game fish' shall mean black bass and such other fish as are defined as game fish by the laws of the State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, in which the fish has been either caught, killed, taken, sold, purchased, or possessed, or from which it was transported.

"SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for any person to deliver or knowingly receive for transportation, or knowingly to transport, by any means whatsoever, from any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, to or through any other State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or to or through any foreign country, any black bass or other game fish, if (1) such transportation is contrary to the law of the State, Territory, or the District of Columbia from which such black bass or other game fish is or is to be transported, or is contrary to other applicable law, or (2) such black bass or other game fish has been either caught, killed, taken, sold, purchased, possessed, or transported, at any time, contrary to the law of the State, Territory, or the District of Columbia in which it was caught, killed, taken, sold, purchased, or possessed, or from which it was transported or contrary to other applicable law; and no person shall knowingly purchase or receive any such black bass or other game fish which has been transported in violation of the provisions of this act; nor shall any person receiving any shipment of black bass or other game fish transported in interstate commerce make any false record or render a false account of the contents of such shipment.

"SEC. 3. Any package or container containing such game fish transported or delivered for transportation in interstate commerce, except any shipment covered by section 9, shall be clearly and conspicuously marked on the outside thereof with the name 'Game Fish,' an accurate statement of the number of each species of such fish contained therein, and the names and addresses of the shipper and consignee.

"SEC. 4. All such black bass or other game fish, transported into any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia for use, consumption, sale, or storage therein shall upon arrival in such State, Territory, or the District of Columbia be subject to the operation and effect of the laws of such State, Territory, or the District of Columbia to the same extent and in the same manner as though such fish had been produced in such State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, and shall not be exempt therefrom by reason of being introduced therein in original packages or otherwise.

"SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized (1) to make such expenditures, including expenditures for personal services at the seat of government and elsewhere, and for cooperation with local, State, and Federal authorities, including the issuance of publications, and necessary investigations, as may be necessary to execute the functions imposed upon him by this act and as may be provided for by Congress from time to time; and (2) to make such regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this act. Any person violating any such regulation shall be deemed guilty of a violation of this act.

"SEC. 6. (a) Any employee of the Department of the Interior authorized by the Secretary of the Interior to enforce the provisions of this act (1) shall have power, without warrant, to arrest any person committing in the presence of such employee a violation of this act or any regulation made in pursuance of this act, and to take such person immediately for examination or trial before an officer or court of competent jurisdiction; (2) shall have power to execute any warrants or other process issued by an officer or court of competent jurisdiction to enforce the provisions of this act or regulations made in pursuance thereof; and (3) shall have authority with a search warrant issued by an officer or court of competent jurisdiction, to make search in accordance with the terms of such warrant. Any judge of a court established under the laws of the United States, or any United States commissioner may, within his respective jurisdiction upon proper oath or affirmation showing probable cause, issue warrants in all such cases.

"(b) All fish delivered for transportation or which have been transported, purchased, received, or which are being transported, in violation of this act, or any regulations made pursuant thereto, shall, when found by such employee or by any marshal or deputy marshal, be summarily seized by him and placed in the custody of such persons as the Secretary of the Interior shall by regulations prescribe, and shall, as a part of the penalty and in addition to any fine or imprisonment imposed under section 7 of this act, be forfeited by such court to the United States upon conviction of the offender under this act, or upon judgment of the court that the same were transported, delivered, purchased, or received in violation of this act or regulations made pursuant thereto.

"SEC. 7. In addition to any forfeiture herein provided, any person who shall violate any of the provisions of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not exceeding $200, or imprisonment for a term of not more than 3 months, or by both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.

"SEC. 8. Nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent the several States and Territories from making or enforcing laws or regulations not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, or from making or enforcing laws or regulations which shall give further protection to black bass and other game fish.

"SEC. 9. Nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent the shipment in interstate commerce of live fish and eggs for breeding or stocking purposes."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 6, line 5, strike out the quotation marks.

Page 6, line 6, at the end of the bill insert:

"SEC. 10. The provisions of this act as relating to game fish shall not apply to steelhead trout (salmo gairdneri) legally taken in the Columbia River between the States of Washington and Oregon."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read the third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 401 OF THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4169) to amend section 401 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, so as to permit the granting of authority for temporary emergency service of air carriers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 401 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"TEMPORARY EMERGENCY SERVICE

"(o) In any proceeding pursuant to subsection (c) or (h) of this section in which there is in issue air-transportation service to and from a point or points not authorized to receive such service by any certificate then currently effective, the Board upon petition shall summarily, prior to the final disposition of such proceeding, make provision for such service to and from such point or points, by issuing a temporary certificate or certificates or by temporarily amending an existing certificate or certificates if it finds (1) that by reason of unusual circumstances affecting the public health, safety, or welfare, there exists an emergency requiring such service to and from such point or points, and (2) that adequate facilities are available at such point or points for the rendering of such service. The duration of each such certificate or amendment shall be determined by the provisions of subsection (g) of this section, but shall not, in any event, extend beyond a date 60 days after final disposition of such proceeding. The issuance of any such certificate or amendment shall not create a presumption that a corresponding permanent certificate or amendment will be granted thereafter."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 9, strike out the word "and".

Page 2, line 11, after the word "service", insert "and (3) that an air carrier is presently fit, willing, and able to render such service properly."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4044) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CONSTRUCTION, PROTECTION, OPERATION, AND MAINTENANCE OF PUBLIC AIRPORT IN THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3510) to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in the Territory of Alaska.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object: This bill, Mr. Speaker, provides for the construction

and maintenance of a public airport in the Territory of Alaska. This was heard by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at which time the War Department presented in secret, executive session, important information in support of this measure. In addition, the Department of the Interior, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Air Coordinating Committee had representatives who made statements all in support of the measure. The chief reason for this legislation is the fact that the United States Army, which previously permitted the use of Elmendorf Field for flying, no longer permits it, and has served notice on the commercial air lines that that field will no longer be available to them. This means that the city of Anchorage and the surrounding area will be without a commercial airport until such time as the facilities provided in this bill are constructed.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has recently authorized a number of American carriers to fly routes through Anchorage, Alaska, to the Orient.

In view of the fact this measure is so closely related to the national defense of this country in that vital part of the world I would not want to take the responsibility for delaying this measure because, as you know, in Alaska construction progress is slow due to weather and other conditions, and construction costs are higher than in the continental United States. I would not want to take responsibility for jeopardizing our national defense in this important area in the Western Hemisphere. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I feel constrained to object to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION OF CLASS IV AIRPORT AND PUBLIC HIGHWAY, FAIRBANKS, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3509) to authorize the construction of a class IV airport for the city of Fairbanks, Alaska, and a public highway or bridge from the city of Fairbanks to the location of the airport.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the same situation is true with reference to this bill as was true of the preceding bill. The air installation at Fairbanks, as everybody knows, is the headquarters of our cold weather air training and experimentation. The Army has permitted civilian authorities to use Ladd Field for commercial and private flying, but they recently served notice upon commercial aviators and companies that the facilities of the field would no longer be available.

This is also vitally connected with the national defense of our country. Because of that fact and because I do not wish to take responsibility for jeopardizing our national defense in this important area of the Western Hemisphere, I object to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, entirely on account of the cost of the bill being too high for consideration under the Consent Calendar, I object.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the calling of the Consent Calendar.

MINING LOCATIONS IN A CERTAIN PORTION OF HARNEY NATIONAL FOREST

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 307 the bill (H. R. 2867) to permit, subject to certain conditions, mining locations under the mining laws of the United States within that portion of the Harney National Forest, designated as a game sanctuary, and for other purposes.

I have talked to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], who objected. I have explained the bill to him and he has told me he has no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, subject to the conditions herein provided, mining locations may be made under the general mining laws of the United States on lands of the United States situated within the exterior boundaries of that portion of the Harney National Forest designated as the Custer State Park Game Sanctuary, S. Dak., created pursuant to the provisions of the act of June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 986), as amended. A locator shall have the right to occupy and use so much of the surface of the land covered by the location as may be reasonably necessary to carry on prospecting and mining, including the taking of mineral deposits and timber required by or in the mining operations, and no permit shall be required or charge made for such use or occupancy: *Provided, however*, That the mining operations herein authorized shall be subject to such rules and regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary in furtherance of the purposes for which the said sanctuary was established: *Provided further*, That the cutting and removal of timber, except where clearing is necessary in connection with mining operations or to provide space for buildings or structures used in connection with mining operations, shall be conducted in accordance with the marking rules and timber sale practices applicable to the Harney National Forest, and no use of the surface of the claim or the resources therefrom not reasonably required for carrying on mining and prospecting shall be allowed except under the national-forest rules and regulations, nor shall the locator prevent or obstruct other occupany of the surface or use of surface resources under authority of national-forest regulations, or permits issued thereunder, if such occupancy or use is not in conflict with mineral development: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture in his discretion may prohibit the location of mining claims within 660 feet of any Federal, State, or county road, and within such other areas where the location of mining claims would not be in the public interest: *And provided further*, That no patent shall be issued by the United States on any location filed pursuant to the authority contained in this act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 3, beginning with line 6, add the following:

"SEC. 2. To facilitate administration for the purpose for which the sanctuary has been established, the western boundary of the sanctuary lying north of Custer State Park is hereby redefined as follows:

"'Beginning at the east quarter corner of section 7, township 2 south, range 5 east, Black Hills meridian, thence south along said section line to its intersection with a line 300 feet north of the Horse Thief Lake Road, thence southwesterly along a line 300 feet northwesterly from the center line of said road and running approximately parallel thereto to the intersection of said road with United States Highway 85A, thence southerly along a line 300 feet west of United States Highway 85A, and approximately parallel thereto to the present south boundary of said sanctuary in section 3 south, range 4 east, Black Hills meridian.'"

Mr. KEAN (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the regular business of the day I may be allotted 5 minutes under a special order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT OF MAY 29, 1930, AS AMENDED

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 4127) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. (a) Any officer or employee to whom this act applies who shall have attained or shall hereafter attain the age of 60 years and have rendered at least 30 years of service computed as prescribed in section 5 of this act, or who shall have attained or shall hereafter attain the age of 62 years and have rendered at least 15 years of such service, shall, upon separation from the service, be paid an annuity computed as provided in section 4 of this act.

"(b) Any officer or employee to whom this act applies who shall have attained or shall hereafter attain the age of 55 years and have rendered at least 30 years of service computed as prescribed in section 5 of this act shall, upon separation from the service, be paid an annuity computed as provided in section 4 of this act, reduced by one-half

of 1 percent for each full month such officer or employee is under the age of 60 years.

"(c) Any officer or employee to whom this act applies, after having rendered at least 25 years of service computed as prescribed in section 5 of this act, (1) upon involuntary separation from the service not be removal for cause on charges of misconduct or delinquency, or (2) upon voluntary separation from the service if such officer or employee had accepted a position with a lower rate of basic salary, pay, or compensation after having been so involuntarily separated from a position with a higher rate of basic salary, pay, or compensation, and was receiving less than such higher rate at the time of his voluntary separation, shall be paid an immediate life annuity computed as provided in section 4 of this act reduced by one-fourth of 1 percent for each full month such officer or employee is under the age of 60 years. This subsection shall become effective July 1, 1947."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. (a) Except as provided in section 204 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 404), and section 3 of the act of July 13, 1937 (50 Stat. 512), any officer or employee to whom this act applies who shall have completed 15 years of service computed as provided in section 5 of this act shall, on the last day of the month in which he attains the age of 70 years, or completes 15 years of service if then beyond such age, be automatically separated from the service, and all salary, pay, or compensation shall cease from that date, and the head of each department, branch, or independent office of the Government concerned shall notify each such employee under his direction of the date of his separation from the service at least 60 days in advance thereof: *Provided*, That should the head of the department, branch, or independent office fail, through error, to give timely notification, the employee's separation from the service shall not be effected without his consent until the expiration of said 60-day period. Upon such separation, the officer or employee shall be eligible for retirement on annuity as provided in section 4 hereof.

"(b) No person who is receiving an annuity under the provisions of this act and who has reached the age of 60 years shall be eligible again to appointment to any appointive office, position, or employment under the Government of the United States or of the District of Columbia, unless the appointing authority determines that he is possessed of special qualifications: *Provided*, That no deductions for the retirement fund shall be withheld from the salary, pay, or compensation of such person, but there shall be deducted from his salary, pay, or compensation otherwise payable a sum equal to the retirement annuity allocable to the period of actual employment: *Provided further*, That the annuity in such case shall not be redetermined upon such person's subsequent separation from the service."

SEC. 3. (a) Paragraph (6) of section 3A of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(6) (a) In the case of a Member of Congress who becomes separated from the service before he completes an aggregate of 6 years of service as a Member of Congress, and who is not retired for disability, the total amount deducted from his basic salary, pay, or compensation or deposited by him as a Member of Congress shall be returned to such Member of Congress together with interest at 4 percent per annum to December 31, 1947, and at 3 percent per annum thereafter compounded on December 31 of each year, to date of separation. No such Member of Congress shall thereafter become eligible to receive an annuity as provided in this section unless the amounts so returned are redeposited with interest at 4 percent compounded on December 31 of each year, but interest shall not be required covering any period of separation from the service.

"(b) In case a Member of Congress shall die prior to retirement the total sums deducted from his basic salary, pay, or compensation or deposited by him, together with interest at 4 percent per annum to December 31, 1947, and at 3 percent per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year to date of death shall be paid, upon the establishment of a valid claim therefor, in the order of precedence prescribed in section 12.

"(c) In case a former Member of Congress receiving an annuity under this section shall die without having received in purchasable annuities an amount equal to the total sums deducted from his basic salary, pay, or compensation or deposited by him, together with interest at 4 percent per annum to December 31, 1947, and at 3 percent per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year to date of retirement, the difference and/or any accrued annuity due shall be paid, upon the establishment of a valid claim therefor, in the order of precedence prescribed in section 12."

(b) Except as provided in this section the amendments made by this act shall not apply to any person subject to the provisions of section 3A of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and the rights and obligations of such person under such act shall continue as though this act had not been enacted.

(c) Section 3 (a) of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, any officer or employee in the legislative branch of the Government within the classes of officers or employees which were made eligible for the benefits of this act by the act of July 13, 1937, serving in such position on the effective date of this act, may give notice of his desire to come within the purview of this act at any time prior to July 1, 1948."

SEC. 4. Section 4 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. (a) The annuity of an officer or employee retired under this act shall be a life annuity, terminable upon the death of the annuitant and shall be an amount equal to the following: (1) 1½ percent of the average annual basic salary, pay, or compensation received by the officer or employee during any five consecutive years of allowable service at the option of the officer or employee multiplied by the years of service, or (2) 1 percent of the average annual basic salary, pay, or compensation received by the officer or employee during any five consecutive years of allowable service at the option of the officer or employee multiplied by the years of service, plus a sum equal to $25 for each year of such service: *Provided*, That if deposit or redeposit under section 7, 9, or 12 (b) hereof has not been made, the annuity for the period or periods of service covered by the deposit or redeposit shall be in an amount equal to 1 percent of the average annual basic salary, pay, or compensation received by the officer or employee during any five consecutive years of allowable service at the option of the officer or employee multiplied by the years of such service: *Provided further*, That in no case shall the annuity exceed an amount equal to 90 percent of the highest average annual basic salary, pay or compensation received by the officer or employee during five consecutive years of allowable service.

"(b) Any officer or employee, if a husband, retiring under the provisions of section 1, 2, or 6 of this act may at the time of his retirement elect to receive in lieu of the life annuity described herein a reduced annuity equal to 90 percent of such life annuity and an annuity after his death payable to his surviving widow equal to 50 percent of such life annuity. The annuity of such widow shall begin on the first day of the month in which the death of the husband occurs or the first day of the month following the widow's attainment of age 60, whichever is the later, and shall terminate upon her death.

"(c) Any officer or employee in good health retiring under the provisions of section 1 or 2 of this act may at the time of his retirement elect to receive in lieu of the life annuity described herein a reduced annuity payable to him during his life, and an annuity after his death payable to a survivor annuitant, duly designated in writing and filed with the Civil Service Commission at the time of his retirement, during the life of such survivor annuitant equal to 50 percent of such reduced annuity and upon the death of such survivor annuitant all payments shall cease and no further annuity shall be due and payable. The annuity hereunder payable to the officer or employee shall be 90 percent of the life annuity otherwise payable if the survivor annuitant is the same age or older than the annuitant, or is less than 5 years younger than the annuitant; 85 percent if the survivor annuitant is 5 but less than 10 years younger; 80 percent if the survivor annuitant is 10 but less than 15 years younger; 75 percent if the survivor annuitant is 15 but less than 20 years younger; 70 percent if the survivor annuitant is 20 but less than 25 years younger; and 60 percent if the survivor annuitant is 25 or more years younger. No such election shall be valid until the retiring officer or employee shall have satisfactorily passed a physical examination as prescribed by the Civil Service Commission.

"(d) For the purpose of this act all periods of service shall be computed in accordance with section 5 hereof, and the monthly annuity installment shall be fixed at the nearest dollar.

"(e) The term 'basic salary, pay, or compensation,' wherever used in this act, shall be so construed as to exclude from the operation of the act all bonuses, allowances, overtime pay, or salary, pay, or compensation given in addition to the base pay of the position as fixed by law or regulation."

SEC. 5. The first paragraph of section 5 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Subject to the provisions of section 9 hereof, the aggregate period of service which forms the basis for calculating the amount of any annuity provided in this act shall be computed from the date of original employment, whether as a classified or an unclassified officer or employee in the civil service of the United States, or in the service of the District of Columbia, including periods of service at different times and in one or more departments, branches, or independent offices, or the legislative branch of the Government, and also periods of service performed overseas under authority of the United States, and periods of honorable service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States; in the case of an officer or employee, however, who is eligible for and receives retired pay on account of military or naval service, the period of service upon which such retired pay is based shall not be included, except that in the case of an officer or employee who is eligible for and receives retired pay on account of a service-connected disability incurred in combat with an enemy of the United States or resulting from an explosion of an instrument of war, the period of the military service shall be included: *Provided*, That an officer or employee must have served for a total period of not less than 5 years exclusive of such military or naval service before he shall be eligible for annuity under this act. Nothing in this act shall be construed as to affect in any manner an officer's or employee's right to retired pay, pension, or

compensation in addition to the annuity herein provided."

SEC. 6. The first three paragraphs of section 6 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"Any officer or employee to whom this act applies who shall have served for a total period of not less than 5 years computed as provided in section 5 of this act, and who, before meeting the age and service requirements for retirement under section 1 (a) hereof, becomes totally disabled for useful and efficient service in the grade or class of position occupied by the officer or employee, by reason of disease or injury not due to vicious habits, intemperance, or willful misconduct on the part of the officer or employee, shall upon his own application or upon the request or order of the head of the department, branch, or independent office concerned, be retired on an annuity computed in accordance with the provisions of section 4 hereof: *Provided*, That proof of freedom from vicious habits, intemperance, or willful misconduct for a period of more than 5 years next prior to becoming so disabled for useful and efficient service, shall not be required in any case. No officer or employee shall be retired under the provisions of this section unless examined by a medical officer of the United States, or a duly qualified physician or surgeon, or board of physicians or surgeons, designated by the Civil Service Commission for that purpose, and found to be disabled in the degree and in the manner specified herein. No claim shall be allowed under the provisions of this section unless the application for retirement shall have been executed prior to the applicant's separation from the service or within 6 months thereafter. The time limitation for execution of claims for retirement under the terms of this section may be waived by the Civil Service Commission in case of an officer or employee who at the date of separation from service or within 6 months thereafter is receiving hospital treatment, but the application in such case must be filed with the Civil Service Commission not later than 6 months after the termination of such hospitalization; in the case of any such person heretofore separated from service application may be filed within 6 months after the effective date of this act. Such time limitation may similarly be waived in the case of an officer or employee who at the date of separation from service or within 6 months thereafter is mentally incompetent, but the application in such case must be filed with the Civil Service Commission within 1 year from the date of restoration of such person to competency or the appointment of a fiduciary whichever is the earlier.

"Every annuitant retired under the provisions of this section unless the disability for which retired be permanent in character, shall at the expiration of 1 year from the date of such retirement and annually thereafter, until reaching age 60, be examined under the direction of the Civil Service Commission by a medical officer of the United States, or a duly qualified physician or surgeon, or board of physicians or surgeons designated by the Civil Service Commission for that purpose, in order to ascertain the nature and degree of the annuitant's disability, if any. If an annuitant shall recover before reaching age 60 and be restored to an earning capacity which would permit him to be appointed to some appropriate position fairly comparable in compensation to the position occupied at the time of retirement, payment of the annuity shall be continued temporarily to afford the annuitant opportunity to seek such available position, but not in any case exceeding 1 year from the date of the medical examination showing such recovery. Should the annuitant fail to appear for examination as required under this section, payment of the annuity shall be suspended until continuance of the disability shall have been satisfactorily established. The Civil Service Commission may order or direct at any time such medical or other examination as it shall deem necessary to determine the facts relative to the nature and degree of disability of any officer or employee retired on an annuity under this section.

"If a recovered disability annuitant whose annuity is discontinued subsequent to June 30, 1945, shall fail to obtain reemployment in any position included in the provisions of this act, he shall be considered as having been separated from the service within the meaning of section 7 of this act as of the date he was retired for disability and shall, after the discontinuance of the disability annuity, be entitled to a deferred annuity in accordance with the provisions of such section."

SEC. 7. Section 7 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. (a) Should any officer or employee to whom this act applies after having rendered 5 years of service, computed as prescribed in section 5 of this act, but less than 10 years of creditable civilian service and before becoming eligible for retirement under section 1 (a) of this act become separated from the service, such officer or employee shall be paid as he may elect, (A) a deferred annuity beginning at the age of 62 years, or the age at separation if beyond the age of 62 computed as provided in section 4 (a) of this act, or (B) the total amount credited to his individual account together with interest at 4 percent per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 percent per annum thereafter compounded on December 31 of each year to date of separation.

"(b) Should any officer or employee to whom this act applies, after having rendered at least 10 years of creditable civilian service and before becoming eligible for retirement under section 1 (a) of this act become separated from the service, such officer or employee shall be paid a deferred annuity beginning at the age of 62 years.

"(c) All amounts returned to an officer or employee under this section must upon reinstatement, retransfer, or reappointment to a position within the purview of this act be redeposited by such officer or employee before he may receive full credit for the service covered by the refund."

SEC. 8. Section 8 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. In the case of any officer or employee who before the effective date of this act shall have been retired on annuity under the provisions of the act of May 22, 1920, as amended, or section 8 (a) of the act of June 16, 1933, the annuity shall be increased, effective on the first day of the fourth month following the month in which this act is enacted by 25 percent or $300, whichever is the lesser: *Provided*, That each such annuitant may, prior to the effective date herein prescribed, elect to retain his or her present annuity, in lieu of the increased annuity provided by this section, and name his wife or her husband to receive upon his or her death one-half of his or her present annuity but not to exceed $600 per annum during the remainder of the life of such surviving husband or wife and upon the death of such survivor no further annuity shall be due or payable.

"In case any officer or employee shall have been separated subsequent to January 23, 1942, and prior to effective date of this act and have acquired title to annuity under section 7 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, beginning after such effective date, such annuity shall be computed in accordance with section 4 of this act but any reduction applicable thereto shall be determined as if this act had not been enacted: *Provided*, That any such officer or employee may elect to forfeit his right to such annuity and elect in lieu thereof to receive the benefits provided by section 7 of this act."

SEC. 9. Section 9 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. Each officer or employee within purview of this act may deposit to the credit of the 'civil-service retirement and disability fund' a sum equal to 2½ percent of his basic salary, pay, or compensation received for services rendered after July 31, 1920, and prior to July 1, 1926; 3½ percent of the basic salary, pay, or compensation for services rendered from and after July 1, 1926, and prior to July 1, 1942; 5 percent of said basic pay, salary, or compensation for services rendered from and after July 1, 1942, and prior to the first day of the first pay period in 1948, and also 6 percent thereafter, covering service during which no deductions were withheld for deposit in the said fund. Each such officer or employee may elect to make such deposits in installments during the continuance of his service in such amounts and under such conditions as may be determined in each instance by the Civil Service Commission. The amount so deposited shall be credited to the individual account of the officer or employee in the said fund. Upon making such deposit, the officer or employee shall be entitled to full credit for the period or periods of service involved: *Provided*, That no deposit shall be required for any service rendered prior to August 1, 1920, or for periods of honorable service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States."

SEC. 10. The first two paragraphs of section 10 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"Beginning as of July 1, 1942, there shall be deducted and withheld from the basic salary, pay, or compensation of each officer or employee to whom this act applies a sum equal to 5 percent of such officer's or employee's basic salary, pay, or compensation: *Provided*, That from and after the first day of the first pay period in 1948, there shall be deducted and withheld from the basic salary, pay, or compensation of each officer or employee to whom this act applies a sum equal to 6 percent of such officer's or employee's basic salary, pay, or compensation. The amounts so deducted and withheld from the basic salary, pay, or compensation of each officer or employee shall, in accordance with such procedure as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the civil-service retirement and disability fund created by the act of May 22, 1920, and said fund is hereby appropriated for the payment of annuities, refunds, and allowances as provided in this act.

"Any officer or employee may at his option and under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Civil Service Commission deposit additional sums in multiples of $25 but not to exceed 10 percent of his ahnual basic salary, pay, or compensation, for service rendered since August 1, 1920, which amount together with interest thereon at 3 percent per annum compounded as of December 31 of each year, shall, at the date of his retirement, be available to purchase, as he shall elect and in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Civil Service Commission, an annuity in addition to the annuity provided by this act. The life annuity shall consist of $7 for each $100 in case the officer or employee has not reached age 60; $8 if he has reached age 60 but not age 65; $9 if he has reached age 65 but not age 70; and $10 if he has reached age 70. In the event of death or separation from the service of such officer or employee before becoming eligible for retirement on annuity, the total amount so deposited with interest at 3 percent per annum to date of death or separation compounded on December 31 of

each year shall be refunded in accordance with the provisions of section 12 of this act."

SEC. 11. Section 12 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 12. (a) Under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Civil Service Commission the amounts deducted and withheld from the basic salary, pay, or compensation of each officer or employee for credit to the 'civil-service retirement and disability fund' created by the act of May 22, 1920, covering service from and after August 1, 1920, shall be credited to an individual account of such officer or employee.

"(b) (1) In the case of any officer or employee to whom this act applies who shall become absolutely separated from the service before he shall have completed an aggregate of 5 years of service computed as prescribed in section 5 of this act, or who shall be transferred to a position not within the purview of this act, the amount credited to his individual account together with interest at 4 percent per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 percent per annum thereafter compounded on December 31 of each year to date of separation shall be returned to such officer or employee: *Provided*, That in computing interest under this subsection, a fractional part of a month in the total service covered by the refund shall be disregarded, and no interest shall be allowed in any case unless the service covered by the refund aggregates more than 1 year.

"(2) All amounts returned to an officer or employee under this subsection must, upon reinstatement, retransfer, or reappointment to a position within the purview of this act, be redeposited by such officer or employee before he may receive full credit for the service covered by the refund.

"(c) (1) In case any officer or employee to whom this act applies shall die after having rendered at least 5 years of civilian service computed as prescribed in section 5 of this act and is survived by a widow, such widow shall be paid an annuity beginning the first day of the month following the death of the officer or employee or following the widow's attainment of age 60, whichever is the later, equal to 50 percent of the amount of an annuity computed as provided in section 4 (a) hereof with respect to such officer or employee: *Provided*, That such payments shall cease upon death of the widow.

"(2) In case any officer or employee to whom this act applies shall die after having rendered at least 5 years of civilian service computed as prescribed in section 5 of this act, or after having retired subsequent to the effective date of this act under section 1, 2, or 6, and is survived by a widow and a child or children, such widow shall be paid an immediate annuity equal to 50 percent of the amount of an annuity computed as provided in section 4 (a) hereof with respect to such officer or employee. Such annuity shall be terminable upon the death of such widow, her attainment of age 60, or upon termination of dependency of the last surviving child by reason of (A) his attaining the age of 18 years, (B) his marriage, or (C) his death, whichever first occurs, except that if such child is incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical disability his dependency shall terminate only upon his death, marriage, or recovery from such disability.

"(d) As used in this act—

"(1) The term 'widow' means a surviving wife of an individual, who either (A) shall have been married to such individual for at least five years immediately preceding his death, or (B) is the mother of issue by such marriage.

"(2) The term 'child' means an unmarried child, including a dependent stepchild or an adopted child, under the age of 18 years, or an unmarried child who because of physical or mental disability is incapable of self-support.

"(3) Questions of dependency and disability arising under this section shall be determined by the Civil Service Commission and its decisions with respect to such matters shall be final and conclusive and shall not be subject to review. The Commission may order or direct at any time such medical or other examinations as it shall deem necessary to determine the facts relative to the nature and degree of disability of any annuitant or applicant for annuity under this section, and may suspend or deny any such annuity for failure to submit to any such examination.

"(e) In case an officer or employee to whom this act applies shall die (1) before having rendered five years of civilian service computed as prescribed in section 5 of this act or without a survivor entitled to annuity benefits provided by section 12 (c) hereof the total amount of deductions credited to his individual account with interest thereon at 4 percent per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 percent per annum thereafter compounded on December 31 of each year to date of death, or (2) leaving a survivor entitled to such annuity benefits the total amount of deductions credited to his individual account without interest, shall be paid upon the establishment of a valid claim therefor, in the following order of precedence:

"First, to the beneficiary or beneficiaries designated in writing by such officer or employee and recorded with the Civil Service Commission;

"Second, if there be no such beneficiary, to the duly appointed executor or administrator of the estate of such officer or employee;

"Third, if there be no such beneficiary or executor or administrator, payment may be made, after the expiration of 30 days from the date of the death of the officer or employee, to such person or persons as may appear in the judgment of the Civil Service Commission to be legally entitled thereto, and such payment shall be a bar to recovery by any other person.

"(f) In case of death of a retired employee (1) who has not elected a joint and survivorship annuity as provided in section 4 (c) of this act and who has not received in annuities an amount equal to the total amount credited to his individual account with interest thereon at 4 percent per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 percent per annum thereafter compounded on December 31 of each year to date of retirement, or (2) who has elected a joint and survivorship annuity as provided in section 4 (b) of this act and who has not received in annuities an amount equal to the total amount credited to his individual account, the difference and/or any accrued annuity due shall be paid upon the establishment of a valid claim therefor, in the order of precedence specified in subsection (e) hereof: In case any separated officer or employee who is entitled to a deferred annuity as provided in section 7 (a) or 7 (b) hereof shall die before having established a valid claim for annuity, the total amount credited to his individual account with interest thereon at 4 percent per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 percent per annum thereafter compounded on December 31 of each year to date of death, shall be paid upon the establishment of a valid claim therefor in the order of precedence specified in subsection (e) hereof.

"(g) Where any payment under this act is to be made to a minor, or to a person mentally incompetent or under other legal disability adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction, such payment may be made to the person who is constituted guardian or other fiduciary by the law of the State of residence of such claimant or is otherwise legally vested with the care of the claimant or his estate: *Provided*, That where no guardian or other fiduciary of the person under legal disability has been appointed under the laws of the State of residence of the claimant, the Civil Service Commission shall determine the person who is otherwise legally vested with the care of the claimant or his estate.

"(h) In case a former employee entitled to the return of the amount credited to his individual account shall become legally incompetent, the total amount due may be paid to a duly appointed guardian or committee of such former employee. If the amount of refund due such former employee does not exceed $1,000, and if there has been no demand upon the Civil Service Commission by a duly appointed guardian or committee, payment may be made, after the expiration of 30 days from date of separation from the service, to such person or persons, in the discretion of the Commission, who may have the care and custody of such former employee, and such payment shall be a bar to recovery by any other person.

"(i) Each employee or annuitant to whom this act applies shall, under regulations prescribed by the Civil Service Commission, designate a beneficiary or beneficiaries to whom shall be paid, upon the death of the employee or annuitant any sum remaining to his credit (including any accrued annuity) under the provisions of this act."

SEC. 12. The first paragraph of section 13 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Annuities granted under the terms of this act shall accrue monthly and shall be due and payable in monthly installments on the first business day of the month following the month or other period for which the annuity shall have accrued. Payment of all annuities, refunds, and allowances granted hereunder shall be made by checks drawn and issued by the Treasury Department in such form and manner and with such safeguards as shall be prescribed by the Civil Service Commission in accordance with the laws, rules, and regulations governing accounting that may be found applicable to such payments."

SEC. 13. The third paragraph of section 13 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"An annuity granted for retirement under the provisions of section 1 or 2 of this act shall commence the first day of the month following the date of separation from the service, or on the first day of the month following the month in which salary shall cease provided the employee meets the age and service requirements for retirement at that time, and shall continue during the life of the annuitant. An annuity granted under the provisions of section 6 or 7 hereof shall be subject to the limitations specified in said sections."

SEC. 14. Section 14 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 15. Except as otherwise provided herein, this act shall become effective on the first day of the fourth month following the month of approval.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes legislation that will liberalize the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended. The committee devoted a considerable amount of time in the study of annuities and benefits that are provided

for Federal employees in view of the increased cost of living and considering the inequities of present retirement payments. This bill is recommended for passage.

It is rather difficult to justify the wide differences in the payments, for example, between those who retired prior to January 1942 and those who retired since that time. This bill does not adjust all inequities. It does provide relief for a large group of people who are unable to work and who are in need of funds in order to carry on the ordinary expenses in everyday life.

Actuaries in civil service, upon whose judgment we should have right to depend, tell us the added cost against the Government will amount to not more than between ten and fifteen million dollars. The remainder of the increased cost, which is by far the most of it, is taken care of because of the increase in the contribution of the employees who will under this bill contribute 6 percent of their salary, instead of 5 percent, as heretofore. In other words, the contribution of those presently on the pay roll and those to be employed hereafter will be 20 percent more than they have heretofore been paying.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. I just want to congratulate the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] for being instrumental in bringing this legislation to the House, and I want the RECORD to show that I favor its enactment.

Mr. REES. I appreciate the gentleman's statement in support of this legislation.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. May I ask the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] to what class of employees this applies? Does it apply to the ones that have already retired from any type of Government service?

Mr. REES. Yes; those employees now under the retirement fund and those who are paying in retirement payments at the present time.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. And this would also apply in the future to all those who retire.

Mr. REES. That is right, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Does this also include postal employees?

Mr. REES. It does, those that are under civil service. Nearly all postal employees are under civil service.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman state whether it would cover also postmasters as well as postal employees?

Mr. REES. It does cover postmasters who are under civil service. Briefly, the principal provisions of the bill are as follows:

(1) Retired employees now on the annuity rolls are to obtain increased annuity benefits, or in lieu thereof are permitted to obtain certain benefits for their surviving spouse.

(2) Provision is made for a more simple and more equitable method of computing annuities which raises annuities by approximately 5 percent in the higher-salary groups to 25 percent in the lower brackets. An increase of 25 percent, or $300, whichever is the lesser, is provided for present annuitants.

(3) Federal employees' contributions to the retirement fund are increased from 5 to 6 percent of such employees' basic salary.

(4) Retirement deductions are to be refunded to employees who have had less than 5 years of service, optional refunds are provided for those employees with from 5 to 10 years of service (excluding military service), but contributions to the retirement fund from employees with 10 or more years of service (excluding military service) are to be retained in the retirement fund until such age as annuities are provided.

(5) The so-called tontine service charge against Federal employees is eliminated.

APPROPRIATIONS NECESSARY FOR CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

The Civil Service Commission estimated that during the fiscal year 1948, 1,400,000 employees with aggregate salaries of $3,700,000,000 would be subject to the Retirement Act. Taking into account the decreased percentage cost of the present law because of increased average salaries, the Commission further estimates that the total annual Government cost of the retirement plan, if amended in accordance with the bill, would be approximately 7 percent of pay roll. On the basis of the estimated pay roll of $3,700,000,000, this results in an estimated appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 of $259,000,000 as compared with the request of $244,000,000, for the fiscal year 1948 under the present law, or an increase of $15,000,000.

The elimination of the tontine charge will greatly simplify administration in the agencies. It has been estimated by the agencies in material furnished the Civil Service Commission that elimination of the tontine will produce savings of 100 man-years in administration.

The substitution of two simple formulas for calculating annuities in lieu of the present four complex provisions makes it possible for any Federal employee to readily determine his own annuity without the aid of an expert. This improvement alone should relieve the agencies of much detail in answering employee inquiries, both oral and written.

ANALYSIS OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

SECTION 1

Under existing law optional retirement is permitted at age 60 after 30 years of service, at age 62 after 15 years of service, and, on a reduced annuity, at age 55 after 30 years of service. This provision is continued unchanged in the bill.

The present law gives an employee involuntarily separated between July 1, 1945, and June 30, 1947, at age 55 with 25 years' service an immediate annuity reduced by 2 percent for each year the employee is under age 60 or 62, depending on his length of service. H. R. 4127 removes this 55-year limitation, thereby permitting the benefit at any age, but with a 3-percent reduction for each year the employee is under the age of 60 years, and makes the provision permanent. This provision will become effective July 1, 1947.

SECTION 2

This section retains the existing compulsory retirement age of 70 years with 15 years' service, and this section also provides an entirely new feature to the retirement law with respect to reemployed annuitants. Under the present law an employee retired under section 1 (age or optionally), may be reemployed in the Federal service only if, in the opinion of the appointing authority, he possesses special qualifications. The annuity previously awarded is terminated upon any such reemployment, and the employee again becomes subject to the Retirement Act with a new annuity right arising under the law in effect at the time of subsequent separation from the service.

It is proposed that the same privileges of reemployment be continued except that if the person is age 60 or over, the annuity will continue to be paid during his reemployment and his salary, as an employee, reduced by the amount of annuity being received. The employee would acquire no additional retirement rights during such period of reemployment.

This will result in a saving in administrative costs because of the elimination of dropping annuitants from the roll, recomputing annuities, and reentering annuitants on the roll. It will prevent inequities arising as a result of annuitants being reemployed primarily for the purpose of acquiring new or additional retirement rights.

SECTION 3

This section amends section 3A of the Retirement Act which was added by section 602 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and which extended to Members of Congress the privilege of becoming members of the civil-service-retirement system. The existing law provides for the payment of the total amount deducted from his salary with compound interest at 4 percent if the Member of Congress becomes separated from the service before completing an aggregate of 6 years of service as a Member of Congress. This section would reduce the interest rate from 4 to 3 percent after 1947.

Stipulation is also contained therein that the above amendment is the only provision in H. R. 4127 which will in any way affect the retirement of Members of Congress. The reduction in interest rate for Members of Congress will conform to that proposed for other members of the system. None of the liberalized features of the act, including survivor benefits, will be available to Members of Congress.

This section will also permit secretaries and clerks to Members of Congress and congressional committees who heretofore have not elected to become members of the retirement system to do so, provided such election is made prior to July 1, 1948.

SECTION 4

The existing law provides that the annuity granted thereunder shall be composed of a sum equal to $30 for each year of service not exceeding 30 (which total may not exceed three-fourths of the average annual basic salary received by the employee for the highest five consecutive years, or be less than the employee's purchasable life annuity), plus the amount purchasable with the sum (including interest) to the credit of the employee's individual account in the retirement fund. Provision is made that the annuity shall not be less than an amount equal to the average annual basic salary, not to exceed $1,600 per annum, received by the employee during the highest five consecutive years of allowable service, multiplied by the number of years of service, not exceeding 30 years, and divided by 40. The law contains a third proviso which guarantees an annuity equal to one-seventieth of the average basic salary for the highest five consecutive years, multiplied by the number of years of service, not exceeding 35. In each individual case, the method which will produce the maximum benefit is used.

H. R. 4127 provides that the annuity formula shall be 1½ percent of the highest average salary for five consecutive years multiplied by years of service, or 1 percent of such

average salary plus $25 multiplied by years of service. In no case may the annuity exceed 90 percent of the employee's highest 5 years' average salary. (In general, only the lower-salaried employees will be able to qualify for an annuity of 90 percent of salary; the average salaried employee would need to work approximately 50 years and the high-salaried employee would need to work approximately 60 years to qualify for a retirement benefit of 90 percent of salary.)

The present option given a retiring employee to elect an increased annuity carrying with it upon his death a forfeiture of his retirement contributions to the Government is repealed.

The present act permits an employee retiring under the age or optional provision of the Retirement Act to elect a reduced annuity carrying with it upon the employee's death a continuing benefit at the same rate or 50 percent thereof to a designated survivor annuitant. This section further provides that in the event of death of the employee within 30 days from the date of retirement, the election shall become void, and the death shall be treated as a death in the active service. H. R. 4127 provides two joint and survivor annuity plans. Section 4 (b) would allow a retiring employee (other than one receiving an annuity under sec. 7) to elect an annuity reduced by 10 percent with the provision that 50 percent of his original annuity would be paid to his widow, beginning at his death or her attainment of age 60, whichever is later. Section 4 (c) would allow an employee retiring optionally or for age to elect a reduced annuity with the provision that a survivor annuitant designated at time of retirement, receive an annuity of 50 percent of the employee's reduced annuity after his death. This election is available only to those employees who furnish satisfactory evidence of good health. The reduction in the employee's annuity depends on the difference between his age and that of the survivor annuitant. This subsection is similar to the existing law excepting that the 30-day waiting period is eliminated, and there is substituted the requirement of physical examination.

SECTION 5

This section requires that 5 years of civilian service be rendered before any employee may have title to annuity, rather than a combination of civilian and military service as provided in the present law. It eliminates the present requirement that military service forming the basis for pension (generally only 90 days) be deducted from the time base for retirement.

SECTION 6

This will allow employees who were receiving hospital treatment an additional period to file claims for disability annuity, which provision will cover only a few meritorious cases. It will also eliminate the necessity for further medical examinations for disability annuitants after they have reached age 60.

SECTION 7

The present law freezes retirement deductions from and after January 24, 1942, in the case of employees who have served 5 years or more, and gives them in return, a right to annuity beginning at age 62 or 55, depending upon whether the separation was voluntary or involuntary.

H. R. 4127 provides a right to annuity beginning at age 62 after completion of at least 5 years of civilian service, and regardless of the reason for separation. Any employee who at the date of separation has served an aggregate of at least 5 years but less than 10 years of civilian service may elect to receive an annuity beginning at age 62 or draw a refund of the amount to his account with interest thereon. If the employee elects to receive the refund, he will then forfeit any right to future annuity unless he is again reemployed in a position within the purview of the act. Any employee who at the time of separation has completed an aggregate of 10 or more years of civilian service must leave his contributions to the fund on deposit, and will receive an annuity upon attaining age 62.

SECTION 8

This section provides certain benefits for retired employees already on the annuity rolls. The annuity of each such person would be increased, effective on the 1st day of the fourth month following the date of enactment by 25 percent or $300, whichever is less, unless the annuitant elects in lieu of such increase to retain his present annuity and to have an amount equal to one-half the amount of his annuity paid to his or her spouse upon the annuitant's death, but the annuity to the spouse may not exceed $600 per annum. Such amount would be payable during the remainder of the life of the spouse.

This section also provides that a former officer or employee who presently holds a vested title to a future annuity shall retain this right, but he is offered the privilege of forfeiting his annuity and to elect in lieu thereof to receive a return of contributions.

SECTION 9

Section 9 of the present law permits an employee to make deposit in the retirement fund covering periods of service when not subject to the act, and for which he made no contribution. This section continues this privilege but provides that no interest on deposits shall be required, and that no deposit shall be required for military service.

SECTION 10

This section provides for an increase from 5 to 6 percent in employee contributions, beginning with the first pay period in 1948. As regards voluntary contributions made by employees to increase their annuities, the present actuarial factors now used in determining the additional annuity are replaced by simpler specified figures.

SECTION 11

This section amends section 12 of the Retirement Act so as to eliminate the so-called $1-a-month tontine charge. Provisions relating to the tontine charge appearing in other sections of the act are likewise eliminated.

This section also provides for return of deductions with interest upon separation with less than 5 years' service. No interest is payable if the service covered by the refund aggregates 1 year or less.

Under existing law, deductions are returnable with interest upon separation with less than 5 years' service, but tontine is withheld in voluntary separation cases, and no interest is allowed for service of 1 year or less.

Subsections (c) and (d) of section 12 as amended by this bill provide survivorship benefits, in the case of employees dying in the service after having served for five or more years. The widow of any such employee would be entitled upon attaining age 60 to receive an annuity terminable upon death equal to one-half the amount of an annuity computed on the basis of the salary and years of service of the employee.

Section 11 of the bill also provides for a return of deductions with interest, as under existing law, to a beneficiary in case of death of an employee who leaves no survivor entitled to annuity and a return of deductions without interest if he leaves a qualified survivor.

Where an annuitant who has not elected a joint and survivorship annuity dies without having received in annuities an amount equal to the total amount credited to his individual account with interest, the difference and any accrued annuity will be returned to his beneficiary. Under existing law the amount returnable in such case is the difference between the amount credited to the employee's account with interest and the amount chargeable to the employee as his portion of the annuity purchased with his contributions.

In all cases the interest rate on amounts credited to employee accounts will be reduced from 4 to 3 percent with respect to periods after December 31, 1947, thus affecting amounts returnable in the case of deceased employees and annuitants.

SECTION 12

This proposed change is for administrative expediency only. It provides that annuities shall accrue monthly, thereby eliminating the necessity of any settlement covering a small sum for a fractional part of a month.

SECTION 13

This section will allow the Civil Service Commission to make an age and optional annuity retroactively payable to the first of the month following termination of the employee's salary if he was eligible for annuity at that point. At present, the annuity cannot begin until actual separation occurs, and some employees who have been in leave-without-pay status have a period when neither salary nor annuity is payable. This will affect only a few meritorious cases.

SECTION 14

This will repeal section 14 of the present act, which section no longer serves any purpose.

SECTION 15

This section provides that the act shall be effective on the first day of the fourth month following approval, except as otherwise provided.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from New York, who has shown considerable interest in this legislation.

Mr. JAVITS. The committee has not corrected all problems connected with the civil-service-retirement system for Federal employees, but it has made a number of desirable reforms. Therefore, I ask support for this bill and trust that it will pass. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Provision has now been made by this bill to look after the contributions to the retirement fund of Federal employees who have had less than 5 years of service; and it is also possible under the bill for such employees who have had more than 5, but less than 10 years of service to take their choice of accepting retirement benefits or to withdraw their retirement-fund contribution. This is certainly a change for the better, as much hardship has been caused up to now by the previous inflexible provision of the law. Many employees who have been let out as a result of the reduction of the wartime civilian establishment will now be able to recoup substantial amounts in retirement contributions which they badly need.

The increase in annuities provided by the bill will be very welcome, especially to present annuitants who receive 25 percent more, or $300 per annum, whichever

is the lesser, in view of the ascending cost of living. The committee has not seen fit to go as far as we had hoped it would in respect to retirement age and other retirement opportunities. Progress has been made, however, and there is opportunity for still further liberalization in the future.

Mr. REES. I appreciate the gentleman's support of the bill.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes. If the chairman of the committee will answer a few questions, I do not believe I will use my 5 minutes. I am particularly interested in section 1 of the bill which apparently is similar to the bill that I introduced this year, to extend the so-called Forand amendment, which is Public Law 688 of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. REES. That is correct.

Mr. FORAND. Under Public Law 688 there was a reduction of 2 percent per year for those who retired before they had reached the ordinary retirement age. From what I understand, this reduction has been raised to 3 percent. Is that correct?

Mr. REES. That is correct.

Mr. FORAND. Will the passage of this bill make retroactive the provisions of Public Law 688, so that there will be no gap from the expiration date of Public Law 688, which was June 30 of this year?

Mr. REES. That is the intent of the bill.

Mr. FORAND. I want to be sure the RECORD shows that, so there will be no question about it. I thank the gentleman for giving me that information.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I regard this as such an important matter, and I am receiving so many inquiries, that I feel compelled to make this statement:

With the close of the war—Seventy-ninth Congress—by resolution there was established a Select Committee on Postwar Military Policy. This committee appointed by the Speaker consisted of seven Members of the House at large, seven of the Naval Affairs Committee, and seven from the Military Affairs Committee, with Hon. Clifton A. Woodrum, of Virginia, as chairman. Among matters studied by this select committee was the subject of universal military training. Extensive hearings were conducted for 14 days during the month of June 1945 in both morning and afternoon sessions and more than 150 witnesses were heard on the subject. Of these, the committee heard a majority who were in opposition. Every phase of the subject was covered. In conclusion the select committee, by an overwhelming vote, recommended a system of universal military training. The printed hearings by this select committee consumed over 600 pages.

In November and December of 1945, the House Committee on Military Affairs conducted hearings on current bills covering this subject over a period of 23 days, hearing in all not less than 65 witnesses from among those both favoring and in opposition thereto. The printed hearings on these meetings consume over 800 pages.

In December 1946, the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Military Training was appointed under the chairmanship of Dr. Karl Compton and, notwithstanding statements to the contrary, among members of the Commission were those who had been in opposition to universal military training. This Commission conducted hearings over a period of 5 months, during the course of which in excess of 200 witnesses were heard. On the statement of Dr. Compton, the majority of those heard were those from the opposition. The unanimous report published in early June of this year, consuming 450 pages, in "The Program for National Security," is now public property.

Following the report of the President's Advisory Commission in early June this year, and since that time, 28 witnesses have been heard either before the full committee or Subcommittee No. 2 of the Armed Services Committee. Among these were Dr. Compton and three other members of the President's Advisory Commission, and of this total number, 16 were selected from among organizations in opposition to the proposal. On Saturday last, July 19, Subcommittee No. 2, by overwhelming action, voted to report favorably H. R. 4278 to the full committee. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWE], chairman of this subcommittee, is placing in the RECORD today for the information of all Members of the House an analysis of this bill, and a meeting of the full Committee on Armed Services has been called for Friday morning, July 25, at 9 a. m., to vote upon this report. Should this measure be reported favorably to the House, I wish to make it perfectly clear here and now that there is no desire whatever on my part for House action on this measure at the present time, the opinions of many organizations, the departments and the President notwithstanding. Thus, for the information of the House, and the many organizations pressing for action now, the leadership on both sides of the House is relieved of any responsibility in this connection at the present time; I willingly accept it. In view of the great scope of all the hearings referred to, this action on the part of the Armed Services Committee, and I am sure a majority agree, will be taken in the one thought of placing squarely before the American people during the recess one measure, H. R. 4278, on the subject which represents the best of all the various proposals in the past with the necessary refinements suggested by the President's Advisory Commission, and only by such action would I, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, feel that I had done my duty as a Representative in Congress and as an American.

Following is a list of all witnesses by name and organization, in order of their appearances, who have appeared before the Congress on the subject of universal military training:

Hon. Joseph C. Grew, former Acting Secretary of State.

Col. Jay Cooke, president of the Citizens Committee for Military Training for Young Men, Inc.

Mrs. Ernesta Barlow, vice president, the Citizens Committee for Military Training for Young Men, Inc.

Statements by Kathleen Norris and Margaret Culkin Banning were filed for the record by Mrs. Barlow.

Mrs. Barbara Skau, domestic nurse, Jackson Heights, Queens, N. Y.

Mr. Philip A. Carroll, director, the Citizens Committee for Military Training for Young Men, Inc.

Dr. Franklin Clarke Frye, president, United Lutheran Church of America.

Capt. Paul Hammond, director, Citizens Committee for Military Training for Young Men, Inc.

Mrs. John Weinstein, president, New York City Federation of Women's Clubs.

Letter from Sgt. John D. Scarlett, Liege, Belgium, was read into the record.

Mr. Charles G. Bolte, chairman, American Veterans Committee.

Maj. George Fielding Eliot, commentator, Columbia Broadcasting System.

Col. John Thomas Taylor, director, national legislative committee, the American Legion.

Mrs. Lorena Hahn, former national president of American Legion Auxiliary and present chairman of the Legion's postwar committee.

Maj. Gen. Ellard Walsh, president, National Guard Association of the United States.

Hon. Edward Martin, Senator, State of Pennsylvania.

Omar B. Ketchum, national legislative representative, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Col. William B. Tuttle, legislative chairman, board of trustees, Reserve Officers Association of the United States.

Mr. William B. Mathews, editor, Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz.

Mrs. Willard Steele, chaplain general, Daughters of the American Revolution.

Vernon A. Eagle, honorably discharged commando.

Dr. Harrop A. Freeman, professor of law, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va., as read by Dr. Theodore A. Paullin, assistant professor, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.

Archibald G. Thatcher, attorney, New York City.

Dr. A. J. Brumbaugh, vice president, American Council on Education.

Dr. William J. Miller, president, University of Detroit, representing Michigan Council to Oppose Peacetime Conscription.

Judge William Hastie, National Association for Advancement of Colored People.

Dr. Gould Wickey, executive secretary, national commission on Christian higher education, Association of American Colleges.

Dr. John L. Davis, executive secretary, board of higher education, Disciples of Christ.

Mr. Benjamin C. Marsh, executive secretary, People's Lobby, Inc.

Dr. James Mendenhall, chairman, legislative committee, department of supervision and curriculum development of National Education Association.

Dr. William Heard Kilpatrick, Liberal Party of New York State.

Mr. Mark Wiseman, commander, Willard Straight Post, American Legion.

Dr. Walter E. Hager, American Association of Teachers Colleges.

Statements from Dr. John Purdy, chairman, Ohio College; Mr. Robert Forsberg, pres-

ident of student body of Wooster College; and Mary Ann Brown, chairman of public opinions committee of Wooster College, Wooster, Ohio, were filed for the record by Dr. Hager.

Letter from Mr. G. O. Aubrey, chairman, committee on work with high-school youth, National Council of the Young Men's Christian Association.

Dr. Herbert J. Burghstahler, president, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio, testifying for the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America.

Very Rev. Msgr. Howard J. Carroll, general secretary, National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Mr. Huber F. Klemme, executive secretary of the commission on Christian social action, Evangelical and Reformed Church.

Dr. Ganse Little, pastor, Broad Street Presbyterian Church, Columbus, Ohio.

Mrs. Glen L. Swiggett, legislative representative, National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

Dr. Robert Gordis, president, Rabbinical Assembly of America.

Dr. Joseph Zeitlin, Rabbinical Assembly of America.

Mr. Eyri A. Whitney, director of education and research and assistant general counsel, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

Rt. Rev. Herman R. Page, bishop, diocese of northern Michigan, Episcopal Church.

Mr. D. Robert Yarnell, vice chairman, American Friends Service Committee.

Rev. T. T. Brumbaugh, executive secretary, Detroit Council of Churches.

Mr. Ensworth Reisner, representing citizens committee of Buffalo, Erie County, and western New York on Peacetime Conscription.

Dr. Karl T. Compton, president, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Mrs. Thomasina W. Johnson, legislative representative, national nonpartisian council on public affairs of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority.

Mr. Ernest Angell, representing Civil Liberties Union.

Dr. Paul E. Elicker, executive secretary, National Association of Secondary-School Principals of National Education Association.

Rev. F. W. Burnham, of the Christian Churches of America.

Mr. Frederick J. Roy, national vice commander, Catholic War Veterans Association.

Mr. Roscoe S. Conkling, attorney, New York City.

Mr. Norman Thomas, president, Postwar World Council.

Prof. Alonzo F. Myers, chairman, National Council Against Peacetime Conscription Now.

Mr. Milton Friedman, free labor committee, Workers Defense League.

Rev. Phillips Packer Elliott, chairman of board of Presbyterian Tribune.

Dr. Edward C. Elliott, president, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.

Rev. Edwin F. Lee, Methodist bishop and director of General Commission for Army and Navy Chaplains.

Mr. Arthur L. Williston, retired educator and engineer, Dedham, Mass.

Mr. Stanley J. Quinn, American Defense Society, Inc.

Mr. Leslie J. Tompkins, American Defense Society, Inc.

Brig. Gen. Albert L. Cox, retired, Washington, D. C.

Brig. Gen. Henry I. Reilly, retired.

Dr. Charles Clayton Morrison, editor, Christian Century, representing the Chicago Committee to Oppose Conscription.

Mrs. Mary Dingman, member, Women's Committee to Oppose Conscription.

Mrs. Charles D. Rockel, member, Women's Committee to Oppose Conscription..

Letters from Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk, Surgeon General of the Army (retired), and Vice Admiral Ross T McIntire, Surgeon General of the Navy (retired), with reference to Mrs. Rockel's testimony.

Mrs. Johanna M. Lindlof, member, Women's Committee to Oppose Conscription.

Mrs. Annie B. Whitner, Roanoke, Va.

Miss Elizabeth A. Smart, National Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

Hon. Josephus Daniels, former Secretary of the Navy, editor, the News and Observer, Raleigh, N. C.

Mr. John W. Hershey, Downingtown, Pa.

Rev. Donald B. Cloward, executive secretary, Council on Christian Social Progress, Northern Baptist Convention.

Mr. Harold S. Bender, assistant secretary, the Mennonite Central Committee.

Mr. B. F. McLaurin, international field organizer, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.

Dr. Leslie W. Kindred, Greater Philadelphia Committee Against Wartime Enactment of Peacetime Conscription.

Mr. William F. Saunders, High School Teachers Association of New York City, Inc.

Dr. Raymond Walters, chairman, Association of American Colleges.

Dr. Daniel L. Marsh, president, Boston University, member Association of American Colleges.

Dr. Guy E. Snavely, executive director, Association of American Colleges.

Mr. Walter Johnson, chairman, national legislative committee, Military Order of the Liberty Bell.

Dr. Donald DuShane, secretary, Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education, National Education Association.

Hon. Maury Maverick, Chairman, Smaller War Plants Corporation.

Mr. Ralph McDonald, executive secretary, Department of Higher Education, National Education Association.

Resolution from the State of North Carolina, with reference to universal military training.

Letter from the Citizens Medical Reference Bureau, Inc., with reference to universal military training.

Miss Dorothy K. Funn, labor secretary, National Negro Congress.

Mr. Eric Hass, Socialist Labor Party of America.

Dr. Ralph E. Himstead, American Association of University Professors.

Mr. Otto Steele, National Conference of Methodist Youth Fellowship.

Mr. H. W. Brown, president, International Association of Machinists.

Rev. Kenneth L. Patton, pastor of the First Unitarian Society of Madison, Wis., representing the Wisconsin Council of Churches.

Dr. Paul H. Bowman, president, Bridgewater College, and vice chairman, Brethren Service Committee.

Mr. Charles C. Rohrer, dairy farmer, Manchester, Ind.

Dr. S. V. Sanford, chancelor, University System of Georgia.

Mrs. Dorothy Groeling, secretary, National Board for International Education, Young Women's Christian Association of the United States.

Mr. Fred Bailey, legislative counsel, the National Grange.

Mr. Edward C. M. Richards, representing the War Resisters League in Opposition to Peacetime Conscription.

Statement by Dr. Evan W. Thomas, chairman, War Resisters League, read for the record by Mr. Richards.

Mr. Russell Smith, legislative secretary, National Farmers Union.

Mr. Homer E. Woodbridge, representing Middletown Committee Against Wartime Passage of Peacetime Conscription.

Mr. Walter H. Uphoff, secretary of the Wisconsin Committee Against Peacetime Conscription.

Mr. Royal C. Stephens, Netcong, N. J.

Mr. Lewis G. Hines, national legislative representative of American Federation of Labor.

Mrs. Mary Farquharson, representing Women's International League and the Oregon and Washington State Committees Opposing Peacetime Conscription.

Mr. R. J. Thomas, president, United Automobile Workers (as read by Loren Grey).

Mr. Vinal H. Tibbetts, representing American Education Fellowship.

Mr. Nathan E. Cowan, chairman, legislative committee, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Mr. R. B. Marston, director, legislative, Federal relations division, National Education Association.

Communication from American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, National Education Association.

Dr. Clinton N. Howard, general superintendent of International Reform Federation.

Mr. Eugene C. Pulliam, editor and publisher, Indianapolis, Ind.

Dr. Douglas Southall Freeman, editor, the Richmond (Va.) News Leader.

Mr. Millard W. Rice, national service director, Disabled American Veterans.

Brig. Gen. John W. Mahan, chairman, national defense committee, Disabled American Veterans.

Communication from Mr. Knowlton Durham, chairman, special committee on universal military training of the Association of Ex-Members of Squadron A.

Mr. Frank L. Weil, president, National Jewish Welfare Board.

Mr. Chester J. Nicklas, veteran of both World Wars.

Mrs. Helen W. Zbikowski, member, house of representatives, Connecticut State Legislature.

Mr. Bernard H. Sandler, chairman, twenty-fifth anniversary, reunion committee, Plattsburg, N. Y.

Mr. Henry Rood, author.

Dr. Gibb Gilchrist, president, Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas.

Mr. Dunlap C. Clark, chairman, national defense committee, Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Mr. Richard L. Feldman, teacher at Roosevelt High School.

Mr. Carl McIntire, vice president, American Council of Christian Churches.

Mr. H. McAllister Griffiths, general secretary, American Council of Christian Churches.

Hon. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War.

Letter from Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Brig. Gen. John McA. Palmer, United States Army, retired.

Brig. Gen. Luther D. Miller, Chief of Chaplains, United States Army.

Maj. Gen. William F. Tompkins, Director, Special Planning Division, War Department Special Staff.

Dr. Daniel A. Poling, editor, the Christian Herald.

Mr. Ben L. Johnson, honorably discharged Marine Corps corporal.

Mr. William Kent Montroy, honorably discharged shipfitter, first class.

Hon. James Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy.

Letter from Fleet Adm. C. W. Nimitz, United States Navy.

Letter from Admiral William F. Halsey, United States Navy.

Vice Adm. Aubrey W. Fitch, United States Navy, Chief of Naval Operations (Air).

Vice Adm. Randall Jacobs, United States Navy, Chief of Naval Personnel.

Lt. Gen. Ira Eaker, Chief of Air Staff, United States Army (retired).

Gen. A. A. Vandegrift, Commandant, United States Marine Corps.

Fleet Adm. Ernest J. King, United States Navy, Commander in Chief, United States Fleet (retired).

General of the Army George C. Marshall, Secretary of State.

Hon. Earl R. Lewis, Representative in Congress from State of Ohio.

Hon. Charles R. Savage, former Representative in Congress from State of Washington.

Mrs. Frances P. Bolton, Representative in Congress from State of Ohio.
Hon. Compton I. White, former Representative in Congress from State of Idaho.
Hon. Everett Dirksen, Representative in Congress from State of Illinois.
Hon. Emanuel Celler, Representative in Congress from State of New York.
Hon. Jerry Voorhis, former Representative in Congress from State of California.
Hon. John E. Fogarty, Representative in Congress from State of Rhode Island.
Hon. Robert P. Patterson, Secretary of War.
General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower, commanding general, United States forces, European theater, and Chief of Staff.
Fleet Adm. E. J. King, Chief of Naval Operations (retired).
Mrs. LaFell Dickinson, president, General Federation of Women's Clubs.
Mrs. Lula E. Bachman, president, National Association of Women Lawyers.
Mrs. Ernesta Barlow, vice president, Citizens' Committee and National Women's Chairman.
Hon. James W. Wadsworth, Representative in Congress from New York.
George W. McClelland, president, University of Pennsylvania.
Dr. George F. Zook, president, American Council on Education.
Benjamine C. Marsh, executive secretary, People's Lobby, Inc.
Dr. Karl T. Compton, president, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Omar B. Ketchum, national legislative representative, Veterans of Foreign Wars.
Millard Rice, national legislative representative, Disabled American Veterans.
Dr. Frank B. Gigliotti, national adjutant, Regular Veterans Association.
Hon. James Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy.
Dr. John T. Tigert, Dr. Frank L. Eversull, and Dr. J. W. Harrelson, representing Land-Grant Colleges Association.
Former Lt. Gen. William S. Knudsen.
S. Stanwood Menken.
Miss Dorothy Detzer, national secretary, the Women's International League.
Donald DuShane, secretary, the National Commission for the Defense of Democracy through Education.
Resolution adopted by American Legion.
Statement of Dunlap C. Clark, representing the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.
Mrs. D. Leigh Colvin, president, National Woman's Christian Temperance Union.
Miss Elizabeth Smart, Woman's Christian Temperance Union.
Dr. James B. Conant, president of Harvard University.
Paul E. Elicker, executive secretary, Legislative Committee of National Association of Secondary School Principals.
Ralph E. Himstead, general secretary, American Association of University Professors.
Dean Virginia Gildersleeve, Barnard College.
Charles R. Hook, president, the American Rolling Mill Co.
J. Henry Scattergood, representing the Friends' Committee on National Legislation.
Carl McIntire, vice president of the American Council of Christian Churches.
Ralph McDonald, representing the National Education Association.
H. S. Bender, assistant secretary, Mennonite Central Committee.
Martin H. Miller, national legislative representative, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
Dr. Allen Bates, Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co.
Dr. Gould Wickey, executive secretary, National Commission on Christian Higher Education of Association of American Colleges.
Rev. Charles F. Boss, Jr., secretary, Commission on World Peace of the Methodist Church.
Edward T. McCaffery, national commander, Catholic War Veterans.
Eugene Meyer, publisher, the Washington Post.
Mr. McCaffery (recalled).
Lt. Gen. Ray McLain, United States Army.
Brig. Gen. Luther D. Miller, Chief of Chaplains, United States Army.
Lewis G. Hines, legislative representative, American Federation of Labor.
Nathan E. Cowan, legislative director, and Meyer Bernstein, director of veterans' legislation, Congress of Industrial Organizations.
William V. Damron, legislative representative, International Association of Machinists.
Maj. Gen. Ray E. Porter, Special Planning Division, War Department.
Maj. Gen. I. H. Edwards, Assistant Chief of Staff, G-3.
Maj. Gen. Willard S. Paul, Assistant Chief of Staff, G-1.
Maj. Gen. George J. Richards, Budget Officer for the War Department.
Pvt. George L. Mark, Camp Kilmer, N. J.
Dr. John W. Rustin, pastor, Mount Vernon Methodist Church.
Rev. Charles R. Bell, Jr., representing Wisconsin Committee Against Pacetime Conscription.
Mrs. Emma B. Swiggett, representing National Congress of Parents and Teachers.
Vice Adm. Louis Denfeld, Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet.
Capt. W. R. Terrell, United States Navy.
Lt. Col. T. B Hughes, the Marine Corps.
Rear Adm. Ezra G. Allen, Budget Officer, United States Navy.
Hon. John H. Steele, former national commander, the American Legion.
Lt. Martin Buckner.
Sgt. Eddie Burns.
Captain Moran.
S. Perry Brown, chairman, the American Legion National Committee on National Defense.
Brig. Gen. E. A. Evans, executive secretary, Reserve Officers Association of the United States.
Maj. Gen. Milton J. Reckford, chairman, Legislative Committee of the National Guard Association.
Sgt. James F. Donnelly.
Dr. Karl T. Compton, Chairman, President's Advisory Commission.
Dr. Edmund Walsh, of Georgetown University.
Mr. Truman Gibson, member, President's Advisory Commission.
Dr. Daniel Poling, editor of the Christian Herald.
Former Justice Owen J. Roberts, Citizens Emergency Committee.
Mr. J. Henry Scattergood, Greater Philadelphia Council Against Conscription.
Mrs. Alexander Stewart, cochairman, Women's Committee to Oppose Conscription.
Mrs. Norton H. Pearl, president, American Legion Women's Auxiliary.
Mr. William Gausmann, Socialist Party, U. S. A.
Mr. Edwin Lupow, Young Progressive Citizens of America.
Mr. Richard Bolling, vice chairman, American Veterans' Committee.
Mr. S. Perry Brown, chairman, American Legion Security Committee.
Rabbi Aaron Opher, Synagogue Council of America.
Miss Elizabeth Smart, director, Woman's Christian Temperance League.
Father Dan Laning, of Mission, Tex.
Mr. Kermit Eby, national headquarters, CIO.
Dr. Blake Van Leer, president, Georgia School of Technology.
Mr. J. M. Dawson, executive director, Baptist of the United States.
Mr. Jesse P. Bogue, secretary, American Association of Junior Colleges.
Rabbi Michael Aronson, of Cincinnati, DAV.
Hon. Adam Clayton Powell, Member of Congress.
Mr. Norman Thomas, chairman, Post War World Council.
Dr. A. Allan Bates, of Chicago.
Mr. Omar B. Ketcham, legislative director, Veterans of Foreign Wars.
Lt. Gen. J. Lawton Collins, U. S. A., Chief of Army Information.
Capt. Thomas F. Darden, U. S. N., Bureau of Naval Personnel.
Lt. Col. William J. Van Ryzin, U. S. M. C., headquarters Marine Corps.
Rev. William J. Mather; Northern Baptists of America.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I deem it necessary, again, to call the attention of the House to activities of departments of Government propagandizing for legislation pending before this body. The subcommittee investigating publicity and propaganda, of which I am chairman, has just concluded hearings involving the War Department and its use of public funds in a drive for the enactment of universal military training. There has been much public indignation regarding the manner in which the military group have been attempting to sell universal military training to the people of this country, with the obvious intent that pressure should be put upon the Congress to enact legislation that will so vitally affect every home and the lives of all of the youth of this Nation.

Civilians were employed by the Secretary of War, as consultants on military training. Evidence before the committee reveals that the primary duty of these so-called consultants was to travel about the country, selling groups—important groups—on what the War Department has claimed to be an emergency requiring every boy in the country to be trained for military service.

In testimony before the committee, the Assistant Secretary of War, Howard C. Petersen, testified that the purpose of employing civilian consultants was "to sell the program to the public, with the hope that the public would sell it to the Congress." We have heard and read much, Mr. Speaker, of Government lobbies. Here we have the frank admission of the Assistant Secretary of War, without reservation that the War Department deliberately set out to sell the people who, in turn, would pressure the Congress. This activity went far beyond the duty of the War Department to inform the people of the country and the Congress, and entered into the field of propaganda—propaganda in support of legislation.

One of the civilians employed with the War Department was Alan Coutts. Mr. Coutts toured the country, at taxpayers' expense, conducting radio panels and speaking to groups wherever and whenever they could be assembled. The radio panels were top-heavy with persons se-

lected to speak for universal military training.

Material supporting the legislation was prepared at the War Department by Mr. Coutts for distribution to participants in the radio discussions.

Evidence before the committee reveals that, on March 5, 1947, over Station WIP, in Philadelphia, Pa., Mr. Coutts asked that the listening audience write to the radio station; and that the letters received would be forwarded to proper congressional authorities. I might say, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Coutts is no longer with the War Department.

Another of the War Department civilian consultants was Mrs. Arthur Woods. Mrs. Woods, a former lieutenant colonel in the WAC's, also, traveled throughout the country, at Government expense, speaking on behalf of universal military training. She was particularly interested in influencing the women and parents of the country, on the virtues of compulsory military training.

Mrs. Woods communicated with others supporting the War Department program, advising that congressional action would be taken during the present session, and urged that support of the program be intensified. A typical statement by Mrs. Woods was contained in a letter to Mrs. Holt, of Portland, Maine, April 23, 1947, referring to universal military training. She stated:

> We believe that the question will come up for definite congressional action this summer and, therefore, we are anxious to stimulate activity and local support over a wide area and as quickly as possible.

Mrs. Woods made contact with many organizations throughout the country, seeking to have the opportunity to discuss the pending legislation. She worked, particularly, with church groups, Girl Scouts, Legion auxiliaries, and known organizations that had been formed to lobby for the universal military training program.

In a speech which Mrs. Woods made in Hollywood, Calif., June 12, to the women of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, she stated, in part:

> I believe that every American parent should demand universal military training.

The War Department has prepared a propaganda motion picture titled "The Plan for Peace." Mrs. Woods, who is a member of the national board of the Girl Scouts of America, wrote to the members of the board—and, again, I am quoting:

> I am hoping it will not be too much to ask you to urge any organization with which you are connected to arrange to show this film at their meetings.

Mrs. Woods' activities on behalf of universal military training with the Girl Scouts of America is quite exhaustive. Through this organization, she attempted to sell the advantages to the youth of the country, as they related to the question of morals and spiritual guidance. Preparation of the material for the organizations which I have referred to—which were lobbying for the universal military training bill—was brought out at the hearings in many instances. One in particular was correspondence between Mrs. Woods and Mr. Justice Owen Roberts, who now heads the committee in support of universal military training. Mrs. Woods advised Mr. Justice Roberts that she would prepare any material he might want in his work with that committee.

In addition to the activities of Mrs. Woods, with the groups to which I have already referred, she was active in preparing support of the plan for the President's Commission, which was appointed to make a study of this subject. Mrs. Woods suggested witnesses to appear before the Commission, and evidence before our committee reveals that she made reports on this activity, to officers in the War Department. A memorandum addressed to Colonel Huntley—and referring to a report which Mrs. Woods had received as to the impression her witnesses had made upon the Commission—reads as follows:

> I thought you might be interested in reading this account of that group of women Mrs. Barlow took before the President's Advisory Commission. The group was set up, each one to cover a certain aspect, as you had suggested. I mapped it all out with her along those lines.

In the report which Mrs. Woods had received from Mrs. Barlow, in reference to the reactions of the members of the Commission, Mrs. Barlow reported that Sam Rosenman said that they had begun to doubt the validity of the popular polls on universal military training and felt reassured by the widely diverse opinions and points of view that had been offered by the women supplied by Mrs. Woods. The Commission, Mr. Speaker, was following the popular polls and the evidence of witnesses supplied, prepared, and briefed by employees of the War Department, whose duty it was to sell the program to the public in hopes that the public would sell the program to the Congress.

Mrs. Woods is no longer with the War Department. We are advised that, on the day of our hearing, she resigned.

This, Mr. Speaker, is only a part of the activities of the War Department, lobbying for universal military training.

The subcommittee to investigate publicity and propaganda does not concern itself with the merits of pending legislation, but is interested in the subject of unlawful and improper activities of Federal agencies and employees in their use of public funds, attempting to influence the Congress for or against pending legislation.

It is the intention of your committee, before the adjournment of Congress, to file a full report of our investigations into these activities.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] has expired.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Instances have been called to my attention where the War Department has been furnishing films of propaganda and sending out Army officers to display those films. Of course, as the gentleman points out, that is a violation of the criminal law.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. There is no question about it. Public funds spent by Federal officials and employees in behalf of legislation pending in this Congress is a violation of the criminal code. This expenditure of public funds is not only unwarranted, it is not only improper, but in instances it is a violation of the criminal code, and before this session ends I shall appear before the House again with an official report of my committee giving in detail the activities of the War Department in connection with this propaganda effort.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. Is this the same legislation that used to be called compulsory military training?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. It is the same legislation, as far as I know. It is the program of the War Department for compulsory universal military training.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWE].

Mr. TOWE. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an analysis of H. R. 4278, National Security Training Act of 1947:

A BRIEF OF H. R. 4278, A BILL TO ENACT THE NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING ACT OF 1947

A. The purpose of H. R. 4278 is to provide for the common defense by requiring all qualified young men between the ages of 18 and 20 to undergo a period of training which will fit them to contribute to the protection of the country in time of emergency.

B. The bill creates the following agencies:

1. The National Security Training Corps.
2. The National Security Training Commission.
3. The General Advisory Board.
4. The Selective Training System.
5. The Code of Conduct.

C. The National Security Training Corps.

This consists of all qualified young men residing in the United States, or the Territories or possessions thereof, except certain categories of aliens to be specified by the National Security Training Commission. The following are specifically exempted:

(a) Present members of the armed forces.

(b) Past members of the armed forces who were discharged honorably therefrom.

(c) Cadets and midshipmen respectively at the United States Military Academy, United States Naval Academy, and the Coast Guard Academy.

(d) Members of the senior division of the ROTC and NROTC, or naval aviation college program.

(e) Members of the National Guard and the Organized Reserve of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

In addition, the President is authorized, pending full-scale implementation of this program, to exempt any person accepted for admittance at one of the service academies, members of the National Security Training Corps, although they shall be legally deemed to have military status, shall not be members of the armed forces, shall be liable to no duty other than training duty, and shall be liable to bear arms for the United States only in the event of a national emergency, so declared by Congress and the President.

After having fulfilled his training obligation hereunder, and upon separation from the corps, a young man will revert to complete civilian status and will have no further obligation to the armed forces, or to any Reserve component thereof, except in the event of a national emergency.

D. The National Security Training Commission:

There is created in the executive branch a Commission to set the policies and standards of the training program. The Commission shall consist of three persons appointed by the President with Senate confirmation. Two of its members, including the Chairman, shall be civilians. One member shall be appointed from the armed forces. The Commission shall report directly to the President.

The Commission shall be the policy and supervisory agency of the training program. As such it shall not operate directly any phase of the program. The War and Navy Departments shall be the operating agencies and will be governed by the policies and standards of the Commission; provided that the Commission itself shall determine the substance and character of the nonmilitary training provided for in this act.

Members of the Commission shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,500 per year, except the Chairman, who shall receive $15,000. The Commission shall appoint an Executive Director, to whom it may delegate all of its powers, duties, and functions. He shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per year. The Commission is empowered to employ a staff and to establish a full-time civilian inspectorate to keep it informed of actual conditions at the local level.

E. The General Advisory Board:

This shall consist of not less than 10 nor more than 25 persons appointed by the President, for the purpose of providing the Commission with the best technical advice on matters pertaining to the moral, religious, and educational phases of the program. The Board shall be composed in large part of outstanding civilians, but shall include not less than three members of the armed forces. The Board shall serve part-time, as the Commission may prescribe, and shall have no policy-making authority. Its members shall receive compensation and expenses when actually serving.

F. Training:

1. Military training:

The military training shall be divided into two phases. The first phase shall consist of 6 months' continuous training, as prescribed by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, in the Ground, Naval, or Air components of the Corps. The second phase shall be devoted to the completion of one of the several "alternative programs," provided herein. In the first phase the trainee shall be given the opportunity to choose his desired service branch, and in the second phase, his desired alternative program. He shall be assigned in accordance with his choice within the limits of applicable quotas, and standards of qualification and selection prescribed by law or by the President.

The alternative programs of the second training phase are as follows:

(a) Additional training in the National Security Training Corps for a period of 6 months.

(b) Voluntary enlistment in the Regular forces for at least the minimum period authorized by law.

(c) Enlistment in the National Guard or Organized Reserve for such period as the President may prescribe.

(d) Enlistment in the Enlisted Reserve Corps and assignment to an organized unit for such period as the President may prescribe.

(e) Entrance into the Military, Naval, or Coast Guard Academies.

(f) Enrollment in the Naval and Marine Corps officer-procurement program (the Holloway plan).

(g) Enrollment in ROTC or NROTC college course with agreement to accept the appropriate Reserve commission, if offered.

(h) Entrance into the United States Merchant Marine Academy or one of the five State-accredited maritime academies, with agreement to accept a naval Reserve commission, if offered.

(i) Entrance upon a technical or specialist course in school or college, the course being approved by the War or Navy Department and the minimum length of the course prescribed by the President.

(j) Enlistment in the Enlisted Reserve Corps for 6 years, with not to exceed 1 month's active duty per year.

The President shall provide for a system of training credits so as to allow transfer from one alternative program to another.

Scholarships and grants-in-aid may be offered to specially selected trainees who enter the educational alternatives (g) and (i) above.

2. Nonmilitary training:

The Commission, after study and consultation with other departments or agencies of the Government, shall determine the substance, character, and rate of implementation of the nonmilitary training for those members of the corps unacceptable physically or mentally for military training, and for conscientious objectors.

Each trainee shall receive during the first training phase and during alternative program (a) a cash allowance of $30 per month. Compensation in the other alternatives shall be as prescribed by law or regulation.

If a trainee is the chief support of his family or members of his family, he may apply for a dependency allowance, which shall be paid in whole by the Government, without reduction in the trainee's monthly allowance. This dependency payment shall be $50 per month for one dependent, $65 per month for two or more dependents.

Trainees in the basic period and in alternative (a) shall be entitled to the benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act of 1940, as amended, and to the benefits furnished to civil employees of the United States who suffer death or disability while in performance of duty. For this purpose trainees shall be deemed to receive compensation of $87.50 per month.

G. The Selective Training System:

There is created a Selective Training System closely analogous to the Selective Service System utilized in the past war. It shall be administered by a Director, who shall be the present Director of the Office of Selective Service Records. This System is established for the registration, examination, classification, assignment, deferment, delivery, and maintenance of records of men registered under this act.

This system shall include local boards in each county or comparable subdivision, appeal boards and other agencies analogous to the former Selective Service System.

Each local board shall maintain a register containing a current record of the address, occupations, training status and other pertinent data of each trainee for a period of 6 years following the trainee's completion of the first military training phase. The local board shall supervise the "alternative programs" with respect to ensuring fulfillment of the training obligation on the part of the trainee.

H. The code of conduct:

This consists of a detailed system of discipline for military trainees in the first training phase and in alternative (a) of the second phase. Trainees concerned shall not be subject to the articles of war, nor to the articles for the government of the Navy.

Three levels of disciplinary punishment are provided:

(a) Commanding officer's punishment to be utilized in cases of minor violations. No restriction or confinement ordered hereunder shall exceed 1 week. The trainee may always ask for a trial.

(b) National Security Training Court. This consists of 5 officers appointed by a regimental commander or above to try cases specified in this act. Punishment of such court may not exceed restriction, extra duty, or confinement of more than 3 months; except that dishonorable discharge may be adjudged by this court.

(c) District Courts of the United States and other civil authorities. Serious crimes, specified misdemeanors, and unlawful acts committed by trainees shall come within the jurisdiction of civil courts—in most cases, district courts of the United States.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

GOVERNOR DEWEY, KEEP YOUR 50,000 REDS; MONTANA DOES NOT WANT ANY PART OF THEM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, according to this morning's press, Gov. Tom Dewey, "Silent Tom," offered to give Montana 50,000 New York Communists to add to its population—and then he went fishing.

It seems to be the habit of the Republican leaders to "go fishing" whenever they are asked to help Montana.

Governor Dewey's suggestion is typical of the attitude of the absentee landlords in the East whenever they think of Montana or for that matter any part of the West. Montana is not a second-class State and it does not want Governor Dewey's Communists. It does not propose to be a haven for the people Governor Dewey, and his backers in Wall Street, do not want.

We wonder if Governor Dewey is going to be as helpful of all Montana's problems as he seems to be on this one of population. Since he is the titular head of the Republican Party and since he is on his first campaign tour, perhaps I could suggest what he could do for Montana.

He could tell his party to do the following things:

First. Stop cutting the appropriations for reclamation, flood control, and public power.

Second. Have the Republican majority in the Congress do something about high prices, inflation, and low-cost housing.

Third. Advise the people of Montana how to keep some of the wealth they have produced retained in Montana instead of having mansions and boulevards built on Riverside Drive while Montanans are made to walk in the mud.

He could do any or all of these things but instead, like all the Republicans whenever Montana's problems are mentioned to them, he "goes fishing."

I want to state emphatically that while we could support many more people in Montana we cannot and will not support

the kind that he, as titular head of the Republican Party, wants to give us. There is room in Montana for more men and women who believe in America and who will help to develop our State, but there is no room for anyone whose first and complete loyalty is not to the United States of America.

I want Governor Dewey to know that Montana resents his slur against our State and that he would be far better off if he had remained in New York attending to his own Communist problem instead of trying to foist it off on a State which, on a per capita basis, bought more bonds and contributed more men than any other State in the Union in both world wars. We in Montana can take care of our own problems, but you, Governor Dewey, are evidently afraid to take care of yours. If all "Silent Tom" has to do is offer Montana 50,000 Reds, then it is up to the Republican Party to look elsewhere for a candidate who will be able to offer to Montana and the West real help in developing the resources which we possess in such abundance so that we can offer more opportunities to the people of Montana and the Nation. In my 5 years as a Congressman from Montana I have constantly been looking for means to help develop our State and to give our people more in the way of opportunities. I have achieved some degree of success, especially in the authorization and appropriations for the Hungry Horse project, which is the first real start in the development of a great State. This is the kind of a project that will benefit not only the people of Montana but the people of the entire Northwest as well. It certainly differs from the project which Governer Dewey is offering to Montana in the form of 50,000 exportable New York Communists. If Governor Dewey would offer to send back to Montana some of the wealth which has been taken out of our rivers and our mines I think he would be contributing to the correction of an injustice which has existed since the days Montana was a Territory. Governor Dewey, your statement indicates quite clearly that you are not interested in Montana's welfare but only in your own chances of achieving the Presidency. If this is the way you really think this problem should be handled God help the State of Montana should you ever be elected President.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEVENSON] and express the hope that the remainder of the time under this suspension will be devoted to a discussion of the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the membership that we still have a very full calendar for consideration and disposition before we adjourn tonight, and the Chair expresses the hope that we can go ahead with the business of the House.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEVENSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEVENSON. Now, let us get back to the bill before us, H. R. 4127.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. I yield to my friend and colleague of Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I wish to express my appreciation and admiration of the gentleman for the ability and tenacity with which he has pushed the task of bringing this measure to the floor of the House. I know he has lived with it day and night for several months and I wish to compliment him now on the action I know the House is going to take in a few minutes.

Mr. STEVENSON. I thank my friend.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 4127 has for its purpose the amending of the existing civil-service retirement law. It provides many needed changes in the present law. Changes that are demanded by simple justice, changes in administrative practices, and changes that bring civil-service retirement in line with benefits already extended to many groups. From a standpoint of clearness and intelligibility, the act is much improved. It can safely be stated that the cost of this bill is borne almost entirely by the increase in employees' contributions.

During the last few years when the cost of living has been excessively high, the retired employees of the United States Government have been living on an average annuity of $950. An increase to this group of faithful retired employees is long since due. These men contributed regularly to the fund prior to their retirement. The dollar they deposited in the fund was a mighty dollar. We hear very little about the "almighty dollar" now, because it has lost its mightiness. We are paying the retired men back with a dollar of reduced purchasing power. In this bill we recognize the just claim of these men and grant them a modest increase of 25 percent or $300, whichever is the lesser amount.

Some months ago we read of a spectacular train wreck on the Pennsylvania Railroad. Six railway-mail clerks were killed and four seriously injured. These men, taken while in faithful pursuit of their duty, left families without adequate means of support. Again, in New York City, a woman jumped off a tall building and crushed to death a mail carrier absorbed in the delivery of his route. These are spectacular cases, but daily, faithful civil-service employees are dying, leaving wives and dependents, while in the performance of work for their Government. The comparative death rate is not high, but that does not reduce the individual need. The modest salaries paid to our Federal and postal employees do not permit the establishment of a large competence. So in this act we have provided for a modest form of widows' annuities. No mathematical formula can compute the immense good that will flow from this provision.

This is by no means a new departure. The Railroad Retirement Act, and the Social Security Act provide for widows and dependents. Our good neighbors to the north in the Dominion of Canada have provided annuities for the widows of Dominion employees for many years.

In making this provision for the widows of our employees; and such provision in the case of active employees is made only where there are dependent children; and, in the case of retired employees, it is made only when they elect to take a reduced annuity to make such provision possible. In making such a provision we are affording a source of security to our employees.

In this bill we have recognized the fact that in 1942 we increased the contributions made by employees to the retirement fund without affording the Government employee an increase in his annuity. We have recognized the fact that the present annuity paid to Government employees is not in proportion to the present salary scales. We have attempted to place annuities in a proper relative ratio to present salary scales. We have recognized the fact that this bill makes a saving that is not possible to find on any balance sheet. Employers around the country recognize the fact that from a standpoint of sound practice and economy a good pension plan permits the employer to maintain a more efficient working force. The discrepancy now existing between salaries and annuities has the effect of keeping men in the Federal service long after they should retire. It creates, as it were, "hidden annuitants," employees who are drawing full pay rather than an annuity. The new proposals found in this bill foster good personnel practices as well as providing a badly needed increase to retiring employees.

In H. R. 4127 we have simplified the administration of the retirement law. We have replaced the existing four complicated formulas with two simple formulas. Under present law, an employee must be skilled in higher mathematics and he must maintain cumbersome accounts to compute how much annuity he is going to receive. In H. R. 4127, every employee will find it simple to compute his own annuity.

Additional benefits are extended to employees under this bill, but substantial reductions are made in costs as well. The bill provides for a reduction in interest rate from 4 to 3 percent; it compels employees who have less than 5 years of service to withdraw their contributions on leaving the service; it permits withdrawal of contributions for those with less than 10 years of service. These provisions will act to materially reduce the future liability of the fund; it provides further that the total annuity received by the employee be charged against his accumulated deductions. Further, as I have previously pointed out, the bill provides for better administration. These are all steps in the direction of economy.

The bill increases the contributions of the employees from 5 percent of salary to 6 percent of salary. Since the retirement law became effective in May 1920, Federal employees have contributed $1,743,411,118.03 to the retirement fund. The total expenditures of the fund over this period has been $1,378,115,033. The employees' contributions have exceeded total expenditures by $365,296,085.03. The additional contribution to the fund to be made by the Federal employees will amount to approximately $40,000,000 per

year. It can safely be said that the cost of this bill is borne almost entirely by the increase in employees' contributions.

H. R. 4127 is a good bill, it is a just bill, it is a necessary and timely bill. It is a good bill for the employees, it is a good bill for the Government, and I urge its immediate enactment into law.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does this bill lower the retirement age?

Mr. STEVENSON. The retirement age is as in the present law after 30 years service. An employee may retire at 50 years but with a 30-percent reduced annuity. He may retire at 60, and also at 62. There is also provision for compulsory retirement at 70.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The employees under the Civil Service pay most of this out of their own salaries, do they not?

Mr. STEVENSON. That is right. The contribution to the fund is now greater than the appropriation by the Government.

Mr. JENSEN. The postal clerks and the employees' organizations of the Postal Department, are in favor of this bill, are they not?

Mr. STEVENSON. That is right. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported the bill unanimously, and the subcommittee of which I am chairman voted it out unanimously. I understand also that the Rules Committee reported it out unanimously.

Mr. JENSEN. It appears to me that the gentleman and his committee have done a very fine job.

Mr. STEVENSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. I yield to my friend and colleague from Wisconsin.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I wish to compliment the gentleman and his committee for reporting out this bill at the present time. What is the nature of the provision made for widows of these employees generally?

Mr. STEVENSON. A widow may receive an annuity, if the annuitant dies and she has a child or children. The annuitant also may designate his widow to receive a reduced annuity during her lifetime or until she remarries.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. If there are no children are there benefits to the widow?

Mr. STEVENSON. Under those conditions, yes. He may name his widow as beneficiary and she receives a reduced annuity.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BUCK. I am uncertain as to the exact increase in cost to the Government of this bill.

Mr. STEVENSON. The actuaries coming before the committee said it would cost approximately ten to fifteen millions dollars a year, but since then we have taken out several provisions of the bill which must materially decrease the cost. We have taken out the provision which would have allowed persons to retire with 10 years' service at 55 and 60, and would have given certain annuity benefits to the children of the widows of annuitants. We have taken those provisions out, which will materially reduce the cost.

I hope the bill passes unanimously. It is one of the most humanitarian and worth-while pieces of legislation that we have ever considered.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I have no more requests for time.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act is one of the very few bills reported out this session which is in the interest of deserving Government employees. Unfortunately it is not the original bill that was reported out which contained several broader and liberal provisions that would have provided retirement after 10 years' service to postal and other employees who are partially disabled by reason of the heavy work or arduous duties they perform. To such employees retiring at the age of 55, among whom are many veterans, the retirement compensation would have been little enough. I shall support this substitute and hope the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will report out a bill in the next session that will carry the just and deserving provisions that were eliminated from the original bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a radio address I delivered on Saturday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire, to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, each member of the Committee on Post Offices and Civil Service has received many communications with regard to amending the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended. The letters increased in volume when S. 637 was introduced in the other body and were noted in still greater number when the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEVENSON] the author of the present bill, introduced H. R. 3232, in essence a companion bill to the Langer-Chavez proposal I mentioned earlier.

But the measure before us presently did not evolve into H. R. 4127 from H. R. 3232; there was an intermediate step since the committee desired to bring out a so-called clean bill after extended discussions of H. R. 3232 and that proposal was numbered H. R. 3872. The merit of the new additions enhanced further inquiries and further increased the letter volume.

With the continued desire to report a complete bill to the House, legislation that would overcome objections raised theretofore, H. R. 4127 was drafted and is now being debated.

We have heard an explanation of the bill by the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEVENSON], the chairman of the subcommittee, has just concluded a longer discussion of the provisions.

I congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEVENSON] for his tenacity of purpose and compliment his fine subcommittee for their application and belief in a liberalization of the annuities and benefits given Federal employees. Their determination, after hearings, to effect desirable amendments obtained unanimous approval of H. R. 4127 by the entire committee and should have like approval by the Membership of the House this afternoon.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. R. 4127, better known as the annuity bill, to increase annuities for Federal employees.

This bill, which amends the retirement law, brings many benefits to Federal workers, simplifies the Retirement Act, and will give all Federal employees larger annuities for their comfort in later life when they retire from Federal service.

It will increase the annuities of all who have previously retired which will help them now to meet the present high cost of living. This act provides for widows of Federal employees and for their children under 18 years of age.

It will not add greatly to the cost of Government. It should and, I believe, will be approved by the Members of the House by a substantial majority.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, there is no need to argue about H. R. 4127 to amend and liberalize the civil-service laws. I found no sentiment whatever against it. It remains only to pass the bill by the required two-thirds majority, and to hope that it will be enacted into law forthwith.

The postal employees, and civil-service workers generally, are entitled to the benefits which the act provides, and I am glad to be recorded in support of the measure.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

House Resolution 292 was laid on the table.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks in the RECORD at the point immediately preceding the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers

on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4106) making appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1948.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 758) entitled "An act to promote the national security by providing for a National Security Organization, which shall be administered by a Secretary of National Security, and for a Department of the Army, a Department of the Navy, and a Department of the Air Force within the National Security Organization, and for the coordination of the activities of the National Security Organization with other departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security," agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GURNEY, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. BYRD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

PRESUMPTION OF SERVICE CONNECTION FOR TROPICAL DISEASES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 3889) to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), parts I and II, as amended, to establish a presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subparagraph (c) of paragraph I, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended by substituting a colon for the period at the end thereof and adding the following: "*Provided further*, That the term 'chronic disease' as used in this paragraph shall include anemia, primary; arteriosclerosis; arthritis; bronchiectasis; calculi of the kidney, bladder, or gall bladder; cardiovascular-renal disease, including hypertension, Buerger's disease and Raynaud's disease; cirrhosis of the liver; coccidiomycosis; endocarditis; diabetes, mellitus; endocrinopathies; epilepsies; Hodgkin's disease; leukemia, nephritis; osteitis, deformans; osteomalacia; organic diseases of the nervous system, including tumors of the brain, cord, or peripheral nerves; functional disorders of the nervous system; scleroderma; tuberculosis, active; tumors, malignant; ulcers, peptic (gastric or duodenal) and such other chronic diseases as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may add to this list: *And provided further*, That, subject to the limitations of this subparagraph, tropical diseases, such as cholera; dysentery, amebic or bacillary; filariasis; fungus diseases; lieshmaniasis; leprosy; loiasis; malaria; black-water fever; onchocerciasis; oroya fever; oracontiasis (or dracontiasis); pinta; plague; relapsing fever; schistosomiasis; yaws; yellow fever and others and the resultant disorders or diseases originating because of therapy, administered in connection with such diseases, or as a preventative thereof, shall be accorded service connection when shown to exist within 1 year after separation from active service or at a time when standard and accepted treatises indicate that the incubation period thereof commenced during active service. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prevent service connection for any disease or disorder otherwise shown by sound judgment to have been incurred in or aggravated by active service.

SEC. 2. Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), part II, paragraph I, as amended, is hereby amended by adding subparagraph (d) thereto, said paragraph to read as follows: "That for the purpose of paragraph I (a) hereof, any person who served in the military or naval service for 6 months or more and was honorably discharged therefrom and contracts a tropical disease such as cholera; dysentery, amebic or bacillary; filariasis; fungus diseases; lieshmaniasis; leprosy; loiasis; malaria; black-water fever; onchocerciasis; oroya fever; oracontiasis (or dracontiasis); pinta; plague; relapsing fever; schistosomiasis; yaws; yellow fever and others and the resultant disorders or diseases originating because of therapy administered in connection with such diseases, or as a preventative thereof, unless shown by clear and unmistakable evidence to have had its inception prior or subsequent to active service, shall be deemed to have incurred such disability in active service when it is shown to exist within 1 year after separation from active service, or at a time when standard and accepted treatises indicate that the incubation period thereof commenced during active service. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prevent service connection for any disease or disorder otherwise shown by sound judgment to have been incurred in or aggravated by active service.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I will take very little time. I think the House will be very glad to pass this bill. The Veterans' Administration has regulations at the present time under which it applies the presumption of service connection to cases involving certain diseases, particularly the tropical diseases. One Veterans' Administration office will interpret the regulation in one way and another office will interpret it in another way. I think the Veterans' Administration feels as we do, that these tropical diseases are extremely far-reaching. Some of them start with just a rash, and the fungus growths then extend inward into the digestive organs. They are extremely dangerous and very painful. This bill was endorsed by all the veterans' organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is absolutely no objection to the bill.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In enlarging the field for the primary diseases, a long list of which is included in the bill, what will be the additional cost to the Veterans' Administration?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the cost will not be appreciable in any event. It cannot be appreciable because the Veterans' Administration say they do not need the bill, since they can do it under regulations under the present law. However, as the regulations are interpreted differently in different offices, it is very essential to pass this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the author of the bill, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON].

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, this bill will establish a presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases. For instance, during the war many of our soldiers, sailors, and marines contracted various diseases while serving their country on foreign shores. Some of these diseases have a period of incubation of, say, 5 years. In many cases boys contracted malaria while in the South Pacific, China, Burma, and in Europe. While they were in action they were taking atabrine or some other suppressive medicine. After discharge from the service and stopping this medication a period of a year might go by, I have been informed by doctors, and the suppressive medicine they had used in the service was still strong enough to ward off an attack of malaria. However, after coming back to civilian life and engaging in their occupations they have come down with malaria or some other tropical disease. I claim that if they have malaria and have been in those areas of the Pacific and Europe where the disease is prevalent, it creates a presumption of service connection. I know in my own case that many of the boys that served under me in the Pacific contracted filariasis. That is a disease that can be arrested, but up to date cannot be cured. This bill is to take care of all kinds of diseases that have been contracted in the service, and if a boy has been serving in the Tropics and comes down with filariasis or any of the diseases that are foreign to this hemisphere it is presumptive evidence that it is service-connected.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. It applies to the veterans of World War II but not to the veterans of World War I?

Mr. PATTERSON. No; it applies to all veterans of World War I and II and the Spanish-American War veterans.

Mr. BREHM. I am glad to know that this does include veterans of World War I and II and the Spanish-American War veterans.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTERSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is it not the purpose of this bill to modernize the rules and regulations of the Veterans' Administration to catch up with the things that happened in this war, making it simpler and easier for a man to prove the service connection of his disability?

Mr. PATTERSON. That is right. Now it is a regulation, and this is putting it in the form of a statute so that when an adjudicator gets a case from a veteran, he will take notice of it because it is the law and not a regulation. There is an old saying that you can waive a regulation but you cannot waive the law.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It will liberalize the rules and make it easier for the veteran to prove his case.

Mr. PATTERSON. That is right.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTERSON. I yield.

Mr. TALLE. May I say to the gentleman that I am in thorough accord with his views. As time passes, it will be found that many bad cases of sinus trouble will develop as a result of high-altitude flying during the war. Such afflictions as well as those already mentioned should certainly be recognized as service-connected.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTERSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I commend the gentleman for bringing in this bill. I served in the China-Burma-India theater and I know there are many veterans who need this legislation badly. I think it is a fine piece of legislation and I intend to support it.

Mr. PATTERSON. I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. LODGE. I join with the distinguished gentleman and commend him for his excellent presentation.

Mr. PATTERSON. I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MITCHELL].

Mr. MITCHELL. This bill came out of the committee unanimously. Every member heard the testimony and is 100 percent for it.

Mr. PATTERSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTERSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEAN. This seems to be a very meritorious bill, but can you tell me why the Veterans' Administration is not in favor of it?

Mr. PATTERSON. It does not fit in with the program of the President. Of course, the committee has unanimously reported it out so I hope it will be accepted.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTERSON. I yield.

Mr. MITCHELL. It so happens that we get very few reports back from the Veterans' Administration in favor of our legislation.

Mr. PATTERSON. That is right. They do not approve of the majority of them because they do not conform with the program of the President.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a very much needed piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed

APPOINTMENT TO VACANCY IN THE BOARD OF REGENTS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 250, to provide for the appointment of Robert V. Fleming as a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, caused by the resignation of Frederic A. Delano, be filled by the appointment of Robert V. Fleming, a citizen of the District of Columbia, for the statutory term of 6 years.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3123) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3123) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 14, 82, 83, 97, 98, 103, 117, 118, 119, 120, 123, 126, 127, 155, 160, 173, 174, and 175.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 42, 43, 46, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 79, 80, 89, 99, 102, 106, 107, 110, 111, 112, 115, 116, 121, 122, 131, 132, 133, 134, 136, 139, 142, 147, 150, 154, 156, 157, 158, 159, 161, 163, 165, 170, and 172, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That not to exceed $50,000 of this appropriation may be used for the Division of Power under the Office of the Secretary"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,596,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"Construction: The funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1947 (Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1947), are hereby continued available during the fiscal year 1948 to meet obligations incurred in contract or contracts duly executed and in force on or before June 30, 1947; for administrative expenses connected therewith; including purchase of five, and hire of passenger motor vehicles; for temporary services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600), but at rates not exceeding $35 per diem for individuals; printing and binding; for the purchase or acquisition of necessary lands for rights-of-way and necessary engineering and supervision of the construction under said contracts; and for the construction of necessary interconnecting facilities incident to and connected with the construction of the Denison-Norfork transmission line."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,175,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,139,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$180,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,012,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,130,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$18,345,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

Davis Dam project, Arizona-Nevada, $9,700,000:

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Central Valley project, California: Joint facilities, $690,000; irrigation facilities $5,622,028; power facilities, Shasta power plant, $427,800, Keswick Dam, $100,740, Keswick power plant, $218,040; transmission lines, Shasta to Delta, via Oroville and Sacramento, two hundred and thirty kilovolt, $256,680, Shasta Dam to Shasta substation, two hundred and thirty kilovolt, $1,500,000, Keswick tap line, two hundred and thirty kilovolt, $160,000, Contra Costa Canal extension, sixty-nine kilovolt, $118,000; substation, Contra Costa, $48,000; in all, $9,141,288;"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$9,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$2,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 92: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in line 4 of said amendment insert "$17,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$49,841,288"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 94: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "as provided in the Act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law 534), Seventy-eighth Congress, and the Act of August 14, 1946 (Public Law 732), Seventy-ninth Congress"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$17,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 100: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 100, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$435,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 108: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 108, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 109: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 109, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 113: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 113, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "the payment, directly or indirectly, for the drilling of water wells for the purpose of supplying water for domestic use"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 125: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 125, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,091,340"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 128: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 129: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$93,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 135: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 135, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,060,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 137: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 137, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 138: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 138, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 140: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 140, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 141: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 141, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$41,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 143: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 143, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,060,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 144: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 144, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$38,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 145: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 145, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$29,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 146: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 146, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 148: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 148, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$680,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 149: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 149, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$580,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 153: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 153, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 162: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 162, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 164: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 164, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$258,450"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 166: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 166, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 167: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 167, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,492,810"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 168: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 168, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,492,810"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 169: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 169, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,082,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 178: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 178, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of said amendment, strike out the figure "9" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "10"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 6, 7, 16, 17, 18, 34, 39, 41, 68, 78, 85, 101, 104, 105, 114, 124, 130, 151, 152, 171, 176, 177, and 179.

ROBERT F. JONES,
BEN F. JENSEN,
IVOR D. FENTON,
LOWELL STOCKMAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
ALBERT GORE,
W. F. NORRELL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH S. WHERRY,
CHAN GURNEY,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
GUY CORDON,
CARL HAYDEN,
ELMER THOMAS,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3123) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4, relating to the Office of the Secretary: Provides for the temporary employment of consultants at $35 per diem, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $50 per diem, as proposed by the House; appropriates $1,103,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,000,000, as proposed by the House; provides that not to exceed $50,000 may be used for the Division of Power, instead of the prohibition against the use of any funds for such purpose, as proposed by the House, and the elimination of any restriction, as proposed by the Senate; and provides that not to exceed $42,500 may be used for the Division of Information or for publicity and public relations activities, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 5: Appropriates $215,460 for the Office of the Solicitor, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $200,000, as proposed by the House.

No. 6: Reported in disagreement.

No. 7: Reported in disagreement.

Nos. 8 and 9: Appropriates $1,900,000 for soil and moisture conservation operations, instead of $1,500,000, as proposed by the House, and $2,100,000, as proposed by the Senate, of which not to exceed $200,000 is provided for use in connection with the aerial seed planting program being carried on by this activity; and provides for the purchase of "not to exceed" four passenger motor vehicles.

No. 10: Appropriates $220,430, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $215,000, as proposed by the House, for contingent expenses, Department of the Interior.

No. 11: Appropriates $136,500 for penalty mail costs, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $185,000, as proposed by the House.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Nos. 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18, relating to the Bonneville Power Administration: Appropriates $8,596,400, instead of $6,907,800, as proposed by the House, and $16,222,400, as proposed by the Senate; authorizes the use of $2,500,000 for operation and maintenance, and administrative expenses, as proposed by the House, instead of $3,290,000, as proposed by the Senate; permits the purchase of "not to exceed" 14 passenger motor vehicles, as proposed by the Senate; provides $24,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $12,000, as proposed by the House; and reports amendments 16, 17, and 18 in disagreement. In connection with amendment No. 16, reported in disagreement, the managers on the part of the House have directed that a motion be made providing a contract authorization in the sum of $4,935,500. Assuming that the recommendation of the managers on the part of the House in connection with the contract authorization is accepted, the following table sets forth the distribution of funds as agreed upon by the conference committee:

Bonneville Power Administration

Description	Appropriation	Contract authorization	Total
Transmission system for which funds have been previously appropriated:			
Grand Coulee-Snohomish No. 1	$3,000,000	$3,000,000	$6,000,000
Snohomish-Arlington-Bellingham-Blaine	12,000	----------	12,000
Chehalis-Olympia	231,000	----------	231,000
Columbia substation additions	141,000	----------	141,000
Olympia-Shelton-Potlatch-Fairmont-Port Angeles	1,754,800	748,500	2,503,300
McNary-Pasco	164,000	----------	164,000
Olympia-Cosmopolis	376,000	185,000	561,000
Hungry Horse-Kerr Dam	237,000	----------	237,000
Subtotal	5,915,800	3,933,500	9,849,300
Transmission system for which funds have not been previously appropriated:			
Covington-Olympia	51,000	650,000	701,000
North Bonneville-Troutdale	29,600	352,000	381,600
Tools and equipment	100,000	----------	100,000
Subtotal	180,600	1,002,000	1,182,600
Total, construction	6,096,400	4,935,500	11,031,900
Operation and maintenance	2,500,000	----------	2,500,000
Total	8,596,400	4,935,500	13,531,900

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

No. 19, relating to the item for construction, Southwestern Power Administration: Continues available during the fiscal year 1948 funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1947 for which obligations have been incurred under contracts executed on or before June 30, 1947; makes the unexpended balance of the 1947 construction appropriation available for construction of necessary interconnecting facilities incident to and connected with the construction of the Denison-Norfork transmission lines; and also makes available the 1947 appropriation for administrative expenses and other expenses necessary to continued operation and supervision, including the purchase or acquisition of necessary lands, engineering, and so forth; instead of appropriating $1,246,000 together with reappropriation of the 1947 unexpended balance, as proposed by the House; and the elimination of the item, as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Nos. 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27: Appropriates $1,175,000 for salaries and expenses, instead of $1,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,218,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $2,084,640, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,888,000, as proposed by the House, for management, protection, and disposal of public lands, and in connection with such item, provides for the purchase of "not to exceed" 25 passenger motor vehicles, as proposed by the Senate, for the payment of a salary of $6 per diem to members of advisory committees of local stockmen, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $5 per diem, as proposed by the House, and increases the limitation on funds available for carrying out the provisions of the act of June 28, 1934, as amended, to $398,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $373,000, as proposed by the House; provides for the purchase of not to exceed 1 passenger motor vehicle in connection with range improvements, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates $469,300, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $425,000, as proposed by the House, in connection with revested Oregon & California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands, Oregon, including authorization for the purchase of "not to exceed" 1 passenger motor vehicle, as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

No. 28: Appropriates $500,000 for salaries and expenses, district offices, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $700,000, as proposed by the House.

No. 29: Appropriates $3,500,000 for the Alaska native service, instead of $3,250,000, as proposed by the House, and $3,650,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 30: Appropriates $11,139,700 for education of Indians, instead of $8,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $11,500,000, as proposed by the Senate, and directs a proportionate distribution of the reduction in the Budget estimate on the basis of the Budget break-down for such item as set forth in the 1948 Budget Estimates.

The conferees recommend that quarterly reports be made to the Appropriations Committees showing the obligations by activity under this appropriation and also the obligations by quarters for the various reservation, nonreservation, and day schools financed out of this appropriation.

The conferees further recommend to the Department that in preparing the justifications for the fiscal year 1949, there should be set forth in the justification for the appropriation "Education of Indians" a table showing for each reservation, nonreservation, and day school, the actual obligations for the fiscal year 1947, the estimated obligations for the fiscal year 1948, and the estimate for the fiscal year 1949.

No. 31: Appropriates $7,000,000 for conservation of health, instead of $6,830,570, as proposed by the House, and $7,240,570, as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees recommend that quarterly reports be made to the Appropriations Committees showing the obligations by activity under this appropriation and also the obligations by quarters for the various Indian hospitals and sanatoria financed out of this appropriation.

The conferees further recommend to the Department that in preparing the justifications for the fiscal year 1949, there should be set forth in the justification for the appropriation "Conservation of health" a table

showing for each hospital and sanatorium the actual obligations for the fiscal year 1947, the estimated obligations for the fiscal year 1948, and the estimate for the fiscal year 1949.

No. 32: Appropriates $498,710, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $488,910, as proposed by the House, for welfare of Indians.

No. 33: Appropriates $801,500, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,000,000, as proposed by the House, for management, Indian forest and range resources.

No. 34: Reported in disagreement.

Nos. 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, and 41, relating to acquisition of lands for Indian tribes: Prohibits the use of such appropriation for the acquisition of land outside the boundaries of existing Indian reservations in the States of California and South Dakota, and strikes out such prohibition as regards the States of Montana and Washington, as proposed by the Senate; prohibits the use of such funds for the purchase of lands either inside or outside the boundaries of existing reservations in the States of Montana, Nevada, Oregon and Washington, as proposed by the Senate, instead of the States of Nevada and Oregon, as proposed by the House; and reports in disagreement authorizations for the purchase of land for the Alamo Band of Puertocito Indians in the State of New Mexico, and for the acquisition of land at Celilo Falls, Oreg.

No. 42: Authorizes the use of $15,500 for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $12,000, as proposed by the House, in connection with Indian arts and crafts.

Nos. 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, and 48, relating to Indian irrigation: Appropriates $406,000, of which $337,833 shall be reimbursable, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $337,233, as proposed by the House, for maintenance of irrigation systems; and in connection with the construction of irrigation systems, appropriates $450,000 for the Colorado River project, Arizona, instead of $400,000, as proposed by the House and $500,000, as proposed by the Senate; $180,000 for the Navajo, Arizona and New Mexico, project, instead of $150,000, as proposed by the House, and $210,000, as proposed by the Senate; $40,000 for the Fort Hall, Idaho, project, and $17,500 for United Pueblos, New Mexico, as proposed by the Senate; and corrects the total of such items.

Nos. 49, 50, 51, and 52, relating to construction of buildings and utilities: Appropriates $400,000 for construction in Alaska, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $160,000, as proposed by the House; $20,000 for water improvements at Fort Belknap, Mont., as proposed by the Senate, instead of $10,000, as proposed by the House, with the understanding that such amount will be used to complete the project; provides for the hire of private architects, as propcsed by the Senate, and corrects the total of such items, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, and 61, relating to appropriations from Indian tribal funds: Appropriates $304,800 for administration of tribal funds, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $294,800, as proposed by the House; appropriates $147,500 for support of the Menominee Agency, Wis., as proposed by the Senate, instead of $135,000, as proposed by the House; provides a salary of $1,954 for the curator of the Osage Indian Museum, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out language authorizing the employment of a tribal attorney for the Osage Indian Agency, as proposed by the Senate; authorizes the use of $2,000 for education of Indian children at the St. Louis Mission Boarding School, Oklahoma, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,500, as proposed by the House; authorizes payment of $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence for travel and expenses of members of the Osage Tribal Council, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $6 per diem as proposed by the House; appropriates $73,000 for expenses of tribal councils, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $35,000, as proposed by the House; strikes out the words "non-Indian owned" in the proviso of the item for purchase and lease of lands, as proposed by the Senate, and excludes the states of Montana, Nevada, Oregon, South Dakota, and Washington from such item, as proposed by the Senate, instead of limiting the proviso to the States of Nevada and Oregon, as proposed by the House.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Nos. 62 and 63, relating to administrative provisions: Strikes out the limitation of $239,000 on printing and binding contained in the House bill, as proposed by the Senate; and inserts the proposal of the Senate inserting the words "not to exceed" in connection with the purchase of automobiles.

In connection with the consideration of construction activities the conferees are in agreement that there should be an improvement in the controls now set up to hold the allocations within appropriations provided by the Congress. The conference committee requests that the Department, with the assistance and supervision of the Bureau of the Budget, work out a system of quarterly reports to the Appropriations Committees which will keep the committees informed as to the status of such funds.

Nos. 64, 65, and 66, relating to salaries and expenses: Appropriates $3,130,000 for this purpose, instead of $3,000,000, as provided by the House, and $3,260,000, as proposed by the Senate; provides for the transfer of not to exceed $7,800,000 for work for the benefit of specific projects, instead of $6,500,000, as proposed by the House, and $9,100,000, as proposed by the Senate; and restricts the use of funds for informational work to $50,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $150,000, as proposed by the House.

Nos. 67 and 68: Appropriates $2,000,000 for general investigations, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $125,000, as proposed by the House; and reports amendment No. 68 in disagreement.

Nos. 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, and 80, relating to construction from the reclamation fund: Inserts the language of the Senate with reference to the reimbursability of construction funds; strikes out the provisions of the House proposing to appropriate funds for the Gila project, Arizona, Davis dam project, Arizona-Nevada, Central Valley project, California, Kings River project, California, Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado, Hungry Horse project, Montana, and the Columbia Basin project, Washington, as proposed by the Senate, funds for such projects being provided from general fund appropriations; strikes out the Pine River project, Colorado ($175,000), as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $930,750 for the Palisades project, Idaho, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $876,000, as proposed by the House; reports amendment No. 78 in disagreement; and corrects the total of construction appropriations from the reclamation fund.

No. 81: Makes $1,600,000 available from power revenues to operate and maintain the Parker Dam power project, Arizona-California, instead of $700,000, as proposed by the House, and $2,140,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 82 and 83, relating to the Columbia Basin project, Washington: Authorizes the use of $1,300,000 from power revenues for operation and maintenance, and so forth, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,326,000, as proposed by the Senate; and strikes out the proposal of the Senate providing for payment to school districts for pupils who are dependents of any employee of the United States living in or in the vicinity of Coulee Dam.

No. 84: Corrects the total of appropriations from reclamation fund.

No. 85: Reported in disagreement.

Nos. 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, and 93, relating to construction from the general fund:

Item or project	*Amount approved by conferees*
Gila project, Arizona	$1,400,000
Davis Dam project, Arizona-Nevada	9,700,000
Central Valley project, California	9,141,288
Kings River project, California	100,000
Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado	9,500,000
Hungry Horse project, Montana	2,500,000
Columbia Basin project, Washington	17,500,000
Total	49,841,288

Realizing that repayment of construction cost is an essential part of the reclamation policy, and that a major portion of repayment of the cost of the Columbia Basin project must depend upon power revenues, the conferees are agreed that funds provided in the bill should be so allocated as to permit completion and installation of the six generators presently on order for this project at the earliest possible date.

In making certain appropriations in this bill from the general fund for reclamation projects, the conferees do so with the recommendation that new legislation shall be passed at the earliest opportunity providing for the disposal of the interest collected on sums invested in power and municipal water features on reclamation projects, and with the understanding that interest heretofore or hereafter collected on such investment in power or municipal water features of any such reclamation project constructed or operated under the authority of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 shall not be allocated during the fiscal year 1948.

No. 94: Appropriates $1,500,000 for the Fort Peck project, Montana, instead of $1,250,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,575,058, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 95, and 96: Appropriates $17,000,000 for the Missouri River Basin project, instead of $9,786,600, as proposed by the House, and $18,535,000, as proposed by the Senate, of which $1,000,000 is provided for the Medicine Creek unit of the Frenchman-Cambridge project; $520,000 is for the Grand River (Shadehill) unit; $200,000 toward the construction of a transmission line from Bridgeport to Alliance, Nebr.; $150,000 is provided for use in the construction of a transmission line from Cheyenne to Pine Bluffs, Wyo.; and in accepting the amendment of the Senate relating to the reimbursability of the appropriation the conferees have agreed to include reference to the act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law 534).

Nos. 97 and 98 relating to operation and maintenance, Boulder Canyon project: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to provide funds for the payment of tuition for pupils who are dependents of employees of the United States living in the area, and appropriates $1,500,000 for operation and maintenance of the project, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,533,300, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 99 and 100: Appropriates $435,000 for continuation of construction, Boulder Canyon project, instead of $400,000, as proposed by the House, and $475,575, as proposed by the Senate; and changes the name of the dam from "Boulder" Dam, as proposed by the House, to "Hoover" Dam, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 101: Reported in disagreement.

No. 102: Appropriates $500,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $250,000, as proposed by the House for investigations, Colorado River system.

No. 103: Appropriates $1,000,000 for operating and maintaining the Colorado River

front work, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,063,300, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 104: Reported in disagreement.

No. 105: Reported in disagreement.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Nos. 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, and 125, relating to the Geological Survey: Authorizes the purchase of "not to exceed" 146 passenger motor vehicles, as proposed by the Senate; in connection with the appropriation for topographic surveys, increases the amount which may be used only for cooperative surveys with States or municipalities from $400,000, as proposed by the House, to $517,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $2,300,000 for geologic surveys, instead of $1,690,000, as proposed by the House, and $2,374,500, as proposed by the Senate, and permits the use of $500,000 of such appropriation for personal services in the District of Columbia, instead of $450,000, as proposed by the House and $580,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $2,625,000 for gaging streams, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,578,680, as proposed by the House, of which $265,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $250,000, as proposed by the House, with the understanding that the restriction on page 30 of Senate Report No. 278 requiring that not less than $740,000 be used for cooperative or noncooperative ground water activities shall not apply in connection with the distribution of the $2,625,000 allowed for this item; provides that $1,586,500 shall be available only for cooperation with States and municipalities, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,570,000, as proposed by the House, provides that no part of the appropriation shall be used for payment, directly or indirectly, for the drilling of water wells for the purpose of supplying water for domestic use, instead of prohibiting the use of any funds for cooperative or noncooperative ground water work, as proposed by the House, and prohibiting the use of any funds for the drilling of water wells for the purpose of supplying water for domestic use, as proposed by the Senate; reports in disagreement amendment No. 114; appropriates $245,000 of which not to exceed $56,500 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $139,000 and a District of Columbia limitation of $35,000, as proposed by the House; in connection with printing and binding, and so forth, appropriates $120,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $130,000, as proposed by the Senate, for printing and binding, $32,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $36,000, as proposed by the Senate, for preparation of illustrations, $237,000 for geologic and topographic map printing and engraving, as proposed by the House, instead of $313,500, as proposed by the Senate, and corrects the total of such items; appropriates $650,000 for mineral leasing, as proposed by the Senate, of which $78,000 may be expended in the District of Columbia, instead of $434,210, with a limitation on District of Columbia expenditures to $65,000, as proposed by the House; strikes out the proposal of the Senate authorizing the Director to contract for the furnishing of topographic maps; reports in disagreement amendment No. 124; and corrects the total of the items for the Geological Survey.

BUREAU OF MINES

Nos. 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, and 152, relating to various provisions for the Bureau of Mines: Provides $93,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $118,000, as proposed by the Senate for personal services and $65,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $85,000, as proposed by the Senate, for printing and binding, in connection with the item for salaries and expenses; appropriates $400,000 for testing fuel, instead of $302,285, as proposed by the House, and $416,500, as proposed by the Senate, and provides $93,500 for personal services in the District of Columbia, instead of $80,000, as proposed by the House, and $97,600, as proposed by the Senate, with the understanding that the reduction in the Budget estimate shall be distributed proportionately; reports No. 130 in disagreement; provides for the purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles in connection with synthetic liquid fuels, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $440,300, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $360,090, as proposed by the House, for mineral mining investigations, and provides $40,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $30,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates $1,060,000 for investigation and development of domestic mineral deposits, except fuels, instead of $800,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,120,000, as proposed by the Senate, of which $39,200 may be used for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $30,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates $75,000 for coal investigations, instead of $57,000, as proposed by the House, and $100,000, as proposed by the Senate, of which $7,500 is made available for personal services in the District of Columbia, instead of $5,000, as proposed by the House and $9,800, as proposed by the Senate, and authorizes the purchase of "not to exceed" one passenger motor vehicle, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $600,000 for oil and gas investigations, instead of $579,000, as proposed by the House, and $634,550, as proposed by the Senate, authorizes the purchase of "not to exceed" five passenger motor vehicles, as proposed by the Senate, and provides $41,500 for personal services in the District of Columbia, instead of $40,000, as proposed by the House, and $43,300, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $1,060,000 for mining experiment stations, instead of $1,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,120,000, as proposed by the Senate, provides that the reduction in the Budget estimate under this item shall be distributed proportionately and that no stations shall be closed, and authorizes the use of $38,500 for personal services in the District of Columbia, instead of $37,000, as proposed by the House, and $40,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $1,000,000 for metallurgical research and pilot plants, instead of $600,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,120,000, as proposed by the Senate, with the understanding that none of the activities or projects proposed in the 1948 Budget estimates shall be discontinued, and provides $29,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia in connection with such item, instead of $25,000, as proposed by the House, and $31,200, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $140,000 for buildings and grounds, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $150,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates $680,000 for economics of mineral industries, instead of $555,000, as proposed by the House, and $755,000, as proposed by the Senate, and authorizes the use of $580,000, for personal services in the District of Columbia, instead of $480,000, as proposed by the House, and $637,500, as proposed by the Senate; authorizes the purchase of "not to exceed" one passenger automobile, as proposed by the Senate; and reports amendments Nos. 151 and 152 in disagreement.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

No: 153 Appropriates $3,500,000 for administration and protection, and so forth of national parks, instead of $3,350,000, as proposed by the House, and $3,637,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 154: Appropriates $260,400 for recreational areas, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $197,000, as proposed by the House.

No. 155: Appropriates $30,000 for recreational demonstration areas, as proposed by the House, instead of $43,400, as proposed by Senate.

Nos. 156, 157, and 158, relating to appropriations for construction and maintenance of roads and trails, and for the construction and repair of buildings and utilities: Appropriates $2,150,000 for such purposes, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,650,000, as proposed by the House; provides that $1,415,000 of such sum shall be available for roads and trails, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,750,000, as proposed by the House; provides $735,000 for construction and repair of buildings as proposed by the Senate, instead of $900,000, as proposed by House: and provides that $7,500 shall be used in making necessary archeological surveys at Old Fort Vancouver, Wash.

No. 159: Authorizes the purchase of "not to exceed" 40 passenger motor vehicles, as proposed by the Senate.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Nos. 160, and 161, relating to investigations respecting food fishes: Appropriates $790,040 for such purpose, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $725,000, as proposed by the House, with the understanding that the various stations financed under this appropriation shall be kept in operation, and that funds will be provided for operation of the *Albatross III* as a fishery research vessel. Funds are also provided in the sum of $20,000 to investigate and eradicate the predatory sea lampreys of the Great Lakes as authorized by joint resolution of August 8, 1946, Public Law 672, as proposed by the House.

No. 162: Appropriates $225,000 for commercial fisheries, instead of $200,000, as proposed by the House, and $280,700, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 163: Appropriates $125,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $100,000, as proposed by the House, for the fishery market news service.

No. 164: Appropriates $258,450, for biological investigations, instead of $241,000, as proposed by the House, and $280,700, as proposed by the Senate, the increase of $17,450 in the House figure being provided for the establishment of cooperative wildlife research units in Nebraska, Oklahoma, Colorado, and Idaho.

No. 165: Appropriates $900,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $750,000, as proposed by the House, for control of predatory animals and rodents.

No. 166. Appropriates $200,000 for river basin studies, instead of $100,000, as proposed by the House, and $245,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 167 and 168: Corrects totals.

No. 169: Authorizes the expenditure of $1,082,700 for departmental personal services, instead of $1,028,100, as proposed by the House, and $1,098,200, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 170: Authorizes the purchase of "not to exceed" 50 passenger motor vehicles, as proposed by the Senate, instead of 100, as proposed by the House.

No. 171: Reported in disagreement.

No. 172: Inserts the words "not to exceed" in connection with the purchase of two passenger motor vehicles, as proposed by the Senate, in connection with the item for salaries and expenses, government of the Virgin Islands.

Nos. 173, 174 and 175, relating to the availability of funds appropriated to the various bureaus and offices for use in attendance at meetings: Provides $2,000 for the Geological Survey, $2,000 for the Bureau of Mines, and

$1,750 for the Fish and Wildlife Service, as proposed by the House.

No. 176: Reported in disagreement.

No. 177: Reported in disagreement.

No. 178: Inserts the proposal of the Senate making funds available for a health-service program as authorized by the Act of August 8, 1946.

No. 179: Reported in disagreement.

AMENDMENTS REPORTED IN DISAGREEMENT

The following amendments are reported in disagreement:

No. 6, relating to the Oil and Gas Division, Office of the Secretary: The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment. Of the $275,000 which the House managers will recommend for this item, $175,000 is for enforcement of the Connally "Hot Oil" Act, and $100,000 is for the coordinating, unifying and other functions of the Oil and Gas Division.

No. 7, relating to the Division of Geography, Office of the Secretary: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 16, relating a contract authorization for the Bonneville Power Administration. The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 17, relating to force account work, Bonneville Power Administration. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur. In accepting the amendment of the Senate it was agreed by the conferees that the term "routine minor construction" shall include only force account operations substantially completed, and shall otherwise represent only expenditures of minor amounts, and the conference committee will expect a full report upon expenditures under this paragraph, and will look with disfavor upon any excessive use of funds not in strict compliance herewith.

No. 18, relating to the use of funds for informational work, Bonneville Power Administration. The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 34, relating to suppressing forest and range fires. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 39, relating to the acquisition of lands for Indian tribes. The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 41, relating to the acquisition of land for Indians in the area of Celilo Falls on the Columbia River, Oreg. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 68, relating to general investigations, Bureau of Reclamation. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 78, relating to the Provo River project, Utah. The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 85, relating to appropriations, general fund. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 101, relating to the Boulder Canyon project (All-American Canal). The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 104, relating to disposition of the Yuma Army air base, Yuma, Ariz. The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 105, relating to force account work by the Bureau of Reclamation. The House managers will move to recede and concur. In accepting the amendment of the Senate it was agreed by the conferees that the term "routine minor construction" shall include only force account operations substantially completed, and shall otherwise represent only expenditures of minor amounts, and the conference committee will expect a full report upon expenditures under this paragraph, and will look with disfavor upon any excessive use of funds not in strict compliance herewith.

No. 114, relating to gaging streams, Geological Survey. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 124, relating to the transfer of surplus supplies and materials to the Geological Survey. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 130, relating to construction of an anthracite research laboratory, Bureau of Mines. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 151, relating to the transfer of the United States Weather Bureau station at Mount Weather, Va., to the Department of the Interior for use by the Bureau of Mines. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 152, relating to the transfer of surplus equipment, materials and supplies to the Bureau of Mines. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 171, relating to the transfer of surplus equipment, materials, and supplies, including aircraft for replacement purposes, only, to the Fish and Wildlife Service. The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 176, relating to the use of funds for the establishment of regional, field or other office or committee without approval by the Congress. The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 177, relating to payment of dues for library membership. The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 179, relating to the use of funds for persons engaged in personnel work. The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

ROBERT F. JONES,
BEN F. JENSEN,
IVOR D. FENTON,
LOWELL STOCKMAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
ALBERT GORE,
W. F. NORRELL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this appropriation bill provides for a cut of $101,547,561 under the budget estimate for the fiscal year 1948, for the Interior Department.

The total amount of the budget estimates was $296,135,420. The amount of the bill as agreed to by the conferees is $194,587,859. The amount of the bill as passed by the Senate was $215,530,353. The difference between the bill as it passed the Senate and the conference report is $20,942,494. In other words, we are $20,942,494 under the Senate bill.

The bill as it passed the House, was $161,413,513. The conference bill is $33,174,346 above the House bill. In percentages, the conference agreement is 34.3 percent below the budget estimates for the fiscal year 1948. In comparison to the 1947 bill it is 24.7 percent below the 1947 bill.

So that you may see this analysis in tabular form, I insert the following table:

Interior Department appropriation bill, 1948

Total amount of budget estimates	$296,135,420
Amount of bill as agreed to by conferees	194,587,859
Reduction under budget estimates	101,547,561

Percentagewise:

Conference agreement is 34.3 percent below budget.

Conference agreement is 24.7 percent below 1947.

Amount of bill as passed by Senate	$215,530,353
(Senate bill is a reduction of 27 percent below budget and 17 percent below 1947.)	
Amount of bill as agreed to by conferees	194,587,859
Reduction in bill as passed by Senate	20,942,494
Amount of bill as agreed to by conferees	194,587,859
Amount of bill as passed by House	161,413,513
(House bill is a reduction of 45 percent below budget and 38 percent below 1947.)	
Increase in bill as originally passed by House	33,174,346

Personally, I think this bill carries too much money. I think as it passed the House the bill was ample and adequate to take care of all the needs of the Interior Department, but a conference is a conference, and you must have a meeting of the minds. While I personally would not report a bill of the size that has been reported, I am going to support the conference report because I believe it is the best bill that any conferees could bring out under the circumstances of the differences of opinion between the House and the Senate on the needs of the Department.

Certainly, nobody worked harder than the House conferees on the majority side particularly to cut down the amounts that were appropriated.

When the Interior bill was before the House there was a feeling apparent that the Republican Party and the House generally were not providing enough money for the Reclamation Bureau, that it would be ruined if the House figures prevailed. You will remember that the House figures were based upon the expenditure during the fiscal year 1947 of $130,000,000 which was the amount of the President's freeze order. At this hour I now have a detailed account of the expenditures of the Bureau of Reclamation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947. Their expenditures to that date amounted to $118,913,000 for the over-all expenditure for all purposes of the Bureau of Reclamation. There is a carry-over of previously appropriated money of $111,878,000.

The House had appropriated $67,892,000 for all purposes for the Bureau of Reclamation, and when you add to that the previous year appropriated funds of $111,878,000 you get over-all funds available for the 1948 Reclamation program of $179,770,000. That is more money by far than has been expended in any year by the Bureau of Reclamation. They had $230,791,000 available for all purposes in the fiscal year 1947 and were able to spend only $118,913,000. In my opinion it is absolutely not necessary to add the $25,475,038 that the conferees added to the House figure making a total new money available of $89,528,038 to be added to the $111,873,000 previous year appropriated funds, to arrive at a total of $201,406,038 available for the Bureau of Reclamation to spend in the fiscal

year 1948. This is 69 percent more than they were able to spend in the fiscal year 1947. I insert a table at this point in the RECORD to show exactly the financial situation of the Bureau of Reclamation:

Preliminary statement (based on as yet incomplete fiscal year 1947 reports) of cash available and expenditures, fiscal year 1947, and estimated cash available, fiscal year 1948 (without consideration of obligations already incurred for payment in fiscal year 1948)

BASED ON CONFERENCE REPORT ON INTERIOR BILL FOR 1948

	Available, 1947 (cash)	Expended, 1947 [1]	Carry-over (including obligations), 1947 to 1948	New funds for 1948	Total available, 1948
Salaries and expenses	$4,724,000	$3,980,000	$744,000	$3,130,000	$3,874,000
General investigations	8,470,000	6,900,000	1,570,000	2,000,000	3,570,000
Construction:					
Reclamation fund	53,861,000	17,345,000	36,516,000	11,876,750	48,392,750
General fund	120,294,000	69,699,000	50,595,000	49,841,288	100,436,288
Colorado River funds	13,450,000	8,167,000	5,283,000	4,180,000	9,463,000
Missouri Basin	28,018,000	12,639,000	15,418,000	17,000,000	32,418,000
Fort Peck	1,944,000	192,000	1,752,000	1,500,000	3,252,000
Total	230,791,000	118,913,000	111,878,000	89,528,038	201,406,038

[1] Based on incomplete reports from field offices, subject to adjustment on final figures.

Let it not be said again that the House figures did not provide enough money to keep reclamation projects going. Let it never be said that the House of Representatives did not provide enough money to develop reclamation on a sound basis, in the arid and semiarid territory in the 17 Western States. As a matter of fact, in the 1948 budget of the President, there is only $70,292,812 of new money requested for irrigation and joint facilities. With the $111,878,000 carry-over of 1947 and prior year appropriations they will have $201,406,038 to develop the program of the Bureau of Reclamation in the fical year 1948.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to ask the gentleman a question with reference to the Missouri River Basin. The House appropriated $9,786,600, and the Senate $18,535,000. The conferees have agreed on a figure of $17,000,000. I wish to ask the chairman if this makes any special reference to Madison Creek Dam near Cambridge, Nebr.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. We earmarked $1,000,000 for the project and $528,000 for the Grand River unit thereof.

Two very important items in the appropriation measure are those for Indian education and the Indian health services. We believe that these items are adequately taken care of in the bill, and that it will be possible to maintain Indian hospitals and Indian schools at an adequate level of efficiency. It is only through education that our Indian citizens may prepare themselves to take their places as free and equal members of our society.

There has been some reduction in the amount requested for administration of the Indian Office. With careful and prudent management, the amount appropriated should be sufficient to cover the essential and worth-while services of the Bureau. We feel that important economies can be made in the district offices of the Indian Service, for which very large sums were asked in the budget. With cuts made necessary at the district office level, every effort should be made to maintain adequate administrative services at all of the agencies. It would be most unfortunate to abandon many of the agencies if by so doing the Indian population of a reservation were forced to travel long distances to carry on business with the Indian Office. Restrictions and regulations established by the Indian Service on the day-to-day affairs of ward Indians make it desirable to have representatives of the Service readily available at each reservation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state on consideration of this conference report that in my estimation it is more desirable that there should be more money in this bill to be spent on America, especially when we look at the needs of the West. Remember, this is a bill that is strictly for this country.

But we had our day in the House and the boys from California, Oregon, and the Midwestern States all voted for this bill that cut the heart out of it, and it is therefore their responsibility and it is going to be their job when they go back home to their constituents to explain their stand. I repeat, as we look at the $900,000,000 damage today in the Missouri Valley and then at the inadequate provisions of this bill, the comparison is pathetic. Remember, this is money to take care of America. When we are shooting money all over the world at the rate we are, what will they say when they get back home? Yes; they have got a great responsibility to go home and tell the people of their communities that they did a good job. Well, the responsibility is theirs, and theirs, too, the task of trying to convince their home folks that they did a good job by reclamation especially in the 17 Western States.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I notice that in this report there is provided $1,500,000 for the Central Valley water project, California, which is to be used for the construction of a 230-kilovolt line from Shasta Dam to the Shasta substation. I want to compliment the committee for getting at least that much for us. We should have had three or four million dollars for that purpose.

As I understand it, this line goes from Shasta Dam to the Shasta substation, which is the Pacific Gas & Electric's substation; is that correct?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. As I understand it, we built that substation some time ago. That appropriation was passed some time back.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It is a publicly owned substation?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. That is right.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. My information is that the Shasta substation is owned by the P. G. & E. We hope this is only the beginning of the steps to be taken in the extension of this line down the west side of the valley to the booster pumps at Tracy, so that we may have an integrated system of power in connection with the Shasta Dam project. May I remind you that five governors of California, a number of legislatures of California, the people of California, and as far as I know every Member of the House from California and both of our United States Senators, irrespective of party, have come out in the past and now are in favor of the development of an integrated system of power in the Central Valley project. That is what we are looking forward to and I hope this is only the beginning of that particular project that some day will be completed and serve not only central California but the entire northern part of California. That was in the original plan and unless we carry out the original plan as devised by Colonel Marshall and others we will not get the full benefit of this project.

Mr. Speaker, I do not favor and have not favored distribution of this power by the local utility in that area because they are really a competitor of ours. If we put ourselves in the position of having them as our customer, we will not get the benefit that our people, our governors, and our legislators anticipated out of this project. We will then be in a position where we can deal with not only the present public utility but also other public utilities as well as public bodies in the sale of our power. For instance, the Sacramento utility district as well as cities and reclamation districts may be customers of ours. In other words, we will not be at the mercy of only one customer and thus the maximum benefits of reduced electric rates to our people will be possible. Naturally, the P. G. & E. would be glad to be our only customer, so they can distribute the electricity to this public power development. They would not need to build any dams or other works to get the juice. They being a monopoly could pay any price, as under the utility laws of California they would be able to charge off the cost and still get enough more to make a reasonable profit. The more they paid us the more profit they would make and the more the people would pay for their electricity. If this is only the beginning of what we may expect in the way of money to build adequate electric facilities in connection with the CVP, then the people can expect to get some

real benefit out of the project, the water users can get cheap water, and the project will soon liquidate itself.

I again say that I hope this is only the beginning of what we may expect to properly build our electric system, as an adjunct to the Shasta development in order that the dream and the hope of our governors, legislators, and the people who ratified this project may expect in the way of public benefits and cheap electricity.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to let go unchallenged the statement of the gentleman from California, which of course he has the perfect right to make, and I do not want to leave unchallenged the legislative intent of this act with reference to the transmission line from Shasta Dam to the Shasta substation. As a matter of fact, for the sale of 1½ billion kilowatts of power we get about $100,000 less than we do from the Columbia River Basin project selling 3½ billion kilowatts of power through its governmental agency, the Bonneville Power Administration. The committee, therefore, can see no reason to extend a governmental power network in the Central Valley project when this amount of money is being earned by Shasta and Keswick Dams, compared to the Government agency, Bonneville Power Administration, disposing of 3½ billion kilowatts of Columbia Basin project power for only $100,000 more money.

As a matter of fact, I hold no brief for the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. Power generated in their own plants costs them an average of 5.2 mills a kilowatt-hour, with taxes included, which they must pay as a private corporation. Without taxes their average cost is 3.7 mills per kilowatt-hour. The Bureau of Reclamation sells prime power and secondary power to them on an average of 2.5 mills a kilowatt-hour. I think it is a crime and a shame, with the tremendous amount of development that is ahead of us in developing the arid and semiarid West, that the Pacific Gas & Electric does not pay something very near the cheapest price for which they can generate power in their own plants. Likewise, I consider it a shame that the Bonneville Power Administration does not provide more revenue to the reclamation fund for the development of the arid and semiarid regions in the 17 Western States. I might say in passing that I frown upon and condemn the public sale of power to private utilities in the Arizona territory where it is reported to me from 200 percent to 400 percent profit is made on public power. I believe that these contracts for reclamation power are made lower to the private utilities—lower than they can generate power in their own plants—in order to work up a demand for Federal grid system. It would be much better to get a reasonable price for the power in order to build up the reclamation fund to develop the West faster.

Congress needs, certainly, consulting engineers rather than accountants to advise committees of Congress to act as board of directors on the public power projects so that the public is given the benefit of the public power generated. Private power has abused its rights and privileges on the one hand and public power is likewise abusing its position. Both at times are preying upon the public. Somewhere in between is the truth and somewhere in between is a sound power policy. We should not appropriate further money for public power until consulting engineers advising Congress help us write a sound power policy. For a meager $50,000 a year, millions of the taxpayers' money could be saved. I have despaired of private utilities clamoring for appropriations for power lines where they have preferential contracts and trying to beat down appropriations where they are not in such a profitable position. We have marked this bill up and we have dealt in conference on the best information we can to deal fairly with the public's investments in these power projects without fear or favor to any pressure group in the private utility field or in the public power field. But Congress has waited too long for the technical engineering advice that a mere $50,000 annually would give them to put reclamation, flood control, and all governmental power projects on a sound basis for the wise development of the resources of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, with reference to nearly everything in the conference report as nearly as I can find out the conferees did a good job. I have heard very little complaint, and I have talked to a number of Members.

However, a strange thing happened with respect to items for the State of Oregon in connection with the Bonneville administration appropriation. The Members of the House may recall that the House, when it passed the Interior appropriation bill, appropriated a total of $1,021,000 for transmission lines in the State of Oregon. The Senate when it passed the bill provided $1,213,900 for lines in the State of Oregon. But the conference eliminated all of those lines except one small one amounting to $29,600. Meanwhile the conference increased the total amount of cash appropriations in the bill from the House figure of $6,907,000 to $8,596,000, but none of it except $29,000 goes into the State of Oregon.

The Columbia River is the source of the power for the Bonneville project and the Columbia River is the boundary line between the States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, and yet in the conference report as reported to the House of Representatives no funds for the building of Bonneville transmission lines and facilities are allowed by the conference report for lines in the States of Oregon and Idaho. I had in mind questioning the right of the conferees to ignore the passage of these appropriations by both the House and the Senate, but in going over the rules of the House and the precedents, I found that the conferees were within their rights. These appropriations are made in what I would consider a peculiar way; in other words, these allocations that I speak of for transmission lines are set up in the report of the committee and are not set forth in detail in the bill as passed by the House.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman complain about the amount of money allowed for Bonneville Power administration in this conference report?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. No; I do not.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman feels that the conferees have given sufficient money to Bonneville Power Administration in this conference report?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. There is a difference in your questions. I do not feel that the conferees allowed what I would call sufficient money. The gentleman asked me if I complained about the report. I do not complain.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman feels that the conferees did not allow sufficient money?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. The Bonneville project is a continuing project until it is completed, and when it is completed it will pay back every cent of the money expended.

Mr. ROONEY. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman, but I was wondering how it was that when this bill was before this House on the 25th of April last, the gentleman from Oregon voted against the minority contention and voted a substantial decrease in funds for Bonneville Power Administration and, as a further matter of fact, voted against the motion to recommit which would have increased the fund for Bonneville Power Administration to about $20,000,000.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I considered the motion to recommit was a request for more money for several other sections of the bill than could be reasonably justified. Had the motion to recommit been on Bonneville alone I would certainly have voted for it.

When the report is adopted and the amendments in disagreement are being considered by the House, I shall offer a preferential motion to recede and concur in amendment No. 16, which is the amendment providing for contract authorization for the Bonneville project. May I explain this. The conferees agreed to offer an amendment to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment calling for a total of approximately $5,000,000, in other words, $4,935,000. It is my intention to offer an amendment to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which calls for $6,000,000. Now, here is the important thing about this. It is right and justice that something be done in this bill to continue the work on transmission lines in the State of Oregon. That is only simple justice. My intention is to offer this motion for the sole purpose of correcting

what I believe was an error on the part of the conferees in the consideration of this bill. My motion will not result in the appropriation of a single cent in addition to that appropriated in the bill. My motion will only provide for contract authorizations for the purchase of equipment in the future.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has again expired.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I address myself to the statement just made by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH]. The conferees on this Interior Department appropriation bill on the part of the House have worked hard and long. It was after many weeks that we arrived at a solution which was satisfactory to every member of the House and Senate conference committee. We now find the gentleman from Oregon with an additional plan which was never brought to the attention of the conferees or to me, and I was present at every single conference meeting, until about 10 minutes before we finally agreed on the entire bill.

To agree to the proposition offered by the gentleman from Oregon at this time would be most unfair to any number of other Members of the House who also have pet projects in their districts. When we get to the point where we vote on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon, I am going to ask that the Members of the House go along with the judgment of the conferees, who have been unanimous on this proposition.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am of course disappointed with the report of the conferees with reference to the funds that were allowed to the Bonneville Administration, as follows: $8,596,400 cash and $4,935,000 in contractual authority; Senate previously voted $16,222,400 cash and $6,000,000 in contract authority; House approved $6,907,800 in cash, no contract authority. The Bonneville Administration as you know is very close to my heart. It is in my district. In the 9 years I have been here it has been one of the problems with which I have had to deal to get adequate appropriations to carry on that great activity. It has been a very successful operation, not alone for the benefit of the people of the northwestern area but for the Federal Government as well, because it is paying its way; it is retiring the obligations it took on to build the project, and the reports which are just recently released show that it has increased the sale of power $1,500,000 in the last year over the preceding year. We were fearful that after the war ended these great hydroelectric plants which were put in by the Government during the war period, some of them going back before the war period, as did Bonneville, would find themselves with an excess of power, but that is not the case. There is a dearth of power throughout the United States everywhere, in the Northwest particularly.

It was by reason of Bonneville and Grand Coulee that we were able to have the hydoelectric power necessary to build the planes and to take care of the atomic-bomb plant in that area, which was a very decided factor in helping us win the war. We feel that a project of this sort, even though we are economy-minded, as I am, with you, should be provided adequate appropriations to carry on its normal activities. The Bonneville project is fully completed. All that is necessary is to have additional equipment and transmission facilities to continue to market the power that is being developed at Government-owned projects in the control of the Bonneville Administration and to transmit the power to the load centers.

Operations of the Bonneville Power Administration during the fiscal year ended June 30 resulted in a surplus of $6,255,230 after deduction of all charges on Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams and the transmission system, Administrator Paul J. Raver, reports.

This net return to the Government, he said, compares with $4,754,895 for the fiscal year 1946 and was higher than had been anticipated at the beginning of the year.

Preliminary financial statements as of the close of business for the past fiscal year show revenues from power sales to be $21,860,970 compared with $19,884,285 for the previous 12-month period.

The year's power sales brought total revenues of the Administration since the first sale of power from the Grand Coulee and Bonneville plants in 1939 to $105,-322,497. Total accumulated net surplus after all charges for operation and maintenance, depreciation and interest on investment is $22,582,177.

All revenues are turned over to the Treasury and are not used by the Administration since Congress appropriates amounts required for operation, maintenance, and construction each year.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Oregon on his statement and to commend him on the fact that from the time this bill was first considered he was firm in his convictions with regard to these reclamation projects and Bonneville Power Administration. The position he takes today, unlike many others, is the same position he took right from the beginning.

Mr. ANGELL. I thank the gentleman. That is true. I was compelled to vote against the bill when it went through the House and to vote to recommit it because I felt that we were not providing in the bill the minimum appropriations necessary to carry on the work of the Bonneville Administration.

When this bill went through the House it carried $1,021,000 for transmission facilities, taking this power down into Oregon. Every single dollar of that was approved by the Senate as it was approved by the House. Of course, we had cut very, very deep in the House already until the blood rushed out, but the House approved it. It went to the Senate, and the Senate approved it with substantial additions. Then in conference all transmission facilities for Oregon which had been approved by the House and Senate were struck out with the exception of one item, the North Bonneville-Troutdale line, which comes down into my particular territory. I am very grateful to the conferees for doing that.

Mr. ROONEY. Of course the gentleman understands that it was a House-Senate conference, and that we were faced with the proposition of having to work out some sort of a solution to get the bill finished. While the minority did not concur insofar as the activities in connection with reclamation projects were concerned, there was nothing we could do but sign the report in order to get the bill on its way.

Mr. ANGELL. I thank the gentleman. I realize that in the conference committee it was a question of give and take. But I do feel in justice to my people in the Northwest I should point out these inconsistencies which to my mind show that there should have been a little better distribution of the funds so that this great power project would be able to develop and deliver its product down into southern Oregon and along the coast of Oregon where there are no lines at all. All of these transmission lines are cut out in the conference report, and they are the lines which will enable us to transmit that power to be delivered to the people of Oregon.

The power is there, but we need the transmission facilities to deliver the power to the people. Those lines have been cut out. I do hope that in the further consideration of this matter when it comes before us again we will take a broadminded view of it.

It is not a question of Government ownership. It is not a question of public power. It is only a question of delivering the power which is owned by the Federal Government which comes from the streams owned by the Federal Government, into the development of which your money and mine has gone to develop this power to the consuming public. The power is there. The demand is there. The territory is waiting for the power. We do not have the transmission facilities to deliver the power.

The private utility companies will not furnish these transmission lines and unless the Federal Government steps in to build these backbone lines into this great portion of Oregon—to the load centers—which is south of my district, Oregon will suffer a great loss. My district is on the northern boundary of this section and is closer to this power than any other. I am very well treated and perhaps I should keep my mouth shut and say nothing. But I am looking at it from the broad viewpoint and taking a long-range view of it. I tell my colleagues today that if we take a narrow view of this question of the development of power on these great streams and the development of these multiple-purpose projects for reclamation and irrigation and hydro power, if we attempt to throttle the right of the people to get this power, we are

making a great mistake. I do hope that my party will not join in that sort of procedure.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. NORBLAD].

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, may I compliment my colleagues, the gentlemen from Oregon, who have just spoken? I certainly agree with their views.

Over a period of years the Congress has spent huge hums in the developments at Grand Coulee and Bonneville, and we are continuing to spend money, particularly at the former place, in the erection of more generators. As this public power comes into being we should have transmission lines in Oregon to carry it to our people. Failure to provide these distribution facilities is like building a fleet of automobiles and then failing to provide highways on which they can run. I sincerely hope that the amendment of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] will prevail.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, when we come back next year the gentleman who has been serving as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of the Interior, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] will be occupying another position with the Government. As you know he will serve as a member of the Federal Communications Commission. At this time I compliment him for the diligence and ability he has shown during the time that he has served in Congress and on the Committee on Appropriations. He has had sympathy for the needs of my people and tried to help them. I am not, however, going to condemn him for the fact that sufficient funds are not provided in this bill, but I do want to call your attention to the reason why these funds are not provided for all the necessary work that must be done.

If you remember, just a little while ago my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] was complaining. He was one of the Members who voted to cut $6,000,000,000 from the President's budget. At that time I stood in the well of the House and pointed out to the Membership that I feared that the cuts being made would reflect on reclamation, irrigation, and flood-control projects, and upon agriculture generally. I think time has shown that that was a correct statement.

I would like to see more money in this bill for the completion of the canals in the Central Valley project in California. That project cannot serve all the arid lands originally contemplated to be served until the project is carried forward to completion with about $2,400,000 added for power and about $487,000 for water. There is no shortage of power in California but there is a shortage of water in the San Joaquin Valley. The farmers in that valley need water very badly at the present time. The people in my congressional district are unable to secure equipment fast enough to take care of their present crops.

I hope that next year we can get enough money and get the Department of the Interior to remain on the job and work long enough and hard enough to complete the water features, as well as the power features, of this project at an early date.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT] has expired.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the conferees on the work they have done, and on the report they now bring to this floor, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I want to say further, Mr. Speaker, that this was not an easy job for any committee, and the members of the subcommittee deserve great credit for bringing back a conference report which comes so very near to meeting every problem in a way that will please all of us, no matter what part of the country we represent.

Several times before, I have taken the floor to speak about this bill and its provisions. As you will recall, Mr. Speaker, I have seldom challenged the actions of the subcommittee, on the amount of money involved in the several appropriations. I have felt confident that these could be worked out. I have called attention to matters of policy, or questions of wording, or the indirect effects of various provisions. It pleases me now to say that these have been worked out, to thank the conferees for their consideration, and to say that the support of this bill by those of us who represent the far Western States will be generally unanimous. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] has one question he wants to raise and I know he will receive sympathetic consideration from the House. The other details which have been questioned by those of us who come from the West have either been settled, or are of such a nature that further experience will be required before we know just what the solution can be, or how much money is actually needed for a fiscal year's construction. We are well satisfied.

Mr. Speaker, I want to add my own personal congratulations to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] for the job he has done as chairman of the subcommittee. He leaves the House on a high note of achievement, and he takes with him the regards and good wishes of all Members, particularly those of us who have worked, and sometimes pleaded or argued, with him during the weeks this appropriation bill has been in committee, on the floor, or in conference.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to reecho what was said by my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] when he said he was disappointed that this conference report did not contain funds to carry the transmission lines of the Central Valley project to a point beyond the Shasta substation. The sale of this power to the people of California at the cheapest rates commensurate with its production is one of the objectives of the Central Valley project. I take issue with the policy enunciated by the chairman of the subcommittee the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] when he says that the Federal Government is receiving more money for a like block for this power by its sale to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. than they are receiving for power generated by the Bonneville Power Authority. I wish to call his attention to the higher rates paid by the people and industries in the northern California economic area as compared with those in the Pacific Northwest. The people are the ones that are paying through higher rates. That is the great test—whether the people benefit through cheaper rates.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] has expired.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I trust that before this session ends, at least a few Representatives from the Western States will come to the floor of the House and just say, "Thank you," to the people of the United States, for making available all these hundreds of millions of dollars for reclamation, irrigation, and hydroelectric power facilities, etc., that we of the West may share the blessings of America with the rest of the people. If you are thankful, and I am sure you are, you need not thank the committee, we are not used to it, the shock might be too great.

The Interior Department Appropriation Subcommittee has been criticized year after year for not appropriating more money for these purposes, in face of the fact that there is each year at least a $75,000,000 carry-over. Every year we take the same criticism. I have not heard more than one or two gentlemen take the floor and say that the Committee has been fair on appropriating these millions upon millions of dollars out of the pockets of the people of America to bring into production that semiarid and arid section of the West, which the Committee has done its best to accomplish and will continue to do so I am sure.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I will, if the gentleman wants to thank the American people.

Mr. MILLER of California. I want to call attention to the fact that all of this money is repayable, and the Federal Government and this country is gaining a great amount of wealth, untold wealth, from the West. And that the West has fed this country. My own State of California is one of the greatest payers of

income taxes in this country. Part of that is the result of this development that has come here. We are grateful for the credit of the Federal Government.

Mr. JENSEN. While the gentleman is on his feet does he not wish to thank the American people?

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the American people for the loan of their credit.

Mr. MURDOCK rose.

Mr. JENSEN. I know my friend the gentleman from Arizona wants to thank the American people.

Mr. MURDOCK. I certainly will and be glad to do it. May I make a further comment?

Mr. JENSEN. Is the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] standing to also thank the American people for their generosity?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I am always happy to thank the American people for everything. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I am pleased to yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I am not going to make a speech, but it seems to me there was a slight, implied criticism of waste.

Mr. JENSEN. Oh, not at all.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Just a moment. Will the gentleman point out to the House that the Eastern States benefit from the rivers and harbors programs and flood control, but never pay back to the Government any part of the cost of that which is done for them?

Mr. JENSEN. How about the appropriations for rivers and harbors all over the United States from which her State and most every other State gets its fair share?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. That is right.

Mr. JENSEN. I live in the great State of Iowa which is in the Middle West.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. But wait a minute. Look at the work done on the Ohio River, for instance.

Mr. JENSEN. That is Mr. KIRWAN'S State, the ranking minority member of this committee, a fine gentleman from a great State in the center of the United States of America.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. All right; and these other great middle States. None of these States in the middle and eastern part of the country have paid back a cent of that money. We are paying back and we are just happy that we can pay back and just want the opportunity to be able to continue to pay back. I thank you.

Mr. JENSEN. Simply because our States have not borrowed money from the taxpayers for such purposes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for just an observation?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. This country of ours has grown from 13 to 48 States and we have grown with it. I am thankful to the American people and especially thankful to the founders of the Republic who wrote a wise colonial development policy into our Constitution; and I thank the committee for carrying it out.

Mr. JENSEN. Will not the gentleman please go just a little further and say that he thinks the committee has done a good job? If he will we will feel our labors have been appreciated a little at least.

Mr. MURDOCK. On the whole it is a good job.

Mr. JENSEN. Thank you, that is mighty kind of my good friend.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. We hope that a year from today we shall be able to be as thankful for the committee's activities as we are today for the gentleman from Iowa will become chairman of the subcommittee, will have jurisdiction of the bill in the House. We are looking forward to the gentleman's generosity a year from today to thank the gentleman as we now thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JENSEN. Now, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] and compliment him for a job well done, not only on this bill, but for being an able, patriotic United States Representative all during his services in this House.

Mr. McDONOUGH. And I thank the gentleman of the subcommittee for his generosity and for his consideration of this bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. So many are on their feet asking me to yield I would like to yield to all of you but time will not permit. I must conclude if I may.

Before I leave the floor, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few more words in behalf of one of the finest men I have ever known, and in my honest opinion, one of the most able and noble gentlemen that God ever sent this way, and that gentleman is the Honorable ROBERT JONES of Ohio, who will soon resign his seat in Congress to become a member of the Federal Communications Commission.

I have worked with BOB JONES on this committee for the past five sessions of Congress, and I must say I have never worked with a more congenial gentleman nor a finer fellow than my good friend BOB JONES. He has done a grand job for the American people. We know Bob will do the same kind of a job in his new assignment, and all of us wish you good luck, Bob, but sorry to see you leave Congress.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. In behalf of the minority members of this subcommittee I wish to take this opportunity to completely subscribe to the statements just made by the gentleman from Iowa in regard to our chairman, BOB JONES.

It is the feeling of every member of this subcommittee that BOB JONES is one of the most able Members of this Congress. We think it is a shame that we are going to lose him. He is a fine gentleman and a great American; and when we say this, we say it with all the sincerity at our command.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, I want to join in everything said about the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], he knows that, but I also want to say that this great development in the West is one that the people do not have to come and bow and scrape for because it will pay for itself. Not only will it pay for itself in the sale of power and redemption of the land of that area but it will more than pay for itself in an increase in the national wealth. This great Columbia River project, like the Tennessee River project, will more than pay for itself as the years go by.

Mr. JENSEN. I do not expect nor do I want anybody to bow and scrape to any Congressman for spending the people's money for this or anything else. Spending the people's money is, after all, a mighty easy thing to do, and the disease seems to be catching.

Mr. RANKIN. They will not owe the American people anything because it will pay for itself.

Mr. JENSEN. I hope the gentleman is right.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 6: Page 3, strike out lines 2 to 8, inclusive, and insert the following:

"Oil and Gas Division: For expenses necessary for coordinating and unifying policies and administration of Federal activities relative to oil, gas, and synthetic fuels, including cooperation with the petroleum industry and State authorities in the production, processing, and utilization of petroleum and petroleum products, natural gas, and synthetic fuels and the compilation of technical reports thereon, for administering and enforcing the provisions of the act of February 22, 1935, as amended (15 U. S. C., ch. 15A); and for the liquidation of the Petroleum Administration for War; including personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $10,000 for employment of a director without regard to the civil-service and classification laws; contract stenographic reporting services; and printing and binding; $324,730."

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 6 and agree to the same with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JONES of Ohio moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate amendment numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 15, at the end of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out "$324,730" and insert "$275,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 7: Page 4, at the top of the page insert the following:

"DIVISION OF GEOGRAPHY

"Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses in performing the duties imposed upon the Secretary by Executive Order 6680, dated April 17, 1934, relating to uniform usage in regard to geographic nomenclature and orthography throughout the Federal Government, including personal services in the District of Columbia, stationery and office supplies, and printing and binding, $12,956."

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JONES of Ohio moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment numbered 7.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 16: Page 7, line 12, after the word "Columbia" insert a colon and the following: ": *Provided*, That in addition to this appropriation the Administrator is authorized to contract in the fiscal year 1948 for materials and equipment for power transmission facilities in an amount not in excess of $6,000,000."

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16 and agree to the same with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JONES of Ohio moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the figure "$6,000,000" and insert "$4,935,500."

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ELLSWORTH moves that in amendment numbered 16 in disagreement in the Interior appropriation bill that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this motion is not, as some might think, simply a gesture on my part. This is a very serious motion. It is offered in the hope that the House shall consider the reason and justice behind the motion and vote in its favor. A moment ago I explained to the House that the transmission line items passed by the House in the Interior appropriation bill for Bonneville lines in the State of Oregon and the appropriations passed by the Senate for the same lines in the State of Oregon were stricken out by the conferees. Now, I am making no move whatever, since no motion is possible, regarding the cash appropriations with respect to the Bonneville lines in the Northwest. This motion that I have offered, if it is adopted by the House, will not increase the appropriation in this bill one penny. The cash appropriations have been set by the conferees. My motion is solely for the purpose of agreeing to the Senate amendment which calls for a contract authorization of $6,000,000 rather than to adopt the committee's amendment which calls for a contract authorization of approximately $5,000,000.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. There is no real difference in contract authorization and appropriation insofar as ultimate expenditure is concerned.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. That is correct. It is correct, insofar as ultimate expenditure is concerned, but the contract authorization involves no money in this fiscal year. If it were the assumption of the Members of this House that the Bonneville project were ended at this point, then the gentleman would have a point, but the fact is that this great project which, as I said a moment ago, is to be paid for out of earnings and paid back entirely, every cent paid by the Government will be returned when completed—cannot be completed until further appropriations are allowed, and there would be no construction in the fiscal year 1949 unless there were proper contract authorizations allowed in this bill.

One point further regarding the State of Oregon. The State of Oregon in this bill for the Bonneville Power Administration is not having a cent appropriated other than $29,000 for a line from the dam down to Portland. That $29,000 is less than a decimal point in the whole bill, whereas down in the southern part of the State, where the lines I speak of in the State of Oregon would be placed if the House will continue to go along with such appropriations, the people down there do not have adequate power at this time, and they cannot have any power in the coastal region of Oregon in the future unless the Bonneville power lines go down there. The reason for that is simple. The expansion of Government-owned power in the Northwest, with the great Grand Coulee Dam and the great Bonneville power dam so dominate the power situation and so control the entire generation and distribution of power in the Northwest that a private company cannot duplicate what would be done by this appropriation.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. In the development of this great project, which has to be completed as soon as possible, the gentleman believes that his amendment will carry that out, does he not?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. That is correct. My motion will not mean any additional cost to the Government. In the long run it will mean a saving to the Government.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I know the gentleman has been intimately connected with the project, having lived with it for 25 years.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Indeed, I have.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I want to compliment the gentleman on his fine argument, and I hope the motion passes.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. One final word regarding this motion. I am merely asking the House of Representatives at this time to do simple justice to the great State of Oregon. As I said a moment ago, the Bonneville project serves several States in the northwestern part of the country—Idaho, Washington, Oregon, and Montana to some extent. The entire facilities appropriations and contract authorizations in this bill go into the State of Washington. I have no objection to the State of Washington receiving a lot of money, but I do think that the passage of this motion, which would increase contract authorizations, with less money than the House itself appropriated in the beginning, is in order, and I urge that the House adopt my motion.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. This power is already being generated at the Bonneville Dam?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is merely asking for the authorization of funds for transmission lines to carry this power to the various areas where it is needed.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. That is correct. I may say to the gentleman that the contract authorizations I am asking for merely would serve to further complete the plan for distribution which has long since been adopted by this Congress.

Mr. RANKIN. And every dollar invested will come back to the Public Treasury with interest.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat amazed that at this late hour in the deliberations on this Interior Department appropriation bill the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] offers the preferential motion that he does, because the RECORD shows that when there was a motion pending before this House on April 25 last to recommit this bill and to give to the Bonneville Power Administration the proper amount of funds, there were only four Members of the majority party across the aisle who supported that motion to recommit the bill for such purpose.

They were the gentlemen from California [Messrs. WELCH, POULSON, and JOHNSON] and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]. Upon final passage we found with us only two Members of the majority from the Coast States of Washington, Oregon, and California voting against the bill, and they were the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I want to correct what the gentleman was saying to this extent. The gentleman is giving the

House the impression that only the Bonneville item was in the motion to recommit. There were a number of other items in the motion to recommit.

Mr. ROONEY. Those items were all reclamation items, all similar in character to the one now under discussion.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. There were many more items than the item on Bonneville, I may say.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I do hope the House in justice will favorably consider and agree to the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon, for the simple reason that his motion includes the program that will enable us to get this power out to our REA lines. The farmers in my district and throughout the Columbia River drainage area are entitled to this service. It is an expanding program. I hope the motion is agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the way the bill passed the House we provided for $6,907,800. In that bill we had counted on an unexpended balance of some $12,000,000 to provide for the heavy grid of the Bonneville Power Administration. Then we provided new money of $6,907,000, less $2,500,000 for administration, operation, and maintenance of the existing plant, which leaves $4,407,000 for new construction. In the $4,407,000 new money was the line which the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] hopes to get by his motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment, providing for the full $6,000,000 contract authorizations.

That was the situation when the bill went to the Senate. They made a cash appropriation of $16,000,000 and $6,000,000 additional in contract authorizations. The point we made in dealing with the Senate in conference was that unexpended balances of prior years' appropriations would provide for adequate expansion of the grid and that they should take the House figure, $6,907,000, which I was willing to raise $2,500,000 to provide the necessary substations. The last proposal was made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], to go $3,400,000 above the House figure to take care of every line the House provided for. However, as the turn of things came, as it does among a body of men sitting around a conference table representing the two Chambers of the last great deliberative body in the world, the consensus of opinion was that the old funds, the 1947 funds, which would be spent in the 1948 fiscal year, were not sufficient to provide for the grid; that is, the loop between the two dams and between the major load centers.

Instead of taking the Senate figure as they had written it or the House figure as we had written it, thus considering two different programs, it was decided by the conference that we would work along the line of establishing and expanding the grid to take care of the new generators as they were installed in Grand Coulee. So that is the way the conferees settled it. We think we settled it on a scientific basis. If the old money, the 1947 money, was not enough to take care of the expansion of the generation of power in Grand Coulee, then we would invest new money in it. That is the proposal that the Senator from Oregon made. That is the way the matter stands in the conference report today.

We have applied the great bulk of the new money to the expansion of the grid.

We have provided $8,596,400 in cash and $4,935,500 in contract authorizations, making a total of some $13,000,000 to add to the $12,000,000 of unexpended 1947 and prior years appropriation balance. The gentleman's motion proposes to add more money to that. Bear in mind that Bonneville Power Administration was only able to spend $11,310,000 in all the fiscal year 1947. We have already provided some $13,000,000 plus the $12,000,000, making a total of $25,000,000 available for expenditure in the fiscal year 1948. We have provided liberally for the expansion of the Bonneville Power Administration. We have provided for the backbone transmission lines.

Of course, the gentleman from Oregon would like to have lines in his district. Some other Member would like to have lines in his district. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN], an able member of the subcommittee, is urging a line in the eastern part of Oregon. If we gave the State of Oregon every foot of transmission line that they want for customer facilities, then we would have to go over to Idaho and give a line to Senator DWORSHAK who is on the Senate Committee on Appropriations and on the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations.

Therefore, your committee decided to throw all personalities out of the window and do this on a scientific basis and provide amply for the grid.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I would like to point out, however, that the money mentioned in my motion is not an appropriation to be spent this year. Therefore, the gentleman's comments regarding their ability to spend this money this year do not apply. My motion is to provide for the continuance of the project in 1949, appropriations for which will be made at this time next year. Furthermore, I would like to point out to the gentleman and to the House that the House did approve lines in the State of Oregon, and the other body did approve lines in our State, but those lines are not included in the conference report. The only way there can be any salvage out of this for the State of Oregon in this whole program is to adopt my motion.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I do not agree with that, because anything that helps the grid and the backbone transmission lines helps the entire territory.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the question.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. There seems to be a difference of opinion on this side of the House as to my motion. My motion was that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment. I insist that the question is on my motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment No. 16.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. As I understand it, the question is whether or not the House will recede. After that the question of whether we would concur would come up, and a motion to recede and concur with an amendment would then be preferential.

The SPEAKER. A motion to concur with an amendment would be preferential.

The question is, Will the House recede?

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Jones of Ohio moves to concur in the Senate amendment No. 16, with an amendment, as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment No. 16, strike out the figure "$6,000,000" and insert "$4,935,000."

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Is an amendment to that motion in order or a substitute for that motion?

The SPEAKER. Not unless the gentleman from Ohio yields for that purpose.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I do not yield for that purpose.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Is an amendment to that motion in order?

The SPEAKER. Only if the gentleman from Ohio would yield.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I still insist from my reading of the rules that a motion to recede and concur takes precedence over a motion to recede or a motion to recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's contention is true except that the House has voted to recede. That makes in order the motion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] to concur with an amendment.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Was the House in order in voting on a motion to recede when my motion was pending?

The SPEAKER. The question was divided and the House receded.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. When was the question divided?

The SPEAKER. On the request of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. A motion to divide was never put in the form of a motion to the House?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio has a right to ask for a division of the question, as indeed would any Member of the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is there any way the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] can get an affirmative vote on his amendment?

The SPEAKER. The only way the gentleman can get a vote on his motion now is to vote down the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Whether or not the real way for them to get a vote on the motion was to have voted down the previous question; but the previous question has been ordered.

The SPEAKER. The previous question has been ordered.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 17: Page 7, line 16, strike out "*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work performed on a force account basis:" and insert "*Provided further*, That no part of any construction appropriations for the Bonneville Power Administration contained in this act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired labor basis, except for management and operation, maintenance and repairs, engineering and supervision, routine minor construction work, or in case of emergencies, local in character, so declared by the Bonneville Power Administrator."

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 18: Page 7, line 25, insert: ": *Provided further*, That not exceeding $21,500 of funds available for expenditure under this appropriation shall be used for salaries and expenses in connection with informational work."

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JONES of Ohio moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: " : *Provided further*, That interest heretofore collected by Bonneville Power Administration from sales of electric energy generated at Grand Coulee Dam on the unamortized balance of investment allocated to power in Grand Coulee Dam shall be covered into the reclamation fund forthwith: *Provided further*, That said interest shall not be allocated during the fiscal year 1948."

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 34: Page 17, line 14, after "$12,000", insert "which amount shall be available also for meeting obligations of the preceding fiscal year."

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 39: Page 18, line 16, after the word "reservation", insert "except that so much of the sum herein appropriated as may be required may be used for the acquisition of land for the Alamo Band of the Puertocito Indians in the State of New Mexico."

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JONES of Ohio moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "except for the Alamo Band of the Puertocito Indians in the State of New Mexico and for the Rapid City Band of Sioux Indians in the State of South Dakota."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, this reference to the Rapid City Band of Sioux Indians in the amendment which the chairman has offered, is to establish the authority of the use of a small portion of these funds as may be necessary to provide a tract of land suitable for housing and camping facilities for Sioux Indians in the vicinity of Rapid City, S. Dak. I have discussed the Rapid City situation with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and members of his staff many times and they are familiar with the need. There are some lands which were formerly assigned to the use of the Indian school which seem to belong to the United States itself and not to the Indians. They may or may not be suitable for the purpose. Other tracts are available in the vicinity. What is needed is some place where the Sioux people who now are said to number more than 1,000 in the community may have shelter and sanitary facilities while they seek to establish themselves with steady jobs and permanent homes. Some surplus buildings have been made available to them but they need a place to locate the buildings and they need some ground where they can pitch their tents and park their belongings until they find a place to settle or return to homes elsewhere. I am very happy that the conferees recognized the merit of meeting this situation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 41.: Page 18, line 24, after the word "reservation" insert "except such sum as may be necessary to purchase in the name of the United States in trust 34½ acres of land at Celilo Falls, Oreg., for the use of the Yakima Indian Tribes, the Umatilla Indian Tribes, the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation, and other Columbia River Indians affiliated with the afore-mentioned tribes and entitled to enjoy fishing rights at their old and accustomed fishing sites at or in the vicinity of Celilo Falls on the Columbia River."

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 68: Page 37, line 11, after the word "costs", insert: ": *Provided further*, That the expenditure of any sums from this appropriation for investigations of any nature requested by States, municipalities, or other interests shall be upon the basis of the State, municipality, or other interest advancing at least 50 percent of the estimated cost of such investigations."

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to explain the situation.

This is the provision that I had stricken out of the bill on a point of order.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. The situation is that the amendment has to be reported back in technical disagreement for the reason that it was stricken out of the House bill on the point of order that it was legislation in an appropriation bill. It is returned in technical disagreement for the same reason. It will be inserted in the language providing for "general investigation" of reclamation projects if the House adopts the amendment.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I wish to state to the gentleman from Ohio that I am not going to object to its being inserted in the bill. I am not fully satisfied as to all the implications of this language, but I have talked to the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation and to others who are interested and I am willing to let it stay in the bill this year. I am not going to interpose an objection to the request of the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, when this Interior appropriation bill was first considered by the House, I supported an amendment raising the funds for investigation work by the Bureau of Reclamation from $125,000 to $2,500,000. I felt at that time that it was very important to give the Bureau sufficient money to carry on surveys and investigations now being made, and also to investigate new projects that might be proposed. I believe this is a good place to practice economy, and we can perhaps save a great deal later on by spending a little more at this time to

determine what projects are desirable and feasible.

For this reason I take great pleasure in commending the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], and every member of his committee, for bringing in this conference report containing the sum of $2,000,000 for investigation work. I have discussed this matter on several occasions with Mr. Straus, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, and he has indicated this amount will enable him to continue the surveys now in progress. He did not get all of the money he requested, but the sum contained in this bill should permit him to carry on investigations of projects now under consideration.

One of these projects is in my district and is known as the Gunnison-Arkansas transmountain diversion project. This is a large project and contemplates the bringing of excess water from the Colorado River on the western slope of Colorado to the Arkansas Valley on the eastern slope. The Bureau has been working on these studies for many years. There is widespread interest in this project. I am anxious to see the survey completed and the report made at the earliest possible moment. The appropriation contained in this bill will provide the Bureau with the necessary funds for this important work.

I feel the committee has done an excellent job in bringing in this conference report. There seems to be general satisfaction with the same. The report before us belies the charge that there is any intention on the part of Congress to curtail reclamation development in the West. I want the committee to know I appreciate their efforts in behalf of reclamation.

While I am on my feet I wish to join other gentlemen who have complimented the gentleman and I wish to call particular attention to the item of $2,000,000 for general investigation work which the committee has included in this bill. I commend the gentleman for bringing in this amount which will enable the Bureau of Reclamation to engage in some needed studies for proposed reclamation projects in the West.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 78: Page 39, line 3, after "$1,000,000", insert "and in addition to this appropriation the Commissioner of Reclamation is authorized to enter into contracts in an amount not in excess of $430,000."

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JONES of Ohio moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 78, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the figure "$430,000" and insert "$215,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 85: Page 43, line 12, insert the following:

"GENERAL FUND, CONSTRUCTION

"For continuation of construction of the following projects in not to exceed the following amounts to be immediately available, to remain available until expended for carrying out projects (including the construction of transmission lines) previously or herein authorized by Congress, and to be reimbursable under the reclamation law, except as provided in the act of August 14, 1946 (Public Law 732), Seventy-ninth Congress."

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85 and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 101: Page 46, strike out lines 23, 24, and 25, and page 47, strike out lines 1 and 2 and insert: "main canal (and appurtenant structures) located entirely within the United States connecting the diversion dam with the Imperial and Coachella Valleys in California, and distribution and drainage systems."

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 101 and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 104: Page 18, after line 11, insert the following:

"For the purpose of effecting settlement of war veterans on public land reclamation projects and to provide facilities for veteran employment in construction and operation of reclamation projects, the property, buildings, equipment, material, and acquired lands heretofore or hereafter declared surplus at the Yuma Army air base, Yuma, Ariz., shall be transferred to the Bureau of Reclamation by any Federal agency having custody or ownership, without exchange of funds, and to be available for the same purpose and to be disposed of in the same manner as the war relocation centers and the prisoner-of-war camp transferred to the Bureau of Reclamation in the Interior Department Appropriation Act of 1946, act of July 1, 1946, Public Law 478."

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 104 and agree to the same with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JONES of Ohio moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 104 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 12 of said amendment, after the words "Reclamation in the", strike the remainder of the line and all of line 13, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1947."

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, in this report on the Interior Department appropriation bill by the conferees, I notice that amendment No. 104 relates to the disposition of the Yuma Army Air Base, at Yuma, Ariz. The chairman has moved to recede and concur with an amendment. In the confusion I was unable to hear the precise language of the amendment. I think it was probably satisfactory, if it did not apply too restrictively to the Yuma Army Air Base. It appeals to my judgment that veterans should be given first preference on most of the buildings and other movable material. However, I do know that the city of Yuma has need of and would like to have a part of that great air base for a municipal airport, and I do hope that the language of the amendment will make such acquisition possible. Yuma needs a part of the field.

I am informed by the Bureau of Reclamation that within a few weeks some good land in the Gila project will be divided into family-sized farm units and disposed of to veterans. It is a matter of special pride to me that I sponsored the legislation last year which gave veterans preference on that very land. I only regret that there is not more of the land thus to be divided and offered to veterans. Naturally, I think in addition to affording them good land with water rights in this region of perpetual sunshine, the veterans ought to have preference in obtaining materials for building and the like from this huge air base adjoining the lands they will occupy. This should be the intent of the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 105: Page 48, strike out line 25, and on page 49, strike out lines 1 and 2 and insert the following:

"No part of any construction appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired-labor basis, except for management and operation, maintenance and repairs, engineering and supervision, routine minor construction work, or in case of emergencies, local in character, so declared by the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation."

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 114: Page 51, line 22, after the word "tributaries" insert: ": *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law to the contrary, the President is authorized to appoint a retired officer of the Army as such representative without prejudice to his status as a retired Army officer who shall receive such compensation and expenses in addition to his retired pay."

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 124: Page 54, line 10, insert:

"The Geological Survey is hereby authorized to acquire by transfer without exchange of funds, for 2 years beginning July 1, 1947, from the War Department, the Navy Department, or the War Assets Administration, equipment, materials, and supplies of all kinds, with an appraised value of not to exceed $500,000 from the surplus stores of these agencies: *Provided*, That the authorization in this paragraph shall not be construed to deny to veterans the priority accorded to them in obtaining surplus property under Public Law 375, approved May 3, 1946."

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 130: Page 57, line 11, insert:

"Anthracite Research Laboratory: For the construction and equipment of an anthracite research laboratory at Schuylkill Haven, Pa., including not to exceed $25,000 for employment by contract, or otherwise, at such rates of compensation as the Secretary may determine, of engineers, architects, or firms or corporations thereof necessary to design and construct said laboratory; and the purchase, maintenance, and operation of not to exceed one passenger automobile, $450,000."

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 151: Page 65, line 19, insert:

"The Department of Commerce is authorized to transfer to the Department of the Interior for the use of the Bureau of Mines, without compensation therefor, full jurisdiction, possession, and control of the United States Weather Bureau Station at Mount Weather, in the counties of Loudoun and Clarke, State of Virginia, together with all buildings, improvements, furniture, and fixtures now in or upon the land."

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 152: Page 66, line 1, insert:

"The Bureau of Mines is hereby authorized to acquire by transfer without exchange of funds, for 3 years, beginning July 1, 1947, from the War Department, the Navy Department, or the War Assets Administration, buildings, equipment, materials, and supplies of all kinds with an appraised value of not to exceed $3,000,000 from the surplus stores of these agencies, for use in performing its functions by the Bureau of Mines or by any office of the Bureau in the United States and Alaska: *Provided*, That the authorization in this paragraph for transfer of surplus property to the Bureau of Mines shall not be construed to deny to veterans the priority accorded to them in obtaining surplus property under Public Law 375, approved May 3, 1946."

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 171: Page 80, line 22, insert:

"The War and Navy Departments, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and the War Assets Administration are authorized to transfer to the Fish and wildlife Service aircraft for replacement purposes only (but not necessarily of the same size or type or at the same locations), and such other equipment, materiels, and supplies, surplus to the needs of such agencies, as may be required by said Service, such transfers to be without charge therefor; and in addition the Navy Department, the Coast Guard, and the Maritime Commission are authorized to transfer without charge therefor vessels for replacement purposes only (but not necessarily of the same size or type or at the same locations) marine engines, parts and accessories surplus to the needs of such agencies."

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JONES of Ohio moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 171 and concur in the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"The War and Navy Departments, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and the War Assets Administration are authorized to transfer to the Fish and Wildlife Service aircraft for replacement purposes only (but not necessarily of the same size or type or at the same locations), and such other equipment, materials, and supplies (with an appraised value of not to exceed $500,000), surplus to the needs of such agencies, as may be required by said Service, such transfers to be without charge therefor; and in addition the Navy Department, the Coast Guard, and the Maritime Commission are authorized to transfer without charge therefor vessels for replacement purposes only (but not necessarily of the same size or type or at the same locations) marine engines, parts, and accessories surplus to the needs of such agencies: *Provided*, That the authorization in this paragraph shall not be construed to deny to veterans the priority accorded to them in obtaining surplus property under Public Law 375, approved May 3, 1946."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 176: On page 89, line 10, strike out lines 10 to 14, inclusive.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JONES of Ohio moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 176, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment, insert:

"SEC. 8. Notwithstanding the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946, no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used, transferred, or allocated for the expenses or salaries of any regional, field, or other office or committee to perform any function of the Bureau of Land Management, or for the transfer or removal of any functions or duties of the said Bureau out of the District of Columbia, unless specific approval therefor has been given by the Congress prior to the establishment of such office or committee or prior to such transfer or removal."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 177: On page 89, line 15, insert the following:

"SEC. 8. Appropriations herein made shall be available for payment of dues, when authorized by the Secretary, for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members."

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JONES of Ohio moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 177, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 1 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the figure "8" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "9."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 179: On page 89, line 23, insert the following:

"SEC. 10. Not to exceed a total of $1,000,000 of the appropriations contained in this act shall be available for expenditure for the compensation of employees engaged in personnel work."

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JONES of Ohio moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 179, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 11. Not to exceed a total of $1,000,000 of the appropriation contained in this act shall be available for expenditure for the compensation of employees engaged in personnel work: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees will be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more on personnel administration consisting of recruitment and appointments, placement, position classification, training and employee relations."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to include in his remarks on the conference report on the Department of the Interior appropriation bill certain tables and extraneous matter.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration and subcommittees thereof may sit while the House is in session for the remainder of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the so-called Patterson bill may extend their remarks at that point, as well as on other bills that were on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works and subcommittees thereof may sit during general debate on tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

AMVETS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES POST WILL PRESENT SPEAKER MARTIN WITH HONORARY LIFE MEMBERSHIP FRIDAY EVENING, JULY 25, 1947

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, AMVETS—the only veterans' organization of World War II to be chartered by an act of Congress—is making arrangements to present Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Speaker of the House of Representatives, with an honorary life membership.

The presentation will be made under the auspices of the House of Representatives Post, recently organized.

Elaborate arrangements are in the making for this ceremony.

Permission is being requested for the use of the beautiful Ways and Means room in the New House Office Building.

The testimonial will take place on Friday evening, July 25, 1947. The exact time will depend upon the adjournment of the House.

All Members of the House are cordially invited to be present. Special invitations will be issued to Hon. CHARLES A. HALLECK, majority leader of the House; Hon. SAM RAYBURN, minority leader of the House; Hon. LESLIE C. ARENDS, majority whip; Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, chairman of the House Veterans' Committee; Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, minority whip. Rev. Bernard Braskamp, Assistant Chaplain of the House, will open the meeting with a prayer.

A radio hook-up is being arranged to carry the speeches over the air waves. In addition the news reels and photographers have been notified.

The assistance and support of every Member of Congress is being requested to help make this event a memorable one in the life of our beloved Speaker.

The arrangements committee will be Richard G. Jefford, Assistant Sergeant at Arms of the House; Allan M. Ames, Assistant Doorkeeper of the House; Lucian O. Hunter, Jr., legislative aide in the Speaker's Lobby; J. H. Leib, publicity chairman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he made yesterday.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works and subcommittees thereof may sit during the session of the House tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he made at Bakersfield, Calif.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Mr. C. I. Smith on the same occasion. The address by Mr. Smith exceeds 2 pages and I am advised by the Public Printer that it will cost $136.34, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

TERMINATING CERTAIN TAX PROVISIONS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 4069) to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

SECTION 1. Suspension of Tariff Duties on Scrap Iron, etc.

The act of March 13, 1942 (Public Law 497, 77th Cong.; 56 Stat. 171), entitled "An act to suspend the effectiveness during the existing national emergency of tariff duties on scrap iron, scrap steel, and nonferrous metal scrap" is hereby amended by striking out "termination of the unlimited national emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941" and inserting in lieu thereof "close of June 30, 1948."

SEC. 2. Free Importation to Members of Armed Forces of Other United Nations

Section 5 of the joint resolution of June 27, 1942 (Public Law 635, 77th Cong.; 56 Stat. 462), entitled "Joint resolution to accord privileges of free importation to members of the armed forces of other United Nations, to enemy prisoners of war and civilian internees and detainees, and for other purposes," is hereby amended by striking out "the expiration of 6 months after the termination of the unlimited national emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1948."

SEC. 3. Free Entry of Gifts From Members of Armed Forces

(a) Section 1 of the act of December 5, 1942 (Public Law 790, 77th Cong.; 56 Stat. 1041), entitled "An act to accord free entry to bona fide gifts from members of the armed forces of the United States on duty abroad" is hereby amended by inserting after the word "claimed" the words "were purchased in or through authorized agencies of the armed

forces of the United States or in accordance with regulations prescribed by the major geographical commands of the United States armed forces, and."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be applicable in the case of articles entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption on and after September 1, 1947.

(c) Section 2 of such act is hereby amended, effective as of June 30, 1947, by striking out "the expiration of 6 months after the termination of hostilities as determined by proclamation of the President, or by concurrent resolution of the Congress" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1949."

SEC. 4. Suspension of Tariff Duty on Coconuts

The act of December 20, 1944 (Public Law 504, 78th Cong.; 58 Stat. 817), entitled "An act to suspend the effectiveness during the existing national emergency of the tariff duty on coconuts," shall not be applicable with respect to articles entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption on or after the 30th day following the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 5. Merchant Marine Construction Reserve Fund

For the purposes of the proviso of subsection (h) of section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, added to such subsection by the act of June 17, 1943 (57 Stat. 158), the present war shall be considered as having terminated on the 15th day after the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 6. Tax Deferments of Service Personnel

Section 13 (c) (2) of the Missing Persons Act (Public Law 490, 77th Cong.; 56 Stat. 146) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(2) December 31, 1947; or."

SEC. 7. Additional Allowance for Military and Naval Personnel

Section 22 (b) (13) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(13) Additional allowance for military and naval personnel:

"(A) In the case of compensation received prior to January 1, 1948, during any taxable year, for active service as a commissioned officer (or a commissioned warrant officer) in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war, or, in the case of a citizen or resident of the United States, as a member of the military or naval forces of any of the other United Nations during such war, so much of such compensation as does not exceed $1,500.

"(B) Compensation received prior to January 1, 1948, during any taxable year, for active service as a member below the grade of commissioned officer (or commissioned warrant officer) in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war."

SEC. 8. Involuntary Liquidation and Replacement of Inventory

Section 22 (d) (6) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by striking out "prior to the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President" and inserting in lieu thereof "prior to August 1, 1947", and by striking out "not more than 3 years after the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President" and inserting in lieu thereof "prior to August 1, 1950".

SEC. 9. Abatement of Tax for Members of Armed Forces Upon Death

Section 421 of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by striking out "the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President" and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1948".

SEC. 10. Collection of Income Tax at Source on Wages

(a) Section 1621 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by striking out paragraph (1), by striking out the sentence following paragraph (9), and by amending paragraph (8) to read as follows:

"(8) (A) for services for an employer (other than the United States or any agency thereof) performed by a citizen of the United States, if it is reasonable to believe that during the entire calendar year the employee will be a bona fide resident of a foreign country or countries, or

"(B) for services for an employer performed within a possession of the United States by a citizen of the United States, if it is reasonable to believe that at least 80 percent of the remuneration to be paid to the employee by such employer during the calendar year will be for such services, or".

(b) The amendments made by this section shall be applicable with respect to wages paid on or after January 1, 1948.

SEC. 11. Tax on Admissions

(a) Section 1700 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by striking out "(except bona fide employees, municipal officers on official business, children under 12 years of age, members of the military or naval forces of the United States when in uniform, members of the military or naval forces of any of the United Nations, when in uniform, and members of the Civilian Conservation Corps when in uniform)", and inserting in lieu thereof: "(except bona fide employees, municipal officers on official business, and children under 12 years of age)", and by striking out the last sentence.

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a), insofar as applicable with respect to amounts paid for admission, shall be applicable to amounts paid after December 31, 1947, and, insofar as applicable to free admissions, shall be applicable with respect to such admissions after December 31, 1947.

SEC. 12. Transportation Tax Exemption of Military and Naval Personnel

Section 3469 (f) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code shall not be applicable to amounts paid after December 31, 1947.

SEC. 13. Time for Performing Certain Acts Postponed by Reason of War

Section 3804 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) Limitation on time to be disregarded: The period of time disregarded under this section shall not extend beyond the date specified in clause (1) or clause (2) of this subsection, whichever is the earlier:

"(1) December 31, 1947, or such date later than December 31, 1947, as the Commissioner may fix in any case in which he makes a determination under subsection (b) if such determination is made after the date this subsection as amended takes effect and is based on the existence prior to January 1, 1948, of one or more of the circumstances specified in paragraphs (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (b); or

"(2) in the case of an individual with respect to whom a period of time is disregarded under this section, the 15th day of the third month following the month in which an executor, administrator, or a conservator of the estate of such individual qualifies."

SEC. 14. China Trade Act Corporations

Section 3805 of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by striking out "the 15th day of the sixth month following the month in which the present war with Germany, Italy, and Japan is terminated, as proclaimed by the President" and inserting in lieu thereof: "December 31, 1947."

SEC. 15. Percentage Depletion

(a) Section 124 (e) of the Revenue Act of 1943 (relating to termination of percentage depletion for certain minerals) is repealed as of the date of its enactment.

(b) So much of section 114 (b) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to percentage depletion for certain minerals) as precedes the second sentence thereof, is amended to read as follows:

"(4) Percentage depletion for coal, fluorspar, flake graphite, vermiculite, beryl, Feldspar, mica, talc, lepidolite, spodumene, barite, ball, sagger, and china clay, rock asphalt, bentonite, gilsonite, thenardite, and metal mines, potash, and sulfur:

"(A) In general: The allowance for depletion under section 23 (m) shall be, in the case of coal mines, 5 percent, in the case of metal mines, fluorspar, flake graphite, vermiculite, beryl, feldspar, mica, talc, lepidolite, spodumene, barite, ball, sagger, and china clay, rock asphalt mines, bentonite, gilsonite, thenardite (from brines or mixtures of brine), and potash mines or deposits, 15 percent, and in the case of sulfur mines or deposits, 23 percent, of the gross income from the property during the taxable year, excluding from such gross income an amount equal to any rents or royalties paid or incurred by the taxpayer in respect of the property."

(c) The first sentence of section 114 (b) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to discovery value) is amended to read as follows: "In the case of mines (other than metal, coal, fluorspar, flake graphite, vermiculite, beryl, feldspar, mica, talc, lepidolite, spodumene, barite, potash, ball, sagger, and china clay, rock asphalt, bentonite, gilsonite, thenardite, or sulfur mines) discovered by the taxpayer after February 28, 1913, the basis for depletion shall be the fair market value of the property at the date of discovery or within 30 days thereafter, if such mines were not acquired as the result of purchase of a proven tract or lease, and if the fair market value of the property is materially disproportionate to the cost."

(d) The amendments made by subsections (b) and (c) of this section shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1946.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I am not opposed to the bill.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] opposed to the bill?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am opposed to the bill, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman who is opposed to the bill is entitled to demand a second. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] qualifies.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the hour is getting late and I hope that we can conclude on our side in the time allotted to us.

Mr. Speaker, this is an omnibus measure which is required by the fact that certain temporary revenue and customs laws enacted for the duration of the war or national emergency have no specific termination dates. The purpose of the bill is to provide for the definite termination of such laws. The bill also makes appropriate amendments to the Internal

Revenue Code in connection with the termination of certain of the statutes affected by the bill.

The bill contains 15 sections and amends existing law as follows:

First. It continues the existing suspension of tariff duties on scrap iron and other metal scrap until June 30, 1948, and on coconuts until 30 days following enactment of the bill.

Second. For members of the armed forces, it continues until July 1, 1949, the privilege of free entry for bona fide gifts purchased abroad, and until January 1, 1948, it will continue existing exemptions from income tax of their active-service pay and the tax abatement provided for them upon death in active service. Expiration of the existing exemption of service personnel from payment of the admissions and transportation taxes is fixed with respect to amounts paid after December 31, 1947.

Third. Terminates 15 days following its enactment all periods of extension which the Maritime Commission may have granted to shipowners within which certain tax-free deposits were permitted to be made in special construction reserve funds.

Fourth. Terminates on August 1, 1947, the period within which certain taxpayers may adjust inventory losses caused by involuntary liquidations due to the war.

Fifth. Provides that wages paid to service personnel shall be subject to the withholding provisions of the Code and clarifies withholding requirements as to American civilians employed abroad.

Sixth. Terminates on January 1, 1948, the period of time that may be disregarded in determining compliance with various requirements of the code, such as filing of returns, application for refunds, and performance of similar administrative acts, both as to individual taxpayers and as to the so-called China Trade Act corporations.

Seventh. Makes permanent the benefits of percentage depletion allowance extended for the war period to miners of various mineral ores.

The Committee on Ways and Means has given careful consideration to this legislation, and there was no opposition in the committee to its general purpose, although the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] was in disagreement with two of its provisions and filed his individual views along with the committee report. He is opposed to the provision terminating the present exemption for service personnel on January 1, 1948, and to a permanent percentage depletion allowance in the case of some nonmetallic minerals but agrees, by implication at least, that the allowance should be permanent on such other extracted materials as oil, gas, sulfur, potash, and coal. These two provisions are of much greater general interest and perhaps greater importance than the other provisions of the bill.

For all practical purposes, the war ended 2 years ago. The exemptions of service personnel from the payment of income taxes, admission taxes, and transportation taxes, therefore, has already been carried 2 years beyond their intended termination. They were enacted as temporary expedients, in recognition of the personal and financial sacrifices arbitrarily imposed upon the vast majority of servicemen who were drafted into the service.

Our present Military Establishment is now on a strictly volunteer basis. Members of the armed forces are not now exposed to the hazards of bombs, battles, and bloodshed. True, they are rendering valuable service to their country, and we need that service, but they also receive benefits and privileges in return, which are not enjoyed by the average civilian. It is only fair to point out the nontaxable items in the income of service personnel which will continue as before to be granted to them under our revenue laws: Cash in lieu of subsistence and quarters; commutation of quarters; family allowances, meal allowances, naval attaché's expense money used in official duties, subsistence, uniform allowance, money allowance upon discharge paid in lieu of clothing allowances; mustering-out pay, amounts received in reimbursements for losses sustained due to appreciation of foreign currencies in relation to the American dollar.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the committee simply does not see the wisdom of permitting, beyond the war, the privilege of service personnel of escaping entirely their financial responsibilities toward the support of the Government they serve and which is serving them. The Army and the Navy offer outstanding opportunities of education, medical care, retirement benefits and a host of other inducements to young America. These advantages cannot be equaled by private industry at anything approaching the low cost of such services to the man in uniform. To continue them further will simply encourage a subsidized peacetime army of professional fighters, Mr. Speaker, and no one wants that.

On the question of percentage depletion allowances, the committee considered this subject in detail. Public hearings were held, at which both sides of the question had full opportunity to present their views.

The percentage depletion allowance, Mr. Speaker, is simply a method of allowing the mine owner an additional compensatory allowance for the risk undertaken in exploration.

The allowance is authorized under section 23 (m) of the Internal Revenue Code upon the basis of certain prescribed percentages set forth in section 114 of the Code. It is a reduction from gross income derived from the property involved amounting, in the case of coal, for example, to 5 percent, metal mines, fluorspar, flake graphite, mica, talc and similar materials, 15 percent and in the case of sulfur, 23 percent. The maximum allowance in any case is 50 percent of the taxpayers net income. It is given to compensate, partially at least, those taxpayers engaged in such mining operations, for the cost of discovering new sources of these products and thus encouraging their production.

Each of these products, including those added to the list by H. R. 4069 is an essential raw material badly needed in times of peace as well as in time of war. The products added by H. R. 4069 are ball and sagger clay, china clay, or Kaolin, bentonite, gilsonite and thenardite, or sodium sulphate.

These products were added because the mining problems involved are similar and in some cases identical with the problems faced by producers of petroleum, coal, and minerals. The deposits of the new products added by the bill are known in some cases, but unknown in others. Yet the producers must constantly explore new fields to determine their commercial value or the existence of new deposits. The depletion allowance encourages this explorative work. It is an expensive process, Mr. Speaker, and one that cannot be avoided. Unless we make a proper tax adjustment in the case of these mining operations we will discourage, if not prevent, discovery of new sources. Obviously, we cannot afford to do that.

This bill removes all the termination uncertainties now found in the laws to which it relates. Most of them, including the income-tax exemptions of service personnel, terminate with the end of the war. No one knows, Mr. Speaker, when the war will end. We are still technically, but only technically, at war. Actually, of course, the fighting has stopped and for all practical purposes the war is over. There is no need, therefore, for continuing the special exemptions indefinitely while we wait for a peace treaty to be signed. The one exception is the percentage depletion allowance which we have learned is essential to full utilization of our resources both in peacetime as well as in war.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I want to say that I attended the hearings on depletion allowance. The Chairman was very fair in the consideration given the witnesses and I am pleased to hear him indicate that consideration was given to the evidence presented at that time on percentage depletion allowance.

Mr. KNUTSON. I thank my good friend from South Dakota.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. While this bill contains a number of sections some of which are not entirely to my liking, there are many important things in it and I shall support the bill. I would like to call attention to a matter that was not presented to the Ways and Means Committee and that has to do with the contributions of corporations to charitable funds that are spent outside the United States. That was a wartime provision which has expired but it was not presented to the committee in time to be incorporated in this bill. Many corporations wish to contribute to the Friends Society and others in foreign relief work. Under the procedure that this bill is presented to the House here in the closing days of the Congress, it is not possible to offer an amendment, so I cannot offer one; but I would like to have the favorable consideration of the Chairman should the Senate Finance Committee find it possible to look into this feature of it.

Section 23 (q) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code allows corporations to deduct, for income-tax purposes, contributions to corporations, community chests, funds, or foundations, formed in this country or its possessions, which are operated for religious, charitable, and other such purposes, to an amount which does not exceed 5 percent of the taxpayer's net income. However, in the case of unincorporated trusts, chests, funds, or foundations, the contributions are deductible only if used within the United States or its possessions. No such limitation attaches to contributions to incorporated organizations or to contributions to any such organization, incorporated or unincorporated, where made by individuals.

This section of the code was amended in 1942 to allow corporations to deduct contributions to unincorporated organizations even though such contributions were used outside the United States or its possessions, if the contributions were made in taxable years beginning prior to the cessation of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President. The President proclaimed the cessation of hostilities on December 31, 1946, and, accordingly, charitable contributions by corporations for taxable years since that date to be used outside the United States or its possessions are deductible only if the recipient is incorporated. The legislative history of the section, which first appeared in the law in 1935, indicates no reason for this limitation. In its present form, of course, the section discourages contributions to, and to that extent hampers the activities of, unincorporated organizations carrying on foreign relief work. The suspension of the limitation for the period of hostilities was designed to encourage contributions to unincorporated organizations engaged in relief and other activities abroad. This limitation should be eliminated or suspended for a further period in the case of unincorporated domestic organizations and funds doing work abroad.

It is very important that action be taken in reference to these contributions. I suggest that we add section 16, to read as follows:

Amend section 23, subdivision (q), of the Internal Revenue Code by striking out the words "the date of the cessation of hostilities of the present war as proclaimed by the President" and inserting in lieu thereof "the taxable year beginning after the 31st of December 1948."

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from Nebraska may rest assured we will give very careful consideration to such an amendment if it is added by the Senate and goes to conference.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Is it not a fact that 14 of the 15 subjects covered by the bill were requested by the President? We were requested to legislate upon 14 of the 15 subjects covered by the bill?

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman is right. The bill contains 15 sections and of the 15 sections the President has requested 14 of them.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. What was the depletion allowance for copper, lead, and zinc?

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not recall.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. They are provided for in permanent legislation. They are not dealt with in this bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. I understood that, but I thought he wanted to know what the allowance was. I had forgotten. They are permanently taken care of.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. I want to congratulate the gentleman for bringing in this bill and may I say to him that I think the percentage depletions allowed in this bill are very fair and will be quite helpful in the development of these minerals in the West. I want to say to the gentleman, however, that we have a new development in our State, the mining of trona. It is quite similar to thenardite in this bill. The company presently operating has spent in excess of a million dollars in the development of this mine, building a shaft, and so forth. They must go deep into the ground in order to take out this mineral. It is an entirely new industry in our State. It is used for the same purpose as thenardite. It will be developed mainly on the public domain and bring income to the Treasury of the United States by reason of the royalties paid. I am hopeful that it too could be accorded the same percentage depletion as is granted to these other minerals in this bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from Wyoming has made a statement that convinces the House of the wisdom of allowing depletion allowances.

Undoubtedly the people who went in and developed this property were encouraged to do so with the knowledge that if they found anything of commercial value they would be given a depletion allowance, and that is precisely the purpose of the provision.

Mr. BARRETT. The chairman is entirely correct, and it will provide new employment for the people of our State, and bring in new money, and bring in money to the Treasury.

Mr. KNUTSON. Certainly. Nobody knows how many undiscovered minerals and veins, and so forth, we have in this country. I am one of those optimistic Americans who believes that we have merely scratched the surface.

Mr. BARRETT. I might say to the gentleman I am very happy that bentonite is added to these minerals. About 35 percent of all the bentonite is mined in the State of Wyoming, and this legislation will be very helpful in the development of that industry.

Mr. KNUTSON. Depletion allowance is going to be very helpful to all the so-called Western States. All of them, with the exception of Nebraska, have valuable deposits that need to be developed.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker has called attention to the fact that the White House requested this legislation, but when the matter was before the committee, representatives of the Army and representatives of the Navy appeared and testified very strongly against section 7 of the bill. So, I do not want the Membership to come to the conclusion that the Administration wants this legislation. The agencies most interested in it are the Army and the Navy, and they are definitely and strongly opposed to it.

Mr. Speaker, this is, in fact, a tax bill. It will raise additional revenue for the Government of the United States of approximately $200,000,000. We have just passed a tax reduction bill over the veto of the President of the United States here in the House, and now a few days late the Committee on Ways and Means comes in here with a bill raising taxes. Upon whom are they raising the taxes? They are going to collect $200,000,000 from the personnel of the armed services, reaching away down to the private in the Army and to the ordinary seaman in the Navy.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, will the gentleman point out where it increases taxes? Here is a copy of the bill.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Section 7, Mr. Speaker, removes exemptions from the payment of taxes which have been enjoyed by the enlisted men in the Army and the Navy and the Marine Corps. By removing that exemption, you force every unmarried enlisted man to pay, or have taken from his pay, every month from $4.70 to $5.10; in other words, the paymaster will withhold this tax at the time of paying the enlisted man.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the case of a second lieutenant, the deduction from pay will be $21.40 and so on up. The noncommissioned officers will have more than $5 a month deducted from their pay. Do you want to vote to reduce the pay of the Army and the Navy when it is so very, very difficult to get recruits to man the armed services? From an editorial in the New York Times of last Saturday, which appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page A3656, we find the following:

In the first 6 months of the calendar year, enlistments were 70,000 below the minimum requirements. In May totals for the Army were only 14,907, and they are supposed to get in at least 30,000 a month.

That is not the worst feature of the measure insofar as this proposition of taxing the men in uniform is concerned. When these boys enlisted in the Army and the Navy, they were told by the recruiting officers—and it is one of the main items in the sales talk to get young men to enlist in the Army and Navy—that they would be exempt from taxation. Under this bill the paymaster must withhold $5 a month from a poor private or from a poor ordinary seaman. These boys cannot quit their jobs, they have to stay in there, once they have enlisted. I ask you, is that keeping faith with these boys who enlisted for a period of 2, 3, 4, or 5 years, or with the second

lieutenants whose pay is $180 a month and from whose pay will be withheld $21 every month? In fact, it amounts to a wage cut for enlisted men of 6 percent. I say it might wreck the recruiting program. We probably will break the morale of the Army and Navy by breaking the promises that were made to them. It will possibly wreck the recruiting program, and we then would have to go back to the basis of compulsory selective service, because the services are not getting their quota from enlistments now. The total in June was only 24,830, and that is generally supposed to be the best month for enlistments. They expected 50,000. So if Congress passes an act like this, I do not know what is going to happen to the recruiting program.

Mr. Speaker, I think on that one basis alone we ought to defeat the whole bill, but there is another section which I do not believe should be enacted, and that is section 15. Section 15, in effect, gives a subsidy in the way of a percentage depletion allowance which would permit companies mining certain types of minerals to take an annual deduction for depletion up to 15 percent of gross income. In other words, 15 percent of the gross receipts is allowed to be deducted before they become subject to the payment of corporation income taxes.

This is unfair in two ways, in my opinion. In the first place, it picks out certain specified mining materials and ignores many others, perhaps 50, 75, or 100. No showing has been made to the committee, in my opinion, of the necessity for this special percentage depletion allowance. The Treasury Department did not testify on this measure, and there is no evidence to justify giving percentage depletion to some nonmetallic minerals, but not to others.

In the second place, percentage depletion discriminates against other taxpayers who are allowed to recover through tax deductions no more than 100 percent of the amount invested in plant, machinery, and equipment. Under this bill, owners of mineral properties may deduct 15 percent of gross income year after year, long after recovery of their full investment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is too important a matter to pass over lightly and quickly, at a time like this. With the vital effect it is going to have on our armed services. I just could not let this matter go by without trying to give the House my thoughts on it and what should be done.

As to the percentage depletion allowance, Mr. Randolph Paul, who was formerly with the Treasury Department, in a book he recently published had this to say:

> Few groups of taxpayers are so favored as those who can take depletion deductions. These deductions frequently turn out to be sheer gifts from the United States to individual taxpayers and corporations and their stockholders.

But they are inexcusable where they serve no public purpose and indiscriminately, as this bill does, favor industries which are in an established financial position, who are not in need of special Government help, for the effect is to shift part of the tax burdens to the shoulders of others who are less able to bear that burden. A sound tax system will not permit one section of the Nation to ride roughshod over others. It will treat all alike who are in a similar situation.

I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FORAND. The gentleman covered the points that I was seeking to have covered. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. Mills.

Mr. MILLS. Will not the gentleman from Pennsylvania admit that the section relating to the $1,500 exemption for soldiers and those in the service is included in the bill because of the request of the President that the Congress legislate on that phase of the matter?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I did not see any communication. I assume there is a communication from the President on that. The Navy sent a representative up here to testify against the passage of this bill and against that section in its present form. The Army sent a representative up and told us in effect that it would wreck the recruiting program and would be breaking faith with those boys who enlisted on the promise that they would get so much pay and so much exemption allowance.

Mr. MILLS. It is true that representatives of the Army and Navy were in attendance before our committee on this particular subject. But the gentleman will recall, will he not, that reprcsentatives of the Navy said that they would be entirely satisfied to permit this termination to occur on January 1, 1949.

Mr. EBERHARTER. They said that they would be satisfied if we would postpone until January 1, 1949, the operation of this section as it appears in the bill because, as they said, in the meantime, "We hope to get through a pay raise for these enlisted men and for the officers, and we do not want that exemption taken away now because they are underpaid as it is at the present time."

That is what they said. They said, "We hope to get a special committee of the Membership of the House and Senate to make a study and make a report as to the general overhauling of the pay rates in the Army and Navy." Their conclusion was, "if you do this, you are going to hurt the Army and Navy tremendously," and Under Secretary Sullivan from the Navy told me while some other Members were talking, "This will absolutely wreck the recruiting program of the Army." That is what the Navy man said to me.

Mr. MILLS. Is not the argument over this question whether or not this provision shall expire on January 1, 1948, or January 1, 1949? Is not that the entire argument?

Mr. EBERHARTER. To me, it comes down to this. When these boys enlisted voluntarily and were promised a certain tax exemption and promised so much pay, they have a right to expect those promises to be kept. Under this bill, on the first of next year the paymaster will begin giving them $5 a month less and I do not thing that is the right thing to do.

I hope the membership will agree with me on this. I think this bill should have been brought out under a rule, and that we should have the opportunity to amend it. The way it is brought up under suspension of the rules we can not amend the bill. I would rather see the whole bill defeated than have the provision go in. As I said, if we had an hour's debate on it, and then could offer amendments to some of these sections which are really very objectionable, that would seem to me to be a more satisfactory way of proceeding——

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Is it not accurate to state that the real difference of opinion here is with respect to the 1 year additional time for the $1,500 exemption for income tax purposes for members of the armed forces? The gentleman from Pennsylvania will remember that I voted as he did in the committee for the additional year, but I did not feel after the committee voted for 1 year less than we had favored, that I should oppose the entire bill because of that fact.

The War and Navy Departments requested that this $1,500 exemption for income tax purposes, for personnel of the armed forces, be extended to January 1, 1949.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. And you and I voted for that in committee.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Yes. And I might say the vote was very, very close. It could not have been any closer.

Mr. COOPER. But the majority decided to make it January 1, 1948. Now the War and Navy Departments both strongly opposed making it permanent, but they did want one additional year, within which time to work out a new pay schedule for the armed forces, and they thought it would assist them in their recruiting program. That is the only difference of opinion. Is that not true?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I would say not only to assist them, but they do not want their recruiting program absolutely wrecked, and they do not want to break faith with the Army officers who, as I said before, will have $21 a month deducted from their pay suddenly, and they do not want to require the enlisted men to have a deduction taken from their pay.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. As I understand it, the Army is about 100,000 short of their volunteer enlistments at this particular date.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is approximately correct.

Mr. FOGARTY. And by the 1st of January they will be 140,000 short, or 40 percent below their anticipated volunteers.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is correct.

Mr. FOGARTY. The Navy and Marines, who have found it fairly easy up to date to get volunteers, are finding a slump taking place at the present time. If this bill is passed it is going to be tougher than ever to get enlistments

either in the Army, the Navy, or the Marine Corps, because it will be a reduction in pay for those who volunteer.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman is absolutely right. It may be just the one thing that will force us to accept selective service and training.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. Will the gentleman not admit that the provision to which we are referring under the present law expires when the termination of the present war is proclaimed by the President, and no one knows when that proclamation will be made.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is true, but that does not overcome the objection that you are cutting $200,000,000 in the pay of the armed-services personnel. If you are going to raise taxes by this bill to the extent of $200,000,000 and take it out of the private and the seamen and the personnel of the Army and Navy, I want you to know what you are doing.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The enlisted personnel gets $75 a month, do they not?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Yes; and they have to pay taxes. If he is a single man, he will have to pay $4.50 or $5 a month.

Mr. KNUTSON. It may be that the $1,500 would make a first or second lieutenant, and from there on up, pay a little more, but the gentleman has been confining himself to the enlisted personnel. I very much doubt that whatever action we take this afternoon will affect the enlisted personnel materially one way or the other. And the gentleman has not told the House that the committee has taken the same position as the Treasury.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman did that in his own time.

Mr. KNUTSON. No. The gentleman is mistaken, which is not so unusual; but the Treasury Department wants this terminated January 1, 1948. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I do not always agree with the Treasury. In this instance I do not think there is any question but that the Army and Navy are right.

Mr. FOGARTY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] has not been interested in the past 6 or 8 months in what the Treasury did, as far as taxes is concerned, but this is just another way of trying to place the blame on the Treasury because he seeks in this bill to cut the pay of the enlisted personnel in the Army and the Navy.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is exactly the result of it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman does not mean to infer that the enactment of this bill will make it unnecessary for us to deal with the compulsory military training, does he?

Mr. EBERHARTER. No; I did not say that. We may have to come to Selective Service if we cannot get the recruits needed to maintain the regular Army and Navy; and this is just one more reason why the Army and Navy may not be able to get the recruits they require.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We are not getting recruits enough now, are we?

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the point I wanted to bring out, yet we are making international commitments and agreements further involving us in need for a bigger Army and a bigger Navy.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. So we may inevitably have to come to universal military training in peacetime, although this bill now before us does not deal with that in any way.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back back the balance of my time.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota that the rules be suspended and that the bill be passed.

The question was taken, and on a division, demanded by Mr. EBERHARTER, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. GROSS for Tuesday, July 22, 1947, on account of attending a funeral.

BILLS LAID ON THE TABLE

The SPEAKER. Without objection, House Resolution 280, providing for the consideration of H. R. 1113, and House Resolution 290, providing for the consideration of H. R. 3043, will be laid on the table, the bills made in order by these resolutions having been disposed of earlier in the day.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a resolution passed by the North Shore Post of the American Legion of Chicago, Ill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Insurance and I wrote to General Bradley regarding the insurance department of the Veterans' Administration. The insurance department badly needs to be reorganized.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two different subjects, one of which may exceed the limit fixed by the Joint Committee on Printing. Notwithstanding the excess I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the excess, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a short article.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. McDONOUGH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 885. An act to provide that the Canadian-built dredge *Ajax* and certain other dredging equipment owned by a United States corporation be documented under the laws of the United States: To the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3961. An act to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to Spanish-American War and Civil War veterans and their dependents; and

H. R. 4017. An act to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide that bonds issued under such act shall be redeemable at any time after September 1, 1947, to permit settlement and compensation under such act to be made in cash, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1508. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance", approved March 9, 1945 (59 Stat. 33).

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to

the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3513. An act to transfer the Panama Railroad pension fund to the civil-service retirement and disability fund; and

H. R. 3767. An act to provide for the protection, preservation, and extension of the sockeye salmon fishery of the Fraser River system, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 22, 1947, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

955. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Temporary Controls, Office of Price Administration, transmitting a report of the Office of Price Administration covering the 2-month period ended May 31, 1947 (H. Doc. No. 410); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

956 A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 293. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Ways and Means to continue its investigation and study of internal-revenue laws; without amendment (Rept. No. 1014). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 298. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to make studies and investigations into matters relating to agriculture; without amendment (Rept. No. 1015). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 318. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 1341, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1016). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. House Joint Resolution 245. Joint resolution to authorize employment of aliens on American ships; without amendment (Rept. No. 1017). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WEICHEL: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 4042. A bill to control the export to foreign countries of gasoline and petroleum products from the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1018). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 1361. An act to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit loans, capital grants, or annual contributions for low-rent-housing and slum-clearance projects where construction costs exceed present cost limitations upon condition that local housing agencies pay the difference between cost limitations and the actual construction costs; with amendments (Rept. No. 1019). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 4242. A bill to amend the income limitation governing the granting of pension to veterans and death-pension benefits to widows and children of veterans, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1021). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 4301. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 4302. A bill to compensate certain Puerto Rican citizens of the United States for services rendered the United States in World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 4303. A bill to provide for a national program of retirement, survivors, and extended disability insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H. R. 4304. A bill providing for the extension of the time limitations under which patents were issued in the case of persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 4305. A bill to increase the pay of post-office employees in the unincorporated territory of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4306. A bill amending the Social Security Act in order to extend to Puerto Rico titles I, IV, and X; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 4307. A bill to bring seamen within the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 4308. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662), as amended, relating to the acceptance of decorations, orders, medals, and emblems by officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations, neutral nations, or other American Republics; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 4309. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (GI bill of rights), pertaining to loans for the purchase or construction of homes, farms, and business property, so as to provide more adequate and effective farm-loan benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4310. A bill to provide that moneys derived from rental or operation of certain temporary housing shall be available for certain expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 248. Joint resolution reenacting section 75 (title 11, ch. 8, U. S. Code, 1940, as amended), the farmer-debtor provisions of the Bankruptcy Act of 1898, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TWYMAN:

H. J. Res. 249. Joint resolution to reduce the rate of interest on postal savings by 1 percent per annum; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. Con. Res. 107. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means to have printed for its use additional copies of the digest of testimony, index to hearings, and each part of the hearings held during the current session relative to tax revision, 1947–48; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

H. R. 4311. A bill for the relief of Gold Star Fur Ranch, Inc., of Owatonna, Minn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 4312. A bill to authorize the promotion of James Y. Parker, Army serial No. O20712, as major, Army of the United States, as of March 1, 1942, under the act of February 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 94), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 4313. A bill to continue in full force and effect patent No. 1,605,697; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 4314. A bill for the relief of the guardian of Porfirio Velazquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4315. A bill for the relief of the estate of the late Anastacio Acosta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4316. A bill for the relief of Gloria Esther Diaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4317. A bill for the relief of the estate of Rafael Rebollo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4318. A bill for the relief of Lilly Velez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4319. A bill for the relief of the estate of Avelino Rivera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 4320. A bill for the relief of James R. Turner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 4321. A bill for the relief of Dr. H. R. Allmon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

761. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of citizens of Racine, Wis., in the interest of H. R. 2910; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

762. By the SPEAKER: Petition of A. M. Keller and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

763. Also, petition of Mrs. Leona Nelson and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JULY 22, 1947

(Legislative day of Wednesday, July 16, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Albert Joseph McCartney, D. D., minister emeritus, Covenant-First Pres-

byterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

He that dwelleth in the secret place of the most high shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty.

O Lord God, amid the burning of the noontide heat and the burden of the day, we stand in reverence under the shadow of Thy wing. It is well for us thus to refresh our souls at the beginning of the day, for other hours will be filled with pressing duties and nightfall will find us tired and exhausted. So let our first thought be of Thee, and let our first speech pronounce Thy holy name, and let our first act be to stand in the need of prayer. In gratitude we offer to Thee our consecrated service. Where any deed of ours can help to make this world a better place in which to live, where any word of ours can champion a worthy cause, where any vote of ours can foster the spirit of good will throughout the world, so may we do and speak and vote.

For the sake of the coming of the kingdom. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 21, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on July 21, 1947, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 880. An act for the relief of Rev. John C. Young; and

S. 924. An act to credit active service in the military or naval forces of the United States in determining eligibility for and the amount of benefits from the policemen and firemen's relief fund, District of Columbia.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 338. An act to amend the Plant Quarantine Act approved August 20, 1912, as amended, by adding thereto a new section; and

S. 1185. An act to provide for the disposal of materials on the public lands of the United States.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate severally, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 364. An act to expedite the disposition of Government surplus airports, airport facilities, and equipment, and to insure their disposition in such manner as will best encourage and foster the development of civilian aviation and preserve for national defense purposes a strong, efficient, and properly maintained Nation-wide system of public airports, and for other purposes;

S. 682. An act to regulate the interstate transportation of black bass and other game fish, and for other purposes; and

S. 1317. An act to give to members of the Crow Tribe the power to manage and assume charge of their restricted lands, for their own use or for lease purposes, while such lands remain under trust patents.

The message further announced that the House further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 17, 18, 19, 43, 50, and 59 to the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; insisted upon its amendment to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42 to the bill; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. PLUMLEY, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, Mr. HORAN, Mr. PHILLIPS of California, Mr. CANNON, Mr. SHEPPARD, and Mr. WHITTEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 254) for the relief of the legal guardian of Glenna J. Howrey.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4106) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22 to the bill and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 27 and 34 to the bill and concurred therein, each with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 29. An act making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers;

H. R. 72. An act to increase the number of authorized aviation stations operated by the Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H. R. 452. An act to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act relating to marketing agreements and orders;

H. R. 489. An act for the relief of the city of El Paso, Tex.;

H. R. 669. An act to provide a method of paying all unsettled claims for damages sustained as a result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944, in the amounts found to be due by the Secretary of the Navy;

H. R. 730. An act to provide for the protection of veterans and career-service employees in connection with reductions in force in the Federal service;

H. R. 774. An act to amend an act to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to make certain disposition of condemned ordnance, guns, projectiles, and other condemned material in their respective Departments;

H. R. 1049. An act to repeal certain acts of Congress, known as Indian liquor laws, in certain parts of Minnesota;

H. R. 1113. An act to emancipate United States Indians in certain cases;

H. R. 1238. An act to permit vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and points in the continental United States;

H. R. 1426. An act to extend veterans' preference benefits to widowed mothers of certain ex-servicemen;

H. R. 1544. An act to provide appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the armed forces who lost their lives in the armed services of the United States in World War II;

H. R. 1826. An act making it a petty offense to enter any national-forest land while it is closed to the public;

H. R. 2096. An act to amend section 11 of the act approved June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 317), relating to Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2239. An act to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended;

H. R. 2453. An act to provide for the establishment and operation of a research laboratory in the North Dakota lignite-consuming region for investigation of the mining, preparation, and utilization of lignite, for the development of new uses and markets, for improvement of health and safety in mining; and for a comprehensive study of the possibilities for increased utilization of the lignite resources of the region to aid in the solution of its economic problems and to make its natural and human resources of maximum usefulness in the reconversion period and time of peace;

H. R. 2622. An act to authorize loans for Indians, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2645. An act to provide that appointments of United States commissioners for the Isle Royale, Hawaii, Mammoth Cave, and Olympic National Parks shall be made by the United States district courts without the recommendation and approval of the Secretary of the Interior;

H. R. 2776. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 2793. An act authorizing an appropriation for the construction, extension, and improvement of a State tuberculosis sanatorium at Galen, Mont., to provide facilities for the treatment of tuberculous Indians in Montana;

H. R. 2867. An act to permit, subject to certain conditions, mining locations under the mining laws of the United States within that portion of the Harney National Forest designated as a game sanctuary, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2964. An act providing for the conveyance to the San Antonio Medical Foundation of that portion of the San Antonio Arsenal determined to be surplus to the needs of the War Department;

H. R. 3043. An act to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3075. An act to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the classification and compensation of employees of the postal service, so as to provide proper recompense in the form of compensatory time for overtime performed by supervisors;

H. R. 3152. An act to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act;

H. R. 3175. An act to add certain public and other lands to the Shasta National Forest, Calif.;

H. R. 3243. An act for the relief of Roman Toporow;

H. R. 3315. An act to authorize conversions of certain naval vessels;

H. R. 3325. A bill to enable Osage Indians who served in World War II to obtain loans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3326. An act to provide for the granting of certificates of competency to certain members of the Osage Indian Tribe in Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3332. An act creating the St. Lawrence Bridge Commission and authorizing said Commission and its successors to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y.;

H. R. 3334. An act granting the consent of Congress to Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Susquehanna River;

H. R. 3370. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of milk at not less than 90 percent of parity;

H. R. 3416. An act to provide for the establishment of the Pensacola National Monument;

H. R. 3417. An act to provide for the conveyance to Escambia County, State of Florida, of a portion of Santa Rosa Island which is under the jurisdiction of the War Department;

H. R. 3503. An act to permit the issuance of unrestricted deeds for town-site lands held by Alaska natives, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3619. An act relating to the sale of the Mission Point Lighthouse Reservation, Grand Traverse County, Mich.;

H. R. 3632. An act to extend the time within which applications may be made to the Railroad Retirement Board for certain refunds from the Unemployment Trust Fund;

H. R. 3703. An act to authorize transfer of surplus real property to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior for consolidation of Federal holdings within areas administered by the National Park Service;

H. R. 3735. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3738. An act to amend Public Law 88, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved June 23, 1945;

H. R. 3834. An act to authorize a project for the rehabilitation of certain works of the Fort Sumner irrigation district in New Mexico, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3862. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to grant and convey to Montgomery County, Pa., a certain parcel of land of the United States in Norristown Borough, Montgomery County, Pa., for the purpose of erecting an additional annex to the present courthouse;

H. R. 3870. An act to authorize certain expenditures from the appropriation of St. Elizabeths Hospital, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3874. An act to authorize the city of Pierre, S. Dak., to transfer Farm Island to the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3889. An act to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), parts I and II, as amended, to establish a presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases;

H. R. 3973. An act relating to the compensation of commissioners for the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 4010. An act to authorize the Treasury Department and the United States Government Printing Office to furnish, or to procure and furnish, administrative materials, supplies, and equipment to public international organizations on a reimbursable basis;

H. R. 4018. An act authorizing the transfer of certain real property for wildlife, or other purposes;

H. R. 4059. An act to provide for the settlement of certain parts of Alaska by war veterans;

H. R. 4069. An act to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II;

H. R. 4079. An act to amend the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), as amended June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1976);

H. R. 4084. An act to authorize the creation of additional positions in the professional and scientific service in the War and Navy Departments;

H. R. 4110. An act to amend title I of the act entitled "An act to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work and the more complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges," approved June 29, 1935 (the Bankhead-Jones Act);

H. R. 4124. An act to amend the peanut-marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 4127. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended;

H. R. 4169. An act to amend section 401 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to permit the granting of authority for temporary emergency service of air carriers;

H. R. 4229. An act to provide that the Canadian-built dredge *Ajax* and certain other dredging equipment owned by a United States corporation be documented under the laws of the United States;

H. J. Res. 231. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Caribbean Commission and authorizing an appropriation therefor;

H. J. Res. 232. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission and authorizing an appropriation therefor; and

H. J. Res. 250. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of Robert V. Fleming as a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement for the information of Senators. It was my thought yesterday that we would call the calendar immediately following the disposition of the concurrent resolution with regard to Reorganization Plan No. 3. That is the present purpose. I now ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the consideration of the concurrent resolution having to do with Reorganization Plan No. 3 the Senate proceed to the call of the calendar of unobjected-to bills and that we start at the beginning of the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on National Resources of the Committee on Public Lands be permitted to sit today during the session of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask that that a certain subcommittee of the Committee of Labor and Public Welfare which has under consideration Senate bill 984 may meet during the session of the Senate today.

I also ask that that a certain subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary which has under consideration the nomination of Roy W. Harper to be United States district judge in Missouri may sit today during the session of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made in each case.

THREATENED STRIKE ON THE SOUTHERN PACIFIC LINES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, apropos of the remarks made on the floor of the Senate yesterday by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] with reference to a threatened strike on the Southern Pacific Lines, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two telegrams I have received regarding that matter.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 21, 1947.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Our Wisconsin members cranberry growers join us in requesting that you urge President Truman to take a firm stand and insist that the locomotive engineers abide by the provisions of the law and accept services of the emergency board appointed.

AMERICAN CRANBERRY EXCHANGE.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *July 21, 1947.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers have called a strike against the Southern Pacific Lines for tonight. President Truman has appointed an emergency committee to consider their grievances. Will you use your influence and insist that the brotherhood withhold strike action until the emergency committee has an opportunity to act. This very important to all lumber dealers as it will affect lumber shipments from West and veteran housing will be very much delayed as lumber stock in hands of dealers low. Need shipments come in regularly.

BOEHM MADISEN LUMBER CO.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letter, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (S. DOC. NO. 95)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture, amounting to $17,900, fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Office of Temporary Controls, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Twenty-second Report of the Office of Price Administration, for the 2-month period ended May 31, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

VETERANS' HOUSING—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF PORTLAND, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Portland, Oreg., on July 16, 1947, in opposition to Senate

bill 1459, introduced on June 17, 1947, by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 23369

Whereas the Federal temporary housing projects in this area are threatened with extinction by Senate bill 1459, introduced on June 17, 1947, by Senator HARRY CAIN, of Washington; and

Whereas said Federal housing units in this area are at least 50 percent occupied by veterans and their families; and

Whereas a great many of these units are multiple dwellings and therefore not subject to purchase and removal to new sites by veterans; and

Whereas many veterans occupying these housing units are of substandard income and occupy these dwelling units for that reason and are obviously not financially able to purchase said dwellings; and

Whereas such veterans now occupying these units would be without homes after sale and eviction; and

Whereas such units would be purchased by speculators and removed to other areas that would constitute fire hazards and slums, not being subject to public control; and

Whereas it was definitely understood and a part of the plan for these dwellings that they were to be temporary expedients only and were not to be used as permanent dwelling places: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Council of the City of Portland, Oreg., does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States not to pass Senate bill 1459, or any other measure effecting the same or a similar purpose as Senate bill 1459; and be it further

Resolved, That the city auditor forthwith send a certified copy of this resolution to the President of the Senate, the Honorable ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, the Speaker of the House, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., and the Members of the Oregon delegation, the Honorable GUY W. CORDON, the Honorable WAYNE MORSE, the Honorable HOMER ANGELL, the Honorable LOWELL STOCKMAN, the Honorable HARRIS ELLSWORTH, and the Honorable WALTER NORBLAD.

Adopted by the Council of the City of Portland, Oreg., this 16th day of July 1947.

WILL GIBSON,
Auditor of the City of Portland.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 29. An act making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

H. R. 72. An act to increase the number of authorized aviation stations operated by the Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1238. An act to permit vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and points in the continental United States;

H. R. 3043. An act to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3152. An act to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act;

H. R. 3619. An act relating to the sale of the Mission Point Lighthouse Reservation, Grand Traverse County, Mich.;

H. R. 4018. An act authorizing the transfer of certain real property for wildlife, or other purposes; and

H. R. 4169. An act to amend section 401 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, so as to permit the granting of authority for temporary emergency service of air carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 452. An act to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act relating to marketing agreements and orders;

H. R. 1826. An act making it a petty offense to enter any national-forest land while it is closed to the public;

H. R. 4110. An act to amend title I of the act entitled "An act to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work and the more complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges," approved June 29, 1935 (the Bankhead-Jones Act); and

H. R. 4124. An act to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 489. An act for the relief of the city of El Paso, Tex.;

H. R. 669. An act to provide a method of paying all unsettled claims for damages sustained as a result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944, in the amounts found to be due by the Secretary of the Navy;

H. R. 1049. An act to repeal certain acts of Congress, known as Indian liquor laws, in certain parts of Minnesota; and

H. R. 3243. An act for the relief of Roman Toporow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 739. An act to provide for the protection of veterans and career-service employees in connection with reductions in force in the Federal service;

H. R. 4084. An act to authorize the creation of additional positions in the professional and scientific service in the War and Navy Departments; and

H. R. 4127. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Civil Service.

H. R. 774. An act to amend an act to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to make certain disposition of condemned ordnance, guns, projectiles, and other condemned material in their respective Departments;

H. R. 1544. An act to provide appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the armed forces who lost their lives in the armed services of the United States in World War II;

H. R. 2964. An act providing for the conveyance to the San Antonio Medical Foundation of that portion of the San Antonio Arsenal determined to be surplus to the needs of the War Department;

H. R. 3315. An act to authorize conversions of certain naval vessels;

H. R. 3417. An act to provide for the conveyance to Escambia County, State of Florida, or a portion of Santa Rosa Island which is under the jurisdiction of the War Department; and

H. R. 3735. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1113. An act to emancipate United States Indians in certain cases;

H. R. 1602. An act to stimulate exploration, development, and production from domestic mines by private enterprise, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2096. An act to amend section 11 of the act approved June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 317), relating to Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2453. An act to provide for the establishment and operation of a research laboratory in the North Dakota lignite-consuming region for investigation of the mining, preparation, and utilization of lignite, for the development of new uses and markets, for improvement of health and safety in mining; and for a comprehensive study of the possibilities for increased utilization of the lignite resources of the region to aid in the solution of its economic problems and to make its natural and human resources of maximum usefulness in the reconversion period and time of peace;

H. R. 2622. An act to authorize loans for Indians, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2645. An act to provide that appointments of United States commissioners for the Isle Royale, Hawaii, Mammoth Cave, and Olympia National Parks shall be made by the United States district courts without the recommendation and approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

H. R. 2793. An act authorizing an appropriation for the construction, extension, and improvement of a State tuberculosis sanatorium at Galen, Mont., to provide facilities for the treatment of tuberculous Indians in Montana;

H. R. 2867. An act to permit, subject to certain conditions, mining locations under the mining laws of the United States within that portion of the Harney National Forest designated as a game sanctuary, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3175. An act to add certain public and other lands to the Shasta National Forest, Calif.;

H. R. 3325. An act to enable Osage Indians who served in World War II to obtain loans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3326. An act to provide for the granting of certificates of competency to certain members of the Osage Indian Tribe in Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3416. An act to provide for the establishment of the Pensacola National Monument;

H. R. 3503. An act to permit the issuance of unrestricted deed for town-site lands held by Alaska natives, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3703. An act to authorize transfer of surplus real property to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior for consolidation of Federal holdings within areas administered by the National Park Service;

H. R. 3834. An act to authorize a project for the rehabilitation of certain works of the Fort Sumner irrigation district in New Mexico, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3874. An act to authorize the city of Pierre, S. Dak., to transfer Farm Island to the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3973. An act relating to the compensation of commissioners for the Territory of Alaska; and

H. R. 4059. An act to provide for the settlement of certain parts of Alaska by war veterans; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1426. An act to extend veterans-preference benefits to widowed mothers of certain ex-servicemen;

H. R. 3075. An act to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the classification and compensation of employees of the postal service, so as to provide proper recompense in the form of compensatory time for overtime performed by supervisors;

H. R. 3334. An act granting the consent of Congress to Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Susquehanna River;

H. R. 3738. An act to amend Public Law 88, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved June 23, 1945; and

H. R. 3862. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to grant and convey to Montgomery County, Pa., a certain parcel of land of the United States in Norristown Borough, Montgomery County, Pa., for the purpose of erecting an additional annex to the present courthouse; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2239. An act to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 2776. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 3332. An act creating the St. Lawrence Bridge Commission and authorizing said Commission and its successors to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y.;

H. R. 4010. An act to authorize the Treasury Department and the United States Government Printing Office to furnish, or to procure and furnish, administrative materials, supplies, and equipment to public international organizations on a reimbursable basis;

H. J. Res. 231. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Caribbean Commission and authorizing an appropriation therefor; and

H. J. Res. 232. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H. R. 3370. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of milk at not less than 90 percent of parity; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3632. An act to extend the time within which applications may be made to the Railroad Retirement Board for certain refunds from the Unemployment Trust Fund; and

H. R. 3870. An act to authorize certain expenditures from the appropriation of St. Elizabeths Hospital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. R. 3889. An act to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), parts I and II, as amended, to establish a presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases; and

H. R. 4069. An act to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II; to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committtees were submitted:

By Mr. CAIN:

From the Committee on Public Works:

S. 1480. A bill authorizing the conveyance to the State of Delaware of a portion of Pea Patch Island; without amendment (Rept. No. 667).

From the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 968. A bill to authorize the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia to limit the number of taxicabs licensed and operated in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 687);

H. R. 3045. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe the processes and procedures for recording instruments of writing in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 688); and

S. Res. 154. Resolution authorizing an investigation of housing in the District of Columbia; without amendment; and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. McGRATH, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 1590. A bill to amend the District of Columbia rent control law so as to provide that schools and universities may recover possession of housing accommodations in certain cases; without amendment (Rept. No. 677);

H. R. 2471. A bill to provide for periodical reimbursement of the general fund of the District of Columbia for certain expenditures made for the compensation, uniforms, equipment, and other expenses of the United States Park Police force; without amendment;

H. R. 3852. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia," approved August 7, 1946; without amendment; and

H. R. 3978. A bill to provide for the temporary advancement in rank and increase in salary of lieutenants in the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia serving as supervisors of certain squads; without amendment.

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 3997. A bill to exclude certain vendors of newspapers or magazines from certain provisions of the Social Security Act and Internal Revenue Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 678); and

H. R. 4043. A bill to change the order of priority for payment out of the German special deposit account, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 679).

By Mr. MALONE, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. 1418. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to control and reduction of pollution in the waters of the New England States; without amendment (Rept. No. 680);

S. 1624. A bill granting the consent of Congress to Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Susquehanna River; with an amendment (Rept. No. 681); and

H. R. 3146. A bill to amend section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved August 28, 1937, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 682).

By Mr. COOPER:

From the Committee on Public Works:

S. 1305. A bill to amend section 24 of the Federal Power Act so as to provide that the States may apply for reservation of portions of power sites released for entry, location, or selection to the States for highway purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 686);

From the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 2173. A bill to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended; with amendments; and

H. R. 2659. A bill to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance, and provide for the medical and scientific treatment of persons found to be alcoholics by the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments.

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 609. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claims arising out of the deaths of Norman Ray Pedron and Carl Franklin Morris; without amendment (Rept. No. 668);

S. 1356. A bill providing for the incorporation of the Franco-American War Veterans; without amendment (Rept. No. 669);

S. 1375. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America; with amendments (Rept. No. 676);

S. 1557. A bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America; with amendments (Rept. No. 670);

H. R. 434. A bill for the relief of Lewis H. Rich; without amendment (Rept. No. 671);

H. R. 3361. A bill for the relief of J. Rutledge Alford; without amendment (Rept. No. 672); and

H. R. 3495. A bill for the relief of Andrew C. Extrom and Harry C. Pearson; without amendment (Rept. No. 673).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Civil Service:

S. 1663. A bill to prohibit the payment of retirement annuities to former Members of Congress convicted of offenses involving the improper use of authority, influence, power, or privileges as Members of Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 683).

By Mr. THYE, from the Committee on Civil Service:

S. 430. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to make such act applicable to officers and employees of national farm-loan associations and production-credit associations; without amendment (Rept. No. 666).

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 1544. A bill to provide appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the armed forces who lost their lives in the armed services of the United States in World War II; without amendment (Rept. No. 674).

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. 1678. A bill to provide for the reincorporation of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 675);

H. J. Res. 231. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Caribbean Commission and authorizing an appropriaton therefor; with amendments (Rept. No. 684); and

H. J. Res. 232. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission and authorizing an appropriation therefor; with amendments (Rept. No. 685).

SURVEY OF FINANCIAL RECORDS AND PROCEDURES OF FEDERAL PUBLIC HOUSING AUTHORITY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I ask unanimous consent to submit a report on a survey of the financial records and procedures of the Federal Public Housing Authority, and I submit a report (No. 665) thereon.

This report, of course, is based on a rather lengthy report of the Comptroller General and has been condensed for the benefit of the Members of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the report may be printed in the RECORD, as it is an excellent illustration of how a Government agency ought not to be run.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was received and was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In accordance with provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments makes a detailed review of each audit and financial report submitted by the Comptroller General. When occasion warrants this committee will make a special report to the Senate which will summarize the deficiencies pointed out by the audits and reports and describe the remedial actions to be taken.

This report is of that nature and is on the Federal Public Housing Authority. A report on the survey of financial records and procedures of the Authority was made by Price, Waterhouse & Co., a public accounting firm, of New York City, under contract to the General Accounting Office. The report, as submitted by the Comptroller General, covers the fiscal years 1945 and 1946.

The deficiencies disclosed by the report are so startling that they must be called to the attention of the Senate. In the long record of sins of omission and commission in the accounting field the following may be singled out as most important:

MAJOR ACCOUNTING DEFICIENCIES

1. "Development costs (i. e., cost of housing property) shown on the books of program 7 (war housing), have not been adjusted to reflect certain transfers of properties to and from other Government agencies, nor have they been adjusted, with minor exceptions, in respect of temporary housing sold or demolished, or removed for use in the veterans' housing program (9.2). Neither have certain transfers between programs and between regions been recorded. Significant amounts are involved in the property accounts, the expenditures in all programs having aggregated some $2,000,000,000, of which upward of $75,000,000 represented movable equipment."

2. "While the Accounting Handbook prescribes that losses sustained on abandonment or disposition of housing be charged off, the files indicate that in numerous instances such losses had not been so reflected on the books at June 30, 1946; also numerous balances are carried on the books in respect of preliminary and other costs relating to abandoned projects on which actual construction was not started or, if started, was never completed."

3. "Detailed records showing number of units and related dollar amounts have not been maintained in the Accounting Division with respect to movable equipment (stoves, refrigerators, household furniture and furnishings, etc.) purchased for use in housing projects."

4. "The temporary housing includes the so-called 'trailer program' costing some $25,000,000; originally the trailers were erected on cinder-block foundations and upon discontinuance of nearby war production or other war activities, many of such trailers were vacated by the tenants. Some of the temporary housing has since been removed to other locations for use in the Veterans' housing program (9.2), but for the most part the properties so removed were not written off (or reserved for) on the books of the war-housing program."

5. "Records of receivables, advances, payables (unliquidated obligations) and other personal accounts have not been properly maintained and in some cases it is impossible to determine readily from the books the amounts receivable from individual debtors and the amounts owing to individual creditors."

6. "Adequate accounting records have not been kept for housing properties (constructed by FPHA or transferred from other agencies), movable equipment, furniture, etc., or for inventories of fuel and supplies; neither have adequate records been kept as to construction and other costs incurred."

COMMENTS ON DEFICIENCES

The foregoing deficiencies result, in the aggregate, in a balance sheet totally without integrity. As the survey report properly states, it is impossible for any accountant to draw from the books of the Federal Public Housing Authority a statement reflecting the true financial condition of the Authority. This is a very serious matter, particularly when consideration is given to the fact that the Authority has invested some $2,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money in the various programs which it has been administering and for which it is accountable. Moreover, this basic accounting defect not only prevents an accurate reflection of the financial affairs of the Authority, but it also distorts such important consolidated reports as are issued from time to time by the United States Treasury Department, notably, the "Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the State of the Finances."

The survey has disclosed, among other things, that even elementary inventory records have not been maintained and, while some effort appears to have been made insofar as recordation of physical properties is concerned, there has been no effort to maintain any monetary records of such properties. It is shown also that monetary values of losses and abandonments have neither been properly covered by reserves nor written off the books, the result being, of course, an inflation of assets, which is no less serious a defect than an understatement of assets.

The survey has disclosed equally serious deficiency in maintaining adequate accounting records of receivables and payables, and it is stated in the report that in some cases it is impossible to determine, from the books, amounts which are receivable from individual debtors and amounts which are payable to individual creditors. Nothing can be added to this charge, it being sufficient to point out that without a record of payables it would be conceivable for charges to be presented against the Authority for an indefinite time in the future, and it is presumed that the Authority would be helpless to verify the accuracy of such claims.

In support of the charges the following excerpts have been taken from the letter of the Director, Corporation Audits Division, in transmitting the report of Price, Waterhouse & Co. to the Comptroller General:

"The accounting of the Authority was found to be inadequate, inaccurate, and otherwise deficient.

"The situation in which the Authority finds itself is one where the accounting requirements of a great and important undertaking of the Government either were not fully comprehended by the undertaking's managers or were ignored, neglected, or regarded as having a relatively unimportant claim to attention, until the situation became very grave.

"It (the FPHA) is under the general supervision of the National Housing Agency, of course; but this agency appears to be more interested in broad policies of housing and in budgetary matters than in the internal management of the Authority."

RESPONSIBILITY

Poor accounting systems are established by poor executives. Inaccurate and incomplete records are maintained by subordinates when top management is inept.

Both the system and its maintenance were so poor that Price, Waterhouse & Co. could not make an audit, as required by law, but could only make a report. Conditions have been so bad that a period of 2 years must elapse beginning with the first year covered by the accounting firm until the books will be in shape to be audited.

It is submitted that, in any enterprise, top management must:

1. Formulate and follow fiscal policies which will preserve the financial soundness of the enterprise.

2. See that a proper and adequate accounting system is established.

3. Supervise the maintenance of accounts sufficiently to insure accuracy and completeness.

FUTURE ACTION OF THE COMMITTEE

The men responsible for this deplorable situation must be called to account for their stewardship. They must not be allowed to hide behind a divided responsibility and go on to perpetuate their ineptitude on other employers.

Your committee intends to hold hearings, at which time individuals responsible for this mismanagement of public funds and property will be called to account. If the charges made in the report are substantiated by evidence presented at the hearings, the committee intends to exert all its power to see that proper disciplinary measures are taken against those who were responsible and who are still on the Federal pay roll, and it intends to expose those who have left Federal employment.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that he had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

On July 21, 1947:

S. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution to terminate certain emergency and war powers; and

On July 22, 1947:

S. 1508. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulations of the business of insurance," approved March 9, 1945 (59 Stat. 33).

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WHITE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

David K. E. Bruce, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce; and

W. A. Ayres, of Kansas, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for a term of 7 years from September 26, 1947.

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

Hugh H. Earle, of Salem, Oreg., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Oregon, in place of James W. Maloney, resigned.

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Civil Service:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Warren R. Austin, of Vermont, to be a representative of the United States to the second session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to be held in New York, N. Y., beginning September 16, 1947;

Herschel V. Johnson, of North Carolina, to be a representative of the United States to the second session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to be held in New York, N. Y., beginning September 16, 1947;

Mrs. Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, of New York, to be a representative of the United States to the second session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to be held in New York, N. Y., beginning September 16, 1947;

John Foster Dulles, of New York, to be a representative of the United States to the second session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to be held in New York, N. Y., beginning September 16, 1947;

Charles Fahy, of New Mexico, to be an alternate representative of the United States to the second session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to be held in New York, N. Y., beginning September 16, 1947;

Willard L. Thorp, of Connecticut, to be an alternate representative of the United States to the second session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to be held in New York, N. Y., beginning September 16, 1947;

Francis B. Sayre, of the District of Columbia, to be an alternate representative of the United States to the second session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to be held in New York, N. Y., beginning September 16, 1947;

Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois, to be an alternate representative of the United States to the second session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to be held in New York, N. Y., beginning September 16, 1947;

Virginia C. Gildersleeve, of New York, to be an alternate representatives of the United States to the second session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to be held in New York, N. Y., beginning September 16, 1947;

Henry S. Villard, of New York, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consul general, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States;

Morris N. Hughes, of Illinois, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States;

Milton K. Wells, of Oklahoma, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States; and

Charles E. Bohlen, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be counselor of the Department of State.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

John Carter Vincent, of Georgia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of Career Minister, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Switzerland.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1692. A bill for the relief of Ludmila Buresova, alias Buresh; Kristina Buresova, alias Buresh; and Edward Buresh, alias Eduard Bures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY (by request):

S. 1693. A bill for the relief of Henry Hill (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1694. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the acquisition by the United States of certain real property in the District of Columbia," approved August 7, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 1695. A bill to amend subsection (d) of section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BUTLER (by request):

S. 1696. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 784), so as to extend the jurisdiction of the United States District Court, Territory of Hawaii, over Canton and Enderbury Islands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1697. A bill for the relief of Henrik Mannerfrid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 1698. A bill to define the exterior boundary of the Unitah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 1699. A bill for the relief of Danyel Sages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1700. A bill for the relief of Szoszana Sierdzka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1701. A bill relating to reemployment rights of persons who were released from Government employment to engage in private employment in support of the war effort; to the Committee on Civil Service.

(Mr. KNOWLAND introduced Senate Joint Resolution 152, to provide for the cancellation of the indebtedness of the Republic of Finland, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

CANCELLATION OF INDEBTEDNESS OF REPUBLIC OF FINLAND

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to provide for the cancellation of the indebtedness of the Republic of Finland. I merely wish to point out to Members of the Senate that there were two Finnish loans made; one, in 1919, for $3,289,276.98; and one, on June 1, 1920, for $4,992,649.19; making a total loan slightly in excess of $8,281,000.

The Finnish Government has paid, in interest, $6,478,000, and, in principal, $1,375,000; making a total in payments of principal and interest of more than $7,854,000. However, Finland still owes approximately $8,259,000.

Finland is the one country to whom this Nation made post World War I loans which, over the years, has desperately endeavored to maintain its position by paying principal and interest. It seems to me, in the light of the terrific obligation that Finland is now facing, this would be a friendly gesture by the United States to a great people and would encourage them in working out their economic problems.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 152) to provide for the cancellation of the indebtedness of the Republic of Finland, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KNOWLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to ask unanimous consent to have printed immediately following the earlier remarks I made a copy of the joint resolution which I introduced today concerning the subject, also a letter which I received from the Treasury Department, together with the table showing the payments which Finland has made.

There being no objection, the joint resolution, letter, and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 152

Joint resolution to provide for the cancellation of the indebtedness of the Republic of Finland

Be it enacted, etc., That the indebtedness of the Republic of Finland to the United States of America under the agreement between that Republic and the United States of America dated May 1, 1923, is hereby canceled.

SEC. 2. The President is authorized to notify the Republic of Finland of the cancellation of such indebtedness, and to return to the Republic of Finland any bonds or other obligations evidencing such indebtedness.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
FISCAL SERVICE,
Washington, July 22, 1947.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: Reference is made to a telephone conversation of July 21, 1947, with Mr. Wilson of your office, requesting information concerning the World War I loan to Finland. Information will be given in the sequence in which requested.

1. The date and the amount of the original loan to Finland.

The indebtedness of Finland arose from obligations received by the American Relief Administration for relief supplies furnished under an act of Congress approved February 25, 1919. The principal amounts of such obligations were $3,289,276.98, dated June 30, 1919, and $4,992,649.19 dated June 1, 1920, totaling $8,281,926.17.

2. Total amount of loan paid, showing amount of principal and interest. Dates and amount of installments which have thus far been paid.

Finland has paid a total of $7,854,361.71 on account of its indebtedness, of which $1,375,500.41 has been principal and $6,478,861.30 interest. (See statement enclosed.)

3. What is the balance due and under what terms is such balance payable?

The present amount of indebtedness of Finland, referred to above, is $8,259,270.28, of which $7,624,499.59 represents principal and $634,770.69 interest accrued and postponed under the moratorium agreement of May 28, 1932, and the postponement agreements of May 1, 1941, and October 14, 1943.

Under the funding agreement entered into under date of May 1, 1923, the principal of the debt was to be paid in annual installments due December 15 each year over a 62-year period ending in 1984. Interest was made payable semiannually on unpaid balances on December 15 and June 15 of each year. The rate was 3 percent per annum from December 15, 1922, to December 15, 1932, and 3½ percent thereafter. This agreement was modified by the postponement agreements described in the enclosed extract from the memorandum covering the World War indebtedness of foreign governments to the United States (1917-21).

4. Has Finland ever been late in making payments?

The Government of Finland has not been late in making payments due on its debt.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH GREENBERG,
Assistant Commissioner of Accounts.

To cover the installment ($235,445.06) due December 16, 1944, Finland tendered to the Treasury funds frozen in this country by foreign funds control. Consideration of this tender resulted in some delay, the installment finally being accepted by the Treasury on February 15, 1945.

Statement showing payments made by Finland on account of its indebtedness to the United States (as of June 13, 1947)

Date	Principal	Interest		Moratorium agreement payments	Total
		Prior to funding	On funded debt		
Mar. 8, 1923		$300,000.00			$300,000.00
May 1, 1923		9,315.27			9,315.27
June 15, 1923			$135,000.00		135,000.00
Dec. 15, 1923	$45,000		135,000.00		180,000.00
June 15, 1924			134,325.00		134,325.00
Dec. 15, 1924	45,000		134,325.00		179,325.00
June 15, 1925			133,650.00		133,650.00
Dec. 15, 1925	47,000		133,650.00		180,650.00
June 15, 1926			132,945.00		132,945.00
Dec. 15, 1926	49,000		132,945.00		181,945.00
June 15, 1927			132,210.00		132,210.00
Dec. 15, 1927	50,000		132,210.00		182,210.00
June 15, 1928			131,460.00		131,460.00
Dec. 15, 1928	52,000		131,460.00		183,460.00
June 15, 1929			130,680.00		130,680.00
Dec. 15, 1929	53,000		130,680.00		183,680.00
June 15, 1930			129,885.00		129,885.00
Dec. 15, 1930	55,000		129,885.00		184,885.00
June 15, 1931			129,060.00		129,060.00
Dec. 15, 1932	58,000		128,235.00		186,235.00
June 15, 1933			148,592.50		148,592.50
Dec. 15, 1933	62,000		148,592.50	$19,030.50	229,623.00
June 15, 1934			147,507.50	19,030.50	166,538.00
Dec. 15, 1934	62,000		147,507.50	19,030.50	228,538.00
June 15, 1935			146,422.50	19,030.50	165,453.00
Dec 15, 1935	65,000		146,422.50	19,030.50	230,453.00
June 15, 1936			145,285.00	19,030.50	164,315.50
Dec. 15, 1936	67,000		145,285.00	19,030.50	231,315.50
June 15, 1937			144,112.50	19,030.50	163,143.00
Dec. 15, 1937	69,000		144,112.50	19,030.50	232,143.00
June 15, 1938			142,905.00	19,030.50	161,935.50
Dec. 15, 1938	71,000		142,905.00	19,030.50	232,935.50
June 15, 1939			141,662.50	19,030.50	160,693.00
Dec. 15, 1939	74,000		141,662.50	19,030.50	234,693.00
June 15, 1940			140,367.50	19,030.50	159,398.00
June 15, 1943			136,220.00	32,725.56	168,945.56
Dec. 15, 1943	84,000		136,220.00	13,695.06	233,915.06
June 15, 1944			134,750.00	13,695.06	148,445.06
Dec. 15, 1944	87,000		134,750.00	13,695.06	235,445.06
June 15, 1945			133,227.50	34,827.24	168,054.74
Dec. 15, 1945	90,000		133,227.50	34,827.24	258,054.74
June 15, 1946			131,652.50	34,827.24	166,479.74
Dec. 15, 1946	93,000		131,652.50	34,827.24	259,479.74
June 13, 1947			130,025.00	34,827.24	164,852.24
Total	1,278,000	309,315.27	5,752,672.50	514,373.94	7,854,361.71

NOTE.—Of the moratorium agreement payments $97,500.41 represents principal and $416,873.53 represents interest.

PROTECTION AGAINST IMPORTATION OF GARBAGE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 597) to protect American agriculture, horticulture, livestock, and the public health by prohibiting the unauthorized importation into, or the depositing in the territorial waters of, the United States of garbage derived from products originating outside of the continental United States, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to an amendment submitted by me on March 27 to the bill (H. R. 597) to protect American agriculture, horticulture, livestock, and the public health by prohibiting the unauthorized importation into, or the depositing in the territorial waters of, the United States of garbage derived from products originating outside of the continental United States, and for other purposes. It was suggested by Maurice Collins, Acting Administrator of Federal Agency, on behalf of the Public Health Service.

Subsequent to the passage of H. R. 597 by the House of Representatives, the Acting Administrator wrote me to the effect the bill might create some confusion between the administration of its provisions and the administration of the Public Health Service Act, as the latter act gives the Public Health Service authority in the field of garbage disposal as it affects the spread of disease into this country and among the States.

The officials of the Public Health Service and the Department of Agriculture have conferred on this matter and I understand they are in complete agreement as to the administration of H. R. 597 were it to be amended as I have proposed.

In further reference to this amendment, Mr. Collins wrote me under date of March 19 as follows:

> The slight amendment would be adequate, I believe, to preserve the existing authority of the Public Health Service, the agency of the Government given primary responsibility under the quarantine laws to protect the public health and prevent the spread of communicable diseases into this country and among the States. This change would also assure cooperation between the Department of Agriculture and the Public Health Service in the control of diseases conveyed by garbage, a matter of concern to both agencies.

INCORPORATION OF JEWISH WAR VETERANS—AMENDMENT

Mr. DONNELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1375) to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

ATTENDANCE OF MARINE BAND AT AMERICAN LEGION CONVENTION, NEW YORK

Mr. IVES submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1633) to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the national convention of the American Legion to be held in New York, N. Y., August 28 to 31, 1947; which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS OF WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, in accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 4002), making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 8, line 7, before the period, add the following proviso: "*Provided further*, That the existing rivers and harbors project at Fire Island Inlet, New York, as authorized by the act approved August 26, 1937, is hereby modified in accordance with reports of the division engineer dated May 16, 1947, subject to final approval by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and the Chief of Engineers."

Mr. IVES also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4002, the War Department Civil Functions Appropriations bill, 1948, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, in accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 4002) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, the following amendments, namely:

Page 5, line 22, after the word "aircraft", strike out the following: "*Provided further*, That no appropriation under the Corps of Engineers for the fiscal year 1948 shall be available for any expenses incident to operating any power-driven boat or vessel on other than Government business" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided further*, That hereafter no appropriation under the Corps of Engineers shall be available for any expenses incident to operating any power-driven boat or vessel on other than Government business, and that Government business shall be construed to include transportation, lodging, and subsistence on inspection trips of Federal, State, or local officials, having a public interest in authorized or proposed improvements for river and harbor and flood control, and any expenses incurred therefor shall be chargeable to river and harbor and flood control appropriations heretofore or hereafter made."

Page 8, line 25, after the word "law", insert the following: "*Provided further*, That funds appropriated herein may be used for necessary bank protection on the Missouri River in the vicinity of Aten, Nebr."

Page 8, in the paragraph "Flood control, general", after the sum of money, insert the following: ", of which, in view of the threat to human life, $200,000, shall be made available for the preparation of detailed plans, for the Dyberry and Prompton Reservoirs in

the Lackawaxen River Basin, Pa., recommended for construction in the report of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, in House Document No. 113, of the Eightieth Congress, and the preparation of such plans is hereby authorized."

Page 9, after line 22, insert the following:

"Garrison (N. Dak.) Reservoir: For acquisition of the lands and rights therein within the taking line of Garrison Reservoir which lands lie within the area now established as the Fort Berthold Indian Reservoir, N. Dak., including all elements of value above or below the surface thereof and including all improvements, severance damages and reestablishment and relocation costs the sum of $5,105,625, which said sum is included in the total allocated under this act for the said Garrison Reservoir and which shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Three Affiliated Tribes of Fort Berthold Reservation, to be subject to withdrawal and disbursement as herein provided. This $5,105,625 is made available subject to the following conditions subsequent and in the event the said conditions are not complied with then this amount shall lapse and be thereby null and void. Said conditions subsequent are:

"That a contract between the United States and the said Three Affiliated Tribes shall be negotiated and approved by a majority of the adult members of said tribes and enacted into law by the Congress, providing for the conveyance of said lands and interests and the use and distribution of said fund and that disbursements from said fund shall be made forthwith in accordance with said approved contract and act of Congress.

"That said contract shall be submitted to the Congress on or before the 1st day of June 1948: *Provided, however,* That, notwithstanding said contract or the provisions of this act, the said Three Affiliated Tribes may bring suit in the Court of Claims as provided in section 24 of the act of August 13, 1946, on account of additional damages, if any, alleged to have been sustained by said tribes by reason of the taking of the said lands and rights in the said Fort Berthold Indian Reservation on account of any treaty obligation of the Government, any intangible cost of reestablishment or relocation or any other basis of claim cognizable under said act of August 13, 1946, and for which the said tribes are not compensated by the said $5,105,625."

Mr. GURNEY also submitted four amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4002, the War Department Civil Functions Appropriation bill, 1948, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

(For text of amendments referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORTS ON SKIPANON RIVER CHANNEL, OREGON (S. DOC. NO. 93)

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated May 5, 1947, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a review of reports on the Skipanon River Channel, with a view to providing a suitable harbor for small boats at Warrenton, Oreg., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate, adopted October 2, 1945, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be referred to the Committee on Public Works, and printed as a Senate document, with an illustration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF A REVIEW OF REPORT ON SMITH RIVER, OREG. (S. DOC. NO. 94)

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated May 2, 1947, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of report on Smith River, Oreg., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate, adopted October 16, 1944, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be referred to the Committee on Public Works, and printed as a Senate document, with an illustration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WONDERFUL WISCONSIN'S 1948 CENTENNIAL—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him on the subject of the forthcoming one hundredth anniversary of the admission of Wisconsin into the Union, which appears in the Appendix.]

ENFORCEMENT OF LOYALTY BY LAW—ARTICLE BY LOWELL MELLETT

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Congress May Do the Unforgivable in Seeking to Enforce Loyalty by Law," by Lowell Mellett, published in the Washington Evening Star of July 22, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

HERNANDO DE SOTO—PAPER BY HERBERT LAMSON

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a paper on the subject Hernando de Soto, presented by Herbert Lamson before the Jacksonville Historical Society, Jacksonville, Fla., on February 12, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

FLOOD CONTROL—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Flood Control," published in the Washington Post of July 15, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

COLUMNAR COLLUSION—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Columnar Collusion," published in the Washington Post of July 15, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSTRUCTION OF DAMS ON THE SNAKE RIVER—LETTER AND STATEMENT

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Oregon State Grange and statements by the Washington, Oregon, and Idaho State Granges at a public hearing on July 9, 1947, before the Army engineers with reference to the construction of Mountain Sheep, Hell's Canyon, and other dams on the Snake River, which appear in the Appendix.]

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF BASIC RESOURCES—STATEMENT OF C. GIRARD DAVIDSON

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made on July 18, 1947, by C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, before the Valley Authority Conference, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS AIRPORTS AND AIRPORT FACILITIES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 364) to expedite the disposition of Government surplus airports, airport facilities, and equipment and to assure their disposition in such manner as will best encourage and foster the development of civilian aviation and preserve for national defense purposes a strong, efficient, and properly maintained Nation-wide system of public airports, and for other purposes, which was on page 7, line 21, to strike out "(c)" and insert "(e)."

Mr. BALDWIN. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

DISPOSAL OF MATERIALS ON PUBLIC LANDS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1185) to provide for the disposal of materials on the public lands of the United States, which were, on page 1, line 5, after "including", to insert "but not limited to"; on the same page, line 5, after "gravel", to insert "yucca, manzanita, mesquite, cactus, common clay,"; on page 2, line 2, after "Secretary", to insert "*Provided, however,* That, to the extent not otherwise authorized by law, the Secretary is authorized in his discretion to permit any Federal, State, or Territorial agency, unit or subdivision, including municipalities, or any person, or any association or corporation not organized for profit, to take and remove, without charge, materials and resources subject to this act, for use other than for commercial or industrial purposes or resale"; and on the same page, line 20, strike out "at least 30 days" and insert "four consecutive weeks."

Mr. CORDON. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3 OF 1947

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (H. Con. Res. 51) that the Congress does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. 3 of May 27, 1947, transmitted to Congress by the President on the 27th of May 1947.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Connally	Hawkes
Baldwin	Cooper	Hayden
Ball	Cordon	Hickenlooper
Barkley	Donnell	Hill
Brewster	Downey	Hoey
Bricker	Dworshak	Holland
Bridges	Eastland	Ives
Brooks	Ecton	Jenner
Buck	Ellender	Johnson, Colo.
Bushfield	Ferguson	Johnston, S. C.
Butler	Flanders	Kem
Byrd	Fulbright	Kilgore
Cain	George	Knowland
Capehart	Green	Langer
Capper	Gurney	Lodge
Chavez	Hatch	Lucas

McCarran	Myers	Taylor
McCarthy	O'Conor	Thomas, Okla.
McClellan	O'Daniel	Thomas, Utah
McFarland	O'Mahoney	Thye
McGrath	Overton	Tydings
McKellar	Pepper	Umstead
McMahon	Reed	Vandenberg
Magnuson	Revercomb	Watkins
Malone	Robertson, Va.	Wherry
Martin	Russell	White
Maybank	Saltonstall	Wiley
Millikin	Smith	Williams
Moore	Sparkman	Wilson
Morse	Stewart	Young
Murray	Taft	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the time for the consideration of Reorganization Plan No. 3 be limited to 4 hours, and that the time be equally divided between the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], favoring the plan, and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], opposing it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no objection to that arrangement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WHERRY submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3123) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 14, 82, 83, 97, 98, 103, 117, 118, 119, 120, 123, 126, 127, 155, 160, 173, 174, and 175.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 42, 43, 46, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 79, 80, 89, 99, 102, 106, 107, 110, 111, 112, 115, 116, 121, 122, 131, 132, 133, 134, 136, 139, 142, 147, 150, 154, 156, 157, 158, 159, 161, 163, 165, 170, and 172, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That not to exceed $50,000 of this appropriation may be used for the Division of Power under the Office of the Secretary"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,596,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"Construction: The funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1947 (Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1947), are hereby continued available during the fiscal year 1948 to meet obligations incurred in contract or contracts duly executed and in force on or before June 30, 1947; for administrative expenses connected therewith; including purchase of five, and hire of passenger motor vehicles; for temporary services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600), but at rates not exceeding $35 per diem for individuals; printing and binding; for the purchase or acquisition of necessary lands for rights-of-way and necessary engineering and supervision of the construction under said contracts; and for the construction of necessary interconnecting facilities incident to and connected with the construction of the Denison-Norfork transmission line."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,175,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,139,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$180,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,012,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,130,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$18,345,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Davis Dam project, Arizona-Nevada, $9,700,000;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Central Valley project, California: Joint facilities, $690,000; irrigation facilities, $5,622,028; power facilities, Shasta power plant, $427,800, Keswick Dam, $100,740, Keswick power plant, $218,040; transmission lines, Shasta to Delta, via Oroville and Sacramento, two hundred and thirty kilovolt, $256,680, Shasta Dam to Shasta substation, two hundred and thirty kilovolt, $1,500,000, Keswick tap line, two hundred and thirty kilovolt, $160,000, Contra Costa Canal extension, sixty-nine kilovolt, $118,000; substation, Contra Costa, $48,000; in all, $9,141,288"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$9,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$2,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 92: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in line four of said amendment insert "$17,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$49,841,288"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 94: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94, and agree

to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "as provided in the Act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law 534), Seventy-eighth Congress, and the Act of August 14, 1946 (Public Law 732), Seventy-ninth Congress"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$17,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 100: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 100, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$435,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 108: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 108, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 109: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 109, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 113: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 113, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "the payment, directly or indirectly, for the drilling of water wells for the purpose of supplying water for domestic use"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 125: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 125, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,091,340"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 128: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 129: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$93,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 135: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 135, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,060,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 137: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 137, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 138: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 138, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 140: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 140, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 141: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 141, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$41,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 143: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 143, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,060,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 144: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 144, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$38,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 145: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 145, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$29,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 146: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 146, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 148: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 148, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$680,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 149: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 149, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$580,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 153: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 153, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 162: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 162, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 164: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 164, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$258,450"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 166: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 166, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 167: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 167, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,492,810"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 168: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 168, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,492,810"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 169: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 169, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,082,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 178: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 178, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of said amendment strike out the figure "9" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "10"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 6, 7, 16, 17, 18, 34, 39, 41, 68, 78, 85, 101, 104, 105, 114, 124, 130, 151, 152, 171, 176, 177, and 179.

KENNETH S. WHERRY,
CHAN GURNEY,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
GUY CORDON,
CARL HAYDEN,
ELMER THOMAS,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

ROBERT F. JONES,
BEN F. JENSEN,
IVOR D. FENTON,
LOWELL STOCKMAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
ALBERT GORE,
W. F. NORRELL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. WHERRY. I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, what report is this?

Mr. WHERRY. The conference report on the Department of the Interior appropriation bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to discuss a matter connected with the report for a brief time. There appears to be no printed report. Am I correct in that?

Mr. WHERRY. The report has been printed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Then apparently the printed report has just come to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. For the sake of convenience, I shall refer to page 9613 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on which the amendments, Nos. 97 and 98, are dealt with. I read:

Nos. 97 and 98 relating to operation and maintenance, Boulder Canyon project: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to provide funds for the payment of tuition

for pupils who are dependents of employees of the United States living in the area, and appropriates $1,500,000 for operation and maintenance of the project, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,533,300, as proposed by the Senate.

Mr. President, I am at a loss to know why the conferees on the part of the Senate surrendered on this item. It cannot be dealt with on any other basis than as the Senate provided. The record has made the situation so plain and so convincing that it seems to me the conferees on the part of the Senate would have been authorized in remaining in session for any length of time in order to sustain it. If the amendments as now brought to the Senate from the conference committee prevail, then about 400 children in the Boulder Canyon area, or rather in Boulder City school districts, will be deprived of tuition.

I read from a letter received by me on the letterhead of the Boulder City schools, over the signature of Elbert B. Edwards, superintendent of schools of that district, as follows:

It has again come to our attention that the Subcommittee on Appropriations in the House has deleted all provisions for the operation of the schools and for the school building project in Boulder City.

We realize that you are thoroughly conversant with our problem, and that you have pledged your efforts in our behalf, but we wish to give you a few points which might be used effectively in your efforts to have these provisions reincorporated in the appropriation bill.

The letter was received by me, let me say, before the hearings which were conducted by the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] who now has charge of the conference report on the floor. I continue to read from the letter of the superintendent of schools:

Herewith is a brief summary of the financial picture for the Boulder City School District for 1947-1948 school year:

1947-1948 estimated receipts for Boulder City Union School District from regular State, county, and local sources, $149,740.

Balance carried forward from previous year, $14,860.

Total resources for operation of schools for 1947-1948, $164,600.

Estimated expenditures for 1947-1948 school year $190,800.

Now listen to this, Mr. President:

Deficit for the school year (normally made up by the Federal Government as reimbursement for instruction in the schools operated by the Boulder City Union School District of each pupil who is a dependent of any employee of the United States living in or in the immediate vicinity of Boulder City, in the sum of $45 per semester per pupil in average daily attendance at said schools), $26,200.

Estimated average daily attendance for 1947-1948, 760 pupils.

Estimated instructional cost per pupil, $251.

Estimated average daily attendance of students dependents of employees of Federal Government, 300.

Estimated cost of providing instruction for dependents of Federal Government, $75,300.

Then he continues:

It is necessary that provision for the continued assistance of the Federal Government to the Boulder City schools be provided for the following reasons:

And this seems to me to be unanswerable:

1. The Boulder City School District has been reimbursed by the Federal Government for instruction given to students who were dependents of employees of the United States since 1939. The educational program and the economy of the schools and of the district have been made possible only on the basis of this assistance.

2. The educational program and the general economy of the district are geared to this assistance of the Federal Government, and any deletion of provision for this assistance from the Interior Department Appropriation Act will result in a sacrifice of the educational standards maintained in the district.

3. The schools of the district will suffer from the loss of this assistance specifically by a reduction in the amount of money available for salaries, for administration, for educational supplies and equipment, and operation. This will seriously and adversely affect the educational program provided for the school children in Boulder City.

4. The resources of the district subject to taxation are limited to personal property and improvements by virtue of Government ownership of the real estate and basic industries. It is, therefore, impossible for the district to carry its proportionate share of the tax burden for the support of its educational program when it does not have the authority to make assessments against its beneficiaries, as is the practice in other American communities.

Let me say here, Mr. President, that all the land in that community belongs to the United States Government and to no one else. No one living in the community can own a single foot of the land. It is entirely Government land. The leases which are made by the Reclamation Bureau for those who build houses and occupy space there provide for an amount of money sufficient to meet the school expenditures, so that if the appropriation were made as the Senate provided, not $1 would come out of the Treasury of the United States. It is provided for, first of all, in the money which is charged for the use of the public land in Boulder City by those who are employed on the Boulder project, and by no one else.

Secondly, with respect to the industries, the businesses that are conducted in Boulder City by what I choose to call the service community of Boulder City—those who serve the employees on the Boulder Dam—their personal property, their stock in trade, if you please, if it be a store, or other personal property, is assessed. Into that assessment goes a part of the cost of maintaining the schools. This is not a question of the Government maintaining the schools. The Government is not maintaining the schools. The maintenance for the schools comes out of the cost of the leases on land occupied by those who work on the dam. The maintenance of the schools is also tied into the power rate for the acquisition of power from Boulder Dam.

The superintendent of schools continues:

The money paid to the Boulder City Union School District is considered part of the cost of operation and maintenance of the project, and is recovered back by the United States out of the power rates and charges paid by the Boulder Dam power contractors.

That is entirely true; and it must have been the result of a misconception of the law, a misconception of the procedure, and a misconception of the entire condition, that the House conferees insisted on changing this item and the Senate conferees concurred in the change.

The superintendent of schools further says:

These power contractors have in the past announced themselves in favor of the charges made against the power rates for the purpose of providing instruction for the children of employees of the Bureau of Reclamation.

That is true. The question has been considered on a number of occasions by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, and representatives of the power allottees have stated that they were entirely content that the power rate should carry a consideration in it for the maintenance of schools for the instruction of the children of their employees at Boulder City.

Continuing, Superintendent Edwards says:

If it is inevitable that the Boulder City schools must rely exclusively on State, county, and local resources we think it only fair and right that they be given ample notice, and be given an opportunity to make the necessary adjustments.

I am at a loss to understand why the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator in charge of the bill, after he held hearings so generously and had developed the record which I am about to read, should for a moment consent that this item be omitted from the bill, and that approximately 400 children in Boulder City, the children of the employees of the Federal Government, should be deprived of a proper school system in that locality.

I read from page 1341 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate on House bill 3123. Mr. Ely was testifying. Mr. Ely is the representative of Bureau of Power and Light of the City of Los Angeles, and a representative of the other agencies which are allottees. He said:

All of the land in Boulder City is owned by the United States. All buildings are either owned by the United States or have been built by lessees on Government land. The Boulder City school district is consequently unable to levy taxes upon real estate to support the local schools. Moreover, the greater part of the school population comprises children of employees of Government personnel. Their parents live in Government-owned homes. School facilities are essential if the Government is to be able to attract and keep family men for employment at Boulder City.

Inasmuch as there is no real property subject to tax, it is wholly impracticable to pass the burden for maintaining these facilities on to the local school district.

The power contractors recognize the propriety of including in the power rates the cost of such schooling, for children of Reclamation Bureau personnel. There is not a burden to the Federal taxpayer involved.

On page 1343 of the record made before the subcommittee of which the able Senator from Nebraska was chairman, we find the following, from the testimony of Mr. Warne:

Senator KNOWLAND. As I understand the situation, within this particular school district, they are receiving from the State of Nevada the school allotment which the districts get in other areas of the State.

The only difference is that there is no local tax base for the school district to supplement what they received from the State.

EXPENSES OF BOULDER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT IN 1947–48

Mr. WARNE. That is right. In the school year of 1947–48, the expenses of the Boulder City School District will be about $190,000. The payment that we anticipate to make, provided the language is restored and the funds are indicated as being available, will be $30,000. There are about 800 pupils attending this school, and 330 of them are dependents of Federal employees, subject to the payments by the Bureau of Reclamation under this provision of the appropriation bill.

The basic authority for this type of payment does not exist in any enactments heretofore outside of the appropriation bills.

That, as I understand it, was the reason that this particular item was omitted in the House. There are several bills pending before the Congress at the present time that would take care of this matter of authorizing these payments.

Mr. President, when that item is reached, if the Senator proposes to have the report read item by item, I shall certainly object to the Senate approving it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest to the distinguished Senator that this is in the conference report.

Mr. McCARRAN. I understand, and it must be voted up or down as a whole. I realize that; but I will not sit idly by and allow it to be approved on the floor of the Senate, when it will deprive 400 children of Federal employees at Boulder City, on desert land, of the opportunity of going to school.

Mr. President, I hope we may be able to send the bill back to conference so that a reasonable degree of justice may be rendered to those children. The Senate cannot afford to do such an injustice, even if only 400 children are involved. As a matter of fact, not a single dollar of this money comes out of the Treasury of the United States. The Senator from Nebraska will agree to that. It is paid in part by the allottees who take the power, and who consent that the charge be made a part of the power rate. They are willing to pay that power rate in order to sustain the schools. It is paid in part by those who lease Government land for the purpose of maintaining their homes in that particular city in order that they may serve the United States Government as employees.

I hope, Mr. President, that I may be afforded the privilege of a yea-and-nay vote on this item, if the Senator is now moving the adoption of the conference report as a whole, without reading it. Otherwise I do not propose to give up and let the matter go unnoticed. I cannot do that, in justice to myself; I cannot do it, in justice to the children of the employees of the Federal Government. If it is necessary to hold the bill here, I shall hold it.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield the floor?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not know whether I have the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. As a parliamentary situation, Mr. President, do I not have the floor?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada has had the floor for the purpose of this discussion.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator from Oklahoma wish me to yield?

Mr. MOORE. I simply want to ask a question which is entirely apart from this matter.

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska regarding item No. 19, which, as I understand, appropriates no new money, but carries over the unexpended balance. Is that correct?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. MOORE. I should like to ask the Senator if the conference committee had in mind the provision of law contained in the Reorganization Act of 1946, section (c), which is as follows:

No general appropriation bill or amendment thereto shall be received or considered in either House if it contains a provision reappropriating unexpended balances of appropriations, except that this provision shall not apply to appropriations in continuation of appropriations for public works on which work has commenced.

Mr. WHERRY. The public works item which the Senator has just mentioned is one exception.

Mr. MOORE. The conference had that in mind?

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, yes.

Mr. MOORE. That was considered. I ask the Senator if he is familiar, or if the conference was familiar, with the ruling of the Comptroller General under date of May 27, 1947, rendered to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, in which it was held that any unexpended balances reappropriated for Southwest Power Administration in the 1948 Appropriation Act may be used only for discharging contracts on which work had actually physically been commenced prior to June 30, 1947?

Mr. WHERRY. I am familiar with that ruling. The Senate amendment provides for another purpose, namely administrative costs in connection with the construction of those projects.

Mr. MOORE. But as to the work, it has to be physically commenced before this appropriation can be applied?

Mr. WHERRY. If there is an unexpended balance of the 1947 appropriation it can be used for the purpose set out in Senate amendment as adopted by the conferees.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wish to read from page 1340 of the record of hearings conducted before the subcommittee, of which the able Senator from Nebraska was chairman. In passing, Mr. President, I desire to pay my sincere personal compliments to the manner in which the hearings were conducted by the Senator from Nebraska. I have attended hearings before this subcommittee ever since I have been in the Senate, and I want to say, with all due respect to all those who preceded him as chairman, that his conduct of the hearings and proceedings was most commendable, most patient, and most understanding of the problems in every respect.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] interrogated Mr. Ely who, I have stated, was the representative of the Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles. The following occurred:

Senator KNOWLAND. Next we will hear from Mr. Ely.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] was acting as chairman.

Mr. Ely said:

Mr. Chairman, my appearance here is relative to the provisions for the Boulder school district in connection with the Interior Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1948.

The item at page 40, line 9, of H. R. 3123, captioned "Advances to Colorado River Dam fund," providing funds for operation and maintenance of Boulder Dam and incidental works, omits the following language which has been carried in past appropriation bills, and which appeared in the budget for the fiscal year 1948.

Then Mr. Ely quotes, as follows:

"And payment to the Boulder City school district as reimbursement for instruction during the 1947–48 school year in the schools operated by said district of each pupil who is a dependent of any employees of the United States, living in or in the immediate vicinity of Boulder City, in the sum of $45 per semester per pupil in average daily attendance at said schools, payable after the term of instruction in any semester has been completed, and under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary."

I am in receipt of a teletype from Mr. S. B. Morris, general manager of the Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, as follows:

"Please appear before the Senate committee considering Interior Department appropriation bill and on our behalf urge most strongly that there be restored to the bill language authorizing payment from the Colorado River Dam fund of tuition to Boulder City school district. Emphasize the intolerable conditions which would result from the action taken by the House abruptly withdrawing from the district this necessary support."

The Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1945 contained the following provision:

"Boulder Canyon project • • • *Provided*, That on or before June 1, 1946, the Secretary shall report to the Congress on expenditures incurred and revenues received in construction, operation, and maintenance of Boulder City, together with his recommendations for allocation and adjustment of such expenditures and revenues between the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Boulder Canyon project and other Federal activities; and that such expenditures from the Colorado River Dam fund prior to such allocation and adjustment, under this or other appropriation acts heretofore or hereafter enacted, shall be without prejudice to the rights, if any, of power contractors to have adjustments, with respect to such expenditures, made to accord with the substantive provisions of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act."

Then Mr. Ely, continuing, said:

Under the terms of that legislation, it is assumed that any tuition paid under the

1948 appropriation act or other acts for the children of personnel of Federal bureaus other than the Reclamation Bureau, would be subject to retroactive adjustments, so that the power rates would not be burdened therewith.

With that understanding, the department of water and power and the other power users feel that the particular situation at Boulder City, and the lack of any established and adequate tax base for the support of the local schools, justify the continuance of the support for the schools out of the Colorado River Dam fund. The situation, as Mr. Morris says in his teletype, would be intolerable if this support were withdrawn.

Mr. President, that is exactly why I have the floor today, namely, to prevent an intolerable condition which was brought to the attention of the Senator from Nebraska, but as to which the Senate conferees surrendered entirely, either not knowing what they were doing, or else tired out, perhaps, by the argument made by the House conferees. I am not certain which is the case. In any event, the result is exactly the same; it is an intolerable and deplorable condition which will be visited on a community in my State.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The distinguished Senator from Nevada well knows that the Senate subcommittee and the Senate full committee in connection with this particular item voted to restore the amount requested for the operation of this school. There is no argument that the members of the subcommittee or the members of the full committee can present to offset the argument the distinguished Senator is now making, and he can continue to make it all afternoon, so far as that is concerned. But I respectfully call to the attention of the Senator the fact that the House raised the question that there is no legislation authorizing the payment of this money. The Senator will agree, I think, that there is no legislation authorizing the payment of these funds.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not agree to that.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator well remembers that recently—I think it was in the session before this one or perhaps in the Seventy-eighth Congress—a bill was passed to do the very thing the distinguished Senator is asking for, namely, the payment of tuition in these particular or unusual cases. But that legislation was vetoed.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is in error.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not think I am.

Mr. McCARRAN. The legislation which was passed at that time was entirely different. It included many other items. With respect to this particular item, the President said at that time that he had no objection to it, and the President included this item in his budget request for the 1947–48 fiscal year.

When I said that I do not agree that there is no legislation, I meant to say that the Boulder Canyon Project Act, when enacted, contained provisions that it might be maintained and supervised by the Department of the Interior, and the act established Boulder City as the place from which it would be superintended.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator can make that interpretation, of course.

Mr. McCARRAN. How can it be contended there would not be a service population and families of those who would be employed on non-Government projects, and that the children who would be there should not be educated?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree that the Senator can read that interpretation into that act, but that does not alter the case that there was a legislative enactment which went to the President—President Truman—and he vetoed it. That measure authorized the very thing against which the House of Representatives is contending in this connection.

I should like to say to the distinguished Senator that all the Senate Members of the Senate conference committee did their level best to uphold the position of the Senator from Nevada. We did our level best to do it. However, the House was adamant, not only as to this item, but also as to the Coulee City item. I think there is some difference between the two, as the evidence shows. I agree with the Senator on that point.

I have kept the Senator advised as to the situation. This item involves $33,000 for tuition. The item for Coulee City was $26,000, as I recall.

The conferees on the part of the House took the position that there was no legislation authorizing it—I am stating what they said—and that the item had no place in an appropriation bill. We pointed out that it had been done since 1940; but that did not make any difference to the conferees on the part of the House. They said, "We are going to stop this thing, and we feel that the Senate should go along with us."

We argued over this item, as we argued over many other items in the Interior Department appropriation bill, and the conferees met time and time again.

I appeal to the Senator from Nevada to inquire of his own colleagues whether the Senate conferees continued to hold out, hoping that we could get the conferees on the part of the House to agree to the amendment the Senate wrote into the bill, based on the very evidence the distinguished Senator is presenting, and on which the Senate subcommittee and the Senate full committee agreed.

I asked unanimous consent for the consideration of the conference report because I knew there were many controversial items in the Interior Department appropriation bill. The Senator knows that we held 23 days of hearings, that the record runs over 3,300 pages, that in the Senate subcommittee and in the full committee there was no dispute, and that the Senate committee adopted the very amendment propounded by the Senator from Nevada; and then conferees were appointed, and the conferees for both Houses met.

I say to the distinguished Senator that I have been told by those connected with the Appropriations Committee that we held more conferences than the average conference committee holds, and we did everything in our power to retain the Senate amendment. I appeal to the Senator from Nevada that time is running out on these appropriation bills.

So far as I am concerned, I should be glad to have the Senate take a record vote for the Senator from Nevada, if he would like to have a yea-and-nay vote taken on the question of adopting the conference report. But if the matter is to be delayed much longer, I shall have to ask that the unanimous-consent request be set aside, and that the Senate proceed with the regular order, because I feel that we should not encroach further upon the time available for debate on Reorganization Plan No. 3.

So I appeal to my friend from Nevada, who knows that I did everything in my power to have the amendment the Senate adopted approved by the House conferees. I tell the Senator now that I am not in disagreement with his argument; but if there is any wonderment about our receding, I appeal to the Senator that it is a wonderment that we got together on as many items as we did.

Now the time is here either to approve or disapprove the conference report. On behalf of all the conferees, because the report was unanimously agreed to, I appeal to the Senator's sense of fair play and his good judgment to let us proceed and have a vote on the conference report.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Nebraska that this matter is a very personal one with me. I have been a member of the committee ever since I have been a Member of the Senate, and I have made the population of Boulder City my particular pet, because they had no one to sponsor their requests, and their children have to be looked out for in the way of education. I do not want 400 children, the children of men who are employed by the Federal Government, to be without education during the coming year, which is exactly what will result if the conference report is agreed to as submitted. I do not want that item to be left out of the bill; and yet I am mindful of the appeal which has been made by my good friend the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to say to the Senator from Nevada that as one member of the Senate committee on the Interior Department appropriation bill, I was very deeply impressed by the argument he made in the committee for this item. As I remember the facts, the power rates which are charged there are sufficiently high to carry the expense of this item which he is seeking to obtain. Am I correct about that?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In other words, when the charges were fixed upon the power they were fixed for the purpose of making it possible to carry out this program?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Moreover, the families of the children for whose education the Senator is so solicitous are living in homes to which they cannot obtain title.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Therefore, taxation cannot be levied to sustain their education, or to raise any fund for education.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say at that point that the rental charged for the use of the houses and for the use of space within Boulder City also covers an item that goes into education.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to say to the Senator from Nevada and to the Senator from Nebraska that I feel that this item might have received a greater amount of discussion in the conference than it did receive, although I know the Senator from Nebraska held out to the very end in favor of the amendment.

I am now desirous of making a suggestion to the Senator from Nebraska and to the Senator from Nevada. There is a supplemental appropriation bill now pending in the Committee on Appropriations. I suggest to the Senator from Nevada that he offer as an amendment to the supplemental bill the amendment which he offered to the Interior Department appropriation bill. I shall be very glad to support such an amendment in connection with the supplemental bill, and I am sure the Senator from Nebraska would be willing to support it.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will yield, the full committee will meet to consider the supplemental appropriation bill at 10 a. m. tomorrow, and inasmuch as I personally have supported the amendment prior to this time I have no objection to doing what the Senator from Wyoming suggests. The Senator from Wyoming well knows that the House was adamant in its attitude on the two provisions, one relating to the Mason City tuition and the one we are discussing. I shall be very glad indeed to join with the Senator from Nevada in supporting the amendment. I cannot guarantee that it will be agreed to, but I shall be glad to support it. I did support it in connection with the bill we are now considering. As I said before, I do not care to argue against my very good friend from Nevada, because we have already supported the amendment. I think the solution offered by the Senator from Wyoming is a way out, and I shall be glad to join the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. President, I agreed that at 1 o'clock or thereabouts, if consideration of the pending report were not concluded, I would ask for the regular order. I appeal to the Senator from Nevada once again to accept the suggestion of the junior Senator from Wyoming and permit us to act on the report. I shall deeply appreciate it if he can see his way clear to do that.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am mindful of the situation that exists in the Senate and the desire to conclude the session. I shall adopt the suggestion which has been made. I think perhaps it is the better course, because to send the entire conference report back to the conferees—and that is all we could do if we did not agree to it—might not be fruitful of beneficial results.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall accept the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Wyoming, and I shall appeal to the full committee having the supplemental appropriation bill before it to insert this item by way of an amendment.

I am grateful to the Senators for their courtesy in connection with the matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on certain Senate amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 3123, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
July 21, 1947.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 17, 34, 41, 68, 85, 101, 105, 114, 124, 130, 151, and 152 to the bill (H. R. 3123) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 15, at the end of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out "$324,730" and insert "$275,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out "$6,000,000" and insert "$4,935,500."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: ": *Provided further*, That interest heretofore collected by Bonneville Power Administration from sales of electric energy generated at Grand Coulee Dam on the unamortized balance of investment allocated to power in Grand Coulee Dam shall be covered into the reclamation fund forthwith: *Provided further*, That said interest shall not be allocated during the fiscal year 1948."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert: "except for the Alamo Band of the Puertocito Indians in the State of New Mexico and for the Rapid City Band of Sioux Indians in the State of South Dakota."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "$430,000" and insert: "$215,000":

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 12 of the said amendment, after the words "Reclamation in the", strike out the remainder of the line and all of line 13, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1947";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 171 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"The War and Navy Departments, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and the War Assets Administration are authorized to transfer to the Fish and Wildlife Service aircraft for replacement purposes only (but not necessarily of the same size or type or at the same locations), and such other equipment, materials, and supplies (with an appraised value of not to exceed $500,000), surplus to the needs of such agencies, as may be required by said Service, such transfers to be without charge therefor; and in addition the Navy Department, the Coast Guard, and the Maritime Commission are authorized to transfer without charge therefor vessels for replacement purposes only (but not necessarily of the same size or type or at the same locations) marine engines, parts and accessories surplus to the needs of such agencies: *Provided*, That the authorization in this paragraph shall not be construed to deny to veterans the priority accorded to them in obtaining surplus property under Public Law 375, approved May 3, 1946."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 176 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 8. Notwithstanding the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946, no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used, transferred or allocated for the expenses or salaries of any regional, field or other office or committee to perform any function of the Bureau of Land Management, or for the transfer or removal of any functions or duties of the said Bureau out of the District of Columbia, unless specific approval therefor has been given by the Congress prior to the establishment of such office or committee or prior to such transfer or removal."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 177 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out "8" and insert "9."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 179 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 11. Not to exceed a total of $1,000,000 of the appropriations contained in this Act shall be available for expenditure for the compensation of employees engaged in personnel work: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees will be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more on personnel administration consisting of recruitment and appointments, placement, position classification, training, and employee relations."

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 16, 18, 39, 78, 104, 171, 177, and 179.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, before the Senate takes final action on the bill, I wish to commend the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who was chairman of the subcommittee and has been serving on the conference committee, for having performed a very diffi-

cult task in working out a bill which as nearly as possible meet desires of the Senate. Of course, there must be give and take in conference committees.

I wish to say at this point, prior to final action, that in the State of California we are deeply grateful for the action taken in regard to the great Central Valley project. That has been a multiple-purpose project, for flood control, for irrigation, and for the development of power resources.

One of the problems which the Senator from Nebraska had to handle was the matter of the transmission lines, which have always been a part of the Central Valley project. Some years ago we started to build a transmission line down the east side of the Sacramento Valley from Shasta Dam to the Delta region, where a substantial amount of the power will be used to pump irrigation water so that it can go into the San Joaquin Valley, where it is desperately needed.

There has always been a desire on the part of the people of California, as represented by their own votes, by the action of their State legislature, and by the action of their Governors, past and present, as well as an overwhelming desire on the part of the Members of the House of Representatives and both United States Senators from California, to have this project completed at the earliest possible data. It includes not only the building of the east side transmission line but the west side transmission line, as well.

The able Senator from Nebraska was not able to get as much in the way of funds as the Senate provided, which was $2,160,000, to build the line down the west side to a point opposite the Shasta substation. Under the conference report this feature of the project gets only $1,500,000. This will at least permit the beginning of the construction of the west side line. The amount provided by the Senate provided for construction down to a point opposite the Shasta substation.

I thank the able Senator from Nebraska for his efforts.

Mr. President, I ask that in connection with my remarks there be printed in the RECORD a letter regarding the initial cost of this transmission line from Mr. H. P. McPhail to the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D. C., July 16, 1947.

To: Commissioner.
From: Director, Branch of Power Utilization.
Subject: Break-down of costs on Shasta transmission line.

In accordance with your request, the following is the break-down of the estimated cost of a double-circuit, 230,000-volt transmission line from the Shasta power plant to the Shasta substation of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. as contemplated in the $2,160,000 item included in the Senate committee report on the Interior appropriation bill for fiscal year 1948, reading as follows:

"West side line, Shasta to Delta, 230-kilovolt, to a point opposite and connecting with Shasta substation."

Break-down of estimated cost

Surveys and designs (covering necessary field surveys and office designs)	$65,000
Right-of-way (involving necessary width for double-circuit line through lands partially cultivated and partially requiring clearing of timber and underbrush)	50,000
Steel towers (involving one major river crossing and an average number of towers of about 6 per mile)	325,000
Conductors and fittings (including necessary clamps, armor rods, and splices; conductors will probably be 795,000 circular mill aluminum cable steel reinforced or copper equivalent)	495,000
Overhead ground wires required for lightning protection	200,000
Insulators and hardware	125,000
Metering equipment for measuring output of each line at Shasta substation	50,000
Labor for erection of transmission line and installation of equipment, including transportation	$650,000
Temporary connections at Shasta substation for controlling delivery of power and protection of apparatus	200,000
Total	2,160,000

The length of each circuit involved in the above estimate is approximately 32 miles.

H. P. MCPHAIL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 176 with amendments, as follows:

In line 6 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "Management", insert "now being performed in the District of Columbia", and in line 7 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "Bureau", insert "including tract books heretofore held and administered in the District of Columbia."

I ask the distinguished Senator from Wyoming if he will explain the two amendments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the purpose of the first amendment, which was originally attached to the bill in the House of Representatives, was to prevent the Department of the Interior from transferring from the District of Columbia functions of the Department of the Interior heretofore performed in the District. There was a proposal to set up certain regional offices and to establish committees affecting the activities of two or more bureaus, which the House of Representatives felt was going beyond the objectives which had the approval of the House.

The Senate struck that amendment out. The substitute amendment which was presented to the House yesterday by the House conferees was a little broader than was intended either by the House conferees or the Senate conferees, and the amendments which are now before the Senate are designed to effectuate the purpose of both the Senate and the House conferees, which is that within the Bureau of Land Management no functions which have not alreday been performed outside the District of Columbia shall now be transferred beyond the District, and particularly that the administration of the tract books, which have been traditionally administered in the Department of the Interior here, shall continue to be handled here.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, at this place in the RECORD, for the information of Members of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to insert a table prepared by the Senate Appropriations Committee, which shows the budget estimate for 1948, the amount allowed by the House, the amount allowed by the Senate, and the bill as agreed upon by the conferees.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Interior Department appropriation bill, 1948

Activity	Budget estimate, 1948	Allowed by House	Allowed by Senate	Bill as agreed to in conference
Secretary's office	$6,286,500	$3,424,000	$4,313,076	$4,063,346
Commission of Fine Arts	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000
Bonneville Power Administration	20,278,000	6,907,800	[1] 16,222,400	[2] 8,596,400
Southwestern Power Administration	3,925,000	1,371,000	125,000	[3] 125,000
Bureau of Land Management	5,007,800	3,619,500	4,078,440	4,035,440
Bureau of Indian Affairs	45,224,520	33,122,133	37,579,100	36,748,230
Bureau of Reclamation	145,952,200	67,892,600	[4] 104,730,532	[5] 93,367,038
Geological Survey	18,104,500	9,113,230	10,256,340	10,091,340
Bureau of Mines	16,834,000	10,533,875	12,426,850	12,035,800
National Park Service	14,555,500	10,304,655	10,168,455	10,018,055
Fish and Wildlife Service	10,338,300	6,110,320	6,615,760	6,492,810
Territories	[6] 9,616,700	[6] 9,002,400	[6] 9,002,400	[6] 9,002,400
Total	296,135,420	161,413,513	215,530,353	194,587,859

[1] Together with contract authorization of $6,000,000.
[2] Together with contract authorization of $4,935,500.
[3] On construction, 1947 funds continued available.
[4] Together with contract authorization of $4,930,000.
[5] Together with contract authorization of $215,000.
[6] Together with contract authorization of $15,000,000 for "The Alaska Railroad."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska will yield, I should like to add another word with respect to the table. The budget estimates as submitted by the President amounted to $296,135,420. The bill, as it passed the House, carried provisions amounting to $161,413,513. The bill in that form would have materially curtailed the functioning of the Department of the Interior; it would have hampered the work of the Geological Survey; it would have hampered the work of the Bureau of Mines; and it would have seriously hampered the work of the Bureau of Reclamation. It would have cut down the program followed for many years in the expansion of the multiple-purpose projects in the West.

The amount allowed by the Senate was considerably in excess, of course, of that allowed by the House. In conference, the Senate conferees were compelled to agree to certain curtailments, but the bill as agreed to in conference amounts to $194,587,859, as compared with $161,413,513 allowed by the House.

There were, however, several provisions, particularly those contained in the report, which make it clear that it is not the intention of the Congress, as the conference report is approved, to curtail the work of the Bureau of Mines, now engaged in developing the mineral resources of the West, and, for that matter, of the entire country.

I feel that there has been a substantial gain in the preservation of the public interest in the bill as it has been presented by the conference committee. I join with the Senator from California in expressing my gratification for the diligent, and I may say the combative, manner in which the Senator from Nebraska sustained the amendments of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator for his words of commendation, and also the Senator from California. I may add that after 23 days of hearings, and after the days and nights of conferences, I thank the Members not only of the Senate but of the House for coming together on a highly controversial bill. It shows what can be done if the effort is made.

I desire also to speak a word of tribute for those who, perhaps, seldom receive it. I think a debt of gratitude is owed to the clerks of the Appropriations Committee, as well as other clerks and research workers, who served in connection with this bill, for their untiring efforts, night after night, as late as 11 and 12 o'clock, all day Saturday, and, if I may say so, even on some Sundays. They prepared statistics and tables and reports. Multiple reports were at our fingers' tips at a moment's notice. I, for one, would like to express my gratitude to those who served us so well, and who are so seldom mentioned in public in connection with the efforts they put forth.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3 OF 1947

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (H. Con. Res. 51) that the Congress does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. 3 of May 27, 1947, transmitted to Congress by the President on the 27th of May 1947.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Is Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947 now before the Senate, and does the 4-hour time limit begin to run from this time?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct. The pending business is House Concurrent Resolution 51, reading as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Congress does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. 3 of May 27, 1947, transmitted to Congress by the President on the 27th day of May 1947.

The 4 hours' allotment of time, to be divided equally, starts at 1:15.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] control the time for the resolution, instead of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made. The time from now on will have to be granted either by the Senator from Washington or the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from New Mexico for that purpose?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Overton
Bridges	Holland	Pepper
Brooks	Ives	Reed
Buck	Jenner	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kem	Saltonstall
Cain	Kilgore	Smith
Capehart	Knowland	Sparkman
Capper	Langer	Stewart
Chavez	Lodge	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Cooper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Downey	McFarland	Tydings
Dworshak	McGrath	Umstead
Eastland	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ecton	McMahon	Watkins
Ellender	Magnuson	Wherry
Ferguson	Malone	White
Flanders	Martin	Wiley
Fulbright	Maybank	Williams
George	Millikin	Wilson
Green	Moore	Young
Gurney	Morse	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. FLANDERS obtained the floor.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to submit a conference report?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on the District of Columbia appropriations bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The division of time under the pending agreement will be suspended for the moment while the Senate considers the conference report submitted by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], which will be read.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4106) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 7, 12, 15, 18, 21, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, and 37.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 13, 14, 16, 19, and 23; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$388,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "183,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$128,377"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$87,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That no part of these funds shall be expended for the care of children the income of whose parents, parent, or guardian exceeds $2,600 per annum"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$2,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 22, 27, and 34.

HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
HARRY P. CAIN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
PAT MCCARRAN,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

WALT HORAN,
KARL STEFAN,
RALPH E. CHURCH,
LOWELL STOCKMAN,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 4106, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
July 22, 1947.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22 to the bill (H. R. 4106) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 2. Vouchers in payment of obligations incurred by the Health Department and Public Welfare pursuant to the appropriations contained in this act shall be certified as lawfully payable in the department, board, or office responsible for the incurring of the obligations; thereafter the vouchers shall be audited before payment by or under the jurisdiction only of the Auditor for the District of Columbia and the vouchers as approved may be paid by checks issued by the Disbursing officer without countersignature."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "8" and insert "2."

Mr. DWORSHAK. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 27 and 34.

The motion was agreed to.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3 OF 1947

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (H. Con. Res. 51) that the Congress does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. 3 of May 27, 1947, transmitted to Congress by the President on the 27th of May 1947.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I am submitting on behalf of the Committee on Banking and Currency, its report recommending that House Concurrent Resolution 51 be disapproved. This is the resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947 which would establish a Housing and Home Finance Agency. In effect, the committee's unfavorable report with respect to this resolution represents approval by the committee of the President's plan.

Reorganization Plan No. 3 would bring together into a single establishment all of the housing agencies, and the principal housing functions of the Federal Government. These functions would be administered through three constituent operating agencies, the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Public Housing Administration. The Housing and Home Finance Agency would be headed by an Administrator responsible for the general supervision and coordination of the functions and activities of these three constituent operating agencies. The plan does not disturb the basic permanent pattern established hitherto by the Congress involving the three major operating units in the housing field, but it does provide for the general supervision and coordination of the activities and functions of these units in a single agency.

It may be noted that the report of the committee is based not only upon the hearings and investigations made with respect to this plan but also upon the basis of the exhaustive investigations and studies made over the past 3½ years by various committees of the Senate, starting with the Postwar Housing Committee, of which the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] was chairman. It is worth noting that the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, in emphasizing the need, as a matter of economy and efficiency, for reorganization and coordination of the multiplicity of Government units engaged in identical fields of Government activity, has cited housing as a prime example where need for reorganization and coordination is obvious.

Essentially, the basic problem involved is the matter of reconciling, on the one hand, the need for over-all coordination of the Government's activities in housing and for a central line of responsibility and accountability for carrying out the housing policies established by the Congress, and on the other hand for preserving the individual identity and the full operating responsibility of the various agencies in which the Government has vested the various Federal functions and activties relating to housing. It is my considered opinion that Reorganization Plan No. 3, more than any other plan that has been presented to the Congress for consideration thus far, strikes the necessary happy medium in this connection and effectively meets both needs.

An organization and coordination of the housing functions and activities of the Federal Government along the lines provided in the plan are clearly necessary both as a matter of sound Government administration generally, and also from the point of view of the special needs of housing which represents one of our most pressing domestic problems today.

There have been many loose charges with respect to this plan. These are answered effectively, I believe, in the report to the committee. I wish to say now, however, that they were carefully examined and that they were found to be without real foundation and based in large part upon erroneous interpretations of the provisions of the plan.

Mr. President, I wish to say that personally I arrived in this august body on January 3 with the long-time thought in mind that housing was one of the activities of the Federal Government that needed coordination. During the decade or so previous to the opening session of the present Congress so many times and in such exasperating ways did I encounter lack of coordination that it was inconceivable to me, and still remains inconceivable, that this body should want to go back, as we may if Reorganization Plan No. 3 is not adopted, to the period of lack of cooperation and lack of coordination.

If there were time and if it were more germane to the subject under discussion, I could tell of the exasperating experiences in obtaining war housing for the town in Vermont where I was formerly in business. It was silly; it was exasperating; it was unbelievable. Coordination is badly needed.

The present arrangement under which the various housing agencies are operating will continue until the Congress ends the war powers. It may—and presumably will—do so early in the next session of the Congress. Should that action be taken, immediately the entire housing situation would fall into the disorganization which has been so characteristic of it for many years. Mr. President, I feel very strongly that that danger should be obviated, and that we should not be faced with the possibility, nor should the various governmental bodies concerned with housing live in constant fear that that may take place.

I wish to say a word or two as to the improvement in the present housing organization contemplated in Reorganization Plan No. 3. There are two important improvements—perhaps three. One of the most important is the change in the functions of the Administrator, who is placed at the head of the whole group of activities.

Under the Reorganization Act of 1942 he was an Administrator who had under him the direction and supervision of all the activities related to housing which were contemplated in the plan. That has not been found the proper way to do it, and a great deal of difficulty has arisen therefrom. So under Reorganization Plan No. 3, with the activities quite similarly grouped, the present assignment given to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is the responsibility for general supervision and coordination of the functions of the three constituent agencies. Each of them retains its authority and its administrative field. However, the Administrator himself is given the useful and necessary task of general supervision and coordination.

The second element in plan No. 3 which is of interest is the creation of a National

Housing Council which is to be advisory to the Administrator. This Council would be composed of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator as chairman, the Federal Housing Commissioner, the Public Housing Commissioner, the Chairman of the Home Loan Bank Board, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs or his designee, the chairman of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or his designee, and the Secretary of Agriculture or his designee.

Another important change is in making the Home Loan Bank Board a three-member board to take the place of the Commissioner of the Home Loan Bank Administration. All these changes have been drawn from experience in administration and will work for the better administration of this very important area activity in our Federal administration.

Mr. President, there are at least two groups, possibly more, either in being or contemplated, which now are concerned, or in the future will be concerned, with the general question of the Federal administration so far as it relates to housing. One of them is the group appointed under the resolution offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I do not remember its name, but the resolution provided for the establishment of a Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. It is a very distinguished body. I see on it the names of a number of Senators for whom I have high respect. I see the names of some private citizens who have the respect of all of us. I have no doubt whatever that from the deliberations of that board on the executive branch study there will evolve fruitful conclusions which we shall want to put into law.

Mr. President, it would be most unfortunate if, while an investigation of this sort were going on, we suffered a temporary disorganization of the housing group by failing to maintain and improve the establishment in the manner contemplated in plan No. 3. It would be a most embarrassing, a most inefficient, and a thoroughly undesirable way to occupy ourselves, or to require the housing bodies to occupy themselves, during the interim between this time and the time when the board makes a report on the subject under discussion. The less we do in the way of reorganizing, disorganizing, and upsetting the housing establishment, the better we shall serve our country.

A somewhat similar situation exists with regard to a resolution proposing a study of the entire housing situation, which has been submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] and with which I am in thorough sympathy. That resolution also calls for a study of the Government's activities relating to housing. But it would be most unfortunate if radical suggestions for improvement were made and eventually accepted, if we, in the meantime, should allow the present relationship between the housing bodies to fall into chaos instead of improving them and tightening them as the President's Plan No. 3 contemplates.

Mr. President, for those reasons I feel convinced that this body will make a mistake if it concurs in the resolution sent over by the House, House Concurrent Resolution 51, and I ask the Senate to vote not to concur therein.

I yield the floor to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. TAFT. For how many minutes?

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana how much time he desires.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think I shall take 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not know that I can add much more for the information of the Senate regarding the plan than what has been given by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, except to go a little more into detail regarding the confused condition in the housing field that existed prior to February 1942, when Executive Order 9070 was put into effect.

It will be recalled that prior to that time a number of resolutions were introduced in this body suggesting that a thorough study be made of the housing agencies in general, with the view of consolidating them. They were then scattered over the lot, as it were, in various branches of our Government. At that time, as I recall, there were from 17 to 20 agencies which dealt in one way or another with housing, and each of those agencies was headed by some kind of an administrator who was adequately staffed. Some of them were administered through a board. There was little effort made by any of these agencies to cooperate with each other. Under title I of the First War Powers Act, which was passed in 1941, the President issued Executive Order No. 9070 and consolidated all of these housing agencies into the National Housing Agency, which is headed by an Administrator. Since that time all of the various housing functions have been administered by the Administrator of the National Housing Agency. Under his supervision and direction there has been a decided improvement in the housing field. There has existed a more unified spirit to do a good job with the tools at hand, and much duplication has been eliminated. With less duplication of effort there has been quite a saving to the Government.

In 1942 there were, as I have just indicated, 18 separate agencies concerned with housing. They are outlined on a chart which I have here. I shall not take the time to discuss the functions of all of them. According to this chart, with respect to the functions which were not related to World War II, defense and war activities, there were the following divisions:

First, the Federal Loan Agency, under which, in turn, there were four subdivisions: (a) The Federal Housing Administration, which had charge, under title I, of home modernization and improvement loan insurance, and, under title II, of home and rental housing mortgage loan insurance programs;

(b) The Federal Home Loan Bank Board, which supervised (1) the Home Loan Bank System and (2) the system of the Federal Savings and Loan Association;

(c) The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, which insures shareholders' accounts in savings and loan associations; and

(d) The Home Owners' Loan Corporation program, which I am certain is familiar to all of you.

Second, the Federal Works Agency, which, in turn, had several constituent agencies: (a) The United States Housing Authority, with its low-cost rental housing program; and

(b) The United States Housing Corporation, which was in process of liquidating its World War I housing program.

On top of that, we had another main subdivision:

Third, the Farm Security Administration, which had under its jurisdiction the subsistence homesteads and suburban resettlements. Under that program we had, for example, the Greenbelt project, which is just outside of Washington, and which has been in the news on many occasions in recent months. The comments as to its operations were most favorable. Similar projects for families of low and moderate incomes, for nonfarm families have been developed in various parts of the country. That program was created back in the early days of the New Deal, and many of the houses were built under the so-called Tugwell plan. This program also included projects owned by homestead associations on which the Government held mortgages.

Then there was a "fourth" main division, namely, the Central Housing Committee, which was an interdepartmental committee set up by Presidential order to coordinate by voluntary cooperation work of governmental agencies in the field of housing.

Then there were the defense and war housing programs, which were divided among the following agencies: First. The Federal Loan Agency, which included, in turn:

(a) The FHA with its title VI program of mortgage insurance on defense and war housing; (b) The Defense Homes Corporation, which was established as a subsidiary of the RFC, to provide needed war housing by public financing.

Second. The Federal Works Agency, to which were assigned the Lanham Act and various temporary defense housing programs, which in turn were assigned for administration to the United States Housing Authority, the Public Buildings Administration, the Division of Defense Housing, and the Mutual Ownership Defense Housing Division, within the Agency itself, and to the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Farm Security Administration, outside of the Agency.

Third. The War Department, which had defense housing assignments in addition to the Federal Works Agency.

Fourth. The Navy Department, which also had defense housing assignments in addition to Federal Works Agency assignments.

Fifth. The Farm Security Administration, which had defense housing assignments in addition to Federal Works Agency assignments.

Sixth. Coordinator of Defense Housing, which office was established as a result of the scattering of defense and war housing functions, to make findings of need with respect to defense and war housing and to coordinate defense housing.

All the various agencies which I have just been discussing were scattered all over Washington. When the President issued his order in 1942, three constituent agencies were created to deal with all the housing functions heretofore administered by all of the agencies just named. They were: One, Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, which was under the supervision of a commissioner. All of the functions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Home Loan Bank System, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and the United States Housing Corporation were transferred to that Commissioner; two, Federal Housing Administration. It is presently headed by a commissioner who has charge of all the functions of Federal Housing Administration; three, Federal Public Housing Authority, also under the direction of a commissioner. The third constituent agency, headed by a commissioner, performs all the functions and duties imposed on the United States Housing Authority, the Defense Homes Corporation, the nonfarm public housing of Farm Security Administration, and the Defense Public Housing, except that located on Army and Navy reservations.

So that by the executive order heretofore described, the President created the National Housing Agency and designated an administrator who had charge of all housing agencies. The Administrator, in turn, had under his authority, three constituent agencies, which, as I have said, were known as the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Federal Public Housing Authority, each headed by a commissioner. Today that is the arrangement under which housing as a whole is being administered and it can readily be seen that by having all of the housing agencies responsible to one head, much time is saved, much effort is preserved and a better chance of coordinating all housing activities is made possible.

The National Housing Administrator has direction and supervision of all these various agencies, as I have indicated. In other words, he is some kind of over-all boss.

It will be recalled that last year the President sent to Congress a reorganization plan which, in effect, made the National Housing Agency a permanent agency. Under that plan, which was voted down by the Senate, the Administrator was clothed with full power of direction and control of the entire set-up which now is under the National Housing Agency. Not only was he empowered to control and supervise, but he could tell the administrators of those various agencies what to do.

The plan was strenuously objected to by many Members of the Congress. The plan was also opposed, although not openly, by some of the heads of the constituent agencies named above. The plan placed too much power in one person. The plan had the effect of giving complete control to an Administrator over all the housing agencies now created by law.

The reorganization plan now before us is much milder. It simply gives to the Administrator general supervision and coordination of the various housing agencies now under the control of the National Housing Agency. The commissioners of each of the constituent agencies will have the same power that they had prior to the issuance of the Executive order which the President issued in 1942. In the case of the Federal home loan bank, a board of three is created. I feel that unless this plan is adopted the whole housing function of the Government will revert to the confusion which existed prior to 1942.

It must be remembered that the National Housing Agency goes out of existence 6 months after the President, or the Congress by resolution, declares the war over. The President could send us another plan if this one is defeated. Under the Reorganization Act he has until April 1, 1948, to send another plan, but why not pass the one under consideration. Surely he cannot improve on the plan unless he removes the power of supervision and coordination from the Administrator, both of which are so essential to any proposed plan.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. There is no Member of the Senate who has devoted more time or effort to the matter of housing than has the Senator from Louisiana. He has been most diligent in this matter, particularly in doing all he could to encourage the construction of more housing and more homes.

Can the Senator from Louisiana tell us how many different agencies, bureaus, or departments were handling some phase of housing or some matter related to housing before 1942?

Mr. ELLENDER. Eighteen.

Mr. HILL. Eighteen different ones?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. HILL. They were scattered all over Washington, were they?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; and each was headed by a separate administration, and there was little effort on the part of the various heads of those agencies to coordinate or cooperate with each other. It seems that all of them were vying with each other for power and to retain their own little organization to itself, without in any manner attempting to cooperate one with another. That is what gave rise, as I indicated a while ago, to the creation of the National Housing Agency, which placed all housing activities of the Government under one administrator, with full power to supervise and coordinate all housing functions.

Mr. HILL. What we would have now would be this one administrator; is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. HILL. He would be clothed with the power and authority to coordinate and bring together, insofar as possible, the operations and functions of the different agencies which have jurisdiction over housing; is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is exactly correct.

As I indicated a while ago, let us bear in mind that the administrator, under Reorganization Plan No. 3, would not have as much power as the Administrator of the National Housing Authority now has.

As I indicated a while ago, the Administrator of the National Housing Agency, the agency which now has charge of all housing, has the direction and the control of all these various agencies. In other words, he is the big boss, and he can tell the administrators under him what to do. But Reorganization Plan No. 3, as I have said, merely gives him the authority to supervise generally the work of all the various agencies, and to coordinate their efforts. Each of the constituent agencies retains such power as it now has under the law. That is about the sum and substance of what Reorganization Plan No. 3 does.

Mr. HILL. In other words, subject to this over-all authority to bring about coordination, the heads of the different housing agencies still retain their power and these units are what we might call autonomous.

Mr. ELLENDER. Exactly; and they get their authority from the laws under which they were created. They are referred to as constituent agencies, but all their authority is spelled out in the law creating them, as I have just indicated. The only authority that the Administrator of the new set-up, created and known as the Housing and Home Finance Agency, will have over the commissioners and the directors of the constituent agencies is general supervision and power to coordinate their work. That is about the sum and substance of his power.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator knows, there is no charge hurled against the Government more than that there are so many different agencies, scattered all over Washington, handling one subject. If there is any one thing which should be done it is the very thing the Senator is trying to do here today, to coordinate these agencies, bring them together, and, insofar as possible, coordinate their activities into one effort. Is that not true?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is exactly what the plan seeks to do. Let me repeat to Senators that the reason why this is necessary is that either Congress or the President may declare the war ended, and within 6 months thereafter the agencies which existed prior to 1942 would be revived and would have control over all the housing functions of our Government. In other words, we would have a reversion to the chaos which existed prior to 1942.

As I have just indicated, the power to issue Executive Order 9070 was given to the President by virtue of title I of the First War Powers Act that was passed in 1941. This authority would expire 6 months after it was declared, either by the Congress or the President, that the war was at an end.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does what the Senator just said mean that the reorganization plan is making permanent some agency which otherwise would lapse; that is, some temporary agency?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; the National Housing Agency would go out of existence. The plan seeks to create a substitute therefor, and consolidate the functions of many of the agencies which are now operating under Executive Order 9070, and thereby extinguish many of them, as it were.

The Senator will recall that under date of June 30, Congress by Public Law 183 abolished the Federal Loan Agency. In view of such abolition, the Federal Housing Administration, with its permanent home and rental housing insurance programs, and its temporary veterans' home and rental housing loan insurance program would become an independent agency. Likewise the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, together with the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, would become independent. The Defense Corporation, which is now in process of liquidation, would be transferred from the FPHA to the RFC.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is not the Home Owners' Loan Corporation in liquidation also?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is still in liquidation. It would become an independent agency and there is no need for permitting such to happen. Its liquidation is now in the hands of competent people who have been handling the matter since 1942, and it would be extreme folly to have it revert as an independent agency. All such matters are now being handled under one head and I ask, why scatter them all over the lot, as was the case prior to 1942? That is some of the things that would happen if the reorganization plan were not agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Louisiana to the fact that his time has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. May I have 10 minutes more?

Mr. FLANDERS. The Senator from Louisiana may have 10 minutes more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is yielded 10 more minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate to go into details as to what the situation would be when Executive Order 9070 expires, but I ask consent to place in the RECORD, following my remarks, a short statement and two charts, which indicates how all these agencies would revert back to their former status if the reorganization plan were not agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I also ask that a brief description of the agencies and functions being consolidated into Housing and Home Finance Agency by Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947 be incorporated following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish I had the time to go into details about this matter, but I have not.

I ask also that there be incorporated in the RECORD a letter addressed to me, signed by the president of the National Savings and Loan League, which, by the way, is in favor of the pending plan, and which was violently opposed to the Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1946, which pertained to housing. The reason assigned by them then was that the Administrator under the 1946 plan was given entirely too much power. I again say that the Congress at that time shared that view, and voted down plan No. 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words in regard to the savings to the Government which will accrue by virtue of this consolidation.

I should like to say that the lack of savings argued by some constitutes one of the more common arguments that have been advanced against Reorganization Plan No. 3. The allegation is made that the Plan would not effect savings and economies, and would thereby fail to meet the requirements of the Reorganization Act of 1945.

The report of the Committee on Banking and Currency shows that there is no basis whatsoever for this allegation. As aptly pointed out by the committee report, elaboration is hardly necessary to prove that without coordination of the housing functions and activities of the Government as provided in the reorganization plan, each agency would undertake its own independent general statistical studies, technical research, and similar matters. Each would duplicate these and other activities which are common to the programs of all of them, and which, as contemplated by the plan, could be done for all of them on a mutually satisfactory and much more economical basis, by a single central unit. This seems so obvious that there would seem to be little point in taking up time in discussing the matter.

But several factors have been used by certain groups opposing the plan in their attempts to confuse the issue, which I think ought to be specifically discussed and clarified.

One such contention that has been made is that the Reorganization Act requires that each reorganization plan involve a 25 percent reduction in administrative costs—the implication being that in connection with each plan there must be a positive demonstration of such a reduction. The simple fact is that there is no such requirement in the law, and this was specifically pointed out by the Committee on the Judiciary last year. The committee pointed out that the provisions in this regard was rewritten during the consideration of the Reorganization Act by the Congress so as to be applicable, not to any particular reorganization plan, but as an over-all expectation with respect to the aggregate of reorganizations proposed by the President under the act.

I make this point not because I think it constitutes a positive basis for the support of the plan, but because it indicates typically how the arguments that have been made against the plan are without foundation.

The opponents of the plan have further tried to create confusion on this issue of economy by trying to take advantage of the fact that many of the savings under the plan are not immediately obvious because of the existing consolidation of housing functions and agencies under Executive order. If we presently had, today, 18 housing agencies scattered throughout the executive establishment, we could readily take a loot at the reorganization plan and get a fairly good picture as to the savings it would bring about. I do not think that under those circumstances 25 percent is at all an extravagant figure as to what might be involved in savings. But this situation no longer exists. It was eliminated by the temporary reorganization made necessary by the war and carried out under the war powers.

Does anyone seriously suppose that a major agency of government, which has been in continuous operation since 1942, could be unwound and scattered over a variety of different departments and establishments without serious disruption of the work, loss of efficiency, and totally unnecessary increased expense? Or does anyone seriously suppose that such a process of multiplication and subdivision could possibly fail to lead to duplication and overlapping of staffs, programs, and activities?

It is just as much a matter of economy and efficiency to prevent the dissipation of savings already accomplished as to effect new savings.

Some of the trade groups opposing the plan have gone even further in their attempts to confuse the picture on the issue of economy. They have attempted to find foundation for their argument that the plan fails to support economy, by pointing out, as certain witnesses did at the hearings on the plan, that the total administrative budget proposed for the National Housing Agency for the fiscal year 1948 somewhat exceeds that for 1947.

Careful examination of this argument shows it to be little better than frivolous. Let me show why:

The testimony of the opposition in this connection was that the 1948 budget submitted proposed an increase of $3,700,000 over the budget figures for 1947. Actually, if we take the figures laid before the House Appropriations Committee, we find that this supposed increase of more than $3,700,000 was in fact a proposed increase of only about $1,205,000.

But this is not the only interesting result of analyzing the figures a bit. What does this increase consist of? We find first of all that it is a net figure, the end result of certain increases and also certain decreases. What has decreased? The decrease is in the amounts provided, first, for over-all supervision and admin-

istration and, second, for the execution of the public housing program. These activities—the very ones which the opponents of the plan claim to fear—have been reduced by nearly $5,000,000. By contrast, the increases are in the budget items which provide for aids to private enterprise in the production and financing of housing. These items have been increased by about $6,000,000. It is therefore this increase of $6,000,000 for private housing aids, in contrast with the $5,000,000 decrease for over-all supervision and public housing activity, which is responsible for the $1,200,000 proposed increase in the budget.

Where does this leave the opponents? On the one hand, they come before the Banking and Currency Committee and oppose the plan on the ground that it is a mere scheme or subterfuge to promote public housing. Then, without batting an eye, they attack it on the ground that the budget for 1948 represents an increase, rather than a saving, and cite figures which, on analysis, prove to be reductions for public housing and increased amounts for assistance to private enterprise. Finally—and this, Senators, caps the climax—these same spokesmen then take their hats and brief cases and go down the hall to the Appropriations Committee, and there they ask that the reductions in the FHA budget which the House had recommended, be restored by the Senate, on the ground that the services are essential and valuable to private enterprise and should be continued without curtailment. Surely, this is arguing all sides of all questions.

Those who have served in this Chamber long enough to remember the good old days will think of another kind of economy which will be promoted under the plan. Before 1942, there was a housing agency to be found under almost every bush and shrub in Washington, as I have previously stated, and those of us who were unfortunate enough to have a question from a constituent or some other matter to be investigated were shunted about from office to office like a man trying to lodge a complaint in one of these big department stores. If we were fortunate enough to obtain answers, more often than not, we would come up not with one answer but with as many answers as there were agencies. It has been a very different story since the agencies have come under a single roof—and we ought to keep it that way.

In conclusion, I would summarize by saying that Reorganization Plan No. 3 consolidates agencies and functions according to major purpose. That was a purpose of the Reorganization Act. By so doing, it prevents a wasteful, inefficient scattering of related programs among many different agencies, and prevents overlapping, duplication, confusion, and lost motion which would inevitably result. It thus promotes economy and efficiency; and that, too, was a purpose of the Reorganization Act. It would consolidate existing agencies under a single head, and prevent the imposition on the Chief Executive of an unwarranted and burdensome administrative load. That was a further purpose of the Reorganization Act. In short, the plan seems to me moderate; based on experience; consistent with the conclusions of the Senate committees which have given the matter the most thorough study and consideration; and wholly in keeping with the intent and purpose of the legislation under which it is recommended. It should be approved and I ask each of you to vote nay when your name is called.

EXHIBIT 1

IV. SITUATION IF EXECUTIVE ORDER 9070 IS TERMINATED WITHOUT NEW REORGANIZATION

1. In view of the abolition of the Federal Loan Agency on June 30, 1947, by Public Law 132, Eightieth Congress (this is the act which extended the RFC), the Federal Housing Administration, with its permanent home and rental housing insurance programs, and its temporary veterans' home and rental housing loan insurance program, would become an independent agency.

2. Likewise, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, together with the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and the Federal Savings, and Loan Insurance Corporation, would become independent.

3. The Defense Homes Corporation—which is now in the process of final liquidation—would nevertheless be transferred from FPHA to RFC.

4. The United States Housing Authority, and its low-rent housing program, would be returned to the Federal Works Agency.

5. The United States Housing Corporation, which is in the final stages of dissolution, would be transferred back to the Federal Works Agency.

6. The management, and eventual removal or disposition, of defense and war housing, now consolidated under FPHA, would be scattered among the Federal Works Agency (and subsidiary units), the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Farm Security Administration.

7. The Lanham Act title V temporary reuse program for veterans would be transferred from FPHA to the Federal Works Agency.

8. The subsistence homestead projects and mortgages, and the Greenbelt towns, would go back to the Farm Security Administration.

9. The two coordinating agencies—the Central Housing Committee and the Coordinator of Defense Housing—would apparently not be revived. As already indicated, the Federal Loan Agency has been abolished, so that its coordinating functions would likewise remain abolished.

EXHIBIT 2

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF AGENCIES AND FUNCTIONS BEING CONSOLIDATED INTO HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY BY REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3 OF 1947

HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

1. Federal Home Loan Bank System

The bank system consists of 11 regional home-loan banks, chartered by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and operating under FHLBA supervision. Its function is to provide a reservoir of credit for the home-financing operations of bank members.

Membership in the system is open to federally and State-chartered savings and loan associations, insurance companies and savings banks. The great bulk of the actual membership consists of savings and loan associations (they comprised all but 37 of the 3,698 bank members as of early 1947). These member savings and loan associations have aggregate assets of $9,000,000,000, representing 90 percent of the assets of the entire savings and loan industry of the country. Member institutions have been making about one-third of the annual total of the nonfarm home-mortgage loans of the country.

The home-loan bank credit is made available to member institutions in the form of advances, for terms up to 10 years, on the security of home mortgages. (The banks do not engage in mortgage discount or purchase operations.) Short-term unsecured advances are made under certain conditions.

The banks obtain their funds for advances to member institutions from three basic sources:

1. Capital subscription: As of early 1947, their outstanding capital amounted to $209,000,000, of which $123,000,000 was provided by Treasury subscription and $86,000,000 by the member institutions;

2. Borrowings: These borrowings are through the issuance, to the general financing community (primarily banks and dealers), of consolidated debentures, notes, and bonds representing joint obligations of all the 11 banks;

3. Deposits of member institutions:

2. Federal Savings and Loan Associations

These associations represent a national system of thrift and home-financing institutions operating under Federal charter, regulation, and supervision. This system was established in 1933 to serve two basic purposes:

1. To provide sound thrift and home-mortgage lending facilities in communities lacking adequate savings and home-loan financing resources;

2. To develop under Federal charter a system of home-financing institutions operating under the best standards and practices evolved upon the basis of experience to date.

Accordingly, the system consists both of (1) newly created institutions, and (2) institutions which have been converted at their request from State to Federal charter.

The basic lending operations of these associations consists of first-mortgage loans upon homes and combination home and business properties. Most of these loans are made under the direct reduction plan of amortization.

Funds are derived from two main sources: (1) Share investments of association members—this is the primary source; and (2) borrowings from the home-loan banks. Each association is required to be a member of the Home Loan Bank System; to have its accounts insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation; and to be examined periodically by the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration.

As of early 1947, there were 1,471 federally chartered associations, with aggregate assets of nearly $5,000,000,000.

3. Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation

FSLIC insures accounts (up to $5,000) of shareholders of federally and State chartered savings and loan associations. The insurance provided is that in the event of default by an insured institution, the insured account holder has the option of either (1) a new insured account in another insured institution not in default, or (2) 10 percent of the amount insured in cash and the remainder in non-interest-bearing FSLIC debentures maturing within 3 years. (These debentures do not carry any Government guarantee. Government financial backing of FSLIC consists of a subscription by HOLC to the entire capital stock of FSLIC in the amount of $100,000,000.)

The insured institutions pay an annual premium charge of one-eighth of 1 percent of their shareholders' and creditor liabilities.

Approximately 2,500 federally and State chartered savings and loan associations participate in this program, involving 5,000,000 shareholders with $6,500,000,000 of share accounts under the insurance protection.

4. Home Owners' Loan Corporation

HOLC, from 1933 to 1936, refinanced the mortgages of more than 1,000,000 home owners. Since then its chief function has been

liquidation of its assets, including collection of the loans made in connection with these refinancing operations, and the sale of the houses that it has been forced to acquire by foreclosure (vendee accounts).

As of April 30, 1947, the HOLC had 364,000 mortgage loan and vendee accounts outstanding in the amount of $582,000,000 representing an 83-percent liquidation of its original total investment of $3,500,000,000 in loans and properties. As of that date also, the impairment of its capital stood at $65,000,000, as compared with a $134,000,000 deficit as of June 30, 1944. It is estimated that on the basis of the continuation of present economic conditions and the normal liquidation operations of HOLC, the impairment of its capital will be completely removed by fiscal year 1951. On this basis, HOLC should be able to return its entire original capital to the Treasury, instead of suffering the huge losses anticipated at the time it was established.

5. United States Housing Corporation

As a minor phase of Home Loan Bank Administration activities, Executive Order 9070, in establishing the National Housing Agency, placed in FHLBA the responsibility of supervising the final liquidation of the United States Housing Corporation which was created in 1918 for the purpose of housing workers in congested war-industry areas during World War I. At the time of the Executive order, the Corporation still held an interest in 445 houses (out of approximately 6,000 residential properties completed under its program). The liquidation job given FHLBA has involved primarily the task of clearing up litigation surrounding the remaining properties of the Corporation in order that they may be sold. This liquidation involves a minor expense covered by special authorization from the Congress.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

1. Title I—Home modernization and improvement program

Under its title I program, FHA insures loans made by financing institutions for home modernization and repair. Such loans may be secured or unsecured, may be up to $2,500 in amount, and up to 3 years in maturity. In practice, these loans have been generally character loans in small amounts averaging less than $450 each, with relatively short maturities, averaging approximately 30 months, and carrying a maximum financing charge to the borrower of 9.6 percent per annum (including the insurance premium charge). The great bulk of the loans have been for heating, painting, roofing, additions and alterations, and insulation, mostly on single-family dwellings.

The insurance protection is not with respect to individual loans, but with respect to the aggregate of the loans made under the contract between the financial institution and FHA and calls for FHA payment in cash of losses in an amount up to 10 percent of the aggregate amount of the loans made under the contract. Experience has shown that the participating institutions receive virtually a 100-percent guarantee against loans where reasonable credit judgment is exercised.

Commercial banks and finance companies have been the two primary types of institutions participating in this program.

Title I insurance operations, originally limited to loans made before April 1, 1936, are, as a result of various extensions, presently limited to loans made on or before June 30, 1949. Under this program, FHA may have outstanding at any time a total liability which, when added to the aggregate amount of all claims paid less income, does not exceed $165,000,000.

As of early 1947, more than 6,000,000 loans, aggregating approximately two and one-half billion dollars in amount, have been insured under this title, of which $355,000,000 was estimated to be outstanding.

2. Title II—Home and rental housing mortgage loan insurance

The title II program is FHA's permanent program of insurance on first-mortgage loans made for (1) home construction, purchase or refinancing, and (2) construction of rental projects. The insurance is with respect to individual loans, and essentially consists of payment of loss on unpaid principal, made in the form of FHA negotiable debentures guaranteed by the Government. (Payment of losses on interest and foreclosure costs is contingent upon adequate recovery on the loans or property by FHA.)

In the case of new construction for owner occupancy not exceeding $6,000 in valuation, FHA, under this program, insures 90-percent 25-year mortgages at an interest rate not exexceeding 4½ percent (exclusive of FHA's one-half-of-1-percent insurance-premium charge). On new homes for owner occupancy, where the valuation is between $6,000 and $10,000, FHA insures mortgages for 90 percent of the first $6,000 and 80 percent of the balance, with maturities not exceeding 20 years, and with a maximum 4½-percent interest rate (exclusive of the insurance premium). On other new homes, or on existing homes, FHA insures 80-percent 20-year mortgages. The maximum interest rate of 4½ percent and the one-half-of-1-percent insurance premium is applicable to this insurance also.

With respect to multiple-family rental projects, FHA insures individual loans up to $5,000,000 in amount and 80 percent of the estimated value of the property when the proposed improvements are completed. The maximum interest rate is 4 percent by regulation, plus a one-half-of-1-percent mortgage-insurance premium. There is no maximum maturity period prescribed by law, and in practice the term on most mortgages has been in the vicinity of 26 to 28 years.

There are no time limitations with respect to this program. Under this program, FHA may have outstanding at any time insurance on $4,000,000,000 in aggregate principal amount of home and rental housing mortgage loans, which limit the President is authorized to increase to $5,000,000,000.

Under this program, FHA has insured as of the end of 1946 over $5,000,000,000 in home mortgages, and $160,000,000 in rental project loans, of which $2,500,000,000 and $52,000,000, respectively, were outstanding as of the end of 1946. The home loans covered 630,000 new dwelling units, and 620,000 existing units; the rental housing loans, 43,000 units.

As indicated, premium charges are made, and the program is on a self-sustaining basis.

On the basis of prewar figures, FHA's insurance activities have come to cover about 30 percent of the annual total of new homes constructed, and over 20 percent of total home-mortgage financing. The bulk of the homes insured have been single-family, and many of the homes financed are in new subdivisions planned and developed from the beginning with the cooperation of FHA. About one-half of the financing on home mortgages under this program has been by commercial banks, with the remaining one-half divided among mortgage companies, insurance companies, savings and loan associations, and savings banks, in that order. Mortgage companies sell practically all the loans they finance. Insurance companies, in contrast, hold approximately one-third of the insured mortgages outstanding, as compared with 12 percent financed by them.

Two-thirds in amount of the insurance mortgages on rental projects are held by insurance companies, the other active institutions being commercial and savings banks.

3. Title VI—War and veterans' home and rental housing mortgage loan insurance

FHA's title VI program was originally undertaken as an emergency program in 1941 to provide needed housing for defense and war workers, and as such would have expired in 1946. Through the operations of this title, FHA was enabled to insure mortgages on homes and rental housing involving risks that were not considered appropriate under its permanent title II program, particularly from the point of view of economic soundness. The title VI program is also more liberal in various respects with respect to the mortgage terms (such as with respect to ratio of loans to value of the property, maximum maturity, etc.). Altogether a $1,800,000,000 program was authorized, under which over 300,000 home mortgages involving nearly 400,000 dwelling units were insured in an aggregate amount of about $1,600,000,000, and about 500 rental housing projects, with 37,000 dwelling units, in an aggregate amount of $162,000,000.

In 1946, in connection with the veterans' emergency housing program, this title was extended to make its liberalized terms available for veterans' housing. For this purpose, an additional billion dollar authorization was made available, which the President was authorized to increase by an additional billion dollars. (This authority has been exercised.) Under the Housing and Rent Control Act of 1947 just passed, the expiration date of this title is March 31, 1948.

PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

1. United States Housing Authority

The USHA program is the low-rent housing and slum clearance program authorized in 1937, involving Federal loan and subsidy aid to local public agencies to provide housing at rentals within the means of low-income slum-dwelling families.

Three forms of financial assistance were authorized under this program:

1. Loans fully repayable with interest, at terms not exceeding 60 years, to finance not more than 90 percent of the capital cost of the projects. Most loan contracts are at a 2½ percent interest rate. Under them FPHA has, on the average, been lending two-thirds of capital costs to be repaid over 50- to 60-year periods. (The remaining one-third has been raised by the sale of local public agency bonds to the general financing community.)

2. Annual contributions to reduce (together with required local contributions) rentals from the amount necessary to meet the annual expenses of the project to the amounts that the low-income tenants can afford to pay. These contributions are made each year on a pay-as-you-go basis to make possible the low-rent character of the project (thus permitting their reduction, as during the war, when income levels rise); are subject to the continuance of the low-rent character of the project; are limited to 60 years; may not exceed 1 percent above the going Federal rate of interest at the time of contract, applied against the cost of the project; and are subject to periodic reexamination as to amounts necessary. Under most contracts to date, the maximum annual contribution payable is 3 percent of project cost, and actual payments have averaged about 30 percent lower than the maximum provided in the contracts.

3. Capital grants, as an alternative method of assistance to annual contributions. The provisions with respect to these grants have been entirely dormant.

The statute requires local governmental contributions amounting to at least 20 percent of the Federal annual contribution, in the form of cash or tax remissions or exemptions. (All local contributions to date have been in the form of tax exemptions.) The statute also requires that the community eliminate unsafe or insanitary dwellings in the locality approximately equal in number to the number of new dwellings provided by the project being assisted ("equivalent elimination").

The program authorized under this program is $800,000,000 in capital loans and $23,000,000 in annual contributions. Substantially the entire annual contribution authorization (which is the limiting one) is under contract.

In 1940 the United States Housing Act was amended by Public Law 671, Seventy-sixth Congress, so as to authorize the use of these authorizations, and the projects provided thereunder, for housing defense and war workers during the period of emergency.

The figures with respect to incomes, rentals, and costs under this program are briefly as follows:

1. In 1945 the average rent charged families admitted to public housing was $22.59 a month, including all utilities, as compared with the average rent of $24.79 in substandard dwellings. Prior to the war, in 1940, the average rent charged families admitted to public housing was $17.95, in comparison with the average rent of $18.80 in substandard dwellings.

2. In 1945 the average money income of urban families in the lowest income third was $1,500 per year. The incomes of families admitted to public housing in 1945 averaged $1,259. In 1941 the income of families admitted to public housing averaged $873, as compared with the average income of $1,050 for families in the lowest income third. The average income of all families living in low-rent public housing in 1945 was $1,566, including the higher incomes of essential war workers admitted in furtherance of the war effort, and of families whose incomes since admission have risen to a point which now makes them ineligible. Despite the continuing difficulties of evicting these families, a program is now under way for the systematic removal of all ineligible tenants.

3. The total over-all cost per unit has averaged $4,649; this includes not only the cost of constructing dwellings but also the cost of land, old buildings purchased and torn down where slum sites were used, site improvements and utilities, movable equipment, and all other costs.

The entire program includes 799 projects with 216,000 dwelling units. These figures include (1) 154 projects, with 19,000 dwelling units, deferred because of the war, and (2) 50 former PWA projects, with 22,000 units, which were transferred to the USHA when the United States Housing Act was enacted. As of June 30, 1946, 126,000 unsafe and insanitary dwelling units had been eliminated under the "equivalent limitation" program.

2. Nonfarm public housing of Farm Security Administration

Executive Order 9070, establishing the National Housing Agency, transferred to the Federal Public Housing Authority all the nonfarm housing of the Farm Security Administration. These included the subsistence homesteads, and suburban resettlement (Greenbelt towns), projects developed by the Farm Security Administration for nonfarm families of low or moderate income. It also included projects owned by homestead associations on which the Government held mortgages.

The transfer involved 31 developed subsistence homestead projects, 3 Greenbelt towns, and 8 undeveloped projects. The 31 projects range from houses with subsistence garden plots to projects for stranded families in mining and timber areas where efforts were made to develop industrial, agricultural, and cooperative activities to help reestablish sources of income.

Of the 31 subsistence homestead projects, 16 were sold by Farm Security Administration before FPHA assumed jurisdiction, but the mortgages are being serviced by FPHA. (Four have now been paid off.) Several hundred homestead units on 5 other projects were also sold by Farm Security Administration. Of the remaining projects, there are only 2 with respect to which no disposition of units has been made by FPHA in its disposition program.

3. Defense Homes Corporation

DHC is a corporation established in aid of the war program by RFC to provide needed war housing, and like other public war-housing programs was transferred to FPHA by Executive Order 9070 in 1942. Under this program, 31 projects were initated in 13 States and the District of Columbia, of which 25 were completely developed, at an approximate cost of $92,000,000. Fifteen of the 25 projects have been sold, and the remainder are in the final stages of sale proceedings. Likewise, the 6 undeveloped projects have been sold or are in the process. It is anticipated that by 1948, all the affairs of DHC will have been wound up.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE ADMINISTRATOR

1. Lanham Act, Temporary Shelter Acts, and Public Law 781, war housing

Beginning with 1940, a series of statutes were passed to provide necessary war housing for defense and war workers which private industry was unable to provide. The basic statutes involved, originally passed as independent measures, are the Lanham Act, (Public Law 781, 76th Cong.), and the Temporary Shelter Acts (Public Law 9, 73, and 353, 77th Cong.).

Under Executive Order 9070, these various programs were all transferred to the National Housing Agency, and under various statutory enactments during the war, management and operations with respect to these various programs were consolidated to a basic extent. Under the procedures developed, operations have been carried out by FPHA, under the policy supervision of the National Housing Administrator.

Originally, housing of a permanent nature was constructed as part of the defense housing program, but with this country's entry into the war, the critical shortages of materials and manpower, the urgent need for speed and other wartime exigencies, transformed the program to one basically of temporary housing.

The present number of still active projects under NHA jurisdiction as a result of this program amounts to 1,566, with approximately 426,000 dwelling units, involving a development cost of approximately $1,400,000,000. In addition, there are under this program approximately 44,000 homes conversion units representing properties which were leased by the Government, for the emergency period, for conversion into additional dwelling units for defense and war workers.

With respect to the permanent units under this program the present law provides that such housing may be sold and disposed of as expeditiously as possible; that in disposition consideration is to be given to the full market value; and that no such housing may be conveyed for slum clearance or low-rent housing purposes without the specific authorization of the Congress.

With respect to the temporary housing (which necessarily has been of a substandard nature, because of the wartime exigencies under which it was built), the law provides that such housing is to be removed as promptly as may be practicable and in the public interest, and in any event within 2 years after the war emergency has ceased to exist. (Under the terms of S. J. Res. 123 recently passed by the Senate, the running of the 2 years would start at this time.) To provide necessary flexibility, however, the law further provides that there will be excepted from this 2-year requirement such housing as may be found still to be needed in the interest of the orderly demobilization of the war effort. These exceptions may be made only after consultation with local communities, and must be annually reexamined and reported to the Congress.

2. Lanham Act veterans' housing (temporary reuse program)

Title V of the Lanham Act was enacted in June 1945. As originally passed, it authorized the National Housing Agency to exercise the war housing powers of the Lanham Act in order to provide temporary housing for servicemen and veterans and their families who were affected by evictions and other hardship. In December 1945, the title was amended to provide for what is now commonly known as the temporary reuse program.

Under this program surplus army barracks and other wartime structures are converted into temporary veterans' housing. The program is carried on jointly by the Federal Government and local communities, educational institutions, and similar local agencies. The local agencies provide the sites and off-site utilities, while the Federal Government undertakes the responsibility for the actual transportation and reerection of the structures. The Federal Government may enter into contracts to reimburse the local agencies or institutions for any costs which they may incur in transporting and reerecting the structures or in connecting utilities from dwellings to mains.

Federal funds in the sum of approximately $440,000,000 have been made available for this program which, as of March 31, 1947, comprised 164,000 units, of which 126,000 units had been completed. Under Public Law 85, Eightieth Congress, passed May 31, 1947, an additional $35,500,000 was authorized to complete projects under construction. Appropriation of this amount is now pending in the Congress.

EXHIBIT 3

NATIONAL SAVINGS AND LOAN LEAGUE,
Washington, D. C., June 27, 1947.

DEAR SENATOR: Although the National Savings and Loan League last year opposed Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1946, which would have created a permanent National Housing Agency under a National Housing Administrator and within that Agency a permanent Federal Home Loan Bank Administration under a Commissioner, the League favors plan No. 3 of 1947 because of important basic differences. We were glad to see the Senate Banking and Currency Committee approve the new plan also.

Plan No. 3 of 1947 would establish a Home Loan Bank Board in lieu of a one-man Commissioner who, under Executive Order 9070, has had all of the duties, powers, and responsibilities of the original Federal Home Loan Bank Board with respect to the Federal Home Loan Bank System, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and the chartering, regulation, and supervision of Federal savings and loan associations under section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as well as other duties and powers vested in the Board.

The quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial functions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board are of such a type and of such life-and-death importance to the thousands of thrift and home-financing institutions with their more than ten billions of assets and many millions of private investors as to require the judgment and the checks and balances which exist in a Board as contrasted to a single Commissioner.

Whereas Plan No. 1 of 1946 gave the Administrator of the National Housing Agency unnecessary directive authority over the constitutent agencies, plan No. 3 of 1947 only gives the Administrator responsibility for "general supervision and coordination of the functions of the constituent agencies."

We do not question the responsibility of the President of the United States to exercise general supervision over these Federal agencies. All that Plan No. 3 does is to designate someone who will be the direct representative of the President in serving this function and will report to him.

Plan No. 3 does not, in any way, lessen the autonomy of the Home Loan Bank Board in performing its functions.

If this plan is effectuated, the Congress of the United States will still have the final authority over the activities and programs of the agencies concerned and if, for any reason, the arrangement contemplated by plan No. 3 does not prove to be satisfactory, then the Congress can change these agencies and the facilities for the coordination of their activities as then indicated.

It is our earnest hope that the Congress will permit this plan to be effectuated.

Sincerely,

CURTIS F. SCOTT,
President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I yield to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] as much time as he may care to use on this subject.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have carefully read the message of the President submitting Reorganization Plan No. 3, and I have read the hearings. There is not a single assertion by anyone that any savings will result to the Treasury by reason of the adoption of this plan. No Senator is more desirous of seeing a reorganization of the 1,152 agencies, bureaus, and commissions of the Government than is the Senator from Virginia. I was a strong advocate to give this reorganizational authority to the President of the United States. In fact, as certain Members of the Senate will recall, I introduced an amendment to the bill, requiring that there should be negative action by both the House and the Senate before a plan submitted by the President could be prevented from going into operation.

I am very deeply disappointed that, despite the great opportunities for economy that exists in every single branch and agency of the Government, the President of the United States has recommended three plans, in not one of which is there a single claim made that any economy will result.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I may say to the able Senator from Virginia that I recall how much interest was manifested by the Senator from Virginia when the legislation was being formulated, and later enacted, which authorized reorganization plans to be prepared by the Chief Executive and submitted to the Congress. I was also greatly interested in the legislation. I understand that now the Senator states with respect to the Plan No. 3 that it brings about no saving in cost whatsoever to the Government.

Mr. BYRD. I say, Mr. President, that the claim is not even made that any saving will result. So far as I can see, there will be no saving, because the plan abolishes nothing. It simply coordinates certain agencies of the Government which will continue to operate as they are operating now.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Was not the very purpose of the legislation as a result of which the plans have been prepared and submitted to make more efficient the administrative side of government, and was it not the thought of those who brought forth the legislation that the cost of government would be lessened by reorganization, and that there would be need for fewer employees in the executive departments under reorganization?

Mr. BYRD. That should certainly be the main purpose of any reorganization plan.

Let me say, Mr. President, that we have 1,152 boards, bureaus, and commissions in the Federal Government. Yet not one single one has been abolished by any one of the three reorganization plans submittee to the Congress. A fisherman, who throws his line into the water, sometimes finds his efforts rewarded. Like the fisherman, it seems to me that one who attempts to reorganize various agencies, could hardly fail occasionally to achieve some little economy under whatever effort is made. Under the condition which now confronts us, when we have nearly numberless boards, commissions, and bureaus, when 2,100,000 persons are still employed by the Federal Government, it seems to me there should be some way whereby the President of the United States, under the power which Congress gave him, could submit to Congress plans which would abolish something. That is what I want to see done. I want to see abolished bureaus or commissions which are doing overlapping work, or departments of the Government which are duplicating the work done by other departments.

What the reorganization plan does is to deal with seven agencies of the Government. It deals with the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. It also deals with the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. Mr. President, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation should be liquidated. It should not be continued and made permanent under the new organization. There has been no better time in the Nation's history to sell the buildings and the homes which are now owned by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, than now. Since, as I believe, the present market for buildings is the highest in many years, and it will probably continue for some time, instead of transferring that agency to some other agency why can it not be liquidated, and thus save the great amount of money which the Government now pays out with respect to employees of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and the administrative costs involved.

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation has not made a loan for homes for many years. The Plan No. 3 proposes to place it under the new agency, and nothing is done except to group it with other agencies. There is no elimination of duplication of effort or of expense.

The next one is the Federal Housing Administration. Then there are the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the United States Housing Authority, the Defense Homes Corporation, and the United States Housing Corporation, and the new coverall agency.

Mr. President, I have always found that when such a thing as simply coordinating and consolidating existing agencies is undertaken, without eliminating anything, and establishing a coverall agency, it really costs more money. That has been the experience of the Government since I have been in the Senate during the past 14 years.

A new council is then placed at the top, which is called the National Housing Council. The purpose of the new council is to coordinate the activities of the seven agencies I have named. In other words, we have a super coverall agency to coordinate the agencies we already have.

Another effect of Plan No. 3 is to make permanent by law temporary agencies of the Government. That is one of my main objections to the plan.

Let me recapitulate the reasons, Mr. President, why I intend to vote against the plan.

First. There is no contention that any savings will result.

Second. The temporary National Housing Administration will be made permanent under the new name of "the Housing and Home Defense Administration."

Third. An additional agency will be added, to be known as National Housing Council.

Fourth. Although the seven housing agencies are to be transferred into the new administration, they will not be consolidated, and they will in no way lose their identities. They will function just the same, doing the same work, and involving the same duplicating expense. The only difference is that there will be at the top of them all a coordinating agency which will result in the outlay of more money.

Fifth. It is bad policy to mix agencies concerned, on the one hand, with public or socialized housing with private housing.

Sixth. It is bad business to mix agencies concerned with banking or housing loans with agencies concerned with construction and materials.

Seventh. Only in very slight degree, if any, would confusion be eliminated, because only 7 out of the 13 agencies dealing with housing are embraced in the plan.

For the reason stated, Mr. President, I am very regretful, as one who has fought for 14 years in the Senate to do all he could to bring about a simplification of the vast governmental machinery, to cast my vote against Reorganization Plan No. 3, just as I voted against Reorganization Plan No. 2.

I wish to say further, Mr. President, that as one who supported the President of the United States with all the capacity he had, by giving to him the authority to reorganize, for which he asked, I do not intend to vote for a single reorganization plan that fails to bring about economies. That is the purpose and that is the reason for reorganization of the Federal Government. We should have economy which goes with efficiency.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The able Senator from Virginia has made a statement which I am glad has been made. When he supported the original legislation and worked hard to have this power placed in the hands of the President to draw up

reorganization plans, doubtless the Senator will remember that I rather insisted that the reorganization should be done by the Congress itself. The Senator will probably recall the discussions we had in committee upon that subject. But my seniors, who had a great deal more experience with such matters in the Senate, prevailed upon me that the only way to do it was to place it in the hands of the Chief Executive. The result has not been a very happy one, because, as has been pointed out, plans are being submitted which contain no saving in cost of administration, and so far as I can find, no reduction in the number of persons employed in administrative capacity.

Mr. BYRD. I will say to the Senator that whenever no claim is made that savings will result we can rest assured that there will be no savings, but, to the contrary, my experience has been that there will be increased costs. If there is any saving whatsoever in contemplation it will be claimed that saving will be effectuated. As I read the testimony of the Director of the Budget, he does not claim that there will be any saving. I have read the report of the committee. I have read the message of the President. I have not been able to find any claim made in any of these documents that one dollar of saving will result to the Federal Treasury by reason of the passage of the reorganization bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, we have now in effect what is substantially the pending reorganization plan. It is in effect under section 1 of the War Powers Act. So that substantially what the plan under consideration would do would be to continue that existing reorganization. Naturally there would not be in such a plan a saving. If left to themselves, the existing agencies may fall apart. Under the reorganization plan, it is proposed to set up a Housing and Home Finance Agency, which will supervise the FHA, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and the Public Housing Administration, under each of which there are a number of constituent agencies. My experience is that in every case such agencies, by themselves, with no supervision, but responsible only to the President, rapidly expand and spend more money than if they are in one consolidated agency.

I dispute entirely the contention of the Senator from Virginia that if Plan No. 3 is adopted there will be no saving. We have had this consolidation during the entire war period. My opinion is that we would spend much more money if we were to let these agencies fall apart into half a dozen constituent agencies, each one responsible only to the President of the United States.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Ohio has touched upon one feature which has influenced the Senator from Virginia to vote against this plan. He admits that what the plan does is to make permanent these emergency agencies. They were created under war powers, but it is proposed, by an enactment of Congress, to make them permanent. That is one reason why I cannot vote for the plan.

Mr. TAFT. So far as I know, none of these agencies were created for the war. They existed before the war. Before the war, there were 15 different agencies dealing with housing. Under the War Powers Act, they were put together and one man was placed in charge of them all. Perhaps he is an extra agency. But it is not an expensive overall change. It is to a large extent a consolidation of research activities in the housing field. It has been unnecessary in many cases to create new agencies under them because they have been able to operate directly in the special field of war housing. So far as I know, no war agency is continued.

Mr. BYRD. I refer to agencies created under the war powers. The Senator is correct; there are about 14 agencies relating to housing, and only 7 of these are dealt with in this plan. Not a single one of them is abolished. There would still be six or seven additional agencies dealing with housing which are not covered by the plan.

Mr. TAFT. I question that. What agencies are there that are not covered by this plan which are now dealing with housing?

Mr. BYRD. I can furnish the Senator a list of them. There are quite a number of such agencies.

Mr. TAFT. I know of none; and I have been over the subject quite often, and fairly recently.

Mr. BYRD. I shall furnish the Senator a list of the agencies. I do not have it at hand.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like, if I may, to come to the Defense of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which reported the resolution adversely. I understood the distinguished Senator from Virginia to say that he found in the report of the committee no reference to a reduction of expenses. I find these words in the report:

> No elaboration is necessary to prove that without the general supervision and coordination of the functions and activities of the constituent agencies provided in the reorganization plan, each would undertake separately its own independent general statistical studies, technical research and similar matters, and would duplicate other activities which are common to the programs of all of them and which, as contemplated by the plan, could be done for all of them on a mutually satisfactory basis by a single central unit more economically.

Mr. BYRD. What is the estimate of savings made by the committee?

Mr. FLANDERS. There is no estimate of savings by reason of improved operation under the proposed plan; but each of us is at liberty to make his own estimate of what the losses would be if we were to disapprove the plan and return to the disorganized situation which existed prior to 1942.

Mr. BYRD. I will say to the Senator that when the question was asked of Mr. Lawton, representing the Budget Bureau, on page 13 of the hearings held in the House, he gave the answer which I shall read. He was being questioned by Representative KARSTEN:

> Mr. KARSTEN. I should like to ask you if you have this consolidation, in your opinion, would it result in greater efficiency and perhaps reduce the expenses of the over-all agency if they were all under one head or authority?
>
> Mr. LAWTON. I cannot answer that specifically. I can only answer it in this general fashion, that is the unification of the housing activities under one general direction.

My observation over quite a long period of years is that when any branch of the Government feels that it can effect economies, the claim is always made that there will be economies, though frequently economies are not effected. However, no claim is even made for economies in connection with this plan. If the committee has any information which is not available to the Senator from Virginia as to the economies, I should like to know what it is.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I believe that the response made to the question in the House was an honest answer. No claims were made for any great reduction in costs by reason of the revision under the existing plan. But again I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Virginia to the very serious alternative possibility of going back to no plan and having a very greatly increased expense. That, in my opinion, is where the question of expense enters into this problem.

Mr. BYRD. In the judgment of the Senator from Virginia it is very much better to wait, even if we wait a year or so, and bring about a real reorganization, abolishing some of these agencies. No agency is proposed to be abolished under this plan. I disagree with the Senator from Vermont that the plan provides for changing the functions of the agencies. It simply coordinates them under a new agency called the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. That is not a new agency. If the Senator will compare the new agency with the existing agency established in 1942, he will find that the only change is to diminish the powers of the head of the coordinating agency and give him general supervision and coordination, instead of making him a dictator. Dictatorship did not work.

Mr. BYRD. My observation is that we always get a coordinator, instead of abolishing something. Instead of discontinuing some function of Government we establish another agency to coordinate the existing agencies. That has happened time and time again in Washington in the past 14 years.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. On page 2 of the report, under the heading "Description

of Reorganization Plan No. 3," I find this:

Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947 groups nearly all of the permanent housing agencies and functions of the Government, and the remaining emergency housing activities, in a Housing and Home Finance Agency, with the following constituent operating agencies:

Earlier we were discussing the question whether all the agencies were included. The report uses the words "nearly all."

Mr. BYRD. There are some other agencies which deal with housing. Unfortunately I have not the data at hand now. There are some other agencies which are not included in the report.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to inquire if the Housing and Home Finance Agency is not a new organization. I did not find it in the corporation appropriation bill. We did discover there the National Housing Agency, office of the Administrator, for which, on page 3 of the bill, line 15, we appropriated $100,000. We discovered that he desired more than $1,000,000 to operate the office of the Coordinator; but after going over the facts it was disclosed that he wanted economists, attorneys, and an organization to do research work. There is a great deal of money spent by all the agencies and bureaus of the Federal Government under the guise of research and coordination. I wonder whether or not the Senator knows of any appropriation which has been asked for the Housing and Home Finance Agency?

Mr. BYRD. I have never heard of it. So far as I know, it is a new agency, though the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] says it is not.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask the floor manager of this legislation, the Senator from Vermont, regarding that matter?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, this is not a new undertaking. It is the same Administrator, but with a new name.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont if the time which he is most interestingly and informatively using comes from the time allotted to him? He has control over the 2 hours allotted to those in favor of the proposal. Does it come from our time, which we could, I think, from our point of view, use to better purpose?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, being similarly unskilled in the arts and wiles of discussion on the floor of the Senate, I likewise ask the same question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). If the Chair make this observation, unless the two Senators cease "kidding" each other considerable time will be lost which belongs to both of them.

Mr. CAIN. I will say to the Senator from Vermont that I was trying to save time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator now advises me that this is not a new agency, but that the name has been changed?

Mr. FLANDERS. Under the existing organization which derives from the reorganization of February 24, 1942, the name "National Housing Agency" is changed to "Housing and Home Finance Agency." Why the name was changed I do not know; so I do not wish to be questioned.

Mr. FERGUSON. I imagine that one of the reasons is that they could use more letters of the alphabet. As we try to consolidate they think about the alphabet a little more, and therefore they are using another name. The National Housing Agency, Office of the Administrator, is the agency which the Appropriations Committee saw fit to limit, both in the House and in the Senate, to $100,000, because we figured that if they were coordinated they should do that job alone and not enter into the big field of research.

Mr. FLANDERS. It would seem to me, Mr. President, that the things on which the heart of the Senator from Virginia is set, in common with the hearts of all of us, have already been accomplished.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am anxious to know more regarding the statement that each individual agency will possess its individual identity and be responsible for the operation of the program. How could a coordinator, no matter how much money was appropriated, do anything with relation to constituent agencies if they were to retain their individual identity and be responsible for the operation of their programs? How could a coordinator do anything in that situation? Is it not pure surplusage?

Mr. BYRD. I think the Senator is entirely correct. That is the point which the Senator from Virginia has made. This is merely a coordination, not a revamping of the functions of the various agencies. They remain and continue as they have been.

Mr. President, I shall conclude. I do not want to take up any more time of the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]. I merely desire to say that it is with very deep reluctance that I shall vote against this Reorganization Plan, because I supported the authority of the President with all the vigor I possessed, and offered an amendment which was agreed to by a close vote, by which the plans were to be made operative, unless rejected by both Houses. I did so, Mr. President, in contradiction of a position which I had taken 2 or 3 years earlier. I doubt very much whether I was correct about it, but I did it because I wanted to give the President every possible opportunity to effect a reorganization which would mean something, which would prevent duplication of effort, which would save money for the taxpayers, and reduce the number of employees who then numbered 2,100,000. I again express my regret that the President of the United States has not seen fit to use this power in any of the three organization plans which he has submitted to Congress in such a way as to effect economy and actually reduce the overlapping and duplicating activities of these 1,142 agencies. Therefore, Mr. President, I shall cast my vote against the plan as submitted by the President.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington shares one conviction with every other Senator in the Chamber; namely, that housing is a national problem, that it is complicated and complex and as difficult of understanding as any other problem which confronts us. By instinct and by study, we realize it to be a problem for which we hope before very long America will find an answer, but for which some of us in this Chamber at this time feel that the President's proposed Reorganization Plan is not even an approximation of the answer which the Nation is seeking.

The consideration given to the President's reorganization plan by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency was a rather thorough one and long extended. It was finally resolved by a vote of 7 to 6 for approval. The junior Senator from Washington obviously represents the minority vote and position, and in connection with it I hope in a few minutes to submit for the RECORD the reasons which guided our negative action on the President's proposal.

I am but one of a good many who will vote against the President's reorganization proposal for approximately five reasons, which are as follows:

First, it is unnecessarily expensive and will, in our opinion, become extravagantly so in the future. I think that what the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has said is incontrovertible, that the consolidation, coordination, and integration contemplated by Plan No. 3 will result in no saving for the American taxpayer. Though it may be held by some that savings will be accomplished in the future, such evidence is not in the record up to this time.

On the basis of the budgets which have been recently submitted by the various component parts which make up the National Housing Agency, no one who understands the situation and studies the figures will gain any impression that we are even beginning to think about saving money in the field of Federal housing.

Second, those of us who strenuously oppose this plan do so because it makes permanent an institution or an agency or a group—call it what we will—which was designed primarily to attempt to do a good job during the war.

I think it was the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] who said a few minutes ago, in response to a question or a comment of the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], that the President's proposal was merely to continue on in the future what we have learned to do through coordination in the field of housing during the war. If that is the basis of the support which the senior Senator from Ohio will give to this program, I am inclined to believe that time will cause him to change his mind, because on my desk there is evidence so

much to the contrary that any reasonable minded person who had thought that what we did in the name of war housing was effective, would be forced to come to a different conclusion.

My third reason, Mr. President, is that I see absolutely no reason to believe that war housing—a very simple phrase of two words—will be better liquidated under the President's proposed reorganization plan than has been the case in the past. That, to me, is tremendously important. War housing, for the benefit of those who do not know its size, scope, and magnitude, cost the American taxpayer by way of investment approximately $2,000,000,000. Through sale and liquidation the average taxpayer in this country has a perfect right, as does his Government, to expect a return on the investment.

It is not necessarily on the basis of my very few months in the Senate that I feel so strongly about this matter as an individual, but it is because of the evidence which is before me. I know of no single agency under the jurisdiction of this great Government which, perhaps because of its inability to understand its accountability, has given to the American citizen such a very bad run for his or her money. Bear in mind that the National Housing Agency, which was created, as I recall, by Executive Order 9070 on February 14, 1942, had three component parts. One was the Federal Housing Agency.

Then there was the Federal Farm Bank Loan Board, and there was the third component part, the Federal Public Housing Authority.

If I am not mistaken, the senior Senator from Ohio in one or two of his questions a few minutes ago indicated that he did not believe that that Executive order did anything other than to group and coordinate. He did not know that it created a new agency. Yet, Mr. President, in 1942 it created the Federal Public Housing Authority to have management and jurisdiction over what previously had been known as the United States Public Housing Authority; I think that is its correct title. That organization concerned itself with low-rent housing and slum clearance. In addition the FPHA was given a mandate by Presidential order to manage, maintain, and construct war housing.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that was not a new agency; it was merely a new name for the United States Housing Authority, which had existed for 6 or 8 years.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio may be correct. I think he will find, upon closer examination, that the United States Housing Authority became but one of a number of constituent agencies under the Federal Public Housing Authority. But the point in that connection—as to whether the interpretation of the Senator from Ohio or my interpretation is correct—I think is not the important item to consider. I am talking about effectiveness and efficiency, and I am talking in the hope that we can do a better job of housing, so as to build more houses and save money for the American people.

I think it was the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] who earlier today in this Chamber asked consent to have read into the RECORD, as he did the other day, a governmental report on a Federal agency, in this case being a report submitted, I think, by the General Accounting Office. The other day he said that he wished to submit 5 or 6 similar reports which he was prepared to clear at that time, but he said he was not prepared to submit for the RECORD of the Senate a General Accounting Report on a particular Federal agency, for he said the allegations and the charges of mismanagement and misdirection were so positive and firm and clear and concise that he would like to give those who as individuals are accused an opportunity to speak for themselves.

Mr. President, most of us had not heard any more about that matter; and then earlier today the Senator merely introduced that document for the RECORD. I have a copy of it before me. It is a result of a public accounting by the firm of Price, Waterhouse & Co., of the city of New York, on its survey of the accounting system of the Federal Public Housing Authority for the fiscal years 1945 and 1946. This accounting report is not going to cover a couple of million dollars, Mr. President; it is not going to cover a couple of hundred million dollars; it covers approximately $2,000,000,000 of assets. When it is said by one of the most reputable firms, accountingwise, in this country, that—

> The foregoing deficiencies result in the aggregate in a balance sheet totally without integrity—

I think that is germane and important to a further consideration of the President's proposal that we shall continue, in part, some of the methods that recently were used during the war.

Mr. President, I hope every Senator in this Chamber will read as closely and carefully as he can the consolidated report coming from the committee of which the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is chairman, and which resulted from the report made by Price, Waterhouse & Co., an accounting firm in the city of New York. I am strongly opposed to the continuance of any system of war-housing disposition which gives us so little reason to believe that the job will be better done than has been the case in the past.

Along with other of my colleagues, my fourth reason for opposing this Presidential plan is because in our opinion it violates congressional directives which have been laid down in the past; and in my considered opinion, at any rate, I think this body should give much more consideration to what it wishes to do about housing in the future, before it adopts a plan which is primarily and essentially what we have been doing already since the year 1942.

Recently other Senators and I voted very enthusiastically, as I recall, for a resolution which proposed the creation by the President of a 12-man commission. I think the author of the resolution was the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I saw a great significance and importance in that resolution, and so, too, did most other Senators.

Several days ago I sat as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, and I joined with other Senators in voting unanimously in favor of a housing resolution which had been submitted by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the purpose of the resolution being to have a complete analysis made of the housing situation in this country. If that work were properly done over a period of a year, and if the duty which was allocated to and directed toward the Presidential commission which grew out of activities arising within the Senate—and the function of the commission, as I understood, was to determine the efficiency of the executive branch and how best to group and coordinate executive agencies within the Government—was properly performed, I think we should have the kind of answer to the housing problem which all of us sincerely and anxiously are looking for.

Mr. President, my next reason for opposing the plan is because I do not see that, if adopted, it will result in the building of any more houses. If we are considering a housing plan with reference to the building of more houses, I do not think we wish to spend any more time on the President's reorganization plan. I think those phrases are used rather loosely. We are discussing an attempt to continue what some persons admittedly have thought was a job well done, whereas others, including myself, think it was purely an experiment, and that the sooner we get rid of much of it, the better off the country will be.

I should like to refer to a colloquy which occurred a few minutes ago between the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. The Senator from Alabama wanted to know from the Senator from Louisiana what power the head administrator would have under the President's proposed reorganization plan. The Senator from Louisiana said, in effect, "I can best tell the Senator what his power would be by telling him what it has been under the National Housing Agency." If I understood him correctly, he said that under the reorganization plan of 1942 the National Housing Administrator had the power of direction over the constituent agencies that, in the words of the Senator, he had a "big stick," that he could get things done, that he had power. As I understood the interest of the Senator from Alabama in the problem, he was agreed that under the previous plan of 1942, and as suggested in the reorganization plan of last year, the Administrator was given too much power.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. As I understood the Senator from Louisiana, he was making the point that under the reorganization plan now before the Senate the over-all Administrator would have as much power as he has under the 1942 Executive order.

Mr. CAIN. That is my understanding. My reason for bringing that up is that if the Senator from Louisiana was correct, and under the reorganization plan of 1942 the chief Administrator has power sufficient to do a job, I cannot

for the life of me understand if, through his office—not himself as a person—the conduct of the Federal Public Housing Authority, which was one of the three constituent agencies, was permitted to be profligate and extravagant and without accountability, and if we are to lessen, under the President's proposal, the power of the chief Administrator, we can look for a better result. If the job was badly done—and on the basis of figures within this one constituent agency, known as the Federal Public Housing Authority, it was badly done—the natural assumption would follow that he should have greater power rather than less.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. If the plan is rejected, this particular agency would be entirely on its own, there would be no check on it at all of any kind, except the President himself. Whether the National Housing Administrator did a job of supervising may be important, but I do not see what it has to do with the question whether we should consolidate housing agencies under one head, because when they were consolidated, the job that should have been done was not done.

Mr. CAIN. In my opinion it is extraordinarily important, because we are not talking about $10,000,000 or $40,000,000, we are talking about a couple of billion dollars, and we are talking further about the fact that the National Housing Administrator in a number of hearings—and this is not to his prejudice as an individual—said, "My difficulty has been that I as supervisor do not know what goes on in the Federal Public Housing Authority," and no one else knows what has been going on within that agency.

The Senator from Ohio has just suggested that if the President's reorganization plan fails the Federal Public Housing Authority will become again an independent agency. For a period of a good many weeks two bills have been pending in the Committee on Banking and Currency——

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator will yield, I take that back, because I remember now that he is to be subjected to the Federal Works Administrator. He will be returned to the Federal Works Administration, and subject to their supervision. I made a mistake in making the statement.

Mr. CAIN. Before the Committee on Banking and Currency for some weeks there have been two bills. One is the bill to which the Senator has just referred. What does it do? It provides that as of the date of the enactment of the bill, if it shall be enacted, the Federal Public Housing Authority, with all its assets, functions, responsibilities, and duties, shall be returned to where it came from under the Lanham Act, to the Federal Works Agency, for the reason that it would be the desire of those who support this character of legislation to liquidate the Federal Public Housing Authority as rapidly as possible, in the interest of the American taxpayer.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Regardless of the desire to do so, it would be wholly impossible, because it has a 60-year obligation to check all the metropolitan housing authorities which have been established. It has to determine the proper amount of subsidy under the contracts which have been made, and it cannot be liquidated. Its functions might be transferred to some other agency, but it cannot be liquidated.

Mr. CAIN. I suggest I referred to its Lanham Act functions. I should like to make it clear to the Senator from Ohio, that if what we think is a counter and proper proposal should prevail, the FPHA, so far as its responsibility for Lanham Act activity is concerned, would be liquidated. The United States Housing Authority, which is presently a component and constituent part of the FPHA, would continue its operations, as it should.

Mr. TAFT. As a matter of fact, the Government should own no housing, and everyone agrees that all the war housing should be disposed of. There is a question as to whether some of it suitable for public low rent housing should be transferred to local authorities. Everyone agrees, and under this reorganization plan it will be just as necessary, that all the war housing be liquidated.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I call to the attention of the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Washington the fact that while the plan now being considered is not a perfect plan, it is the first reorganization plan having to do with housing I have seen presented since I have been a Member of the Senate. Going back to 1941, I remind the Senator from Washington that for the first time we will have an over-all housing agency. When one goes to a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations, on which I have had the pleasure to serve for 5 years, he will find one appropriation to cover various branches. On too many occasions I have seen this agency and that agency, each vying with the other to get more appropriations, whether it be the FHA, the Home Loan Owners Organization, the Alley Dwelling Organization, or whatever it may be.

The Senator knows that in the committee I voted for the approval of the plan. It was, of course, a negative vote. I do not believe it to be a perfect plan, but despite the remarks of the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] a few moments ago, I believe it would save some money, because there would be only one agency before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations and before the Committee on Appropriations, and we would get an over-all picture from the one agency, whereas in 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1946, as a member of the subcommittee which had charge of the housing appropriations, I could see all these agencies, vying with each other, come with their over-all staffs, each desiring the full appropriation.

I am supporting Plan No. 3 reluctantly. I agree with the Senator that it is not perfect. I believe Lanham Act housing, as he knows, should be returned to the communities, and I am supporting his bill, so there would be one over-all control in the communities, but I believe the plan submitted is the beginning of something on which we may build.

I merely wanted to express to the Senator what I thought about the matter as it pertained to the appropriations, which, after all, are the expenditure of tax money.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, if I understood the Senator correctly, he said that during the years he had been in the Senate this had been the first attempt to coordinate housing agencies.

Mr. MAYBANK. On the floor of the Senate, yes. In the Committee on Appropriations in 1942, I think, or in 1943, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] tried to coordinate the activities through an amendment to a bill. I may be wrong in that statement, but I think I remember correctly.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to make the point, if I may, that in 1942 the National Housing Agency was directed to group under and within itself most of the separate housing agencies then in existence. What is the essential difference between the plan before us, the President's proposal, and the Reorganization Plan of 1942? I think there is no difference.

Mr. MAYBANK. I might say to the Senator that in 1941, when the war began, there was of course a great demand for war housing not only in Washington but in communities where there were large camps, for the purpose perhaps of housing the wives of officer personnel. There were large housing developments in the Senator's State of Washington, where so much war work was done; likewise, in South Carolina. I think that after the commencement of the war, it was not carried out as I hope this will be. When I say I hope, I mean that we all entertain a hope, at least to some extent.

Mr. CAIN. I may say to the Senator from South Carolina that, should the plan prevail, I shall join with the Senator in a very serious hope that it will work as effectively as certain of its sponsors are firmly of the opinion it will work.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is my hope and prayer. I admit it is not perfect, but in my judgment it is at least a start. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, if it is permissible, I had had prepared for delivery on this floor a statement covering individual views in opposition to the majority views of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which reported favorably the President's Reorganization Plan. If I may be permitted to do so, I shall for the reason that I have already stated

much of what is in the statement, submit it for the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

GENERAL STATEMENT

Under the Reorganization Act of 1945 on May 27, 1947, the President submitted to the Senate and House of Representatives Reorganization Plan No. 3 affecting the so-called housing and home-finance agencies. House Concurrent Resolution 51 was, after hearings, reported by the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments favorably by a vote of 13 to 4 and the same was passed by the House of Representatives disaffirming said plan without opposition.

The House committee's opinion on this plan was as follows:

"Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947 is inconsistent with the action taken by the Seventy-ninth Congress. The substance of the opinion filed by the committee last year is as follows:

"1. Congress and the Federal Government should encourage private home ownership and discourage Government ownership because private home ownership is the foundation of our democracy.

"2. Private home ownership is strongly favored and will not be encouraged or protected by an agency whose policy favors Federal building and Federal control of homes; therefore,

"3. While there should be a permanent consolidation and grouping of all related housing agencies and functions thereof, such agencies as the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the Federal Housing Administration, which respectively makes mortgage loans to and insures mortgage loans for private builders and private home owners, should not be placed under administrative control of an agency whose primary function is to build houses with Federal funds or manage federally owned housing projects.

"The views of this committee are substantially the same."

The undersigned in principle agree with the House committee's conclusions.

Said resolution was considered by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and reported to the Senate adversely by a vote of 7 to 6. Said plan will become law unless disaffirmed by the Senate by July 27, 1947.

The undersigned object to Reorganization Plan No. 3 and favor House Concurrent Resolution 51 for the following reasons:

1. Said plan is the same in substance and effect as Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1946, which was disaffirmed by the House and Senate last year.

2. Said plan seeks to accomplish by Executive order of the President a form of organization of the so-called housing and home finance agencies now under consideration by the Senate in S. 866, by Mr. TAFT for himself and Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. WAGNER, and it is the judgment of the undersigned that the questions dealt with in said reorganization plan should be more appropriately dealt with in S. 866 or other appropriate legislation.

3. Said plan was forwarded to the Congress under the Reorganization Act of 1945, which expressly provides in section 2, as follows:

"SEC. 2. (a) The President shall examine and from time to time reexamine the organization of all agencies of the Government and shall determine what changes therein are necessary to accomplish the following purposes:

"'(1) to facilitate orderly transition from war to peace;

"'(2) to reduce expenditures and promote economy, to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government;

"'(3) to increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable within the revenues;

"'(4) to group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;

"'(5) to reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and to abolish such agencies or functions thereof as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government; and

"'(6) to eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort.'

"(b) The Congress declares that the public interest demands the carrying out of the purposes specified in subsection (a) and that such purposes may be accomplished in great measure by proceeding under the provisions of this act, and can be accomplished more speedily thereby than by the enactment of specific legislation.

"(c) It is the expectation of the Congress that the transfers, consolidations, coordinations, and abolitions under this act shall accomplish an over-all reduction of at least 25 percent in the administrative costs of the agency or agencies affected."

It is the opinion of the undersigned that said plan will not accomplish economy or efficiency but, on the other hand, that it will require much larger appropriations and be less efficient, as has been demonstrated by the National Housing Agency, which is in effect continued by this plan under another name.

4. The Reorganization Act of 1945 in section 5 expressly prohibits the continuance of temporary war agencies and prohibits the creation of new functions by such reorganization plan. Section 5 is as follows:

"SEC. 5. (a) No reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of—

"'(1) abolishing or transferring an executive department or all the functions thereof or establishing any new executive department; or

"'(2) changing the name of any executive department or the title of its head, or designating any agency as "Department" or its head as "Secretary"; or

"'(3) continuing any agency beyond the period authorized by law for its existence or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

"'(4) continuing any function beyond the period authorized by law for its exercise, or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made, or beyond the time when the agency in which it was vested before the reorganization would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

"'(5) authorizing any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law at the time the plan is transmitted to the Congress; or

"'(6) imposing, in connection with the exercise of any quasi-judicial or quasi-legislative function possessed by an independent agency, any greater limitation upon the exercise of independent judgment and discretion, to the full extent authorized by law, in the carrying out of such function, than existed with respect to the exercise of such function by the agency in which it was vested prior to the taking effect of such reorganization; except that this prohibition shall not prevent the abolition of any such function; or

"'(7) increasing the term of any office beyond that provided by law for such office.'"

This plan in effect continues the National Housing Agency under a new name and it appears to be the purpose to continue certain functions requiring very large appropriations which have been developed by this organization.

5. The Reorganization Act of 1945 expressly prohibits any restriction upon the exercise of discretion or quasi-legislative or quasi-judicial functions created by Congress. This plan abolishes the five-man Federal Home Loan Bank Board as created by Congress and provides a new type of board of three members, vesting extraordinary powers in the chairman, thereby diluting discretion and consideration intended by Congress to be given to important quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial functions.

6. It is objectionable in the view of the undersigned to create one centralized Housing and Home Finance Agency under one man in Washington, with jurisdiction over the public-housing functions of the Government and the facilities provided by the Government to encourage and assist private thrift and home ownership. These diverse functions should be dealt with separately and upon their respective merits and demerits.

Finally, the Congress now has under consideration with legislation in H. R. 3492 and S. 1459 to transfer certain public and war housing activities from the Federal Public Housing Authority, which is involved in this reorganization plan, to the Federal Works Agency. S. 1179, by Mr. BRICKER, provides for a form of organization of the private housing agencies with a provision for a coordinating council. Furthermore, the Congress has recently passed a resolution creating a 12-man Commission to be appointed by the President, the Speaker of the House, and the President of the Senate from Government and private life to study the organization of the executive branch of the Government and report, and this proposed reorganization should be deferred until that report is made.

For these and other reasons, we believe that the disaffirming resolution should be adopted.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the hour is exceedingly late, and for the further reason that all Senators have a great deal to do, and also because I take it for granted that most of the Senators, having lived through a reorganization attempt, however abortive it was, a year ago, are probably very well convinced of what they want to do on this issue. I, on behalf of those who, as strenuously as they can, oppose the plan and program of the President, relinquish whatever portion of our 2 hours may remain, in the hope that thereby the matter might be brought to a more speedy conclusion.

I should like merely to restate four reasons which constitute our opposition to the President's proposed program:

First. I say again that on the basis of the studies which we have given to housing operations generally with particular reference to the Federal Public Housing Authority, we know of no single reason for believing that any economies would result from the grouping of constituent agencies in the manner proposed.

Second. We oppose the program for a most important reason, in the view of those who are in opposition, namely, it makes permanent that which had been a war-born experiment, an experiment in housing, which, with many virtues, also possessed numerous vices, and for which we shall be paying for a good many years to come. There should be a better

way to retain the good parts of what we learned in the war, by discarding the bad. It is our considered opinion that the President's reorganization program merely makes permanent what has been temporary. We further think that his proposal violates certainly the spirit if not the letter of certain congressional directives which have been imposed upon boards of directors of various home building and financing institutions in the years gone by.

Third. We have a certain degree of faith in the coming results, to ensue from the studies to be made by the recently created Presidential commission of 12 men, to inquire into the executive abilities of the many Federal agencies, and the resolution submitted by the junior Senator from Wisconsin, proposing a national study of current housing shortages and the ineffectiveness of present programs.

Fourth. We oppose the plan because in itself it will produce no houses, although houses are what we principally desire at this time. I hope that many people will agree that an issue of this character will focus emphatic attention on the need for further consideration of what the President proposed last year, a proposal which was not adopted, that we shall take all the time that may be required to determine how to balance properly the delicate mechanism of housing as it exists today, through the governmental agencies. I am satisfied that the President's proposal does not approach a solution to the problem.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that the Senator surrenders the remainder of his time.

Mr. CAIN. The Chair's understanding is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont has 60 minutes remaining.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire how much time was turned back by the opponents of the plan?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-seven minutes. It would be the understanding of the Chair that that time was canceled.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I regret I did not understand the statement of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont has 60 minutes remaining to his side.

Mr. FLANDERS. The opponents of the plan have how many minutes remaining?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The other side has turned back its remaining time and canceled it.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Chair. I understand that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In other words, the Senate will vote at 4:20, if the Senator uses all his time.

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield the floor to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask the Chair whether, if quorum calls are suggested in the meantime, the time consumed in the quorum calls is to be deducted from my time?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thought, when a certain amount of time was allotted to each side, it was exclusive of quorum calls. However, it makes no difference to me, since I am not going to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to make the suggestion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Quorum calls are, under the agreement, charged to both sides, when each has time available.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask unanimous consent that a quorum call may be had, before the Senator from Kentucky proceeds with his remarks, and that no time be charged to the proponents of the plan by reason thereof.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair supposes the Senate can do anything it pleases, by unanimous consent; but what the Senator from Illinois asks is a departure from the procedure under which such proceedings are conducted.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that, but it has been done many times, let me say to the able Presiding Officer, on occasions of this sort.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has never been done, if the Chair may be permitted to disagree with the Senator, when a reorganization plan was under consideration.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know what has occurred in the case of reorganization plans, but unanimous-consent agreements have been entered into at least a thousand times since I have been in the Senate. It makes no difference whether it be a reorganization plan or anything else, if there is a unanimous-consent agreement, what I have suggested may be done.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is probably correct that the Senate can do anything it pleases by unanimous consent. The Chair would like to repeat, however, that this is a statutory procedure, and, under statutory procedures, the procedure proposed by the Senator has not been followed. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to make an inquiry.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, out of whose time is this colloquy being taken?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time is taken out of the time of the Senator who yields the floor to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, there is no other recourse than to object.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Washington having yielded back 57 minutes, if a quorum call is indulged in is the time taken out by such quorum call to be divided equally, as the Chair indicated a moment ago?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Not without the consent of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, neither the Chair nor the Senate, nor anyone else can reclaim any of that 57 minutes of time except by the consent of the Senator who surrendered it?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. That, to me, is an unusual situation. My interpretation is that a statutory requirement for debate presents no different situation from that created when there is unanimous consent agreement for debate on any proposition for a certain length of time, the time to be divided. Heretofore, under such conditions, a quorum call has never been taken out of the time allotted. But it makes no difference to me. I shall proceed and take whatever time I am allotted by the Senator from Vermont, regardless of the quorum call.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator will yield to me, I shall renew my unanimous-consent request, because I think the Senate is entitled to hear the minority leader on the pending question.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the request is made on that basis I will not yield for the purpose of having a quorum call.

Mr. LUCAS. I will place the request on any other basis, if the Senator does not like the reason I assign. I make that unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield for that purpose?

Mr. BARKLEY. No, Mr. President; I shall proceed, because I am satisfied that the time taken for a quorum call will be taken out of my time, and not divided, as the Chair previously indicated it would.

Mr. President, I shall not take very much of the Senate's time in discussing the pending matter. I wish, however, to register one or two or three reasons why I think the Reorganization Plan No. 3 should be adopted. For a long time we have been expostulating in the Senate and throughout the country about economy and efficiency. Prior to the adoption of reorganization legislation we all seemed to be in favor of it. We are all in favor of the consolidation of departments and agencies for efficiency purposes and for economy purposes if economies can be worked out. But strange to say, when, operating under such a law and carrying out the mandate of Congress, the President of the United States sends a reorganization plan to us, we get out our spy glasses, our lenses, to see if we can find some reason which would justify us in rejecting the plan.

The reorganization law under which the President has sent in the plan was not the outgrowth of the war particularly. Ever since I have been a Member of the Senate, and even before, we have talked about reorganizing the Government, we have talked about agencies and departments growing up like Topsy, scattered all over Washington. We passed a reorganization bill in 1939. We created a special reorganization committee, of which the former Senator, former Su-

preme Court Justice, and former Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, was the chairman. I happened to be a member of that committee. We brought in a reorganization plan, in a limited way, which authorized the President for a temporary period to bring about the consolidation of various departments and agencies, and he submitted two or three plans under that temporary law.

The housing agencies were not necessarily a creation of the war. We established the Home Owners' Loan Corporation in order to preserve, or to put the Government of the United States at the service of those who desired to preserve their homes. Some of those who are opposing this very plan opposed the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, although they were being bailed out by the Government of the United States. They wanted to control the bailing process. They were willing to accept whatever assistance the Government would render to them, but if it was to render any assistance to the individual home owner they preferred themselves to control the method by which such assistance was to be given.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I desire to call the Senator's attention to the fact that, in addition to being the means of bailing various persons out in the manner referred by the Senator from Kentucky, the Federal Government itself in many instances paid the very taxes which were due on properties to the communities and to the States. When the Corporation was first organized, back in the 1930's, I had considerable experience with various home-loan agencies, or whatever they might be designated, and I may say that many municipalities throughout America, as well as many States, accepted Government bonds which were given in connection with this bailing-out process, although they were selling at only $30 or $90, in payment of taxes. There were many houses being foreclosed during that period.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is correct. I thank him for reminding me of that matter. The Corporation was established in order to preserve an atmosphere of home ownership at a time when homes were being foreclosed at the rate of 1,000,000 a year, at a time when, because of the economic conditions, hundreds of thousands of families were on the verge of being put out in the streets under the foreclosure of mortgages which could not be paid, nor could the interest on the mortgages be paid, nor could the taxes be paid on the property.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The only thought I wished to express was that not only were foreclosures being made by banks and individual mortgage holders but in many instances the States and political subdivisions thereof, the townships, the counties, and the cities themselves were foreclosing on many properties, not because they desired to do so, but because it was obligatory upon them to do so under the law by reason of the fact that taxes were not paid. Tax sales appeared on page after page of the newspapers during that period.

Mr. BARKLEY. The home owners were the victims of an economic situation which they themselves could not remedy, and were being approached from all directions by everyone who had a mortgage or by various divisions of government, whether it was the State or the city or the county, to which taxes were owing but not paid. In that circumstance, the Federal Government, through the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, undertook to make it possible for homes to be preserved in the ownership of their occupants, and the Government created at the same time, or a little before, the Federal Home Loan Bank, under which the building and loan associations of the United States, which, I am glad to say, had rendered a great service in the past, were to be coordinated.

Then after that the Federal Housing Administration, which was not a Government housing project, was created. The Government of the United States put no money into the Federal Housing Administration, except for administrative purposes, and even then it paid itself out and it never cost the Government anything. The Government guaranteed the bonds which were accepted in payment of mortgages by banks and other lending agencies in order that private capital might be invested in homes throughout the United States.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is eminently correct. I feel as he does with respect to the private building industry. My mind goes back to 1932 and 1933. In many instances in those days not only were mortgages on homes being foreclosed but I know of many instances in which water had been turned off because of nonpayment of water bills. That was done pursuant to law. In those depression years there was nothing left for the public service commissions of the various cities and communities to do, under the law. I cannot say too much for the generosity of the Federal Government toward various private real-estate concerns, as well as many individuals, and the mortgagees themselves.

Mr. BARKLEY. Undoubtedly. I certainly remember the tragic conditions which existed in 1931, 1932, 1933, and 1934. The situation was desperate. It was not one which the Federal Government had created. It was the result of the economic depression, which was not only Nation-wide, but world-wide. It was to the interest of real-estate operators, builders, and mortgagees of real estate that the Government of the United States do exactly what it did. It was not only in the interest of the home owner, but in the interest of the mortgagee and in the interest of those who had invested their money in homes for the benefit of the people. The Federal Government did the only thing that could have been done. No one else was qualified to do it. The banking system had collapsed, and there was no agency except the Government of the United States which could come to the relief of the American home owner.

It is a strange circumstance that some of those who now oppose consolidation of the housing agencies in order that they may be coordinated actually opposed what was done in the trying days of 1932, 1933, and 1934.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct. I remember the experience of those days. If one goes back to the records of 1932 and 1933, he will find that most of the mortgages which the Government took over in those days were taken from the banks themselves, which transferred real-estate mortgages so that they might obtain cash and become liquid.

Mr. BARKLEY. Undoubtedly that is true. It was a case of—

> The devil was sick—the devil a monk would be;
> The devil was well—the devil a monk was he.

We are now faced with the same situation. Undoubtedly the war accentuated this condition. It resulted in the creation of other agencies, with which we are all familiar.

We all recall also that there were so many agencies scattered around Washington and over the country that no one anywhere in the United States who wanted to obtain exact information about a housing property knew where to go to get the information, or to get the last word as to what his rights or opportunities might be.

Mr. MAYBANK. I must say that the situation is not much different today.

Mr. BARKLEY. No.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is the primary reason why I hope that this reorganization plan will be adopted. At least, we shall have a central agency, under central control, where we can find out what is going on. We may like it, or we may not. Time will give us an opportunity to change the plan if we do not like it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, one of the grounds of objection to the reorganization plan which we are now considering is that it results in no economies. That is a speculative objection. I do not suppose it can be said categorically that in the first year a very great amount of money would be saved, although I believe that in the long run at least $1,000,000 to $2,000,000 a year would be saved. Even in these days that is not something to be laughed off. However, there would be a saving so far as concerns the convenience of the people who must deal with these agencies. There would be a saving in the convenience of United States Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, who act as go-betweens between their constituents and the agencies in Washington. The people generally do not know anyone in Washington except their Senator or their Representative. Whenever they have a problem to bring to the attention of some governmental agency the natural and proper thing to do is to take it up with their Senator or Representative. If we consider only our own convenience, our own time, our own knowledge, and our own efficiency in representing our constituents, it would be well worth while to establish a consolidated, coordinated housing agency, to see what the result would be.

I am not able to predict, and I presume no one is able to predict with certainty, how much actual saving in money would result from the consolidation of these agencies. But in the long run, even though a saving were not effected in the first year, it would be bound to bring about a substantial saving in the administrative costs of operating whatever housing activity the Government of the United States may undertake.

Mr. MAYBANK Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. If I may digress a moment, the Congress has passed a unification bill for the armed services. No one knows what it will save during the first few years. The testimony before the committee was to the effect that it might not save much the first year, but at least it was a unification; and in the years to come it may save a great deal. Likewise the housing reorganization plan is a beginning. It is a unification. At first the saving may be small; but ultimately there will be a saving not only in money, but, as the Senator has so aptly stated, a saving in time and in the efforts of the people to find out the facts as to where they should go.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator. What he says is undoubtedly true.

Another objection which has been raised to the reorganization plan is that it makes permanent temporary powers and functions, in violation of the Reorganization Act. I have been unable to find anything in the reorganization plan, reading it alongside the Reorganization Act itself, which is inconsistent with the act. There is nothing that I have been able to find in the plan which undertakes to make permanent temporary powers in violation of that act. Of course, the act itself was couched in broad terms. It had to be couched in broad terms. It had to be of a general nature.

The plan certainly would not perpetuate any of the temporary powers which ought to be temporary and are temporary, and were intended to be temporary so far as the Reorganization Act itself was concerned.

Another objection is raised to the plan on the ground that it places arbitrary control in the hands of the proposed Administrator under the reorganization plan. Some of us recall the reorganization plan which came before us in 1946, and which was rejected by the Congress. That plan proposed to give to the Administrator specific power to supervise, direct, and control. I think those were the precise words. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] will correct me if I am mistaken. I am speaking from memory.

Mr. FLANDERS. Those are the words.

Mr. BARKLEY. The words were "supervise, direct, and control." Largely because of the power proposed to be lodged in the hands of the Administrator, Congress, not being willing to go that far, rejected the plan.

Having in mind the previous action of Congress, the President has not followed that course in connection with the present reorganization plan. The Administrator is authorized to have general supervision of policy and to coordinate, by which I presume it is meant that he is to bring the various agencies into closer relationship. But they are still left independent in their respective fields, insofar as independence may be necessary, in order that they may function economically and efficiently in the field which they occupy. Certainly there can be no valid objection, as I see it, to the coordination of the functions of all these agencies which are taken under one roof with respect to housing. Not only should there be no objection to the plan, but it ought to be welcomed by the Senate, by the House of Representatives, and by the people of the United States. I have every belief that in the long run it will work for economy and efficiency; it will work for a more harmonious housing program in the United States, whether it be under the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, which is gradually being liquidated, or under the Federal Housing Administration, which is still a private-enterprise program. All the money which has gone into it and which will go into it is private capital which has been profitable to the American people, and even to the American Government. It is one of the few agencies which has declared a dividend and turned money back into the Treasury of the United States.

So, Mr. President, there is no fear on my part, and I do not think there is or ought to be any valid fear on the part of anyone that this plan would set up a sort of housing dictatorship, an arbitrary czar over the housing agencies established by the United States Government, whether they are in any way related to the private construction of homes, to the lending of money, or to the guarantee of money loaned by private institutions to home owners and home builders.

An objection has been raised that this plan would put Federal public housing, such as may remain, under the same housing organization with private housing institutions. Why not? There ought not to be any competition, certainly among Government agencies. There ought not to be any rivalry between them. There should be no incentive for one agency, which is trying to help the American people, to go beyond its legitimate authority in order to take away authority from some other agency under Government supervision. There is nothing which leads or tends toward inefficiency, chaos, or confusion more than does competitive action between Government agencies dealing with the same general subject. This plan is undertaken with the view of trying to consolidate and coordinate all these agencies.

So, Mr. President, taking into consideration every phase of the problem, taking into consideration the history of housing legislation in the United States, beginning in the early 1930's and coming on down to the war, in the war, and since the war, there ought not to be any fear, doubt, or hesitation on our part, it seems to me, to bring these agencies and activities under one roof, under one general administrator who has supervisory or coordinating power, leaving each constituent part sufficiently independent to act within its own field without arbitrary control on the part of anyone. It seems to me that is something which the Government of the United States ought to look to, not only in the housing field, but in as many other fields as possible.

So I am in favor of this plan, Reorganization No. 3. I hope it will be adopted. I think it is very vital from the standpoint of economy and efficiency, and from the standpoint of the psychological effect it may have upon the American people and upon the Congress. If we continue to reject the plans sent here in good faith by the President—I am not talking about President Truman or President Roosevelt, I am talking about any President who seeks to bring about economy and efficiency—if we continue to reject these plans because of some petty difference of opinion, or because of the activity of some group which has a selfish interest in the defeat of the plan, the time will come when we may not have hope of obtaining any sort of coordination or of efficiency in the operation of the Government of the United States.

So, Mr. President, I hope that this plan will be adopted. I believe it will have a successful operation, subject to any change which experience may bring about. I have no doubt that there are weaknesses in the plan. I have no doubt that if any one of us had been writing it we might have provided some differences in it. We should try the plan. It is a process of trial and error. That is true of all legislation. We hope to profit by experience. Until we have tried it, we cannot know with any degree of certainty what this plan will accomplish. If it turns out to be not so good as we hope it is, there is always the possibility of change. Let us give it a trial. Let us put these agencies under one roof. Let us have a general supervisor. In the long run, I believe it will satisfy the American people and convince the Congress that it can take a chance on these efforts to bring about efficiency and economy in the administration not only of all Government agencies but particularly in this field which is so important and so essential to the life of the American people.

I reiterate what I have before said, that we ought to be interested in every American having a stake in the American economy. The greatest stake is the ownership of a home, around whose fireside a man and his wife and children may gather to discuss the problems of the day and of the age in which they live. It is one of the most vital points at which our economy touches the American people. Let us not for any petty reason or for any individual objection to something that may be contained in the plan, reject it when it holds out such a hope, in my judgment, ultimately, for the American home owner, the American real estate dealer, and all the agencies dealing with the building and preservation of homes in this country.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, in view of the housing shortage which exists today, I find it difficult to understand the reasoning behind the opposition to

the housing reorganization plan which is now before the Senate.

It would seem to me to be merely a matter of good business sense as well as good governmental sense that the various complex programs of Federal assistance to housing should operate on a coordinated basis with a common purpose and a common basic policy of maximum assistance in helping overcome the housing shortage. It would seem to me to be just the opposite of good business sense or good governmental sense to allow these various housing programs to be scattered and to operate helter-skelter.

As long as I have been a Member of this Congress, and I am sure that as long as any other Senator has been a Member, businessmen and taxpayers have pleaded for simplifying and streamlining the Government. It is they more than any other group who have argued for streamlining, for efficiency, for economy, for uniform and consistent Government policy, for the elimination of conflicting practices, and for simplifying lines of contact between business and the Government.

I strongly sympathize with that point of view. I believe it to be a sound position under any circumstances, but in my opinion, it is particularly appropriate in the field of housing where there is a crying need today and for years to come for maximum coordination in the dealings of the Federal Government with the builders, the lending institutions, and the communities which are grappling with the housing shortage.

I am a firm believer in the FHA program. I think the Federal Home Loan Bank System has demonstrated its importance and value in the field of home finance. I believe the public-housing program has made a pioneering contribution to the relief of the problem of the slums and of low-income families who cannot afford decent shelter. But I do not believe any of these programs should operate in a vacuum. I think each of them, important as they are in their own right, should be in balance with each other and should proceed with a common sense of direction rather than at cross purposes.

That is precisely what Reorganization Plan No. 3 would make possible. Under this plan these agencies would continue to exercise full responsibility for their day-to-day operations. But there would also be adequate machinery, through the Administrator of the House and Home Finance Agency, for general supervision and coordination of their functions. In short, this plan would make possible a balanced housing program, without overlapping or duplication and without interagency bickering and disputes.

If anyone will take the time to examine the record of the Federal Government's housing activities since the early thirties he will find that record full of complaints against the very lack of coordination which this reorganization plan would correct. The various trade and business organizations in the housing field were particularly vehement in their criticism of the administrative confusion in housing and of the difficulties of trying to do business with a maze of uncoordinated Federal agencies dealing with various aspects of housing. Their publications and their testimony before various congressional committees in the last thirties and early forties are filled with their complaints against that situation and with their expressions of satisfaction with the temporary consolidation of the housing agencies into the National Housing Agency during the war.

Most of these trade organizations have now changed their position and are opposing Reorganization Plan No. 3 in favor of returning to the prewar situation in housing. I cannot say what has led them to change their minds, although I have heard it frequently stated that this all stems from their opposition to public housing. Of course, the decision as to how much more public housing to authorize, if any, will be made by the Congress and not by the head of any agency. Furthermore, as a matter of simple common sense, I would much prefer to see public housing administered in a housing agency where all the considerations pro and con would receive full weight than to have it placed in an unrelated agency where other considerations would be controlling.

Neither can I cite any evidence as to how accurately the opposition of these organizations to Plan No. 3 reflects the true and considered views of the rank and file of businessmen in the housing field. In this connection I was struck by a letter to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] from Mr. Ben H. Wooten, chairman of the board of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Little Rock, Ark., which is printed in the hearings of the Banking and Currency Committee on Plan No. 3. I understand that Mr. Wooten is a highly respected businessman and banker in the Southwest. His views impress me as so sensible that I should like to read this brief letter to the Senate:

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: I am hopeful that you have had time to study the President's Reorganization Plan No. 3, which deals with housing and home-financing agencies of the Government. We believe it to be good. Certainly the Home Loan Bank Board should be reestablished, and beyond any doubt the housing efforts of the Government should be coordinated and a national policy formulated.

You will recall, I am sure, the differences of opinion between the various housing agencies and the conflict of views and programs that have retarded construction not only for veterans but for others. The Government has a tremendous liability in its guaranty on FHA insured mortgages, insurance of shares of savings and loan associations, and guaranteed GI loans. Before another 5 years have elapsed, it is easy to believe that the Government's total guaranty will run $50,000,000,000 and the mishandling of any phases of the housing program will affect all the agencies. Therefore, I am strongly in favor of the coordinated plan as set out in the order.

I understand that a vicious attack is being made by two or three trade organizations on the theory that the order tends toward socialized housing. A careful reading of the order will not bear this out, and it will be noted that the Housing and Home Financing Administrator will be responsible for the general supervision and coordination of functions of the various agencies. The order does not give him authority to issue directives and the term "supervision" limits him to seeing that laws governing these agencies are complied with.

The Government should supervise and coordinate the efforts of the agencies for which it is responsible on guaranties. Any sound business operation demands that there be an over-all policy where the activities of the various agencies deal with the same subject. By no stretch of the imagination can the order be justly termed a "public-housing program." It is a common-sense business approach to what is now a confused condition in the various housing agencies.

If hearings are held on the order, it is possible that I would like to appear before the committee.

With warm personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

BEN H. WOOTEN.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I believe that Plan No. 3 represents a businesslike solution to the problem of housing reorganization, and I trust that it will be supported by the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. FLANDERS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. From whose time will the time for the quorum call be taken?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be taken from the time of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. I expect it to be taken out of my time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Overton
Bridges	Holland	Pepper
Brooks	Ives	Reed
Buck	Jenner	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kem	Saltonstall
Cain	Kilgore	Smith
Capehart	Knowland	Sparkman
Capper	Langer	Stewart
Chavez	Lodge	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Cooper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Downey	McFarland	Tydings
Dworshak	McGrath	Umstead
Eastland	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ecton	McMahon	Watkins
Ellender	Magnuson	Wherry
Ferguson	Malone	White
Flanders	Martin	Wiley
Fulbright	Maybank	Williams
George	Millikin	Wilson
Green	Moore	Young
Gurney	Morse	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont has the floor. Does he yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield the balance of the time to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. FLANDERS. I do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, since I came to the Senate, 8 years ago, I have been intensely interested in trying in some way to develop an over-all Government housing policy. There is no question that is more important to the people of the United States than the development of a housing policy. Not only does it affect their comfort, but it affects the construction industry and the prosperity of the whole country.

When I came to the Senate, there were approximately 15 agencies of the Government involved in housing. At the time when I campaigned for the Senate, and ever since, I cited it as one of the worst examples of confusion which exists in the entire governmental structure.

Of those 15 agencies, today there are three main agencies. There is the Federal Home Loan Bank System, which finances the building of savings and loan associations, which today furnish approximately 35 percent of all the mortgages on new homes in the United States. There is the FHA, in which the Government insures loans on housing. The Government today, through the FHA, is really in the housing business. The third agency is that which supports public low-rent subsidized housing. Those three agencies dominate all the others. There are many others, however.

The Public Works Agency, as well as the War Department and Navy Department and the Department of Agriculture, undertook housing, and there were all the Tugwell housing plans. We experimented in every field. Under the war powers, most of these agencies were consolidated in the National Housing Agency. In my opinion they should be in a National Housing Agency.

Under the proposed plan these three main functions, and a number of others which are being liquidated, which have been consolidated with them, are under a new Administrator of Housing and Home Finance.

If we do not approve this plan, the war consolidation will come to an end with the end of the war, and the agencies will fall to pieces. The FHA will become an independent agency, the head of it responsible to nobody except the President of the United States. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board will become an independent agency, responsible to nobody but the President of the United States. The Public Housing Authority will go back to the Federal Works Agency. The War Department and the Navy Department will get back their various housing projects. I do not know what will become of the Farm Security Administration. Then there were the various "Green" towns which were constructed under the original Tugwell administration.

I feel very strongly that we should put all housing agencies into one administration. We have had put upon us one after the other of these various plans of housing, and their advocates have been strong. The advocates of one plan have fought the advocates of another. The result has been that before the war, each of them tried to expand its importance, and spend all the money it could in order to build up itself.

Of course the President of the United States never had time to coordinate the three large ones and half a dozen small ones, so that for all practical purposes they went their own way and developed their own policies.

When I first came to the Senate I tried to persuade the Senate to order a general investigation of the housing program, and finally such an investigation was obtained, and was proceeded with under the Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, headed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. There was a subcommittee composed of the then Senator from Maryland, Mr. Radcliffe, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the then Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. La Follette, and myself, and in our report we developed a plan for consolidation. That report, which was submitted on August 1, 1945, provided specifically for the organization of a Federal agency. We said in the report:

> The first requirement for the postwar establishment, therefore, is that it be sensitive to rapid changes in the economy and flexible in its adjustment to new demands. In order to achieve such adaptability, it is essential that all the housing activities of the Government be subject to a common policy and, to assure the consistent execution of that policy, that the agencies operate under some form of unification.

Mr. President, that was the recommendation of the committee at that time. It was the recommendation of the Committee on Banking and Currency when it recommended a general housing bill last year, and it was the recommendation of the Committee on Banking and Currency this year when it recommended a general housing bill.

In submitting the plan which is now before the Senate, the President does no more than follow what has been already suggested by committees of Congress, and particularly committees of the Senate.

Last week we spent some time in an effort to unify the armed forces, through the medium of a unification bill, because in reality the two departments involved dealt with one subject, and because in determining the defense policy, we wanted one man to head up all opinions into one thought and one policy. We wanted to have a man who was not the President himself—who, after all, has not the time to coordinate the thinking of a number of others. So in this case we want a national-housing administrator who can develop a housing policy and take it to the President of the United States. I think that in housing we are doing, in a somewhat smaller field, although almost as complicated a field, exactly what we did in passing the unification bill.

The principal objection to the consolidation—and we heard it all through the committee hearings—is that the so-called private agencies, the private builders, the real-estate boards, do not want to have the FHA and the Federal home loan bank combined with the Federal Public Housing Authority. They have felt that if those were put together the head man would be a public houser, and for some time there was perhaps some justification for that idea. But certainly President Truman has shown that it need not be true under his administration, for when the last National Housing Administration resigned the President appointed the man who had been head of the Federal Housing Administration Insurance Agency, which is to a large extent the representative of the private builders of homes in the United States. Mr. Foley has not been in that position very long, and has not had time to correct the things which should be corrected, but the President has certainly shown that, so far as he is concerned, he is just as likely to appoint a man with a previous private housing experience as a man with a previous public housing experience. In any event, my own opinion is that the man who has the job of coordinating policy will look at all phases of the situation.

No one can help realizing that today, regardless of how important we may think public housing is, the construction of even 125,000 homes a year, which is the largest number anyone has proposed in the way of public housing, is only a small fraction of what should be built in the way of private houses, and that the real problem is primarily a private housing problem. Any man who is broad enough to look at the whole housing policy is bound to take that position. The idea that the Administrator is going to play down FHA or play down the Federal home-loan banks seems to me to be utterly fantastic. I can see no reason why the activities should not be combined.

Incidentally, the private builders are not very reasonable, because they say, "We do not want the Government in the housing business," but they invite the Government into the housing business. Under the FHA, and under the pressure of private builders, the Government today is actually lending builders 90 percent of the cost of the construction of houses, not the man who ultimately buys the house, but the Government is lending the builder 90 percent, so that he does not have to put in one cent of his own money. The FHA program today is financed practically 100 percent by the Government of the United States, so far as the cost of building is concerned. There is about as much public housing as the subsidized housing of the United States Housing Authority. The private builders want the Government to help them, they want the Government to relieve them of the necessity of providing capital, but they oppose public housing. They oppose the consolidation of the housing agencies which help them, with the other housing agencies of the Government, which are administering public housing previously authorized. Today there is no public housing authorized, and there is no construction. There is no work that can be done by

the Federal Public Housing Authority unless Congress specifically grants money with which they may build houses or may subsidize housing throughout the United States; so there is no public housing today.

The idea that the head of this agency is going to favor the Public Housing Authority over the other agencies which are rendering most of the assistance to the construction of building today seems to me to be completely untenable.

There has been a complaint that the Administrator will oppose the FHA and the Federal Home Loan Bank System. I think that fear also is groundless. He is supposed to supervise and coordinate. I take it that means that if they develop a policy which is in conflict with other housing policies of the Government, he may check that policy. He has a kind of veto power. He has not, as he had last year, the power and authority to step in and really take over the management of these particular agencies. They are created under statute. The statutes define very closely what they may do. There is a certain latitude. His job is to see that the policies are coordinated, and that, when they are added together, there is a consistent and a progressive housing policy for the Federal Government.

Last year I opposed the plan because after we had struggled over certain words, and used the words in our bill "supervise and coordinate the administration," without consulting anybody, it was proposed to bestow power on the new Administrator to direct and, in substance, to substitute himself for the man who headed the three lower agencies. That has been corrected; and he is now to have the same functions which were proposed by the original committee and the power to supervise and coordinate the various agencies of the Federal Government.

I may say the plan goes still further. Certain agencies are not consolidated. I think perhaps it might be better if they were. But in order that the policies may be coordinated there is created a National Housing Council, which is composed of this new man—the over-all policy man, as he might be called—the head of each of the three constituent agencies, and three others. The first is the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The Veterans' Administration today plays a large part in the building program, and we cannot very well take away from the Veterans' Administration the housing functions they exercise for the benefit of veterans; and they are merely required to have a representative sit on the Council, with the regular housing officials.

The second is the Chairman of the Board of Directors of RFC. The functions of the RFC have now been restricted to buying mortgages guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration, and, through the Federal National Mortgage Association, to help buy other mortgages which may be guaranteed by the FHA.

The third is Secretary of Agriculture. There is hardly a housing policy in the rural districts. There should be. There are certain vestiges of a suggested policy, and it was thought desirable that he should also sit on this over-all National Housing Council.

So the various agencies have representation on the Council, and all the active housing agencies, except the Veterans' Administration, are placed under one man, whose job it is to develop the national housing policy and to recommend to the Congress what the national housing policy should be.

I regret that at this session of the Congress we have not, ourselves, developed a definite policy. I think it should be realized that so far as financing is concerned, these agencies have almost unlimited power to finance any houses. We have not undertaken to discuss the question of renewing the public housing policy. That is, we have not discussed it here in the Senate, itself, nor have we dealt with the question of urban development; both of which I think are essential, and which next year should be one of the main considerations of this body. But in order to do that we should have the executive department's recommendations of a single housing policy, not a dozen housing policies; not a dozen requests for money, considered independently, but a single housing policy. I feel perfectly confident that if we do have that we can save money; not only in administration, but I believe very strongly that we can save money in the character of the programs which are finally developed and approved by the Congress of the United States.

So, Mr. President, I trust that Reorganization Plan No. 3 will be approved. I think if it is not approved, the alternative of a dozen scattered housing agencies independent of each other, without any coordination, responsible only to the President, is the very poorest form of organization we could possibly have. I believe very strongly that the concurrent resolution adopted by the House should be disagreed to by the Senate, the result would assure the adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 3, submitted by the President.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, would it be fair to say he believes that while this plan does not necessarily involve a decrease in expenses, or deal with expenses, yet it is a step toward achievement of that purpose, and toward further consolidation, which, itself, is one of the preliminary steps to be taken in order to reach the desired goal?

Mr. TAFT. I think that is true. We now have, of course, a form of consolidation. If we had not had that form, I think we would have had a much more expensive set-up. I think there would have been four or five independent agencies, each engaged in enlarging the scope of its particular activity, with no restraint except by the President himself. I think if we had not had the war consolidation, housing agencies in general would have been much more expensive than they are today.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What I had in mind is that there is complaint, for example, that the HOLC has not been consolidated or liquidated. There are other agencies about which that complaint is made, but it seems to me that the coordination which is provided in Plan No. 3 is the most efficient way to achieve that end and is a step toward the gradual consolidation of agencies which are still preserved under the plan.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator is correct. Of course, there is a provision in the plan for the liquidation of the Defense Homes Corporation, which is being liquidated. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation is being liquidated about as fast as anything can be liquidated, but it has thousands and thousands of homes. They are making substantial progress, but perhaps they could proceed faster.

I may say this plan does something which the building and loan organizations have always wanted done. It restores the Board. Under the War Reorganization, the original Home Loan Bank Board was abolished, and one man was appointed in its place. This restores the Home Loan Bank Board. That Board is, I think, generally more satisfactory to building and loan associations that are financed than the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, and, furthermore, I think it may be expected to speed up the liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and to get rid of the remaining houses. I do not know whether it was the fault of the one man or whether it was the fault of the particular man who happened to occupy that position during the last 10 years, that the liquidation has not proceeded faster, but I think, under this plan, the liquidation will be faster, if we leave it as it is.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is not the condition to which the Senator has referred natural, in view of the fact that there has been no single over-all agency? Certainly in the early days each agency was vitally concerned with its own preservation, but if there is consolidation at the top, there will be some way by which liquidation can be effected. It seems to me Plan No. 3 is a vital step in that process. I may say that practically every savings and loan association in my State, at least every one I have heard from, is very strongly in favor of this plan.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator for his statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. There is only 1 minute left of the time allotted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There are 8 minutes left.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I had been told the time would be up at 4:20. I should like to have definite information on the point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The computation which put the vote at 4:20 was 8 minutes in error. The Senator has eight additional minutes at his disposal, if he wishes it.

Mr. FLANDERS. I merely desire to introduce into the RECORD two letters, one from the National Housing Agency, the other from the Comptroller General of the United States, relating to the errors and inefficiencies in accounting, to which the Senator from Washington

addressed himself in the course of his remarks. The letters, which I wish to appear in the RECORD immediately after these brief remarks, show, first, that the head of the National Housing Agency discovered the bad conditions in the Federal Public Housing Authority. The letter from the Comptroller General of the United States states that they are now well under control. I ask unanimous consent that the letters may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, July 22, 1947.

Hon. RALPH E. FLANDERS
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have your letter of July 21, 1947, as follows:

"Reference is made to the Report on the Survey of the Accounting System of the Federal Public Housing Authority, dated April 30, 1947.

"I have noted that your report suggests that in the years 1945–46, the period covered by your survey, the Authority's accounting system was inadequate and in numerous instances inaccurate. I understand that steps have been taken to remedy this situation.

"I would appreciate any information you might give me on the present status of accounting of the Federal Public Housing Authority. I would also appreciate any information you could give me with respect to the steps taken to remedy the situation that existed in 1945. Were these steps initiated before the making of the audit by the General Accounting Office?"

It is believed that the answers to your questions are contained in the testimony of Mr. T. Coleman Andrews, Director, and Mr. S. B. Ives, Assistant Director, Corporation Audits Division of the General Accounting Office, before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, on the Government Corporations appropriation bill for 1948. With reference to the steps taken before the making of the audit survey by the General Accounting Office pursuant to section 5 of the act of February 24, 1945 (59 Stat. 6), to remedy the inadequacies in the accounting for the Authority's financial transactions, your attention is invited to the statements appearing on page 344 of part II of the cited hearings, a copy of which it is understood has been furnished to you.

By way of amplification it may be stated that Mr. T. Jack Gary, Jr., referred to in Mr. Andrews' testimony, had been transferred to the Federal Public Housing Authority on September 1, 1944, from the position of Accounting Officer in the Office of the Administrator, National Housing Agency, in which capacity he had made a survey of the accounting system of the Authority in consultation with officials of the Authority, and that Mr. Herbert Wooten had been transferred to the Authority from the Estimates Division of the Bureau of the Budget.

With reference to the present status of the accounting of the Authority, noteworthy improvements have been made in the current accounting system and substantial progress is being made in clearing up the backlog of work covering the period prior to July 1, 1945.

I trust that the foregoing is the information you desire.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK L. YATES,
Acting Comptroller General of the United States.

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY,
Washington, D. C., July 21, 1947.

Hon. RALPH E. FLANDERS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR FLANDERS: I am very glad to respond to your request for information with respect to the accounting situation in the Federal Public Housing Authority particularly in connection with the report of the Comptroller General of the United States transmitted to the Senate under date of April 30, 1947.

The report of the Comptroller General indicates that for the fiscal year 1945 (i. e., July 1, 1944, to June 30, 1945), and prior years, the accounting of the Federal Public Housing Authority "was found to be inadequate, inaccurate, and otherwise deficient."

I desire to call your attention to the fact that the inadequacies in the accounting system of the Federal Public Housing Authority were initially disclosed in 1943 in the course of the supervision exercised by the National Housing Administrator over the constituent units. Following consultations with the FPHA, they were discussed in a staff memorandum of November of 1943 from T. Jack Gary, Jr., Agency Accounting Officer for the Office of the Administrator, to Lyman Moore, Assistant Administrator for Administration.

Rather than build up a large supervisory staff in the Office of the Administrator to oversee the correction of these inadequacies it was mutually agreed to transfer Mr. Gary from the Office of the Administrator to the Federal Public Housing Authority for the purpose of installing in the Federal Public Housing Authority the system of accounting recommended by Mr. Gary, after consultation with the FPHA, to overcome the inadequacies originally disclosed. It was likewise determined to strengthen the entire finance and accounts division of the Federal Public Housing Authority by placing it under a comptroller reporting directly to the Commissioner. Mr. Herbert Wooten was selected to fill the position of Comptroller.

In this connection I desire to call your attention to the testimony of Mr. T. Coleman Andrews, Director of the Corporations Audits Division of the General Accounting Office which appears at page 344 of the printed House hearings on the Government Corporations appropriation bill for 1948 (H. R. 3756):

"Mr. ANDREWS. I would like to say further that we found when we went over there that the situation encountered was one which the present management had inherited, and we found this management already hard at work undertaking to get the situation straightened out. They had employed for that purpose a man who is a certified public accountant.

"Mr. SCHWABE. Who is that?

"Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. T. Jack Gary, Jr. Now, I happen to know something about Mr. Gary, because he was for a long time on my firm staff, and I know he is a tremendously fine accountant. I would like, frankly, to have him back.

"Mr. SCHWABE. You mean he is on the General Accounting Office staff?

"Mr. ANDREWS. No; he is on the staff of the Federal Public Housing Authority as assistant comptroller. They also have a man over there who is comptroller, Mr. Herbert Wooten, whom we regard as a very capable person, under whom Mr. Gary is working. * * * We concluded that the steps that they had taken to correct the situation were the logical steps that anyone would take, and that under all of the circumstances they had made good progress with it up to the time that we went in."

I would also like to call to your attention the testimony of Mr. S. B. Ives, Assistant Director of the Corporation's Audit Division of the General Accounting Office, which appears at pages 370 and 371 of the printed hearings on said Government corporation's appropriation bill for 1948.

"Mr. WHITTEN. Actually you had to start from scratch, almost, as far as setting up a proper system of bookkeeping and accounting in the agency is concerned, did you not, Mr. Ives?

"Mr. IVES. I would say that they had made very great steps toward setting up the proper accounts by the time we got in there. They had started from scratch.

"Of course, it took some time for them to survey what was wrong and to decide on the steps that were necessary to correct the situation, and then to educate their whole staff as to how to put those steps into effect.

"I have the feeling now that their current accounting is in very good shape. It is this backlog of old errors and unidentified entries and matters of that nature that is causing trouble.

"They are making great strides in that matter now. They have what they call the backlog section which is engaged in that, and in some cases they have had to go back to the inception of the organization and rewrite the books in order to find out what was going on."

The record is abundantly clear that—

1. The inadequacies in the accounting system for the fiscal year 1945 and prior fiscal years were disclosed in the course of the supervision exercised by this office over the constituent units;

2. Upon such disclosure, this office, in conjunction with the FPHA, promptly took adequate steps to correct these inadequacies;

3. The staff personnel of the FPHA selected for this purpose are extremely capable and are so regarded by the General Accounting Office;

4. The General Accounting Office regards the steps which had been taken to correct the situation as the logical steps that should have been taken;

5. Good progress in correcting the inadequacies had already been made by the FPHA when the General Accounting Office made its initial survey of the accounting system; and

6. The current accounting system of the FPHA is in very good shape, and there remains only the backlog of old errors which can now cause any difficulties.

In connection with the latter item, I also desire to call attention to the fact that the General Accounting Office has indicated that excellent progress is now being made in clearing up this old backlog and bringing it forward on a proper basis, and that for this purpose there has been included in the administrative expense budget for the Federal Public Housing Authority for 1948 a special fund of $175,000.

I realize, of course, that the representatives of some of the groups who have opposed Reorganization Plan No. 3 have sought to confuse this matter by reference to this report of the Comptroller General of the United States. An example of the type of distortion given to this report is found at page 39 of printed Senate hearings on the plan where the representative of the National Association of Real Estate Boards testifies that it shows that a single administrator, as proposed by the plan, "has not on the basis of actual operations provided for efficiency and economy."

I realize also that a great many statements have been made about the so-called "Lee report" of an investigation of the activities of the Federal Public Housing Authority. This is also referred to in the testimony of the representative of the National Association of Real Estate Boards at page 40 of the printed Senate hearings on the plan.

As I indicated in recent testimony before the Committee on Banking and Currency, although both the FPHA Commissioner and I

have on several occasions requested that a copy of this report be made available to us so that we might take any action which might be warranted—depending on the actual facts—no copy has ever been furnished. As indicated by the FPHA Commissioner in recent testimony before the Committee on Banking and Currency, some of the allegations, presumably contained in the so-called Lee Report, were brought up and answered in the course of the House Appropriations Committee hearings on H. R. 3756. Aside from statements contained in a press release of the committee which is answered at pages 110 to 116 of the printed Senate hearings on the plan, this represents the only information available to us as to the substance of the so-called Lee Report.

Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND M. FOLEY,
Administrator.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I now surrender my time in the interest of having a vote on the concurrent resolution.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Morse
Baldwin	Hawkes	Murray
Ball	Hayden	Myers
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Brewster	Hill	O'Daniel
Bricker	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Buck	Holland	Overton
Bushfield	Ives	Pepper
Butler	Jenner	Reed
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Capehart	Kem	Saltonstall
Capper	Kilgore	Smith
Chavez	Knowland	Sparkman
Connally	Langer	Stewart
Cooper	Lodge	Taft
Cordon	Lucas	Taylor
Donnell	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	McClellan	Thye
Eastland	McFarland	Tydings
Ecton	McGrath	Umstead
Ellender	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ferguson	McMahon	Wherry
Flanders	Malone	White
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
George	Maybank	Williams
Green	Millikin	Young
Gurney	Moore	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. TAFT. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. A vote "yea" on the concurrent resolution is a vote against Reorganization Plan No. 3. A vote "nay" is a vote for the plan. Is that a correct statement of the situation?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUCK (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. I understand that if the Senator from New Hampshire were present he would vote "nay." If at liberty to vote I would vote "yea."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. On this vote I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. The Senator from New Hampshire, if present and voting, would vote "yea," and the Senator from New York, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. The Senator from Wyoming, if present and voting, would vote "yea," and the Senator from Washington, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] who is absent on official business, is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. The Senator from Iowa, if present and voting, would vote "yea," and the Senator from Georgia, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is detained on official committee business. If present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is unavoidably detained. If present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who is necessarily absent because of illness in his family, is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK]. That pair has been previously announced by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who is necessarily absent, is paired on this vote with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "nay" and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea."

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is detained on official committee business, is paired on this vote with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay" and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. The transfer of that pair to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has been previously announced by the Senator from Kansas. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "nay" and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—38

Brewster	Butler	Capehart
Bricker	Byrd	Capper
Bushfie'd	Cain	Cordon
Donnell	Kem	O'Daniel
Dworshak	Knowland	Reed
Ecton	McCarran	Revercomb
Ferguson	McCarthy	Robertson, Va.
Gurney	McFarland	Thye
Hawkes	Malone	Wherry
Hickenlooper	Martin	Wiley
Ives	Millikin	Williams
Jenner	Moore	Young
Johnson, Colo.	Morse	

NAYS—47

Aiken	Hill	O'Mahoney
Baldwin	Hoey	Overton
Ball	Holland	Pepper
Barkley	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kilgore	Smith
Connally	Langer	Sparkman
Cooper	Lodge	Stewart
Downey	Lucas	Taft
Eastland	McClellan	Taylor
Ellender	McGrath	Thomas, Okla.
Flanders	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McMahon	Tydings
George	Maybank	Umstead
Green	Murray	Vandenberg
Hatch	Myers	White
Hayden	O'Conor	

NOT VOTING—10

Bridges	Robertson, Wyo.	Watkins
Brooks	Russell	Wilson
Buck	Tobey	
Magnuson	Wagner	

So the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 51) was not agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Ferrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1519) to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 981) to amend section 2 of the act of January 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 21), relating to the refund of taxes illegally paid by Indian citizens.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3587) to establish a National Aviation Council for the purpose of unifying and clarifying national policies relating to aviation, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 176 to the bill (H. R. 3123) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1602) to stimulate exploration, development, and production from domestic mines by private enterprise, and for other purposes,

in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CONGRESSIONAL AVIATION POLICY BOARD

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement of the Senate the calendar is now in order beginning with the first number, for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection.

Pending the call of the calendar, conference reports are in order.

CONGRESSIONAL AVIATION POLICY BOARD—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BREWSTER submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3587) to establish a National Aviation Council for the purpose of unifying and clarifying national policies relating to aviation, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That it is the purpose of this Act to provide for the development of a national aviation policy adequate to meet the needs of the national defense, of the commerce of the United States, both interstate and foreign, and of the postal service, and to provide for the formulation and clarification of national policies relating to or affecting aviation, including policies relating to the maintenance of an adequate aeronautical manufacturing industry.

"SEC. 2. There is hereby established a temporary Congressional Aviation Policy Board (hereinafter referred to as the 'Board') which shall be composed of five Members of the Senate, not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party, to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives, not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"SEC. 3. It shall be the duty of the Board to carry out the purposes of this Act, and, in so doing, to study the current and future needs of American aviation, including commercial air transportation and the utilization of aircraft by the Armed Services; the nature, type and extent of aircraft and air transportation industries that are desirable or essential to our national security and welfare; methods of encouraging needed developments in the aviation and air transportation industry; and the improved organization and procedures of the government that will assist it in handling aviation matters efficiently and in the public interest. The Board shall report to the Congress, together with such recommendations as it deems desirable, on or before March 1, 1948.

"SEC. 4. (a) The Board shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. A vacancy on the Board shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection.

"(b) The Board is authorized to employ such experts, assistants, and other employees as in its judgment may be necessary for the performance of its duties. The Board is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the various departments and agencies of the Government to the extent that such services, information, facilities, and personnel, in the opinion of such departments and agencies, can be furnished without undue interference with the performance of the work and duties of such departments and agencies.

"(c) The Board shall have the power to hold hearings and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses, the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable.

"(d) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act the Board may seek information from such sources and conduct its studies and investigations at such places and in such manner as it deems advisable in the interest of a correct ascertainment of the facts.

"SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $50,000, as may be necessary to enable the Board to carry out its functions under this Act.

"SEC. 6. The members of the Board, and employees thereof, shall be allowed all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred while so engaged in the activities of the Board."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to provide for the establishment of a temporary Congressional Aviation Policy Board."

OWEN BREWSTER,
A. W. HAWKES,
HOMER E. CAPEHART,
ED C. JOHNSON,
BRIEN MCMAHON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
CARL HINSHAW,
EVAN HOWELL,
A. L. BULWINKLE,
J. PERCY PRIEST,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on July 18 I gave notice that I would enter a motion for the reconsideration of House bill 3587, which had passed the Senate 2 days previously. I now desire to withdraw that motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is withdrawn.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The conferees working out the terms of the bill have agreed among themselves, as I understand, not to make any effort to promote the so-called single instrument or monopoly with respect to foreign aviation. While the bill itself is silent on that question, it was the general understanding—as I understand, at least—that no effort would be made to promote the single instrument, and no time would be wasted on it by the joint control board which is provided for by this legislation.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as the bill passed one House or the other, it provided for a joint committee or commission, composed of Members of the two Houses, and also others, to be appointed by the President, I believe.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. What does the conference report contain?

Mr. BREWSTER. In the light of the President's action—and I may say that I discussed this question with him on Monday—he has appointed a board of five members. The bill eliminates the Executive or Presidential appointments and proposes simply a temporary congressional aviation-policy board confined to Members of Congress. That was the unanimous agreement.

Mr. BARKLEY. I gather from the remarks of the Senator from Colorado that there is nothing in the bill which involves the controversial question which has been discussed here so often and so long, and upon which hearings were held, with reference to the so-called chosen instrument of aviation. As I understand, the bill deals largely with the manufacturing end of aviation.

Mr. BREWSTER. The emphasis is on that feature. As the Senator from Colorado pointed out, the language is broad enough to include everything. The language of this measure includes the language used by the President in his commission to his board. So the commission is the same. However, as the Senator from Colorado says, the question was discussed among the conferees, and it was their objective to go forward within this charter, without further agitation of that question.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SMITH submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'National Science Foundation Act of 1947'.

"ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

"SEC. 2. There is hereby established in the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the National Science Foundation (hereinafter referred to as the "Foundation").

"MEMBERSHIP OF FOUNDATION

"SEC. 3. (a) The Foundation shall have twenty-four members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The persons nominated for appointment as members (1) shall be eminent in the fields of the fundamental sciences, medical science, engineering, education, or public affairs; (2) shall be selected solely on the basis of established records of distinguished service; and (3) shall be so selected as to provide representation of the views of scientific leaders in all areas of the Nation. The President is requested, in the making of nominations of persons for appointment as members, to give due consideration to any recommendations for nomination which may be submitted to him by the National Academy of Sciences, Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities, Association of American Colleges, or by other scientific or educational organizations.

"(b) The term of office of each member of the Foundation shall be six years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and (2) the terms of office of the members first taking office after the date of enactment of this Act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, eight at the end of two years, eight at the end of four years, eight at the end of six years, after the date of enactment of this Act. Any person who has been twice appointed as a member of the Foundation shall thereafter be ineligible for appointment.

"(c) The President shall call the first meeting of the Foundation, at which the first order of business shall be the election of a chairman and a vice chairman.

"POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE FOUNDATION

"SEC. 4. (a) The Foundation is authorized and directed—

"(1) to formulate, develop, and establish a national policy for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences;

"(2) to initiate and support basic research in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences, by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) for the conduct of such basic scientific research;

"(3) to initiate and support scientific research in connection with matters relating to the national defense by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) for the conduct of such scientific research;

"(4) to grant scholarships and graduate fellowships in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences;

"(5) to foster the interchange of scientific information among scientists in the United States and foreign countries;

"(6) to correlate the Foundation's scientific research programs with those undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups; and

"(7) to establish (A) a special commission on cancer research, (B) a special commission on heart and intravascular diseases, (C) a special commission on poliomyelitis and other degenerative diseases, and (D) such other special commissions as the Foundation may from time to time deem necessary for the purposes of this Act.

"(b) In exercising the authority and discharging the functions referred to in subsection (a) of this section, it shall be one of the objectives of the Foundation to strengthen fundamental research and education in the sciences, including independent research by individuals, throughout the United States, including its Territories and possessions, and to avoid undue concentration of such research and education.

"(c) The members of the Foundation shall meet at the call of the Chairman but not less frequently than once each year. A majority of the members of the Foundation shall constitute a quorum. Each member shall be given notice, by registered mail mailed to his last-known address of record not less than fifteen days prior to any meeting, of the call of such meeting.

"(d) The Foundation shall elect its chairman and vice chairman biennially, who shall also serve as chairman and vice chairman of the executive committee. The vice chairman shall perform the duties of the chairman in his absence. In case a vacancy occurs in the chairmanship or vice chairmanship, the Foundation shall elect a member to fill such vacancy.

"(e) The Foundation shall render an annual report to the President for submission on or before the 15th day of January to the Congress, summarizing the activities of the Foundation and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate. Such report shall include in full the report of the Executive Committee to the Foundation provided for in section 5 (e).

"CREATION AND POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

"SEC. 5. (a) The Foundation shall elect biennially from its own membership an executive committee composed of nine members. The executive committee shall, except as otherwise provided by the Foundation, exercise the powers and duties of the Foundation. It is intended that the membership of the executive committee shall be representative of diverse interests and shall be so chosen as to provide representation, so far as practicable, for all areas of the nation. In case a vacancy occurs on the executive committee, the Foundation shall elect a member to fill such vacancy. The executive committee may delegate or assign to officers, employees, and divisions, within the Foundation, any of its powers, duties, and functions.

"(b) The executive committee shall meet at the call of the chairman or at such times as may be fixed by itself, but not less than six times each year.

"(c) Five members of the executive committee shall constitute a quorum.

"(d) The executive committee may establish such advisory committees as may be necessary for the consideration of programs administered by the Foundation.

"(e) The executive committee shall render an annual report to the Foundation, summarizing the activities of the executive committee, making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate, and setting forth the recommendations of the divisional committees and special commissions. Minority views and recommendations, if any, of members of the executive committee, the divisional committees, and special commissions shall be included in such annual reports.

"DIRECTOR OF FOUNDATION

"SEC. 6. The Foundation shall have a chief executive officer, who shall be known as the Director of the Foundation (hereinafter referred to as the 'Director'). The powers and duties of the Director shall be prescribed by the executive committee and shall be exercised and performed by him under the supervision of such committee. The Director shall be appointed by the Foundation and shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum.

"DIVISIONS WITHIN THE FOUNDATION

"SEC. 7. (a) There shall be within the Foundation a Division of National Defense, and such other divisions as the Foundation may, from time to time, deem necessary. Each such division shall exercise such powers and perform such duties as the Foundation may prescribe.

"(b) Until otherwise provided by the Foundation there shall be within the Foundation, in addition to the Division of National Defense, the following divisions:

"(1) a Division of Medical Research;

"(2) a Division of Mathematical, Physical, and Engineering Sciences;

"(3) a Division of Biological Sciences; and

"(4) a Division of Scientific Personnel and Education, which shall be concerned with programs of the Foundation relating to the granting of scholarships and graduate fellowships in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences.

"DIVISIONAL COMMITTEES

"SEC. 8. (a) There shall be a committee for each division of the Foundation.

"(b) Each divisional committee, except the Committee for the Division of National Defense, shall be appointed by the Foundation and shall consist of not less than five persons who may be members or nonmembers of the Foundation.

"(c) The Committee for the Division of National Defense shall consist of members in a number which is a multiple of twelve, to be fixed by the Foundation, but which shall be not less than twelve and not more than thirty-six. One-half of the members of such committee shall be civilians appointed by the Foundation, and the remaining half shall be representatives of the armed services, designated in equal numbers, respectively, by the Secretaries of the principal branches thereof. There shall be within the divisional committee for the Division of National Defense an executive committee of not more than six, consisting of the chairman of the divisional committee, as chairman; two civilian members of such committee elected annually by the civilian members thereof; a member of such committee representing each of the principal branches of the armed services and designated by the Secretary thereof. Such executive committee shall perform such functions as may be prescribed by the Committee for the Division of National Defense with the approval of the Foundation.

"(d) The term of each member of each divisional committee shall be fixed by the appointing or designating authority. Each divisional committee shall annually elect its own chairman from among its own members, and shall prescribe its own rules of procedure, subject to such restrictions as may be prescribed by the executive committee.

"(e) Each divisional committee shall exercise and perform the powers and duties of its division, shall have the power and duty to make recommendations to, and advise and consult with, the executive committee and the Director with respect to matters relating to the program of its division, and shall have such additional powers and duties as the Foundation may delegate or assign to it.

"(f) The executive committee, after receiving the advice of the Committee for the Division of National Defense, shall establish regulations and procedures for the security classification of information or property in connection with scientific research (having military significance) under this Act, and for the proper safeguarding of any information or property so classified.

"SPECIAL COMMISSIONS

"SEC. 9. (a) Each special commission established by the Foundation pursuant to section 4 (a) (7) shall consist of eleven members appointed by the Foundation, six of whom shall be eminent scientists and five of whom shall be from the general public. The members of each special commission shall serve for such time as may be prescribed by the Foundation. Each special commission shall choose its own chairman and vice chairman.

"(b) It shall be the duty of each such special commission to make a comprehensive survey of research, both public and private, being carried on in its field, and to formulate and recommend to the Foundation, at the earliest practicable date but not later than one year after the establishment of such special commission, an over-all research program in its field, and constantly to review the manner in which such program is being carried out.

"SCHOLARSHIPS AND GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS; REGISTER OF SCIENTIFIC PERSONNEL

"SEC. 10. (a) The Foundation is authorized to award, within the limits of funds made available pursuant to section 14, scholarships and graduate fellowships for scientific study or scientific work in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences at accredited nonprofit American or foreign institutions of higher education, selected by the recipient of such aid, for such periods as the Foundation may determine. Persons shall be selected for such scholarships and fellowships from among citizens of the United States, and such selections shall be made solely on the basis of ability; but in any case in which two or more applicants for scholarships or fellowships, as the case may be, are deemed by the Foundation to be possessed of equal ability and there

are not sufficient scholarships or fellowships, as the case may be, available to grant one to each such applicants, the Foundation shall award the available scholarship or scholarships or fellowship or fellowships to the applicants in such manner as will tend to result in a wide distribution of scholarships and fellowships among the States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia.

"(b) The Foundation shall maintain a register of scientific and technical personnel and in other ways provide a central clearinghouse for information covering all scientific and technical personnel in the United States and its Territories and possessions. No individual shall be listed in such register without his consent.

"AUTHORITY OF FOUNDATION

"SEC. 11. The Foundation is empowered to do all things necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, and, without being limited thereby, the Foundation is specifically authorized—

"(a) to prescribe such rules and regulations as it deems necessary governing the manner of its operations and its organization and personnel;

"(b) to make such expenditures as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of this Act;

"(c) to enter into contracts or other arrangements for the carrying on, by organizations or individuals, including other Government agencies, of such scientific research activities as the Foundation deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act;

"(d) to enter into such contracts or other arrangements, or modifications thereof, without legal consideration, without performance of other bonds, and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C., sec. 5);

"(e) to make advance, progress, and other payments which relate to scientific research without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C., sec. 529);

"(f) to acquire by purchase, lease, loan, or gift, and to hold and dispose of by sale, lease, loan, or otherwise, real and personal property of all kinds necessary for, or resulting from, scientific research;

"(g) to receive and use funds donated by others, if such funds are donated, without restriction, other than that they be used in furtherance of one or more of the general purposes of the Foundation;

"(h) to publish or arrange for the publication of scientific and technical information so as to further the full dissemination of information of scientific value consistent with the national interest, without regard to the provisions of section 87 of the Act of January 12, 1895 (28 Stat. 622), and section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (40 Stat. 1270; 44 U. S. C., sec. 111);

"(i) to accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and to pay the actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses (including, in lieu of subsistence, per diem allowances at a rate not in excess of $10) of such personnel incurred in the course of such services; and

"(j) to prescribe, with the approval of the Comptroller General of the United States, the extent to which vouchers for funds expended under contracts for scientific research shall be subject to itemization or substantiation prior to payment, without regard to the limitations of other laws relating to the expenditure of public funds and accounting therefor.

"PATENT RIGHTS

"SEC. 12. (a) Each contract or other arrangement executed by the Foundation which relates to scientific research shall contain provisions governing the disposition of inventions produced thereunder in a manner calculated to protect the public interest and the equities of the individual or organization with which the contract or other arrangement is executed: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize the Foundation by any contractual or other arrangement to alter or modify any provision of law affecting the issuance or use of patents.

"(b) No officer or employee of the Foundation shall acquire, retain, or transfer any rights, under the patent laws of the United States or otherwise, in any invention which he may make or produce in connection with performing his assigned activities and which is directly related to the subject matter thereof: *Provided, however*, That this section 12 (b) shall not be construed to prevent any officer or employee of the Foundation from executing any application for patent on any such invention for the purpose of assigning the same to the Government or its nominee in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Foundation may establish.

"INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

"SEC. 13. (a) The Foundation is hereby authorized, with the approval of the President and through the Department of State, to cooperate in any international scientific research activities consistent with the purposes or provisions of this Act and to expend for such international scientific research activities such sums within the limit of appropriated funds as the Foundation may deem desirable.

"(b) The Foundation may defray the expenses of representatives of Government agencies and other organizations and of individual scientists to accredited international scientific congresses and meetings whenever it deems it necessary in the promotion of the objectives of this Act.

"APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 14. (a) To enable the Foundation to carry out its powers and duties, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Foundation, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"(b) The funds hereafter appropriated to the Foundation, as herein authorized, shall, if obligated during the fiscal year for which appropriated, remain available for expenditure for four years following the expiration of the fiscal year for which appropriated. After such four-year period, the unexpended balances of appropriations shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury.

"INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE

"SEC. 15. (a) There is hereby established an Interdepartmental Committee on Science, to consist of the Director of the Foundation, as chairman, and the heads (or their designees) of such Government agencies engaged in or concerned with the support of scientific activity to a substantial degree as the President may from time to time determine. The interdepartmental committee shall meet whenever the chairman so determines, but not less than once a month.

"(b) The Interdepartmental Committee on Science shall gather and correlate data relating to the scientific research and scientific development activities of the Federal Government; and shall make such recommendations to the President, the Foundation, and other governmental agencies as in the opinion of the committee will serve to aid in effectuating the objectives of this Act and of other legislation providing for Federal support of scientific research and scientific development, and in preventing and eliminating unnecessary duplication of such activities by departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

"(c) The Interdepartmental Committee on Science shall submit to the President, for transmission to the Congress, an annual over-all report with respect to scientific research and development activities of the Federal Government and the activities of the Interdepartmental Committee in relation thereto, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable; and the Interdepartmental Committee may submit to the President, for transmission to the Congress, such special reports and recommendations as it may deem advisable. Minority views and recommendations, if any, of members of the Interdepartmental Committee shall be included in such annual reports and in such special reports and recommendations.

"GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 16. (a) The Director shall appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. Such appointments shall be made and such compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that, when deemed desirable by the Director, technical and professional personnel may be employed without regard to the civil-service laws or regulations, and their compensation may be fixed without regard to the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The Director, the Deputy Director hereinafter provided for, and the members of the divisional committees and advisory committees, shall be appointed without regard to the civil-service laws or regulations. Neither the Director nor the Deputy Director shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as such Director or Deputy Director as the case may be; nor shall the Director or Deputy Director, except with the approval of the Foundation, hold any office in, or act in any capacity for, any organization, agency, or institution with which the Foundation makes any contract or other arrangement under this Act.

"(b) The Director may appoint with the approval of the executive committee a Deputy Director who shall receive compensation at a rate of not to exceed $10,000 per annum.

"(c) The Foundation shall not, itself, operate any laboratories or pilot plants.

"(d) The members of the Foundation, and the members of each divisional committee, special commission, or advisory committee, shall receive compensation at the rate of $25 for each day engaged in the business of the Foundation pursuant to authorization of the Foundation, and shall be allowed actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses (including, in lieu of subsistence, per diem allowances at a rate not in excess of $10) when engaged, away from home, in the duties of their offices.

"(e) Persons holding other offices in the executive branch of the Federal Government may serve as members of the divisional committees, special commissions, and advisory committees, but they shall not receive remuneration for their services as such members during any period for which they receive compensation for their services in such other offices.

"(f) Service of an individual as a member of the Foundation, of a divisional committee, of a special commission, or of an advisory committee shall not be considered as service bringing him within the provisions of section 109 or section 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 18, secs. 198 and 203) or section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, unless the act of such individual, which by such section is made unlawful when performed by an individual referred to in such section, is with respect to any particular matter which directly involves the Foundation or in which the Foundation is directly interested.

"(g) The Office of Scientific Research and Development is abolished and its affairs shall be liquidated by the Foundation, which shall be its successor agency. The property, records, funds (including all unexpended balances of appropriations or other funds now available), and contracts (and rights and

obligations thereunder) of the Office of Scientific Research and Development are transferred to the Foundation. Such abolition and transfer shall take effect thirty days after the Director has taken office.

"(h) In making contracts or other arrangements for scientific research, the Foundation shall utilize appropriations available therefor in such manner as will in its discretion best realize the objectives of (1) having the work performed by organizations, agencies and institutions, or individuals, including Government agencies, qualified by training and experience to achieve the results desired, (2) strengthening the research staffs of organizations, particularly nonprofit organizations, in the States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia, (3) aiding institutions, agencies, or organizations which if aided will advance basic research, and (4) encouraging independent research by individuals.

"(i) The activities of the Foundation shall be construed as supplementing and not superseding, curtailing, or limiting any of the functions or activities of other Government agencies (except the Office of Scientific Research and Development) authorized to engage in scientific research or scientific development.

"(j) Funds available to any department or agency of the Government for scientific or technical research, or the provision of facilities therefor, shall be available for transfer, with the approval of the head of the department or agency involved, in whole or in part to the Foundation for such use as is consistent with the purposes for which such funds were provided, and funds so transferred shall be expendable by the Foundation for the purposes for which the transfer was made.

"(k) The National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel shall be transferred from the Department of Labor to the Foundation, together with such of the personnel, records, property, and balances of appropriations as have been utilized or are available for use in the administration of such roster as may be determined by the President. The transfer provided for in this subsection shall take effect at such time or times as the President shall direct.

"(l) The Foundation shall not support any research or development activity in the field of atomic energy, nor shall it exercise any authority pursuant to section 11 (f) in respect to that field, without first having obtained the concurrence of the Atomic Energy Commission that such activity will not adversely affect the common defense and security. Nothing in this act shall supersede or modify any provision of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946."

And the House agree to the same.

ROBERT A. TAFT,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
ELBERT D. THOMAS,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
CARL HINSHAW,
EVAN HOWELL,
J. PERCY PRIEST,
OREN HARRIS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, would a motion to postpone consideration at the present time be in order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A motion to postpone either indefinitely or to a date certain is in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to postpone the consideration of the conference report until next Friday at 1 o'clock p. m.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon to postpone consideration of the conference report until next Friday at 1 o'clock p. m.

Mr. MORSE. The reason for my motion, Mr. President, is that I think it calls for a considerable amount of discussion. We have scheduled this afternoon the calling of the calendar. I think we ought to proceed with the calendar, and I think that this conference report ought to be thoroughly discussed by the Senate before it is agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, approximately 12 conference reports must be adopted before Congress adjourns. I think we must give them priority over everything else if we are to be able to get through next Saturday night. I feel very strongly that that is the contemplation of the Rules. If the Rules give conference reports priority in every respect, and I believe, Mr. President, that we ought to act on them, regardless of any other consideration. I think that is necessary. If we begin to postpone conference reports we will get into a position in which we might on Saturday be tied up indefinitely.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question recurs on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, is the question subject to debate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. MORSE. I had not expected to debate it this afternoon, but I think I can, even though I do not have the material here which I would like to use in the debate.

As I understand—and I ask the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] if I am correct—the National Science Foundation bill comes back from conference without a provision in it for a geographical distribution of any of the funds, although the Senate, by a vote of 42 to 40, after prolonged debate on the matter, voted that 25 percent of the funds should be made available to State-supported institutions for individual research projects offered by such institutions meeting the criteria of the National Science Foundation.

Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I regret to say that I could not hear the question, because of the noise in the Chamber.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senators will please take their seats, and the Senate will be in order.

Mr. SMITH. Will the Senator from Oregon be good enough to repeat his question?

Mr. MORSE. The question is whether the conference report has eliminated the provisions adopted by the Senate involving the geographical distribution of 25 percent of the funds to State institutions proposing a scientific research project which meets the criteria of the National Science Foundation?

Mr. SMITH. The report does reject the so-called Morse amendment, but in lieu of that, other provisions endeavor to recognize the land-grant colleges, which was the issue raised by the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator mean that there are provisions now in the bill which were not in the bill when it passed the Senate?

Mr. SMITH. The bill as it passed the Senate had provisions put in it by the House to which I called the Senator's attention yesterday when he appeared before the conferees.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from New Jersey explain to the Senate what additional provisions have been placed in the report?

Mr. SMITH. There is provision in the bill for recommendations to the President of the United States in connection with the appointing of members of the Foundation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has been asked whether there are copies of the report available. Are there printed copies available?

Mr. SMITH. I had sent to me a copy of the conference report of the House. It appears on page 9745 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am particularly interested in having the Senator from New Jersey explain to the Senate what provisions have been added to the bill which, in the opinion of the conferees, protect the State institutions and give them a fair opportunity to secure funds for research.

Mr. SMITH. I read the one to which I particularly refer:

> The President is requested, in the making of nominations of persons for appointment as members, to give due consideration to any recommendations for nomination which may be submitted to him by the National Academy of Sciences, Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities, Association of American Colleges, or by other scientific or educational organizations.

There are no mandatory provisions in the bill for the distribution of funds. That was discussed very fully with the Senator from Oregon yesterday at the conference; and the reason was that the Members of the House did not approve of the provision for mandatory distribution of the funds.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, now that we have the issue drawn, the language read by the Senator from New Jersey, so far as giving any protection is concerned, is purely empty language. Let us not fool ourselves. The issue is very clear, namely, Shall we authorize an appropriation of vast sums of money for Federal research under the National Science Foundation and permit a bill to be passed which, in my judgment, will allow monopolistic control of scientific research so that those institutions will be benefited which, over years past, have demonstrated that even in connection with private foundations, they get the lion's share of the funds? What we are doing, in my judgment, is to hasten

through the Congress a bill which ought to receive much more consideration than we can possibly give it under the pressure of the closing days of the session.

That is well pointed out in an excellent editorial in the Washington Post this morning. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Both the House and the Senate have so vitiated the Science Foundation concept urged by the President long ago that we think their respective bills, now in conference, could best be consigned to oblivion. This newspaper championed the Science Foundation bill passed by the Senate last year. That measure, very wisely in our judgment, vested control in a full-time single administrator to be nominated by the President, with a national science board of distinguished scientists to serve in an advisory capacity. This year, however, the Senate passed a bill which would have placed control in a board of 24 scientists serving the Government only part time and empowered to prescribe the duties of an executive director to be named by the President. The House went this one worse by providing that the part-time board should actually choose the executive director.

This seems to us in either case administratively altogether unsound. It is an essential of good administration that an administrator be directly responsible to the President. A Government agency, moreover, ought to be administered only by men whose interests are identified exclusively with the Government. Scientists, however distinguished and patriotic, whose principal identification is with some private foundation or university, cannot be counted upon to exhibit the absolute impartiality or to possess the breadth of outlook demanded for the dispersal of great Federal grants. Their advice and assistance are important; but so long as they have outside allegiances they should not be cloaked with official authority. The appointing power is a Presidential prerogative which should not be lightly waived. In this situation we think the President should not consent to the nullification of it as the House proposes or even to the impairment of it proposed in the Senate version. Greatly as we desire to see a national science foundation established, we believe the present bills should be allowed to lapse in the hope that, with a more sober second thought, Congress will produce something more satisfactory in its next session.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SMITH. I may suggest to the Senator that in the session of Congress last year the Senate debated this bill 3 days; and in the present session, as the Senator will recall, we debated it 5 days. So it is difficult for me to understand how additional debate at this time on the issues involved would help to clarify the situation in the slightest. Either we want a National Science Foundation or we do not want one. I think we should vote on that question, inasmuch as there has previously been all this consideration and study and compromising in regard to meeting the different views.

Now the conference report is presented for action by the Senate, and I think we should act on it promptly.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the reply to that argument is very clear, I think, namely, that if the Members of the Senate will take the time to go into this issue and check again with the presidents of the land-grant colleges in their States and the presidents of the State universities, they will find ample reason not to agree with the position of the Senator from New Jersey.

Let us consider the position of the Senator from New Jersey. On the conference committee there were two Members of the Senate—and I mean them no disrespect when I differ from their views—who were opposed to the Morse amendment. They said that if they could convince the House conferees of the merits of the Morse amendment, they would support it.

I think the Washington Post editorial to which I have referred has stated the correct position, namely, that it would be better not to pass this bill now, but to let it go over until January, during which time we can check with educators in our respective States.

Of course, there has been debate in the Senate, but I am sure that the majority of the Senate will agree with me that most Senators have not gone into the merits of the point I am raising. I am suggesting that we should let this matter go over until January, and that we check with educators in our respective States during the fall, and come back here in January and do what I think we should do, namely, rewrite this National Science Foundation bill so that it will emerge as a science bill that will truly support scientific research in our respective States. I think this bill is very dangerous, if what we really wish to do is to encourage scientific research in the college laboratories of America.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to ask the Senator if it is not true that the provision known as the Morse amendment, which has been referred to in the debate, will be especially significant after the administrative changes have been adopted, under which the Director of the Foundation will be completely cut off from any responsibility to any branch of the Government. Under the Morse amendment, as I pointed out in the previous debate, he would be beyond control by any branch of the Government.

Last year, in connection with the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], who, I remember, was chairman of the committee, the same question was settled in the opposite way from that in which the conference report provides, insofar as the administrative arrangements are concerned.

Mr. MORSE. I quite agree with the Senator from Arkansas. I think his position is unanswerable, and I think it is obvious that we should let this matter go over until January.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator restate the Morse amendment?

Mr. MORSE. I will, but first let me say that it was adopted by this body by a vote of 42 to 40. It was adopted on a Monday, whereas on the preceding Friday the Senate had voted down the Kilgore amendment, which in principal, at least, sought to accomplish the same objective. But the Senate voted it down at that time, before there had been adequate consideration of it and before the Members of the Senate had had an opportunity to hear from the college presidents in their home States.

The Senator from Alabama will recall that when Senators did hear from the presidents of those tax-supported institutions, they found that a very large majority of them are in favor of the Morse amendment, and are against the type of bill which the Senator from New Jersey has brought back in behalf of the conferees.

The Morse amendment provides that 25 percent of these funds shall be apportioned among the States and shall be available to the States for the tax-supported institutions, if—and only if—a given institution can propose a particular research project that meets the research criteria laid down by the National Science Foundation itself. In other words, not one dollar will go to any State, under my amendment, unless an institution in such State comes forward with a project which meets the criteria of the Foundation.

Mr. President, when we are dealing with Federal tax money belonging to all the people of the United States, I think we should put in the act protections against having the funds go to a few selected and preferred institutions in the United States. If Senators really wish to have scientific research spread out across the country, as they should, instead of developing a centralized, single administration program of the type that exists in Communist Russia, they should be in favor of the Morse amendment.

No great harm will be done by postponing this matter for a few more months until we can have an opportunity to check with our respective States with regard to the advisability of the Morse amendment.

I am satisfied that if we do, when we come back in January we shall amend the bill in order to meet the objections which are raised in the excellent editorial appearing in the Washington Post of this morning, and in keeping with the Morse amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The question of what should be provided in this bill is a debatable subject, certainly, and the Senator from Oregon will remember that we debated it at length. In regard to the particular amendment of the Senator from Oregon, we decided that we did not want it, and it was voted down. Then the Senator from Oregon sent telegrams to all the presidents of State universities and land-grant colleges, over the week-end, and in response a flood of telegrams came in. Then the Senate reversed its former decision, by a vote of 42 to 40.

But that is not the question today. I venture to say that if every one of those college presidents were asked the ques-

tion, "Do you want a National Science Foundation bill this year or not?" he would say, "Well, I should like to have it this way, but I would be willing to take my chances with a new board which has full power to give money to these institutions." I believe the board will do so in every case which is entitled to consideration, and I think the Senator from Oregon cannot cite the opinions of many university presidents in favor of his present position that we should entirely reject the conference report and turn down the whole idea of a National Science Foundation.

I have talked to college presidents, and they are in favor of this or that, but above everything else, every one of them to whom I have talked thinks the Government should establish a National Science Foundation.

I think differences which have been exaggerated in the Senate do not affect the opinions of the college presidents. I think they would say today, "If this is the final result of the conference, and if it is a question of taking either this or nothing, we want this National Science Foundation." I think that is what they would say.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Ohio is quite in error in regard to the position he has taken. He is in error, first, in regard to the statement he made that I sent telegrams to all college presidents in regard to the amendment. As the RECORD shows, I sent telegrams—and I put them in the RECORD—to the president of the Associations of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, and to Mr. Day, of Cornell; and to Mr. Gustafson, of Nebraska; and to Frank Graham, of the University of North Carolina; and to the president of the University of Oregon, and to the president of the Oregon State College; and I put in the RECORD the telegrams I sent and the answers I received. But what do not appear in the RECORD are some of the long-distance telephone calls which were made to some presidents of universities by some Members of the Senate and by those who acted for Members of the Senate, in regard to certain representations which I am supposed to have made, but which I never did make.

In the second place, I wish to say that the Senator from Ohio will be very much surprised if he will check with the college presidents of the United States on the proposition as to whether they would object to a postponement of this matter until January. Of course they want a science bill, and I want a science bill; but I want the best science bill we can get, and so do they. So I do not think the Senator from Ohio will find many college presidents who will strenuously object to a postponement of this matter until January, if they can have some reasonable assurance that in January, February, or March, we shall get a good National Science Foundation bill, and if they can get the Morse amendment in that bill. I am perfectly willing to take my chances on a poll of the college presidents today or tomorrow as to what their position would be on the question of postponement until January.

What I think we should be working for here is a science bill that will make possible the most effective expenditure of Federal tax dollars in the interest of promoting a Nation-wide scientific research program. That is why I argue for the postponement.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oregon yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MORSE. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and then to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

Mr. BUTLER. I merely wish to ask the Senator a question. I supported the science foundation bill, and I expect to support the conference report. I presume there are others besides the junior Senator from Oregon who have not gotten everything in the bill they may want. But as a friend of the proposal, I wish to ask the Senator if he does not think it would be advisable to take what we can get today, and amend the act, if we care to amend it, at the beginning of the next session? I am sure I can speak for the chancellor of the University of Nebraska, whose name has been mentioned here, Chancellor Gustafson, to this extent, that he would rather have the bill now, and any amendment the Congress may believe should go on the bill at a later date.

Mr. MORSE. My specific answer to the Senator from Nebraska is that in my judgment we should not pass the bill, because I think it has in it some very unsound principles, as was brought out in the Washington Post editorial this morning. I think we should give some individual study to this subject through the fall, come back in January, and pass a national-science foundation bill which will have the hearty endorsement of a great majority of the university and college presidents of the country.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Oregon if it is not true that there are now in none of the appropriation bills funds provided for the operation of the Foundation and for the distribution of money at this session. Does the Senator know of any such appropriations?

Mr. MORSE. I do not know of any; but am not informed on that point.

Mr. KILGORE. I myself know of none. If that is the case, the Foundation could not operate until next session, until funds were appropriated.

Mr. MORSE. There is no real rush or immediate haste in regard to the bill. We can act on it in January, and can accomplish all the good that could possibly be accomplished by passing it now, and avoid all the bad which in my opinion will be involved if we should pass the bill now.

Mr. KILGORE. One other question. I was present at most of the hearings on the question of the need for a science foundation. The main need expressed was for the development of research workers. I ask the Senator whether or not that is his idea.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. The distribution of funds as provided in the amendment of the Senator from Oregon went to that very point, the development of research workers and the Nation-wide spread of research, which has been so seriously curtailed, particularly in respect to the development of research workers, during the war, and, with the concentration and the possible favoritism which might develop, the very purpose for which the initial idea was proposed would be defeated by the adoption of the conference report, and delay to next year would hurt no one.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, this discussion simply brings out the 2-year-old debate which has taken place about this matter. Shall we establish a Foundation which will undertake to subsidize all the universities or colleges of the country, or shall we establish a foundation which will endeavor to determine research projects which should be pursued?

The bill provides for scholarships and fellowships in any college to which a scholar or a fellow who may be selected wants to go. It provides for them in an adequate way. The only issue here is between what the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] calls the tax-supported institutions, and the private institutions which are not tax-supported, but which raise funds to take care of themselves.

As I stated before, this matter was weighed and debated last year and this year, and now, after all this time, what the Senator is proposing is not what those who are studying this matter feel is the right approach.

I was told by the House conferees that on the floor of the House there was a 3 to 1 vote against the Senator's amendment. There was no way by which they could be persuaded to change their view. They realize that what we are aiming at is to develop projects of science and to help research in fields wherever it might be found necessary, whether in Oshkosh, or Oklahoma, or wherever it might be. The object is also to find budding young scientists, younger men and older men, in a land-grant college, an eastern college, a southern college, a northern college, or a western college. The suggestion that this would lead to monopoly has no foundation in fact whatever.

When the Senator suggested that some Senators used the long-distance telephone, I reply that I did not call a single person on long-distance phone while the debate was in progress. Yet the Senator knows that he told the presidents of land-grant colleges to telegraph Senators to defeat the bill. I have seen the telegram. I am trying to locate it in the RECORD.

Mr. MORSE. It is in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH. It was sent out for that purpose. I suggest that if any college president receives a telegram saying, "There is a bill pending that is going to distribute money for scientific research. Don't you want your share of it? Support my amendment." The

natural answer is "Yes." Then they finally discover what the real issue is.

There is no attempt whatever in the bill in any way to shut out any college or any group of colleges or any classification of colleges. We want to encourage research wherever possible. But we feel it should be the Foundation that determines what kind of project should be pursued, what kind of things need investigation, where the best results in research can be obtained, and where the best young men to go into these fields can be found.

Mr. President, this is an old question, I say it is an old question because it has been under consideration for 2 or 3 years. To bring the matter up again now, after it was debated for 2 or 3 days, seems to me to be a strange way to deal with the matter, after there has been a conference with the House.

The members of the conference on the part of the House invited the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to come before them. They heard him completely, they questioned him, exchanged views with him, and after he left the conference I asked them what their feelings was after hearing him, and they said their feeling had not been changed at all, that they thought the Senator from Oregon was working on one type of thing and the committee was working on another type, and they felt they should stand by their position.

I cannot agree with the Senator's thought about postponing the matter. If we want to set up a foundation, we should do so now. The Senator spoke of the editorial in the Washington Post this morning. I did not see any reference to the Senator's amendment in that editorial.

Answering the question of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] with regard to appropriations, how can there be appropriations for an institution which has not even yet been brought into existence by legislation? How can we ask for an appropriation for a science foundation when the science foundation has not been established or even authorized?

I call attention to the further fact that if we pass the bill now it will take the President of the United States some time to find the scientists. Twenty-four have to be discovered. The Senate will have to confirm them. We must lay the groundwork before we can be prepared to ask for an appropriation. It is because we anticipated that time would be needed that we wanted the bill passed now, so that the matter could be gotten under way this summer.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. I think I now understand the situation. In spite of the fact that the United States Senate has twice passed the bill with other phraseology, apparently the managers of the conference did not consider it in conference, but the committee report writes a new bill for the Senate, as is very apparent from what has been said on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, If I may answer the Senator from West Virginia, I refer to the report of the House committee in reply to what he said about our writing a new bill. I shall read their statement as to exactly what we did, so far as the bill was concerned. This is found on page 9748 of the RECORD and reads as follows:

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and inserted an amendment in the nature of a substitute. The substitute agreed to in conference is substantially the same as the House amendment. Except for minor clarifying and clerical changes the differences are as follows:

In section 3 of the conference substitute there has been included a sentence from the Senate bill, as follows: "The President is requested, in the making of nominations of persons for appointment as members, to give due consideration to any recommendations for nomination which may be submitted to him by the National Academy of Sciences, Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities, Association of American Colleges, or by other scientific or educational organizations."

In section 5 (a) the following sentence has been included: "It is intended that the membership of the executive committee shall be representative of diverse interests and shall be so chosen as to provide representation, so far as practicable, for all areas of the Nation."

In section 9 (a), a sentence has been included authorizing the Foundation to prescribe the period of time for which members of special commissions, appointed by the Foundation, shall serve.

Section 12 (a), relating to the inclusion in contracts or other arrangements of provisions governing the disposition of inventions produced thereunder, has been made to conform, so far as language is concerned, with the provision as it passed the Senate. In substantive effect, however, it does not differ from the corresponding provision in the House amendment.

In section 16 (a) a sentence has been included, as follows: "Neither the Director nor the Deputy Director shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as such Director or Deputy Director as the case may be; nor shall the Director or Deputy Director, except with the approval of the Foundation, hold any office in, or act in any capacity for, any organization, agency, or institution with which the Foundation makes any contract or other arrangement under this act."

Section 16 (h) provides that in making contracts and other arrangements for scientific research the Foundation shall utilize appropriations available therefor in such manner as will best realize certain specified objectives. There has been added to these specified objectives the following, taken from the Senate bill with a clarifying change: "(3) aiding institutions, agencies, or organizations which if aided will advance basic research,".

CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
CARL HINSHAW,
EVAN HOWELL,
J. PERCY PRIEST,
OREN HARRIS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

I may say that the last provision was one offered in the Senate before the bill was sent to the House by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who was just as zealous to protect the principle the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is advocating as are other Senators. It is merely a question of the method to be used to accomplish the purpose. We did not feel that the 25-percent allocation to certain institutions was affected by the other provisions we placed in the bill.

I read the statement of the managers on the part of the House in full, because of the suggestion that we had rewritten the bill in conference. Obviously it refutes any such statement.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I want to ask the Senator from New Jersey what is in the conference report—I want to be clear about this—with respect to research commissions in the fields of heart disease and cancer. In the Senate bill, those commissions were to be distinct, with personnel to be appointed by the President. I think that is what has been done by the conference, but I wanted to be sure.

Mr. SMITH. I am glad the distinguished Senator from Florida asked that question, because, among the powers of the Foundation, appointed by the President, the Foundation is authorized and directed——

Mr. PEPPER. No; if the Senator will yield, I am asking about the commissions provided in the Senate bill for cancer and heart disease.

Mr. SMITH. I am about to read that. The Foundation is authorized and directed—

(7) to establish (A) a special commission on cancer research, (B) a special commission on heart and intravascular diseases, (C) a special commission on poliomyelitis and other degenerative diseases, and (D) such other special commissions as the Foundation may from time to time deem necessary for the purposes of this act.

In section 9 there is a reference to the commissions. This is a little bit beyond that place. The following section was inserted:

SPECIAL COMMISSIONS

SEC. 9. (a) Each special commission established by the Foundation pursuant to section 4 (a) (7)—

That is the section I just read—

shall consist of 11 members appointed by the Foundation, six of whom shall be eminent scientists and five of whom shall be from the general public. The members of each special commission shall serve for such time as may be prescribed by the Foundation. Each special commission shall choose its own chairman and vice chairman.

(b) It shall be the duty of each such special commission to make a comprehensive survey of research, both public and private, being carried on in its field, and to formulate and recommend to the Foundation, at the earliest practicable date but not later than 1 year after the establishment of such special commission, an over-all research program in its field, and constantly to review the manner in which such program is being carried out.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield once more, evidently then, the conferees have not preserved the Senate provisions, because in the Senate bill there was a separate commission on heart disease and a separate commission on cancer. The personnel of these two commissions was to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. From what I have understood the able Senator from New Jersey, to read, the Presidential appointment has been abandoned, and the separate commissions are now to be appointed by the Foundation, not by the President of the United States.

Mr. SMITH. I do not recall the original draft of the Senate bill, but I thought this was the same language exactly as that which was contained in the Senate bill.

Mr. PEPPER. No; that must be the House provision or a compromise, because I am sure the Senator, upon reflection, will recall—no doubt the Senator from Ohio will recall—that the Senate provided the heart commission and the cancer commission should be separate commissions, the personnel to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. I think that is very important, and I am exceedingly sorry it is no longer in the bill.

Mr. SMITH. I do not recall that that was in the original bill. The Senator may be correct. I do not think the House made any changes in the provision. I think we provided in the beginning that the Foundation should take the responsibility for setting up the commissions.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to say I thank the Senator from Florida for his contribution, because it illustrates very clearly that Members of the Senate, if they vote in favor of the conference report this afternoon, will be voting in favor of a report which they have not taken the time to study, to note the differences between the conference report and the Senate bill. We are dealing with a very important piece of legislation, and I think we ought to pass it only when we know it is the right type of legislation to pass. Individual Senators cannot be sure of that if they proceed this afternoon hastily to a vote on the conference report, when they have not had an opportunity really to study it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator suggests it is merely a question of postponing this matter until January. I may say I was perfectly convinced that, unless these two changes were made, the House would turn it down, and there would be no report in the present Congress. The committee turned down the Morse amendment. It was offered on the floor of the House, and it was defeated by a vote of 180 to 90. It is my sincere opinion, that if we should not agree to the report, there will be no Science Foundation bill in the Eightieth Congress. It is not a question, I submit to the Senator from Oregon, of postponing it for a year. It is a question of postponing it for 2 years, at the least.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Ohio is completely in error in his observation. I am willing to let time determine that. I have read the House debate, too, Mr. President, and I am satisfied that when the Members of the House take the time to really study the Morse amendment, and when they return to their respective States and check up with the heads of their educational institutions, a remarkable difference in the House attitude will be seen, just as we saw a remarkable change in the Senate attitude even over a weekend, when we got an opportunity to ascertain the opinion of many of the leading educators of the country.

Now, let us go back to the telegrams, because a point has been made in regard to them by the Senator from New Jersey. Let me make it perfectly clear, Mr. President, that the so-called Morse amendment was not mine, except in name only. The Morse amendment is the amendment proposed by the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and by the Association of State Universities. It is not an amendment that is simply supported by individual college presidents, but it is an amendment which, so far as the delegates to the annual conventions of those two associations are concerned, represents the formal action of those associations. So I sent telegrams to the presidents of the two associations, notifying them of the fact that the Smith proposal was contrary to the action taken by the associations, and that if they wanted to bring any weight to bear upon the Congress they should make known to the members of their associations the action which was contemplated by the Senate of the United States. That is exactly what happened. I spread the material into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and the RECORD is perfectly clear. College president after college president of State-supported institutions made clear to the Members of the Senate that they did not want the Smith bill without the Morse amendment in it.

I tell you, Mr. President, that if we will only take the time, the few months necessary to double check on this matter, I am satisfied that the Congress will come back in January and vote for a National Science Foundation bill which will meet the criteria requested by the Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Was there any evidence adduced before the committee by the different colleges demonstrating an interest in the amendment the Senator offered, or did the expressions referred to come at the last moment when the Senate was debating the bill?

Mr. MORSE. I think the representations of the two associations were before the committee. But in the closing days of the debate on the bill, when they woke up to the fact that the Smith bill did not include the Morse amendment, or did not contemplate including the Morse amendment, I think they made very clear to the Senate of the United States how important they think my amendment is to the development of a sound research program in State-supported institutions. One of the things they feared—rightly so, and I stressed it in the debate on the bill—is that they are not going to be able to keep their best and most competent professors of science in the laboratories on their campuses, because if a National Science Foundation bill such as this one is passed, it will make it possible for a few institutions which will become the principal beneficiaries under the bill, as they fear, to hire away from the campuses of Illinois, of Oregon, of Nebraska, and elsewhere their best scientists, because after all a teacher of science wants to have adequate support for educational research. What we are proposing to do is to act upon a bill which does not provide the necessary safeguards in protecting the teacher personnel in State-supported institutions.

Mr. LUCAS. The only reason I raised the question, I will say to my friend from Oregon, was that I thought, in the event the bill should go over until next year, perhaps those who have a vital stake in this kind of a bill would have a further opportunity, or possibly a more ample opportunity, to appear before the committees and express themselves in a way which perhaps they have not heretofore.

Mr. MORSE. I think that is exactly what will happen once the fight becomes clearly known throughout the States.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that last year 150 witnesses testified on the subject. The question was thoroughly debated. This year the House committee held hearings and the question was again thoroughly debated. The Senate committee did not hold hearings because we had so much evidence from last year, and so much evidence adduced before the House committee this year. There is no doubt that the question has been thoroughly debated. Every college president in the country has thought it over. Some college presidents are for it, some are against it. It is a matter of honest difference of opinion which is the best way to effectuate the program. There is no intention to do wrong on either side. I give my distinguished colleague from Oregon the credit for absolute sincerity, and I want him to give me credit for sincerity. It is a matter of judgment as to what is the best way to carry on research in basic science for the benefit of the United States. That is the fundamental consideration.

We carried on the research successfully in wartime. We had to concentrate then, but we know that is not the best way to do. Dr. Bush himself admitted that that is not the best way to carry on research in basic science. He said the reason he wants such a Foundation as that provided for in the bill is so that research may be scattered all over the country. But we do not scatter it by saying that 25 percent of the funds shall be allocated to the States. The matter of research cannot be determined on the basis of population. It

must be determined on the basis of projects. I think it would be unfortunate to continue the discussion further after these nearly 3 years of earnest debate, after the thousands of pages of testimony which have been taken, and after practically every scientific man in the United States has been called before committees of Congress before the hearings were concluded.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from New Jersey. He has given me information which to some extent I was not aware. I understand the able Senator to say that those who represent the land-grant colleges of the country have had ample opportunity to discuss the question which was submitted by way of the Morse amendment, before the Senator's committee or before some other committee at some time in the past, or during the present session of the Congress?

Mr. SMITH. I will say, not the Morse amendment, but the equivalent of the Morse amendment was under discussion last year in all the hearings. The subject was discussed fully last year. The big difference of opinion was over the issue of the division of funds on the 25-percent basis. I will say that the amendment of the Senator from Oregon is very much of an improvement over the original amendment, and that the defects contained in the original amendment were considered by the Senator in drafting his amendment. But even with that improvement, the Members of the House, who, believe me, have been overwhelmed with telegrams on this subject, and they are in many ways nearer to the people than we in the Senate are because they are elected every 2 years, rejected the amendment. As the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] pointed out, the vote in the House against the Morse amendment was 170 to 90. They have had every opportunity to have the opinions and expressions from the people back home. A telegram was sent to every college president again when it was rumored that the House was against the Morse amendment. I do not know how long continued the debate was in the House, but there was a very long debate on the point we are now discussing.

Mr. President, we are not going to be given any more light on the subject. The time now has come to act. If we want a National Science Foundation let us act now. I do not think we can raise this dead dog again if we postpone action on the question now.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Illinois that the Morse amendment was the product of educational conventions which were held last winter, and as to the particular amendment the individuals who attended the conventions have not appeared before the committee, but they would appear if we went into the subject again after the recess.

Further, I desire to point out that the Morse amendment is in keeping with the principle involved in the apportionment of Federal funds which has been applied many times under the National Government. It allays a fear and suspicion. That is a fact concerning which my good friend, the Senator from New Jersey, whose sincerity I can assure him I never have questioned, and I am sure I never will, for some reason simply does not seem to agree with me, but it is a fact. All that has to be done is to talk to the college presidents, and they will say it is a fact, and because it refers to their state of mind it cannot be denied as a fact. They will say that the adoption of the National Science Foundation bill, as reported by the conference committee, fills them with great fear and suspicion, because they have had unhappy experiences, may I say, with science foundations that have apportioned or appropriated private scientific funds in the past. I say that we should not inaugurate a national science foundation when a large body of educators are suspicious and fearful of its provisions.

When the Senator from New Jersey tells the Senate that there are some college presidents for and some college presidents against it, let me state how that roll lines up. Place over here on one side certain private institutions, and there will be found most of the presidents of the private institutions who are perfectly willing to go along with the bill, but when we go to the other side, to the State tax-supported institutions, it will be found that an overwhelming majority of those college presidents will say that the principle of the Morse amendment should be incorporated in the bill. I say that, after all, we are here apportioning money which belongs to the Federal taxpayers. I do not think we ought to run the risk of letting down our State tax-supported institutions, and play upon the fear and the suspicion of many that certin powerful private institutions will receive the lion's share of the funds. The amendment provides a check which ought to go into the bill.

Mr. President, I am about to close by simply saying that as individual Senators I think we ought to have more facts on this subject than I am satisfied most Members of this body will have if they vote in favor of the conference report this afternoon. After all, really nothing effective can be done until we reconvene and money is appropriated. In view of that fact, I certainly see no harm in postponing consideration of this subject until we can double check and triple check in regard to it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad the Senator from Oregon has raised this question. There is no doubt whatever that there is no check in the bill except the check which was contained in the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon, which the Senate adopted. Otherwise the bill grants to a small group complete authority over scientific development in the United States.

I agree with the Senator from Oregon that the sincerity of the Senator from New Jersey should not be questioned. I do not question it. This is not an issue involving the sincerity of anyone. It is an issue concerning the grant of power which we are making in the bill.

It is no wonder that the heads of land-grant colleges and tax-supported colleges—the people's colleges—throughout the United States are disturbed. The provisions of the bill—I refer to section 11 (c) of the conference report—make it clear that the Science Foundation will be above the Government itself. Section 11 (c), with respect to the authority which the new Foundation shall have, provides that it shall have the authority "to enter into contracts or other arrangements for the carrying on, by organizations or individuals, including other Government agencies, of such scientific research activities as the Foundation deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this act."

Section 4, dealing with the powers and duties of the Foundation, provides, in subclause (3), that the Foundation is authorized "to initiate and support scientific research in connection with matters relating to the national defense by making contracts or other arrangements—including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance—for the conduct of such scientific research."

It becomes apparent that we are now asked to pass a bill which will give to the Foundation, through its executive committee, complete power to make loans and grants as they choose. The purpose of the amendment of the Senator from Oregon was merely that, in making loans and grants, and in utilizing the appropriations to be made, 25 percent should go to a certain type of institution. That amendment was the only provision in the bill which guaranteed that the benefits of the Foundation should be enjoyed by all the schools of the United States. Otherwise no person could tell what the course of the Foundation might be in a year, 2 years, or 5 years.

We are delegating away a power of the Congress to what will turn out to be a private institution. There can be no doubt of that, because section 4 (a) provides that—

> The Foundation is authorized and directed—
>
> (1) to formulate, develop, and establish a national policy for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences.

It becomes clear, therefore, that the Congress is now conveying away to the Foundation the power which belongs to the Congress to establish a policy with respect to research. If the Senate abandons this single controlling provision, the only one in the bill which would guarantee a wide distribution of the benefits of the law, it will in my opinion be giving away an essential right of the people of the United States. I am glad that the Senator from Oregon has raised the question.

We should not hesitate on this issue. It will be remembered that there was a long debate about whether or not the Executive Director should be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. Finally, we were persuaded to give away the right of confirmation and give the President the right to appoint

Mr. MORSE. It was a great mistake to give that power away.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was a terrible mistake. If on top of that mistake we shall now make the other one of removing the only security we have to guarantee distribution of these funds among the public institutions of the United States, I think we shall be sacrificing the public interest.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his comments. I am in complete agreement with him.

Because I shall ask a yea-and-nay vote, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Overton
Brooks	Holland	Pepper
Buck	Ives	Reed
Bushfield	Jenner	Revercomb
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Kem	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kilgore	Smith
Capper	Knowland	Sparkman
Chavez	Langer	Stewart
Connally	Lodge	Taft
Cooper	Lucas	Taylor
Cordon	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McClellan	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Tydings
Eastland	McGrath	Umstead
Eaton	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	McMahon	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	White
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Young
Gurney	Morse	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make the following motion: I move to postpone further consideration of the conference report on the National Science Foundation bill until 2 o'clock p. m. on the second Thursday of January 1948.

May I say in explanation of my motion that it makes it the order of business on that day? Members of this body can be sure that the National Science Foundation bill will be before them for consideration at that time. There is no attempt on my part to prevent a final vote on the bill, but I think the debate this afternoon has shown very clearly that the bill needs and deserves further consideration. We ought to talk about it in our respective States this coming fall. I think dangers are involved, so far as a future research program is concerned, if we pass upon it this afternoon without further study and deliberation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon moves that further consideration of the conference report be postponed until the second Thursday in January 1948, at 2 o'clock p. m.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I want to say something by way of history, because I sat in the original hearings on this bill a year ago last February, as I recall with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. I want to call the attention of the Senate very briefly to the fact that the bill which we then passed and I think it passed unanimously, or practically so—carried the equivalent of the Morse amendment, but, in addition to that, and in some respects even more important than that, it carried an entirely different administrative set-up. I think that is one thing which has been overlooked.

I do not desire to belittle the importance of the Morse amendment. Taken in connection with the administrative procedure and the set-up provided by the original bill, I think it is very significant. I stated during the debate on the Morse amendment, and told the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], that my principal objection originally ran to the administration of the bill. It cuts off practically all the influence of the Government in connection with the Science Foundation. The original bill did not do that. The original bill provided for a board of nine eminent scholars and scientists who would lay down a policy, and so forth, for the Foundation, but the Administrator was to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, which would keep us in touch with the Board and with the Foundation itself.

It has just been pointed out by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] that great power is lodged in this Foundation. I am for it. I do not criticize that, provided there is a proper check on the responsibility to the Government which has to supply the funds and to the people who are interested in it.

I dislike very much being in the attitude of opposition to this bill, because last year I did everything I could to promote it. I lost some of my own amendments. I think it is a great mistake to eliminate from the bill many provisions affecting the Foundation which have been eliminated. I was for the bill, but I have been forced, in a sense, to be in opposition to it, not because I am not in favor of the Foundation, but primarily because of the administrative set-up. In a sense I have had to take that position because the so-called Morse amendment, which was in the bill which passed the Senate last year, has been eliminated.

I have one other observation regarding the approach to this problem. It seems to me that we are attempting to do what we did in wartime. We are looking for results which leaves the implication that we are looking for another atomic bomb or a proximity fuze. I do not think that is the proper approach. We are trying to build a scientific foundation, a broad interest in science, and a broad base in many of our schools from which, in case of necessity, we can draw upon our most intelligent young men.

The original hearings were held shortly after the dropping of the atomic bomb in Japan, and there appeared before the committee such scientists as Oppenheimer, Urey, and others, who made the point that what had been done during the war was to shake the tree for the fruits which had been accumulating for many decades. That is not what we are trying to do through this bill. We are trying to build a Foundation which will create conditions through which we can secure such things as atomic bombs in case of emergency. I think the idea that it must be operated just as Dr. Bush operated his organization in the war is the wrong approach to the problem.

I hope the Senate will support the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the last hours of the first session are always a very dangerous period. Under the whip and spur of emergency and the desire to leave, Senators are not always as careful in the examination of legislation as they are when there is ample and adequate time. There is no real emergency in connection with this particular piece of legislation. I hope that the Senate, merely because a date has been fixed for adjournment toward which we are all striving, will not be driven to abandoning the principles for which we stood after a long fight on this legislation previously. We have twice gone on record as favoring the philosophy of this measure. It has now been submitted to us by the conferees. There is no real reason for us in haste to abandon the position we took after due deliberation. If we do I am certain that the measure will be ineffectual and will be unfairly administered, to the detriment of a great many States which will never be permitted to participate if the conference report be adopted.

Mr. President, it cannot do any harm to postpone this measure until next January. We can do great harm to many land-grant colleges if we take precipitate action. In my judgment, the motion of the Senator from Oregon should prevail. Let us take the matter up in January, when Senators do not have other conference reports on their minds, when we can study it, discuss it, and deal fairly with all the elements involved; because I can assure the Senate that if we pass the bill in this form we shall never be able to enact a piece of legislation amending it which will do justice to all sections of the country.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion submitted by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to postpone consideration of the conference report on the National Science bill until the second Thursday in January 1948, at 2 o'clock p. m.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, at this juncture I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] a question with respect to the conference report.

Since the conference report was agreed to by the conferees, some of those interested in the Warm Springs Foundation for the treatment of infantile paralysis have expressed some fear that under the terms of the bill embodied in the conference report they would in some way or other come under the jurisdiction or control of the Board or the provisions of the bill. I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey if there is anything in the bill that in any way relates to that, or which would bring that Foundation under the control or jurisdiction

of the Board, or in any way would affect the Foundation.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I am very glad to have the question presented. The matter was discussed in the conference, because it had been raised with other members of the conference committee.

I should like to read into the RECORD for the benefit of the Senator from Kentucky the provision having to do with this matter, to show why I feel the danger he anticipates is not in the bill at all. I read:

SEC. 4. (a) The Foundation is authorized and directed—

* * * * *

(7) to establish (A) a special commission on cancer research, (B) a special commission on heart and intravascular diseases, (C) a special commission on poliomyelitis and other degenerative diseases.

Section 9 (a) and section 9 (b) are provisions with regard to special commissions. Section 9 (a) merely provides for the appointment of the commissions. Subdivision (b), which I think is the important one, reads as follows:

(b) It shall be the duty of each such special commission to make a comprehensive survey of research, both public and private, being carried on in its field, and to formulate and recommend to the Foundation, at the earliest practicable date but not later than 1 year after the establishment of such special commission, an over-all research program in its field, and constantly to review the manner in which such program is being carried out.

The Senator will note that that is simply the provision for the program and the recommendation of the program by the Commission.

The point which the Senator has made was raised and there were others who felt that it was desirable to insert this provision, because there were various groups working in the field of polio who felt it would be wise to have a commission set up like the Cancer Commission to make recommendations for the carrying on of a research program which would be helpful and complementary, but not controlling.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator knows, as we all know, that the Warm Springs Foundation has inspired the interest and enthusiasm of a great many people in this country. It is doing very fine work. Of course I would not suggest that it can cover the entire field of research or treatment with regard to polio. But if I understand the Senator, there is nothing in the bill which would handicap or hamper the Foundation, which is going forward with this work in its own research, or in carrying out any policy it might see fit to pursue as a result of its research with the funds which may be available to the Foundation in the future. Is that the Senator's view?

Mr. SMITH. If I had thought for a moment that there could be any interference with the Warm Springs Foundation or the American Cancer Foundation by the provisions of the bill, I would not have been in favor of inserting the provisions, because I agree with the implications of the Senator's remarks. We want to do all we can to encourage those organizations to proceed with the magnificent work they are doing today.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's reply.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I had hoped that the creation of a National Science Foundation would be one of the accomplishments of this session of Congress. The conference report comes to us, because it is the best and the only possible method of obtaining a Science Foundation. It was signed by both Republicans and Democrats. It seems to me we have exaggerated in our discussion the importance of certain matters. The bill does not exclude the State universities. When money is to be distributed for proper research purposes, presumably it will be distributed to all those who are equipped and entitled to be considered as being able to conduct the kind of research that may be in question. I feel perfectly confident that the college presidents, themselves, might prefer to have their money absolutely insured, but as I talk with them, they say, "We will take our chance with a group of scientists, a group of educators; we will take our chance in getting our share, just as every other university in the United States must take its chance."

It seems to me, Mr. President, perfectly clear that if we postpone this matter, we shall not have a National Science Foundation bill passed by this Congress. As I say, the House rejected this particular amendment by an overwhelming vote. I think we have exaggerated the importance of the differences; perhaps they have. At any event, the Senate itself voted once against the Morse amendment. At another time it was carried by the changing of one vote. It is a question which has been in dispute. The question has been argued back and forth for 2 years. Surely, now, there is but one question: Do we want a National Science Foundation, or do we not? I think it would be a tremendous advance, and I think every educator in the country, every research worker, every scientist, every college man, if he were here today, would say, "All right; I may not agree with everything in it, but meanwhile we ought to go ahead and establish it. We can consider its faults later, if faults develop."

Mr. President, I hope the motion will be voted down, and that the conference report will be agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me? As the Senator well knows, I have a very great interest in this bill. I think I was the author of the original Science Foundation bill.

Mr. SMITH. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to say at this point that the Senator from Washington has been of the greatest help in building up the material and getting a bill together, and in its present position.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I regret I could not be here earlier in the day when the conference report was being discussed. I ask the Senator whether or not the conferees agreed to every part of the House bill which was different from the Senate bill?

Mr. SMITH. No; there were certain changes made. We agreed to certain provisions of the House bill and they agreed to certain provisions of the Senate bill, in working out an agreement. We have not compared it to determine exactly what the changes were.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The principal differences related to the organization of the Science Foundation and the Morse suggestion as to the distribution of funds?

Mr. SMITH. It was the organization of the Science Foundation, the method of appointing the director, that constituted the chief difference. That and the Morse amendment comprised the principal differences.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Those were the two principal differences?

Mr. SMITH. There were other provisions which were added in conference, to emphasize the desire to make the program nationwide, to include all areas of the country, and to be sure that every opportunity would be given to any institution to have its share of the funds.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say to the Senator that, reluctant as I am to agree with what the House did, and as enthusiastic as I have been for the so-called Morse amendment, I think I shall have to say, regardless of that, the importance of having a National Science Foundation is far greater in my mind probably than the settling of certain differences. I am sorry the Senate conferees agreed to certain provisions, but neverthless we need the National Science Foundation. The cause of basic science in this country is pressing. I hope the basic act may be amended, as it may be found necessary in the future.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Would the Senator from Washington agree that all the points he has raised, and all the points which have been raised by the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Ohio, can be considered on the second Thursday of January 1948, after Senators have had a chance to check into the matter in their States this fall? I raise the question especially in view of the fact that before the National Science Foundation can be launched, appropriations will have to be voted, and appropriations cannot be forthcoming until the next session of the Congress.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think there is a great deal in what the Senator says.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I want to point out that there are appropriations. The Army and Navy have very large appropriations for research, which can be distributed. It is intended that they shall be distributed by the Science Foundation.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I want to say a word or two in support of the motion of the Senator from Oregon. On

a certain occasion, when Christ was reported to be a resident of Galilee, the question was asked, "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" There are many people who think nothing good in the way of research will come out of the smaller schools and public universities. I think that is contrary to the history of the Nation. Unless we have a guarantee that will compel the Science Foundation to give proper consideration to a quota to be allocated to the public schools and universities and other public-supported institutions, there will be a natural gravitation of the research program into large universities and colleges. I think Harvard University has followed the salutary principle for a good many years of trying voluntarily to impose a sort of quota system upon its student body, and, I am proud to say, to permit a certain number of students from my section to have access to that great institution. What many schools have voluntarily assumed, Mr. President, we, in the expenditure of public money, have tried to impose in the Senate bill; which has been impaired by the conference report.

Mr. President, I was personally interested in another aspect of the bill. That was the provision that there should be two separate commissions, one for heart research, the other for cancer research. Heart disease, of one kind or another, kills one out of three of the people of America; cancer strikes down one out of seven. Surely, Mr. President, no research could be more important to the lives of our people than research in the fields of heart disease and cancer. There, again, in order to assure that the public interest would be best served, the Senate provided that the personnel of those two special commissions should be appointed by the President of the United States and confirmed by the Senate. Now, Mr. President, what do we find in the conference report? The Senate provision providing that the executive director should be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, has been impaired. We find instead an executive director, appointed by the Foundation. It is not a full-time Foundation, but a group of 24 men delegated to give only partial time to the grand function of the organization. So we do not have even an executive director appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate to be the executive head of the Foundation. Mr. President, not even the Foundation itself has full authority for the performance of its functions, but an executive committee of the Foundation, consisting of 24 persons. The special commissions, instead of being appointed by the President, as provided in the Senate bill will be appointed by the Foundation in form, but actually by the executive committee, a subordinate part even of the Foundation itself.

When we add those deficiencies, Mr. President, contained in the conference report to the failure to assure something like an adequate opportunity to all sections of this great country, we find that we have not given to the people the kind of a research plan to which they are entitled.

Genius, Mr. President, comes from the remote places. It comes from the humble places, as it came out of a log cabin once in the West to the great leadership of the Republic.

Mr. President, I do not believe this is a democratic science bill. I favor research. I would vote for 10 times the amount provided in the bill, and I believe it would be among the best purposes for which money could be spent. But the program must be a democratic one, it must be an American program, for all parts of America in the great war upon ignorance and for progress. All parts of America must have a chance to play a fair part.

Mr. President, I hope the motion of the Senator from Oregon will prevail.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to postpone further consideration of the conference report until the second Thursday in January 1948, at 2 o'clock p. m. On this motion the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. The Senator from New Hampshire, if present and voting, would vote "nay," and the Senator from New York, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] are detained on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. The transfer of that pair to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has been previously announced by the Senator from Kansas. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—38

Barkley	Downey	George
Chavez	Dworshak	Green
Connally	Ecton	Hatch
Cordon	Fulbright	Hill
Hoey	McKellar	Overton
Johnston, S. C.	McMahon	Pepper
Kilgore	Maybank	Russell
Langer	Morse	Sparkman
Lucas	Murray	Stewart
McCarran	Myers	Taylor
McClellan	O'Conor	Tydings
McFarland	O'Daniel	Umstead
McGrath	O'Mahoney	

NAYS—46

Aiken	Hawkes	Robertson, Va.
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Ball	Holland	Smith
Bricker	Ives	Taft
Brooks	Jenner	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Kem	Thye
Cain	Knowland	Vandenberg
Capehart	Lodge	Watkins
Capper	McCarthy	Wherry
Cooper	Magnuson	White
Donnell	Malone	Wiley
Ellender	Martin	Williams
Ferguson	Millikin	Young
Flanders	Reed	
Gurney	Revercomb	

NOT VOTING—11

Brewster	Eastland	Tobey
Bridges	Hayden	Wagner
Bushfield	Moore	Wilson
Byrd	Robertson, Wyo.	

So the motion to postpone was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE IN CONNECTION WITH ALLEGED ELECTION FRAUD IN MISSOURI

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as one of the three Senators on the Judiciary Subcommittee that has had charge of the hearings on the resolution to investigate Tom Clark, the Attorney General, in connection with the Missouri primary election of last year, I want every Member of this Senate, I want every man, woman, and child in America to know just exactly what this resolution relative to the action of the Department of Justice in connection with the Missouri elections will do if adopted. Here are the facts:

First. There was a corrupt, rotten, un-American, crooked primary election last year in Missouri.

Second. In that election there were both Federal and State candidates.

Third. Decent citizens and the Kansas City Star have investigated that election, interrogating roughly 8,000 witnesses.

Fourth. The State of Missouri has a governor, an attorney general, and various county prosecuting officials the same as any other State, and they are functioning.

Fifth. The board of elections passed a resolution demanding an investigation by the Federal Department of Justice.

Sixth. The Federal Government has no right to, and should not, supplant local authorities unless a violation of Federal law is involved. State officials, and not the Attorney General of the United States, should enforce State laws. If a Federal gestapo from Washington ever runs the elections—either primary or general—in every State in this Union, there will be the same Federal control over elections that there is in some foreign countries.

Seventh. In 1936—and, Mr. President, I ask every Senator upon this floor to

mark this well—United States District Attorney Maurice Milligan sent about 250 men to the penitentiaries and jails of Missouri for violating Federal election laws, and he thereby became the leading advocate of clean, honest elections. I challenge any Senator upon this floor to say that Mr. Milligan is not honest, that he is not capable, and that he did not do a good job in Missouri.

Eighth. In order to have clean, honest elections, Mr. Milligan came to Washington and made definite recommendations to the Department of Justice. The present Supreme Court Justice, Robert Jackson, was then Attorney General and Mr. Milligan's recommendations were adopted in full by the then Attorney General, Mr. Jackson.

Ninth. These recommendations, which were instituted by Attorney General Jackson in 1941, were followed by his successor, Attorney General Frank Murphy, now also an Associate Supreme Court Justice.

Tenth. When Frank Murphy went on the Supreme Court, the new Attorney General, Francis Biddle, also followed the practice instituted by Mr. Jackson.

Eleventh. When Francis Biddle resigned to be one of the judges at Nuremberg, Tom C. Clark became Attorney General, and he also followed exactly and precisely—exactly and precisely, Mr. President—what his three immediate predecessors had done in following Mr. Milligan's original recommendation.

Twelfth. Therefore, when complaints came in from the election board in Missouri, Attorney General Clark issued the identical orders for a preliminary investigation as had been issued in every election case, whether under Attorney Generals Jackson, Murphy, or Biddle.

Thirteenth. J. Edgar Hoover, the head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, who is directly responsible to Congress, has made painstakingly clear the fact that Attorney General Clark has done nothing in this Missouri case which was different in any way from what was done in any other case. In other words, the Missouri election was treated just the same as any other election case by the Attorney General and his three predecessors.

Fourteenth. Six members of the Judiciary Committee are now criticizing Attorney General Clark for not doing enough. Mr. President, had he deviated from Mr. Milligan's recommendations, these men could perhaps successfully ask him "Why?" Had he, for example, impounded the ballots, as suggested at one of the hearings before our committee, could it not have been charged by his opponents that he had done so to gain possession of them, and take them out of their possession—and possibly the jurisdiction of the grand jury of the State of Missouri, who had possession of them? Also, would there not have been the sinister implication that the ballots might have been changed while in the possession of the Federal Department of Justice?

Fifteenth. With startling clarity, Mr. President, these three facts stand out:

(a) The Attorney General had just convicted and sent to prison men holding high office.

(b) He had, only a few weeks previously, announced that his newly appointed assistant, John Sonnett, appointed in place of Wendell Berge, had been placed in charge of the Antitrust Division and would investigate the Clayton and the Sherman antitrust statutes, and he had announced that for the first time in the history of the United States he would send to jail anyone who violated the Clayton or the Sherman Antitrust Acts.

(c) He had dared to—faithful to his duties as Attorney General—antagonize Ed Pauley, the former treasurer of the National Democratic Party, in the Tidelands case, and in the Supreme Court he had just won the lawsuit which will ultimately result in securing many billions of dollars to the common people of America. He had had the courage to go counter to the opinions of 44 State attorneys general, in 44 States, to win for the American people as a whole the oil that the greedy, large oil companies had long thought was their own.

Mr. President, the people of America are entitled to know the truth; they are entitled to have that truth told upon the Senate floor. Although I am a Republican and I yield to no other Republican Senator on this floor in my fidelity to the Republican Party, I propose to tell the truth as I see it.

Very obliquely, my republicanism has been challenged by the author of the resolution. He said the other day, "There are six good Republicans on the committee." Inasmuch as I was the only Republican who voted against this resolution and inasmuch as there are seven Republicans on the committee, the inference was obvious. I ask this simple question: Did the States represented by any of the Republican Senators on the Judiciary Committee give a majority to the Republican Party for Mr. Willkie in 1940, and for Mr. Dewey in 1944, except North Dakota, the State which I have the honor of representing? The answer is "No." Inasmuch as I was, only a short time ago, described as the "political boss of North Dakota," it is evident that I must have had at least a small part in the carrying of North Dakota for both these Presidential candidates, inasmuch as I openly campaigned for both Mr. Willkie and Mr. Dewey in the years mentioned. My republicanism, therefore, is not open to successful challenge.

Now, Mr. President, let us tear away the veil, the curtain, that has been created by newspapers and radio propaganda. Let us examine this charge so eloquently expressed against me by the cartoon published in the Buffalo Express. Let us find out—let us get at the meat in the coconut—and let us ascertain whether the real battle here is not a fight to get rid of Mr. Clark, to get another Attorney General appointed; to scare the President of the United States; to get the President to remove him and to get an Attorney General appointed in his place whom the large, unscrupulous oil companies will like better; an Attorney General who will do what every Republican and Democratic Attorney General has done since 1890, namely, not enforce the antitrust laws of this Government.

I declare, Mr. President, that this is the issue, and I want every Senator on this floor to realize that it is the issue.

Mr. President, I have here with me, and I ask unanimous consent to place it in the RECORD, the testimony of Wendell Berge when he appeared before the Committee on Civil Service, and there admitted that since 1890, when the Sherman antitrust law was passed, not one single person has been sent to jail or to the penitentiary in the entire United States for violating the antitrust statutes of this country.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL—ANTITRUST DIVISION

STATEMENT OF WENDELL BERGE, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The CHAIRMAN. We have with us Mr. Berge, Assistant Attorney General, in charge of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice.

Will you proceed, Mr. Berge, first giving your name, position, and address?

Mr. BERGE. My name is Wendell Berge. I am Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

The CHAIRMAN. What we are interested in above everything else is the personnel and the compensation of that personnel, Mr. Berge.

Mr. BERGE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you state how many employees you have in your office over there in the Antitrust Division?

Mr. BERGE. Yes, Mr. Chairman. As of the 1st of February we had 175 lawyers on our staff, 21 experts and economists, 97 stenographers, 41 typists, and 10 messengers, or a total of 344.

Incidentally, that amounts to a reduction since January 1. That is, within 3 months we had a reduction of 21. We had 365 on our rolls as of January 1.

The CHAIRMAN. How many did you have a year ago?

Mr. BERGE. Well, I would have to figure it for you. It was approximately the same. If you want the precise figure, I will have to supply it.

The CHAIRMAN. Approximately.

Mr. BERGE. Approximately the same.

The CHAIRMAN. How about 2 years ago?

Mr. BERGE. A few less. I have, if I can lay my hands right on it, but I cannot seem to be able to do so. However, the personnel roughly fluctuates with the appropriations by Congress. We have the kind of law where you can do as much or as little as policy considerations dictate and the appropriations over a period of half a dozen years would give the trend of that.

Well, I will just have to state it roughly from memory, as I cannot lay my hands on it, but I can supply the precise figure later.

Going back as far as 1938 the Antitrust Division had an appropriation of $450,000, and I will have to give it in terms of legal personnel which would be a comparable figure to the 154 now; roughly legal personnel of about 45 and the appropriation was doubled the next year, I think, which gave a legal personnel of approximately 75 to 100. It was gradually stepped up to the

fiscal year 1942, at which time the appropriation was $2,325,000 and the legal personnel around 260, and then with the war there was a substantial reduction because, of course, curs was an agency which, contrary to the general trend, its activities were restricted during the war, and the antitrust laws were to a considerable extent superseded by controls and also the arrangements which were made with the War and Navy Departments that during the war certain cases would be postponed because the active prosecution might interfere with the war effort.

As a consequence, the appropriation was reduced to $1,400,000 and the legal personnel cut down to approximately 110, and it has been gradually increased since 1943.

The appropriation was about $1,600,000, I believe, when I took charge of the Division, during the fiscal year of 1944 with a personnel of 110 to 120, which has been increased to $1,900,000, exclusive of the congressional pay increases, which were effective last year.

Now, I have called those figures from memory. They are approximately correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Who appointed you?

Mr. BERGE. I am personally the President's appointee. I am the only one in the Division who is. The rest of the staff are appointed by the Attorney General, usually on my recommendation.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you been in the Department?

Mr. BERGE. I have been there a long time, Senator. I have been there 17 years.

The CHAIRMAN. Who appointed you originally?

Mr. BERGE. Attorney General Mitchell, John Lord O'Brien was head of the Antitrust Division. I served on the staff for nearly 10 years, first as just a memorandum writer, later as trial attorney, and later as Chief of the Appellate Section, and Chief of the Trial Section, and then as first assistant to the head of the Division, and early in 1941 I was appointed Assistant Attorney General.

At that time Justice Jackson was Attorney General. I was appointed by President Roosevelt on Attorney General Jackson's recommendation, assigned to head the Criminal Division, which I headed for a little more than 2½ years.

In August of 1943 the present Attorney General, Tom Clark, was then head of the Antitrust Division, and he and I exchanged posts. I became head of the Antitrust Division.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you appoint the 175 lawyers yourself?

Mr. BERGE. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Who appoints them?

Mr. BERGE. I would say that of our present staff, approximately 25 or 30 have been there for periods of 10 years or more; we term them career men.

That is, they are men who are happy and content to stay in the Federal service.

Mr. Western, chief of our appellate section, has been in the Department since 1928. He is one of the best brief writers in the Government.

Mr. Snyder, expert on petroleum matters, has been there since 1917, and the remaining number have been appointed at different intervals since 1938, when we commenced this period of expansion due to a policy change in the Government in which the policy became one of more vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws.

So, except for 25 or 30 men, the balance have been appointed since 1938. They have been appointed by the Attorney General at the recommendation of whoever was head of the Antitrust Division.

I believe that of the present staff approximately half of them were appointed during the period when Mr. Thurman Arnold was head of the Antitrust Division, and a few were appointed during the relatively short period when Mr. Clark was head of the Division, and probably 30 or 40 of the present staff were appointed on my recommendation.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the average pay of these 175 lawyers?

Mr. BERGE. The average would be—parenthetically in terms of the old schedules before the increases were made—I would say the average would be between $5,000 and $6,000 on the professional staff. Thinking in terms of the old schedule, the top would be $8,100, but of course with the several pay increases the top actually is $9,975.

Our section chiefs receive that, and a few of our lawyers; not very many. Probably half a dozen of our top trial men receive that.

Our great shortage is in the very lowest-paid brackets. You can get in an organization like ours a great deal of work out of able young men just a few years out of school, and 5 or 6 years ago, perhaps 20 to 25 percent of our staff was composed of young lawyers receiving from $2,500 to $3,000.

I may state the lowest-paid lawyer on our staff is now receiving $3,200. The war closed the law schools and there were not many men turned out in the recent period.

That does suggest this, which it is always well to bear in mind as to all agencies, especially ours, that the same amount of money does not begin to purchase the same amount of legal service it did a few years ago.

I have been going before the Appropriations Committees; for example, I always have to point out, as compared with the prewar position at the time we received $2,325,000 in our present appropriation, the figures are not comparable because at that time we had a much lower average salary and substantially more men in the lower-pay brackets than we have now, and probably if one were to equate the present purchasing power of the dollar to 1941, our appropriation would be the equivalent then of close to $3,000,000 in present terms.

It is reflected in the fact we have approximately 100 lawyers less than we had in 1941.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you been head of the Antitrust Division?

Mr. BERGE. Since August 1943.

The CHAIRMAN. How many cases did you institute in 1943?

Mr. BERGE. I can get that in just a second. I have the figures here of cases pending.

The CHAIRMAN. We want them by years.

Mr. BERGE. All right, cases instituted, how far back?

The CHAIRMAN. 1943, when you went in, when you became boss.

Mr. BERGE. I became boss in the fiscal year 1944.

During that year we instituted 22 cases. That was a war year.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, the next year?

Mr. BERGE. Twenty-four cases. The next year 26 cases. The present year to date, that is since last July 1, 34 cases.

Now, if we were to take last year on a calendar basis, we instituted 43 cases during the calendar year 1946.

The CHAIRMAN. You enforce the Clayton Act and the Sherman Antitrust Act?

Mr. BERGE. The Sherman Act, definitely. We have exclusive jurisdiction over that.

Many Sherman Act cases also involve questions of violations of the Clayton Act in the same case and we will allege violation of the two acts, but I think we have not brought any cases under the Clayton Act, exclusively.

The Federal Trade Commission has brought several cases under the same clauses of the Clayton Act and more or less by comity, we have left the major part of the enforcement of the Clayton Act to the Federal Trade Commission.

For example, the section under which the Robinson-Patman Act, which is an amendment; that is being administered by the Federal Trade Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The Sherman Antitrust Act provides both for criminal and civil actions.

Mr. BERGE. Correct.

The CHAIRMAN. I am interested in knowing, in 1944, how many criminal actions you had and how many convictions you had.

Mr. BERGE. During 1944?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; your first year.

Mr. BERGE. We instituted 11 criminal cases that year; during 1945 we instituted 8 criminal cases—no; I am sorry—during 1945, 5 criminal cases, and during 1946, 8 criminal cases.

The CHAIRMAN. How many are pending now in 1947?

Mr. BERGE. We have pending——

The CHAIRMAN. You started this year, 1947.

Senator JOHNSTON. Instituted.

Mr. BERGE. I am sorry, I cannot give you that figure.

Senator CHAVEZ. I think you said you filed 34 or 36.

Mr. BERGE. Yes; but of the cases we filed in the last year, 34, I do not have the breakdown here as between criminal and civil, but I will supply that to the committee.

I would say, roughly, 10.

The CHAIRMAN. How many men did you put in the penitentiary that you prosecuted under the Sherman Act?

Mr. BERGE. Under the Sherman Act, in the penitentiary?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; how many men did you put in the penitentiary as a result of prosecutions under the Sherman Antitrust Act?

Mr. BERGE. None for a generation.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to know why, if you are prosecuting the antitrust statute, why nobody has been put in the penitentiary.

Mr. BERGE. I have no trouble answering that question myself. I think, frankly, we have to recognize that the community does not regard the antitrust violation as a moral violation in the same sense that they would regard embezzlement.

The CHAIRMAN. Who says that?

Mr. BERGE. The courts and juries. I mean there have not been convictions. Our problem, sir, in criminal cases, is to get convictions of businessmen who in the mores and traditions of the community are not regarded as criminals.

The CHAIRMAN. If a man stole a loaf of bread in Minneapolis, he would go to jail, but if a combination get together and fix the price of that wheat, you do not send them to jail.

Mr. BERGE. No.

The CHAIRMAN. No one before you did?

Mr. BERGE. No.

The CHAIRMAN. No one, and that has continued under the Republicans and Democrats, and yet the law provides the man shall be sent to jail.

Mr. BERGE. The law provides for a fine or prison sentence, it being optional with the court.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not want to get away from it. I am coming back to your courts.

Mr. BERGE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And because your Department has been operating that way when you convict the man the judge will not send him to jail. Is that right or is it not right?

Mr. BERGE. I suppose it is right. There has come to be an acceptance of the fact that in the usual Sherman Act case a prison sentence has not been considered the appropriate punishment. I would say in a case where the activities are of a racketeering nature, where there has been force and violence employed in connection with the Sherman Act violation, that there are instances in the past where prison sentences have been imposed, but we think that in the usual case our most effective relief comes from a civil remedy in

which the parties are compelled affirmatively to change their practice.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us take a few examples.

The farmers in the Northwest bought trucks and automobiles from those big automobile people. As you know, there was a conspiracy formed among them whereby the purchaser had to pay the same amount of interest.

That was before your time, but your Department brought an action and they pleaded nolo contendere and the result was in effect the Department said, "Don't do it any more."

Mr. BERGE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Has that not been the practice in the country for years and years, "Just don't do it any more"?

Mr. BERGE. As far as the criminal remedy goes, of course when you impose a fine, it is, I am willing to agree, a slap on the wrist as far as large corporations go, and the fine can really be deemed in the books of the corporation almost as a license fee to continue an illegal practice, and I would have to say candidly that I do not think the criminal remedies of the Sherman Act have been a very effective deterrent to the repetition of Sherman Act violations.

Take our tobacco cases. We obtained very substantial fines, amounting to a quarter of a million dollars against the major tobacco companies, on an indictment which charged the price fixing of cigarettes in a concentrated drive to put the 10-cent cigarette out of the market.

The CHAIRMAN. What good does that do? They will raise the price 1 cent per package to make up for that.

Mr. BERGE. The maximum fine is $5,000.

Senator THYE. And that fine has been imposed, and they paid the fine; is that subject to deduction from income tax as part of the general overhead?

Mr. BERGE. I should think not. However, I am not a tax expert.

Senator JOHNSTON. I can answer that in the negative. No.

Senator THYE. If that is the case the United States Treasury paid the fine, and they went on doing business.

Mr. BERGE. There are cases where I think we have got to seek criminal remedies, roughly two classes of cases, price-fixing cases.

Where you have a price fixing, we have to bring criminal action, and the courts have held that price-fixing agreements are illegal per se.

Senator CHAVEZ. But from your past experience in trying those criminal cases where you find out you cannot get a conviction, what is the use of trying them?

Mr. BERGE. We can get convictions in price-fixing cases and we generally get them, and I would point out the amount of fines we collect annually in the criminal cases is very substantial, but my point, Senator, is this, if your defendant is a large corporation, and they generally are, the financial penalty is not a very big item to them and they will spend hundreds of thousands of dollars—I know of a case where they spent $2,000,000 in attorneys' fees—to fight a fine liability at most of a few hundreds of thousands of dollars.

The real deterrent as far as criminal penalty goes is the onus of an indictment.

Businessmen, most of them, do not like to be indicted and they do not like to be charged criminally.

The CHAIRMAN. We do not like it any more than the small fellow does. Nobody likes to be indicted. That is true.

Mr. BERGE. Quite true.

The CHAIRMAN. Why should the big fellow not be sent to jail and the little fellow sent to jail?

Mr. BERGE. I am not arguing against it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not your job to put them in jail? Did not the Congress say that the Sherman Act for the violation of it, they can be sent to jail?

Now, I want to know why they have not been sent to jail.

Mr. BERGE. If you want me to tell you why, I think——

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BERGE. I think the prosecutors of the Sherman Act long before I came into office—and I accepted it because I think it is true—concluded that except in a case where there are very heinous circumstances, you cannot get a jail conviction. The disposition of juries would be against conviction.

Senator CHAVEZ. That being the case, your coming to that conclusion, and for the purposes that the committee has in mind, which is only personnel, why should you have those criminal lawyers in the Division when you cannot get a conviction?

Mr. BERGE. Do not misunderstand. I have not said I do not think the criminal penalties do not have their place. I say they have. I think if you take them out of the act, businessmen will be very much more likely to violate the act.

I would like to see the penalties increased. But if we had a maximum fine of $50,000 instead of $5,000, we could not get it very often.

The fear of the criminal penalties is the in-terrorem effect of their being there and the businessman will go to any length to avoid a Sherman Act indictment.

I do not want to name cases, but it is almost daily that parties who know there is a grand jury investigation in progress come in and plead for us to transfer it to the civil side.

They do not want to be indicted. We have many, many instances where the indictments have been returned.

Our doors are always open. We are not there to persecute people. We will listen to them.

The instances are rare—in fact, I cannot think of any at the moment—where we have dismissed a criminal suit and brought civil suit.

Businessmen do not like the onus of an indictment. It is a social stigma, and the in-terrorem effect of those penalties and the criminal prosecution of those practices is a deterrent, but where there are violations deliberately, willingly, and knowingly done, and where there are no mitigating circumstances, it should be brought on the criminal side.

Senator CHAVEZ. But you would not bring any other cases on the criminal side, except where you think the testimony would warrant conviction, that notwithstanding where you brought that you had sufficient evidence to bring a criminal case.

I know it is pretty hard to bring a criminal case against a corporation. You might be mistaken, but nevertheless you come to the conclusion that a criminal case is necessary, and then you come before this committee and tell them that notwithstanding that, we cannot get a conviction.

Mr. BERGE. Notwithstanding that, we do not get a conviction.

Senator CHAVEZ. You stated you did not have a single conviction in 1944.

Mr. BERGE. No; I was certainly misunderstood if I said we did not have a conviction. I certainly did not mean that.

Senator CHAVEZ. I am sorry.

Mr. BERGE. We have won most of our cases.

The CHAIRMAN. Nobody went to jail?

Mr. BERGE. The only question I was answering was whether or not we had jail sentences. I can show you—I am not too good at picking out the right figure just when I want it.

The CHAIRMAN. Take your time.

Mr. BERGE. If I can go over the transcript later, I say I can supply the figure, and I will do so.

Senator CHAVEZ. Does the department under your direction do any prosecuting?

Mr. BERGE. Yes, sir.

Senator CHAVEZ. Or is it turned over to the local United States attorney?

Mr. BERGE. No; we usually handle the actual indictment and trial of criminal cases. We have cooperation from the local district attorneys, but these cases are worked up by the antitrust staff.

Often we do not know until the final institution of the case where we will institute it, because it involves Nation-wide activity.

Senator CHAVEZ. No; we only want to discuss them only if they can be of any help to the committee in deciding whether or not you have too much personnel or not too much personnel.

Mr. BERGE. Yes.

Senator O'CONOR. I gathered, before you were about to say as to the amount of the fine, that the fines given here, if I anticipated it correctly, exceeded the amount of the appropriation.

Mr. BERGE. I did not mean to say "exceeded." They were very substantial.

Senator O'CONOR. In connection with the imposition of those fines, did your division recommend jail sentences?

Mr. BERGE. No. I think we have only recommended jail sentences in a few cases where the practices were accompanied by violence or conduct which, according to the usual standards, is highly immoral as well as technically illegal, but there has been no jail sentence imposed since 1930 when some candy racketeers out in Chicago went to jail in connection with the Sherman Act violation, but it was in a broad sense a racketeering case. It was an effort to put out of business the candy merchants who sell those nickel bars of candy three for a dime, the so-called tobacco merchant who has that price on candy, and they had an association in an endeavor to fix the price at 5 cents a bar, and they tried to get everybody into it.

Those that would not join, they would surround with tear gas and break windows and go to all limits and conduct of that sort.

We jailed them. I think that is the last jail sentence.

It would be quite a futile gesture, and I do not want to provoke an argument, but it would be quite a futile gesture in the automobile finance case, for example, to put Henry Ford, Walter Chrysler, and Knudsen in jail.

The CHAIRMAN. Your section has a suit pending against the tungsten manufacturers.

Mr. BERGE. That case is being tried right now.

The CHAIRMAN. These people are buying that at $24 a pound, and they got together and raised that to $480 a pound.

Mr. BERGE. $453, I believe.

The CHAIRMAN. And it cost $24, and not a single living soul went to jail.

Mr. BERGE. The case is being tried now. I know they probably will not go to jail.

Senator ECTON. Supposing a jail sentence were imposed, who would go to jail, the president, secretary, or the entire board of directors?

Mr. BERGE. Under the law of criminal liability, those responsible criminally are those who have personal knowledge of the activities.

In civil cases we join the officials where the theory is that the injunction is to operate in the future and control the policies of the company, but in a criminal case you could only hold responsible those who actually conceived the policy and guided the criminal act or conduct.

You might be president of the corporation, but you might be the kind of president who spends most of the time on the golf course and only comes to the office occasionally.

The fact that you are president of the company would not be any basis for criminal conviction.

On the other hand, if you were actively engaged, you would be subject to fine; and if anyone was going to jail, undoubtedly it would be those fellows who had personally been responsible for the illegal act.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us take it down in common, ordinary horse sense. We will say a fellow has 10 liquor stores in a prohibition State like Kansas. He is the president of the company, and he hires 10 fellows and 3 or 4 of them get together and raise the price.

Do you mean to say the fellow that sells the liquor ought to go to jail and not the president of the outfit?

Mr. BERGE. If the president directed the conduct.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Ecton is very much interested in that. A man goes to play golf and charges $453 a pound for tungsten.

Mr. BERGE. There are all kinds of presidents. Some are active and some do not have anything to do with what is going on. We have evidence in a criminal case indicating an individual is without knowledge. No court in the land would allow a case to go to the jury as against an individual where we did not have some evidence against him personally; and if they did and there was a conviction, on appeal it would no doubt be reversed.

The CHAIRMAN. Would not the president know?

Mr. BERGE. I think usually they do.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. Usually they do. If they charge $453 for tungsten that cost them $24, they would know.

Mr. BERGE. As a usual thing, presidents are included in criminal cases; but one of the Senators asked what the test was, and I said the test was not the office you held, but the knowledge you had.

Occasionally a case is received—and I think it is only fair to point this out—where there is a large conspiracy involving some loose practices, and some combination, the only responsible official in the company who knew what was going on was the sales manager. We do not like to indict the sales manager and let his superiors go, but there have been instances where we either indicted him or could not indict anybody.

But I do not like to be in the position of arguing for a soft policy, because that is not what I believe in.

The CHAIRMAN. As I understand it, you took an oath of office to enforce the Sherman Antitrust Act, and part of that is criminal. Why come before us and say you are not sending a man to the penitentiary?

Why not get rid of that penalty? You are not using it now.

Mr. BERGE. We have tried to explain it. The belief we have had, based on years of experience, was that the real effective deterrent of the criminal violation was the onus that goes with a criminal trial and conviction, and that, as a practical matter, jurors would not convict and judges would not sentence if the penalties were too steep.

That is not due to any personal whim of mine, but if it is clear we have misconstrued what Congress wants in connection with criminal penalties, I am quite confident the Attorney General would change the policy.

Most of the complaints we get, going the other way around, are complaints that we applied criminal penalties to honest fellows who really did not intend to violate the law, and since they are innocent men, they only ought to receive civil proceedings.

Senator CHAVEZ. The law imposes penalties after a conviction.

Mr. BERGE. It is in the disjunctive. The prosecutor has an option as to what penalty he will seek or he may recommend none to the judge, and it is up to the judge.

It is just as in minor traffic cases, there is discretion in the prosecuting official to ask a jail sentence, but if it is a first offender, he probably gets a small fine.

Senator CHAVEZ. I am speaking about the law itself, not the policy by which the law is administered.

The law itself, if it says a man convicted of a certain offense can be fined or sent to jail, then there is a penalty attached to the law.

Mr. BERGE. There certainly is a penalty attached to the law.

Senator CHAVEZ. But as I understood you from your experience, and due to the fact that as a general rule it might be hard to get a conviction, generally, it is better to recommend a fine.

Senator JOHNSTON. Are any penalties in the conjunctive?

Mr. BERGE. Disjunctive. If it is clear that the statute said there shall be a prison sentence and a fine we would be under the legal obligation of asking it.

Senator CHAVEZ. Or to pay a fine and go to jail, too, but in this law it is discretionary for the court to impose either a fine or imprisonment?

Mr. BERGE. Yes; and discretionary with the prosecuting officials what they will recommend. I do not know of any criminal statute, barring high crimes and misdemeanors where it is otherwise.

The penalty is only a misdemeanor and the maximum is 1 year.

The CHAIRMAN. One year in jail.

Senator CHAVEZ. Except when you bring it about by conspiracy.

Mr. BERGE. All your cases under section 1 of the Sherman Act are conspiracy cases, and agreement to violate the Sherman Act, but the maximum penalty is a year or a fine, so it is a misdemeanor. I am quite confident there is not a misdemeanor statute that does not at least give an option between a jail sentence or fine in a misdemeanor case.

Senator CHAVEZ. I am not criticizing the law itself.

Mr. BERGE. You just asked what it was. I just want to get it clear. It is optional.

Senator CHAVEZ. It is optional and in the instances you have been discussing, it has always been a fine and not a jail sentence.

Mr. BERGE. Yes, with very few exceptions.

Senator ECTON. How are proposed violations of the law called to your attention? Through complaints?

Mr. BERGE. Mostly through complaints. And something I would like to emphasize whenever I have the opportunity, is that usually Sherman Act cases are not basically a row as between Government and business, but a row between two different groups of businessmen.

Senator ECTON. I wonder if these complaints did not often originate by what—by one competitor.

Mr. BERGE. Usually. They may originate from a present competitor or a potential competitor. Very often by someone who tries to enter the business.

A brief shorthand test of monopoly is whether a man can get into a business. Or if he finds he cannot get a source of supply, then they gang up and he cannot get patents and licenses, and there are so many fields of business in this country you cannot get into. The only way you can get in is to go to the big boys and join the club.

Senator ECTON. Is that not one reason why you have to be a little hesitant to send everybody to jail?

Mr. BERGE. Possibly.

Senator ECTON. Most competitors would like to see all of their competitors in jail.

Mr. BERGE. There is a tendency to feel that way, but most complaints arise from some business source. They may be consumers who feel that they are being mulcted.

Senator THYE. How did it come to your attention in the first case you are now prosecuting that it was necessary for you to enter the case?

Mr. BERGE. Which case?

Senator THYE. The tungsten case you referred to.

Mr. BERGE. I would have to look that up. It was instituted before the war. The indictment was returned in 1940 or 1941 and I inherited it. It was one of the cases that had been postponed at the request of the Army and Navy and after VJ-day, all this happened, all those bans were lifted, and we got busy.

Senator THYE. You mean the Army and Navy requested that no action be instituted against this firm?

Mr. BERGE. No; they permitted it to be instituted, but asked that the trial be postponed.

Senator THYE. Why would they make such a request?

Mr. BERGE. Well, there were roughly between 30 and 35 cases where indictments were returned, or civil proceedings instituted shortly before Pearl Harbor. It came up even before Pearl Harbor, that in connection with the defense program many of the defendants felt they could not fairly be asked to give the time to prepare their defense and supply their officials and experts to appear as witnesses in the proceedings and they went to the War Department about it.

I was not head of the Division, but it was explained to me what happened; it was during the period I was in the Criminal Division.

There were a few cases where an informal arrangement was made to postpone trials, but the Department of Justice did not like to be in the position of just taking the defendant's word for it that it would upset their operations if they were put to trial during the war, so we reached an arrangement with the War and Navy Departments which was approved by the President that if the War or Navy Department would request it in writing, request us to defer the institution or trial of the case, we would do it on their statement that the prosecution of the trial during the war would interfere with the war effort, and there are about 30 or 35 cases in which that was done.

There were not any since I have been head of the Division where the request was to postpone the institution of the case, but there were these thirty-odd cases in which the trial was delayed.

That gave us quite a backlog of cases to be tried, which is one of the causes of the personnel shortage.

You asked the reasons. They did not have to assign reasons. That was the determination the Army and Navy reached. I know what kind of reason it was. For example, it was a cartel case, and the defendant would have to put on the stand the heads of the operating department and some of their business officials who negotiated contracts.

It was not only a matter of time taken up to testify, but in a big case they would have to spend weeks or months reviewing old contracts and go through old files in order to adequately testify.

After I became head of the Department in 1944, we instituted a suit against du Pont and the Imperial Chemical Industries of Great Britain, and there were some 2,000 patents involved in that case.

Under an agreement originally made between du Pont and Imperial Chemical Industries to divide the entire world into noncompetitive departments so there was no competition in the international field between du Pont and Imperial.

They claimed, and I am not in position to dispute it, that the trial of that case during the war would upset their whole production and operating organization.

We all know du Pont was giving a great deal of its effort to the war work.

In fact, I believe it was stated to us in that case that some of the vital contracts and papers that the defendant Imperial Chemical Industries would need were buried in caves in England to keep them from being destroyed.

This carbide case on trial now—during the war their effort was all concentrated on winning the war and the military authorities felt that an attempt to try the case would be an unnecessary distraction.

Senator THYE. Your men never made an attempt to find out why an automobile of the same horsepower and same weight is in the same price bracket as others, as well as tractors and plows.

Mr. BERGE. Senator——

Senator THYE. Your men never make an investigation to ascertain why these manufacturers could find themselves within almost the same identical price range.

Mr. BERGE. Are you not changing the subject? We were talking about the postponement of the trial.

Senator THYE. I am asking you the question, sir.

Mr. BERGE. I am sorry.

Senator THYE. All you have to do is make the answer.

Mr. BERGE. I did not understand the question.

Senator THYE. My question was simply this: Do your men go out in the field and attempt to ascertain the price of an automobile and the weight and horsepower is relatively the same and the machinery, the plow or tractor happens to be near the price insofar as the weight, size, and type of equipment happens to be?

All you have to tell me is what you do.

Mr. BERGE. We would if there were reason to believe the similarity of price was fixed by agreement.

Senator THYE. How do you happen to arrive at the conclusion that the similarity seems to indicate it requires an investigation on your part?

Mr. BERGE. The fact of similarity in price of itself would not be sufficient reason for us to investigate because, in some instances, competitive activities will result in similar prices.

Senator THYE. The thing is to ascertain whether or not—the question I am trying to find out, is there any justification for the existence of your Department under the present management and policies of the administration.

Mr. BERGE. Senator, we do not have the personnel or facilities to investigate every industry in which there is a similarity of price to determine whether that similarity is accomplished with competition or whether as the result of restraining competition, but we do investigate such similarities when a complainant submits evidence, or when we otherwise get hold of evidence other than mere similarity in price which would suggest the violation.

Senator THYE. When you say a claimant, that would mean, we will say, a buyer, a man seeking to make a purchase, found the price was just this, no matter which company or which merchant he may go to, and seek to make this purchase, and unless that man has the courage to say what I think you have entered into an agreement to fix the price, he proceeds to bring that information in to you, and only in that manner would there be any action instituted.

Mr. BERGE. No.

Senator THYE. The point was how does this happen, Mr. X and Mr. Y manufacture that merchandise, can manufacture it in every conceivable way and arrive at the same identical expense on their product. And with all of your experts and your 170 attorneys you never try to ascertain how they arrived at that identical price?

Mr. BERGE. Yes; we have taken certain industries and made economic studies for the very purpose of arriving at that kind of understanding, and it has always been done.

We have experts, and we have taken certain industries and made economic studies for the very purpose of arriving at that kind of an understanding.

We have made such studies in cement. We have made such studies in steel. We have made studies of industries in which the basing-point system operates where there is apparently a lack of price competition. But the defendants in industries where you have a basing-point system have explanations and theories not easy to counteract always.

We are testing the basing-point system now in one important case, and I think there may be others.

Now those cases were instituted by studies of our own economists, and it is a very complicated matter to understand price structures, and you have to go through all the relevant data in it and try to apprise whether or not there is similarity of price due to lack of competition or not.

On the other hand there are many industries where the similarity of price has come to our attention initially from a complainant.

I would like to make this suggestion, if I may. I hope it will help you to understand our problem.

You state it quite correctly that we have a staff of economists and a staff of lawyers, and one might from that just immediately reach the conclusion that we ought to be able to ferret out every situation of importance in the country where there is lack of competition.

I would like to suggest that in the preparation of this basing point case I mentioned, it probably took the time of six men approximately a year to analyze that data and work it up.

As I said here, we have 21 economists. We have 1 man of those 21 who is an expert on steel. We had one who was an expert on aluminum. He recently left us.

But to take up one of those industries——

The CHAIRMAN. Wait a minute. Be fair to the Senator.

Mr. BERGE. I am trying to be.

The CHAIRMAN. You have got nearly 8,000 FBI men right in your Department over there; is that not right?

Mr. BERGE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You can use them anytime you ask for them from Mr. Hoover.

Mr. BERGE. We are using the FBI.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you have not got 120; you have got 8,000 men.

Mr. BERGE. To do our field investigation and secure the factual data necessary in these cases. All our field work is done by the FBI. I was talking about the analysis at headquarters where we have to apprise the significance of this data and make determinations as to whether or not there is a suit. It is one thing to compile a mass of factual data through investigation and another thing, and a much more difficult thing to decide——

The CHAIRMAN. You are answering Senator THYE's question. Just go right ahead.

Mr. BERGE. I am trying to the best of my ability to answer the questions.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to make it clear to the Senator you have got these 8,000 men.

Mr. BERGE. I do not think the FBI could allocate 8,000 men for an antitrust investigation. They have other duties.

Senator THYE. It is conceivable that your men out in the field observe these things—at least they should, or otherwise I do not know why they are there—in the event there was a question in your mind that it just could not be possible that two manufacturers or two processors could arrive at the identical figure of this commodity or of this manufactured merchandise, you might say, "Would your department, the FBI, give us a rough report of the situation?" as you either have it rumored up in this area or as you happen to pick it up. After you got that type of report it would then be possible to proceed, if you thought it was justifiable, to put your experts in there, too, to analyze the entire question.

I can readily see that would be the procedure. At least, common sense would tell me that is how I would try to arrive at some of the information.

Mr. BERGE. Senator, let me just say, we do that very often, and that there are many of our price-fixing cases which have originated after just that kind of inquiry, where we were led to be suspicious that there was something wrong, some exclusive arrangement about prices, because of the identity of price.

A fair percentage of the investigations we have made and of the cases we have brought have been cases that originated just about that way, where the appearance of the industry indicated some understanding about prices, and we made our investigation and found that there was.

I, perhaps, overemphasize it, but I merely want to suggest that identity of price does not in, and of, itself suggest a case. It does require further investigation, and we make many price investigations that do establish to our satisfaction that there is an illegal agreement, and we go ahead.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you through, Senator Thye?

Senator THYE. Yes; thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The Federal Trade Commission conducts investigations also?

Mr. BERGE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What does your department do that they do not do?

Mr. BERGE. We enforce the Sherman Act, and the Federal Trade Commission does not take any cases under the Sherman Act. We have a close working arrangement.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Riley, find out how many employees the Federal Trade Commission has.

Mr. RILEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BERGE. When they develop cases that they think properly fall under our activity they refer them to us, and we refer cases to them.

I am in no position, certainly, to explain what the Federal Trade Commission does.

The CHAIRMAN. Wait a minute, Mr. Berge; you do not want this committee to understand you are so ignorant you do not know what the Federal Trade Commission does.

Mr. BERGE. What I mean to say is, I am not authorized to testify for the Federal Trade Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. We are not asking that.

Mr. BERGE. I do not want to be unfair to the Federal Trade Commission, but I want to give you my best judgment.

I think the Federal Trade Commission spends a substantial part of its efforts on two efforts that have nothing to do with our work. One is the enforcement of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act which prohibits unfair methods of competition. And as a result of that the committee knows many cease-and-desist orders have been issued. Second is misbranding of products and misrepresentation of products.

We have nothing to do with that, and I think the Commission would agree that a substantial part of its effort is devoted to that.

The Commission also has a function of working out trade-practice agreements with industry. It is not my business to know how much of their personnel is devoted to that, and I do not know; but a substantial part is.

When it comes to investigations, the principal overlapping, I would say, is in Clayton Act cases. But there, if we find that they are in a particular investigation first and that the remedies under their act are sufficient, they go ahead and we devote our attention to something else.

Occasionally they pass something to us with the recommendation that it is more appropriate for us to proceed with it.

There is really not a great deal of overlapping even in our statutory duties except for the Clayton Act.

The CHAIRMAN. They have 637 employees with the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. BERGE. May I volunteer a little statement at this point?

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead, say anything you want.

Mr. BERGE. I just want to suggest this: That I think the history of the Sherman

Act shows you that until about 10 years ago—I do not say this in criticism of anybody. I was in the Division during part of that time. But I think up until about 10 years ago there was not any attempt by any administration to apply the Sherman Act in a broad base of industry. I think it is a fair statement to make.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, Mr. Berge, you remember the great, beautiful headlines about Frank B. Kellogg, known as the trust buster.

Mr. BERGE. I think there is a great deal of credit to be given to the pioneers for certain outstanding cases, and I do not for a moment intend to belittle it, but I say this: That for a period of 30 or 40 years—and statistics will show this—there would be two, or three, or four large cases brought during a particular administration.

Now, I think that the Standard Oil case, and the Tobacco case, and the Northern Securities case, which were brought in the Theodore Roosevelt administration, were great cases, and they accomplished a substantial divestiture of the concentrated economic power in those industries. They also made some good law on the interpretation of the Sherman Act, but we must bear in mind that was over a period of about 7 years, and that is, after all, only three or four large cases.

Now, I found out recently, in connection with the looking over of the history of prosecutions, from 1896 until 1901 there were only three suits instituted under the act. That was the very early days of the act.

Now, as you go on from the period of Theodore Roosevelt to, say 1938, the numbers of suits that were brought did increase per administration, but a candid appraisal of the suits would indicate that many of them were not of broad national significance, just as some of our cases are not.

I am not saying it cr'tically at all. I am giving only my personal opinion. But I think that the Sherman Act philosophy presents most Americans with a sort of emotional or psychological conflict.

We all believe in free competition. We all believe, as a matter of principle, in a free and open market. And yet there is a certain reluctance to see an all-out attempt to really make the Sherman Act effective, and I think that for 35 or 40 years we paid lip service to the ideals of the Sherman Act, and we, in practice, brought a few suits as a token to those ideals.

I think, Senator, we cannot escape that conclusion if we look at the statistics of the concentration of economic power during that period. I mean it increased. In other words, we wanted our cake and we wanted to eat it too.

Now, without trying to explain what happened, I think there were various reasons for it—and I am still giving my personal opinion—but in the latter part of the 1930's we determined to try an experiment in broader enforcement. My own explanation of it may not be any good. I will give it for whatever it is worth.

When our economy collapsed in the late 1920's and early 1930's, we were faced with a national emergency, and we turned, as one does in an emergency, to methods that were not wholly consistent with our history and tradition and our notions.

We turned to a period of control, NRA, and various other measures which went directly contrary to the Sherman Act philosophy. Whether or not that was a wise thing to do, there is no point now to debate. When a house is on fire you do not stop to adopt the most scientific methods.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us take up this "house on fire" business. On July 2, 1890, 57 years ago next July, the Congress passed the Sherman Act. Just read the first paragraph of the act, the very first paragraph of the act, gentlemen. [Reading:]

"Every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, is hereby declared to be illegal: * * * Every person who shall make any contract or engage in any combination or conspiracy hereby declared to be illegal shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by fine not exceeding $5,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court."

So, the house has not been burning for 57 years. This was long before World War I, when they got together food combinations, as you know.

Mr. BERGE. All I am trying to say, I think we have to agree during that period, let us say, before the last depression, we did not make the section you just read very effective in American life.

The CHAIRMAN. That is why we are here. Your predecessor or his predecessor did not do it, and you are not doing it.

Mr. BERGE. I admit we are not doing it as well as it ought to be done, and it is my personal belief, and I have said so on many occasions, that we ought to give a lot more emphasis to it and bring a lot more suits—and have a lot more men and money with which to do it.

That gets down to cases, but I point out that in the Socony-Vacuum case—the Madison, Wis., oil case—back there in 1939, there were 50 lawyers on the other side and we had 6.

The CHAIRMAN. I can tell you about that. Go ahead. I did not tell you about it—you brought it up. You remember what happened when these big oil companies were indicted and right here in the city of Washington. You know what happened. They went over here after they were indicted—and this Government had roughly over a billion dollars coming—and your Department of Justice walked down here to Judge Laws 2 days before Christmas——

Mr. BERGE. You are talking about——

The CHAIRMAN. About your oil cases.

Mr. BERGE. I was talking about the one up in Wisconsin.

The CHAIRMAN. That was insignificant compared to the one you had right here in Washington. And your Justice Department signed an agreement with those companies whereby you serve 21 more. You serve them at 10 o'clock in the morning and at 2 o'clock in the afternoon they had in there their answer, the same day, about the 21st of December.

It came before the judge and the judge said, "Do you gentlemen mean you have agreed to take a plea of nolo contendere?" and two Assistant Attorneys General resigned because they would not sign it. Two of your Assistant Attorneys General would not sign that agreement, and the judge said, "Well, it is Christmas time, and it must be Christmas time when you are giving away a billion dollars."

General Gillette, of Iowa, tried to get an investigation, and I tried to get an investigation, and we could not get anywhere.

Here the other day, only about 5 or 6 weeks ago, you dismissed an oil case.

Mr. BERGE. We have not dismissed it, Senator; that was an erroneous report in the papers; we have not dismissed it.

The CHAIRMAN. Still pending, are they?

Mr. BERGE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. But those 21 are dismissed.

Mr. BERGE. You were referring to the Elkins Act cases which involved——

The CHAIRMAN. Pipe line.

Mr. BERGE. Pipe line; yes, sir. The report the other day that was incorrect was that we were going to dismiss the American Petroleum Institute case.

The CHAIRMAN. I am referring back to 1941.

Mr. BERGE. I know it by hearsay. That was during the period I was head of the Criminal Division, and I do not know the full story.

The CHAIRMAN. They paid a fine, the Government lost a billion dollars.

Mr. BERGE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What shape are the present oil cases in? Are you prosecuting them or who is prosecuting them.

Mr. BERGE. Yes. We are bringing some more cases, too. We have pending this case against the American Petroleum Institute and several hundred defendants. That is pending here in the District.

We filed within the month two major oil cases on the west coast against two of the large companies operating out there, involving their system of exclusive arrangements with service stations. I think it involves some 7,000 exclusive dealer contracts that we charged tied up and, in effect, monopolized the distribution outlets on the west coast, and we have some further cases coming up.

The only trouble, there are so many practical problems presented in this large American Petroleum Institute case, because of the vast number of defendants and the fact the suit was brought prior to the war and involves only prewar facts. There is going to be a tremendous investigatory job involved to bring that up to date. You realize that case was filed late in 1940, but we have not dismissed it.

The CHAIRMAN. It has been pending 6 years.

Mr. BERGE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to give you an example of what the common people think of your Department of Justice. Senator THYE, Senator ECTON, and I all live in the Northwest.

A farmer up there made a loan from one of your Federal agencies, a miserable loan of a few hundred dollars. He was poor and rather ignorant. And when the Government took this mortgage they said they also had a mortgage on the increase of cattle. That poor farmer sold a little during the drought in order to feed his family. They arrested him. He pleaded guilty because he had no money to hire a lawyer, and he was put in the penitentiary because he sold a calf or two. That was the Hammond case, Senator, where I think they sold two or three calves, butchered them, to feed the family.

In the second paragraph of this Antitrust Act it says:

"Every person who shall monopolize, or attempt to monopolize, or combine or conspire with any other person or persons to monopolize, any part of the trade or commerce among the several States or with foreign nations, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by fine not exceeding $5,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court."

In 57 years, you said a little while ago, you had not sent one man to the penitentiary.

Mr. BERGE. I did not say that. We have sent some. In reply, I believe, to Senator O'CONOR's question a little while ago, I mentioned this candy manufacturers' case back in 1930. There are several others.

I agree with you that, as a general practice, we have not, and only in a few instances were there prison sentences imposed, but I do not want to be misunderstood as to prison sentences.

The CHAIRMAN. As a matter of fact, there have not been any imposed. Why should we have this Department at all? In 57 years you have not sent anybody to jail?

Mr. BERGE. I do not think for a minute, and I doubt that you do, that the only purpose of the Sherman Act is to put people in jail.

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly it is. The Congress said if they violate that law.

I will leave it to Senator THYE; he was a governor. You had that experience, Senator, when you were Governor. You put in an ad for tires—do you remember that experience? You put in an ad for tires for the highway department, and six bids came in—$17.11, all

alike from every tire company right down to the very last penny. And when you applied to the Federal Government for help you could not get it.

Mr. BERGE. I wish that I could some way adequately tell you how many, many instances we have had of small business organizations coming in and telling us, and writing us, and thanking us for keeping them in business by suits that we have brought. I think that you cannot overlook the vast importance of our civil remedies. There has been hardly any discussion of that.

Take in the motion-picture field, all over the country there is a problem of the independent exhibitor staying in business.

The CHAIRMAN. Now we will stop right there. Take your picture business.

In Devils Lake, N. Dak., there is a fellow who had a picture business. The trust walked in, your monopoly walked in, and said: "If you do not sell out, we are going to put in a bigger picture house than you have, and we will not give you any pictures."

And in Grand Forks, a fellow, Benny Berg; now in Minneapolis, who had three theaters. The trust came in and said: "We will put you out of business." He came to our legislature and our legislature passed a law divorcing the owner of the theater business, the owner of the building, from the fellow producing and showing the film.

They took us into Federal court. We notified your Department of Justice. That trial lasted 3 weeks. The motion-picture industry came in with lawyers headed by Factor of New York, and hired a whole floor of the Gardner Hotel. We could not get one penny from the Federal Government. We had to hire our own attorneys and we did. We hired good ones.

What happened? Three judges came down and at the end of 3 weeks they convicted them. They said they could not have an injunction against our State enforcing that law.

The first thing we knew the moving-picture fellows had a case in the Supreme Court of the United States. And we had Judge Devaney—one of the lawyers from your State, Senator—and over his protest they repealed that statute.

Senator Neely promptly put in a bill in Judiciary Committee, and when we came in 1941 to pass that bill in Judiciary Committee one of your men from the Attorney General's office came in there and said, "Please, please, do not pass this statute in time of war."

And they held it up for 1 year, 2 years, 3 years—held it up 4 years.

I would like to have you tell me what difference that made to the winning of the war.

Mr. BERGE. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. And yet your Attorney General's office stopped us from passing that statute. And then Senator CAPPER tried it, and the Attorney General's office came in and said, "Do not pass this statute."

Mr. BERGE. Is that the divorcement bill?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BERGE. I am not aware we opposed it.

Senator JOHNSTON. When you are bringing a suit, does not a corporation come to the Congress sometimes and propose legislation to take it out from under you?

Mr. BERGE. We have had that happen in the railroad field, in the newspaper field. We have had that threatened in other situations whenever we win a suit or think we are going to win one; they come in and try to deprive the court of jurisdiction by special legislation.

I do not know, Mr. Chairman, and you do know—I am not questioning your accuracy—but I do not know of any effort by our Department—and I was not involved in it—to defeat any action on that bill.

What you said about the North Dakota situation: I am sorry we could not give effective relief up there, and we have got that situation all over the country. If we were to proceed by separate legal actions in each jurisdiction where there are those practices you have mentioned in your statement, it would take more than the staff of the whole Antitrust Division devoted to movie matters alone.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you not think if you put three or four of those fellows in the penitentiary that would do more to stop it than all of the rest of the things you are talking about?

Mr. BERGE. I do not know that it would.

Senator CHAVEZ. Would that not be a real deterrent?

Mr. BERGE. Well, I think you have got to go further than just punishment.

I think you have got in this movie situation, and many other situations, a fundamental wrong in the structure of the industry that has to be remedied. I think there is where we can be most effective in antitrust actions. We have got this suit pending in New York where we are trying to tackle the problem on the whole national scale and get divestiture of the motion-picture houses from the control of the big fellows, so that every motion picture will be independent. And that is going to the Supreme Court.

The CHAIRMAN. The Attorney General's office did a marvelous job when they convicted Brown and Bioff, the labor racketeers, and did a lot of good and helped keep union labor racketeers from taking advantage of union members.

It is just as logical if you put two or three big movie fellows in the penitentiary for putting little fellows out of business in places like Devils Lake and Grand Forks; that would also be a deterrent.

Mr. BERGE. I do not like to be in a position of defending the motion-picture fellows who are defendants in these cases, because I think their practices ought to be reformed. But in all fairness, I think we have got to say this: That the control of the motion-picture theaters, the integration of the movie industry, just like the integration of many other industries, has been accomplished over the years by many, many people over a process of gradual growth and development of the business organizations.

And there is not any rational way I know of that you can assess moral guilt on a few fellows and put them in jail to atone for the economic wrong of the whole industry.

What you have got to do is by a fundamental and drastic reorganization of the industry free these fellows from control, and I would not know and I do not think we could find——

This integration of the movie industry, for example, has been going on for 20 to 25 years, and there was no attempt during that period to enforce the antitrust laws against the basic wrong. There were little suits against block booking and particular practices.

We have tried in this New York suit to tackle what we believe is the basic wrong in the industry, and if we succeed in it finally, it will take several years and a good many men and a great deal of labor to disentangle these corporate structures and get these theaters sold. Suppose you do put someone in jail. You still have got the basic wrong that the independent has to compete with his source of supply. He has got to go to one of the big five for his film or he cannot operate effectively; and it is not so simple a solution, I think, as to merely punish someone.

The CHAIRMAN. If some of the big five were in that penitentiary, do you not think it would have a salutary effect?

Mr. BERGE. Well——

The CHAIRMAN. I do not know whether you have a son or not.

Mr. BERGE. I have two.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose he wants to go into business. He goes to the drug business. You will find two or three concerns owning three or four thousand stores, and if you try to compete they will put you out of business. The grocery business is the same way, with the A & P; and clothing the same, with Grant.

I maintain that is due to the fact that the men in your position who have the job of enforcing this law for 57 years have not done your job. That is the reason you have these great big combinations.

Mr. BERGE. Senator, I agree with your basic philosophy, that that is a job that should be done. I have no quarrel with that. You said much more eloquently than I could what I would like to say about the tendency of concentration of control to keep the little fellows and sons who are coming along out of these businesses.

You and I are agreed on that.

I want to say this: So far as the enforcement of antitrust laws goes—and I am not offering any alibi—I think it will stand a lot of scrutiny if you want to go into detail. It takes a good deal more of a legal staff—with all due credit to the great capacity of the FBI for investigating, I am not thinking about that—it takes a great deal more of a legal staff than we have or ever had.

The CHAIRMAN. You have got 175 lawyers. How many more hundred do you need in order to keep down the price of bread?

Mr. BERGE. Well, you have taken bread——

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; bread.

Mr. BERGE. You have taken a case where you have got, maybe, a separate problem in dozens or hundreds of different communities. I do not think we could bring local suits in all those communities.

One of the things we have been criticized for, unjustly, I think, is that we bring little suits. If we go after some of the big baking combines perhaps, you mean——

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BERGE. It would take—I am taking this hypothetical case because you suggested it. I do not mean to say, I do not know whether we have a case in that industry or not.

But suppose we have to go after some big baking combines on the notion there is a Nation-wide conspiracy to fix bread prices. An investigation of that sort of a case on a Nation-wide scale would involve—after the investigative effort has been made and reports have piled in from all over—it would involve a substantial staff of analysts for the data involved perhaps every community and would take a substantial number of lawyers to do.

Now, maybe we could do it with six or eight men, but the trouble is that you have suggested just one situation, and I assure you there are hundreds that are acute and critical, and that we simply are not able to go into. We are in that position right now, all the time. I wish you could sit in the office a few days with me and see the precise problems of this sort coming across my desk, of having to rob Peter, figuratively speaking, in order to pay Paul in the assignment of the staff.

A matter comes up, a critical new complaint which looks like we must immediately direct an investigation. Before the FBI can do the field work, we want to find out the facts; we want to analyze the complaint and direct it on an intelligent basis. Then the same men doing that have some background for a case coming for trial in New York, and we have to switch them to that. We are having to postpone cases because personnel is not available to try them.

The CHAIRMAN. In every State you have got a United States district attorney with a lot of help. Take Victor Anderson in Minneapolis. He will help you prosecute those cases down there. They are all personnel.

Mr. BERGE. We will use them whenever we can, Senator, but experience has been that United States attorneys' offices, I do not think would agree that they are overstaffed, and right now—that is in Mr. MacGregor's field rather than mine—he was telling me

he has had to reduce personnel in United States attorneys' offices for financial reasons.

One United States attorney told me—because he knew me well—was telling me of the situation where he had an order from Washington to cut off one of the two assistants—he is from a Western State and only had two—and he contended that the work of his office was such that he could not spare one assistant.

The CHAIRMAN. Your United States attorneys and your assistants can all take private lawsuits, even those engaged in the pay of the Government. Is that not right?

Mr. BERGE. I guess it is.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what the Attorney General said the other day.

Mr. BERGE. Whatever the Attorney General testified is, of course, correct.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what he said. If you kept him busy and said you needed them in this work, they could not take private cases in the meantime.

Mr. BERGE. Here is the thing, Mr. Chairman, and I respectfully call it to your attention:

In most of these cases the work of preparation of the case and listing the evidence proceeds simultaneously with the investigation, and it ties up men for periods varying from several months to several years. The United States attorneys, as their offices are presently set up, and with the staff they have, do not have men available to assign to work with us in Washington in the preparation of these cases.

Now, you may ask why cannot that work be done in the field? Well, sometimes it can, if it is purely a local situation, but the usual antitrust case involves facts garnered from all over the country.

The CHAIRMAN. Wait a minute. I am interested in what Senator THYE said about automobiles and farm machinery. Have you ever called a meeting of United States attorneys and got them together and said, "Now, you boys get together and make an investigation and we will help you"?

Mr. BERGE. I do not think we have done that specific thing. Of course we do not usually use the United States attorneys for making investigations. We usually use the FBI on that.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know why the price of mowers and binders and drills has gone up to where the farmer cannot buy unless he has a great big crop and gets a big price for it? The price of a binder has tripled in the last 13 or 14 years.

Mr. BERGE. I can say that farm machinery is one of the things that we are going into.

The CHAIRMAN. You have had 57 years to go into it.

Mr. BERGE. You look at the personnel that we have had over the period of 57 years, and I say it is only since 1938 or 1939 there has been any sizable group. The case statistics show the number of cases instituted fluctuates in almost direct proportion to the amount of funds that we have.

Senator THYE. It would be very interesting if we might have information as of the personel that was in the Department at the times of the prosecutions which were carried out under Theodore Roosevelt's administration, and at the time Kellogg was busting up the monopolies, and what personnel you have now, because you have referred back to this specific era as the era when they busted the monopolies. It would be interesting to see that.

Mr. BERGE. Let me qualify that, sir. I referred to the oil and tobacco cases as being very significant cases. They were brought in an administration that was in office for 7 years, and they were decided about 1912, 4 years after that administration went out of office.

I am not belittling those cases, they were important. But they were two cases spread over a 10-year period, and I do not think that that is sufficient to prevent monopolies, monopolistic control of our national economy.

Now, the case statistics in that period, numbers of cases instituted, and numbers of cases instituted today, there has been almost as many—I can get the precise figures—almost as many, I think—there have been as many cases and a few more instituted since 1938 as were instituted in the whole prior history of the Sherman Act.

That is statistically correct and I can give the exact figures. In other words, in the number of filings, more were instituted in the last 10 years than the whole prior period.

Senator CHAVEZ. The fact also remains there were more trusts busted prior to that time than since.

Senator THYE. That is the question I would like to have answered where you are making that comparison; and that would be the number instituted and the number of convictions. That is the thing I would be concerned about.

Mr. BERGE. I call to your attention that the three big cases of the Roosevelt period to which you are referring as being important antitrust cases were all civil and not criminal. In those cases they sought to break them up by a decree of dissolution. The first Roosevelt trust-busting reputation was not based on criminal prosecutions, but based on civil suits. I do not know of any major criminal case in that administration.

Senator CHAVEZ. The point is, they brought relief, whether by civil or criminal action.

Mr. BERGE. I quite agree that those cases brought a sound measure of relief for a period. We are right back again prosecuting the tobacco companies for price fixing and we have numerous cases against the oil companies. It would not be fair to say that those cases produced a millennium. They did do a lot of good. I mean, they divested the single-company control of the oil industry and made it possible for numerous competing companies to come into the field.

This is a field where there has to be constant vigilance, and you will never accomplish a lasting competitive system unless you are on the job. You may in 1912 break up the oil companies and in 1935 you again have an oil monopoly.

Antitrust enforcement must be continuous, and I think those cases have accomplished substantial good, but I do not think we want to say they have broken up monopolistic practices in those industries so you do not have to worry about them any more.

Senator CHAVEZ. That is it.

Mr. BERGE. If the Government prevails on the present oil case, I will not be satisfied that will break up the monopoly as a whole. You will have to get busy on others.

Senator JOHNSTON. As the world's wealth drifts into the hands of the few, you are going to have it more and more. Is not that true?

Mr. BERGE. It is my own feeling that the period ahead is a very critical one, and that the vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws is essential if we are going to preserve a private competitive economy. I think this economy logically continued will in time destroy any opportunity for the small or independent or competitive business, and when you get that situation your political liberties also are in danger.

My own view is that the efforts that we are able to put into these today is not adequate for what is needed to reverse the trend toward concentration, and to really keep a free competitive market in this country.

But I would like to get in, if I may, since we are talking about what has been accomplished and can be accomplished. I think a lot has been accomplished, but I do not think nearly enough, and since we have given due recognition to old suits, I would like to mention one or two recent ones I think we can claim justly have freed particular industries for competition.

I think our aluminum case has accomplished a lot. It was a long hard-fought case. We lost it in the district court. The court made factual findings that were favorable to us in some respects and unfavorable in others, but concluded as a matter of law it did not constitute monopoly under the Sherman Act because it was a natural normal growth and was not based on predatory practices or illegal acquisitions; sort of a case of getting control of the industry by lawful and normal means.

We disagreed with that finding. We felt there were some predatory practices, and not entirely lawful practices, but over and above that we felt the extent of domination and control of Alcoa over the industry was in and of itself illegal.

When that finally was decided by the appellate court, the Circuit Court of Appeals of the Second Circuit, they reversed and held in our favor. They did not reverse the findings, and that makes it a stronger case. They held, even though the acquisition of the power was not in itself illegal, that the power was; that the control over the industry was a violation of section 2 of the monopoly section of the act, and as a normal result of that a dissolution of Alcoa should be brought about.

The case had been closed in 1940. The record had been closed; it had been tried. And it was 1945 when it was finally decided by the appellate court.

They took notice during that interim period a lot of plants had been built by the Government. In other words, the record was "stale," as we lawyers say.

They said, in effect: "We will postpone final judgment on whether dissolution of Alcoa is necessary or not until we see whether competition is effectively created out of the war plants disposal program."

Now that gave the Government a club, so to speak, which has been wielded pretty effectively. The war plants did not go to Alcoa, and there are at least two integrated competing companies in the field and many more fabricating companies. I think that we can say, as a result of the Alcoa case, that a competitive condition has been established in the industry.

Now, the final fate of Alcoa is still undetermined. The case is still pending in the lower court, and at some reasonable time in the future Alcoa will try to make a showing that sufficient competition has been reestablished in the industry, and whether or not the Government can agree on that will be determined on the facts then. We are not willing yet to agree to it. But the case is still pending and will pend, I am sure, until such time as sufficient competition has been established; or, if it is not established, or the competitors collapse, we still have that weapon of dissolution over Alcoa.

One other instance, the Hartford-Empire case. That was a big patent-abuse case. All of the patents, or substantially all, covering the processes and methods for making bottles were held by a single patent-holding company. They held the patents on the manufacture of the machinery and on the processes for using it, and everything, and they licensed those patents to certain manufacturing companies and had a policy of licensing so as to avoid competition, and, of course, they collected royalties from the patents.

The record in that case had many instances in it where independent business wanted to go into the business of making bottles and could not get a license to operate under the patents, all of which this company held, because they did not want any more competition. They did not want to have more competition with their present licensees.

We alleged a conspiracy between the licensees and the patent-holding company to monopolize the manufacture of bottles, and it was a tight monopoly, and that is a big business. There are a lot of bottles made

and used in this country, and these fellows had the whole control of it.

Well, we had a trial on that out in Toledo, and we got a judgment that breaks up that control and provides that the patents must be licensed to applicants for reasonable royalties. There is now a position where new business can get into that industry.

I could go on with others.

We have got cases pending against 61 of the 100 largest corporations in this country, I think the figure is.

Within the last 10 years we have brought action against 61 of the 100 largest.

The CHAIRMAN. All civil actions?

Mr. BERGE. No; both criminal and civil. It is both, Senator. I have not that breakdown.

Well, General Electric is being tried on a criminal indictment today.

The trial is in process in New York—the Carboloy case.

We indicted Standard Oil of New Jersey, and Bausch & Lomb, and numerous others.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you change your policy to bring criminal instead of civil actions?

Mr. BERGE. We have not changed the policy.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you have not put anybody in jail. You have a similar policy today as when you started.

Mr. BERGE. The test, of course, of whether or not the action should be civil or criminal is not, in our minds, whether or not we should put the people in jail.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not up to Congress? When they passed this statute they said these fellows should be put in jail. Why should you or anybody else say, "We are not going to enforce the criminal end of it"? Congress has talked about these criminal cases since 1890.

Mr. BERGE. In order to make that the clear mandate of Congress, that language, as I would interpret it, would say "shall impose both fines and imprisonment on conviction."

The CHAIRMAN. You know better than that.

Mr. BERGE. No.

The CHAIRMAN. You cannot name a single statute, aside from treason, that says you shall do that.

Mr. BERGE. No; but in all these criminal statutes——

The CHAIRMAN. It says "fine or jail" in all of them.

Mr. BERGE. Precisely; and when Congress says that, it does not mean jail and no fines. It means, I take it, what it says—that the courts have the option of jail sentences or fines and that prosecutors have also.

Senator CHAVEZ. That is right; it is up to the court.

Senator JOHNSTON. Will you read that first section? Does it say "or both"?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; "or both."

Senator CHAVEZ. But whenever Congress or a legislature passes a law and defines an offense, and sets out what shall be the offense, and then sets out penalties, it is not up to the prosecution to impose that penalty.

Mr. BERGE. Let me make one thing clear. Perhaps—I am afraid I have not. I would say in the majority of cases we do not make any recommendations as to the penalty. Where a criminal trial——

Senator CHAVEZ. I know it is a practice of the courts to inquire of the prosecution.

Mr. BERGE. Often they do, and often they do not.

Now, it is not our mandatory duty to make any recommendation at all. And some courts want recommendations, and some courts do not. Now, surely, there is nothing in the statute that requires us to recommend a jail sentence or any sentence.

Senator CHAVEZ. I am trying to differentiate between the recommendation of the prosecutors of the Government and the law itself. Of course, I know the practices of the average court. Even for murder they will ask—unless it is mandatory—they will ask the prosecutor what they think and "have you had this fellow investigated?"

Mr. BERGE. That is right.

Senator CHAVEZ. You seem to be confused with the idea of the duty of the court in passing judgment and the duty of the prosecution in enforcing a law. The Sherman antitrust law was a creation of Congress; created by Congress. It happens to be the duty of the Department of Justice to enforce that law if it has been violated.

The law says that for such an offense, if a conviction takes place, the court, not the prosecutor—not the prosecutor—can fine him or send him to jail. There is nothing wrong with that. Nearly every statute has that same thing. But the question of the law is, itself, the duty of the Department of Justice.

Mr. BERGE. Yes; but, Senator, I do not mean to be asking you a question. I am trying to make sure I understand in order to make my own response.

I would not take it from what you said, that it means it thereby becomes the duty of the prosecutor to ask for a jail sentence.

Senator CHAVEZ. Not necessarily; no.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not peculiar that law has been in existence 57 years and apparently nobody has been put in jail. The price of everything is up out of sight; gone hog wild.

Mr. VOGEL. In the 57 years you have operated this department, the fact remains, today your problem is very much larger than it has ever been before?

Mr. BERGE. Right.

Mr. VOGEL. Then one or two things is wrong: Either your Sherman Act is not stopping this practice, or else your Department is undermanned to such an extent you have too big a problem for your Department to handle; or the convictions you have made in the past have been no deterrent in stopping the practice.

Mr. BERGE. I will tell you what I think. I do not think basically there is anything wrong with the Sherman Act. I think if it is vigorously enforced on a broad front it could be more effective than it has been in deterring this concentration of control, and that we are all concerned about.

Mr. VOGEL. It has not been effective.

Mr. BERGE. It has not been; and the reason, in my judgment, we have never had a sufficient staff with which to do it.

Mr. VOGEL. That is what this committee is interested in.

Mr. BERGE. I can give plenty of footnotes on that if we want them.

I recited again, in shorthand fashion, this law which concerns all of American industry, with a few exceptions—I mean particular industries that are regulated—but it covers a larger scope than, say, the Federal Communications Act, or Securities and Exchange Act, or the Interstate Commerce Act. And, yet, notwithstanding that wide scope, up until the time I came into the Antitrust Division, there were only about 24 or 25 lawyers on the staff, and then when that force commenced to be increased in 1934 and 1935, for several years a substantial number of the manpower were used in other duties than enforcing the Sherman Act.

We had on our laps then the enforcement of NRA and the enforcement and prosecution part of the AAA and other regulatory statutes of the emergency period.

So that I think it is safe to say that up until about 1938 there were not more than 35 to 40 lawyers engaged in this policing job for the whole United States.

Now, as I have indicated earlier, we commenced increasing the staff in 1938, built it up to a high point in 1942, and it slipped back during the war, and we are trying to build it up again.

Senator THYE. You said you had the enforcement and prosecution under the AAA?

Mr. BERGE. We did not have all of it.

Senator THYE. What would be the prosecutions under that particular act?

Mr. BERGE. Well, for example, I remember that lawyers from the staff of the Antitrust Division on occasions—I never handled any of it—lawyers from the staff handled some of these cases in the lower courts that involved the constitutionality of the NRA and AAA. The Schechter case was handled by a member of our staff in the lower courts.

Senator THYE. The prosecutions under the AAA would be a question of where someone had filed inaccurate figures on acreage or something of that kind.

Mr. BERGE. There were all kinds of forms that the legal actions took, and I have not firsthand knowledge or recollection of it. For example, the tax case that finally went to the Supreme Court, the Butler case, we did not handle that.

I recall this—that members of our staff, quite a few of them, at one time were engaged in enforcing the milk orders, the orders under the AAA program for the control of milk. There was a big case up at Boston that involved the constitutionality of the milk order that four or five men were on. That was back about 1937 and, of course, that was after the original AAA was held unconstitutional. I think that was under the Agricultural Marketing Act.

I merely point out, until about 1937 or 1938 we had, first, a small staff; and second, a substantial part of that staff was on other duties than antitrust enforcement.

Beginning with 1938 we were able to subordinate those other duties. We still have a few, such as routine defense of orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Secretary of Agriculture's orders under the Packers Act. We do not spend much of our time on that, only having two or three men on that kind of activity.

Mr. VOGEL. You admitted you are unable to handle the situation as it is now?

Mr. BERGE. Yes.

Mr. VOGEL. There may be a difference of opinion as to the reason for that. But as head of that department, could you present to this committee your ideas of what is necessary to make this department effective? Can you do that? That is what this committee is interested in.

Mr. BERGE. Yes; I am glad to, and glad you asked me to do it. In doing it, I fear I will sound like a bureaucrat asking for a larger staff, a role I do not relish.

I am not anxious to administer, for the sake of administration, a larger staff than we have. We have enough headaches with the present staff.

Mr. VOGEL. I think the committee would give you several days to get that written proposal to them.

Mr. BERGE. I think that, simply stated, it comes down to this: Of course, there has got to be efficient administration. If we are not doing the best we can with the funds we have, that is one thing, and I will come to that later.

We have taken various steps to tighten and strengthen our administrative organization. No organization is ever perfect, but we are doing the best we can. We are making very careful studies to eliminate duplication, waste, and inefficiency in the assignment of the men in the administration of our field offices. We are reducing, and bringing some of our field men into Washington because we think it will save money.

You have got a problem there. For example, if you have a lot of litigation in Chicago, there is a certain amount of expense involved in maintaining a field office there. On the other hand, it saves certain expenses through elimination of travel and per diems of men who have to be sent out there. It is a question of administrative expert judgment on getting the maximum of efficiency out of the assignment of the men, and questions like saving travel and per diem and all of that.

It is a question of wise administrative judgment.

We are doing the best we can to tighten those inevitable problems that sometimes arise in administering a large office.

Mr. VOGEL. Did you ever think of the question that possibly your penalties have not been sufficient to do the job? That is, the penalty of $5,000 was not a deterrent, and possibly a jail sentence might produce something that had not been produced in 57 years.

Mr. BERGE. Of course, we have considered it. But, as I told you and whatever my judgment is worth—I may be wrong—but I am sure if we are given a mandate that Congress wants jail sentences we will go out and try to get them. We have not understood that was what was wanted. It had been our judgment that was not.

Mr. VOGEL. It has not been successful.

Mr. BERGE. I do not think so. This is a matter on which judgment can differ. I do not think the basic trouble is that we have not put people in jail. I think the basic trouble is we have not instituted proceedings against many large industries where practices ought to be corrected, like in Alcoa and the Hartford Empire cases, more like several we now have pending. Farm machinery. There are so many industries we know we ought to go into. And, without mentioning names of complainants or industries, we had a group in this week that have a very trying situation that needs correction.

The adequate investigation of this case will take a substantial force of the FBI, which I assume can be supplied, but before that is done we have got to analyze a lot of complicated data that they have put down on our desks to determine whether the general charges they make warrant investigation.

The reaction of the committee here is very interesting to me, because we are so often charged with harassing business and persecuting, and all of that. We expect the brickbats, and we are prepared to take them, but this is the situation:

We do not want to just put a crew in the field on something that may be patently flimsy, or something that just amounts to waste of Government funds, in investigative efforts just because a fellow comes in the office and say he has got a case that should be investigated. In other words, we cannot order 10 FBI men into the field because some fellow with a private grudge wants this thing investigated. We have got to exercise our judgment intelligently.

We have got to analyze this stuff and prepare carefully FBI instructions and send people into the field. If this makes a case it is something my guess would be would take 10 lawyers to prepare and try. That came in within the last 2 weeks, and I am trying to get men off these other things for that. That is one instance.

The CHAIRMAN. Except you said the Federal Trade Commission worked with you. They have 637 men; your Department 334; FBI 8,000. You have got 48 district attorneys and assistants; that is 500 more. In the whole Department of Justice you have got 23,668. That makes a total of 32,805. How many more do you need to regulate the price of farm machinery?

Mr. BERGE. The only thing of all those figures you gave me we have is the Antitrust Division.

The CHAIRMAN. All you have to do is ask Clark or Hoover and they will give you more lawyers or investigators.

Mr. BERGE. The FBI will give us investigators, that is true; but not 8,000. Is that not the total?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; but they will give you 500 or 300.

Mr. BERGE. I have no complaint as to the number of investigators they will make available to us.

The CHAIRMAN. Tell this committee how much more personnel you need to see the farmers can get farm machinery at decent prices.

Senator JOHNSTON. What happened to the fertilizer case some years ago?

Mr. BERGE. That was tried in North Carolina, was it not?

Senator JOHNSTON. Richmond, Va., I believe.

Mr. BERGE. I thought it was at Asheville. That has been so long ago. I think that is the case in which we got convictions and fines, but we have some investigations in the fertilizer industry going on now. I would have to check back on the records to give you it exactly.

Senator JOHNSTON. That is close enough.

Mr. RILEY. Have you got a copy of next year's budget with you that we could put in the record at this point? Would it reflect the number of persons by break-down?

Mr. BERGE. I have the marked copy I was going to use in my testimony tomorrow before the subcommittee but I can supply you a copy.

Mr. RILEY. Maybe you could read out a few high spots.

Senator CHAVEZ. Only as far as your section is concerned.

Mr. BERGE. That is just antitrust. We had $1,900,000 last year, and the request that went to Congress is $2,500,000. That is an increase of $600,000 for the coming year.

Senator CHAVEZ. Would that reflect on personnel? How much additional help could you get?

Mr. BERGE. It would depend, of course, on the salaries at which we hired them, and there is a certain flexibility in that.

Senator CHAVEZ. Incidentally, what are the mechanics that you use in order to hire a real good man for the Department? Do you go through Civil Service?

Mr. BERGE. Yes; except that the civil-service registers have been so depleted in recent years the temporary arrangement has existed where we found qualified men outside civil-service registers, Civil Service would examine their qualifications and certify them for temporary appointment. That is how we got along during the war.

Senator CHAVEZ. Would you classify your position first or would you get the person first?

Mr. BERGE. If we had the money to hire additional personnel and did not have a vacancy we would have a new position set up for him. If we had a vacancy at a salary level in which he would appropriately fall we would just put him into the vacant position. We have a lump-sum appropriation for the Antitrust Division, and we can make our own allocation on it, as between travel and other things.

If, for example, our estimate to Congress was so much for salaries and so much for travel and so much for court reporting, and so forth, and if we found midway in the fiscal year that we could get along with less travel, we could put more on salaries.

Senator CHAVEZ. Do you pass on the salaries yourself? I mean the Antitrust Division.

Mr. BERGE. Yes; that is, we pass on whether or not the particular applicant is qualified for a position at a certain salary, but that is subject to review by the group in the Department who administer civil service. If, for example, I should have the bad judgment to recommend a boy just out of law school for $5,000, that would not go through.

There is a scale of salaries as related to experience that applies in the lower brackets. That is, a fellow so much out could not be made more than so much, and with 2 years' experience, so much. And when you give a boy a few years of experience it does become a matter of judgment.

Of course a very good man of unusual capacity might, after 5 or 10 years, warrant your highest salary, and another with 30 years might not warrant more than four or five thousand dollars.

It is subject to review in the Department and by the Civil Service Commission as to the qualifications of the men.

Now, at the present time we can only make war-service appointments, and, as a practical matter now, that means we cannot make any. We had to take back about 138 antitrust men we had in the armed services. That was about half of our total personnel.

Senator CHAVEZ. Have they been returned?

Mr. BERGE. I would say close to 100 of them are back. I think 85 is the correct figure. There will be a few more come back, not very many. Most of the balance went into other fields when they returned from the services. You see, those men are entitled to their jobs back.

Now, if we were able to take additional men now—which we are not because we are just within balance on our budget and have not funds between now and July 1 for additional men—but if we were, my understanding is that we would have to give the position to men with veteran priorities. Maybe we could make a temporary war-service appointment for some special job, but, as I understand it, we would not be free to give a permanent appointment to someone from outside, even though a good man.

Senator CHAVEZ. Provided the servicemen had the qualifications?

Mr. BERGE. Yes; but if one has not another one has, and I suspect that the situation at the present—it will no doubt iron out in a year or so—but I think the way things are at the present time, we could not put on for permanent appointment an outside civilian, maybe war service, but only for a few months.

Senator JOHNSTON. You have a lump-sum appropriation. Can you carry over from one month to another, or does it stop if you do not use it during the month?

Mr. BERGE. I think it is allocated on a quarterly basis, Senator. I think we can spend our whole appropriation any time within the fiscal year. I may make some technical inaccuracies, but I am trying to state it the best I can. Just so we come out at the end of the year in balance, we are all right as far as the law goes.

I think they have imposed from the Budget Bureau some regulations that so much of our funds are allocated to us on a quarterly basis, in order to prevent irresponsible spending of all your funds in the first part of the fiscal year. They check on us constantly to see we are not out of balance. We were a few months ago as a result of letting people go.

Mr. RILEY. Do you get any fund allotments from any other agencies?

Mr. BERGE. Not as a regular thing, but there is one exception I should mention right now. We recently took on the responsibility of preparing a reparation case before the Interstate Commerce Commission. You may recall that some Members of the Senate, I believe Senator TAYLOR, and I think others, requested that, or consideration be given. This was taking action against the railroads to recover overpayments made on wartime transportation for the Government.

Without going into detail, the procedure on that is: We instituted our reparations suits before the Interstate Commerce Commission which determines whether or not the rates paid through those emergency negotiations were reasonable rates, and then the extent to which overpayments were made, and there is a procedure for a judicial review of the Commission's findings.

Now, the amounts overpaid are variously estimated and the total is from $1,000,000,000 to $2,500,000,000. We do not know how much is involved in that. A tremendous amount of effort has gone into it and we have borrowed a lot of men from other agencies.

Mr. RILEY. On a reimbursable basis?

Mr. BERGE. Mostly on that basis.

Since that had to be undertaken promptly—there is a question whether the statute of limitations may not bar some of these claims if we do not get them in in a hurry, and we had to move promptly and did not have the staff for it. We got some men on a reimbursable basis which temporarily helped put the budget out of balance.

Then we got an allocation, I think $50,000, for the present quarter—that would be the third quarter of the fiscal year from January 1 to April 1—to take on some men especially for this reparations work, and I believe we are asking a deficiency appropriation for the fourth quarter to carry that through. That work will have to be paid for next year, as I am told, out of the $2,500,000.

Senator JOHNSTON. I think that case should be completed as quickly as possible.

Mr. BERGE. Yes.

Senator JOHNSTON. Not only because of the statute of limitations, but because billions of dollars are tied up for the railroads and they cannot pay out dividends, and some are in receivership.

Mr. BERGE. I understand that. The legal importance is to get it in before the statute runs out, but it is highly desirable all around, both from the railroads' and our standpoint to get it determined.

Senator CHAVEZ. When you say you get your funds in a lump sum, are you talking now about the Antitrust Division?

Mr. BERGE. That is all I am talking about.

Senator CHAVEZ. Do you get it directly or go to the Department of Justice, who in turn allots it to the Division quarterly, or in whatever form they do?

Mr. BERGE. Personally our staff does not administer the custody of any funds or the keeping of books. We have a central accounting office in the Department which keeps the books and tells us if we are in balance or out of balance, and handles the payment of checks and contracts for the court reporting and the like. But they have no discretion by law, it is our money. They have no discretion to allocate it to another division of the Department.

Senator CHAVEZ. That is the point I wanted to make. Do the other divisions work under the same system, for instance, the Lands Division?

Mr. BERGE. I do not think so. I think there is a difference.

Senator THYE. Mr. Berge and Mr. Chairman, I think this is a question wholly concerned with the audit division of his division, or audit director, and I think you could get a much quicker reply to that question if he was permitted to ask his auditor.

Senator CHAVEZ. The point I was trying to make was this: Whether or not other divisions were lump sum and could transfer some of their funds to your division.

Mr. BERGE. I understand not, but I think on this I am subject to correction. I think the other legal divisions of the Department are covered in a general Department appropriation with a congressional allotment in the general appropriation to the different divisions, and that there is some option, at least there used to be when I was head of the Criminal Division. We had a 10-percent latitude, and could transfer up to 10 percent to another division.

I understand that does not apply to the Antitrust Division. I tried it and could not do it.

Senator CHAVEZ. What I had in mind was the Lands Division. During the war they were very busy, condemning lands and acquiring lands for the War Department, clearing titles, and so forth.

Mr. BERGE. They were.

Senator CHAVEZ. They are not so busy now, and I wondered if some of those funds could go to your division.

Mr. BERGE. Senator, I explored that possibility, because we wanted to keep from having to let any more people go, and we could not get it.

So far as this coming year, while I am not familiar with the detail, I am sure with this pressure for economy and cutting out any unnecessary people, that the Bureau of the Budget in its estimates—and if they have slipped anywhere the House committees will see to it that any division, like the Lands Division, or any other, they will cut that down if possible. In other words we cannot assume that in the coming year there will be funds available in another division for transfer to us. I am quite confident in that.

Mr. RILEY. It has been approximately 15 percent tolerance in the past, Mr. Chairman, between bureaus.

Mr. BERGE. Here is the thing, if you will indulge me this. We all must agree, and I certainly do, that it is highly necessary to economize whenever it can be done, and we all want it for our own welfare and the country's to balance the budget as soon as possible. I do not like to be in the position of a bureaucrat who says, "I am an exception," but I think this policy of antitrust enforcement is one that the country wants and needs during this period.

I think it is an exception, and with the views I hold, I think that is a period not only when antitrust should not be cut but when the activities should be expanded, and I hope that the enforcement is not prejudiced by insufficient staff and funds because of the keen necessity to balance the budget and cut expenditures, an object with which I am in sympathy, and am firmly for it.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Johnston, you did not get an answer to your question about that suit you inquired about?

Senator JOHNSTON. The fertilizer case?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BERGE. I would have to dig up the exact facts. That was about 1938 or 1939. My recollection is it was prosecuted in Asheville, N. C., and we won it and got some fines, but I cannot give you any more detail than that from memory.

The CHAIRMAN. What proportion would you say were consent decrees in the cases that you brought?

Mr. BERGE. I would guess that, in our civil cases, about 1 out of 3 results in a negotiated settlement. Some of the best relief we have got sometimes has been in consent decrees.

Senator JOHNSTON. How close do you get to the suit generally before you get a compromise?

Mr. BERGE. There is no generalized answer to that, Senator. I can give you this. There are instances where the decree proposal is made before we file the suit. They know we have been investigating them and they come in.

The CHAIRMAN. They say, "We have stolen, robbed the people out of $5,000,000,000, and now we will pay you $5,000".

Mr. BERGE. Of course the consent decree is a question of what sort of affirmative relief will be given.

The way that would arise would be, for example, if we claimed that they were restricting their patents, that they had some restrictive provisions in licenses that were illegal and they will come and say, "We thought it was legal," but if we do not think so they want to bring themselves within the law and will give us any decree we want, and they do not want to fight the case and do not want the expense, and we just write our own ticket.

There have been instances when we enter the decree the same day we file the suit. That is not very often.

Other times immediately the suit is filed they come down and want to settle. Other instances are settled on the threshold of the courthouse.

Senator THYE. Then it is a $5,000 fine?

Mr. BERGE. There is no fine.

Senator THYE. Where is the penalty?

Mr. BERGE. In court, an injunction, but——

Senator THYE. I mean in the case settled right on the courthouse doorsteps.

Mr. BERGE. A consent decree is entered. The only difference between a consent decree and a decree after judgment is, in the one case the parties agree in advance to the relief we want, and sign a judgment and say, "We consent to the entry of this judgment."

In the other case, the case is tried and then the court orders that judgment.

Senator THYE. What are the penalties?

Mr. BERGE. Senator, only half of the Sherman Act is concerned with penalties. In equity suits it is not a question of penalty at all, injunctive relief only.

Senator THYE. You get the injunctive relief, but you could almost go back and say Senator Langer was entirely right. The public has been fleeced of $5,000,000,000. I use that word because I know no other expression to cover it quite so well. And maybe they are told, "You shall not and cannot do this any more." And the individual or individuals guilty will say, "We will not ever do this again," and they go their way. Is that the situation, or are there means in which the Federal Government proceeds to impose a penalty because they were found to be in violation and this is what they have done to the public in general?

That is the question I am concerned about. Where is the punishment?

Mr. BERGE. If you just have a civil case, there is not punishment. I suppose I may be quite wrong. I suppose that the purpose of this whole act was not necessarily to inflict punishment; yes, where necessary for an effective deterrent, but the purpose of the whole antitrust business was to preserve and create conditions of free competition in an industry.

The CHAIRMAN. What does that say in the first two paragraphs? [Handing Sherman Act to witness.]

Mr. BERGE. The first two paragraphs are the criminal paragraphs and section 4 says——

Senator THYE. Which paragraphs have you the responsibility for?

Mr. BERGE. The whole act.

Senator THYE. Now, you have found him guilty, and he gets up on the courthouse steps and knows that he is soon going to be inside, and he says, "I am sorry. I am guilty." What do you do then?

Mr. BERGE. Senator, there are civil remedies in the act as well as criminal remedies. It is my own judgment in many instances civil action is more effective in continuous policing of an industry than criminal, because civil means injunctions continuously over their heads.

Senator THYE. If that gentleman knows he may be able to plead he is sorry when he gets on the courthouse steps, he always knows if he gets into trouble and you get him there, he will say, "I am sorry," and you let him go; and the next fellow will know that is the practice.

Mr. BERGE. No; no.

Senator THYE. That is what you have primarily said here.

Mr. BERGE. No.

Senator THYE. I am trying to get this thing straight.

Mr. BERGE. Senator JOHNSTON asked me about negotiations for a consent decree, and I said sometimes the decree was tendered immediately before suit was filed and other times just when about to go to trial. Consent is only in relation to civil injunction cases.

The fact that the parties do not assume as a matter of course they can get a settlement on the courthouse steps is proved by the fact in most cases they do not. In most cases they do go to trial.

I take it we could agree the Government brings an injunction suit to secure civil relief. Just take for example, certain illegal provisions in a patent license agreement, and we want to have those stricken from the agreement and have the court say they will have none similar in the future.

Now, they finally decide the week for the arraignment or the week before the trial they are willing to give us that relief. Then there is nothing to fight about. We get without trial what we get if we went through with it. I contend it is much sounder administration and economy to take these settlements when you can get them than to put the Government and the parties to long trial maybe to secure the relief you can get by settlement.

Mr. VOGEL. When you have a case you decide in your own department whether it will be a criminal or civil case?

Mr. BERGE. Right.

Mr. VOGEL. If you decide on a criminal case, you try it, and the penalty is not to exceed $5,000.

Mr. BERGE. Right.

Mr. VOGEL. Or a prison term which you have asked for?

Mr. BERGE. Yes.

Mr. VOGEL. Secondly, in a civil case you bring, you think they are violating certain things under the antitrust laws, and you state what those violations are. They come in then before the case is tried, and they admit those things, or if they go into court the court gives an injunction saying they must change that method of business, and they change that method of business, or they agree with you before you go to court and they sign with you that they will cut out that practice. What is there after that to see that they do that?

Mr. BERGE. Yes——

Mr. VOGEL. There is no penalty involved at all in that civil action?

Mr. BERGE. We must all be clear, and there can be no dispute about it. The purpose of a civil action is not punishment. The purpose is to reform the practice. The legal effect of a consent decree is precisely the same as the legal effect of judgment after trial. Once we sign this agreement and go into court and it is entered in the court of judgment, and thereafter it has the same effect as the decree after trial.

Mr. VOGEL. Then if they violate that, it is a matter for the court to decide.

Mr. BERGE. It is subject to contempt proceedings.

Mr. VOGEL. That is right.

Mr. BERGE. Of course, there are penalties for contempt.

The CHAIRMAN. How many contempt proceedings have you brought since you have been in office?

Mr. BERGE. I cannot give you the number right offhand. We have brought quite a few, one within the last month. I had better not name the company unless I am sure I am right; one of the cash register companies—I had better not. We brought several contempt proceedings within the last year.

The CHAIRMAN. What did the judge fine them for contempt? How much?

Mr. BERGE. Not as much as we asked.

The CHAIRMAN. What did he fine them?

Mr. BERGE. In this particular case we asked for the maximum, which was—well, I cannot give the exact figure. He let them off too easy.

Senator THYE. What would that be.

Mr. BERGE. He left them off for $2,500 fine.

Senator THYE. And you asked $5,000?

Mr. BERGE. We asked $5,000. This particular one was not one of our biggest cases.

The CHAIRMAN. I am interested in the question I think Senator THYE asked. If they pay that $2,500 can they take it off their income tax?

Mr. BERGE. I do not think so.

Senator ECTON. Senator JOHNSTON told us a while ago Internal Revenue would not allow it.

Senator JOHNSTON. In my opinion they cannot.

The CHAIRMAN. Can they take off their attorneys' fees, where they hire all these lawyers?

Senator JOHNSTON. That is a hard question to answer, for this reason: They put it in as part of the costs of the corporation, and whether in this particular case or that, sometimes you have a time cutting them off. Attorneys' fees are allowed as deduction for income tax but not for that particular case.

Senator THYE. I think we would have to have that question answered by the internal-revenue people. It is just a question that came to my mind.

Mr. BERGE. Could I just supplement the answer I made to one of the questions about consent decrees? I feel it is good economy to get them when we can. Whether or not we get the best settlement is a matter of judgment in each particular case, and I am willing that the record in each case should be examined. I think lots of times you get better results out of negotiations than out of court.

Senator THYE. The fact of the matter is, I do not think the settlement was intended when Congress passed the act. All Congress had in mind when they passed the act was protection to the public against monopolies and groups of people agreeing to do a certain thing in a certain way, and so Congress passed the act, and then the penalties were agreed upon in order that they in some manner could police the industries so that the industries would restrain, or refrain, from such action.

The fact of the matter is that in the event they are all treated in a similar manner and if found to be guilty—and it may involve a million dollars—and yet if that little penalty of $5,000 is the only penalty, the only other question is whether they were found guilty or not, and if they can say at the courthouse steps, they are sorry, they will not do it again, this is not even recorded against him as having been guilty. And if they have only posted a $5,000 fine, they pay the fine and it does not mean a thing to them financially.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator, you missed the greatest part of the penalty to our friend here, and that is that it hurts their social standing.

Mr. BERGE. To a lot of people that is pretty serious.

Senator THYE. If the same gentleman or corporation executive was compelled to spend 1 year in prison and have it on his record, believe me, they would not be putting themselves in a position to have to talk themselves out of it on the courthouse steps. They would know before they got involved.

What I am getting at, it has been proven here this morning it is somewhat of a farce, somewhat of a farce. If they can get by with a penalty of anywheres from $2,500 to $5,000 only, where it involves millions of dollars, possibly, or come to an agreement on the courthouse steps with you, it is pretty much of a farce. And it shows that there has not been the policing that the act was intended to bring about.

Mr. BERGE. May I just make a few comments. As far as the expression "On the courthouse steps," I do not want any unfortunate implications to be drawn from that. I have confined that to civil cases, and I think the argument the Senator is just making goes against the whole civil process.

Senator THYE. Then it is your error of classification, you have placed it.

Mr. BERGE. That raises the question of which presents the more effective remedy in particular cases. I will say this: I think it is unfortunate, but in many, many instances where we request the maximum fines, they are not imposed.

The conclusion from it is that except in cases where you have price fixing or other wanton and willful conduct—and most of the cases are cases which involve intricate contracts and corporate set-ups that require affirmative relief to solve.

I think in most situations the equity remedy is more effective to secure relief, and I say the reason it has not been more effective in impact on the total economy is because we have not been able to bring enough suits. If we had more Aluminum, and Hartford Empire, and more like the old Standard Oil and the Tobacco cases, which were equity suits, we would get somewhere.

I am not saying we should not bring criminal actions. I am saying my judgment is in your average complicated corporate set-up more effective relief is civil relief. There are other situations where we should bring both kinds of relief.

I have one thing that would not meet all of your objections, but part of them. On the matter of adequate fines. You may all disagree about these fines, you may think they are inadequate, as I do myself, but we cannot be blind to what actually takes place in the mind of a court when it has one of these cases before it.

My experience, and I would be less than candid if I did not bring it to your attention, is that the courts are very loath to impose even the maximum fines we have now, because there is some feeling, which I do not share, but nevertheless there is something about a Sherman Act violation that is a little nicer than the ordinary kind of crime and we cannot be tough with the kind of defendant we have in Sherman Act cases.

Now, how do we get around that and have an effective penalty? It is not because the court is afraid to extract money from the average corporate defendant. He knows they can afford to pay it, and knows the lawyers before him are drawing more in a single day than the maximum fine he could impose.

So when he decides to make it $2,000 instead of $5,000 it is not because he does not want to impose the burden but because there is a feeling in the minds of many people, including judges, that criminal fines are not quite the kind of punishment these defendants ought to have. I just say that as a fact you cannot ignore.

There have been suggestions made that the law be amended to provide for civil penalties.

Now, in this strange folklore we have in the law, we call one civil and another criminal and the difference in words makes a difference in the way it is recorded. A civil penalty and a criminal fine are the same thing in terms of money out of your pocket, but there is a great reluctance on the part of most people to want to pay any kind of a fine where they will have to cough up a criminal penalty, and there is a reluctance on the part of the judges to impose them.

Now, there was a proposal at one time, not pressed very hard and it did not get far before Congress, but it was proposed while Arnold was head of the Antitrust Division to add to the act provision for civil penalties making a $50,000 maximum for civil offense. I remember hearing Arnold argue, some courts would impose civil penalties where they would not impose fines. I think there is something to it.

If you want to make a real effective financial deterrent, one that will pinch, but which we can get a civil penalty might be effective.

I venture the suggestion and with due deference, I may be wrong. But it is my belief that if you raise the criminal penalty, say to $50,000 maximum, we probably would not get it from the judges.

Senator O'CONOR. Are you in favor of that civil penalty?

Mr. BERGE. Personally, I am.

Senator O'CONOR. I cannot find myself in agreement on that. Do you think that fair, if a number of men are in conspiracy of restraint of trade to deprive people of the necessities of life, to invoke a civil penalty? It apparently sweetens the thing up because the people are of reputedly high standing. Do you think that is the ultimate aim of justice, which ought to be to ferret out the crime regardless of whom committed by and impose adequate penalties. As a matter of fact if it is done consistenly, a series of actions, he can be fined each time. So you are not limited to $5,000.

Mr. BERGE. Let me put it this way. I do not think people should be treated differently because of wealth or social position. I would agree wholeheartedly with that. I think the test should be the type of offense involved. Without saying I agree with it myself, I think that is a general feeling. When you take the matter of mulcting people of $5,000,000 that is true.

In some Sherman Act cases, I hate to say this, I am talking like their defense counsel, but nevertheless I want to tell you what their reaction is and there may be certain justification in some cases. Certain practices in industry I cannot say are altogether wrong, mala in se as distinguished from mala prohibita. A lot of things are wrong because the law says they are.

We have to have traffic lights in order to make driving safe, but it is not morally wrong to go through a light like it is to steal.

A lot of Sherman Act violations are probably in that category. For example, an industry has been operated according to a certain close pattern. I am a little fellow and do not want to violate the law and do not know much about law, and I want to enter this industry and in order to do it I have to play ball with the crowd, either keep out of the industry or else go in on their terms and take one of these restrictive patent licenses and agree not to sell the stuff in certain territory. That whole system of doing business is wrong. But you cannot say that everybody who subscribes to it is a criminal that ought to be in the penitentiary. And there are a lot of Sherman Act violations of that category.

I would say that the distinction perhaps between treating certain Sherman Act violations by civil penalty and treating other kinds of violations by criminal penalty is not because Sherman Act defendants are wealthy or belong to clubs or because they are a different class of people, but it would be a recognition on the part of Congress that there is a certain difference in the moral element of the offense that is involved in many Sherman Act violations.

It is not always the big fellows. We try to concentrate our fire on the big fellows, but it is not all the big fellows.

For example, there are little industries where there are bad restrictions. I might mention, I see no reason I should not—take this artificial limb case. There was a bad situation, no question about it. In the price fixing on artificial limbs and the agreement about the type of limbs there was some bad practices. We brought a criminal suit not because the fellows were small but because there was straight price fixing in it and definitely bad practices, but they were small fellows, and it was not a case of us selecting some little fellow to say that we wanted to prosecute. There was great pressure on us to bring suit, especially from the veterans' group.

And yet some of these manufacturers of artificial limbs who are party to the conspiracy only operated in a single room with one or two employees. I do not think they should be sent to jail, but I think some sort of a criminal fine was appropriate there.

I mention that to point out if there had been a civil-penalty-approved provision, it might have been invoked and they would have had maybe gotten larger penalties although they did a lot of crying. The $1,000 on a lot of them was enough to put them out of business. We remitted a few fines, I think, where we were satisfied that was the case.

But I think what we are against is restraint of trade or monopoly practices which keep the independent fellows out of the industry, and we are against them whether or not the people participating in them are big shots or little fellows, except, other things being equal, we would concentrate our fire on the big fellows because the economic effect of a large conspiracy, say in a basic industry like aluminum, might be greater than one in artificial limbs. But there are some instances where we have to proceed too in small cases.

I do not think there is utterly no merit in the suggestion that some Sherman Act offenses do not have that element of wickedness and wrongdoing even though technical crime. I think sometimes the violators are very wicked in their actions and should be prosecuted criminally and should get the maximum we can get, and I do not think $5,000 is enough in some of those cases.

If we want to be realistic though, and say we ought to penalize them $50,000 instead of $5,000 in order to get an effective deterrent, the chance of getting the $50,000 is a lot better if we take a civil penalty.

But I still say that the greater economy in our cases, in my judgment, comes in those situations where we get affirmative relief through civil action.

I might just remind the Senators that while it is true that sections 1 and 2 of the act provide criminal penalty, section 4 equally important, provides for equity relief.

The CHAIRMAN. You know better than that. Why try to tell us something like that? Take an ordinary man selling liquor out in Montana. He is not treated like the bankers, he is put in jail, and belongs there. You cannot try that with an injunction suit.

Mr. BERGE. I would not say.

The CHAIRMAN. You are a well-known, outstanding lawyer here. You know an injunction suit ought to be brought where people have been fined and put in jail, and then you get your injunction suit just like where a man is in Montana or North Dakota selling liquor violates that kind of a law. Any lawyer who has gone through any kind of college knows that. I am not going to sit here and have you tell this committee that kind of stuff because it is not true and you know it is not true.

Mr. BERGE. I am sorry, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. Do not try to tell this committee that kind of rot. In section 6 it provides for seizure of property by the Government. I challenge you to name one case.

Mr. BERGE. Right offhand, some sardine cases.

Senator THYE. I wish you had left that out. That sounds ridiculous.

Mr. BERGE. Let me tell you of that. The seizure provisions have usually been brought in respect to cases where there are foreign defendants and seizure is necessary in this country to get jurisdiction. The sardines were necessary because the defendants were Norwegian and Swedish importers, and it was necessary to get jurisdiction over the concerns.

Senator THYE. I believe that question was answered because they were Scandinavians.

Mr. BERGE. I would be glad to have stricken from the record any mention of sardines.

Senator THYE. I agree with him.

Senator CHAVEZ. Mr. Chairman, it is now a quarter after 1.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose we meet—how about Saturday morning at 10 o'clock?

Mr. VOGEL. The Senator from New Mexico has some gentlemen here.

Senator CHAVEZ. I have a witness from New Mexico. He cannot stay very long.

The CHAIRMAN. How about 3 o'clock this afternoon?

Senator CHAVEZ. Mr. Sanders, when do you think you want to go on.

Mr. SANDERS. I am here at the pleasure of the committee. I have my reservations back leaving here at 11:40 tomorrow morning by plane.

Senator CHAVEZ. Would it be possible to give him a little opportunity this afternoon? It is in reference to that Lordsburg matter.

The CHAIRMAN. How about 10 o'clock tomorrow morning?

Senator THYE. I could not be here.

The CHAIRMAN. How about 2 o'clock this afternoon? All right, Senator ECTON?

Senator ECTON. I will be here soon after.

Senator THYE. How long will it take?

Senator CHAVEZ. Not very long.

Senator THYE. Why not call him now and take another 15 or 20 minutes, then we can recess or adjourn.

The CHAIRMAN. Call Mr. Sanders and you interrogate him.

Senator CHAVEZ. Yes, sir.

Will you state your name for the record?

Mr. LANGER. It is true, Mr. President, as the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] said a few days ago, that very few were arrested, but the cold-blooded fact remains that not one single one was sent to jail.

May I not say, Mr. President, that the reason why a veteran cannot today open a grocery store, cannot go into the banking business, cannot go into any business which the great trusts control, is that the antitrust statutes were not enforced by men who held the office of Attorney General before Tom C. Clark?

I rise today, Mr. President, to express my full belief in the honesty and the integrity and the full capacity of the man now holding the office of Attorney General of the United States.

In that connection I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a speech delivered by Mr. Clark before the National Association of Manufacturers, Fifty-first Annual Congress of American Industry, on December 5, 1946, in New York City. I ask every Senator to read this, because in it the Attorney General gave notice that the time had come in America when the cartelists and the monopolists could no longer control the common people of this country. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that the ultimate welfare and security of our people depends upon the pioneering spirit of our industries.

Therefore, I appreciate deeply this opportunity to address this gathering of American businessmen. You and your association—as Americans and as men—have a real rendezvous with destiny in these times.

They have talked in the past about times which stir the hearts of men.

These times stir our hearts—our minds—all of our ingenuity and that latent fire which we call patriotism.

Industry has become our shield in war and our design for living in peace.

You are wrapped in the skein of American history.

A few nights ago I was studying some of the background of management and labor.

This was in connection with the coal litigation now before the court of the District of Columbia and with which you are familiar.

I ran across some history of your organization, in which the association was in 1907 engaging in a tariff debate—a most important issue then before the country.

It is recorded by your secretary of that date that "fully 40 percent of the membership of the National Association of Manufacturers were heartily in favor of tariff reduction."

At that time such a position was tantamount to business treason.

It took much of personal courage for that 40 percent to buck the 60 percent and to go all out for tariff reduction.

But they were exhibiting the old-fashioned American characteristic of thinking for themselves.

They knew the Wall Street adage that "A bull can win and so can a bear, but a hog always loses."

At that time great changes had taken place in the American scene—a vast upheaval all the way from the end of the Civil War.

The forces which brought about this revolution were not in the realm of politics, but in business.

The Goliaths of business, Rockefeller, Carnegie, Vanderbilt, Gould, Armour, and others, were riding the crest of opportunity and were blueprinting the future of the Nation from their baronies of steel, oil, and finance.

In a few decades their holdings were scattered over the land.

The iron bands of their railroads bound the industrial life of the Nation with inflexible strength and carried their goods everywhere in the country.

Overseas, in the markets of Europe and Asia, began to appear goods bearing tags setting forth some fateful messages for the world trade: "Made in Philadelphia," "Boston made," or "From the mills of Chicago."

The flow of goods was at first a small trickle, almost an affront to the power and pride of Manchester and Leeds, of Lyon and Frankfort.

But the goods were found to have honest value in them; and, too, they embodied true American ingenuity.

The outlook for the future was made bright by the industrial revolution, but this industrial development must be keyed to social needs.

Ah, that was the rub.

Only a few were reaping the great benefit of this vast movement into world markets.

Some thousands were sharing the wealth, and thus lived from the rich men's table.

But millions were engaged in producing the wealth and were barely gaining living wages.

The measure of success in this "Gilded Age" was only in the number of dollars a man could amass.

Politics had become the handmaiden of big business.

Corruption was rife in the body politic.

The moral crusade that brought the antislavery amendments had been supplanted by a game of "multiplication, division, and silence," not only among politicians but among public officials and business leaders.

Then came Theodore Roosevelt.

On February 19, 1902, Attorney General Knox announced he was filing a compliant under the Sherman Act to dissolve the Northern Securities Co.

This company was born the year before in the struggle of Hill, Harriman, Morgan, Rockefeller, and Kuhn-Loeb to control the railroad network from Chicago to Seattle.

The fight ended in a draw, so the contestants very politely organized the Northern Securities Co., with a capital of some four hundred million dollars, and divided the stock among them.

Nice going, they figured, until the Attorney General showed up.

The ticker tapes sang out a sad story of Senator Sherman's law of 1890.

It had been filed away, except when it was occasionally used against labor unions.

United States Steel's billion dollar empire, likewise formed in 1901, was in for attack, which resulted some years later in the famous case of *U. S.* v. *U. S. Steel Corporation*.

A series of consolidations and amalgamations followed.

In 1904 Roosevelt declared that no free people could tolerate the "power conferred by vast wealth."

The Government must be endowed, he said, with "a still higher power" in the interest of the people.

If the courts ruled against national regulation an amendment to the Constitution was necessary, he insisted.

His fight was successful in the courts, but little was accomplished to break up the control the trusts had acquired by 1904 over 40 percent of the manufacturing capital in the United States.

Even the stock market crash of 1903 did not destroy this strangle hold; but it, together with the depression of 1907, placed a temporary brake on further combinations and consolidations.

By 1909, 200 corporations owned one-third of the nonfinancial institutions of the country.

In the Taft administration the Sherman Act was again put on the shelf.

World War I prevented its wide use in the Wilson administration.

The postwar period of the twenties again saw consolidations and amalgamations.

The war was another great stimulus to business.

Businessmen were eyeing each other with a view to getting bigger and better business deals under way by bigger and better amalgamations.

The trend, despite public feeling that the big trusts had been broken, was still toward advantages for the big fellows.

In 1909 the large manufacturers had on their pay rolls some 15 percent of all employees in manufacturing industries.

In 1919 this number had almost doubled.

Merger after merger was put through until the crash of 1929.

The reports of the TNEC show that 45 companies owned 92 percent of the transportation facilities of the Nation; 40 utility concerns owned 80 percent of the facilities; 20 banks held 27 percent of the total loans; 17 life insurance companies carried 81.5 percent of all life insurance assets.

Again, in 1939, small business (firms employing 500 or less) accounted for 52 percent of total manufacturing employment.

In 1944 this figure had declined to 38 percent.

Did you know that in 1944 firms employing over 10,000 employees accounted for over 30 percent of total employment in the Nation?

Over a half million small businesses disappeared entirely during the war.

As for them, the atomic bomb itself could not have been more destructive.

From June 1940, through September 1944, the Government awarded $175,000,000,000 of contracts to 18,539 firms—and here is the important part—two-thirds of this stupendous total went to the 100 largest firms; in fact, almost one-half of the value of the contracts went to the 30 top corporations.

The top five received more than one-fifth of the total.

One alone copped $14,000,000,000, approximately 8 percent of all contracts during the war period.

If we consider facilities for manufacture, the total in the Nation was about $40,000,000,000; of this amount 250 corporations owned about $25,900,000,000.

The war added about $26,000,000,000, with the Government advancing about $18,000,000,000 of this amount.

These same 250 concerns operated for the Government $8,900,000,000 of federally financed projects which are earmarked as usable in the postwar period.

Take the financial aspects of our present economy.

Run down the list of these 250 giants and you find that 30 of the largest ones, which control almost one-third of the Nation's manufacturing facilities, are dominated or controlled by five banking groups.

Each one of those banking groups heads up in New York, except one. It is in Cleveland.

As I see it, our progress is the sum of the progress of the individuals that make up our society.

When individual progress is retarded, national progress is prevented.

We either walk forward—fall back—or take root in proportion to the advancement, retreat, or indolence of the sum total of individuals making up our country.

Character building, like production, is done by piecework.

Freedom of opportunity is the great American heritage.

Every man has the right to start his own business—put his ideas and his money together.

He is limited only by his industry, his imagination, and his daring.

But he is entitled to know that the "dice are not loaded"—that his competitors will not be permitted to combine to destroy him; that the free market we speak so much about is not rigged against him.

This is deep-rooted American tradition.

It is not politics—it is far above that—it is the American way of life.

Free enterprise has no party affiliations nor does it have any party affinities.

It is bipartisan.

Business now has its freedom from controls.

These wartime controls were necessary for the gearing of our economy into total war production.

They were troublesome not only to government but to you as businessmen and to the individual citizen.

Upon the removal of these controls, your responsibility increases.

You—business—must not substitute selfish controls for legislative control.

There are some people who would scuttle our way of life.

They cry the loudest for free enterprise and opportunity.

What they want is freedom for their own activities; freedom to destroy not only their competitors but our democracy.

They want freedom for guaranteed profits and safe markets; freedom from competition; freedom to be the hogs of monopoly; freedom to fix prices; freedom to control production, patents, labor; freedom to divide markets; freedom to carry a business blackjack in a community where all others go unarmed.

These are not freedoms at all.

They are industry licenses.

Now, mind you, they are not backed by any law—nor are they issued by any arm of Government created by the Congress. No—

They are issued by an industry to those who dominate it.

In the foreign field we call them cartels.

The diplomacy of dollars.

Treaties never passed upon by the Senate of the United States but more enforceable than those that are.

They spell life and death to industry—life to those lucky enough to be signatories; death to those not strong enough to inscribe.

In the domestic field they are monopolies.

It is your responsibility to help prevent this destruction of the American way of business.

If you fail to assume that responsibility fully and discharge it, you will force upon the American people a lower standard of living—you will pave the way for additional failure in the workings of democracy.

Free enterprise fosters, encourages, protects a free democracy.

As Walter Lippmann has said, "The system of free enterprise has never meant, except to those who ignorantly or for selfish reasons misunderstood it, a general license to private interests in the presence of a helpless national government. This view is * * * but a kind of nihilism. * * * It is necessary to have strong government and firm laws and a continual and progressive program of public action to establish a free economy and make it work."

This does not mean government by injunction.

We do not intend to have government by court edict—with witch hunts and all the attendant trappings.

But we shall secure for Government all of its rights, contractual as well as statutory.

The law shall be enforced, whether it be with regard to business, and that includes management and labor—or the common thief who steals from his government.

As to the Sherman Act, I still say, as I did in 1945, "We in Washington know the state of honest uncertainty that sometimes assails the American businessman in determining his status under the antitrust laws."

As I have in the past, I invite you to bring in your problems.

We, of course, cannot solve them because that is your lawyer's job but we will throw what light we can upon them.

That calls for cooperation.

In this way, we can hope to dissipate some of the doubt and uncertainty as to the antitrust laws that are themselves deterrents to initiative and enterprise.

This policy goes for labor, too.

Management and labor should not sit back and depend on Government always to carry the ball.

You should know more with regard to the problem than anyone.

Why not advance some suggestions?

Constructive ones, of course.

We should do more thinking about the problem and less crabbing about the Government being "tough" on the one hand, or an "appeaser" on the other.

Surely labor, management, and Government can solve it.

May I add, at this point, another storm warning in the concentration of economic power in too great amounts.

I believe it to be hostile to our democratic ideals.

I am not a man who believes that to be big is reprehensible in business, but I am certain that business can be too big for the good of the Nation.

There is a line of demarcation which should be observed.

Certain nationally operated firms make it a point to be represented on the community level by small businessmen, thus keeping up the tradition of opportunity for all.

Others stamp out competition from one street corner to the other with the ruthlessness of a dictator.

You have all seen this happen—in the great cities and in the little towns.

The right to start a business is inherent in our American ideals.

We teach it in the schools and we should practice it in later life.

The small business is the beginning and the backbone of all business for it is here that the lessons of thrift, hard work, and probity are learned.

The antitrust laws, which I am sworn to uphold like all other laws, were enacted for the protection of business, and its enforcement, night and day, is a charter of business freedom.

It prevents trusts from towering too high over the economic pattern of the Nation.

It has not prevented some injustices, but it has been a restraining measure wherever it has been applied.

I will make this charter, with your assistance, something of which business can be proud, so that there will be profit and opportunity for all.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Mr. Clark's speech delivered before the American Society of Bakery Engineers on the 10th day of March, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a pleasure and privilege to be with you today.

I look at this large gathering, all devoted, in varying capacities, to the production of bread and bread products.

The thought is in my mind that it must be very satisfying to be dealing—actually—with what has been called, from time immemorial, the staff of life.

You are the technicians, chemists, and general production men—in short, those in the bakery industry entrusted with the actual development and production of bakery products.

You represent the small retail bakeries which produce and sell the breads, cakes, and cookies that constitute a temptation to the homeward-bound householder.

You represent the large institutions, with many branches, from which flow the breads that appear in our grocery stores or are delivered to our doors.

You actually make the bread that is our staff of life. We others merely talk about it.

We, of my generation, when we think of bread, think of baking days at home with our mothers or grandmothers mixing the doughs in the kitchen, the children hanging around for trimmings.

We think of the breads as they came from the family ovens and appeared on the family tables.

This old household manufacture has largely vanished. Like everything else in modern life, machinery has revolutionized the old customs.

We are glad of this. How much drudgery are the women of our Nation saved through all these marvelous mechanical devices!

The fact that your society was organized in 1924, witnesses the fact that for a quarter of a century now, and at an ever-increasing pace, life is becoming a matter of organization and machines.

Today, specialization is everywhere. Individuals, with similar skills and problems, organize into associations. These associations grow in proportion to the growth of the basic activity they represent.

The Department of Justice is no exception.

In the earliest days of this Nation the Department was not a Department, but an office: Edmund Randolph, of Virginia, was the first Attorney General.

His compensation was the modest sum of $1,500 per year. He was expected to furnish his own quarters, fuel, stationery, and clerical help.

By 1818 Congress had provided $1,000 for employment of a clerk, and by 1819, $500 for office rooms, stationery, and incidental expenses.

It was not until 1861, after the Attorney General and his staff had occupied a succession of temporary quarters, that a suite of rooms was provided for them in the newly completed Treasury Building.

Today the Department is a huge machine.

The Attorney General has many aides. The Solicitor General and the Assistant Solicitor General, and seven Assistant Attorney Generals. He has the Directors of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Federal Bureau of Prisons. He has the head of the Office of Alien Property, the Pardon Attorney and the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization. He has administrative and executive assistants.

He is further assisted by 93 United States attorneys and their assistants and clerical employees who operate in the field, and by 93 United States marshals and their deputies and clerical employees. In addition there is the personnel in the field offices of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the field service of the Bureau of Prisons and the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

The personnel of the Department reached its peak during the war crisis. It is now returning to peacetime standards.

We have here the problem that faces all organizations, whether of business or government.

We must prevent size and centralization from obstructing individual initiative and from losing sight of the end product. You must make and bring your bread and bakery products to the very tables of your customers. We must bring justice to the very lives of our customers—the American people.

Let me give you a bird's eye view of our Department.

It is the Department's primary responsibility to enforce Federal law, to represent the Federal Government in the courts, and to act as legal adviser to the President and to the heads of various departments of Government.

The Attorney General, however, is not legal adviser of the people of the United States in the sense that any who asks may obtain an opinion.

Daily I receive letters from citizens. Recently we had a letter from a woman who said she was about to be evicted from her home. She wanted to know whether her landlord could do that to her.

Another person writes in that his neighbor looks suspicious, he may be a seditious individual.

If a complaint seems justified we seek to investigate it. If, on the other hand, it is a request for advice, we usually are not in a position to answer it because, as I have said, the Attorney General is adviser only to the President and heads of Government departments.

The criminal division, headed by an Assistant Attorney General, has the responsibility for investigating and prosecuting Federal offenses. Its field is the Federal field, which it covers through seven sections: an Administratice Regulation Section; a Civil Rights Section; an Internal Security Section; a War Fraud Section; a General Crimes Section; an Appeals and Research Section; and a Foreign Agents Registration Section.

It is a large and highly diversified division; yet the primary responsibility for enforcement of Federal statutes lies, however, with the United States attorneys and marshals. The Criminal Division, in addition to many other activities, advises and counsels with them in connection with the many investigations, grand jury proceedings, preparation of indictments and trial procedure.

The work of the Criminal Division rests upon investigation.

As you know, the agency for the investigation of crimes in the Department of Justice is the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Under Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has successfully demonstrated that it is possible to have an effective investigative agency in a democracy without having a gestapo.

This was proven under conditions of great difficulty during the war, when the country had to be protected from its many enemies, while, at the same time, the civil rights and liberties of individuals were not invaded.

You are aware of the brilliant successes of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in connection with the apprehension of the German spies who landed on our shores from a submarine during the war.

You are perhaps familiar with the many situations—robbery, kidnapping, extortion, theft of cars, embezzlement, white slave traffic, bribery, the violation of election laws, the violation of antitrust and antiracketeering laws—the investigation of which is the responsibility of the Bureau.

Mr. Hoover's summary of statistics for the fiscal year 1946 gives an idea of its work: Convictions, 11,873; actual, suspended and probationary sentences, more than 26,624 years; fines imposed, $1,449,668; savings and recoveries, $167,035,267; fugitives located, 10,990; stolen autos recovered, 11,458.

You know too the vital work the Bureau has done with its centralized system of fingerprint records and its advanced techniques of crime detection.

You are probably less aware of the collaboration between the Bureau and members of State and local police departments.

The National Academy, organized by the Federal Bureau of Investigation many years ago, trains enforcement officials from the States and municipalities, graduating some 270 students a year.

These graduates go back to their towns and cities and train their fellows.

In 1946 over 1,300 separate schools for enforcement officials were sponsored by local police departments in cooperation with the Federal Bureau of Investigation. These schools in 1946 trained in the neighborhood of 67,000 enforcement officials.

The National Academy and these local schools are a splendid illustration of how a national problem can be solved through the collaboration of the Federal and State and local governments.

Because of collaboration, as with the many other activities of the Bureau, you as citizens, located in your towns and cities around the country, are the immediate and direct beneficiaries in the safety, order and justice obtainable in your communities.

There are two other divisions of the Department which, I thnk, will be of particular interest to you.

The Lands Division exercises supervision over litigation and other matters arising in the Department involving the public lands, public works, Indian affairs and real property of all kinds owned by the United States.

During the emergency and war periods, and solely for defense and war projects, over 6,000,000 acres and more than 37,000 parcels of land not measured in acres were acquired by the Government.

In the States of Tennessee and Washington alone more than 350,000 acres were acquired for experimental work on the atomic bomb.

Large acreages were obtained for bombing ranges to test the atomic bomb and other new projectiles.

Rights-of-way for the "Big Inch" pipe lines extending from Texas to the eastern seaboard were procured in order to speed eastward the flow of petroleum.

The Antitrust Division strikes more closely home to the business community than perhaps any other division.

It is the American philosophy that competition creates the need for better products—the fight for markets creates value.

Progressive abandonment of free and competitive enterprise leads, we believe, to Government domination of business.

Rigid control and sanction over cartels were the forerunners of Hitler. Mussolini erected a Fascist corrupt state upon the foundation of gigantic industrial combinations. These things will be fresh in your minds.

You also know the story of the monopolist. The Department of Justice through its Antitrust Division has taken vigorous action against, to only name a few, the Tobacco Trust, the Railroad Trust, and the Aluminum Trust.

We have other battles before us.

As technicians you will have a particular interest in the effect of trade restrictions on invention and discovery, which is also this Division's province.

The introduction of fluorescent lighting was retarded—the revenues of the power companies were at stake.

That more electric lamps could be sold, the manufacturers built them with shorter lives.

Vitamins were kept from the needy, because patents for producing vitamin D by ultraviolet ray came into the hands of a foundation located in the butter-producing area. The holders of the rights to the violet ray method denied licenses to producers of oleomargarine, so largely used among the poor.

The list is long and not pleasant to read.

The Sherman Act is rightly known as the magna carta of free enterprise and the bill of rights of business. It is the function of our Antitrust Division to enforce the Sherman Act and a number of kindred statutes.

As industries continue to grow and consolidate, these laws become more and more vital. We shall continue to enforce them vigorously.

More important to your industry, the Antitrust Divison has a Small Business Section to which I wish to call your particular attention.

It was reestablished in conformity to the declared policy of President Truman in a message to the Congress on the state of the Nation.

No. 2 on the President's list of five major policies was "restriction of monopoly and unfair business practices; assistance to small business and the promotion of the free and competitive system of private enterprise."

The work of the Small Business Unit is unique in the field of Government. It acts on behalf of this large and important segment of American business—to which, in many of its aspects, the baking industry belongs.

The complaints of small business are handled by our Small Business Unit. It acts as the small buinessmen's advocate. Complaints are treated entirely in confidence. Even in efforts to obtain relief, the name of the complainant is never disclosed without specific consent.

The Small Business Unit has close working arrangement with the Office of Small Business in the Department of Commerce. Cooperation between these two agencies has brought about an unusually comprehensive type of service on more than one occasion.

We welcome your problems and will do our best to help you solve them.

We have also done pioneering in the field of collaboration between the State and local governments and Federal administrative agencies.

There seem to be only three choices for governmental machinery in these chaotic times: Dictatorship—the tightly centralized system of Communist and Fascist governments; the modified socialism of Great Britain; or, for our choice, the democratic federalism which is the pride of America.

One constant criticism of our dual system is that it cannot achieve the reputed efficiency of the controlled systems.

The problem of making our system of Federal Government and 48 sovereign States work effectively became acute in 1940, when the war was obviously approaching. It was necessary to develop, on a collaborative basis, a program of State legislation which would stimulate the largest degree of participation by the States in the national war effort.

Accordingly a conference of some 250 State and Federal officials was convened. It deliberated for several days and produced a program of 7 pieces of State legislation which were widely enacted by the States.

Since that time we and other Federal agencies have worked closely with the Council of State Governments—the official representative organization of the States—and its important drafting committee of State officials. Over the years the new machinery has produced, on a joint Federal-State basis, well over 100 proposals for State legislation—first in the field of national defense, then to implement the war effort, and now, in these uneasy days of peace, to strengthen ourselves as a nation.

Among these 100 proposals is the model State bill relating to the enrichment of white bread and flour, with which you are familiar.

I have seen the resolution adopted by the Associated Retail Bakers of America, which endorsed and reemphasized the association's earlier approval of "enrichment of appropriate baking products with vitamins and minerals."

It also approved "the model State flour- and bread-enrichment bill as a model for consideration by the bakers in, and local associations for, a particular State."

I note that the approval of the model bill was not to imply "a policy for or against having any enrichment legislation, that being a matter for consideration by the industry in each State."

This is as it should be.

I know we are all agreed that there are too many laws; that the enactment of a law is no panacea; and that the best results are those achieved by noncompulsion.

I know we are agreed also that the casting back of responsibility both for decisions as to policy and the manner of executing policy, to those who are the closest to the problem itself—the grass roots, as we say—is the unique and essential characteristic of our American dual system of government.

This enriched bread bill represents, as do all the proposals in the annual Federal-State programs, a fusion of views among all interested parties—Federal, State, and nongovernmental—a sound way, I'm sure you will agree, to develop any kind of proposal.

Your own baking representatives played an important part.

The model bill was approved by all concerned, including your representatives, who were thus enabled to deal with a single text, to have their views incorporated in the text, and to support a single text, should they so desire.

When the Council of State Governments took the bill to the States they did not say: "Here is a bill. It is your duty tn enact it."

They said the contrary. The reports on suggested State legislation, containing this and other proposals, state, and I quote: "The study of these proposals and their introduction into the State legislation, where appropriate, is recommended. * * * They constitute no more than suggestions as to the problems posed. They should * * * be introduced only after ample consideration of local conditions * * *."

This is universally understood.

I think you will agree that the approach is sound.

Under the Federal-State mechanism which we and the States have developed, the Federal agencies and the States own representatives join in saying to the States—as did your national organization to you: "Here is the problem. Its solution is necessary to the welfare of the Nation. But the how of the solution is up to you."

The world is in a perilous and disturbing state.

The growth toward complexity which is reflected in all business and Government activities is moving us in a direction the end of which we cannot see.

The atomic bomb and all that it implies is a component part of this tide.

When I get worried over the state of the world, I like to reread the words of Mr. Justice Holmes, which I will now read to you. It was in 1913 that Mr. Holmes in a speech before the Harvard Law Association of New York said these prophetic words:

"For most of the things that properly can be called evils in the present state of the law I think the main remedy, as for the evils of public opinion, is for us to grow more civilized.

"If I am right, it will be a slow business for our people to reach rational views, assuming that we are allowed to work peaceably to that end.

"But as I grow older I grow calm.

"If I feel what are perhaps an old man's apprehensions, that competition from new races will cut deeper than workingmen's disputes and will test whether we can hang together and can fight; if I fear that we are running through the world's resources at a pace that we cannot keep. I do not lose my hopes. I do not pin my dreams for the future to my country or even to my race.

"I think it probable that civilization somehow will last as long as I care to look ahead—perhaps with smaller numbers, but perhaps also bred to greatness and splendor by science. I think it not improbable that man, like the grub that prepares a chamber for the winged thing it never has seen but is to be—that man may have cosmic destinies that he does not understand.

"And so beyond the vision of battling races and an impoverished earth I catch a dreaming glimpse of peace.

"The other day my dream was pictured to my mind. It was evening. I was walking homeward on Pennsylvania Avenue near the Treasury, and as I looked beyond Sherman's statue, to the west the sky was aflame with scarlet and crimson from the setting sun.

"But, like the note of downfall in Wagner's opera, below the skyline there came from little globes the pallid discord of the electric lights.

"And I thought to myself the Gotterdammerung will end, and from those globes clustered like evil eggs will come the new masters of the sky.

"It is like the time in which we live.

"But when I remembered the faith that I partly have expressed, faith in a universe not measured by our fears, a universe that has thought and more than thought inside of it, and as I gazed, after the sunset and above the electric lights, there shone the stars."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD the address prepared by the Attorney General for delivery before the Associated Industries of Massachusetts on the 24th of October 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Free enterprise is the American way.

In Massachusetts, your heritage of freedom stems from the Pilgrims who rebelled at restraint. And in my State of Texas, the plainsmen knew the free life.

Freedom of opportunity is the great American heritage.

In our free enterprise system, every man has the right to start his own business. He has the right to put his ideas and money together, to take a chance on making money or losing it. He is limited only by his imagination, his industry, and his daring. But he also has the further right to expect that the market will not be rigged against him and that his competitors will not be permitted to combine to destroy him.

This is deep-rooted American tradition. It is our duty, our privilege, to guard and to defend it.

We Americans believe that the free enterprise system is the best way to encourage and to develop new industries, to advance art and science, to raise the American standard of living, to distribute the most goods to the greatest number of people at the lowest cost, and to assure the preservation of our democratic form of government. We have never waivered in this belief.

The antithesis of free enterprise is State ownership. Progressive abandonment of free and competitive enterprise leads to Government domination of business. We have seen tragic examples of this.

Rigid control and sanction of cartelization were the forerunners of Hitler.

Powerful business combinations headed by small groups needed only indoctrination to become the backbone of the Nazi war machine. By reason of their long practice of stifling free enterprise they were ready for and grasped the evil Nazi philosophy.

Mussolini erected his Fascist corporate state upon the foundation of giant industrial combinations.

These alien philosophies are abhorrent to us. Yet they arose in countries which had operated on a competitive system basis.

There are other economic philosophies which differ from ours. But the world is large and we can all live in peace together as United Nations.

Our own path is plain. We must not permit the economic system in which we believe, our system of free enterprise and opportunity with its attendant civil rights, to deteriorate. We must not allow it to be robbed of its vitality and of its blessings. Assaults upon it by the selfish must be withstood.

There are those who would scuttle our way of life. These greedy men clamor loudest for free enterprise and opportunity. Actually, they mean freedom for their own activities—freedom to drive competitors from the market place. These men would have freedom for guaranteed profits and safe markets with none of the risks inherent in our capitalistic system. They would have freedom to insulate their business from the uncertainties of competition and freedom to gorge themselves with monopolistic profits.

These are not the freedoms to foster and protect in America. They are not freedoms at all. They mean only license—license to carry a business blackjack in a community where other citizens go unarmed.

These men would play the game of restrictive agreements, agreements which fix arbitrary and unreasonable prices for the goods which they sell, agreements which divide markets in which their goods are sold, agreements which divide fields of production and sale, and agreements which suppress technolcgical advance and new products.

Let me tell you just how their system operates.

The story of the monopolist who corners the market is an old one; it is familiar to you all. The Department of Justice has fought the Oil Trust, the Tobacco Trust and the Railroad Trust and has recently won the battle against the Aluminum Trust. The title "Trust Buster" is well earned.

But the monopolist constantly seeks new methods of tying up markets. Cornering and controlling markets, production, prices, and inventions are no longer done openly. Secret agreement is now the device. Telephone conversations and club luncheons have replaced agreements and memoranda of understanding.

Price-fixing agreements by which goods are sold at artificial and exorbitant prices are common. Housewives, storekeepers, wholesalers, and even manufacturers are forced to pay tribute to producers of goods and hoarders of materials who have conspired in secret to make helpless buyers pay monopoly prices. These prices include the unseen tax of the monopolist, the extra charge which the monopolist takes unto himself by reason of his preferential position, a preferential position engineered in secret to mulct the public.

The monopoly tax is levied by the private Government of the monopolist. It has no legal sanction and the unfortunate taxpayer has no right of appeal.

This monopoly tax has been reliably estimated to reach many billions of dollars annually. It is money which could have bought more radios and clothing, automobiles and housing. Many times, it is money which could have bought food.

The price fixing agreement is sometimes clothed in the garment of illegal patent-license agreement. It may also appear in the guise of trade-mark agreement. But it must be recognized as the same purse-bleeding agreement of the same price fixers.

The American people demand that these vultures be stamped out of the market place.

The secret agreement has also been employed to parcel out exclusive areas for the production and sale of goods. This agreement is known as the division-of-territory agreement. This is the scheme of two or more conspirators. They see no advantage in fighting for the whole market since such a fight may result in lower prices to the consumer and less profits to them. Accordingly, they cut the pie neatly into portions. Each conspirator then gets a piece for his very own. In this piece or exclusive area, only he can produce and sell. His conspirators have agreed to stay out of this area and he, of course, has agreed to stay out of their areas. Each trading area is then at the complete mercy of the monopolist who controls it. The consumer finds no competition between producers and is compelled to pay whatever price the monopolist cares to charge. This always includes the monopoly tax.

The evil of division of markets also embraces our foreign trade. Industry after industry is subject to export restraint. Whole continents have been delivered as exclusive marketing areas. These cartelists, and we can so dignify the monopolists when they act in combination and in concert with others, have erected supergovernments. They refer to their restrictive agreements as treaties. There is no senate, no representative of the consumers, to approve these treaties. The cartelists are sovereign in themselves and owe allegiance only to their profits. They know only the diplomacy of the dollar.

Their policies are planned to withstand the effects of the rise and fall of nations. This is clearly revealed in cases brought by the Department of Justice against American companies in league with the German dye trust, I. G. Farbenindustrie. Nations conquer or are vanquished, but the monopoly profits of the private economic empire continue.

There are also the secret agreements which divide fields of production and sale. By these devices the conspirators divide the pie not geographically but according to product. They may all operate in the same area but restrict themselves to specific operations or products. No one dare enter the field granted to another.

Such was the case in the glassware industry. Here the conspirators created exclusive fields in which each acquired a monopolistic and noncompetitive position in the production and sale of a particular type of glassware. The buyer found a complete absence of competition in each field.

You have also heard stories about the suppression of inventions and the smothering of discoveries.

You know about the match trust and its miracle match which could light 1,000 times but which never reached the market. No conventional monopolist would think of allowing such a match to reach the consumer. The consumer might be benefited, but match sales would be drastically reduced.

The introduction of fluorescent lighting was retarded. Here power-company revenue was at stake.

Again, so that more electric lamps could be sold, the manufacturers built them with shorter life.

Vitamins have been kept from the poor and the lame. Vitamin D is a boon to children with rickets who suffer from malformation due to defective bone metabolism. Rickets are most prevalent with the poor. The poor are also the largest consumers of oleomargarine.

Some years ago patents for producing vitamin D by ultraviolet ray came into the hands of a university foundation located in a butter-producing area. The sole right to use this artificial method of producing vitamin D in foods belonged to the foundation.

The foundation denied licenses for irradiating oleomargarine with vitamin D to manufacturers of oleomargarine because the patent holder was, as the inventor said, unsympathetic to oleomargarine.

Monopolists think of their profits first and of the people last.

These are but a few of the practices engaged in by the monopolists who would tear down our free-enterprise system while they declare their love for the American way of life.

Fortunately these men are in the minority.

I wasn't always Attorney General Clark. Once I was just Attorney Clark, one of the lawyers in the Department of Justice.

In later years, it was my privilege to be Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division. I speak, therefore, from first-hand experience in antitrust work when I say that these men are in the minority.

On the whole, the businessmen of America, of which this association is very representative, play the game squarely. They give the other fellow a chance and are willing to pass on a reasonable portion of their gains to the buying public.

That is the way the fair American shoe manufacturer and the fair American textile machinery manufacturer operate.

It is the way laid down by the founders of this country. It is the way crystallized by the provisions of the Sherman Act.

In giving us the Sherman Act, a Congress more than 50 years ago reaffirmed by statutory enactment the American principle of freedom of opportunity in a competitive system. Since the beginning of the century, the Democratic and Republican Party platforms have repeatedly pledged adherence to these principles.

The Sherman Act is rightfully known as the magna carta of the free-enterprise system and the bill of rights of business.

The Sherman Act asserts the principle that in a free market, enterprise and initiative shall have the opportunity to compete without fear of restraint by combination, and without fear of reprisal by monopoly methods.

The Sherman Act asserts the principle that the ultimate interests of the entire economy and of all the people will be best served by freedom of opportunity to introduce new ideas, new goods, and new services, and to enter the market and compete on equal terms.

In the famous Trenton Potteries case, the Court found the congressional intent in enacting the Sherman Act to be: "based upon the assumption that the public interest is best protected from the evils of monopoly and price control by the maintenance of competition."

The events of recent years have amply demonstrated the wisdom and foresight of the Congress which wrote this charter of economic freedom.

An astounded world watched our industrial machine pour forth the goods and matériel which overwhelmed the enemy.

Many nations in a weary world look for succor to our Government and our system of free enterprise and free opportunity and would emulate that which has brought to us the greatest standard of living known to any people of the world.

I have just returned from a Europe sick from many ailments. Very apparent is the disease that comes from industrial combination and cartelization.

It is a hateful disease which must not infect us. Our job at the Department of Justice is to protect the American economy from contagion.

The Department of Justice must preserve our economic freedoms and the civil rights which flow from them by enforcement of the Sherman Act.

The Department of Justice is the public protector. It is the law department of the greatest clients in the world—the United States of America and its people.

Many antitrust actions start from the people. Complaints are received by the Department of Justice every day.

One may be from the machine-tool manufacturer who finds all his suppliers of ball bearings lined up against him offering bearings at identical prices.

Another may be from the tobacco farmer who finds himself confronted with the same prices and buying conditions from all the big tobacco companies.

Another may be from a municipality which is planning to build a school but finds that all contractors operate through a bid depository and decide among themselves who shall be the successful bidder and at what price the successful bid shall be made.

And still another complainant may bewail the fact that overstocked suppliers have agreed to withhold their goods from the market to create a scarcity with consequent higher prices or to put him out of business.

If, after investigation, it is determined that the complaint is well-founded, the Department of Justice moves swiftly.

Where it is plain that the offender clearly intended to violate the antitrust laws, criminal indictment is immediately sought.

Let me say very clearly that the Department of Justice does not seek to punish for the sake of punishment. It does not carry on a vendetta with the businessman. It seeks only to deter the violation of our basic economic law.

The civil action is used to obtain affirmative relief.

Large fines do not correct a situation which has already become fixed. Fines have proven to be merely license fees. We must insist upon and secure jail sentences. The maximum of 1 year in jail for every violator would be most helpful. It is our purpose, in proper cases, to attempt to secure such sentences.

Where an illegal business structure exists, we may ask that it be dissolved if it is indicated that this is the way to remedy the wrong.

Where a corporation uses its subsidiaries, divisions, or plants in violation of the antitrust laws, we may ask for what in legal language is known as divestiture. This means separating the subsidiary, division, or plant from its parent toward the end that two competitive units will appear in place of the single structure which acted in violation of the antitrust laws.

We must untrack the trend toward concentration of economic power.

The Smaller War Plants Corporation recently issued a report to the Senate Small Business Committee. The report decries the trend toward mergers and acquisitions which was accelerated during the war and which must be prevented and reduced in stature.

The report concludes that antitrust, small business, and surplus-disposal programs are the remedies indicated.

The Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice has long maintained separate sections dealing with small-business problems and surplus property disposal.

I should like to make another point clear about the Sherman Act and its enforcement.

We know that because of the broad language of the Sherman Act, violation of its terms is sometimes unpredictable although the Supreme Court is making clearer and clearer the bounds of proper activity. Nevertheless, should a specific program be contemplated and should the planners be fearful that it violates the law, the Department of Justice is prepared to discuss it.

The American businessman who wants to play the game according to American rules has nothing to fear.

We are now going back to the old rule book.

For five weary years, business has complained of the OPA and price control.

It has begged for the return to the economies of supply and demand.

Well, it is just about here.

Business will be on its own.

There will be no Government to whip and to blame.

It is expected that business will accept the responsibility of the free market.

It is expected that business will not substitute private price control for Government regulation.

The average American—the elevator operator as well as the apartment-building owner, shoe-store salesman, and the chain-store operator—has been protected from runaway prices under Government control.

They are entitled to expect fair and reasonable treatment with the removal of Government control.

This is now the obligation of business.

To shirk this obligation is to betray a trust imposed on business by the removal of control.

It is to shirk a responsibility to the public and to the free enterprise system.

The removal of price control places the free-enterprise system on trial.

The American businessman has a personal and vital interest in the preservation of the American system of free enterprise, free opportunity, and free men.

His future as an independent businessman depends upon vigorous, night-and-day enforcement of the antitrust laws.

We call out, then, to businessmen like you to help us.

For it is with your continued support and assistance in enforcing our basic economic law that the American business scene will remain free from enterprise and open for opportunity.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I likewise ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the address by the Honorable Tom C. Clark delivered at the annual conference of the National Association of Attorneys General on the tideland oil controversy.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TIDELAND OIL CONTROVERSY

In order to understand the question which the Supreme Court is now called upon to decide, it is necessary to distinguish between three classes of land beneath navigable waters. In the first place, there are the inland waters, which include rivers, lakes, bays, and estuaries, as well as "tidelands," or the lands between ordinary high and ordinary low-water marks. Then there is the marginal sea area, which under the present international policy of the United States, is that part of the sea within 3 miles of the shore measured from the ordinary low-water mark or the seaward limit of a bay or river mouth. Lastly, there is the area seaward of the outer limit of the marginal sea, which, of course, is not involved, as such, in this controversy.

The pending suit does not involve any bays, rivers, or other inland waters, nor does it involve the tidelands. It is limited solely

to that portion of the ocean embraced within the marginal sea.

It is the contention of the Government that no State littoral to the oceans ever had or now has any proprietary interest in the marginal sea lands and therefore no State ever had or now has any power to grant rights to remove petroleum or other minerals from these lands.

The States rest their case upon the reasoning that when the original States separated from the Crown of England they became individual sovereigns, and, because the Crown at common law owned the submerged lands, the original States, as an incident of sovereignty, succeeded to such ownership. The States further maintain, to quote from the brief of attorneys general filed with the House Judiciary Committee a few months ago: "The original States did not surrender their lands beneath tidal waters and navigable waters to the Federal Government either by the Constitution or otherwise."

These propositions are fallacious as may be seen from the decision of *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Corp.* (299 U. S. 304). The opinion in that case points out that by "the Declaration of Independence 'the Representatives of the United States of America' declared the United (not the several) Colonies to be free and independent States"; and, quoting again, "the powers of external sovereignty passed from the Crown not to the colonies severally, but to the colonies in their collective and corporate capacity as the United States of America. Even before the Declaration, the colonies were a unit in foreign affairs, acting through a common agency * * *." Quoting again "when, therefore, the external sovereignty of Great Britain in respect of the colonies ceased, it immediately passed to the Union," and again, "* * * the Union * * * was the sole possessor of external sovereignty * * *"; "The States were not 'sovereigns' in the sense contended for by some."

As a final quotation, and one which refutes the contention of the States that the Federal Government did not acquire ownership of the marginal sea because the States did not expressly grant it by the Constitution: "It results that the investment of the Federal Government with the powers of external sovereignty did not depend upon the affirmative grants of the Constitution."

If anything is beyond doubt in this controversy, it is that the principal basis for the creation and the continued recognition of the marginal sea belt theory is the security and defense of the national sovereign. An examination of any work on international law, or of the writings of any publicist, will clearly demonstrate the correctness of this statement, so I shall not further develop the subject.

Since the development and acceptance of the concept of the marginal sea, it has been continuously identified with the external powers and national interests of the United States. This is evidenced by the numerous instances in which the executive branch of the Federal Government, in conducting our external affairs, has had occasion to reconsider the status of the marginal sea, particularly its extent, in relation to questions which have arisen between the United States and foreign nations. That such instances will continue to occur seems certain, especially since, notwithstanding the concern of the United States to maintain the principle of the freedom of the seas, there exist strong reasons for extending our territorial jurisdiction beyond the present three-mile limit.

The marginal sea having been created and continued in the field of international affairs for the reasons stated, it would seem only natural that title to the underlying lands should be in the Nation rather than in the political units making up the sovereign state recognized by other nations. Not only are the powers of our Federal Government supreme in the field of national security and defense but they are also supreme in the fields of international relations, foreign commerce, immigration, and import duties and customs. The only powers which the individual States of our Union may exercise in the marginal sea area are those of a local or municipal character as distinguished from powers in the field of international affairs. It would, therefore, seem that title to the marginal sea lands would more appropriately follow as an attribute of sovereignty of the Nation rather than as an attribute of sovereignty of the individual States.

It has been strenuously asserted by the States that the issue of ownership has been determined by the Supreme Court of the United States a great many times. It is the position of the Department of Justice that there has been no case decided by the Supreme Court where ownership of the marginal sea lands was involved.

Practically all of the cases cited in support of the States' claims pertain exclusively to inland waters. Three cases touch upon the subject in a somewhat broader manner, but are, by no means, in point upon the question of the ownership of the marginal sea lands.

In my view, there is no clear and conclusive authority which disposes of the case either way and we must therefore proceed to obtain such a determination.

May I say at this point that the established rule that States own the lands under navigable rivers and bays is in no way incompatible with the proposition that the Federal Government owns the lands underlying the marginal sea. Rivers and bays are within the physical body of a State. This reasoning, and its historical background, was made clear as early as 1793 in an opinion by the Attorney General in the Delaware Bay case (1 Op. Atty. Gen. 32).

The marginal sea, however, is governed by entirely different considerations. It is not within a State, in the physical sense, and its primary justification is the security and defense of the United States.

Of course, there are other points which are material and important to this general issue, but time limitation precludes a present discussion of them.

A number of you from inland States signed the memorandum filed with the House Committee on the Judiciary. It is thus apparent that you are concerned about the possible effect of this suit upon the beds of lakes, rivers, and bays. As I have said, the suit will have no effect upon those lands, nor will it have any effect upon titles to the beds of the Great Lakes.

My understanding is that the Great Lakes are considered inland waters and no contention has ever been made by anyone that a marginal sea exists there. The present suit, therefore, raises no question as to the title of the lands beneath the Great Lakes.

I understand that it has been suggested that we should have joined other States with California in the Supreme Court suit. In filing the action in the Supreme Court against the State of California alone, there was, of course, no intention to discriminate against that State. There are many other coastal States of the Union as well as thousands of individuals and corporations who assert claims in the marginal sea area under authority of the States. The decision of the Supreme Court, we hope, will settle the question as to all the coastal States of the Union.

Another reason we have not joined other States in the proceeding is that there is serious doubt whether under the rules relating to joinder they could be make joint parties. No other State except California is involved in the production of oil in the marginal sea off the California coast and it would appear, therefore, that no other State could be joined in an action relating to that area. On the other hand, if other areas were included in the action the State of California would not be involved as to those areas.

I have no doubt that many of the States will take advantage of the rules of the Supreme Court permitting the filing of briefs as friends of the Court. The Federal Government will welcome your assistance to the Court in that manner since its interest lies in securing a correct decision and every aid to the Court should be available for that purpose.

Regardless of whether you agree with what I have said, I hope that you are convinced that the suit which I authorized to be filed in the Supreme Court has been brought in good faith in the sincere belief that the question is still open and ought to be settled.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have received consent to have printed in the RECORD the testimony of Mr. Wendell Berge, and I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that after Mr. Berge testified before the committee of which I am chairman on the 13th day of February last, after he got through being cross-examined, after he got through admitting that for all the years he has been in the Attorney General's office as the head of the Antitrust Division not one single person has been convicted and sent to jail, he went from that office over to the office of the Attorney General and within a few hours handed in his resignation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks my separate report as a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, entitled "Investigation Concerning Failure of Attorney General and the Department of Justice To Act With Respect to Alleged Irregularities in Missouri Democratic Primary Election," be printed in full.

There being no objection, the separate report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Separate report of Senator WILLIAM LANGER, member of Subcommittee on S. 116, Committee on the Judiciary, "Investigation concerning failure of Attorney General and the Department of Justice to act with respect to alleged irregularities in Missouri Democratic primary election"]

Because of the grave importance of the charges against the Attorney General of the United States reflected in this resolution, I have read the testimony with unusual care. Certain facts stand out with startling clarity. One is that the Attorney General has been terrifically burdened as an aftermath of the war. The record shows that there are about 100,000 cases a year in the Department of Justice for his supervision (record, p. 74). As a result the Attorney General must of necessity place Assistant Attorneys General in charge of the various divisions, including the criminal division which had charge of prosecuting election frauds including the Kansas City election.

The head of any governmental department is properly held responsible for the actions of his department and for the efficiency of his assistants; but, having been myself attorney general for the State of North Dakota during the period of World War I and experienced with the duties of attorney general in a single State both during and after the war, I can well understand the multitudinous and varied matters that project themselves into the office of the Attorney General of the United States.

It is with this background that we must consider the approach of the Kansas City

case to the attention of the Department of Justice. Because of the possible involvement of the President of the United States, the Attorney General must have known how highly important this election was—not only to the Republican and Democratic Parties, but to the people of the country at large. In my opinion, for such reason it would have been the part of wisdom for the Attorney General to have undertaken charge of that complaint himself rather than to have delegated the authority to an assistant, even though the latter course would have been in conformity with the usual practice. The record shows (p. 53) that the policy followed by the Attorney General was established by former Attorney General Robert Jackson on the recommendation of the Honorable Maurice Milligan, the United States district attorney at Kansas City, who himself in 1936 prosecuted the Pendergast machine for election frauds and who prosecuted Pendergast himself for income-tax violations—(record, p. 53). Mr. Milligan, under Attorney General Murphy, was responsible for the adoption of the policy which required specific authority from the Attorney General and the initiation of a preliminary investigation where vote frauds were claimed in violation of Federal statutes (record, pp. 54 and 65). The Department of Justice followed that practice in this case. In my opinion, however, for reasons stated, the Attorney General should have himself taken personal charge of this investigation. However, I can readily conceive that during these months there were many problems facing him—strikes (including the legal proceedings involving the mine workers), important litigation involving billions of dollars (such as the notable tidelands suit), lynchings in the South, serious immigration problems, important war assets investigations, claims against the Government—that he could have in all honesty felt were so important to the people that they required his general supervision to the same extent as that required by violation of civil rights statutes, including election irregularities.

From the Attorney General's testimony (record, pp. 74 and 75), he evidenced the fact that in his judgment this case should be handled as any other regardless of the individuals or personalities involved.

In addition to the foregoing, the State of Missouri was undertaking a serious investigation of its own through the county grand jury which returned indictments against 78 persons because of these self-same election irregularities. Criticism has been leveled at the Attorney General because the Department of Justice did not step in and seize the ballots, some of which were stolen. Had he done so, the charge might well have been made that the Department of Justice was trying to get physical possession of the ballots for sinister purposes by impounding them and preventing their use by the county grand jury.

The Attorney General did order the Federal Bureau of Investigation to make a preliminary investigation; and unquestionably that being a preliminary one was subject to the same type of instructions as had been given in all other election cases. The testimony of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, so states. (Record pp. 50–55). Here are his words:

Mr. HOOVER. No. I would not consider that in any way out of line, because that has been the practice in practically all of the preliminary investigations of election frauds. We have received many cases where they outline specifically whom to interview and exactly what steps we are to take.

"Senator FERGUSON. Under these instructions?

"Mr. HOOVER. Under these instructions. That is correct."

In a communication of June 18, 1947, addressed to the subcommittee, Mr. Hoover has set forth his views specifically. His impartiality and integrity are well known to all the Senate and to the American people. He would know better than perhaps any other whether there was partiality or favoritism or deliberate disregard of duty on the part of the Attorney General of the United States. He states in his letter, "I think that in all fairness both to the committee and to the Attorney General, I should elaborate upon the specific items which appear to be in issue." He says, "The fact that we were ordered to make a preliminary inquiry in this case was not unusual. In the summer of of 1941 Mr. Maurice Milligan, who you will recall prosecuted the original Kansas City vote fraud case in 1936, as a special assistant to former Attorney General Robert H. Jackson instituted the policy that unless advised to the contrary in election fraud cases, preliminary inquiry was to be made only upon Departmental instructions, after which the facts were to be submitted to Departmental attorneys who would study the facts for decision as to further action. This same policy is followed in other classes of cases." He further states, "I think in all fairness I should make the observation that in the years the present Attorney General, Tom C. Clark, has been associated with the Department of Justice, I have had the opportunity of working with him in innumerable cases and I am glad to state that he has not in any way taken any action to prevent any investigation being conducted to its logical conclusion."

In determining whether more investigations should be undertaken, let us look at the record. At the present time there have been instituted the following investigations in the Fifth Congressional District in Kansas City, Mo.:

1. An investigation by the Kansas City Star with two experienced reporter-investigators and over 30 assistants. They have interrogated more than 8,000 people.

2. An investigation by a committee of the House of Representatives.

3. An investigation by the grand jury of Jackson County, Mo., which has returned 78 indictments.

4. An investigation under the direction of Richard K. Phelps, who was a former United States attorney in the western district of Missouri, and was chief assistant to Maurice Milligan in the prosecution of the Kansas City vote fraud when 250 persons were convicted.

5. A Federal special grand jury has been summoned to inquire into this matter. This committee has already taken the testimony of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; Daniel Milton Ladd, Assistant Director; Attorney General Tom C. Clark; Sam M. Wear, United States attorney, Kansas City, Mo.; Albert J. Reeves, Albert Ridge, J. Collett, all United States district judges for the western district of Missouri; and Allen Stokka, an employee in the office of Senator KEM.

It is difficult to overemphasize the importance of maintaining our elections free from fraud and corruption. However, I cannot in good conscience hold that the foregoing will not fully insure adequate protection of all civil rights, including those guaranteed under our Federal constitutional statutes to our citizens.

I can therefore see no need for further expense and effort.

I have always favored State law enforcement where the interests of the citizens could be adequately protected.

In addition, I have the strongest belief in the integrity and the honesty of the Attorney General of the United States. All of the testimony presented in this record has not changed that opinion. Had his work allowed it, I believe that he could have better served the people by giving more of his personal attention to the direction of this matter, but I can better understand his difficulty in not so doing considering the other burdens he bears in the performance of this high office, especially in these unusual times.

I have never willingly confused criticism of a man's judgment with questioning his integrity.

I think that at no time in our history is it more important to refrain from unjust criticism, especially involving charges of lack of integrity, than today. Not only do I feel that another investigation added would produce no good; I fear it would do harm. There are stern duties facing the Attorney General of the United States in protecting the people from other wrongs. I refer particularly to protection against plundering cartelists, racketeers, and their brethren.

The Attorney General some months ago brought to his side a new Assistant Attorney General, John F. Sonnett, who has announced for the first time since the passage of the Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890 that corporations and individuals that violate the antitrust laws are going to be arrested and prosecuted in the same manner as other criminals. This, to my mind, is one of the very important duties resting upon the Department of Justice. It has been the failure of all Attorneys General, Republican and Democratic, since 1890 to sternly enforce antitrust laws and to seek terms in prison for those involved therein. This lack of law enforcement has led to abuses in the formation of billion-dollar trusts, cartels, and monopolies.

These for a long period have borne down and burdened the American people. Never was it more important than today that these antitrust laws be rigorously and effectively enforced. We owe this to all our citizens, to the veterans returning from the war, to start businesses of their own, and to others who have suffered by having competition stifled in private enterprise to such an extent that it has made it almost impossible for a small businessman to hope to compete with these vast aggregations of wealth. If our entire way of American life is to be preserved, these duties must be performed, and I have full confidence that the Attorney General will carry them out faithfully, vigorously, and effectively. It is strange, indeed, that immediately after he, for the first time in the history of the United States as Attorney General, announced that these monopolists and cartelists would be prosecuted and jailed when found guilty that he should be harassed by an investigation of this type. Nothing would give more comfort or more smug satisfaction to the heads of these giant cartels and combinations than to see the efforts of the Attorney General of the United States thus diverted from them, while they continue their practice to the detriment of millions of wage earners and millions of housewives trying to squeeze out an existence on a budget rapidly diminishing from day to day.

There are many people, according to the views expressed by the Senator from Nevada, who will feel that a continuation of such investigation and pressing of these charges are political, and that those that make them have an eye to the election just around the corner; that they are made more to influence election results than to contribute to the common welfare of the people.

The Attorney General has demonstrated that he is no respecter of persons, parties, or groups.

He has proved his mettle. Witness his impartial record, whether sending prominent men of his own party to jail or battling for the common people by sternly enforcing all laws, civil and criminal, whether saving billions of dollars in oil lands or protecting the rights of the humblest citizen, regardless of race, color, or creed.

Finally, other issues facing us are of such vast importance, the people of the United States expect the undivided attention of their Senate to solve them. With the whole world prostrate, with the eyes of millions of starving people in other countries looking anxiously and hopefully to us for help and guidance, with the President of the United States confronted with one bewildering public problem after another, with the whole system of economy and our way of life being challenged here and abroad and perhaps being weighed in the balance—in these very critical days, I cannot faithfully under my oath ask this Government to expend its energy, time, and money on an investigation of this sort.

If we ever could have risked the danger of being charged with playing politics—even risk the danger of being suspected thereof—we cannot do so now. The perilous times in which we live demand nothing less than our very best. We are compelled by a common interest of survival to stand shoulder to shoulder and make our Government succeed. We certainly must not discourage those bearing these heavy burdens. For such reasons, I regret—very sincerely regret—the necessity of differing with one of my colleagues in voting against this resolution.

WILLIAM LANGER,
Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of J. Edgar Hoover, a man in whom I believe the people of America have as much confidence as in any other man, originally addressed to my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], be printed in full.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATIONS,
Washington, D. C., June 18, 1947.

Hon. HOMER FERGUSON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Since reviewing my testimony before your committee of the Kansas City election situation, comments have been made indicating that portions of my testimony have been misinterpreted and I think that in all fairness both to the committee and to the Attorney General, I should elaborate upon the specific items which appear to be in issue.

As you will recall, the departmental instructions ordering the preliminary inquiry specified specific persons to be interviewed and stated that in addition other employees of the Kansas City Star were to be questioned. As I pointed out in the latter part of my testimony, the some 30 Kansas City Star investigators were not interviewed inasmuch as we had secured their statements from other employees of the Kansas City Star and it was not believed by the agents conducting the inquiries that any purpose would be served in personally contacting these investigators whose statements were incorporated in our report. However, at the very beginning of my testimony, I indicated to the Committee that we had interviewed only the specified persons and had not gone beyond this inasmuch as we were not instructed to do so. As indicated, this was later clarified and the testimony as revised, deleting the phrase "and no one else" on page 58, and the phrase "we were not told to interview them" on page 66 expresses the true facts in the matter.

The fact that we were ordered to make a preliminary inquiry in this case was not unusual. In the summer of 1941 Mr. Maurice Milligan, who you will recall prosecuted the original Kansas City vote fraud case in 1936, as a special assistant to former Attorney General Robert H. Jackson instituted the policy that unless advised to the contrary in election fraud cases, preliminary inquiry was to be made only upon departmental instructions, after which the facts were to be submitted to departmental attorneys who would study the facts for decision as to further action. This same policy is followed in other classes of cases.

With regard to the Mumford memorandum referred to before the committee, I wish to advise that I used the word "restricted" in my longhand note on the memorandum as a definitive term of my own to determine whether the Bureau's inquiry had been limited to specified interviews. I did not intend my inquiry as an indication that I had any question in my mind that an ulterior motive had actuated the Attorney General or the Department of Justice with respect to the scope of the preliminary inquiry ordered under the established policy.

I think in all fairness I should make the observation that in the years the present Attorney General, Tom C. Clark, has been associated with the Department of Justice, I have had the opportunity of working with him in innumerable cases and I am glad to state that he has not in any way taken any action to prevent any investigation being conducted to its logical conclusion.

I trust that the foregoing may be helpful to you and the members of your committee in clarifying any misinterpretation which may have arisen with respect to my testimony.

With expressions of my highest esteem and kind personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

J. EDGAR HOOVER.

SUGAR QUOTAS

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have taken very little time of the Senate. I feel that I should impose on the Senate only when I have something to contribute in the way of information. However, there is in certain pending legislation something which has been bothering me. I beg the indulgence of the Senate for only a few brief moments while I make a short statement of what I have in mind.

Mr. President, directly the Senate will consider either House bill 4075 or Senate bill 1584. The bills are better known as Sugar Acts of 1948. In general the overall objective of the proposed legislation would be effectuated through the establishment and use of quotas under which the United States market would be divided among the various domestic sugar producing areas and certain foreign producing areas which have historically supplied the domestic market. I have no hesitancy whatsoever in telling the Senate that I feel that the general objectives of the proposed legislation are correct and that such a measure should be enacted into law as soon as possible. However, there is one new provision in the bill which I feel has no place at all in this class of legislation. The main purpose of the legislation is the stabilization of the sugar industry for the next 5 years. Specifically referring to the provision which I have in mind, I call attention to section 202 of the proposed law, subsection (e), which reads as follows:

SEC. 202 (e). If the Secretary of State finds that any foreign country denies fair and equitable treatment to the nationals of the United States, its commerce, navigation, or industry, and so notifies the Secretary, the Secretary shall have authority to withhold or withdraw any increase in the share of the domestic consumption requirements provided for such country by this act as compared with the share allowed under section 202 (b) of the Sugar Act of 1937: *Provided*, That any amount of sugar so withheld or withdrawn shall be prorated to domestic areas on the basis of existing quotas for such areas and the Secretary shall revise such quotas accordingly: *Provided further*, That the portion of such amount of sugar which cannot be supplied by domestic areas may be prorated to foreign coutnries other than a country which the Secretary of State finds has denied fair and equitable treatment to nationals of the United States.

When I first read the language of section 202, subsection (e), I wondered why the Committee on Agriculture on the House side or the Committee on Finance on the Senate side put in a provision that is political in its nature and has nothing whatever to do with the stabilization of the sugar industry; hence, I went to the reports accompanying H. R. 4075 and Senate bill 1584. In the general statement in one report I find the following explanation:

Section 202 (e) is a new provision under which the Secretary is authorized to withhold or withdraw any increase in the quota for any foreign country over that provided for such country under the Sugar Act of 1937 upon a finding and notification by the Secretary of State that such country denies fair and equitable treatment to nationals of the United States, its commerce, navigation, or industry. In the event that any quota, or any portion thereof, is withheld or withdrawn pursuant to this section the amounts so withdrawn are to be allocated proportionately among the domestic-producing areas, and if the domestic areas are unable to fulfill such amounts so allotted by the Secretary to foreign countries which do not deny fair and equitable treatment to nationals of the United States.

It has been brought to the attention of the committee that there have been instances where nationals of the United States have been unable to collect pecuniary claims from foreign governments notwithstanding the fact that, in many instances, the validity of such claims has been acknowledged by, or adjudicated in the courts of, such foreign countries.

It is the intent of the committee—

That is the Committee on Finance on the Senate side, and the Committee on Agriculture on the House side—

that the nonpayment of valid claims which have been adjudicated or acknowledged by foreign countries shall constitute unfair or inequitable treatment within the meaning of section 202 (e). Representatives of the State Department appearing before the committee concurred in this construction of the language of section 202 (e).

It does not say that they agreed on the policy of the language, but that they concurred in the construction of the language of section 202, subsection (e).

From this explanation it appears that the committees handling the legislation have gone into international politics—in this instance to such an extent that I believe it would be to the interest of the Senate and the world at large that I make a brief comment on what I feel will be the reaction throughout the world, and especially in Latin America. If section 202, subsection (e) is allowed to stay in the bill and it becomes the law of the land I am afraid the good-will policy will go out the window, or at least our sincerity will be doubted. No one can take issue with the committee that foreign

governments should pay their just debts, and whatever country the committee had in mind in this instance should be no exception. However, a country such as ours, now leading the world, having fought two wars in order to protect the dignity of the nations and people of the world, should not use coercive or compulsory legislative methods to obtain results that can be obtained as well with dignity and justice and with the sincerity of purpose that this country has shown Latin America for years.

Long ago this country announced the sound idea that it was opposed to the use of force, be it military or economic, to obtain the payment of claims or debts. In the not far distant past England and the then Germany tried to use naval and military force to collect debts in Venezuela, and an American President and an American Secretary of State told those two countries that the United States would not tolerate such action.

For many years, what was known as dollar diplomacy seemed to be the policy that prevailed, especially in Latin America, but thank goodness that we had such Secretaries of State as Elihu Root and Cordell Hull who decided correctly that that was not the way in which a big country, such as ours, should deal with its neighbors. Hence, the good-neighbor policy came into being; and it has been a good-neighbor policy. Our standing in Latin America has been improved to such an extent that when this country found itself at war, practically every nation in this hemisphere, large or small, rich or poor, declared war against our common enemy and contributed what little it had for a common purpose. In this land, when we are preaching to and convincing the world as to our sincerity of purpose, when we want the basic rights of every nation in Europe, Asia, or elsewhere to be respected, are we now going to use arbitrary legislation and act in a unilateral manner in deciding justice? That is contrary to all our concepts of dealing with other nations. Whatever claims there are, be they pecuniary or otherwise, can be adjudicated by dealing with the nation affected in a correct way, but not by using the power of might against the other country's welfare. This action, in my opinion, not only violates the good-neighbor policy but it is contrary to all of the resolutions, conventions, declarations, and principles that have been adopted and subscribed to by the countries of the Western Hemisphere, including our own. It is a serious matter, fellow Senators, more serious than can be visualized at the moment. That section gives aid and comfort to whatever enemies we might have in any place in the world.

During the discussion of the tax bill I heard our minority leader make an impassioned speech to sustain the President's veto. He told us of this Nation's noble efforts, to which I subscribe, in trying to lead the world into peace, self-respect, and dignity amongst nations. He indicated that he was worried because there might be a different philosophy prevailing in other parts of the world.

Keep section 202, subsection (e), in this bill and let it become law and it will become the subject of the most vicious propaganda in the Western Hemisphere that we shall ever see. This section will undermine any visit by public officials, or any conference, be it held in Buenos Aires, be it held at Rio, be it held at Washington, or be it held in Chapultepec.

In 1936 there was a conference held at Buenos Aires which was called a "Conference for the Consolidation of Peace." The fundamental principle reached at that conference was included and ratified in the Act of Chapultepec in 1945. The conference at Chapultepec was attended by the then chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate [Mr. CONNALLY] and the former Senator from Vermont, our good friend, former Senator Austin.

Purposes and conclusions reached at Chapultepec were good will and hemispheric solidarity.

But under the proposed Sugar Act by the section that I have referred to, we do away with all of those sound principles and tell a foreign country we shall forget open conciliations and forget unrestricted arbitration or the application of international justice. We are not going to let the other country have her day in court. We shall be claimant, judge, jury, and executioner.

I do not know the claims that American nationals have against foreign countries, with the exception that I know some constituents in my home State have some Russian bonds and they cannot get a dime. I say, with the exception of Finland, European countries have paid us very little on account of World War I. Any country in Latin America or elsewhere that owes money to American nationals should pay them. Those countries possibly owe their own nationals more than they owe foreign nationals. Is it proper, is it right, is it in keeping with what we are trying to do for the world, to force any country by unilateral law to pay claims which we, acting alone, say must be paid or else? Will we be consistent if we include section 202 subsection (e)?

I want the Senate to think it over seriously. I want it to think it over when we make another loan to Greece, or to Turkey, or to England, or to Holland.

If this provision is included in the bill it is my opinion that there will be no need for a Rio conference. Countries will say, "Now you do it to sugar, next it will be copper, then lumber, then manganese, and then will come hides, quinine, sugar or coffee." Yes, I want each and every country to pay the debts that they owe the nationals of this country but I do not want my country to go back to the idea of "dollar diplomacy" to collect such debt. I do not think that American people want it done that way. Let us do it with dignity and self-respect, and be worthy of respect and might.

Can might be right?
Then tear the page from our Columbia's story
Of heroes dead of every age
Who died to weave her glory.

Let us think this over before we let this section stay in the proposed legislation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I have great respect for the opinions of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. I do not regard this as an appropriate occasion on which to debate the sugar bill, but I assure my colleagues that the matter will be fully set forth and, I feel, fully justified when we reach the debate on the subject.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understand that the pending business is the calling of the calendar?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHITE. If the Senate should now recess, would the calling of the calendar still be the pending business on the assembling of the Senate tomorrow?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It would be.

CONTINUATION OF PREMIUM PAYMENTS FOR COPPER, LEAD, AND ZINC

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am advised that this afternoon the House of Representatives passed House bill 1602, providing for the continuation, for a period of 2 years, of premium payments for copper, lead, and zinc. The Congress cannot afford to adjourn until it has assured that this Nation will be amply protected by having made available to it from the world the all-essential metals—copper, lead, and zinc. The subject was covered in a bill which I had the privilege of introducing some months ago and which has been pending before the Committee on Public Lands. It is a companion bill to the one introduced by the brilliant young Representative from Nevada, CHARLES RUSSELL, in the House of Representatives. I am now advised that the House has passed a somewhat different bill from the Russell bill which I introduced in the Senate. Be that as it may, I am very much in favor of the immediate passage of the House bill. I hope that we may have from the Committee on Public Lands speedy action on the House bill, so that the Senate may have before it that bill before it adjourns and that we may be sure, in this hour of world trouble, that there will be an ample supply of the all-essential metals covered by the legislative measure.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] just requested a statement, as I understood him, from the Committee on Public Lands. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is in the Chamber, and I hope that he will make a statement on the subject.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] spoke of the urgency of premium price legislation relative to copper, lead, and zinc. I am very happy to say that the policy committee of the majority side has listed that proposed legislation as among the legislative matters which are at all events to receive action. I am assured by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the Public Lands Committee that the measure which has come from the House will

be processed promptly and will be reported to the Senate promptly. So I feel that we shall have action taken on it in the immediate future.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, judging from what the Senator from Colorado has said, I think we may count upon it as a certainty that action will be taken on this matter before final adjournment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. So far as I can see, action will be taken on it before adjournment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am indeed happy to hear the Senator from Colorado state that the bill to continue the premium prices on copper, lead, and zinc will receive or has received attention from and by the Committee on Public Lands.

Let me say that my interest in that action is extremely serious because this country may at this very moment be in a position when it will be called upon very shortly to utilize all its natural resources and facilities, and certainly there is nothing more important for the defense of a nation than copper, lead, and zinc. Therefore, both Democrats and Republicans who are looking to the national defense should see to it that there is encouragement for the production of these metals here at home.

MANAGEMENT OF RESTRICTED LANDS OF THE CROW TRIBE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1317) entitled "An act to give to members of the Crow Tribe the power to manage and assume charge of their restricted lands, for their own use or for lease purposes, while such lands remain under trust patents," which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, any Indian who is the owner of an allotment or of other trust or restricted land under the jurisdiction of the Crow Indian Agency in Montana, after filing notice of intention with the superintendent or other officer in charge of the Crow Indian Reservation, may lease without restriction, and collect the rentals therefrom, except as specified in this act, any part of his allotments for farming or grazing purposes: *Provided, however*, That this authority shall not extend to any Crow Indian who has pledged the income from such land or has executed a power of attorney or other authorization for the leasing of such lands and the application of the income therefrom in consideration of a loan from the Crow Tribe of Indians or the United States: *And provided further*, That the provisions of this act shall not repeal or modify any of the provisions of the act of June 25, 1946 (Public Law 441, 79th Cong., 2d sess.).

SEC. 2. Lands or interest in lands belonging to more than one Indian through inheritance or otherwise may be leased by the holder or holders of a majority in interest, but any such lease shall provide that the holders of any interest therein shall receive their proportionate share of the total compensation. Leases of inherited and devised allotments or other restricted lands may be made by the superintendent when (a) the heirs or devisees of the deceased owners have not been determined, (b) when the land is not being used by any of the heirs or devisees and the heirs have not been able within a 30-day period to agree upon a lease, and (c) when there exist claims for indebtedness against the land allowed by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. Lands or interests in lands belonging to minors or to persons non compos mentis may be leased or permitted by the parent, legal guardian, or natural guardian.

SEC. 4. All leases and permits authorized by this act shall be made on forms approved by a majority vote of the Crow Tribal Council, and shall be effective and valid only after they have been recorded at the Crow Indian Agency.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed with the consent and approval by a majority vote of the Crow Tribal Council to make rules and regulations for the purpose of conservation, including the operation and management of grazing units on the principle of sustained yield, the limitation of the number of livestock to the estimated carrying capacity of the designated range units, the full utilization of the range, the prevention of soil erosion, and like purposes. To carry out these purposes, the Secretary of the Interior, or any officer designated by him, is hereby authorized and directed to establish on the Crow Indian Reservation land use districts, zones, or units: *Provided*, That 65 percent in acreage of the Indian landholders within such district, zone, or unit shall consent in writing to the establishment thereof for a specific term not to exceed 10 years. All leases or permits within any such district, zone, or unit authorized by this act shall specify the district, zone, or unit in which the leased or permitted lands are located, and no such lease or permit within any district, zone, or unit shall be valid for any purpose or use except as authorized in the designation of the district, zone, or unit.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Interior or his designated representatives, after the establishing of any such district, zone, or unit, is authorized and directed to issue permits on range units with the consent of the majority of landowners in interest in such district, zone, or unit, after public advertising for competitive bidding. The permittee shall make payment of grazing fees direct to landowners who are authorized to receive direct payments by this act. If any Indian owners of lands or interests in land shall fail or refuse to authorize the issuance of a permit on his land to the successful bidder, the permittee shall pay to the Superintendent of the Crow Indian Agency for the credit of the landowner grazing fees at the rate established for the unit by a vote of the majority of the Indian landholders within said district, zone, or unit: *Provided*, That nothing contained herein shall preclude an Indian landowner within such district, zone, or unit from using his own land and supplementing thereto by leasing additional lands for all grazing purposes.

SEC. 7. No lease or permit authorized by this act shall be made for a longer term than 5 years.

SEC. 8. All leases made pursuant to the provisions of this act shall not be transferable or subject to assignment or subleasing, except with the consent of the Indian lessee. No permit made pursuant hereto shall be transferable or subject to assignment without the consent of a majority of the Indian landowners within the area covered by the permit sought to be transferred or assigned.

SEC. 9. All leases under this act shall be recorded at the Crow Indian Agency, and shall be subject to public inspection during the regular hours of the said agency.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. CORDON, Mr. ECTON, and Mr. HATCH conferees on the part of the Senate.

INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF BLACK BASS AND OTHER GAME FISH

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 682) entitled "An act to regulate the interstate transportation of black bass and other game fish, and for other purposes," which was, on page 6, in line 2, to strike out "purposes.", and insert:

purposes.

SEC. 10. The provisions of this act as relating to game fish shall not apply to steelhead trout (salmo gairdneri) legally taken in the Columbia River between the States of Washington and Oregon.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

THE DREDGE "AJAX"

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on July 17, 1947, the Senate passed Senate bill 885, dealing with the dredge *Ajax*. That bill thereupon was transmitted to the House of Representatives. On yesterday, the House, instead of acting on the Senate bill, passed its own bill, House bill 4229, which was transmitted to the Senate today.

I ask unanimous consent that House bill 4229 be read twice, considered, read the third time, and passed.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4229) to provide that the Canadian-built dredge *Ajax* and certain other dredging equipment owned by a United States corporation be documented under the laws of the United States was read twice by its title, considered, read the third time, and passed.

THE VETO OF THE TAX BILL

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, those sitting in the galleries who listened to the debate last week on the President's veto of the tax bill must have thought, as they heard the speeches made by Senators who advocated that the veto be overridden, that our whole economy would be endangered if the tax bill did not become law.

A recent editorial which appeared in one of Pennsylvania's great metropolitan dailies, the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, gave a complete answer to such fallacious reasoning. This editorial demonstrates the exact contrary to be the fact, and contends that the veto was dictated by realities at home and abroad. The editorial also expressed the hope that the veto would be sustained, and it very effectively pointed out the folly of cutting taxes when we are engaged in an ideological war with the totalitarian power of eastern Europe.

But more important is the answer which the editorial gives to the threat that there will be no foreign relief unless there is tax relief. The answer of the

Post-Gazette to this serious threat is as follows:

Perhaps the most alarming fact about this do-little Congress is its unawareness, for the most part, of the nature and scope of the world problem and our relation to it. Thus, we are sickened to hear of a growing sentiment in the House that without tax relief there will be no foreign relief. No more dangerous assault than this could be made on our national security.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TAX BUNGLE

President Truman's veto of the second tax bill should not have surprised anyone. He had no reason to change his stand of 1 month ago that the Republican measure was "the wrong kind of tax reduction at the wrong time."

The Republicans can be expected to make election capital of the President's twin-tax vetoes. But their case is thin. From the first, this bungling Congress seized on the budget with political thoughts uppermost. Before studying where cuts might reasonably be made, the House talked about slashing six billions and the Senate four and a half.

But, to the present, Congress has been able to reduce the total budget by only a small fraction—and even this amount is likely to be canceled by redemption of veterans' terminal-leave bonds. With little regard for the public debt and with no regard for our commitments in Europe under the Marshall plan, Congress have twice plunged ahead with tax relief which, if we are to look to our best interests, cannot now be.

The latest Falk foundation-sponsored report on the national debt notes: "Practically all schools of thought agree that the time to reduce debt is when business and employment are active and national income is high. * * * Moreover, debt retirement in times of prosperity tends to act as a break upon overexpansion and inflation. By both of these tests we should be reducing the debt now. Under today's conditions the rules of sound debt management require a resolute paring down of Government expenditures and giving debt retirement first call on budgetary surpluses."

This last is the point: Congress has done anything but resolutely pare down Government spending. Indeed, it has been so busy counting its unhatched tax chickens that today, with adjournment 1 week away, only 4 of 12 departmental money bills have been approved.

Certainly a sensible approach to the tax problem would include a study of the sprawling executive branch, with a view to its reorganization, and a rigid adherence by Congress to the principle of adjusting taxes to expenditures. Most of all, during this boom period, any surplus should go first toward retiring the debt.

Outstanding in both bills, however, was the almost suicidal folly of cutting taxes at a time when we are engaged in an all-out political war with Russia. We have grasped the nettle of a divided Europe, and at our urging 16 nations on the continent are now studying their needs and assets.

We have pledged to aid them in their efforts to rebuild themselves. We have done so for the enlightened purpose of restoring that healthy trade on which our own prosperity depends, and in order to avoid paying billions upon billions in the future as the price of having now abandoned Europe to the Soviets.

Perhaps the most alarming fact about this do-little Congress is its unawareness, for the most part, of the nature and scope of the world problem and our relation to it. Thus, we are sickened to hear of a growing sentiment in the House that without tax relief there will be no foreign relief. No more dangerous assault than this could be made on our national security.

Mr. Truman's latest tax veto was dictated by realities both at home and abroad. Apparently, the little men in the House, who voted to override him, cannot see this. Happily, there are enough big men in the Senate, where the veto was sustained, who do see it.

NEEDS OF THE NAVAJO INDIANS

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I have prepared for delivery an address on the needs of the Navajo Indians, and I had hoped to deliver the address in this Chamber, for the information of the Senate. However, I do not wish to take the time of the Senate to deliver the speech; and therefore I ask unanimous consent to have it incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be printed in the RECORD as a statement, if there is no objection.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF ARTHUR V. WATKINS ON NAVAJO INDIANS

On the first day of June in 1868, the Government of the United States made a peace treaty with the Navajo Indians. This treaty specifically obligated our Government to assist the Indians in making economic and social adjustments in an area which the United States willingly conceded to them. Prior to the ratification of this treaty, we had gradually forced the Navajo Indians into an area comprising approximately 15,000,000 acres located in Arizona and New Mexico and Utah. The great proportion of the Navajo people live in New Mexico and Arizona, a small number are living in the State of Utah. The land on which they now live is the most seriously eroded section of land of its size in the United States. The area, however, is beautiful, and constitutes a tourist's paradise. There are some mountains, but most of the country is a colorful, unproductive desert land.

I regret that this group of original Americans has been the object of carelessness on the part of the United States Government. During the past 15 years, conditions among the Navajos have consistently deteriorated from year to year. During the time we were engaged in a great drive to make people of the world believe we were working for the common man, we were unwittingly starving people in our own midst.

The promised assistance to the Navajo Indians has never completely been forthcoming from our Government. If economic readjustment programs now under way among foreign people are as ineffective as has been our rehabilitation of the Navajo Indians, we will never adequately solve our problems.

I have listened to a great many pleas within the Senate that have indicated the great need for assistance to people in other parts of the world. Furthermore, we have many organizations in the United States devoted principally to securing aid from this country for respective groups suffering difficulties in other parts of the world. Let me make myself clear—I am in favor of our doing everything we can to aid other people insofar as such aid is effectively administered and does not unduly undermine the economic system of this country.

Today I want to leave with the Senate a statement concerning the Navajo people, who are still "half citizen, half foreign" and are so economically and socially poor that their ranks are torn by disease, malnutrition, and educational deficiencies.

SUBSTANDARD ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT

It should be kept in mind that substandard economic environment has made it impossible for the great majority of the Navajo tribal members to provide the necessities of life. The average income in 1940 for the Navajo people was about $82 per person, compared with a national average of almost 10 times as high. In 1944 Navajo income had increased to almost $200 per person. I am informed, however, that average income is now declining as we enter the postwar era. Many Navajo men who served in the armed forces and worked in war plants are now returning to the reservation. Employment conditions on the reservation are such as to make it impossible to absorb the available manpower.

TUBERCULOSIS IS RAMPANT

With further reference to the plight of the Navajo Indians, permit me to call your attention to the fact that 3,000 to 4,000 Navajos have tuberculosis—that is eight times the tuberculosis rate found in the United States generally. There is only one tuberculosis sanatorium operating on the reservation, with a capacity of 100 beds.

HIGH INFANT MORTALITY

Infant mortality for the United States is 44 per 100,000 population, and 110 for all Indians. The Navajo infants die at the rate of 318 per 100,000, or eight times that of the United States' average. Over one-half of all Navajo deaths occur among children under 5 years of age.

Let me quote from Facts About the Navajos, 1947, by George A. Boyce, Director of the Navajo schools:

"Eye defects, defective hearing, venereal disease, and other physical defects run very high. Measles and other epidemics sweep the schools frequently. Among preschool age children, measles often runs into penumonia or other serious complications because temperatures run up to 105 degrees and home care of the sick is very poor. Only one hospital has isolation facilities for diseases. People sick in their hogans have not a single field doctor or nurse.

"Cases of diphtheria, smallpox, and typhoid fever which are preventable, break out intermittently. Because of the limited medical service, only a small percentage of the people is able to get immunizations.

"In the reservation schools, there are about 4,500 children in attendance but only one school has a nurse. When the children get sick, the teachers do the best they can in providing nursing care.

"The Navajo Tribe employs one dentist. The Government employs one dentist full-time and one part-time for the Navajo country. This is less than three dentists altogether for 55,000 persons spread over 30,000 square miles.

"Since 1941, five of the small hospitals on the Navajo have been closed. Five of the remaining six hospitals have only one doctor. Consequently, thousands of Navajos are a hundred miles from the nearest doctor. This is too far to go except for broken bones or extremely serious illness, and often there is not room after the patient gets there.

"In short, the Navajo people are among the sickest in the Nation, with the least amount of medical service. A sick people cannot be a productive people. Much remains for the Government to do in providing health education, in reducing preventable disease, in reducing the infant mortality, and in protecting both the Navajo people and the surrounding public from tuberculosis and other contagious diseases. More doctors and nurses are desperately needed for this task."

NO FEDERAL OR STATE ASSISTANCE

The Navajo Indians do not receive Federal or State assistance under the Social Security Act either in Arizona or New Mexico. No institutions exist for the care of delinquents, the crippled, the deaf, blind, or otherwise handicapped persons. There is no State or Federal aid for dependent children and consequently many orphans and other dependend children are very seriously neglected. The Navajo people have about half enough to eat and their diet includes pinion nuts, wild peaches and home-grown products.

DIET LESS THAN 1,200 CALORIES

It is estimated that the individual diet averages less than 1,200 calories daily. The cost of food consumed would total about $1 per week per person. Many Navajos have less than this amount upon which to live. Consequently, they have the highest death rate in the United States.

There are over 55,500 Indians living in an area suitable to support slightly over one-half of that number. There are very few settlements in the Navajo country; consequently it is difficult to locate schools and it is a problem to get the children into schools. The Navajos are a sheep-raising people and therefore must follow the flocks over the grazing land. They move from summer to winter hogans about every 6 months. This mobility makes the location of 9-month day schools difficult to determine. At the present time boarding schools appear to be the answer to this problem.

DENIED RIGHT TO VOTE

Incidentally, and extremely important in my mind, is the fact that Navajos, including some 3,000 returned veterans, are denied the right to vote both in New Mexico and Arizona. The denial of voting rights rests on wardship, literacy, and tax regulations.

I briefly point out the economic position of the Navajos inasmuch as their poverty is a disgrace to the American people and is the cause of impaired health and subjects them to a very inadequate educational system. The Navajos economy is not one that makes easy the solution of the school and health problem.

FAIL TO LIVE UP TO TREATY

Under treaty obligation, the United States Government agreed to provide 1 teacher for every 30 Navajos of school age and to construct necessary plant facilities. The extent to which we have failed to live up to this agreement is apparent when we note that present educational facilities care for approximately 6,500 Navajos out of a potential school attendance of 20,000 Navajo children of school age. The total estimated capacity of Federal schools is slightly over 5,100. Missions and public schools bring the total capacity for Navajos to about 6,500 pupils. Thus, 13,500 Navajo children cannot attend school. I am informed that there are 47 Navajo schools, but at the present time over 12 of these are closed down.

ILLITERACY IS HIGH

A few more figures will show that the Navajo area is one of the dark spots in America insofar as education is concerned. Illiteracy is very high. Seventy-five percent of the Indians on the reservation cannot read or write. Compare this condition with Negro illiteracy of 16.1 percent; foreign-born whites 9.9 percent; and the native white illiteracy of 1.5 percent. The median number of years of school completed by all persons in the United States is 8.4, while Navajos probably average 0.9 of 1 year.

Information available indicates that there has been very little expansion in Navajo school capacity during the 10-year period ending in July 1946. Likewise, the average daily attendance in schools has not shown any great variation for the past 10 years, although the number of children of school age is growing rapidly. During the 1945–46 year, the Federal Government day and boarding schools on the reservation had a combined enrollment of 4,720 pupils. Federal Government day and boarding schools off the reservation reported 388 enrollees. Mission schools on and off the reservation enrolled 777 Navajo pupils. State schools were providing educational services for approximately 650 pupils.

From the limited information I have presented, it is apparent that within the confines of our own country exist a people whose needs are equal to and surpass the needs of many foreigners for whom we hear so many eloquent appeals.

The total amount available for all Navajo activities in the fiscal year ending 1945 exceeded $10,000,000. This amount includes earned Navajo income, as well as gratuity grants from the Federal Government. Nevertheless, as has been indicated, the Navajo per capita income is critically inadequate.

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES FOR EDUCATION

Let me present a year by year report of expenditures on the Navajo Reservation for education over the past 10 years as reported by the Federal Government:

TABLE I.—*Appropriations and expenditures for education on the Navajo Reservation during period 1937–47, and average daily attendance in the schools*

Year	Number of schools	Funds appropriated	Funds expended	Average daily attendance
1947	47	$1,509,617		
1946	43	1,083,608	$1,267,705	3,723
1945	43	959,630	1,221,194	3,939
1944	55	1,054,755	1,214,896	3,725
1943	55	1,070,980	1,008,536	3,639
1942	56	1,142,855	1,018,785	4,493
1941	56	1,143,680	1,077,016	4,329
1940	54	1,154,630	1,110,776	4,192
1939	56	1,246,655	1,123,666	3,416
1938	57	1,272,955	1,151,878	2,796
1937	56	1,210,260	1,217,511	3,487

The figures just presented indicate that the average daily attendance for all Navajo schools over the past 10 years has been approximately 3,773. If the same average is maintained for daily attendance during the fiscal year just ending, there will have been an expenditure of $400 per student. Over the past 10 years we have averaged approximately $300 per Navajo pupil per year based on average daily attendance.

Furthermore, if we were to take the total of money expended during the last 10 years on education on the Navajo Reservation, the average expenditure per student would be far greater than the average amount expended on students throughout the United States generally. For example in the school year 1944–45 the United States average daily attendance in elementary and secondary schools was 19,671,398 pupils, with an average expenditure per pupil of $125.41. I call this to the attention of the Senate in order to show that even though the number of Navajo students attending school is comparatively very small, the average expenditure per student by the Indian Office considerably exceeds the average expenditure per student throughout the United States.

FOOD PART OF COST

It would appear that the type of education provided for these Navajos who do attend school should be of extremely high quality insofar as expenditures are concerned. This, however, is reportedly not the case. Much of the purported per capita cost is for food for the Indian student.

STUDY IS NECESSARY

Conditions on the Navajo Reservation are such as to require much more money in order to maintain schools equal to the rest of the United States. The wide discrepancy between the amount needed to educate a Navajo and to educate other citizens of the country is so great that a complete study of Indian education should be made.

It can be easily seen that if the other 13,500 Navajo children are to be placed in school at a yearly cost of $300 to $400 per student, the cost on the Navajo Reservation alone would be tremendous. If the 13,500 Navajo children now denied education are to receive a minimum of school training we must appropriate an additional $5,000,000 directly to the Navajos.

I am not presenting these figures as a basis upon which to argue for reduction of expenditures on Navajo education. On the contrary, I am convinced that this Government is obligated to do more for the Navajo Indians, but I am concerned with the heavy expenditures per pupil as compared with average per pupil expenditure in our public schools.

RECEIVE SMALL COMPARATIVE SHARE OF MONEY

Even though per pupil expenditure as based on average daily school attendance is high, other phases of Navajo economy have received comparatively small amounts of money. Reliable sources of information reveal that the Navajo Indians number approximately one-sixth of the total Indian population of the United States living on Indian reservations, but they receive about one-twelfth of the Indian Office appropriation. On a per capita basis, in 1940 the Indian Office averaged $126 yearly expenditure per Indian. The Navajo yearly expenditure was $64.

In the field of relief, in 1944 the Indian Office spent an average of $2.60 per California Indian in addition to the benefits the California Indian received under social security. In the same year, the Navajo Indians not eligible for social security benefits averaged 50 cents per capita for relief from the Indian Office.

The following figures from the fiscal years 1938 through 1945 will give some insight into Navajo expenditures:

TABLE II.—*Appropriations for the Office of Indian Affairs together with appropriations for the Navajo Indian Agency for selected years*

Fiscal year	All agencies	Navajo
1938	$43,092,691.00	$3,954,150.00
1940	44,263,905.60	3,919,145.00
1941	45,409,303.00	3,514,668.00
1942	48,941,061.53	3,670,750.51
1943	40,669,671.48	3,007,644.69
1944	31,775,143.70	2,871,196.70
1945	35,246,325.23	2,925,395.27

Money spent on the Navajo reservation has consistently decreased since 1938. Emergency expenditures also have decreased with curtailment of the CCC and other Federal agencies.

HAVE OBLIGATION TO NAVAJO

I feel that our obligation to the Navajo Indians is much greater than our obligation to feed and care for people not living within our country. Nevertheless, our obligation to the Navajos has a parallel obligation to the American taxpayer. We should make sure that every dollar expended is effective in promoting the advancement of the Navajo Indians. It is possible that much of the money which should be going directly to help the Indian is being siphoned into unnecessary personnel and Bureau expenditures. It is likely that a more fair distribution of Indian Office appropriations may be needed.

The conditions on the Navajo Reservations are serious and from a study of available information it appears that a complete study of that reservation should be made by the

Congress of the United States in conjunction with the States of Arizona and New Mexico.

I am amazed at appeals which come to me requesting support for foreign peoples who are comparatively in better economic condition than the Navajo people. I am in favor of diverting some of the requested aid to underprivileged American people, the Navajos.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF GLENNA J. HOWREY

Mr. WILEY submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 254) for the relief of the legal guardian of Glenna J. Howrey, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert "$1,000"; and the House agree to the same.

E. H. MOORE,
JOHN S. COOPER,
J. HOWARD MCGRATH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOHN JENNINGS, JR.,
ALBERT L. REEVES, JR.,
FADJO CRAVENS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator explain the report?

Mr. WILEY. It is a report on a bill as to which the Senate allowed $500 and the House allowed $1,500; and the conferees have agreed on $1,000. It is a private bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon——

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the motion and yield to me, for a moment.

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. There is a private immigration bill which the House has passed and has sent to the Senate, and which the Senate Judiciary Committee has reported.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, there are numerous bills in a similar situation.

Mr. WILEY. This measure is an immigration bill which calls for special treatment.

Mr. WHITE. Treatment on the bill is not required tonight; is it?

Mr. WILEY. I think it would be better if the Senate were to dispose of the bill at this time. Therefore I wish to ask unanimous consent for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Is not the pending business the calendar, by unanimous consent?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. It would be necessary to displace that order to get the unanimous consent requested by the Senator. Cannot the Senator take the matter up tomorrow, before we proceed with the calendar?

Mr. WILEY. Of course I could take it up.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator could take it up if he could get the consent of the Senate, and not otherwise.

Mr. HATCH. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. Might not the Senator from Wisconsin finish his statement as to what the bill is about?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine has the floor. Does he yield further to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. WHITE. I decline to yield for that purpose.

Mr. WILEY. Very well.

RECESS

Mr. WHITE. I renew my motion that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 23, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 22 (legislative day of July 16), 1947:

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Charles M. Eldridge, of Rhode Island, to be United States marshal for the district of Rhode Island, vice Neale D. Murphy, resigned.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

To be colonels

Lt. Col. Manly Broadus Gibson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. John Harold Keatinge, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. George Allan Miller, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Stockbridge Carleton Hilton, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. William Russell Philp, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. George Anthony Horkan, Quartermaster Corps (assistant to the Quartermaster General with rank of brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Charles Herman Unger, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Vennard Wilson, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Lewis Anderson Page, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Alexander Oscar Gorder, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Geoffrey Marshall, Chemical Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Edward Maynard Fickett, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. John Francis Roehm, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Milo Victor Buchanan, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Wilbur Reece McReynolds, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).

×Lt. Col. Howell Redd Hanson, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. George Robert Hayman, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Howard Everett Camp, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. James Couzens Van Ingen, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Fred Currie Milner, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Charles Frost Craig, Infantry (temporary colonel).

×Lt. Col. Lloyd Smith Partridge, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Karl Eugene Henion, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Russell J. Potts, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. William Hoover Craig, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Levi Monroe Bricker, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. James Gaulding Watkins, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Christopher Columbus Strawn, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. William Fulton Magill, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Alfred Joseph de Lorimier, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Everett Busch, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. James Taylor, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Frank Joyce Pearson, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Peter J. Lloyd, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Theodore Morton Cornell, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Paul Vincent Kellogg, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Herbert Ludwell Earnest, Cavalry (temporary major general).

Lt. Col. Charles Spurgeon Harris, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Arthur Richard Walk, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Leslie Egner Toole, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Paul Wolcott Rutledge, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Ray Tyson Maddocks, Cavalry (temporary brigadier general).

×Lt. Col. Cecil Leland Rutledge, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. John Orland Lawrence, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. John Johnson Albright, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Alexander Adair, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Harry John Collins, Infantry (temporary major general).

Lt. Col. James Van Valkenburgh Shufelt, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Henry Paul Hallowell, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Hobart Raymond Gay, Cavalry (temporary brigadier general).

×Lt. Col. Thomas Jeffries Betts, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Buhl Moore, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Mordaunt Verne Turner, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Norman E. Waldron, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Adrian Robert Brian, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Burton Loren Lucas, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Morris Clinton Handwerk, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. George Stephen Wear, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Walter Throckmorton Scott, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. John Wilson O'Daniel, Infantry (temporary major general).
×Lt. Col. John Gilbert White, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Stanley Joseph Grogan, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Leonard Roscoe Crews, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Warner Beardsley Gates, Air Corps.
Lt. Col. Thomas Bennett Woodburn, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Charles William Higgins, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Stanley French Griswold, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Edmund Jones Lilly, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel.)
Lt. Col. Charles Edward Dissinger, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Cornelius Edward Ryan, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Thomas Francis Bresnahan, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Samuel White, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Gilman Kimball Crockett, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Wallace Alan Mead, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Evans Read Crowell, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Robinson Earl Duff, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Irvine Callander Scudder, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. James Chester Bates, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Harry Edmund Pendleton, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel.)
×Lt. Col. Paul Samuel Beard, Finance Department (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Edwin Allan Smith, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Floyd C. Harding, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. James Montagu Adamson, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Frank Albert Allen, Jr., Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Bernard Franklin Hurless, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Guy Orth Kurtz, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Louis Joseph Compton, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Arthur Breckinridge Wade, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. John Hurst Rodman, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Thomas Wade Herren, Cavalry (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. William Emanuel Goe, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Alexander Bull MacNabb, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. William Leonard Ritter, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Kendall Jordan Fielder, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col Hugh Donald Adair, Infantry.
Lt. Col. Joseph Robbins Bibb, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Russell Conwell Snyder, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. James Tolmie Watson, Jr., Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Eugene Hill Mitchell, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. John Wesley Russey, Field Artillery.
Lt. Col. James Dennett McIntyre, Ordnance Department (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Bryan Lee Milburn, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Nyal L. Adams, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Virgil Norberto Cordero, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Walter Shea Wood, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. William Henry Quarterman, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Benjamin Brandon Bain, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Stanton Louis Bertschey, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Cheney Litton Bertholf, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Ellsworth Young, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Edward Reese Roberts, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Albert Hugh Dumas, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Robert Porter Bell, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Edwin William Piburn, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Kenneth Stoddard Whittemore, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Jerry Vrchlicky Matejka, Signal Corps (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Frank Huber Partridge, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Derrill deSaussure Trenholm, Field Artillery.
Lt. Col. Michael Edmond Halloran, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Carl Julian Dockler, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Milton Heilfron, Coast Artillery Corps.
×Lt. Col. Olin Coke Newell, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Paul Steele, Infantry (temporary colonel).

NOTE.—Dates of rank are omitted from this nomination. The nominees will be given dates of rank appropriate to the vacancies they will fill. The dates of rank are omitted in order to assure that the officers may be promoted to fill the vacancies on the proper date. If any of these officers should retire or die prior to promotion it would necessitate renominating the remaining officers in order to change their dates of rank to correspond with the vacancies.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Thomas L. Gatch, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons, under the provisions of an act of Congress approved April 16, 1947 (Public Law 36, 80th Cong.), for appointment in the Regular Army in the Army Nurse Corps, in the grade specified, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of War pursuant to provisions of the mentioned act. These officers have been selected to fill existing vacancies in the grades for which they are nominated, and appointment in these grades will not act to exceed the number of positions authorized for such grades.

To be captains

Pauline E. Adams, N724078.
Lois H. Alfred, N703039.
Edith A. Aynes, N702750.
Mescal Baker, N702896.
Carrie E. Barrett, N702856.
Mary C. Bateman, N702880.
Martha L. Benston, N703913.
Irene C. Blochberger, N702966.
Ruby G. Bradley, N702770.
Marie E. Bradsher, N726626.
Eileen W. Brady, N702681.
Margaret N. Brannon, N702777.
Minnie L. Breese, N702914.
Margaret M. Bresnahan, N726000.
Kilie E. Bridger, N702758.
Ruby F. Bryant, N702771.
Nora P. Capps, N702430.
Minnie L. Carr, N702899.
Beatrice E. Chambers, N703354.
Margaret A. Creedon, N703851.
Thelma Crowell, N703092.
Mary K. Cuppy, N702845.
Caroline Davis, N703582.
Kathryn L. Dollason, N702897.
Eileen E. Donnelly, N702935.
Fannie C. Easley, N702634.
Alma O. Eidsaa, N736013.
Sara W. Entrikin, N702918.
Claretta Evans, N703808.
Frances Ewing, N702648.
Dorothy B. Fels, N722154.
Catherine M. Flatley, N702785.
Mary M. Flowers, N730314.
Lillian C. Girarde, N703461.
Laura E. Goodale, N702763.
Alice E. Greenawalt, N702865.
Edith S. Grimes, N702837.
Francis C. Gunn, N702741.
Margaret Harper, N736343.
Kathleen Harris, N702842.
Inez Haynes, N702718.
Bernice M. Hill, N702658.
Priscilla C. Hill, N703746.
Lorena Hoffman, N702895.
Luluah Y. Houseknecht, N730175.
Virginia Hughes, N703345.
Rhoda U. Jahr, N703290.
Naomi J. Jensen, N702632.
Elizabeth N. Johnson, N702768.
Katharine V. Jolliffe, N702532.
Doris A. Kehoe, N702816.
Laura C. Kelley, N702540.
Clara M. Kiely, N703302.
Marguerite M. Klein, N703004.
Anna Koltvet, N703472.
Helen A. Kornfeind, N703377.
S. Margaret Kowaleski, N730182.
Marilyn Kroll, N702931.
Agnes E. Kutac, N702686.
Harriet G. Lee, N703313.
Mary G. Lohr, N702907.
Margaret L. Lomen, N703602.
Agatha M. Martin, N702882.
Isabelle A. C. Mason, N703721.
Dorothy L. Matlock, N703561.
Pauline E. Maxwell, N703392.
Zita L. McCloskey, N703123.
Daisy M. McCommons, N702872.
Inez V. McDonald, N702933.
Hortense E. McKay, N702838.
Kathleen L. McNulty, N702800.
Elizabeth E. Mettie, N728218.
Helen E. Miller, N702862.
Anna E. Miser, N732020.
Eileen K. Murphy, N702949.
Ruth S. Murphy, N704101.
Frances L. Nash, N702827.
Esther V. Newkirk, N703731.
Lucile Newton, N703678.
Dorothy J. Odell, N730008.
Lily M. Ogden, N703208.
Marie L. Pace, N700552.
Ida E. Peschon, N702839.
Jeaninne H. Peterson, N736511.
Isa G. Pifer, N702762.
Helen Porter, N703885.
Mary F. Prucha, N702603.
Erma J. Rabou, N702819.
Clara M. Rachuig, N703247.
Ida S. Rider, N703122.
Rowena G. Roach, N703308.
Alice J. Robbe, N702736.
Miron L. Robbins, N702941.
Miriam C. Schaupp, N726364.
Ruth M. Schwing, N702805.
Vera F. Shaw, N702938.
Edith L. Shutt, N703523.
Ada M. Simpson, N702610.
Helene F. Sorensen, N702675.
Pearl Spearnak, N702873.
Helen A. Stack, N703024.

Mary M. Steppan, N703082.
Katrine F. Stone, N703196.
Mabel G. Stott, N702712.
Ruth M. Straub, N702908.
Anna C. Sweeny, N724481.
Edna Traeger, N702677.
Mildred Turner, N702925.
Cathern M. Ullom, N702590.
Madeline M. Ullom, N703031.
Artie M. Ussery, N703987.
Audrey Van Zandt, N702932.
Alice N. Waddill, N722326.
Mary M. Wagener, N703620.
Edith M. Wimberly, N703069.
Dora E. Witte, N734488.
Kathryn G. Witter, N702716.
Marian York, N 702451.
Dorothy N. Zeller, N702879.
Verena M. Zeller, N702847.

To be first lieutenants

Gertrude F. Allen, N703431.
Katherine V. Allen, N703728.
Virginia E. Anderson, N703621.
Myrtle E. Arndt, N703482.
Elizabeth Artz, N703926.
Lillie Avirett, N703991.
Mary C. Axmann, N703672.
Rosalie Bacior, N703829.
Mary E. Baggett, N703206.
Louise Bainbridge, N703389.
Ann B. Bakalar, N704024.
Katherine Ball, N703396.
Grace I. Bender, N728509.
Maude Benedict, N703115.
Anne A. Benton, N703049.
Bonnie J. Best, N704125.
Margaret N. Bishop, N736179.
Edith I. Blennerhassett, N720321.
Catherine G. Boles, N736192.
Mary R. Bonner, N703557.
Betsy Bradford, N720121.
Aileen E. Brimmer, N704070.
Juanita M. Bronson, N703183.
Frances L. Bryant, N703144.
Muriel Burchfield, N703460.
Lottie B. Burk, N703815.
Barbara P. Burnham, N704105.
Grace I. Burrus, N725062.
Ethel Burton, N722437.
Sara C. Butts, N703163.
Laura P. Byrne, N703444.
Helen E. Cameron, N703635.
Lilah M. Cameron, N703282.
Ruth L. Cameron, N704095.
Violet R. Campbell, N703159.
Peggy G. Carbaugh, N722000.
Eva L. M. Carter, N726533.
Eleanor Cassidy, N704137.
Jane C. Chadwick, N730019.
Rebecca Chamberlin, N703707.
Ruth E. Church, N730312.
Elsie M. Clise, N703619.
Barbara A. Clymer, N703770.
Madeleine D. Cochick, N703758.
Ethel Barbara Colahan, N724648.
Florence B. Combs, N703395.
Florence T. Connell, N703305.
Margaret E. Connor, N724079.
Hazel V. Cooley, N703914.
Catherine V. Coyne, N703221.
Ellen G. Crigler, N724018.
Lillie U. Crow, N703228.
Ruth L. Crowell, N704121.
Margaret P. Culbreth, N703440.
Lois B. Cullimann, N730015.
Elizabeth A. Darden, N702992.
Gertrude G. Davidson, N734348.
Kathleen E. Davis, N736753.
Bernice Y. Deason, N703414.
Grace Delaney, N728160.
Jewell Derryberry, N703012.
Lucretia M. de Schweinitz, N704009.
Grova N. Dickson, N734118.
Louise E. Dittmar, N703617.
Helen L. Doll, N704085.
Rhoda E. Donahoe, N730774.
Mary E. Donovan, N703280.
Kathryn M. Doody, N703477.
Annie M. Dorset, N724049.
Anna J. Dorsey, N728192.
Magdalene Drozd, N703109.
Mamie Dumas, N703309.
Claire P. Egan, N720151.
Naidene D. Evans, N703417.
Bessie Facuna, N703291.
Eleanor H. Faulk, N726369.
Ruth A. Fisher, N703420.
Hallie E. Fondren, N734156.
Marie E. Frese, N734259.
Marie C. Gaddis, N704039.
Florine T. Gallagher, N703243.
Mabel Galvin, N703875.
Helen L. Gardner, N703215.
Helen M. Garrison, N703355.
Julia F. Gawarecki, N722258.
Pauline H. Girard, N703489.
Rena M. Godwin, N703886.
Edith A. Graham, N703667.
Barbara A. Grass, N703732.
Pauline W. Grier, N703536.
Hortense S. Groh, N703107.
Revella Guest, N703126.
Estella M. Guilliams, N703566.
Martha C. Habib, N703276.
Louise M. Hackfort, N703137.
Geraldine C. Haglund, N726463.
Ruby M. Hammond, N704126.
Inez Harris, N702071.
Helen M. Heinrich, N703216.
Nellie L. Henley, N704097.
Helen M. Hennessey, N703674.
Elma E. Hennies, N732669.
Leona M. Henry, N703507.
Jane E. Herrin, N703718.
Irene S. Hertsgaard, N703920.
Sue I. Hester, N726232.
Estalene L. Holloway, N703973.
Sarah B. Holmes, N728056.
Eugenia L. Holzknecht, N728067.
Hallie E. Hoover, N734199.
Frances L. Hubbard, N704083.
Maude A. Hudson, N703467.
Fay J. Hutton, N703517.
Ann T. Hyland, N704023.
Rose A. Iannotta, N703999.
Alberta T. Ingram, N703607.
Velma V. Jablunovsky, N704027.
Cecilia P. Jamula, N704093.
Bertha K. Janas, N704089.
Kazmiera A. Jeffer, N703210.
Leda E. Jelinek, N736274.
Bernice C. Johnsen, N736364.
Dorothy M. Johnson, N736820.
Mary E. Jones, N703922.
Florence E. Judd, N730212.
Katherine R. Jump, N724462.
Evelyn A. Kackman, N703888.
Theresa E. Kaufmann, N734427.
Alice E. Keisker, N722312.
Bertha I. Kellogg, N703865.
Evelyn A. Kelly, N703202.
Leila Kemp, N703831.
Josephine C. Kennedy, N720155.
Violet L. Keniston, N720224.
Blanche M. Kiernan, N703174.
Mary C. Kin, N730024.
Helen W. King, N703356.
Mary L. King, N703269.
Olive P. King, N722217.
Ruby L. Kinnaird, N732604.
Lois F. Kinnison, N703725.
Kathryn M. Kirkhoff, N724124.
Elizabeth A. Korn, N732117.
Dorothy E. Kraftschenk, N730460.
Sylvia May Kronemeyer, N730334.
Kathryn J. Kulig, N728134.
Marjorie W. Kydd, N703609.
Phyllis M. La Conte, N720507.
Marion L. Lamoreau, N703686.
Viola H. Laurie, N703869.
Mildred M. La Velle, N728072.
Frances I. Lay, N703161.
Beata M. Lieske, N703469.
Edna J. Linn, N703241.
Wealthy F. Litton, N703928.
Marie L. Lockhart, N704045.
Loretta L. Lokuta, N722137.
Esther M. Long, N734404.
Ruby E. McCain, N734492.
Iola R. McClellan, N703592.
Shirley M. McCorquodale, N703269.
Margaret M. McCray, N703903.
Dorothy R. McDermott, N703193.
Martha A. McFadden, N732133.
Sadie L. McGibboney, N703263.
Barbara R. McGill, N703948.
Mary A. McGill, N703785.
Marguerite M. McGrath, N730356.
Margaret J. McNulty, N720629.
Doris Maness, N703724.
Julia M. Martin, N703297.
Lorraine H. Martin, N703741.
Mary L. Martin, N736288.
Marian E. Martini, N736315.
Louise M. Mateer, N722585.
Helen G. Meikle, N703357.
Edith M. Mercer, N728467.
Elizabeth T. Merscher, N703372.
Dorothy L. Meyer, N703346.
Irene E. Micklick, N703603.
Annie M. Mills, N704111.
Marjorie Mirkin, N720501.
Jane E. Mobley, N703736.
Gladys Moore, N726197.
Lillian E. Moore, N703918.
Elsie Morgan, N704100.
Mary S. Morris, N703459.
Goldie Morrison, N703856.
Helen E. Morrison, N722138.
Doris V. Murchison, N704038.
Martha E. Nash, N703627.
Dorothy M. Newcomb, N703154.
Pearl G. Nicolls, N703081.
Evelyn M. Oberkirch, N722593.
Maureen P. O'Dwyer, N728114.
Lucille J. Orcutt, N703840.
Cora C. Overberger, N730339.
Philomena A. Pagano, N703390.
Jamie F. Palm, N722122.
Eunice P Panzeri, N703963.
Mildred G. Parish, N732236.
Edna M. Parker, N726118.
Jean L. Parks, N736352.
Josephine C. Parrish, N703399.
Evelyn M. Patterson, N722105.
Macie E. Paul, N726061.
Phoebe M. Paul, N703409.
Florence M. Pecora, N704018.
Barbara H. Pensinger, N703817.
Sally M. Perkins, N703775.
Rosemary L. Perry, N704145.
Elizabeth A. Pesut, N703098.
Pauline F. Peterson, N732351.
Beatrice L. Pilgrim, N703932.
Flora V. Pittman, N703485.
Sarah M. Pollock, N703233.
Vivian R. Pool, N734250.
Katherine M. Powell, N736350.
Ethelyn M. Preecs, N703700.
Gladys E. Prestwood, N726184.
Margaret M. Price, N703325.
Cunegundes J. Przybilla, N703989.
Doris M. Quinn, N703825.
Jean C. Rancoilta, N704012.
Berneice B A. Rappath, N732496.
Katherine C. Reed, N703734.
Mary F. Render, N703883.
Mary J. Reppak, N703227.
Marguerite C. Reutenauer, N703893.
Helen V. Richardson, N703710.
Edith V. Richman, N703541.
Martha Rifkin, N722674.
A. Inez Robinette, N726338.
Roberta M. Robinson, N703862.
Luella Rodenburg. N703651.
Agnes C. Roesle, N724000.
Theda W. Rogers, N703947.
Geraldine Rollins, N726337.
Josephine B Rosicky, N704077.
Edna E. Ross, N703671.
Ramona M. Saar, N703957.
Wilma K. Sandberg, N703841.
Helen F. Sanderson, N704056.
Anna K. Schelper, N734048.
Elizabeth V. Schnebly, N703697.
Foy M. Scott, N703688.
Frances E. Scott, N734137.
Bernice M. Sebelien, N732628.
Marjorie Seekins, N720094.

Gertrude C. Seibert, N703568.
Azile Self, N703995.
Virginia M. Sessoms, N703162.
Elizabeth E. Shepherd, N703358.
Mary R. Sheppard, N726157.
Helen M. Shivers, N703792.
Gwendolyn M. Sickles, N734021.
Regina M. Sieleni, N703675.
Bernice C. Simmet, N730161.
Itaska Simmons, N734183.
Sophia C. Skiba, N724517.
Emma R. Smart, N703165.
Mildred E. Smith, N703465.
Agnes C. Sokol, N728353.
Grace H. Stakeman, N728577.
Joan M. Steen, N724900.
Mary F. Steuart, N703961.
LaVerne U. Stievenart, N703451.
Harriet A. Stover, N724314.
Kathryne C. Stuwe, N703419.
Marie E. Sutliff, N703649.
Alice O. Swenson, N703933.
Stella M. Sylak, N703535.
Ruth P. Taylor, N703178.
Madge M. Teague, N742092.
Mollie A. Tewell, N703496.
Jean D. Tewksbury, N730138.
Ida M. Thompson, N730000.
Joyce A. Thornton, N703895.
Elizabeth J. Thurness, N728169.
Evelyn F. Tinkle, N703542.
Margaret E. Tollefson, N703274.
Mary P. Toudouze, N724494.
Estelle M. Travers, N703213.
Ruth E. Tregea, N703203.
Marjory E. Truax, N722056.
Anne A. Tyler, N704019.
Eula M. Umbarger, N703866.
Mary T. Votava, N703436.
Joella Wallace, N703404.
Mary A. Ward, N703870.
Lelia H. Watson, N726335.
Ruth V. Watson, N720055.
Kathleen Waugh, N703108.
Betty J. Weddell, N703248.
Irene Wertenberger, N734489.
Ada V. Wester, N704146.
Gertrude E. Wuerdinger, N703590.
Mary H. White, N703427.
Geraldine Whitehurst, N703781.
Dorothy E. Whitsell, N703848.
Virginia M. Wickensheimer, N703511.
Kathryn H. Williams, N703366.
Margaret L. Willis, N703777.
Lucille A. Wilson, N722025.
Doris M. Yeasted, N703257.
Eunice F. Young, N703199.
Mary M. Younger, N703923.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JULY 22, 1947

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunston-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou gracious Benefactor, who hast placed at our disposal all the blessings which are needed for each succeeding day, we pray that our minds and hearts may be encouraged by these assurances of Thy divine providence.

May those blessings become contributions in our hands with which we shall seek to meet more effectively the deep and desperate needs of mankind. May we have the mind and mood of the Master and daily authenticate the reality of His spirit within our souls by a life of service and sacrifice.

We pray that we may be coworkers with one another in lifting the nations of the earth into the loftier altitudes of amity and peace. May the civilization we are striving to build be one in which friendship prevails.

To Thy name we ascribe all the glory. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3601) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54 to the above-entitled bill; disagrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42; further inserts upon its amendments Nos. 1, 17, 18, 19, 42, 43, 50, and 59, and asks a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BROOKS, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. REED, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. TYDINGS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agency:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Justice.
3. Department of War.
4. War Assets Administration.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 981) entitled "An act to amend section 2 of the act of January 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 21), relating to the refund of taxes illegally paid by Indian citizens."

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday when the so-called Rockwell bill, H. R. 2873, was called on the Consent Calendar, its consideration was deferred upon request of the gentlemen from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH and Mr. PHILLIPS].

This bill in its original form was a barrier to further financing of the Central Valley project and other projects by the Federal Government. Due to the persistent efforts of a militant minority of the Committee on Public Lands, it is now the people's bill whereby the Central Valley and other projects can be financed; it will make possible annually the saving of 36,000,000 barrels of our fast-dwindling oil reserves, more than 10,000,000 barrels of which are now being used each year to develop electricity in the hydroelectric-power-producing State of California alone.

H. R. 2873 in its present form was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Public Lands and has the approval of the Department of the Interior.

TAXATION OF MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS AND PHOTOGRAPHIC APPARATUS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4259) to amend sections 3404 (d), 3406 (a) (4), and 3443 (a) (3) (A) (i) of the Internal Revenue Code.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment to the bill which I discussed with the gentleman from New York. I understand he is ready to accept it.

Mr. REED of New York. I accept it.

Mr. FORAND. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, we would like to know what this bill provides and what this amendment provides. It at least ought to be explained before we give unanimous consent to dispose of it.

Mr. REED of New York. The purpose of the bill is this: In 1942 Congress put a 25-percent tax on commercial photographic apparatus. It is the same as putting a tax on the saw or the chisel or the hammer that a carpenter uses with which he earns his daily bread. It is the highest war excise tax ever put on anything during the war. The result is that this tax has injured the commercial photographers and also the manufacturers of this apparatus. That is one approach to it.

The other purpose is to remove the war excise tax on musical instruments that are bought by religious or educational institutions. For instance, a small church may wish to buy an organ. The tax on a pipe organ under the present tax may be as high as $750. That is too much. Then, some of your schools have bands, and they buy these instruments for the children in these schools, and the idea is to take off the excise tax where the students buy them through the schools. These are the two propositions which are involved in the bill H. R. 4259 prior to the amendment now offered.

Mr. RANKIN. What does the amendment provide for?

Mr. FORAND. This amendment deals with the jewelry tax. It eliminates the tax on the first $25 on so-called jewelry which includes compacts, fountain pens, and other jewelry items enumerated in section 2400 of the Internal Revenue Code. You have two different types of compacts, for instance. Both are gold wash. One is tax exempt, and the other, because it has a small ornament on it,

is subject to excise tax. The same thing applies to hollow ware, fountain pens, pencils, things that the average person uses every day in the week. They have been classified as jewelry and subject to this tax because of the necessity of raising funds during the war.

Mr. RANKIN. Was this bill considered by the full Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. FORAND. It was.

Mr. REED of New York. This is a unanimous report.

Mr. RANKIN. And there is no opposition to it?

Mr. FORAND. Not so far as I know.

Mr. RANKIN. And the purpose of the gentleman's amendment now is to add another classification?

Mr. FORAND. Yes. My amendment takes in jewelry, because modern jewelry today is something that every woman needs to add to her dress. It is a shame that they have to pay a 20-percent tax on those items.

Mr. RANKIN. Has that amendment been submitted to the other members of the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. FORAND. Practically every one of them; everyone we have been able to reach, and everybody has agreed. The Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader have also been consulted.

Mr. RANKIN. I will be frank with the gentleman; the man paying the highest tax in America today is the American farmer. It seems that he is the forgotten man these days. I do not care to fly in the face of the Committee on Ways and Means, but it seems to me that we ought to take up a general tax bill instead of doing it piecemeal.

Mr. FORAND. This tax bill will do a favor to the people of low income and will be helpful to all the workers in the jewelry trade.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. In this bill, do you take off all taxes on jewelry?

Mr. FORAND. On the first $25 of expensive jewelry. It takes the tax off all the so-called low-cost or costume jewelry, imitations, and so forth, that are classified now as jewelry.

Mr. RICH. They pay the tax, then, on anything over $25?

Mr. FORAND. They definitely do. When it gets over $25, it is considered a luxury. Below $25 it is considered a necessity.

Mr. RICH. Will there be no tax on photographic supplies?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes; absolutely. This is only on commercial cameras; that is all.

Mr. RICH. Does it take in any price camera? If a man wants to pay $75, is there any tax on that camera? Will that eliminate all the tax on cameras?

Mr. REED of New York. No; certainly not; only those weighing over 4 pounds, and that does not include the lens.

Mr. RICH. Who would carry a 4-pound camera?

Mr. REED of New York. These are commercial cameras. They are the stock in trade of the commercial photographers. Taxing them would be just the same as if you taxed the saw of a carpenter.

Mr. RICH. Have you discussed this with the President? He has been vetoing these tax bills. What do you think he will do with this? Do you think you have an opportunity to get this tax bill through?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3404 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to manufacturers' excise taxes on musical instruments) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) Musical instruments, but the tax imposed by this section shall not apply to musical instruments sold for the use of any religious or nonprofit educational institution for exclusively religious or educational purposes. The right to exemption under this subsection shall be evidenced in such manner as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may prescribe by regulations."

SEC. 2. Section 3443 (a) (3) (A) (i) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to credits and refunds) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(i) Resold for the exclusive use of any State, Territory of the United States, or any political subdivision of the foregoing, or of the District of Columbia, or, in the case of musical instruments embraced in section 3404 (d), resold for the use of any religious institution for exclusively religious purposes."

SEC. 3. Section 3406 (a) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

"(4) Photographic apparatus: Cameras (except X-ray cameras and cameras weighing more than 4 pounds, exclusive of lens and accessories), and un-exposed amateur photographic roll films for still cameras and motion-picture cameras, 10 percent. For the purpose of this paragraph roll film less than 150 feet in length (or less than 25 feet if 30 millimeters or more wide) shall be considered amateur film and any person who purchases unexposed photographic roll film more than 150 feet in length (or more than 25 feet in length if 30 millimeters or more wide) and resells such unexposed film in shorter lengths shall be considered the manufacturer of film so resold."

SEC. 4. The amendments made by sections 1 and 2 of this act shall be applicable with respect to sales made after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 5. The amendment made by section 3 of this act shall become effective on the first day of the first month which begins more than 10 days after the date of the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 12, strike out "institution for exclusively religious purposes" and insert "or nonprofit educational institution for exclusively religious or educational purposes."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FORAND: After line 6 on page 3, insert the following new section to be numbered section 4, and renumber existing sections 4 and 5, sections 5 and 6 respectively; the new section 4 to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. (a) Section 2400 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by adding the following sentence at the end thereof: 'The tax imposed by this section shall not apply to the first $25 of the price for which any article described herein is sold.'

"(b) The amendment made by this section shall be effective upon the first day of the month following enactment of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELSAESSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Henry C. Link entitled "How To Sell America to the Americans." I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $159.75, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, who is Mr. Link?

Mr. ELSAESSER. Mr. Link is president of the Psychological Corp. It is a very good statement.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, if that article will sell America to the Members of Congress so that we will take care of America instead of all the world, I think it is well worth the money.

Mr. RANKIN. In what was that article published?

Mr. ELSAESSER. The United States Investor.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Fred Brenckman relating to communism.

PANAMA CANAL

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, under an act of the Seventy-ninth Congress the Governor of the Panama Canal was directed to make a comprehensive review and study of Panama Canal expansion needs. Under the act he is required to report to the Congress through the Secretary of War and the President not later than December 31, 1947. The guesses are that the improvements will run all the way from $200,000,000 to $2,700,000,000. In contemplation of the Governor's report, the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, of which subcommittee I have the honor to be chairman, proceeded to the Canal in April of this year. As a result of that visit, the committee has filed its report with the House. It is Report No. 781. Anyone who is

interested in the history and background of the Canal and its contemplated improvements, running all the way from the present lock-level canal to a sea-level canal, will find it of tremendous interest.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the record.

INDONESIA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States and the people of the world must be appalled at the display of force now being employed in Java against the colonial peoples there and which is called police action.

The United Nations Charter in chapter XI deals with the relationships between the colonial powers and their non-self-governing peoples. It certainly seems that the Netherlands should have explored fully the possibilities of using the United Nations machinery to correct the situation in which it found itself, before resorting to military action. The least that could be done now is that the Dutch Nation should explain to the people of the United States and to the people of the world exactly why the use of force was required. The understanding of the peoples of the world should be clear, that the Netherlands, itself a small nation just relieved from the distress of occupation, is not willingly bypassing its first real opportunity to proceed under the United Nations Charter with respect to a non-self-governing territory.

ARCHBISHOP ALOYSIUS STEPINAC, OF YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that it should be necessary for me to recite to the Members of the House all of the particulars of the persecution and sham trial of Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac, of Yugoslavia.

The freedom-loving people of the world who respect all religions have been profoundly shocked at the harsh, unjust, and inhuman treatment that has been given to this great and humane priest. Long study by disinterested non-Catholic investigators and students of the actions of Archbishop Stepinac, as well as the persecution which was called a trial, has brought to light one of the most vicious conspiracies against Christianity that this world has ever seen. The entire record as compiled by these disinterested observers shows that the archbishop's life and motives, both during the war and in the troublesome period thereafter, were inspired and motivated by deep Christian principles, mainly, "Love thy neighbor as thyself."

In those hard, trying, and desperate days he was the sole source of refuge for the people of all faiths and political beliefs in his country. He gave shelter to all who were oppressed, regardless of their religious or political beliefs. He was the solitary island of sanity and peace in a wildly confused nation. He was guilty of no sin other than his recognition of the dignity of man and the necessity of preserving mankind's body and soul.

My colleague the gentleman from New York, Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY, has introduced a resolution into this House asking that the Congress and the President of the United States, through diplomatic channels, formally and vigorously protest to the Government of Yugoslavia the unjust incarceration of this saintly man and 16 of his brother priests.

Our Nation has just completed a great and cruel war. One of the alleged "four freedoms" for which we fought was freedom of religion. The nation Yugoslavia would not exist except for the free flow of American blood and American dollars during that conflict. Are we to learn now that that war was in vain and that the godless, atheistic hordes have prevailed over the forces of the Lord? Is recognized civilization to be sacrificed by Tito and his mob who consider man soulless and who feel that his body exists merely for their nefarious uses? Are these perverters of decency to be permitted to destroy the forces of good without challenge by governments which call themselves Christian?

This Congress is in its closing hours and I address myself particularly to the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House and also to the members of the committee.

Gentlemen of the committee, there is ample time to act in the next few days. The people of all faiths residing in this country are looking to you for positive and immediate action in this case. In is your duty to report this bill out to the House so that we may have an affirmative vote showing the Nation's displeasure to the Yugoslavian Government. If you fail to act, I then ask all of the Members of the House, regardless of political party and regardless of faith to sign discharge petition No. 5 so that we may discharge the Foreign Affairs Committee from consideration of the Rooney resolution and take immediate action ourselves.

Gentlemen of the House, the petition lies on the Speaker's desk. It is my sincere hope that each and every one of you will see fit to affix your signature so that the world may know that this Nation honestly and sincerely believes in real liberty, the liberty that recognizes every man's right to worship his God according to his own conscience.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 15 minutes on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AMERICA, HOLLAND, AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it comes with poor grace for the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] to be attacking the Dutch Empire with reference to one of its colonial possessions after the fiasco that he went through here yesterday in sticking the nose of Congress into the affairs of the various sovereign States of this Union.

Another thing, it is not up to the Congress of the United States, and it is not up to the United Nations to be meddling in the internal affairs of every country in the world. That is exactly what we do not want.

I know there are some people who are clamoring to make the United States subordinate to the United Nations, to make us a subsidiary, if you please. They are preaching all over the country—they want to destroy the United States and set up this super-government, this Tower of Babel, with its confusion of tongues, to control our internal affairs.

No, as long as the Dutch Empire owns Indonesia, it is none of our business what transpires there, and as long as the United States flag flies over this country it is our business as to what happens here. And as long as we maintain the several States of the Union it is the business of the several States as to what happens, so far as their internal affairs are concerned and so far as State sovereignty is concerned.

So I submit that it comes with poor grace indeed from the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] after supporting that monstrosity on yesterday to arise here and attempt to speak for the United States in attacking Holland, a friendly country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, 1948

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DIRKSEN, PLUMLEY, H. CARL ANDERSEN, HORAN, PHILLIPS of California, CANNON, SHEPPARD, and WHITTEN.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARTLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the United States News by David Lawrence.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FOLGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some extraneous matter.

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

INCOME-TAX LIABILITY OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES DYING IN THE SERVICE

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by the Committee on Ways and Means to ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 479) relating to the income-tax liability of members of the armed forces dying in the service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]?

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I am heartily in favor of this bill, but I think the gentleman from Ohio should make some explanation of it. It is doing simple justice to some veterans' families.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this bill seeks to do two things. Both of these propositions have been unanimously approved by the unanimous vote of the Ways and Means Committee. Likewise, they have been approved by the Treasury.

In the first place, this bill seeks to correct an oversight which has been brought out as the law has been administered.

Under the present law, all the income taxes of a man in the armed services are remitted if he should die in the service and any taxes that he paid during the time he was in the service after Pearl Harbor are refunded to his estate. The present law does not provide for a rebate of any taxes that his estate or his family may have paid for him. This bill which I am asking to be passed provides that the taxes shall be refunded to anyone who might have paid them for the deceased serviceman. This is only doing the fair and equitable thing.

The second provision is that a time limit is fixed as to this plan of refunding taxes. Under the present law this practice of refunding these taxes shall continue until the President declares the war to be terminated. Instead of waiting for the President to take this action, this bill fixes the date as January 1, 1948. In other words, if any serviceman dies in the service after January 1, 1948, his estate will be compelled to pay all accrued taxes. The Treasury favors this provision of the bill because under the present law there are some servicemen who do not pay their taxes for they take the chance of having their estate relieved of making this payment in case they die in the service.

I think that under the circumstances this is a bill which should be passed immediately.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 421 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to abatement of tax for members of armed forces upon death) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 421. Abatement of Tax for Members of Armed Forces Upon Death

"In the case of any individual who dies on or after December 7, 1941, while in active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States or of any of the other United Nations and prior to the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President—

"(a) the tax imposed by this chapter shall not apply with respect to the taxable year in which falls the date of his death, or with respect to any prior taxable year (ending on or after December 7, 1941) during any part of which he was a member of such forces; and

"(b) the tax under this chapter and under the corresponding title of each prior revenue law for taxable years preceding those specified in clause (a) which is unpaid at the date of his death (including interest, additions to the tax, and additional amounts) shall not be assessed, and if assessed the assessment shall be abated, and if collected shall be credited or refunded as an overpayment."

SEC. 2. If at any time prior to January 1, 1947, the allowance of a credit or refund of an overpayment of the tax for any taxable year specified in section 421 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (as amended by this act) is prevented by the operation of any law or rule of law (other than sec. 3801), a credit or refund of the overpayment of such tax to the extent that the overpayment is attributable to the change in law made by this act may, nevertheless, be allowed or made if a claim therefor is filed before January 1, 1947.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 2, strike out "the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President" and insert "January 1, 1948—"

Page 2, line 18, strike out "1947" and insert "1948."

Page 3, line 3, strike out "1947" and insert "1949."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 108.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby created a joint committee to be composed of eight members, as follows: Four Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate; and four Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The committee shall serve without compensation and shall select a chairman from among their number.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the committee to prepare an appropriate plan for the participation in the observance and celebration in Cuba during the summer of 1948 of the fiftieth anniversary of the victories of the military and naval forces of the United States and of their Cuban allies in the war with Spain, resulting in the liberation of Cuba. In the preparation of such plan the committee is authorized to cooperate with official representatives of Cuba.

(b) The committee shall, not later than February 2, 1948, submit a report to the Congress setting forth the plan prepared pursuant to subsection (a) of this section and containing such recommendations for carrying out such plan as it deems advisable. The committee shall cease to exist within 30 days after the date of the submission of such report.

SEC. 3. The committee is authorized, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and prescribe the duties, and fix the compensation, of such employees as are necessary for the execution of its function. The committee may make such expenditures as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this concurrent resolution, including expenditures for necessary traveling expenses and subsistence expenses of the members of the committee and of employees of the committee.

SEC. 4. The necessary expenses of the joint committee herein authorized not exceeding $25,000 shall be paid one-half out of the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives on vouchers authorized by the joint committee and signed by the chairman thereof.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman make a brief explanation of the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the appointment of a committee of four Members of the House and four Members of the Senate to report back on February 2 of next year to the Congress, recommendations in relation to the participation of our Government in the fiftieth anniversary of the Spanish-American War. The celebration in connection therewith will take place in Cuba. In other words, the Cuban Government is going to have a celebration and naturally our Government should participate. This committee, with an appropriation of $25,000, one-half to be borne by the House and one-half by the Senate, to be appointed if this resolution is agreed to, is to recommend back to us the manner and extent to which our Government shall participate in the celebration.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR CLAIMING CREDIT OR REFUND WITH RESPECT TO WAR LOSSES

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4257) to provide for an extension of time for

claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That if a claim for credit or refund under the internal-revenue laws relates to an overpayment on account of the deductibility by the taxpayer of a loss in respect of property considered destroyed or seized under section 127 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to war losses, for a taxable year beginning in 1941 or 1942, the 3-year period of limitation prescribed in section 322 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code shall in no event expire prior to December 31, 1948. In the case of such a claim filed on or before December 31, 1948, the amount of the credit or refund may exceed the portion of the tax paid within the period provided in section 322 (b) (2) or (3) of the Internal Revenue Code, whichever is applicable, to the extent of the amount of the overpayment attributable to the deductibility of the loss described in this section.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 22, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I beg leave to inform you that on July 16, 1947, I transmitted to the Governor of Texas my resignation effective at midnight, July 31, 1947, as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Sixteenth District of Texas.

With great respect,
Your obedient servant,
ROBERT EWING THOMASON.

THE HONORABLE R. EWING THOMASON

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 15 minutes and during that time that I may yield to other Members.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I assure you that this will be in no wise a memorial exercise for the next 15 minutes. I want to speak for a moment, and I know some others do, of how happy we are that we have been associated with and have known so intimately a man of the high character and the great ability of ROBERT EWING THOMASON.

It has been to me a source of constant inspiration to have had his association and to have enjoyed his loyalty, and I know his love. It has been reciprocated, because he is the type and character of man who not only gives loyalty but elicits it from other people.

His service in this House has been outstanding. He goes from us to a work and to a neighborhood that is more congenial to him, and his good wife, and we, everyone I know, wish him well, and that he will continue in the same vigor of health, the same happy mood that has attached us so well to him for so long.

I have known few men as good as he and none better. I have known many patriotic and outstanding Members of the House of Representatives, but I have never known one more patriotic, more outstanding in service, and love, and loyalty to his country than EWING THOMASON.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all those who are not fortunate enough to say something within the limited time at our disposal may have the privilege of extending their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] is recognized.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, on occasions when other Members have left these Halls, I have been impressed too many times that such occasions have been too serious and solemn. I never regard them as such, and the little I am going to say may be in a light vein because I think of EWING THOMASON in a happy way. I think he is rather fortunate. EWING THOMASON and I came here to Congress at the same time, in the days of turmoil to those of us who were here at that time in 1932. I suppose it seems to every Congressman that he comes here in a time of turmoil, but we did come here at such a time and our service of 17 years here has been in a time of turmoil and throughout the last war.

EWING THOMASON and I served on the Military Affairs Committee together for 14 years. We now serve together on the Armed Services Committee. I can recall in the early days of the Military Affairs Committee when a bill was drafted by three of us. It became known as the Thomason bill. We respected EWING THOMASON as a member of the committee and in drafting that bill it became, as I said, the Thomason bill. It so happens that two of those draftees are now judges, the other being Hon. J. Joseph Smith, Federal judge of Connecticut.

I am glad that EWING THOMASON is leaving the House in good health, in good spirit, and with the friendship of a very large part of the membership on a personal basis. It has been a genial friendship and he is a good friend.

Moreover, during the long period of the war, no Member of this House or the Military Committee made a more direct contribution in ability, fidelity, and patriotism to the successful prosecution of the war. For those qualities and that contribution EWING THOMASON is known and will be remembered by those charged with the conduct of the war.

I am going to conclude my remarks by saying:

Here is to EWING THOMASON, here is to his good wife Abby. Here is to the State of Texas from which he came, and here is to the State of Texas that takes him back in a fine capacity.

Good luck and God bless you.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, our friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], after 17 years of service in the House of Representatives, leaves for Texas tomorrow night where he will assume another duty and responsibility among the people he loves and among the people who love him and who have honored him through the years.

Mr. THOMASON has had a long and distinguished career in the public service. His longest and most distinguished service has been here in the House of Representatives, where his leadership has been outstanding and his accomplishments of a very high order. Before his election to Congress he had already served the people of Texas in many capacities. He was prosecuting attorney of his home county, mayor of his city of El Paso, and speaker of the Texas Legislature, a position of no small honor.

It has been given to few men to serve mankind so well and so successfully. There is a reason for this—that reason can be found in his wholesomeness of character and personality, in the depth of his moral and intellectual integrity, in his innate sense of fairness, in his tremendous capacity for understanding his fellowman. All who know him recognize the fact that there is something about him which is indefinably fine—something which makes people love and respect him. These qualities have added greatly to his influence and stature among his fellows, and they will serve him well as he goes from these legislative halls to further honor and distinction in the judgeship of the United States district court for the western district of Texas.

I have unbounded admiration for EWING THOMASON. He and I have been intimate friends and confidants for years. I shall miss him very, very much. EWING, we salute you, we congratulate you, we wish you and your charming and delightful wife, Abbie Thomason, every happiness and success in your new field of endeavor. You will leave Washington tomorrow, but your colleagues will cherish happy memories of you as long as we shall live.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, since January 1935, I have been a member of the Military Affairs Committee of the House and more recently a member of the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, during which time it has been my pleasure to continuously serve on this committee with my colleague, the Honorable EWING THOMASON, of Texas. During these many years we have become good friends and it is with regret that we see him leave the House of Representatives where since 1931 he has rendered such valuable service to his district and his country. However, one can easily understand why after 17 years of service an individual might

feel ready to leave this body since these last years have been particularly hard and trying years for any Member. During these years of service on the Military Affairs and Armed Services Committee of the House, EWING THOMASON has worked diligently and hard for the best interests of our national defense.

On matters political, there have been many times when I have disagreed with my good friend, but such disagreement was always based on honest differences of opinion on which every individual is entitled to stand. I have enjoyed working with you, EWING, and now as you step forth into your new job as judge of the Federal District Court for the Western District of Texas, and start out on your new work for which you are so eminently qualified and in which you have such great interest, I know I speak for the many Members on this side that we wish you all good health, prosperity, happy days, and Godspeed.

It was a pleasure to have served with you, Ewing, and I shall always remember you as a true and trusted friend and will personally miss you when you depart from these Halls. Again, my every good wish to your wonderful wife and yourself.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER].

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, if I had my way, of course, EWING THOMASON would remain in Congress. These are troublous times, and we need men of great capacity. EWING THOMASON is a man of ability. He has been devoted to duty. He has brought to bear upon the difficult problems of government a high order of ability, and what is more important than all else, he has given to the service of the American people great character and true integrity. It has been said that earnest devotion to one's highest conception of right is the sublimest expression of life. That is the standard of life which received EWING THOMASON'S devotion. Whether Mr. THOMASON'S efforts were devoted to the promotion of social welfare or to the assistance of the individual he was always in real earnest. I can pay no person a higher compliment than that he is thoroughly genuine and I say wholeheartedly that EWING THOMASON is genuine. He has always been very helpful to those new Members who have asked for his assistance and information in the field with which he was so familiar. Indeed, Mr. THOMASON always delighted to be helpful to his colleagues whether new or long in the service. My own reaction in view of EWING'S many kindnesses is well indicated by the last stanza of the poem by Robert Burns, entitled "Lament for James Earl of Glencairn." This is the stanza:

The bridegroom may forget the bride
Was made his wedded wife yestreen;
The monarch may forget the crown
That on his head an hour has been;
The mother may forget the child
That smiles sae sweetly on her knee;
But I'll remember thee, Glencairn,
And a' that thou hast done for me!

We will not say good-by to EWING THOMASON. We will say farewell. Come back and see us.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have known Mr. THOMASON for 5 years, and I can truthfully say that I have never seen him take a partisan stand on any question concerning our national security. We have dealt with these harassing problems in the Military Affairs Committee and the Armed Services Committee, and everything that I have seen him do in the way of talking or in the way of voting has been statesmanlike.

If I could point out what I consider the one distinguishing feature of his character and his personality, it is sound common sense. He has the capacity of getting along with people whether they differ with him or agree with him because he has an understanding and tolerant mind.

I know that he will be a tremendous success as a judge. He has the capacity of getting at the meat of a problem and has the courage to make the decision that he thinks to be right. I wish him success, which I know he will have, and I hope that I may see him again soon. My service in Congress has been enriched because of his association and friendship.

It has been said by someone that "behind every successful man is a noble woman." It happens that my wife and I have come to know Mrs. Thomason well and we both love and respect her. We shall miss her as much as we miss my colleague. We wish them both great happiness and good health, which they so richly deserve.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN].

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, 1 minute is a very short time to pay tribute to a good friend and a great Congressman. In 1935 when I came to this body EWING THOMASON was here and it was my privilege to become acquainted with him. Our association here during these eventful years has ripened into a strong friendship. I prize that friendship greatly, and I deeply regret seeing him leave this body. We are losing a great Congressman. The Nation is losing a great public servant. But he carries back to his home town the friendship, love, and admiration of every Member of this body. EWING THOMASON has the capacity for making and keeping friends. I think that is due largely to the fact that he is honest, intelligent, and just, and always plays the game in public and private life by the rules. He has always been fair, just, and considerate in all his dealings with his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. So I join his many friends here in wishing him good luck, health, and the fullest measure of success as he goes back to his home to take up the important work of a United States district judge. He possesses every qualification to make a great jurist, and no doubt he will serve in that capacity with as great distinction as he has served in this body. I am happy to pay this tribute to my friend and to our colleague, loved by all.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I came here 17 years ago to the Seventy-second Congress at the same time our distinguished colleague, EWING THOMASON, came. I have watched with admiration his splendid career. We sustain a great loss in his going, but he goes to fill the best and most pleasant position a President of the United States can bestow upon a citizen, to be a United States judge for life in his own land and among his own people. He goes to administer the law, whose "seat is the bosom of God, whose voice is the harmony of the world. All things both in heaven and earth do her homage. The very greatest is not beyond her power and the very least is not beneath her care." It is an attribute of the Diety to administer justice, for the Lord is our judge. There is a new opportunity open to EWING THOMASON for distinguished service to the people and very great distinction to himself. We who know him best know that he will meet every requirement of this great position and that new honors, new distinctions, and new friendships will come to him. In his going I wish him and his fine wife every happiness and success and health and long life.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, among my most treasured possessions is a photograph of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Seventy-third Congress. As EWING THOMASON now retires to accept larger opportunities and assume greater responsibilities, he is the last one on his side to go—of those who were members of that committee with which I proudly served.

The surviving members on the Republican side are the present chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]. I was very jealous of the chance to serve as a member of that committee. It was an educational opportunity to be associated with those men; among whom, outstandingly able, of unquestioned integrity, was the man who leaves us now for another field of service to administer equal justice under law, tempered with mercy.

For the discharge of the duties of the office to which he has been called he is preeminently qualified.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, our good friend, Congressman EWING THOMASON, was reared in my congressional district in Cooke County, Tex. This is the same county which produced former Congressman, now judge, Marvin Jones, and also the late distinguished Senator from Texas, Joseph Weldon Bailey.

Ewing grew to manhood in the small community of Cooke County known as Era. After finishing college, he returned to Gainesville where for 4 years he acted as prosecuting attorney. In 1911, he moved to El Paso which has since been his home, and to which city he returns

to become a Federal judge. Although EWING THOMASON moved from Cooke County a good many years ago, he is still universally loved by the folks of that section as a native son of whom they are exceedingly and justly proud.

EWING THOMASON'S thoughtfulness, concern, and friendship have meant a great deal to me since I came to Congress. He has always been a leader among the Texans in Washington, and many of us have sought and benefited from his counsel and advice. Among EWING THOMASON'S many admirable traits is a scintillating and perpetual sense of humor. We often charge him with needling us, but we all have enjoyed it tremendously. As Ewing often says, "I joke only with my friends." That, of course, includes everybody who knows him.

Mr. Speaker, the great State of Texas never had a better Congressman, and I predict our good friend will add luster to the Federal bench upon which he now goes. All of us are proud of him. We congratulate the President upon his selection of him as a new Federal judge for Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, while this is a time of congratulations for our good friend, Judge EWING THOMASON, it is a moment of personal sadness to me.

I have had the proud pleasure of sitting next to Ewing on the Committee on Military Affairs of the House, and then subsequently on the Committee on Armed Services, over a period of many years. I have known Ewing as a legislator and I have known him as a friend. I have seen him cast his vote and then discussed the vote with him. I can say as one who sat next to him on those two great committees for many years that he has always conducted himself as a great legislator and a truly great patriot and a fine friend. As a member of the Military Affairs Committee of the House, he made such a contribution to the winning of the war as few men in this Congress have made.

I personally regret deeply his going. The Armed Services Committee will feel the loss of his calm counsel and wise judgment. He will make a just and sympathetic judge.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I regret that EWING THOMASON is going to leave us. It happens that I have been rather closely associated with him because when I arrived here, going on 9 years ago, I was assigned to the old Committee on Military Affairs. We went through some very troublesome days back in 1939 and 1940 and 1941. He was the great leveling influence on that committee. He was the one who, when things got to going wrong, could generally bring us back on the right track, and those of you who served on the committee will recall that.

He is leaving us to become a judge of the district court of my own district. I wish for him every happiness and every success. I am sure that he will have it. I hate to see him leave here, but he is going into the judicial branch of the Government, and I am sure that he will enjoy that service.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, no man alive can properly evaluate the great services rendered in the House of Representatives in time of peace and in time of war by EWING THOMASON. History will record his contribution. If Congress is great, and I truly think that it is, it is so because of such individuals as EWING THOMASON, who have tirelessly and unselfishly worked so devotedly for America.

EWING THOMASON wrote a record as a real national legislator. His conscientious approach to all public problems was measured on the need of the country, and his courage in facing each issue on its real merits without fear, marked him as a leader among leaders in the House.

Our great loss in losing . true friend and a good comrade will be the gain of the State of Texas. I wish to congratulate the judicial district of West Texas on their good fortune of having such a man serve as judge.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States, the Honorable Harry S. Truman, is to be congratulated for selecting the Honorable ROBERT EWING THOMASON for United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas.

The Members of the House of Representatives, with whom Congressman THOMASON has served for many years, regret very much that he is leaving us, but, at the same time, we realize that he is entering a field of great and useful service, which we know he will perform in an excellent manner.

Congressman THOMASON has demonstrated his unselfish service to the people by ably serving them as a member of the house of representatives in the State Legislature of Texas, as speaker of the house in the Legislature of Texas, as mayor of the city of El Paso, and as a Member of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress for the last 17 years. He is a man who has demonstrated his ability, sincerity, and honesty of purpose. He is also a man of judicial temperament and possesses the poise, along with real legal ability and knowledge, to make a wonderful United States district judge.

I desire to wish him continued health and happiness in his new place of great honor and distinction.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret I learn of the resignation of our good friend R. EWING THOMASON, of Texas. We shall miss him greatly as a friend and as a fine Member of our body. He has served this country well and faithfully as a Representative. We congratulate his State and the Nation on the fact that he has been elevated to the judiciary. Certainly he will maintain the high standard of the courts and his administration of the office will be honorable and just.

Our association with the gentleman and his wife has been pleasant, as well as the fact he is a good friend of Mary Seely Graves, of El Paso, one of the grandest girls in the world and a good friend of the Thomasons and the Riches. We wish them all Godspeed wherever they go and during all their life.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join with the gentlemen of Texas and my other colleagues in the House in extending my congratulations and good wishes to Congressman EWING THOMASON, recently nominated by President Truman to become Federal judge of the Western District of Texas, and recently confirmed by the Senate.

Judge THOMASON was born in Bedford County near Shelbyville, Tenn., the district which I have the honor to represent in the Congress. Judge THOMASON has deep roots in Tennessee. He has many friends and relatives in my State and a host of friends and admirers who point with pride to his accomplishments and achievements, and who refer to EWING THOMASON with pride and admiration as a native Tennessean. I know that the people of Bedford County, middle Tennessee, and the State of Tennessee join with me in extending congratulations to Judge THOMASON and in wishing him every continued success, all happiness, and good luck.

As a new Member of the House I became acquainted with Judge THOMASON shortly after the convening of this the Eightieth Congress. It has not been my privilege to have known him as long as other Members of this body but I assure you that my friendship and admiration for him are equally as strong. He has been most helpful to me and I have looked to him as a counselor, adviser, and friend. I have admired his stand on public issues and have followed his devotion to the public welfare. I shall miss association with my friend and colleague Judge THOMASON but say again that I join with all of you in wishing him all happiness and success. I know that he will attain eminence as a jurist as he has attained eminence as a legislator and statesman. Tennessee congratulates Texas on its new Federal judge.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, EWING THOMASON is a fortunate man. He has been privileged to bring happiness and contentment to his family, joy and inspiration to his friends, and strength and loyalty to his Government. Good government exists and develops only in relation to the capabilities and devotion to duty and energies of those entrusted as its public officials. Few men are privileged to leave indelibly the imprints of their character, justice, and wisdom on the annals of history. EWING THOMASON is one of those so privileged.

It is fitting we should recognize his contribution to our national life on this occasion of his resignation to accept further duties and responsibilities as a United States district judge. Perhaps his life and public service have created a pattern whereby those of us who follow can measure our conduct that we, too, may contribute to a better way of life. The years that lie ahead of EWING THOMASON as judge will verify the President's choice, and he unquestionably will not be just a good judge, but a magnificent and outstanding one.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I share with all the other Members of the House the sincere regret that Representative EWING THOMASON soon will cease to be a Member of this body. We all shall miss him much.

The friendship and helpful attitude of EWING THOMASON have meant a great deal to me. Frequently I have discussed with him legislation as well as other problems one faces here. His judgment has always been helpful, his encouragement sustaining.

The work of EWING THOMASON as a member of the House Military Affairs Committee benefited our Nation very greatly during a most crucial period. His accurate facts in conjunction with the full confidence every Member of the House had in his statements and representations assured the passage of vital bills reported by his committee many times.

In the time I have been here in Congress it has been my privilege to know well a good many Members of Congress. I regard EWING THOMASON as an ideal man, citizen, and Member of Congress in every respect. He will make an ideal and a very outstanding Federal judge we all know.

Mr. ALMOND. Mr. Speaker, I know of no Member who more thoroughly enjoys and more richly merits the trust, confidence, and esteem of this, the greatest parliamentary body in the world, than the distinguished gentleman from Texas, R. EWING THOMASON. A man is measured here—by his colleagues—by the highest standards of personal and official integrity, of courage, sincerity of purpose, devotion to duty, and unwavering fidelity in the service of his country. That yardstick presents a challenge to the highest attributes of human character.

EWING THOMASON, through 17 years of constructive and patriotic service, has met the challenge and fully measured up to every requirement of lofty idealism and splendid statesmanship.

In running his course as an outstanding Member of this body he has fought the good fight and he has kept the faith.

Seasoned, mature, able, courageous, tolerant, industrious, with a passion for right and justice, he will grace the bench of the Federal judiciary with dignity and adorn it richly through those rare and enviable qualities of mind and spirit which have characterized more than a quarter of a century of conscientious and devoted public service.

Mr. Speaker, I shall ever remember and cherish EWING THOMASON'S fine friendship, and as he ascends to the bench I invoke upon him God's richest blessings for his health, happiness, contentment, and success.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to make the following comments in regard to my very good friend and colleague the Honorable EWING THOMASON, of Texas.

I regret very much to see Ewing leave the House of Representatives, to enter upon his new duties in his home State of Texas. Congressman THOMASON has always been a great inspiration to me. In 1940, while I was serving with the First Cavalry Division at Fort Bliss, El Paso, Tex., he was most kind and gracious. He wrote to several of his friends in the State to make sure that I was given a royal Texas welcome.

To Ewing and those fine people I am deeply grateful for their friendships, which I made and cherish from my stay in El Paso.

I think it was Robert Burns who wrote in his farewell message to his friend Bonnie Prince Charlie, who was leaving for India, a fitting sentiment which is apropos to the warm thoughts and feelings that I hold for Congressman THOMASON. Robert Burns wrote:

Bonnie Charlie's noo awa,
Sailing o'er the bounding main;
Many a heart will break in twa
Should he ne'er come back again.

Will ye no' come back again,
Will ye no' come back again;
Better loved ye canna be,
Will ye no' come back again?

To Ewing, and your fine family: Goodby, good luck, and God bless you.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more beautiful than the warm friendship between Members of the House who work together day in and day out, and nothing sweeter than the love and affection which all of us feel for our colleague, EWING THOMASON, and for Mrs. Thomason, a love and affection shared in full measure by the Representatives from New Mexico, past and present, and by the people of my State.

As indicative of the esteem in which Judge THOMASON is held in New Mexico, may I say that our newspapers, when reporting the vote of the New Mexico Representatives on important measures designed to promote the public welfare, invariably include him and say, "Mrs. LUSK, Mr. FERNANDEZ, and Mr. THOMASON, Democrat, Texas, voted 'aye.'" No three Representatives ever worked in closer harmony. When on rare occasions we disagreed, it was with regret but with a feeling of mutual respect for the respective opinions of each. We who were younger than he in point of service looked to him for advice, which was always freely and cheerfully given us; and now that he is leaving, we tender him our heartfelt and sincere thanks. Though we hate to lose him, though we will miss his affectionate and kindly smile, we congratulate him and his court on his selection by the President to become an honored member of the judiciary.

On behalf of my colleagues and my State, I say to you, Judge THOMASON, and to Mrs. Thomason:

I touch my heart as the Easterns do,
May the peace of Allah abide with you.
Wherever you come, wherever you go,
May the beautiful palms of Allah grow;
Through days of labor, and nights of rest,
May the love of Allah make you blest.
I touch my heart as the Easterns do,
May the peace of Allah abide with you.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join my very good friends in the Texas delegation today in their words of praise for our colleague the Honorable EWING THOMASON, of Texas, on the occasion of his impending retirement from this body to assume his new duties as judge of the Federal court for the Western District of Texas.

I am not given to emotional nor flowery language, but this is one occasion when I can say that to me EWING THOMASON is a beloved friend. I know no other Member for whom I have a greater degree of admiration or whom I hold in higher regard for his genuine honesty, his ability as a legislator, and his great quality as a leader.

The House loses a valued Member and the court gains a man who will do honor to the judicial branch. No appointment to the Federal bench could meet with such unanimous sanction as that which followed the announcement that Mr. THOMASON had been accorded this honor by President Truman.

I am a comparatively new Member, being in my third year, but I have known EWING THOMASON for a much longer period. I met him for the first time more than a dozen years ago when I was serving as a secretary to another good friend of Mr. THOMASON, the former Member from Illinois, the Honorable Edwin M. Schaefer. Mr. Schaefer early discovered the many fine traits in Mr. THOMASON'S character, and later when it became my privilege to enter Congress and be assigned to the Military Affairs Committee I quickly learned why Mr. Schaefer always thought so well of EWING THOMASON. No one who has ever served on any committee with the man could help but recognize his outstanding qualities.

As happy as I am to see this honor come to my friend, I deeply regret his leaving, because I shall miss his wise counsel and the helping hand which he has extended to me on more than one occasion.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago ROBERT EWING THOMASON was a member of the Legislature of Texas. The next session he was elected speaker of the house. I was a freshman in college when I first met him. He has been my friend ever since, just as he was the friend of my father before.

EWING THOMASON was known all over Texas as a broad-visioned, progressive statesman long before he came to Washington. He is now so known all over the Nation.

I knew him as a friend almost 20 years before I came to Congress. In the more than 10 years I have served with him here, that friendship has been strengthened.

He leaves us to become judge of the Federal court in the Western District of Texas. While it is 672 miles from El Paso to Waco, that court holds sessions in my home town. We have a great judge on that bench from Waco. Doubtless Judge THOMASON will hold court in Waco only infrequently, but I want to assure you, Judge, that when you come to the heart of Texas officially, you will be just as welcome as you always are when you come unofficially.

We will all miss you here, but I am happy that your new assignment will bring you back to Texas, and especially to central Texas.

Best wishes, Ewing.

We welcome you, Judge THOMASON.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, our friend, EWING THOMASON, comes from the Mexican border and I come from the extreme north. Our districts are far

apart. He is a regular Democrat and I am a regular Republican. We often differ on political questions; however, there is no carry-over.

In rising at this time, I am not doing a perfunctory thing. I sincerely regret that our very able colleague is forsaking this turbulent forum of debate for the placid and serene courtroom. He has made an exceptionally good record here, and his ability, his temperament, his experience, and his common sense should make him an ideal jurist. Few, if any, men in the House are better known by his associates. His friends are limited by his acquaintances.

The Congress is losing one of its best, and the Federal judiciary is acquiring a new member whose decisions will be fair, just, and always intellectually honest.

Mr. and Mrs. Thomason will be greatly missed in Washington, and we wish them much happiness in the days that are to come.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this occasion pass without paying my personal regard to the life and character of our colleague, EWING THOMASON. When I read in the press of EWING THOMASON'S nomination to be United States district judge, I was, of course, happy that he had been named for this high position; but I must confess that my joy was mixed with sadness over the fact that he was leaving the House of Representatives.

I first had the opportunity of meeting EWING THOMASON when he was a member of the joint special committee investigating the Tennessee Valley Authority. I attended several public hearings of this committee and I was impressed by his thorough knowledge of the problems being considered, of his sense of absolute fairness, and of his courteous consideration of the witnesses who testified before this committee. Since I came to Congress in 1939 I have had many contacts with EWING THOMASON, both personal and in connection with legislative matters. I consider him one of the best-informed and most valuable Members of this great deliberative body. EWING THOMASON is a hard worker, he gets at the real issues in a controversy, he has definite convictions and always has the courage to express and stand by them. The Federal Legislature is losing a most valuable and personable Member.

While we all know that EWING THOMASON will make a great jurist, I personally hope he may be elevated to the highest post in the land; still we will miss his engaging smile and his warm friendship which association with him in Congress has brought to so many of us.

We in Tennessee take a great deal of pride in the fact that EWING THOMASON was born in the Volunteer State. In pointing out the distinguished Members of Congress to our friends and constituents we are always happy to call their attention to EWING THOMASON and to remind them that he is a native Tennessean and that he is proud of this fact.

I wish EWING THOMASON much success as a United States district judge. I know that he and his lovely wife will be happy to be among their thousands of friends at El Paso, Tex. I know, however, they will always appreciate the fact that they have countless friends among the Members of Congress and among the officials in the Government at Washington.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and a privilege to say a good word in tribute to Judge EWING THOMASON. When Members of the House speak of their first year they always mention some older Member who gave them some good advice. This is my first year, and Judge THOMASON has been like a father to me. He has given much good advice which has been most helpful. Judge THOMASON is the kind of man who longer known is better liked. I sincerely regret that he is leaving the House of Represenatives, but since he is going, I wish to say that it has been a pleasure to have been with him this year, and I wish for him and his family the best of luck, and may God bless them.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, my deep regret in EWING THOMASON'S leaving the House is tempered by the knowledge that he is going back to Texas, to live among his hills of home, and to perform another public duty of greatest importance to the people. His assumption of the judicial robes will simply utilize more of his seemingly unlimited talents, and as a judge, interpreting the laws which he has been so instrumental in enacting, he can take to the bench a deep conception of the legislative intent and thereby render a finer and more understanding quality of justice.

I am proud that I have been privileged to serve as one of his colleagues in this House. A poet has written that we are a part of all we have seen. I surely hope this is true, for I would certainly desire to have gained through this association with EWING THOMASON just a mite of his wit, his wisdom, and his understanding heart. I know that his friendship has brought me much pleasure and inspiration. His absence will be noted by all of us, I am sure, with much sadness, and we will envy those who in the future will enjoy his company and comradeship.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the House will lose one of the ablest men it has had in many, many years when EWING THOMASON becomes United States district judge. As a Member of the House he had rendered an outstanding service to his district, his State, and the Nation. During the dark days of World War II—from 1939 through 1945—he carried a load for the War Department that few men in our national history have had placed upon their shoulders. Throughout those hectic, fearful days when we were trying to prepare for war, and when we were in it, without much to fight with, he showed vision, imagination, and courage that was an inspiration to all of us. He always added balance, good judgment, and foresight to every action of his great committee, the Committee on Military Affairs.

In his new job as United States district judge, his achievements will be equally brilliant, and will reflect credit to himself and to the United States judiciary. That same good common horse sense, balance, and vision will motivate every decision he renders. He is well adapted for this judgeship, not only because of his fine analytical mind, legal training, and experience, but also because of those human qualities that have endeared him to his people and to his colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I lose the close, stimulating association with a personal friend which I have enjoyed for more than 10 years. However, my loss will be the gain for the splendid west Texas people whom he will serve in a judicial capacity. Good luck to Judge THOMASON and his family in this new undertaking.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, I join with the host of friends and colleagues of the Honorable EWING THOMASON in wishing him much happiness in his new field of service. He has made a great contribution as a Member of Congress to good government and the enactment of sound laws. It has been a delightful pleasure to know him and to serve with him.

But as a lawyer I am thinking most, at this moment, of the distinguished service I am sure he will render as a member of the Federal bench. Ours is a government of liberty under the law and the bedrock of our institutions is the respect the American people have for the courts of our country and their faith in the impartial administration of justice.

We who know EWING THOMASON have no misgivings as to the character of service he will render in the high position to which he is going. He is a learned lawyer who can understand and interpret the law, but what is even more valuable he has a deep sense of justice and right. He will dispense justice without bias. Rich and poor, the powerful and the weak, will alike receive his just consideration. Added to all that is his vast capacity for human understanding and kindness which insures that he will never abuse the tremendous powers that will be lodged in his hands as a Federal judge by using them arbitrarily. A true gentleman and loyal friend, he will be a just and able judge. In leaving these Halls, he carries with him the affection and good wishes of us all.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this would be a better nation and a better world if all parents could feel that the highest calling to which their children could aspire would be that of public servant. Unfortunately, an attitude toward public service has developed in this country that has not been conducive to enlisting and retaining the best minds and hearts in Government service. The demagogs and the opportunists of this generation have done much to cause promising young citizens to avoid the highest calling that can come to an American. This is more true now than it was in the early days of our history. The leaders of that early era were more deeply revered than are public servants of today. Some parents feel that they prefer their children to go into the fields of medicine, law, agriculture, or engineering when they reach the age to determine their life's work. A certain amount of suspicion and distrust has been created because of the failure of a few public servants to live up to the confidence reposed in them. "Politics" and "politicians" carry a stigma and a taint to some that parents would like to see their children spared.

Our Nation needs and must have the most honorable, able, and energetic men and women in its Government positions of responsibility. Wise, courageous persons of integrity are more needed in Government service today than ever in our history. We are having difficulty recruiting people that possess these qualifications for these places. A competent administrator in the executive branch of the Government is experienced and equipped to do a job for the people that would pay four or five times as much if it were done for a private business. A good legislator must possess talents and ability that now command in private life several times his Government salary. A person qualified by temperament, training, and talent for the bench can earn much more than his judgeship pay in the private practice of the law. Thus today we find far too many of our most brilliant and promising young people uninterested in a career of public service.

I am glad for Texas and the Nation that EWING THOMASON did not feel that way when he finished Southwestern University at Georgetown, Tex., and the University of Texas at Austin, two great schools in the district I represent. I do not believe that many of the young men of today would feel as they do about Government service if all Government servants had measured up to the standard that EWING THOMASON set and achieved for himself.

Few persons in our country have been honored with positions of respect and responsibility in all three of the separate and independent branches of our Government. We can almost count the number on our fingers and toes. Chief Justice, Secretary of the Treasury, and Congressman, Fred M. Vinson; Justice, Secretary of State, and Senator, James F. Byrnes; and Chief Justice of the Court of Claims, Congressman, and War Food Administrator, our own beloved fellow Texan, Marvin Jones, are among the most outstanding. If every public servant in the executive branch of our Government could render the type and quality of service EWING THOMASON rendered as the mayor and chief executive of El Paso; if every legislator could serve as he served as speaker of the Texas House of Representatives and as a Member of Congress for 16 years, then the field of public service would be held in such esteem that mothers and fathers would want their children to enter it. EWING THOMASON'S rugged honesty, great intellectual capacity, sturdy character, and unusual political acumen have permitted him to make a great contribution to his country's history.

When I was a youngster in high school my daddy told me of his deep affection and respect for his colleague, EWING THOMASON, then in the Texas House of Representatives serving as speaker of that great body. When I arrived in the Nation's Capital as an inexperienced secretary in the dark days of the depression, EWING THOMASON was then taking the oath as a freshman Member. Through the years that have passed, I have looked to him for counsel and strength. He has not failed me. When he leaves this body more than a vacant seat remains. We will remember him as a colleague of absolute integrity and unquestioned ability that has seldom been equaled and never surpassed. We will remember his wife Abbie as the genuine person who can walk the path with a noble legislator, a firm and able administrator, and a generous and just judge. Those of us who know his two children, Bill and Isabelle, know that they are the kind of children who contributed to his service instead of detracted from it. Judge THOMASON has been the kind of public servant that every man in public life should be, and the members of his family have done their part toward helping him write that kind of a record.

EWING THOMASON'S good judgment was demonstrated in the choice of his efficient office staff, headed by the lovable and capable Mrs. Kate George. Mrs. George has served that congressional district competently and efficiently for almost 30 years. She was secretary to Congressman Claude Hudspeth, Mr. THOMASON'S predecessor. When I first came to Washington my father told me to meet Mrs. George. I did so, and I shall always be in her debt for the help and advice she has given me and my district throughout the years.

The entire combination, Congressman, wife, family, and staff, has added to the net result. They have inspired and stimulated all who have come in contact with them. They should serve as a model for the young to emulate and the old to respect and honor.

EWING THOMASON is a fine example of the best our democratic system produces, and no compliment great enough can be paid to the people who have elected him term after term. The honor is theirs and his.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add a few brief, but nonetheless sincere, words to the remarks of the preceding distinguished gentlemen on our loss of the services of a man whom I have always considered one of the finest and ablest Members of this House, the gentleman from Texas, ROBERT EWING THOMASON. When I first was elected to this House during the Seventy-eighth Congress I became a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, of which Judge THOMASON was the ranking majority member. As a new Member I came to know Judge THOMASON for his kindliness and friendliness as well as for his valuable and patriotic work on that important committee during the late World War. I well remember his hearty handclasp on the day I first took the oath of office in the well of this House. I have greatly appreciated his friendship ever since. We know that he will serve as judge of the United States district court in the State of Texas with the same honor and the distinction that he has served the people of his district, his State, and his country for many years in the United States Congress. I wish him many, many years of good health and happiness in his new and exalted position of United States district court judge for the Western District of Texas.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret, but also with a genuine sense of pride that we see our beloved friend, EWING THOMASON, leave the Halls of Congress. Few men have served his people with the same high fidelity and ability as has he. No man has ever enjoyed more genuine and universal affection from his colleagues. We will miss his earnestness, his never-failing good humor and cordiality, and his great devotion to principle.

But it is with pride we join in congratulating this fine man on his ascending the bench of another great department of this Government. His experience will stand him in good stead. His legal training and sound sense of justice will soon demonstrate his remarkable ability to attain the same high record of achievement in a judicial capacity that has marked his record as a mayor of his city, speaker of the house of representatives of Texas, and a Member of Congress. His record in each place has been an unusual one.

So our best wishes in his new undertaking go to Ewing, to his charming wife Abbie, and the other members of his fine family.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I did not know until now what a man I am. I am almost persuaded that perhaps I have made a mistake, but it is a little late now, in view of my resignation, but I think you might have said something about it sooner.

I know from experience that in these closing hours of a busy session it would not be appropriate for me to trespass upon your time or indulge in a lot of free advice. I do appreciate, more than I know how to express, your generous references to me and my service here. A man cannot serve in this historic body for 17 years and leave it without regret.

I have served under three Presidents and six Speakers—all great Americans. A man cannot be President and a man cannot be Speaker—the second most powerful place in the Government—without possessing a high order of character, ability, and patriotism. My acquaintance with these men has strengthened my faith in democracy and in the future of our Republic. I came here during the depression. I served during the war. I now know something about the terrible problems that confront you in this the postwar period. I have seen a nation and the world almost remade. But I am an optimist, and I have an abiding faith in the future of this country and its peaceful relations with other nations. I know the United States has no ulterior motives. I have an abiding faith, too, that with your experience, intelligence, and patriotism, backed by the spirit of the American people, you will find a solution of the terrible problems which now confront this Nation and the world, and restore to all peace-loving people prosperity and permanent peace. Civilization as we know it cannot survive another war in this atomic age.

I wish I could tell you how I feel on this occasion and how I am going to miss you. I approach my new duties with humility and keen sense of my responsibility. In my judgment, one of the greatest bulwarks of democracy today is respect for the courts, enforcement of

the law, and the fair and equal administration of justice. To that high purpose, my old friends, I pledge you the best there is in me.

So I leave you with regret and heartache. I shall not further trespass upon your time, but I do want you to know that from the bottom of a grateful heart I shall always hold you in affectionate regard. With me there has never been any middle aisle, as we call it, when it comes to friendship and esteem. We are not Republicans or Democrats—we are Americans. I hope you come down to El Paso to see me, and if you are ever unfortunate enough to find yourselves on the south side of the docket in my court I promise to temper justice with mercy.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to my close and devoted Republican friend the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I hope the gentleman will tell the other part of the Thomason team, representing 51 percent of the team average, and referring to your wife, Abbie, that we are sorry to see her go, too.

Mr. THOMASON. Thank you and I will take your message to her and to my children down in Texas, and I will try to preserve a copy of today's RECORD for my two new granddaughters in Texas to read in the years to come and discover what a man Grandpa was.

Anyway, as we leave for Texas tomorrow night, I will be thinking about you and our pleasant association over the years. This means I am bidding you an affectionate farewell. As we say down on the border "Adios," but not goodby. I will be seeing you later.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4106) making appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers.

Mr. HORAN (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be considered as read unless there is a disposition to debate this report. I may say that we are completely unanimous in the subcommittee and have agreed with the Senate on all disagreements.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4106) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 7, 12, 15, 18, 21, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, and 37.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 13, 14, 16, 19, and 23, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$388,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$183,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$128,377"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$87,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That no part of these funds shall be expended for the care of children the income of whose parents, parent, or guardian exceeds $2,600 per annum"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$3,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 22, 27, and 34.

WALT HORAN,
KARL STEFAN,
RALPH E. CHURCH,
LOWELL STOCKMAN,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
HARRY P. CAIN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
PAT MCCARRAN,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4106) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, submit the following detailed statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1, relating to the Executive office, appropriates $208,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $222,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2, relating to the Office of the Corporation Counsel, appropriates $224,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $218,550, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3, relating to the Assessor's office, appropriates $574,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $554,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 4, relating to the Collector's office, appropriates $299,900, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $291,900, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 5, relating to the Auditor's office, appropriates $388,000 instead of $392,850, as proposed by the House, and $383,900, as proposed by the Senate. It is the intent of the conferees that $2,500 of the increase over the budget estimate shall be used for the purchase of an additional bookkeeping machine.

Amendment No. 6, relating to the Board of Indeterminate Sentence and Parole, appropriates $56,600, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $40,600, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 7, relating to the Department of Weights, Measures, and Markets, appropriates $135,700, as proposed by the House, instead of $134,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8, relating to the Office of Administrator of Rent Control, appropriates $100,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $107,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 9 and 10, relating to the Office of Recorder of Deeds, appropriate $183,500 instead of $175,000, as proposed by the House, and $196,000, as proposed by the Senate, and include a provision of the Senate allocating $21,000 of the appropriation to the purchase of photostatic equipment. It is agreed by the conferees that the modernization of the office, as suggested in the House report and made possible by new legislation, will be reflected in a considerably reduced budget estimate for the fiscal year 1949.

Amendment No. 11, relating to the Public Utilities Commission, appropriates $128,377 instead of $119,000, as proposed by the House, and $130,800, as proposed by the Senate. It is agreed by the conferees, and it is accordingly suggested, that the need for the People's Counsel be reviewed by the District Commissioners with a view to suggesting legislation for the elimination of this seemingly unnecessary office.

Amendment No. 12, relating to the Zoning Commission, appropriates $29,500, as proposed by the House, instead of $22,500, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13, relating to capital outlay, public schools, appropriates $600,000 for furnishings and equipment, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $620,600, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 14 relating to capital outlay, public schools, appropriates $450,000 for school building and playground sites, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $880,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 15, relating to operating expenses, Health Department, appropriates $2,042,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $2,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16, relating to operating expenses, Department of Corrections, appropriates $2,500,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,550,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17, relating to administrative expenses of Public Welfare, appropriates $87,000 instead of $82,000, as proposed by the House, and $120,994, as proposed by the Senate. It is anticipated by the conferees that of the amount of $3,110,400 appropriated for agency services under Public Welfare, the amount of $50,000 will remain unexpended in the fiscal year 1948 as a result of the conferees not having made provision for reorganization of the administrative offices.

Amendment No. 18, relating to operating expenses, protective institutions, Public Welfare, appropriates $1,852,900, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,845,600, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19, relating to St. Elizabeths Hospital, Public Welfare, appropriates $6,229,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $6,000,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 20, relating to day-care centers, Public Welfare, restores the language inserted by the House providing for a limitation on the type of care and increases the income maximum of parents from $2,000 to $2,600 per annum.

Amendment No. 21, relating to capital outlay, Street and Bridge Divisions, Public Works, appropriates $5,285,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $5,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 23, relating to operating expenses, Sewer Division, Public Works, appropriates $1,140,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,154,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 24, relating to capital outlay, Sewer Division, Public Works, appropriates $3,750,000 instead of $3,931,000, as proposed by the House, and $3,500,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25, relating to the National Guard, restores language inserted by the House providing for the compensation of the commanding general.

Amendment No. 26, relating to the National Guard, appropriates $68,600, as proposed by the House, instead of $65,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27 is reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, and 33, correct section numbers.

Amendment No. 34 is reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 35, 36, and 37 correct section numbers.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

Amendment No. 22, relating to Capital outlay, Refuse Division, Public Works, provides for an increased limitation in the construction cost of an incinerator and provides for an additional amount for the construction of a refuse transfer station, from funds already available. The managers on the part of the House move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 27 under General Provisions, strike out language of the House relating to auditing procedures in the District Government. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment as follows:

"SEC. 2. Vouchers in payment of obligations incurred by the Health Department and Public Welfare pursuant to the appropriations contained in this Act shall be certified as lawfully payable in the department, board, or office responsible for the incurring of the obligations; thereafter the vouchers shall be audited before payment by or under the jurisdiction only of the Auditor for the District of Columbia and the vouchers as approved may be paid by checks issued by the Disbursing Officer without countersignature."

Amendment No. 34 under General Provisions clarifies House language pertaining to the investment and reinvestment of funds in United States Government securities. The managers on the part of the House move to recede and concur with an amendment changing the section number.

WALT. HORAN,
KARL STEFAN,
RALPH E. CHURCH,
LOWELL STOCKMAN,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 22: Page 51, line 20, insert "(at a total cost not to exceed $1,160,000), an additional amount for construction of proposed refuse transfer station (at a total cost not to exceed $706,000)."

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 27: Page 60, line 8, strike out lines 8 to 16 inclusive.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HORAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 27 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

"SEC. 2. Vouchers in payment of obligations incurred by the Health Department and Public Welfare pursuant to the appropriations contained in this act shall be certified as lawfully payable in the department, board, or office responsible for the incurring of the obligations; thereafter the vouchers shall be audited before payment by or under the jurisdiction only of the Auditor for the District of Columbia and the vouchers as approved may be paid by checks issued by the disbursing officer without countersignature."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 34: Page 63, line 13, strike out lines 13 to 17 inclusive and insert:

"SEC. 8. The Commissioners are hereby authorized in their discretion to invest and reinvest at any time in United States Government securities, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, any part of the general fund, highway fund, water fund, or trust funds, of the District of Columbia, not needed to meet current expenses during the fiscal year, to deposit the interest accruing from such investments to the credit of the fund from which the investment was made, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to sell or exchange such securities for other Government securities, and deposit the proceeds to the credit of the appropriate fund."

Mr. HORAN (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Speaker, this is merely a clarifying amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be considered as read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HORAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 34 and agree to the same by changing section No. 8 to section No. 9.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the calendar.

CLARENCE J. WILSON AND MARGARET J. WILSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 718) for the relief of Clarence J. Wilson and Margaret J. Wilson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Clarence J. Wilson and Margaret J. Wilson, of Richmond, Calif., the sum of $7,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Clarence J. Wilson and Margaret J. Wilson against the United States on account of the death of their minor son, Robert C. Wilson, who was killed on December 18, 1944, in Richmond, Calif., when he was run over by a United States Army truck. At the time of such accident the said Robert C. Wilson was employed by the United States post office at Richmond in delivering mail as a member of a crew working from such truck. He fell from the truck and the left rear dual wheels passed over his chest: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$7,500" and insert "$3,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRAFF, WASHBOURNE & DUNN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1534) for the relief of Graff, Washbourne & Dunn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Graff, Washbourne & Dunn, New York City, the sum of

$12,656.64. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such corporation against the United States arising out of the completion of contract N120-s-15121 (dated December 29, 1941) and of contracts N120-s-15225 and N120-s-15227 (dated January 8, 1942), which contracts were completed at substantial loss to such corporation on the representation of the Navy Department that consideration would be given to adjusting the prices shown on the contracts, on completion, on a fair and reasonable basis: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$12,656.64" and insert in lieu thereof "$7,204.72."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNIE L. AND WILLIAM BENJAMIN TAYLOR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1781) for the relief of Annie L. Taylor and William Benjamin Taylor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Annie L. Taylor, of Seaford, Va., the sum of $16,590, and to Capt. William Benjamin Taylor, of Seaford, Va., the sum of $625, for loss sustained when the fishing trawler *Joyce* was blown up and sunk as a result of contact with a mine or obstruction on August 22, 1945, near Ocean City, Md. The payment of such sum of $16,590 shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Annie L. Taylor on account of the loss of the fishing trawler *Joyce* and equipment and cash on board when sunk. The payment of such sum of $625 shall be in settlement of all claims of said Capt. William B. Taylor on account of personal property damage sustained by him in the loss of the fishing trawler *Joyce: Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$16,590" and insert in lieu thereof "$8,295."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$625" and insert in lieu thereof "$315."

Page 1, line 11, strike out "$16,590" and insert in lieu thereof "$8,295."

Page 2, line 4, strike out "$625" and insert in lieu thereof "$315."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BELMONT PROPERTIES CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 851) for the relief of Belmont Properties Corp.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

PERSHING HALL, A MEMORIAL IN PARIS, FRANCE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 358) to provide for settling certain indebtedness connected with Pershing Hall, a memorial in Paris, France.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, from the Pershing Hall memorial fund to Julian M. Thomas, of Oakland, Calif., for legal services and expenses in connection with Pershing Hall, a memorial in Paris, France, the sum of $14,717.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "from the Pershing Hall memorial fund" and insert in lieu thereof "out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of Julian M. Thomas."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MASSMAN CONSTRUCTION CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2192) for the relief of the Massman Construction Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Massman Construction Co., Kansas City, Mo., the sum of $88,000, representing the amount of an item for the use and rental of equipment under a contract with the United States, which sum was inadvertently and mistakenly omitted by said company from its bid for the work done under its contract with the United States, contract No. W-1096-eng-7350, the work under the contract having been satisfactorily performed, and the United States having enjoyed the full use of such equipment in the reasonable sum of the amount claimed; the bid of the Massman Construction Co. having been $250,000 less than the nearest competitive bid and approximately $86,000 less than the Government's own estimate of the cost of the work without any profit therefor; and the said company having discovered the error in its bid within 13 days after the submission thereof and having asked the contracting officer of the United States that this amount be added to its bid or that its bid be rejected; and the contracting officer having refused and having insisted that the Massman Construction Co. sign the contract and proceed therewith or forfeit its bid bond in the amount of $200,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 15, after "$200,000", insert a colon and the following: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PETROL CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3499) for the relief of Petrol Corp.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed, for and on behalf of the United States of America, to enter forthwith into a written arbitration agreement with Petrol Corp., a Pennsylvania corporation. Such agreement shall contain the customary covenants used in arbitration agreements as mutually agreed upon by said parties thereto and shall provide for final determination by arbitration, notwithstanding any prior determinations or any statute of limitations, of the following:

(1) The amount, if any, by which the United States failed to reimburse Petrol Corp., in accordance with commitments made by Federal officials, for losses said corporation incurred by paying excessive war-risk marine insurance and purchasing residual fuel oils in aid of the war effort as requested and directed by such officials.

(2) The amount, if any, by which the petroleum supply programs and related rulings (which were approved by the United States for the purpose of compensating the petroleum industry for excessive costs and expenses its members incurred aiding the war effort, by maintaining, at the request of Federal officials, adequate petroleum supplies on the Atlantic Coast of the United States from September 1, 1941, to October 10, 1945), discriminated against Petrol Corp.

(b) In determining such amounts due Petrol Corp., the board or arbitrators shall consider among other things the following:

(1) The nature of the operations of Petrol Corp. as compared with the operations of other companies under said petroleum supply programs.

(2) The extent to which war compelled excessive costs and expenses of Petrol Corp. above its actual normal costs and expenses were not equitably reimbursed and compensated for due to—

(A) the use of War Shipping Administration tanker rates as normal tanker rates in computing compensation due under said petroleum supply programs in the case of nonintegrated marketing companies;

(B) the deprivation of Petrol Corporation of the benefit of its long-term purchase contracts in computing compensation due under said petroleum supply programs;

(C) rulings made by committees administering said petroleum supply programs denying certain claims of Petrol Corporation for compensation under said programs; and

(D) the use of profits from transactions between the United States and companies participating in said petroleum supply programs (which were not available to Petrol Corp. because of the nature of its opera-

tions) by said companies, to offset failure to reimburse and compensate fully under said programs for their excessive wartime costs and expenses.

SEC. 2. There is hereby established a board of arbitration to be composed of three members, one to be selected by the Comptroller General, one by Petrol Corp., and the third by the two thus chosen. Such selections shall be made as soon as practicable after the arbitration agreement herein authorized is executed. In the event that the two arbitrators thus chosen cannot within a reasonable time agree upon the third arbitrator, such third arbitrator shall be appointed by the Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, acting in his individual capacity. The arbitrators selected, or a majority of them, may summon in writing any person to attend before them and to produce any book, record, document, or paper which may be deemed material as evidence in this matter in accordance with the provisions contained in section 7 of the United States Arbitration Act.

SEC. 3. The board of arbitration, after it determines the amount, if any, which the United States failed to reimburse Petrol Corp. as promised and the amount, if any, that the said petroleum supply programs and related rulings discriminated against Petrol Corp., shall make an award assessing against the United States the total of said sums as damages which said corporation suffered.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay Petrol Corp., from the general funds in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum of money as may be necessary to pay the amount of any award determined hereunder. The amount of such award shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury on the presentation of a copy of the award of said board of arbitration, duly certified by the arbitrators, or a majority of them.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "That", strike out "(a)."

Page 1, line 7, after the word "agreement", strike out "shall contain the customary covenants used in arbitration agreements as mutually agreed upon by said parties thereto and."

Page 1, line 9, after the words "provide for", strike out "final determination by"; line 10, after the word "arbitration", strike out "notwithstanding any prior determinations or statute of limitations."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "(1)" and insert "(a)"; and in line 8, strike out "(2)" and insert "(b)."

Page 2, line 17, strike out the bill through line 23, page 3.

Page 4, line 16, strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 3. The board of arbitration shall determine the amount, if any, which the United States failed to reimburse Petrol Corporation as promised and the amount, if any, that the said petroleum supply programs and related rulings discriminated against Petrol Corporation, and shall report the result of such determination to the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 60 days after the completion of the arbitration proceedings."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM DUDLEY WARD-SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3088) for the relief of William Dudley Ward-Smith.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws relating to the issuance of immigration visas for admission to the United States for permanent residence and relating to admission at ports of entry of aliens as immigrants for permanent residence in the United States, the quota provisions of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 153), as amended (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 201-226), shall not hereafter be held to apply to William Dudley Ward-Smith. If he is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, an immigration visa may be issued and admission granted to William Dudley Ward-Smith under this act upon application hereafter filed. Upon admission into the United States of William Dudley Ward-Smith, the Secretary of State shall deduct one number from the quota of the Union of South Africa for the year in which the admission occurs or from the quota of the first available succeeding year.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. AKIKO TSUKADO MILLER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2347) for the relief of Mrs. Akiko Tsukado Miller.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of law, excluding persons of races ineligible to citizenship from admission to the United States, Mrs. Akiko Tsukado Miller, who is the wife of Lt. (junior grade) John J. Miller, United States Navy, 388550, a United States citizen, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence upon meeting the requirements of Public Law 271, approved December 28, 1945, the so-called Soldier Brides' Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUIS H. DEAVER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3111) for the relief of Louis H. Deaver.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby directed to receive the claim of Louis H. Deaver, of Tuthill, S. Dak., who allegedly was permanently disabled as the result of an injury received in August 1921, while employed as postmaster at Cody, Nebr., and his claim is authorized to be considered and acted upon under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 5, secs. 767 and 770), notwithstanding sections 17 to 20, inclusive, as if said Louis H. Deaver were entitled to such benefits under the act: *Provided*, That claim hereunder shall be filed not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this act: *Provided further*, That no benefits hereunder shall accrue prior to the approval of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIDELITY TRUST CO., OF BALTIMORE, MD.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3383) for the payment of claims of the Fidelity Trust Co., of Baltimore, Md., and others, covered by findings of fact made by the United States Court of Claims, dated June 5, 1944, and contained in Senate Document No. 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

PATENT IN FEE TO DANIEL BROKEN LEG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3696) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Daniel Broken Leg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Daniel Broken Leg, of Chadron, Nebr., a patent in fee to the following-described lands situated on the Rosebud Indian Reservation in the State of South Dakota: Allotment No. 4316, northeast quarter, section 33, township 100 north, range 78 west, of the fifth principal meridian, Tripp County, S. Dak.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM R. DOHNT, ADMINISTRATOR, AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 625), first, for the relief of William R. Dohnt, administrator of all and singular, the goods, chattels, and credits which were of Margaret E. Dohnt, deceased; second, Joseph A. Hauser, individually and as guardian of Florence Hauser, an infant of the age of 19 years; third, Richard Adams, Sr., individually and as guardian of Richard Adams, Jr., an infant of the age of 16 years; fourth, William P. Novotny, Sr., individually, and as guardian of William Joseph Novotny, Jr., an infant of the age of 18 years; fifth, William P. Novotny, Sr., individually and as guardian of Bernadette Novotny, an infant of the age of 20 years; sixth, Grace Swiadek, individually and as guardian of Stanley Swiadek, an infant of the age of 18 years; and seventh, Joseph F. Krotz, Sr., individually and as guardian of Joseph F. Krotz, Jr., an infant of the age of 18 years.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to (a) William R. Dohnt, New York City, N. Y., administrator of all and singular, the goods, chattels, and credits which were of Margaret E. Dohnt, deceased, the sum of $15,951.60, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injuries sustained by the said Margaret E. Dohnt, resulting from her being injured in an automobile collision with a United States Army automobile truck on January 8, 1944, as a result of which injuries said Margaret E. Dohnt died on January 9, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the

amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding.

(b) Joseph A. Hauser, New York City, N. Y., individually, and as guardian of Florence Hauser, the sum of $25,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injuries sustained by the said Florence Hauser, and the damages sustained by said Joseph A. Hauser, resulting from her being injured in an automobile collision with a United States Army automobile truck on January 8, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contract notwithstanding.

(c) Richard Adams, Sr., New York City, N. Y., individually and as guardian of Richard Adams, Jr., the sum of $4,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injuries sustained by the said Richard Adams, Jr., and the damages sustained by the said Richard Adams, Sr., resulting from the former being injured in an automobile collision with a United States Army automobile truck on January 8, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding.

(d) William P. Novotny, Sr., New York City, N. Y., individually and as guardian of William Joseph Novotny, Jr., the sum of $4,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injuries sustained by the said William Joseph Novotny, Jr., and the damages sustained by the said William P. Novotny, Sr., resulting from the former being injured in an automobile collision with a United States Army automobile truck on January 8, 1944, as well as the damages sustained by the said William P. Novotny, Sr., to an automobile owned by him and which was completely demolished in the said collision with the aforesaid United States Army automobile truck on said January 8, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding.

(e) William P. Novotny, Sr., New York City, N. Y., individually and as guardian of Bernadette Novotny, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injuries sustained by the said Bernadette Novotny, and the damages sustained by the said William P. Novotny, Sr., resulting from her being injured in an automobile collision with a United States Army automobile truck on January 8, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding.

(f) Grace Swiadek, New York City, N. Y., individually and as guardian of Stanley Swiadek, the sum of $2,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injuries sustained by the said Stanley Swiadek, and the damages sustained by the said Grace Swiadek, resulting from his being injured in an automobile collision with a United States Army automobile truck on January 8, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding.

(g) Joseph F. Krotz, Sr., New York City, N. Y., individually and as guardian of Joseph F. Krotz, Jr., the sum of $1,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injuries sustained by the said Joseph F. Krotz, Jr., and the damages sustained by the said Joseph F. Krotz, Sr., resulting from the former being injured in an automobile collision with a United States Army automobile truck on January 8, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 8, strike out the figures "$15,951.60" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,764.43."

Page 2, line 22, strike out the figures "$25,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,518.54."

Page 3, line 10, strike out the figures "$4,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,074.94."

Page 3, line 23, strike out the figures "$4,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$949.42."

Page 4, line 16, strike out the figures "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$777."

Page 5, line 5, strike out the figures "$2,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$851.05."

Page 5, line 18, strike out "$1,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$466.05."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES L. BAKER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1131) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim or claims of Charles L. Baker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims of the United States of America, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim or claims of Charles L. Baker, of Ophir, Alaska, for any losses and damage sustained by him by virtue of his arrest and imprisonment in the Territory of Alaska, arising out of any acts or actions of any employees or officers of the United States: *Provided*, That the action in the Court of Claims to establish such losses and damages may be instituted within 1 year from the date of approval of this act and the same right of appeal to the United States Supreme Court from any judgment of the Court of Claims shall be had as in other causes in that Court.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the name "Alaska", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof: "against the United States for loss or damage alleged to have been sustained by him as a direct result of his arrest on or about November 4, 1937, and subsequent imprisonment for approximately 95 days in the Territory of Alaska, if such arrest and imprisonment were occasioned by wrongful acts or omissions of any of the officers and employees of the United States while acting within the scope of such office or employment: *Provided*, That the United States shall not be liable for punitive damages. Suit upon such claim may be instituted in the Court of Claims at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations, and the proceedings in such suit shall be had in the same manner, and be subject to the same provisions for appellate review, as in the case of claims over which the Court of Claims has jurisdiction by virtue of section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended (28 U. S. C. 250). The judgment in any such suit shall constitute a complete bar to any action by the claimant by reason of the same subject matter against any officer or employee of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF W. H. RODGERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1155) for the relief of the estate of W. H. Rodgers, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the executors and trustees of the estate of W. H. Rodgers, deceased, late of Trousdale County, Tenn., the sum of $7,866. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising out of damages to the Lowe farm, which was owned by the said decedent and situated 1 mile south of Hartsville in Trousdale County, Tenn., as a result of special field exercises conducted on such farm by the United States Army from August 1943 to April 1944. As a result of such field exercises (1) the hay crop on 47 7/10 acres of such farm was reduced by 143 1/10 tons (one-third of the normal output of those acres for 3 cuttings), and (2) the fences on the pasture fields of such farm were destroyed, necessitating the removal of 139 head of mules to a barn on such farm and the purchase of extra feed for such mules: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike "$7,866" and insert "$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. LEONA McMINN WINKLER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1615) for the relief of Mrs. Leona McMinn Winkler.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000, to Mrs. Leona McMinn Winkler, of Springfield, Mo., in full satisfaction of her claims against the United States for reimbursement for medical and hospital expenses incurred by her, and for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her, as the result of having been struck by a missile thrown by a wheel of a United States Army truck through the windshield of the automobile in which she was riding as a passenger on United States Highway No. 66, near Lebanon, Mo., on January 19, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MATTIE A. HORNER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2891) for the relief of Mattie A. Horner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mattie A. Horner, of Richmond, Va., the sum of $500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and medical and other expenses sustained by her as the result of a fall on December 22, 1944, at the naval air station, Fort Lauderdale, Fla.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$500" and insert "$176."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OSCAR AND ANNA CARLBLOM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3754) for the relief of Oscar and Anna Carlblom.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $32, or such other sums as he has, or may hereafter, collect from Oscar and Anna Carlblom, of Lisbon, N. Dak., as income tax for the calendar year beginning January 1, 1944, and ending January 1, 1945, the said Oscar and Anna Carlblom having had no net income that was subject to taxation, their total net income being $489.96.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM D. McCORMICK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 706) for the relief of William D. McCormick.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, and notwithstanding any provisions of section 12 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (43 Stat. 153), William D. McCormick, of Windsor, Ontario, Canada, who is of Scotch ancestry and the husband of Mary Rita McCormick, who has been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, shall be deemed to have been born in Scotland rather than in India, where his parents were temporary residents at the time the said William D. McCormick was born.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That in the administration of the immigration laws, William D. McCormick shall, upon application at a port of entry into the United States, be admitted for permanent residence without an immigration visa, provided he meets all the other requirements of the immigration laws. Upon his admission into the United States, the Secretary of State shall deduct one number from the quota for India for the year in which the admission occurs or from the quota of the first available succeeding year."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ELFREIDA SAKOWSKY PASSANT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 648) for the relief of Mrs. Elfreida Sakowsky Passant, alias Elfreida Sakowsky, alias Elfreida Pogue.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, directed to cancel forthwith the outstanding warrants of arrest and deportation in the case of the alien Elfreida Sakowsky Passant, alias Elfreida Sakowsky, alias Elfreida Pogue, and is directed not to issue any further such warrants or orders in the case of such alien, insofar as such further warrants or orders are based on any act or acts which served as a basis for the warrants of arrest and deportation that are being canceled by this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FILIBERTO A. BONAVENTURA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1916) for the relief of Filiberto A. Bonaventura.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cancel the outstanding order and warrant of deportation issued pursuant to the act approved February 18, 1931 (46 Stat. 1171; U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, sec. 156a), in the case of Filiberto A. Bonaventura, any provision of existing law to the contrary notwithstanding. From and after the date of the approval of this act, Filiberto A. Bonaventura shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which the present outstanding proceedings rest.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROMAN TOPOROW

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3243) for the relief of Roman Toporow.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, directed to cancel forthwith the outstanding warrant of arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond, if any, in the case of the alien Roman Toporow, of Los Angeles, Calif., and is directed not to issue any further such warrants or orders in the case of such alien, insofar as such further warrants are based on any unlawful entry of such alien into the United States prior to the enactment of this act. Hereafter, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, such alien shall be considered to have entered the United States on June 12, 1946, the date of his last entry, and to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Polish quota of the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. PEARL COLE

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2012) for the relief of Mrs. Pearl Cole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes", approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., and Supp. V, title 5, secs. 765-770, inclusive), the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized and directed to consider any claim filed with the Commission by Mrs. Pearl Cole for compensation under such act, within 6 months from the date of enactment of this act, on account of

the death of her husband, Jesse T. Cole, deceased, whose death in August 1936 is alleged to have been a result of injuries, with consequent disability, received on June 10, 1931, in the performance of his duty as a rural mail carrier in the civil service of the United States; and the Commission, after such consideration of such claim, shall determine and make findings of fact thereon and make an award for or against payment of compensation provided for in such act of September 7, 1916, as amended.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "United States" and insert "Bureau of."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "Commission" and insert "of the Federal Security Agency."

Page 2, line 2, strike out "Commission" and insert "Bureau."

Page 2, line 9, strike out "Commission" and insert "Bureau."

Page 2, line 13, after the word "amended." insert "No benefits shall accrue prior to the approval of this act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF GLENNA J. HOWREY

Mr. JENNINGS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 254) for the relief of the legal guardian of Glenna J. Howrey:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 254) for the relief of the legal guardian of Glenna J. Howrey, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "$1,000"; and the House agree to the same.

JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,
ALBERT L. REEVES, Jr.,
FADJO CRAVENS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

E. H. MOORE,
JOHN S. COOPER,
J. HOWARD MCGRATH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 254) for the relief of the legal guardian of Glenna J. Howrey, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying report.

The bill as passed the Senate appropriated to the legal guardian of Glenna J. Howrey the sum of $500 for personal injuries, resulting from an accident involving a United States mail truck in Pueblo, Colo., on December 27, 1943. The House increased the amount to $1,500, and at the conference a compromise of $1,000 was agreed upon.

JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,
ALBERT L. REEVES, Jr.,
FADJO CRAVENS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill S. 254.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in connection with the bill H. R. 29, passed on yesterday, and include some material furnished by the Congressional Library.

NATIONAL MINERALS RESOURCES DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1602) to establish within the Department of the Interior a National Minerals Resources Division, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICH) there were—ayes 116, noes 6.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-two Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 342, nays 32, not voting 56, as follows:

[Roll No. 128]

YEAS—342

Abernethy	Boggs, Del.	Combs
Albert	Boggs, La.	Cooley
Allen, Calif.	Bolton	Cooper
Allen, Ill.	Bradley	Corbett
Allen, La.	Bramblett	Cotton
Almond	Brehm	Courtney
Andersen, H. Carl	Brooks	Cravens
	Brophy	Crawford
Anderson, Calif.	Brown, Ga.	Crosser
Andresen, August H.	Brown, Ohio	Cunningham
	Bryson	Curtis
Andrews, Ala.	Buchanan	Davis, Ga.
Andrews, N. Y.	Bulwinkle	Davis, Wis.
Angell	Burke	Dawson, Utah
Arends	Burleson	Delaney
Arnold	Busbey	Devitt
Auchincloss	Byrne, N. Y.	D'Ewart
Bakewell	Byrnes, Wis.	Dolliver
Banta	Camp	Dondero
Barden	Canfield	Donohue
Barrett	Cannon	Dorn
Bates, Ky.	Carson	Doughton
Bates, Mass.	Case, N. J.	Drewry
Battle	Case, S. Dak.	Eaton
Beall	Chadwick	Eberharter
Beckworth	Chenoweth	Elliott
Bell	Chiperfield	Ellis
Bender	Church	Ellsworth
Bennett, Mich.	Clark	Elsaesser
Bennett, Mo.	Clason	Elston
Bishop	Clevenger	Engel, Mich.
Blackney	Coffin	Engle, Calif.
Blatnik	Cole, Kans.	Evins
Bloom	Colmer	Fallon
Feighan	Kilburn	Price, Fla.
Fellows	Kilday	Price, Ill.
Fernandez	King	Priest
Fisher	Kirwan	Rabin
Flannagan	Klein	Rains
Fletcher	Knutson	Ramey
Fogarty	Landis	Rankin
Folger	Lane	Rayfiel
Foote	Lanham	Redden
Forand	Larcade	Reed, Ill.
Gamble	Latham	Reed, N. Y.
Gary	Lea	Reeves
Gathings	LeCompte	Richards
Gavin	LeFevre	Riehlman
Gearhart	Lemke	Riley
Gillette	Lesinski	Rivers
Gillie	Lewis	Rizley
Goff	Lodge	Robertson
Goodwin	Love	Robsion
Gordon	Lusk	Rockwell
Gore	Lyle	Rogers, Fla.
Gorski	Lynch	Rogers, Mass.
Gossett	McConnell	Rohrbough
Granger	McCormack	Ross
Grant, Ala.	McCowen	Russell
Grant, Ind.	McDonough	Sabath
Gregory	McGregor	Sadlak
Griffiths	McMahon	Sadowski
Gwynne, Iowa	McMillan, S. C.	St. George
Hale	McMillen, Ill.	Sanborn
Hall, Leonard W.	Mack	Sarbacher
	MacKinnon	Sasscer
Halleck	Macy	Schwabe, Mo.
Hardy	Madden	Schwabe, Okla.
Harless, Ariz.	Mahon	Scoblick
Harness, Ind.	Maloney	Scrivner
Harris	Manasco	Seely-Brown
Hart	Mansfield	Shafer
Hartley	Marcantonio	Short
Havenner	Martin, Iowa	Sikes
Hedrick	Mathews	Simpson, Ill.
Heffernan	Meade, Md.	Smathers
Herter	Merrow	Smith, Maine
Heselton	Meyer	Smith, Wis.
Hess	Michener	Snyder
Hill	Miller, Calif.	Somers
Hinshaw	Miller, Conn.	Spence
Hoeven	Miller, Md.	Springer
Hoffman	Miller, Nebr.	Stanley
Holifield	Mills	Stefan
Holmes	Mitchell	Stevenson
Hope	Monroney	Stigler
Horan	Morgan	Stockman
Howell	Morris	Stratton
Huber	Morrison	Talle
Hull	Morton	Taylor
Jackson, Calif.	Muhlenberg	Teague
Jackson, Wash.	Mundt	Thomas, Tex.
Jarman	Murdock	Tollefson
Javits	Murray, Wis.	Trimble
Jenison	Nixon	Twyman
Jenkins, Ohio	Nodar	Vail
Jennings	Norblad	Van Zandt
Jensen	Norton	Vorys
Johnson, Calif.	O'Brien	Vursell
Jonnson, Ill.	O'Konski	Wadsworth
Johnson, Ind.	Owens	Welchel
Johnson, Okla.	Pace	Welch
Johnson, Tex.	Passman	West
Jones, Ala.	Patman	Wheeler
Jones, Ohio	Patterson	Whittington
Jones, Wash.	Peden	Wigglesworth
Jonkman	Peterson	Williams
Judd	Pfeifer	Wilson, Ind.
Karsten, Mo.	Philbin	Winstead
Kearney	Phillips, Tenn.	Wolcott
Keating	Ploeser	Wolverton
Keefe	Plumley	Wood
Kefauver	Poage	Woodruff
Kennedy	Poulson	Youngblood
Kerr	Preston	Zimmerman

NAYS—32

Buck	Hand	Rooney
Buffett	Harrison	Scott, Hardie
Butler	Jenkins, Pa.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Coudert	Kean	
Crow	Kearns	Simpson, Pa.
Dague	Kunkel	Smith, Va.
Fenton	Lucas	Sundstrom
Fulton	McDowell	Taber
Gallagher	Pickett	Tibbott
Graham	Potts	Towe
Gwinn, N. Y.	Rich	Wilson, Tex.

NOT VOTING—56

Bland	Chelf	Dawson, Ill.
Bonner	Clements	Deane
Boykin	Clippinger	Dingell
Buckley	Cole, Mo.	Dirksen
Carroll	Cole, N. Y.	Domengeaux
Celler	Cox	Douglas
Chapman	Davis, Tenn.	Durham

Fuller	Kelley	Powell
Gifford	Keogh	Rayburn
Gross	Kersten, Wis.	Rees
Hagen	Ludlow	Sheppard
Hall,	McGarvey	Smith, Kans.
Edwin Arthur	Mason	Smith, Ohio
Hays	Meade, Ky.	Thomas, N. J.
Hébert	Murray, Tenn.	Thomason
Hendricks	Norrell	Vinson
Hobbs	O'Hara	Walter
Jones, N. C.	O'Toole	Whitten
Kee	Phillips, Calif.	Worley

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Cole of New York with Mr. Clements.
Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Deane.
Mr. Dirksen with Mr. Sheppard.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. McGarvey with Mr. Hobbs.
Mr. Gross with Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mrs. Douglas.
Mr. Hagen with Mr. Norrell.
Mr. Cole of Missouri with Mr. Murray of Tennessee.
Mr. Fuller with Mr. O'Toole.
Mr. Gifford with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Mason with Mr. Durham.
Mr. Meade of Kentucky with Mr. Cox.
Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Carroll.
Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall with Mr. Whitten.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Worley.
Mr. Smith of Kansas with Mr. Chapman.
Mr. Phillips of California with Mr. Bonner.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1602, with Mr. HOWELL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Thursday, July 17, the Clerk had read the first section of the bill.

Are there any amendments to the first section of the bill?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let us strip this bill of its flag waving and its buncombe and see what we have left.

Under existing free markets the prices of these commodities are up 81 percent, 131 percent, and 30 percent from wartime fixed prices. Free markets always have and always will bring adequate supplies. We do not need subsidies in free markets.

The requirements of the Army and Navy just have nothing to do with this bill. Nowhere in the bill is there anything to assure the Army and the Navy of obtaining anything from this marginal production. What the Army and Navy want they will get on the open market, and this in itself will stimulate further production without benefit of subsidies.

The third point is that we need no continuing operation of these marginal mines to safeguard our resources of copper, lead, and zinc. The history of mining is a history of opening and closing mines. As a matter of fact, reserves in the ground are safer than present production, since present production will immediately be dissipated.

So what do we have left? We have a plain and simple hand-out, a raid on the Treasury, for the benefit of some mine owners whose low-grade mines seem, from the debate that has already taken place, to be very strategically located.

Mr. Chairman, the taxpayers of my district do not want their tax money wasted in this manner. I suggest the taxpayers in other districts probably feel similarly.

Hold your hats, taxpayers; the sleigh ride is on.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the southwestern part of Wisconsin, the Third Congressional District of Wisconsin, which I am honored to represent, is devoted to a great extent to the mining of lead and zinc. I have always been in favor of the premium-price plan for these materials since its inception in 1942, and was in favor of its continuation when the question came up again in 1945. I am in favor of the continuation of the premium-price plan as provided in H. R. 1602, which is now before the House for consideration. This bill extends the premium-price plan on copper, lead, and zinc for 2 years from June 30, 1947, and authorizes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to administer the premium payments on these strategic minerals, which are very urgently required by our Government for industrial purposes as well as for our national defense. The bill authorizes payment of $35,000,000 each year. The Public Lands Committee and the Rules Committee are of the opinion that there should be encouragement to marginal mines and their owners and producers, and that exploration programs are desirable, and that these programs should be expanded and extended.

Our country is short on strategic minerals and metals. The mining of minerals and metals will create the discovery of more minerals and metals. Soviet Russia is now engaged in that very operation. Russia is offering premium payments and also individual awards to anyone who can discover minerals and metals of any kind anywhere in her entire empire. Russia realizes that the more minerals and metals are discovered and mined, the greater the opportunity to discover other lodes of minerals and metals for use in her national defense.

There are a great number of marginal mines in my congressional district in the southwest part of Wisconsin. If we do not continue their operations through this program, it means these mines must be closed down. We would then lose all the marginal resources in lead and zinc which we now have there. Once these mines are closed, they will fill with water and mud, which will cause them to cave in. Then it will be impossible, and beyond all reasonable cost, to go in and reopen them and get the mineral resources out.

It is very necessary for our industrial welfare that lead and zinc be produced and these marginal mines kept in operation. Most everything in the industrial line contains zinc, lead, or copper in some degree. It is a question whether or not the Congress wants to have a domestic mining industry in this country. If we vote this bill down, we will deal a death blow to our own domestic mining industry and, if we have to import these metals, the cost will be many, many times more than the amount appropriated for the premium-price plan. If you want proof brought to your attention very graphically, just try to go out into the business and industrial world today and buy metals consisting primarily of copper, lead, or zinc. Try to find some of these strategic metals for use of the public. You will then know how very important and necessary is the passage of H. R. 1602.

Our own Stock Piling Act will be wiped out if this bill is not passed by the House today. If you do not pass this bill, you will close the marginal mines of our country, permit them to be flooded, and thus pass up the recovery of those ores. If a mine closes and you cease to work it, the mine is flooded, the timbers break down, and it is impossible, except at extraordinary expense, to reopen the mine and start operations again. It certainly is not good common sense to let our national resources go to waste in that manner. We must get these minerals out of the ground. You cannot get lead and zinc from foreign countries except at a loss to our economy. The cost would be too great and, as I said before, much greater than the appropriations called for in H. R. 1602. If we do not keep these marginal mines open, the cost of all industrial commodities containing any amount of lead and zinc and copper will be out of the reach of the ordinary consumer.

Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with critical and strategic metals. There is an acute shortage of lead and zinc in the United States today. We have fought two wars in the last generation, and during that time we dug the lead and zinc out of the earth to such an extent that our country is faced with a strategic shortage in these metals today. There are many millions of dollars invested in mining machinery and equipment in the Third Congressional District of Wisconsin. My district made an enormous contribution to the winning of the last war. The Federal Government has invested millions to help open up marginal mines to increase their output. The whole Nation is affected if these marginal mines are not allowed to continue. Every man who drives an automobile has to buy a battery for his car. Every farmer knows that lead and zinc are necessary for and are contained in every piece of machinery and nearly every article on the farm. When you paint your house you pay a higher price for the paint because of the high price of lead. We are worse off now than we were at the time of Pearl Harbor. It is time we were stock piling lead, zinc, and copper which are so essential in peace and in war. For adequate safety in our national defense and for the preservation of our industrial life we must have a national stock pile and supply of all things containing these metals that are now in short supply. They are in the ground, but we must have a continuing mining and production of these metals, not dependent upon foreign sources.

Lead and zinc production from 1939 to 1944 was produced in 1,455 mines producing less than 500 tons per year in 1939. The number of these mines dropped to

800 in 1944. These are the mines that I am interested in. The only way you can develop lead and zinc is to dig for more lead and zinc. If our Government encourages the little miners and producers and marginal-mine production by providing incentives for them to find new ore, I assure you that hundreds of mines in my own district and throughout the United States will produce new ore reserves so vitally needed for our country in times of emergency and to maintain our peacetime industrial economy.

I have received many letters and telegrams from mine owners and producers in my congressional district during the past weeks informing me that many mines have been closed in southwest Wisconsin since June 30, and that thousands of people in that area have been, and are, very seriously and adversely affected by the expiration of the premium-price plan. It is absolutely necessary that this bill, H. R. 1602, be passed by the House today, so that it can be enacted into law before the Eightieth Congress adjourns.

Under the premium-price plan the producers of these metals in marginal mines are paid a premium price in order to get these metals out of the ground. Producers in southwest Wisconsin have spent years searching and prospecting for, and developing the lead and zinc mines in my congressional district. Prospecting and exploring and mining in marginal mines develop new ore bodies, and will bring forth new and greater stock piles of lead and zinc. No one is more entitled to encouragement from the Government than these producers and mine owners—those who develop new mines and mining. In my district they are the little fellows, hard-working miners and producers who need encouragement from their Government. Regardless of what we pay to mine and to produce these metals, every pound of lead and zinc produced in southwestern Wisconsin puts new wealth into circulation. Our national wealth and safety are based largely upon the raw materials, metals, and minerals that we take from the ground and grow on the land. Every ton of minerals and metals we produce in the United States benefits our economy to a much greater degree than would be the result if these metals and minerals were imported from foreign countries where labor is cheap and the standard of living very low.

If we encourage a flood of imports of minerals and metals from other countries there will come a day when our market will not stand the strain, and prices for our minerals will fall below the cost of production. Thus more and more of our mines will become marginal mines, which may have to shut down unless they are supported by the premium-price plan as provided in H. R. 1602. This bill is intended to stabilize the prices for these critical metals and minerals which are necessary for our own defense as well as for our industrial protection.

Under the Stock Piling Act, the Army-Navy Munitions Board can purchase domestic copper, lead, and zinc only when there is a surplus of those metals above the needs of industry; but industry is now faced with a grave shortage of these metals. On the basis of a 6-year-period average, it is estimated that industry will use 760,000 tons of lead and about 800,000 tons of zinc next year. Under normal production, we produce on the average only about 370,000 tons of lead and 645,000 tons of zinc a year. If we do not pass this bill, and thus curtail marginal mining, our country will face a greater shortage of these metals; and then, if an emergency should arise, our Nation will be in a far more critical situation relative to its mineral stock piles than it was at Pearl Harbor.

If our marginal mines are forced to close and thousands of miners thrown out of work, it will cost our Government an enormous sum for unemployment compensation and relief.

Mining production cannot be turned on and off upon the order of any Government agency or by act of Congress. For our own national defense and our national industrial development, we must have a continuous supply of these strategic metals and a continuing production of lead, copper, and zinc from our own mines. We should not be dependent upon foreign sources for these strategic metals.

The purpose of H. R. 1602 is laudable and patriotic. It will keep America independent and insure our national defense. The bill should be passed unanimously by the House today. It must be passed today.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is absolutely necessary that H. R. 1602 be enacted into law without further delay. This bill, in effect, extends the premium price plan on copper, lead, and zinc for a period of 2 years from June 30, 1947, and authorizes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to administer the premium payments on those urgently required strategic minerals. It authorizes payments not to exceed $35,000,000 in each of the ensuing 2 years.

Personally, I would have preferred to see the passage of H. R. 2455 which covered this problem of strategic minerals in its entirety. But since that is not possible at this session of Congress, it is imperative that we do continue the present premium price plan in order to preserve and protect our three principal strategic materials, namely, copper, lead, and zinc.

Our stockpiles are empty of these and other important strategic minerals. We appear to have no coordinated minerals policy. Those who believe we can fulfill all of our requirements from abroad are engaged in wishful thinking. Already competition for foreign supplies is developing, and although we should buy what we can for our stockpiles anywhere we can get the materials, for the present moment at least, the plain and disconcerting facts are that even those who advocate such a policy the most loudly actually have done nothing to build up defense stockpiles.

It looks, therefore, as though we would largely have to depend on two things: keeping alive all the mines we can and encouraging them to explore and develop new ore bodies, and store every pound of domestically produced material not urgently required for industry. It is true the pending bill does not provide for stockpiling. But the bill has its national security aspect aside from direct stockpiling. It will insure the continued operation of mines from which stockpiles eventually can be accumulated and will insure the steady production which is the backbone of a war effort.

The Select Committee on Small Business of this House has stated in a recent report that continuation of premiums is necessary in order to assure that existing mines will continue operation and that newly discovered ore bodies will be explored and developed. The committee also stated that other factors combining to threaten the life of the domestic mining industry, especially the marginal mines, are the rising domestic cost of mining, exhaustion of ore bodies during the war, and delayed development programs.

Mr. Chairman, the copper mines of Michigan are among the oldest in the Nation. These mines are deep and the cost of operation is high. There remains perhaps more than 50,000,000 pounds of copper in sight which will be lost to this Nation if H. R. 1602 does not pass. If they are permitted to continue operations it is entirely probable that new and important ore bodies may be found in the copper mines of Michigan which will extend their lives and add materially to the wealth of the Nation.

To quote again from the report of the Select Committee on Small Business, it appears that from a cost study of marginal mines made in May 1947, 270 mines producing 20 percent of the domestic mine production of lead, zinc, and copper cannot continue in operation on the basis of present costs and normal prices which later may reasonably be expected to prevail for these metals. We neither can afford to permit these mines to shut down because of the present needs nor because of the ultimate needs of this great Nation as later, when industrial demands lessen, this metal will be available for stock piling. As a matter of fact, in the ultimate analysis, most of the metal used industrially would be a secondary stock pile for war should the necessity become sufficiently acute.

"Accelerated prospecting and exploring, together with continued development and operation of existing mines," says the report from which I have been quoting, "is insurance against the loss of foreign sources of supply in wartime. Even though foreign sources were willing to continue supplying this country with ore, it would still be difficult because of the submarine menace. Witness the high mortality rate of even our coastwise tankers during the early days of the war, to say nothing of the dangers faced by trans-Atlantic slow-moving freighters." All this adds up to the fact that we must get out of domestic mines every pound of ore we can, however marginal, and at almost any cost. The loss of one battleship protecting a strategic metal supply line would cost more than this entire premium program calls for, in addition to the loss of life.

Mr. Chairman, we need a more comprehensive measure than this bill provides. We need to include other strategic and critical minerals and we need to integrate the operation of conservation payments with stock piling. But most of all, at the moment, we need to pass this bill in order to keep our mines open and provide a breathing spell in which Congress can prepare to pass a more comprehensive bill.

I am opposed to the payment of Federal subsidies except in cases where such a program is imperative to our national welfare or to the security and defense of our country. The present bill comes within that category. We cannot under any circumstances afford to get ourselves into the position that we were in during the last war when the copper shortage was so acute that it almost meant disaster. It will be much cheaper and safer to keep our marginal high-cost mines in operation on a peacetime basis than to try to do so under the pressure of war. Copper mines do not work automatically. Production cannot be turned on and off by merely pressing a button. The business of copper mining, particularly in the deep mines of northern Michigan, is a continuing process. The operation must be uninterrupted and continuous. Once a shaft is abandoned and filled with water, for all practical purposes it becomes useless.

The cost of this legislation is infinitely small compared to the immense benefits to be derived by keeping in production the small marginal copper mines throughout the United States. It is the best insurance that can be devised for a thoroughly sound national defense. It would be a great tragedy to discontinue so important a program during this critical period.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is some misapprehension in regard to the bill before us. I would like to comment on that and see if I cannot straighten out a matter or two.

I know the generally unfriendly attitude of the membership toward premium price payments and subsidies as a holdover from the war. Also I know the unfriendly attitude of the membership toward establishing any new agency of government. Both of these ideas are frowned upon, more so I think by the present Congress than by previous Congresses, but let me call your attention to the fact that in this bill we are not considering the establishment of a National Mineral Resources Division.

If one will glance at this bill and notice the first page title of the bill, "To establish within the Department of the Interior a National Mineral Resources Division," he is inclined right off to say that we do not want any more bureaus or anything of that sort. That is not what this bill is about. It is not what this bill does. True, that is the title of the original bill which was amended by the substitution of the Allen amendment. The Allen amendment is what is before us and it is an entirely different title which you may see by referring to page 8, where appears the amended title.

Do not be deceived. You are not voting now on whether we shall have a new bureau or new department of mineral resources. You are now deciding whether we are to give encouragement to domestic production, which is the real purpose of this bill.

Another thing, no fixing of price is established in this program in an OPA sense. It is true that the price established for copper, lead, and zinc is higher than we paid during the war, but it simply means that if the law of supply and demand forces the price up to a certain point as seems likely the market price will be so-and-so and there will be nothing paid out of the Treasury because the natural price is as high as that in the bill. It is only to bring the price up to the limit on copper, lead, and zinc so that the small operators are encouraged and enabled to produce, since there is a shortage and we cannot supply what we need for our domestic consumption. These prices are likely to continue high and there will be nothing or little taken out of the Treasury so long as that is the case.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman mean to say that under this bill the Treasury will not have to pay a support price? Where will the money come from if it does not come out of the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. MURDOCK. There is a shortage of copper in this country. In fact, there is a world shortage. We were told the other day how they could not get copper for all their domestic manufacturing, so that if the price of copper is forced up to 28 cents, the market will stand at that price or beyond and there will be nothing paid out of the Treasury in that case.

Mr. RICH. Oh, if that is the case. That is an "if." We have too many "ifs" here already.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. Is it not true that copper has dropped to 24½ cents a pound and that foreign copper is coming into this country below 21½ cents a pound because they cannot find buyers for it?

Mr. MURDOCK. Not because foreign copper cannot find buyers. That is what I want to point out. The gentleman from New York the other day frankly stated that he was a stockholder or owned shares in the Anaconda Copper Co. I appreciate his reason for that statement. I happen to know about the Anaconda Copper Co. It has holdings in the State of Montana; it has, I understand, extensive holdings in Chile. I am not sure this bill would affect it, but there are a lot of people who would like to have copper shipped in here from South America, from Africa, or from Canada; there a lot of people who prefer to get all of our necessary supplies from abroad because some foreign copper can be produced cheaper by peon labor, even as cheap as 5, 6, or 7 cents a pound. But we cannot safely depend upon foreign sources for these strategic materials and metals not only in wartime but we cannot do so in peacetime either.

For example, during the war we needed bauxite to make aluminum. We can get it from South America and we tried to do so. I am told that 58 shiploads of bauxite were started on their voyage across the Gulf of Mexico to our own shores bringing needed bauxite. What happened? Perhaps we did not know the submarines were so active out there in the Gulf of Mexico. Only 5 of the 58 ships, I am told, reached our shores with that cargo. Heaven help us, what would our Nation have done had it not been for the bauxite in Arkansas, at home, to make these airplanes that we needed. I have always said the safe thing to do is to get what we must have abroad, if necessary, and at the same time see to it that such are also produced at home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

ANOTHER NEW DEAL HANGOVER

Mr. Chairman, this is another New Deal hangover. These New Deal hangovers will haunt us for years, perhaps generations, to come.

The time was when no man could be elected from the congressional districts of southwestern Missouri, southeastern Kansas, and northeastern Oklahoma, which contain the so-called tri-State lead and zinc mining district, unless he advocated and worked for a high protective tariff on the importation of lead and zinc into this country. Everyone knew that it was absolutely essential if these mines were to operate, that they must be protected against the importation of cheaper ores or metals from abroad.

These operations are very extensive, and yet for the most part they are what we ordinarily designate as marginal operations. Collectively, during World War I these mines produced 40 percent of the zinc that was produced in the United States and some 10.5 percent of the lead, and I am told that similar figures prevailed during World War II. They have produced 26.3 percent of the zinc-lead of this country for the past 40 years. The production of lead and zinc from this area has been almost a lifesaver to this Nation in two wars. It makes one shudder to think what would have been the results if we had not had this production available.

Therefore, the element of national defense plays an unusually important role in the consideration of this bill. The production and the continued production of these ores from this area may determine our national security.

When the New Deal crowd took over, they frowned upon the protective tariff policy and almost destroyed it as an American program. They substituted numerous forms of premium payments and other types of subsidies. Ordinarily, protective tariffs are paid by the ultimate consumers of commodities,

while subsidies are paid out of the Federal Treasury by the taxpayers, regardless of what proportion of the taxpayers may be consumers.

It is my firm conviction, that a national economy built upon subsidies, subsidies to the producers, subsidies to the manufacturers, subsidies to the distributors, and subsidies to the consumers, will bankrupt any nation that pursues such an economy as a permanent program. Therefore, I have always been opposed to subsidy payments as a general or permanent policy. Neither do I like programs based upon expediences and emergencies. We have had entirely too much of that sort of thing during the past 15 years, both at home and abroad.

I have told the people of the tri-State district that I am opposed to any subsidy or premium-paying program that is designed as a permanent policy, and I have insisted that all who are interested in this situation attempt to evolve and suggest a program that will be a permanent solution to the very acute problem that confronts us in this area. Subsidies and premium payments are not the answer. The good people of the tri-State area are working hard to develop a plan that will protect these valuable resources, enable the production of these strategic and critical materials, and the protection of our national security.

In the meantime, the best thinking seems to indicate that the premium-payment plan should be continued temporarily, for 1 or 2 years, until the Small Business Committee of this House can give careful consideration to the entire situation and suggest a permanent program that will be for the best interests of all concerned and not jeopardize our national defense.

I might suggest that perhaps the situation in the tri-State district, in many respects, is the most unique that maintains in any mining district in the country. We have perhaps some six or eight thousand miners, employed in these mines, and in the operations connected with them. For the most part they are native red-blooded Americans of a very sturdy type. The operators generally have come up through the school of hard knocks. Many of the people in this area have lived there most of their lives and are experts in their line of work, but have not had any experience in other types of industry. Since the premium payments were discontinued on July 1, 1947, the unemployment lines have formed and are more extended day by day. The owners and operators of the mines, and the business people in these communities, and the home owners, stand to lose all their life savings.

From the physical standpoint these operations have what is known as the water problem, more emphasized than in most mining areas. There is an abundance of water in the levels at which the ores are found and large pumps must be kept in constant operation to prevent water encroachments and inundation of the workings. It is said that since some of the pumps closed down since July 1, 1947, the water level has risen 20 feet in many of the mines, forcing cessation of operations. If this continues much longer, it is admitted that many of the mines will never be operated again, for it will not be economically feasible for them to be dewatered.

The underground workings are more or less connected in this area. There is a veritable honeycomb and the water from one working may flood all of the others for miles around, after the pumps cease to operate.

Another aspect of the situation which I wish to call to your attention and which I think is worthy of most serious consideration is the fact that the Army engineers have been surveying the Tri-State area with a view to determining the feasibility and possibility of underground industrial installations. Please remember that these mines are located in almost the exact center of the United States. The depth of these workings is on an average of 250 feet below the surface. The formations and the rock in which the ore is found, and immediately above the same, is extremely hard, which will afford perhaps the best bombproof protection for any underground industrial installation in this country. If for no other reason, pending the further investigations and conclusions and recommendations of the Army engineers, these mining operations should be continued and these underground caverns preserved, as of possible invaluable security to our national defense.

Hence, only as a temporary program, and until the Small Business Committee of this House, with the collaboration of the operators of these mines, and of technicians capable of developing a permanent program, and to preserve our national security in the meantime, I shall vote for this bill and the premium payments on lead and zinc which it provides for a period of either 1 or 2 years, to be determined by this Congress.

I sincerely trust that these considerations may impel my colleagues to go along with this program temporarily, with a distinct understanding that it is not to be a permanent program and that the payment of subsidies is not the answer. It must be borne in mind that lead and zinc are among the most critical and most strategic of all metals and that we must have them and continue to produce them, almost regardless of cost of production, for they are not to be had on the open market and from abroad. Our whole economy will suffer if these mines are shut down and their operations discontinued, which will be the inevitable result if this or some similar measure should fail of passage before this Congress adjourns.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I note that a number of times some of the Members have referred to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] because he was honest enough to come in here and say that he owned some stock in some of the copper corporations. He was honest enough and gentleman enough to inform the committee just exactly what he had, so that nobody could cast any reflections against him. It is a wonderful thing to think that we have Members in the House that are so honest and honorable to do a thing like that. I respect him for it. I am glad he owns them. I wish I were so fortunate.

Then I listened to the same gentlemen who criticized and talked about tariffs; they want materials to come into this country free of duty. I wish some of the Members would look at the record they voted for in regard to eliminating tariffs in this country. I want to tell you that that is where it counts with me. If we are going to protect America, we have to protect America in everything, from the farmers, the manufacturers, the laborers, and guard against the improper importation of products which destroy our jobs and industry. It does not make any difference whether it is copper, lead, or zinc or other commodities. I am for the protection of America as to every item that we consider vital to our national welfare, to protect our economy and our high standard of living.

The OPA set the price on copper at 13 cents, but you now come in here under this bill and boost it up to 28 cents. It just does not make sense to me. Take lead. The price of the OPA was about 6½ cents, and now you are boosting it up to 18 cents. The price of zinc was about 6½ cents, and you boost it up to 18 cents. Why, it seems to me that you are a bunch of boosters when you come to boosting these prices so high. And then you talk about trying to bring prices down. It just does not make sense. Then there is this further fact, that you are going to dip into the Treasury of the United States to the tune of $70,000,000 to try to make up this deficit. Where will you get the money?

Now let me tell you this. I am a wool manufacturer when I am back home. Now, if I was a high-cost-wool manufacturer, would it not be a nice thing for me to come in and ask you to pay me a bonus on the things I manufactured, because I could not compete in manufactured things as cheap as somebody else? I have to be on my toes in my business to try to keep ahead of the other manufacturers; that is as it should be. We must take individual initiative, and that is the thing that we want in all industries of this country, whether it is mining or whether it is manufacturing or whether it is farming. People have got to be on their toes today to make things go and make ends meet, and I do not believe in paying any drones by way of a subsidy just to keep their plants in operation. I do not think it is American. I do not think that that is what this country was made great by, by paying drones. But, in the last 10 or 12 years it seems to me that the Government of the United States wants to pay everybody a big salary for not doing anything; for inefficiency. The law of supply and demand should be put in effect here to govern prices and supply. To be sure we have had a shortage after the war of lumber, of building materials, of metals—iron, coal, steel, copper, zinc, lead—so that eventually we will soon meet the demand. Be a little patient but do not pass this legislation.

We have got the people of America so now they think the Government ought to support them and they do not have

to work. You have to get out of that idea and get back to the old process of work, earn and save. Do you fellows know that it takes 10 pennies to make a dime? Do you know that it takes 10 dimes to make a dollar? That is what I was taught in school many years before many of you were born, and it is just as important today to remember that fact.

Why should we pay these subsidies? You are paying subsidies on too many items today. It is about time you stopped, if we are going to keep this country from wrecking itself. These subsidies are the worst thing that has come to America, yet you are trying to put through a bill here for the continuation of a lot of these things that we had during the war. You say we need it because we need to carry on the industry, you say we need it because the War Department wants it. The War Department never made any request for this legislation. You come in and talk as if the war were still on. The war is over. It has been over for 2 years. The President of the United States ought to declare the war over. The Members of Congress ought to know the war is over. Let us get back to sanity, hard work, and trying to economize in the operations of Government. Vote against this legislation.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation because it will serve to provide strategic and critical materials for our national stock piles. As chairman of Subcommittee No. 3 of the Armed Services Committee which is charged with the responsibility of stock-piling strategic metals, I am deeply concerned about the probability of closing the marginal mines of our country if this bill fails to become law.

My utter dislike of subsidies is well known in this House. I do not like this bill, to tell the truth, but I am forced to support it because it will be the only legislation possible of enactment in this session of Congress that will insure the Nation against the closing of the small mines.

As I have stated before, we need the production of marginal mines. Reports of our domestic mineral position that have been issued by the Army and Navy Munitions Board and the Department of Commerce convince me that we must mine whatever marginal ore bodies that are already open and equipped so that this Nation will not lose 1 pound of recoverable metal in our domestic reserves.

This bill, as I read it, will stabilize prices to the mines for all strategic and critical minerals which we need for national defense and security without increasing the prices of those materials for domestic use.

In other words, regardless of a possible drop in copper, lead, or zinc prices, where there will be a loss of the American economy, mines will receive the necessary assistance to put copper, lead, and zinc where it belongs—above the ground. Prices of minerals must drop considerably before any of these marginal mines can be paid the subsidies provided for in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this bill should pass. I shall vote for it.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, we are told that this bill will not increase the price of lead, copper, and zinc to the consumer. While it is true in the first instance that the consumer directly will not pay more, nonetheless the producer does get more. He gets the present price of 21½ cents per pound for copper, a very high price, 18 cents for lead, and 18 cents for zinc, plus the premiums involved in this bill, and the premiums go up to an aggregate of $70,000,000. In the long run, the American taxpayer pays for the increase, just like he pays for the increase on all other products which are subject to a subsidy, such as wool, potatoes, cotton, and so forth. Imposition of subsidies, especially upon copper, zinc, and lead, is quite consistent with a public-be-damned attitude. Consumers are not benefitted. They pay and pay through the nose. The beneficiaries of this bill are the large mine owners.

It is significant to know and to remind the Members of the House that in the production of copper and in the production of zinc there is a byproduct, a very valuable byproduct, called silver. What is our policy as to silver? We pay the domestic producers of silver the outrageous—and I say the word "outrageous" advisedly—90 cents per ounce, when the intrinsic value or the world price of silver is much lower than 90 cents and at one time went down as low as 25 cents an ounce. We are, therefore, paying a double subsidy to the producers of copper and the producers of zinc. We will be paying them the subsidy or premium embodied in the current bill and we also pay them a premium of fully 60 or more cents an ounce on the silver. Beyond that there are attempts in this body and also in the other body to increase the price of silver to the producer of over $1 an ounce—to $1.25 an ounce.

It took herculean strength to prevent a bill being passed in the last session of Congress which would have mulcted the American people at the rate of $1.25 per ounce for silver.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Does the gentleman mean to inform the House that the Treasury of the United States is paying out money for silver?

Mr. CELLER. Of course they are. They issue I O U's. They issue silver certificates. Those silver certificates must be redeemed at some time, and if anyone is so childlike and so naive as to believe that the American people do not pay for that silver, it is just too bad.

Mr. HILL. On the floor of this House in 1942 when we debated this very question that you are talking about today we had proof from the Committee on Appropriations that not a single dime was paid out of the Treasury of the United States for this silver support program that you are talking about. There is not a word of truth in that.

Mr. CELLER. Do not lay any flattering unctions to your soul that the American people must not at some time in the future redeem these certificates. They are I O U's and must be redeemed. If that were not the case, then why do they not take broomsticks or candles or hatchets or any other thing and issue silver certificates for those articles? Further, there is 3,000,000,000 ounces of surplus silver stored at West Point. Much of it can be used as a substitute for copper and for other strategic metals. But you do not allow such substitution. You want us to continue to worship silver as a "sacred cow." Talk about stock-piling. Here is a stock pile of silver. Use it. Let silver take its place as an ordinary metal. Let it compete in the market with other metals.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Does the gentleman believe that this bill includes silver?

Mr. CELLER. No, it does not include silver except in the way that I have indicated—that many of these producers of zinc and the producers of copper already get a subsidy when they produce the silver, and silver is the byproduct of copper and zinc. If they get the subsidy in one direction, I do not think they should get a subsidy in another direction as embodied in this bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman knows that the price of silver used to be about 35 cents per ounce, and then for some reason we passed a law here making it 45 cents an ounce; then, last year they came here and asked for silver to be raised, and they raised the whole business to 92 cents an ounce. The American public has to pay that bill.

Mr. CELLER. Of course, the gentleman has not asked a question, but he has made a speech, and I am grateful to the gentleman for that explanation. Certainly ultimately the American public pays the bill.

Mr. RICH. These silver boys ought to know how the Government is helping their mines, too.

Mr. CELLER. See how the silver people are hoist by their own petard. They got ninety-odd cents for silver. What happened? That attracted silver from all over the world into the New York market, so we are now flooded with silver, and instead of the price remaining at 90 cents, the price in the general market has now gone to 60 cents. Yet the Treasury must under the Silver Purchase Acts pay ninety-odd cents for domestic silver.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Silver was melted and was sent to New York from all over the world, because we raised the price of

domestic silver to 90 cents. That price set the standard price for all silver with some startling results; the coins of India, the coins of Mexico, and the coins of many other countries were actually melted down, because they were not worth intrinsically the price of the coin in their own country. The silver in these coins was worth more in the United States, and so shipload after shipload came into the United States because of the rapacity and selfishness of the silver producers, the copper producers, and the zinc producers who had demanded the 90-cent price. But instead of the price remaining at 90 cents, because of a superabundance of supply the price dropped to 60 cents. It will go still lower. That only shows you that when we try in an artificial way to interfere with the old economic law of supply and demand, we get that very wretched result.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. WELCH. I take it for granted the gentleman has read the bill. Will the gentleman tell the House what this bill has to do with silver?

Mr. CELLER. The bill has a great deal to do with silver, in the sense that the man who produces copper and the man who produces lead, in most instances—not always—in most instances produces silver. He gets the gravy of 90 cents per ounce from the silver. Now you want to give him more gravy with this kind of subsidy.

Of course, we are in very short supply of copper, zinc, and lead. I would want to get more of that supply, but not at the expense of the American taxpayer by subsidy. For example, I mentioned the country India before. At the present time India has locked up in the sterling area bloc pool a balance of $5,000,000. India wants to spend those locked-up dollars in the United States. India is most anxious to buy and sell to and from us. We could easily procure from India the strategic materials like chrome, magnesium, lead, copper, and zinc for the goods India covets from us—autos, radios, refrigerators, machinery, and so forth. The sterling area bloc pool was supposed to be dissolved on the 15th of this month. If England keeps her word, India can use its favorable trade balance in dollars to buy goods from the United States. That would bind India closer to us—encourage trade. We could buy these much needed strategic materials from India, like zinc, copper, and lead. I would rather do it that way than at the expense of the American taxpayer, lining the pockets of some of these miners from the West who have been inordinate in their demands upon this Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has again expired.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I favor the enactment of this measure for a number of reasons. I think its objectives with respect to the development of these industries, and so far as it will encourage research and development necessary to bring new mines into production of copper, lead, and zinc, are very worthy.

I remember when the last war came upon us that the little children of this country gathered aluminum pots and pans and the housewives of this country were induced to give up all of their aluminum cooking utensils. They were led to believe that it was necessary that we might build airplanes. I doubt whether any of that aluminum thus gathered went into the construction of airplanes, but I do know that the airplanes that were produced of aluminum made in this country—much of it made in my district—shortened the war and saved the lives of thousands of American boys. I also know that there is a shortage of copper, zinc, and lead in this country. There is a large zinc mine within 15 miles of my city. Zinc is carried in limestone. To get the zinc the limestone that carries it must be mined in vast quantities, then be crushed, and by a flotation process the ore is separated from the limestone. There is also a large copper mine and plant in Polk County, adjoining my district. We have to have copper in order to transmit our electric current and for many, many other purposes; and we have to have zinc in order that we may produce fencing wire of all kinds and that we may use it for many, many other purposes. We have to have all three of these metals for war. I hope we are not going to have another war, but ominous indications of the possibility of a fighting, shooting war are abundant.

We would be penny-wise and pound-foolish if we failed to provide the $70,000,000 carried in this bill to see that we continue to have an abundance of these three strategic materials. It is just a matter of being a realist.

The average zinc miner's wages are high. It is a dangerous calling. Those men who follow that hazardous calling are not going to accept any smaller wages than they are now getting. This bill will be in effect with respect to the subsidy paid for only 2 years and these subsidies will be payable on the zinc or copper ore and the lead mined within those 2 years. We cannot afford to take chances on this matter.

I want to compliment the able, patriotic members of the committee who have brought this measure before this House at this time. I think it is a public necessity. I think we would be unwise if we voted down this measure, because I know what farmers are paying for fencing wire. I bought two rolls of screen wire the other day. They cost me $70 and I was glad to get them at that. I wanted two rolls of barbed wire, and I had to comb my city of 200,000 with a fine-toothed comb, and I paid a price for those two spools of barbed wire, a price that would have bought half a dozen rolls before the shortage arose. We must have fencing, roofing, buckets, batteries, paint, scores of other utensils and implements. To obtain them we must have lead, zinc, and copper.

If we fail to pass this measure many marginal mines will be shut down, thousands of miners will be thrown out of employment, and there will continue to be a shortage of these vital metals. They are needed in our industrial life, on the farm, in the kitchen, and for the national defense.

We cannot afford to depend on foreign countries for these strategic metals. Lead, zinc, and copper obtained from foreign countries at the cost of shutting down our own mines and throwing American workingmen out of their jobs will be obtained at a cost too great to be paid.

This bill should be passed by this House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that this measure is brought before the House at this time. It means subsidizing the Copper Trust in this country. The next thing, I presume, will be a bill to subsidize the Steel Trust.

Mr. RICH. How about coal?

Mr. RANKIN. I am concentrating on the Steel Trust now, for the simple reason that the steel monopoly is holding back the steel needed to manufacture electric wire.

Let me show you what has developed in the last few years. You are talking about copper for electric wire, transmission lines, and rural power lines. They are not made out of copper, as a rule they are made out of aluminum with a steel core.

Where it takes 16 poles a mile to hold up a copper wire, it takes only about 12 poles a mile to hold up an aluminum wire with a steel core. I know as much about the wiring in the Tennessee Valley as any other man in Congress. You will hardly find a wire there that I know anything about, at least below 110,000 volts, that is not made of aluminum with a steel core.

Today the rural electrification program throughout this country is being slowed down, not for the want of copper, but for the want of steel to make the core for these aluminum wires. A man representing a great aluminum company said a day or two ago that he had been promised about five times as much steel in the next 30 or 40 days as he had been getting. The trouble with copper is that it has a great competitor today, and that is aluminum. Aluminum production is unlimited.

It may astound you when I tell you that an expert from one of the great aluminum companies of this country told me that since they have developed the process of manufacturing aluminum out of clay they have found that from 25 to 40 percent of all the clay in the earth is aluminum, and that there is enough aluminum in the first 10 feet of the earth's surface to cover the ground a foot deep all over the world.

It is the coming material for building construction. That is what is being used today to build these transmission lines, to build these rural power lines. It is aluminum wire with a steel core.

If you start subsidizing the Copper Trust, then next week you may be called upon to subsidize the Steel Trust and to subsidize every other monopoly in the United States.

The best thing we can do is vote this bill down and leave the situation as it is today, serving notice on these great monopolies that we are not going to encourage them by subsidizing their productions.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I have the highest respect for the gentlemen who are are opposing this measure, but I am forced to state frankly some of them have been misinformed, most of them are totally uninformed about this bill. Originally, I opposed this measure myself, when I knew nothing about it, but after much serious study I am convinced that this legislation is not only desirable but also necessary.

I repeat, we have no lead, zinc and copper in our stock pile today, though the last Congress over a year ago passed legislation, reported by the old House Committee on Military Affairs, with authorizations totalling $300,000,000, to create a stock pile. We subsidize wheat, potatoes and other farm products of which we have a surplus. We spent $80,000,000 subsidizing potatoes last year, and recently we destroyed thousands of tons.

Lead, zinc and copper are in a different category. We have an acute shortage of these stragetic and critical materials, not a surplus.

Mr. Chairman, there is not much I can add to what I said a few days ago concerning this legislation. I do hope that the Members will for a few minutes seriously think and analyze with me this premium-price plan, contained in H. R. 1602.

WHAT IS IT?

It is a systematic method of keeping the mining industry of the United States operating under cost conditions which are the highest in the industry's history, many of which have been imposed by governmental action. It was used successfully during the war to get out much needed metal. It is equally essential today for the same reason.

HOW DOES IT OPERATE?

Each mine unable to operate on market prices without additional help submits data on mining conditions and operating costs to a group of impartial experts who after careful scrutiny determine the amount in excess of the market prices necessary to keep such mine in operation. That amount expressed per pound of recoverable metal is the premium. Data has been accumulated on each mining district, and any attempt on the part of any operator to use the plan to take an unfair advantage of the over-all program in any district is promptly rejected; the operator is assigned a premium which is only sufficient to keep the mine operating. Allowances are also made in certain cases, approved by Government technicians, to those needing exploration and/or development premiums. A tabulation of six of the better class lead-zinc mining companies in the Rocky Mountain region shows an average margin before depletion of less than one-half cent per pound of metal for the group as a whole. Profit before depletion was approximately 1.5 percent on May 1, 1947—depreciated—market values of the stocks, and only 5.9 percent of ore values plus premiums.

DOES IT PROMOTE INEFFICIENT OPERATION?

No, in the tri-State area, for example, where the major part of the subsidized metal has been produced during the last few years, production before the plan was placed in operation was at the rate of four rock tons per man shift. Under the plan, efficiency has actually been increased to 10½ tons per man-shift. Like increases in efficiency could be cited in other areas which prove that the contention that this plan promotes inefficient operation is false and is probably made by major low-cost, high-grade mining operators who desire to close down the marginal mines of the Nation knowing full well that by such action one-third of the zinc and one-fourth of the copper and lead production in the United States will be cut off and the price of metals will thereby tend to rise, thus increasing the profits of such low-cost producers who are ineligible to receive premiums and ultimately making them more costly to the consuming public.

WHY HAVE A PREMIUM-PRICE PLAN WHEN THE MARKET PRICE OF COPPER, LEAD, AND ZINC HAS RISEN FROM THE WARTIME CEILING OF 12, 8.25, AND 6.5 CENTS, RESPECTIVELY?

Simply because under present cost conditions for which the industry is not responsible but which nevertheless prevail in the production of metals, the marginal or high-cost producers have received during the war and up to June 30, 1947, as much as 27 cents for copper, 14.75 cents for lead, and 16.5 cents for zinc, and many must continue to receive these prices in order to operate. While these ceilings are provided in the present legislation as the maximum amounts obtainable, the industry today is confronted with even higher costs not only from a production standpoint, but also from a transportation and marketing standpoint. To contend that these producers are advocating legislation which will enable them to get more for their metals than they are at present obtaining is false and untrue. Some large high-grade producers are receiving more for their metal on the open market today than they formerly received and are naturally inclined to want all marginal mines closed.

Premium price does not increase profits; it simply enables the producers to stay in business.

COULD TARIFFS BE ADJUSTED TO MEET DOMESTIC PRODUCERS' REQUIREMENTS?

No, the Eightieth Congress has removed the 4-cent duty on copper to help alleviate the metal shortages and encourage foreign producers to ship in metals produced with foreign labor and under cost conditions which are generally much lower than they are in the United States. In effect, this action by the Eightieth Congress has subsidized foreign producers at the expense of domestic producers and consumers. The fixing of a higher market price for metals without tariff protection has had the same effect. In fact, the premium-price plan is another form of tariff which might be called an internal tariff for the protection of domestic industry.

DO WE NEED METAL FROM MARGINAL MINES AS WELL AS RICH MINES?

Yes. All impartial estimates show that at best under present conditions we will not be able to meet the demands for metals necessary to keep our present day requirements. Estimates vary, but 1,200,000 tons of copper, 1,000,000 tons of zinc, and 1,000,000 tons of lead will certainly be needed this year; whereas, with all our present mines operating, we probably will not be able to produce over three-fourths of our estimated needs.

We will be compelled to import more metal, but in doing so, it should be remembered that there are world-wide shortages, that Europe has been devastated and so have parts of the Far East, and it is also true that metals in ever-increasing quantities are needed in other countries for rehabilitation and new construction projects.

Heavy demands for metals are being made and will be made for new industrial development projects in foreign lands. With all our mines operating, it is doubtful whether stock-piling programs as authorized by Congress can be carried out. Our Government has actually been releasing metals from our stock piles to meet consumer demand and keep domestic manufacturers in business. For example in March 1943, we had 275,000 tons of lead in Government stocks; today we have none.

WILL THIS LEGISLATION DEVELOP OUR NATURAL RESOURCES?

Yes. Our new mines and ore bodies are largely discovered by the small independent miners of America. These men need this legislation in order to develop and bring into production new mines. It is also true that ore begets ore; that all big mines were once small mines.

Operating mines often develop new ore bodies which may not be uncovered if mines are forced to shut down. General disintegration will then take place causing costly losses. America can become a have-not Nation if these marginal mines are shut down. How many new mines in America have those who oppose this legislation brought into production? The answer is, practically none. It is generally their policy to let the more venturesome small independent miners of America discover and explore new mines. Outright purchases may be made and development done by big miners, but we must encourage those who prospect for new mineral deposits. This legislation is antimonopolistic in that it enables free independent American enterprise in the mining industry to survive and gives it a real incentive to develop and produce more metal which America must have to continue to grow and prosper.

IS THIS PLAN NEEDED FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE?

Yes. If these mines are allowed to shut down and become inundated and disintegrated, if crews and working personnel are disbanded, if managerial know-how is scattered, America will be less prepared to meet an emergency than she was in the last war when many American boys lost their lives largely because of metal shortages needed to equip them with proper armament. It involves not only an economic loss to our entire economy to shut down our mines but it is particularly dangerous at this time in view of world-wide conditions. We should not forget that 54 out of 60 ships bringing ore and metal to our shores during the last war were sunk. Can we afford to rely on subsidized foreign production for our safety and security? Is it not possible for these supplies to be shut off almost overnight by foreign governments, especially of the dictator variety? Abandoned American mines cannot be reopened overnight in the event of an emergency.

COST OF PREMIUM PRICE PLAN VERSUS UNEMPLOYMENT COSTS AND TAXES LOST

Estimates show that total taxes which will result from keeping the mines operating and the savings in unemployment payments will more than offset the cost of premium payments required under this plan. Of 488 lead-zinc mines reporting to the United States Bureau of Mines in January 1947, 469, or about 96 percent by number, will require some subsidy payment on lead and zinc, or both, on their 1947 output. Can we afford, in the name of sound economy, to shut these mines down?

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. Is it not a fact that the ability of farmers throughout the entire country to obtain fencing wire and roofing material depends upon the operation of these mines?

Mr. SHORT. Not only roofing material and wire fencing but every staple and nail. Everyone who paints a house depends upon the operation of these mines. Lead goes into paint. Anybody who drives an automobile has to have a battery, and you cannot get batteries today because of the shortage of lead. One could name a hundred other things.

Mr. JENNINGS. Nothing has been said about aluminum. I was forced not long ago to buy aluminum roofing material because I could not get galvanized roofing material and I paid three times as much for that aluminum roofing as I would have had to pay if I had bought the galvanized material.

Mr. SHORT. Every farmer who buys a zinc milk pail is affected by this legislation. Utensils in the kitchen of every housewife are made of these metals. We need this bill to mine these metals.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last six words, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section, and all amendments thereto, close in 15 minutes after the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] has concluded.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. What is considered "this section"?

Mr. WELCH. Section 1. We have not started on section 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am down here again today with somebody else's business. I have no zinc, lead or copper mining in my area, but I do it from the standpoint entirely of directing my remarks to the national defense.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], who just preceded me, has answered the question of whether or not this is a matter of subsidizing certain interests in this country. I do not believe it is in the interest of so-called monopolies, because, if you will review the payment plan used during the war and look at the record of the small mines of this country which contributed so much to our stock piling and to our national defense, you will find that their earnings during that entire period were a net of about 1.9 percent. I feel that if there is any other industry in this country that operated at that kind of a profit, I would like somebody to tell me.

They contributed their part. They were brought into this program by the necessity and urge of the national defense.

I do not like subsidies. I think it is one of the worst policies we can adopt, but when it comes to subsidizing something in the interest of our national defense, I am going to support it.

I am fully convinced, after studying this matter over a period of years, that the only thing to keep these people in an operating status is to at least help them. I happen to know something about the need for the material at the present time. The Army and Navy Munitions Board report to us every 6 months. That report will be here on the 23d of July. It will show to you, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] has told you, that our stock pile is in a very precarious state.

I also happen to serve on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and have just come from a meeting of that committee. I happen to know something of the need for these materials for that work also. That report will be here in a few days, and you can draw your own conclusions.

That is my sole reason in appearing here and speaking and trying to stimulate what interest I can, and trying to help these small marginal mines. If you will study the mining operations, there is a vast difference in the operation of mines. Pockets appear in small pockets in certain mines and that operation is very expensive. There are other pockets that appear in large quantities, and are very easily mined, and the operation becomes less expensive.

To gather this extra material in and to add it to our stock pile in this country is not only important for our national defense but also to the people who use copper, zinc, and lead in the domestic economy. We all know today how difficult it is to secure any of these metals whether we go to the hardware store to buy roofing or any one of the many items into the manufacture of which these metals enter. They have become almost extinct in some parts of the country.

It is true that today we have developed methods in the transmission of electric power that releases us from dependence on copper lines entirely, a process developed for the use of steel. If this process had not been developed we would be in even worse condition today than we are.

We still must have these three metals for use as moderators for heat resistance. So far no other materials have been developed that are better moderators for heat than lead, zinc, and copper. We know what the problem is when we begin to try to develop fission material and we have some knowledge of what the heat-resisting materials have. We all have information that was developed from the Bikini test and other tests and there is much more, of course, we would like to talk about, but under the present set-up it is impossible to do so. I am not throwing that out as a scare at all or anything to be alarmed over, but I think it is necessary that we try to get all this material that we possibly can.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Are the Army and Navy actively supporting this legislation?

Mr. DURHAM. I do not know whether they are or not. This bill, of course, did not come from our committee. If they are not supporting it, I assure the gentleman they should be with the knowledge I have of our stock-pile condition at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, it so happened that I introduced the original amendment providing for premium payments, in the Banking and Currency Committee of which I was then a member. It was adopted by the committee and passed by this body, although my wording was changed somewhat at the other end of the Capitol. The plan was one which saved the taxpayers many millions of dollars during the late war and was proper in wartime; but if I had realized that attempts would be made to continue these programs in time of peace I never would have proposed the amendment.

Subsidies are dangerous medicine. Once beneficiaries get their noses in the trough it is hard to pull them out; and as the gentleman from Nebraska said, when will there be a better time to get back to fundamental American principles than right now at a time of high prices?

I hope the Members on this side of the aisle at least will not swallow, hook, line, and sinker this New Dealish legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and five Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, at the present time the world market on copper, lead, and zinc is at an all-time low so far as supply is concerned. This bill does more than actually support the production of copper in this country. It aids us in holding up the world supply. As a matter of fact, the price of copper would be materially higher than it is now if it were not for the premium-price plan. If you take away the premium-price production mines in this country you would materially jump the price of copper because the supply would be very much lower.

This is not a bill that has been sponsored by the Copper Trust, as some here would tell you; it is a bill to help the little man. In my State, for instance, it is the small or marginal miner who draws the subsidy. I can think of only one copper mine of any size at all that is drawing any premium in Arizona.

The price of copper on the world market now will go to at least 24 or 26 cents or maybe to 30 cents if the American producers do not hold it in check by abundant production. Therefore, this premium-price plan will save the consumers and taxpayers more than the cost of the premiums. It will save the American taxpayers money by holding the price of copper down. Every family in this country is affected by the price of copper because every family buys something that is produced from copper. I am more familiar with copper than I am with zinc and lead because our State produces so much of it. I bring that out because I want you to know the facts behind this matter.

This bill will not only bring about the production of more copper but it will hold the price down. We have many small mines that will close if this bill should fail to pass. If these mines close they will never open up again and ultimately we will not be able to have a stock pile of copper for the armed forces. Therefore, it is more than merely a price matter. It is a protection matter for the defense of our country.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that this bill be passed for our defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be for this legislation, but I cannot. I would like to assure that our Army and Navy do get stock piles of materials of which we were short during the past war, and which will be essential if we are unfortunate enough to get into war again. I would like to build up our stock piles of these materials, and if this bill gave any assurance whatever that the Army and the Navy would get 1 pound of strategic materials it otherwise would not get, I could support this proposed law.

But it does not do that. It does not assure the accumulation of any of these strategic materials as a part of our stock pile of strategic materials. I believe that the military and naval authorities do not want the bill amended to contain a proviso that the copper, lead, and zinc from those mines, which would receive a benefit under this bill, should go to the Army and Navy for a stock pile. I wish they would agree to that, and under such circumstances I believe that the bill could be supported much more strongly than it will be supported as it is now.

Basically, all that I can see in this bill is an attempt by fine men, representing their congressional districts well, men who are here seeking to have us pass legislation to help the wartime producers within their congressional districts. They seek to help a few from their districts whose war-time operations cannot compete in a peacetime economy. In my district and in your districts, wherever it may be in this country of ours, there were many, many industries which were operated during wartime that cannot be operated today. We have not brought bills in here urging that those industries, essential though they be during the wartime, be subsidized today in order to keep them going, and yet that is what this bill does. It selects a part of one industry, if you please, and it provides funds from the Federal Treasury which will keep those marginal industries operating during peacetime, at the very time when there are no trade restrictions upon importations of these materials. There are ample supplies in the world. They can come into our country today, substantially free of any limitations, and so long as the copper, lead, and zinc remain in our soil, they are an asset; they can be secured at any time necessary during war. They are being conserved. Consequently I think this Congress would make a sad mistake if we adopt and enlarge upon a policy of providing subsidies to maintain an industry which, while essential during wartime, should be allowed to produce in great excess today. Rather, we should encourage the importation of these materials today and allow the price level amply high to provide the impetus for supply and demand, that system of free enterprise in which we all believe.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Does the gentleman know that it would take from 3 to 5 years to get any metal production in this country at all after you close down the mines?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman knows that these mines were reopened during the war in far less time than 3 to 5 years. The gentleman knows it will be many years until they are in such condition that they cannot be reopened, and I repeat, so long as copper remains in the soil here it is being conserved and is available whenever conditions require that it be produced.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. May I say that in my State two mines have recently reopened that have not produced since the Revolutionary War.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say that I am supporting this bill for two reasons only. One is that we ran along here for some 7 or 8 years under the plans which brought into operation the international agreements which we became a party to, then there there came the Truman doctrine of March 11, and then on June 5 that doctrine was declared obsolete: We now have the Marshall plan. God only knows what our commitments are throughout the world today. Certainly we are moving directly across the path of Russia and toward war as fast as countries can move when they make some pretense of keeping out of war.

As far as I am concerned, I am not knowingly going to support a program which closes down lead, zinc, and copper mines in the United States. I am not going to support a program which at this time prohibits our people from bringing into this country from other parts of the world those strategic minerals which we so badly need; I want the imports to come in and I want the production to go ahead without any interference whatsoever, as strictly a national defense proposition to give us needed minerals for domestic use and defense stock-piling.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Does it make common sense for us to send money to European countries to explore and develop mines and deny our own mines the same thing?

Mr. CRAWFORD. It certainly does not. Here is the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development that has just floated a $250,000,000 debenture issue in this country, and our people are buying them for the specific purpose of doing what the gentleman from Illinois just said. We propose under that mechanism alone to send out of this country literally billions of dollars to expand and develop the national resources of the other parts of the world, and here we have those who propose at the same time to close down copper, lead, and zinc mines in the United States. If that is not a silly performance, I wish somebody would write me a formula for one.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York, and I disagree with him entirely in his advocacy here today.

Mr. BUCK. Would the gentleman suggest subsidizing the iron mines and the steel industry?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I suggest subsidizing anything in this country that in this

troubled hour puts us in a defense position. I do not care what it is, because we have had some experiences along this line the last few years, but only provided it is necessary. If there is no necessity for the assistance, it should not be given.

I do not advocate throwing money away. I never did it and I am not going to start now. But if for national defense it is necessary to do what we here advocate, then let us go ahead and do the job. Certainly it is necessary for us to do something, with these obligations we are assuming today under the various commitments we are making almost every day.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Why is it that some Members of this body are so anxious to take care of foreign producers, but when it comes to domestic producers they are all against it?

Mr. CRAWFORD. There are three tremendous companies operating in the world that primarily control 75 to 80 percent of all the copper produced in the world, and we have actual warning that those companies should be investigated under the 600-page report recently released by the Federal Trade Commission. I have had a resolution in here calling for that investigation to find out who is controlling this mineral production and these prices. If this Congress wanted to do its job properly, we would look into that matter and get at the very bottom of this thing. That is what we should do along with this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, it has been said here today that many Members are ably representing their districts, and they are. I come from an agricultural district. There is not a mine in it. I have spent 9 years here in Congress studying this subject, and I have come out thoroughly convinced that there is one interest in this Nation a little higher than one's district, and that is our national defense.

I heard the charge made here a while ago that there is a lot of flag-waving in bringing in the subject of national defense when we talk about this bill. If that is what I am doing now, I will be mighty glad and mighty proud to wave the flag.

The chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs last year [Mr. DURHAM] has spoken to you about some of our experience in this field, some of the scares we had. We worked together in developing Public Law 520 in the last Congress, and we placed in there one provision that I regret is in there because it has done things to our stock pile. We put in there the provision that these purchases shall be made, as far as practicable, from supplies of materials in excess of current industrial demand. In spite of our asking originally for a $1,800,000,000 authorization for stock piles of strategic minerals, and later cutting that down to an open authorization and asking for a very humble appropriation of $300,000,000, the Government officials having charge of the program have not acquired anything because private industry has taken all of our stock-pile resources, and we now have practically nothing in our military stock pile.

What would happen if we had another Pearl Harbor today? I lived through the hazards of unpreparedness in World Wars I and II all too dramatically. I know what it means to send our sons out on the battlefield without adequate training because of the shortage of ammunition. I think we will have to find the right answer in the years ahead even more than we do now.

We have a new field of development in defense requiring even greater supplies of many metals. We must face the challenge of future crises without the delay necessary to develop and expand our mineral resources. I heard the statement made awhile ago that they no longer needed copper in the REA. I have not forgotten the Arkansas-Louisiana investigation of the Committee on Military Affairs into charges that they were hoarding copper down there. I was on that investigating committee. I know that REA was mighty hungry for copper and we desperately needed all available copper for ammunition manufacture. I was a friend of the REA, but I took them to task on that. Except for the Arkansas-Louisiana case, REA cooperated with the war program magnificently.

In the consideration of this bill let us keep our feet on the ground and keep the idea of adequate national defense uppermost in our minds. When we exhaust our domestic stock piles of critical and strategic materials we have no military stock piles, and that is the relationship of this bill to the field of national defense. I mean to stand by and support adequate national defense first, last, and always.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) That the premium price plan for copper, lead, and zinc is hereby extended for a term of 2 years from June 30, 1947, in accordance with the provisions of this act.

(b) Understanding any other provision of law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make subsidy payments for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1948, and June 30, 1949, with respect to copper, lead, and zinc, in the form of premium payments not to exceed in the aggregate $70,000,000 and not to exceed $35,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948: *Provided*, That (A) such premiums shall be paid on ores mined or removed from mine dumps or tailing piles subsequent to June 30, 1947, and before July 1, 1949, though shipped and/or processed and marketed subsequently thereto; that (B) the premium price plan for copper, lead, and zinc shall be extended until June 30, 1949, and (i) adjustments shall be made to encourage exploration and development work, (ii) premium payments for any particular metal contained in an ore shall be in addition to the amount received per unit by the producer of the metal, but no payment shall be made to a producer when the market price plus such payment would exceed the limits of the plan in effect June 30, 1947, which maximum limits shall not be reduced unless necessary in order to make individual adjustments of income to specific mines, and may be exceeded only when the Director shall determine special consideration is necessary for the stimulation of exploration of particular projects.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Page 7, line 5, after the first comma, insert "Manganese" and, in line 11, after the word "thereto", insert "*Provided*, That with respect to manganese ore (1) no payment shall be made to a producer when the base market price plus such payment would exceed $1 per unit (22.4 pounds) of contained metallic manganese, (2) payments shall be made only on marketable ores or concentrates containing in excess of 35-percent metallic manganese."

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PLOESER: Page 6, line 22, strike out sections 2, 3, and 4 of the committee amendment, and insert: "That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, payments may be made by the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to operations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, in the form of premium price payments for copper, lead, and zinc: *Provided*, That such payments shall not exceed, in the aggregate, $40,000,000: *Provided further*, That premiums shall be paid on ores mined before July 1, 1948, though shipped and/or processed and marketed subsequently thereto: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of Commerce shall continue the premium price plan for copper, lead, and zinc in force on June 30, 1947, through June 30, 1948, on terms not less favorable to the producer than heretofore and (a) adjustments shall continue to be made to encourage exploration and development work, (b) adequate allowances shall continue to be made for depreciation and depletion, and (c) all classes of premiums shall be noncancelable unless necessary in order to make individual adjustments of income to specific mines."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the portion of the committee amendment which the gentleman seeks to amend has already been amended, and that since we are considering a committee amendment and it has already been amended, this would be an amendment in the third degree.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HOWELL). The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order.

The Chair is constrained to rule that the Committee is considering a committee amendment as an original bill, under a special rule. Therefore, the Chair overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, first let me say that I propose to support this bill. I say that although whenever I support any sort of a subsidy I do it reluctantly and only because I think the situation is such that there is no other immediate solution for it.

The amendment which I propose does this: It changes the length of the subsidy-paying period to 1 year. It further pays the subsidies directly out of the Treasury, and it continues the present method of handling premium payments in the Department of Commerce.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. If the gentleman's amendment is adopted it will require an appropriation of $40,000,000 to make funds available so that the Department of Commerce can pay the premiums.

Mr. PLOESER. That is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. So that if the appropriation is not made at this session of Congress, until such appropriation is made the bill would be totally ineffective.

Mr. PLOESER. Well, there is no reason why an appropriation cannot be made at this session of Congress, and I am so informed by those in charge of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I refuse to yield until I finish my statement, and then I will be glad to yield.

The reason for removing this from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and putting it directly in the Treasury is this: Within the last few weeks this Congress has cleaned up the RFC and taken from it all of its activities in the field of subsidy or premium payments. We have just completed the arduous task, for which the Banking and Currency Committee of this House should be highly complimented, of cleaning up the RFC and getting it back into a banking institution for extremely necessary loans which would not be made by ordinary banking institutions.

Now, here we come muddying up the RFC and putting premium payments right back in the place where we almost unanimously said we would not do it again. Now, it does not defeat this plan at all to pay it directly out of the Treasury. I believe it is the proper way to do it.

Either method requires an appropriation.

Three months ago, people representing the small mining interests of this Nation came to the Small Business Committee of this House and asked us to make a study of the condition of their industry. Under the very able chairmanship of the gentleman from Colorado, [Mr. HILL], as chairman of the subcommittee handling this particular subject, small mines and the industry are under study. It has been under way for 3 months and will continue until we have learned something worth while about what may be done to encourage prospecting and the development of new mines, and also discourage the monopoly control that apparently exists in certain branches of the mining industry. Because of the imminence of the expiration of the premium price program on June 30, our committee unanimously made an interim report in which we recommended that two steps be taken. We confessed in that report that our studies were not complete; neither had we found any other place in Government where a comprehensive study had been made of the situation.

We do not like subsidy programs, but at the same time we were perfectly willing to advocate one for another year until such time as studies could be completed. So we advocated two steps to be taken: First, the introduction of a bill, which was done by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL], doing exactly what I am doing in this amendment. In fact, the amendment I have offered is the Hill bill; and, second, amending the Critical Materials Stock Piling Act to authorize the Army and Navy Munitions Board to make contracts for the purpose of stock piling critical materials directly with marginal mines. It is true, whether the statement should have been made public or not, it has been made heretofore in these debates that we do not have any stock piles of copper, lead, and zinc, but it is further true that this bill—and I repeat that I am for it—this bill does not provide one ounce of either copper, lead, or zinc for any stock pile. It does enable the production at our present rate to continue, and by doing so it does a very vital thing in national defense in that it continues the operation of mines which, if closed down, may never again be reopened. So the bill does have a relationship to national defense in that it continues the operation of certain marginal mines which one day may be very vital to national defense.

As for a contribution to the stock pile, it makes no contribution whatsoever. The other legislation which was introduced and which has already been heard by a subcommittee of the Committee on the Armed Services would make a direct contribution to the stock piling by allowing the Army and Navy Munitions Board to make direct contracts with marginal mines for the purpose of stock piling.

A lot has been said about the attitude of the Army and the Navy. I personally believe that their attitude has been extremely narrow. In accordance with their interpretation of the Critical Materials Stock Piling Act they are planning a program of buying almost 100 percent foreign. I for one am in agreement with foreign buying, and I am in agreement with certain foreign buying for the purpose of stock piling, but there is not any man living who can tell us how much material we are going to need for the next war. There will be no one who will ever know prior to the war whether we have acquired sufficient amounts as a result of foreign purchasing to build a great enough stock pile. So regardless of foreign purchasing, it is absolutely essential that every reasonable marginal critical-material mine in America be kept in operation.

So I submit the idea of a subsidy, reluctant as I am to support subsidies, for 1 year until we can have a greater knowledge of the subject; and I furthermore am pursuing the course of trying my best to get to the floor for your consideration before adjournment this amendment to the Stock Piling Act which would permit the Army and Navy Munitions Board to make direct contracts with marginal mines.

I may say in passing that among experts in mines there is difference of opinion as to whether this should be for 1 or 2 years. So far as I personally am concerned it makes little difference. I say it should be long enough to allow us to know more about the subject; and that, of course, is a minimum of 1 year. But they are all generally agreed that an amendment to the Stock Piling Act is of importance not only to the national defense but also to the maintenance of these reasonable marginal mines; and the chairman of the Industry Advisory Committee to the Army and Navy Munitions Board has so advised that Board, whereupon they immediately recommended against it.

I am carrying out in this amendment that which was unanimously adopted by my Committee on Small Business at an interim point in our studies. Now, I do not propose or claim to know anything about the mining industry except that which has been revealed to our committee. I say here that their studies have been intelligent and the subcommittee has done a good job up until this time. They are pursuing the subject until this House, this Congress, and the Army and Navy too, if you please, can have a more intelligent report on the over-all situation concerning strategic materials and marginal mining than we have had up to this time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I am happy to know now at this minute that the gentleman is for this bill.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman, of course, has known it for months. As a matter of fact I have urged the gentleman for action many weeks ago.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I have not known that for months.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I had occasion to examine the gentleman's amendment which is at the desk and it concerns part of the bill which has been amended by my amendment. I wonder if the gentleman would agree that the issue is between whether or not manganese should be included in this bill and whether or not he would ask unanimous consent to modify his amendment by inserting manganese at the proper place with lead and zinc?

Mr. PLOESER. Personally, I have no objection, except I know no more about manganese than I do about most things in this world. I do not think I am sufficiently informed that I can say yes or no.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Maybe I can make a suggestion that will be helpful to the gentleman. When the Military

Affairs Committee of the House was considering the question of strategic materials, Col. C. T. Harris, testifying for the War Department, said:

> Naturally some materials have a higher importance and are more difficult to obtain than others. I place manganese at the top of the list. * * * There is no substitute for manganese. Without manganese the steel industry would produce a very inferior quality of steel and there is no substitute.

During the war our consumption of manganese went from 800,000 tons to 1,300,000 tons. After the premium price plan was discontinued our domestic production dropped from 241,000 tons to 140,000 tons. There were 56 producers out in California, for example, which went down to 10 after the premium price was discontinued. We are now dependent on sources of supply that are 4,000 miles away—Russia, Africa, India, and Brazil. That is the importance of it, I may say to the gentleman. Manganese is one item that is important to the national defense above all others, under the testimony of the War Department.

Mr. PLOESER. May I answer the gentleman?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Surely.

Mr. PLOESER. I always dislike holding myself out as an expert on a subject with which I am not too familiar and am not expert. I have no objection to the gentleman's amendment. But let me say that the recommendation he brings here does not answer the question as to whether this makes a contribution to the stock pile. The gentleman knows this bill does not. Furthermore, the gentleman knows, if he is going to take the testimony purely as a matter of fact that comes from the Army and Navy Munitions Board, he would not support this bill, because it was indicated, and even the new Secretary of War has indicated opposition to this proposition. All of those gentlemen speak as experts, including the gentleman from South Dakota, but I am not. I am just a Member of Congress.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the gentleman will permit, this definitely will add to the stock pile for national defense, because it will encourage development of our domestic deposits. In my State alone there is one deposit of manganese which could meet all demands for a thousand years, if properly developed. I asked the gentleman whether or not he would make the two sections of the bill conform so the vote on his amendment would be solely on the issue he has raised. In order to produce steel in this country you need manganese. You cannot make steel without having manganese.

Mr. PLOESER. I understand the essential character of manganese.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the gentleman wants the issue on his amendment to be voted on, and properly, before the House, he ought to include manganese, because it is already included in the body of the bill he is seeking to strike out.

Mr. PLOESER. If it will make the gentleman from South Dakota, who is obviously an expert on the subject, feel any better, I have no objection to the inclusion of it, and he may ask unanimous consent to do so. The gentleman may ask unanimous consent, but I still propose my amendment. I wish he would make his request first.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am asking the gentleman—it is his amendment—if he will not make the request himself to modify his own amendment.

Mr. PLOESER. I will not object to the gentleman making the request to modify it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. With that understanding, I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I have talked to many members of the Committee on Appropriations, including the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], and they say it is very unlikely that if this is taken out of the RFC, there will be an opportunity for the Committee on Appropriations to do anything about it. Now, it is important that we do it promptly in order to get to the Senate, and the best move that the gentleman can pursue to kill this bill is to do just what he has been doing by making it necessary that we go to the Committee on Appropriations here in the late days of the session asking for funds, and then going over to the Senate. So again I say if the gentleman wants to kill this bill in its entirety, there is nothing better he can do than to offer this amendment.

Mr. PLOESER. Is the gentleman saying that I am trying to kill this bill?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Not purposely.

Mr. PLOESER. Answer me.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is the result of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. PLOESER. Is the gentleman inferring that I am trying to kill this bill?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Intentionally, no.

Mr. PLOESER. All right.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. But I am inferring that what the gentleman is doing will kill the bill.

Mr. PLOESER. Of course, I do not concur with the gentleman, because I have also talked to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and he said that if this bill becomes law there is still a deficiency bill to go through in which it can be included.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. How about the Senate?

Mr. PLOESER. I guess I should not say what else he said, but he expressed disapproval of subsidies, which is his privilege.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I have a statement in which the gentleman says that it is unlikely that it will pass the Senate at this late date.

Mr. PLOESER. That I said that?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. PLOESER. No; I have not said that.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The Wall Street Journal quotes the gentleman as saying that.

Mr. PLOESER. Well, the Wall Street Journal may be the mouthpiece of some others, but not mine. Why does not the gentleman explain that an appropriation is necessary in the gentleman's bill? It is.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE of California. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the Army and Navy Munitions Board is now empowered under the Stockpiling Act to make contracts with producers, and is it not a fact that the law specifically directs the Army and Navy Munitions Board to buy American wherever possible, and is a preferential right to domestic production?

Mr. PLOESER. The law also says that it should not interrupt the domestic supply, and the domestic supply now is short. The latest bids of the Army and Navy Munitions Board have been at prices under the market which, of course, means that they will not get any material; which, of course, means that they buy foreign. There are some incongruities.

Let me further say to my friend the gentleman from Illinois, it is not quite fair to make the implication that I am not supporting the bill.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I cannot read the gentleman's mind what he is trying to do.

Mr. PLOESER. If the gentleman will let me continue until I yield to him, the Russell bill has been laying on the Speakers' desk for some time, quite some time, and the gentleman is the chairman of the Committee on Rules, and under the rules of this House could have called it up long ago. Now comes the Allen bill with an amendment which changes the Russell bill. I am happy for the change. But, anyone who was overly ambitious to get this done early, so there would be ample time for appropriations, had weeks to do so. In fact, I have urged the gentleman to act. The recommendation of the House Small Business Committee was prepared and many bills were introduced immediately upon the publication of that recommendation. That was on June 25. So, we have been aggressively pursuing the policy for almost 1 month.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. RUSSELL. The bill the gentleman referred to, H. R. 2415, the Russell bill, was reported out of the Committee on Rules and did not come up on the floor of this House.

Mr. PLOESER. That is right. Because the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] did not call it up.

Mr. RUSSELL. The reason it did not come up on the floor of this House was the fact that it was opposed by the Department of the Interior and also some phases of the bill by several other departments and therefore, with my consent, this other measure was worked out in cooperation with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. PLOESER. I think the gentleman has suddenly done remarkably well. You

do not seem to be concerned about departmental support of this bill. It is a big improvement on the Russell bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri may be modified by inserting the word "manganese" after the comma following the word "lead" where it appears in his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to become involved in this friendly controversy between two very good friends of mine. I think it is obvious, however, that the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri is going to complicate the issue before the House at this time. I share the opinion of my colleague from Illinois that the gentleman from Missouri is not trying to defeat the bill. I feel satisfied he is for this legislation, but I am also convinced his amendment is causing some confusion, as there appears to be an honest difference of opinion concerning the practical effects of this amendment, if adopted.

This bill continues the premium-price payment plan adopted during the war in order to insure an adequate supply of copper, lead, and zinc. The legislation authorizing this plan expired on June 30. The purpose of this legislation is to extend this premium-price plan for another 2 years. This is a simple extension and nothing more. This bill is quite different from the Russell bill which was reported out of the Committee on Rules some time ago. That measure provided for a new and rather complicated system of providing for these premium-price payments for the production of certain metals. That bill is not before us today. I think that the closer we stay to the simple extension of the present plan the clearer the issues are going to be before the House during the debate this afternoon.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman, of course, recalls that last year this premium-price plan expired and it was extended for 1 year. The unfortunate circumstance is that no one in this Congress made any effort to make a study of this situation as it affected these marginal mines so that we might have an intelligent report before the Congress this year. Are we going to continue in that vein, never learning, always subsidizing?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I am just as much opposed to subsidies as is the gentleman, but I am sure he does not propose the suspension without notice of the premium-price plan which was in operation up until June 30. I feel certain the gentleman does not advocate that such action be taken.

Mr. PLOESER. If I did advocate it, I certainly would not have recommended the program be extended for 1 year.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The gentleman has referred to the time limit which is another objection to his amendment. The committee bill extends the present plan for 2 years. The gentleman for some reason limits the extension to 1 year. You will recall that the Steagall amendment, providing a price-support plan for certain agricultural commodities, runs for another 2 years. I believe those engaged in the production of metals should be entitled to the same consideration as those who produce agricultural products, and that is what we are trying to do in this legislation before us today.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does not the gentleman from Colorado agree with me that 1 year would not be ample time to go in and develop new sources of minerals that are in the ground? What this bill is aimed at is not only taking out the marginal ores but going into the ground and developing new grade sources that will bring material out to this Nation at this time when we need it very critically.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution. I think sometimes in discussing metals we forget that there are some very important and essential steps which must be taken before we have metals of any kind. First is exploration. We must explore for metals, and that is a rather costly process. These minerals must be located before they can be mined. This requires the skill of practical miners and capable mining engineers. It is a slow and tedious process. A great deal of money is spent and lost in looking for new deposits of metals. Then, after they are found, we must have development, which requires even larger investments of capital.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE of California. If the amendment proposed is adopted, what possibility is there of a miner going out and undertaking exploration work and development work which might take a period of 4 or 6 or 8 months?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I would say there would be very little possibility that such work would be done.

Mr. ENGLE of California. He would not be inclined to do that, would he?

Mr. CHENOWETH. No; I think not.

Mr. ENGLE of California. That is because he would have perhaps 3 or 4 months under the premium-price program whereas if this 2-year program goes through, he will have 6 months or 8 months of the first year to do his development work, and then he can rely upon having an additional year in which to operate under the premium-price program.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I appreciate the contribution made by the gentleman, and he has called attention to another reason why the amendment should be defeated.

The plan which the committee has presented to you provides for a simple extension for a period of 2 years. If the amendment is adopted providing for a 1-year extension, the miner will not do the exploration work which the gentleman from California refers to. If the extension is merely for 1 year, those now depending on the premium-price plan to continue their operations will have to take necessary steps to close their mines on June 30, 1948. This will be the practical effect of the amendment now under consideration.

It is only after exploration and development are completed that production is possible. In other words a large amount of money must me spent before any ore is mined.

The miners of the West have been referred to as a greedy group. These accusations are made by those who have no knowledge of mining conditions. Those who are willing to risk their time and money to locate and produce these metals which are in such short supply should have our full support. We must have a strong domestic mining industry in this country. This was brought to our attention most forcibly during the recent war. Let us encourage our miners to continue to produce all of the metals possible.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, Public Law 520 of the Seventy-ninth Congress is the law which authorizes the acquisition of stocks of critical and strategic materials. It should be perfectly clear that the Army and Navy Munitions Board charged with the responsibility of acquiring critical and strategic materials under the terms of this law may only acquire domestically produced materials under the language of the law, "in excess of current industrial demand." The industrial demand has at all times exceeded the production all along the line and, therefore, under the very terms of the act which it was contemplated would permit the Army and Navy to stock pile critical and strategic materials, they have not been able to do so.

The gentleman from Missouri says, and very properly so, that this provision of the law should be amended so as to permit the acquisition by the Army and Navy Munitions Board of stock piles at least of those materials which are produced as a result of the application of the premium payment plan.

I hope that legislation is adopted.

Let me say to you, my friends, that we are faced now with a critical situation. I have no zinc mines or any other mines in my district, and I do not own stock in any such mine and have no personal interest whatsoever in them, but like my friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], I do have a consuming interest in seeing that the national defense is protected and provided for. How are you going to do it—with a complete shortage of stock piles of copper, lead, and zinc, and manganese? How are you

going to do it? These marginal, high-cost producing mines produced a substantial amount of copper, lead, and zinc, that was produced during the war. They did it only because they were given assistance by the United States Government in the form of premium payments.

Now, there are people who stand here and say, "Oh, that was all right during the wartime, but this is peacetime." Why, gentleman, they cry, "Peace, peace," but there is no peace. We are still fighting this war. There is no peace in the world. No one can tell from day to day what tomorrow will bring forth requiring the utilization for the War and Navy Departments of critical and strategic materials. Let us not have such a short-sighted policy.

Down in the southwest corner of my State are some zinc mines. I have received telegrams from the operators of those small mines that they are all closed down now, and have been since the 1st of July. And they will remain closed down. They will continue to pump those mines and keep the water out at their own expense, hoping against hope that this bill will be passed, which will enable them to continue the operation. I say to you, if they do not get relief, those mines will close and they will be closed permanently; and they will be closed permanently all over this country. As a result we are going to lose for the War Department and the Navy Department and for the consumers of America a vast production from these small mines throughout the United States.

I want to address myself for just a moment to the amendment offered by my good friend from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]. I know what he is trying to do and I am in accord with it. I was hopeful that some way could be worked out by which we could relieve the RFC from having anything more to do with premium payments, and we thought we did that. Now, here is an emergent condition. How are we going to make it possible to get those mines back into operation and provide these premium payments? If this bill passes the House, then it has to be passed by the other body. Having passed the other body, it has to be signed by the President. This is Tuesday. The House says it is going to adjourn by Saturday of this week. After it becomes law there must be a budget estimate submitted to provide $40,000,000 under the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]. That budget estimate has to go to the Appropriations Committee. Then it has to be scanned again, and there has to be an item of $40,000,000 inserted in the final deficiency bill. I know the hurdles that have to be passed in appropriation machinery.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. I happen to be a member of the Appropriations Committee, and therefore I think I can speak with some knowledge of the situation. I regret that the very mechanics of the situation, in my humble opinion, while I realize these things can be put through very rapidly, in view of the opposition that has developed on the floor to this legislation, I certainly doubt whether the appropriation could be put through before adjournment, in order to implement this program and permit these mines to continue operation. If they wait until next January the whole thing is going to fade out of the picture. Now, that is what it means.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. It is true that it is the common custom that we wait for a budget estimate, but there is nothing in the world to prevent this Congress from initiating its own appropriation. We do not need to wait for a budget estimate.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, that is very true, but the opposition could reflect itself in the Appropriations Committee just as well as on the floor, and the demand could come up, "There is no budget estimate for this." I can see what is in the offing in regard to this matter.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman says he does not impugn my motives.

Mr. KEEFE. Oh, certainly, I do not. I have the highest regard for the gentleman. I have talked to the gentleman about this and I think his amendment is sound. We are confronted, however, with a very critical and emergent situation. If we were back a month ago I would be wholeheartedly with the amendment, but here we are faced with a termination date and adjournment in 4 days.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. I want to say that back a month ago I called to the attention of the author of this bill the fact that an error had been made about the RFC, and there was plenty of opportunity to change it before it was ever reported out of committee.

Mr. KEEFE. I may say to my friend that that is water over the dam. We are faced with the realities of the situation. It was not changed, and the change is proposed to be effectuated on the floor this afternoon. If it is so effectuated it means that this bill is dead and that the relief that is expected for these high-cost marginal operators of copper, lead, and zinc will not be forthcoming and they will be closed down, and most of them will stay closed down permanently, and you are going to lose that production.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I notice in line 2 on page 7 of the bill that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make subsidy payments; and then in section 5 there is the language:

> There is hereby authorized to be appropriated sums sufficient to carry out the provisions of this act.

Where does the Reconstruction Finance Corporation get the money to make subsidy payments except by an appropriation under the provisions of this act?

Mr. KEEFE. I presume there is a very sound reason for the gentleman's question in view of what has happened recently on the floor of the House during the adoption of the bill that was referred to by my friend from Missouri. I am frank to say I do not know. I assume it would require some examination of existing law to determine whether or not in view of the attitude taken when we passed the appropriation bill for Government corporations, and when we passed the bill that came out of the gentleman's Committee on Banking and Currency, whether or not there would still be available to the RFC the right and the ability to make these payments out of its own funds or from its own borrowing capacity. If it does not do so then we come to the same conclusion; but I assume that the people who drafted this bill had that fact in mind.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. This bill was introduced in one fashion. On July 1 it was reported out of committee with this amendment which changed the entire form of the bill, continued the premium-price plan for 2 years instead of setting up a new bureaucracy to finance a new price plan. When that came to my attention the RFC situation was called to the attention of the advocates of this bill, the author of this bill. The matter the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has called to the attention of this Committee now is proof that probably there has not been too much thinking in the drafting of this bill. I do not know. I have tried to introduce an amendment to clear the thing up and make it workable; but I do not care, I own no mining stock in this world, I have no mines in my district. I do, however, have a very deep interest in the maintenance of these small mines, because they are small business and they are essential to the economy of this country; but they have been kicked around for the last few weeks and it is time somebody gave them something akin to workable legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. I may say to the gentleman from Missouri that that argument may be perfectly sound but it does not touch the situation that confronts the Congress this afternoon.

If the gentleman's contention is correct, and the contention of the gentleman from Michigan is correct, this bill

is no bettter than a smelt even though you pass it because there will not be any money available. Do you think for one minute that even if his amendment is adopted and goes into this bill that you can get a deficiency appropriation of $40,000,000 prior to adjournment? I cannot see any possibility of it, and I admire the optimism of my friend as to the facility with which appropriations can get through; but as one member of the committee, and I happen to be a member of the Deficiency Subcommittee, I cannot see any possibility. So you are face to face with this situation: If you take the position assumed by the gentleman from Michigan that there is no authority in existing law for the RFC to provide the funds, then if you pass the bill it will be an innocuous piece of legislation. If you adopt the amendment it will still be an innocuous piece of legislation because there will not be any money to implement it. So it seems to me that we better take a chance and pass the bill in the language in which it has been submitted by the committee that, I assume at least, under the leadership of the gentleman from California has given some study to this proposition and I assume that the sponsors of this bill have not been so woefully ignorant and so woefully unprepared as would seem to be the case by the innuendos contained in the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri. If the bill is changed in its legalistic aspects, as my friend would try to have it changed, then it is as dead as a smelt because I cannot see where it would possibly get through the other body.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me if we change the time of this bill here on the floor this afternoon, in the closing hours of the first session of the Eightieth Congress, we do kiss the bill good-by and it is out for good. I am convinced that if you are a friend of the mining industry of the United States, if you believe in developing the great resources of this Nation of ours, that have not been scratched, then you must vote against this amendment in its entirety.

Mr. Chairman, I am not one of these folks who stick their head in the sand and go up and down this broad land of ours telling the people that we are the greatest have-not nation in all the world. That is about the silliest propaganda that the gentleman now addressing you has ever heard.

Let me give you a few illustrations, and if I had the time I could talk 15 minutes, showing the great opportunities and the great resources that have not been scratched as yet, not touched as yet. We come before you this afternoon asking only one little thing; that is, continue this program that we started in the war for 2 years. We ask you to leave it exactly where it is. Where is the sound argument in opposition?

I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin, who is a member of the Appropriations Committee and who knows full well that in the waning hours of the Eightieth Congress, in the rush to get out of here, there is not a chance in the world of this bill being passed in any other form. The bill will be absolutely sabotaged if we change it in any respect, in my personal opinion. Let us leave it alone, just exactly as it is. It may not be the best piece of legislation, but we have been working on this bill since the first day of this session. This committee has gone into every detail and tried to come up with something worth while, yet we have met a stone wall time after time. Even gentlemen on the floor of this House this afternoon tell you that we are working into the hands of the great Copper Trust. The very opposite is the truth and every man knows it who has given one minute's thought to the bill.

Here is a bill that comes up for consideration that has for its purpose keeping the submarginal mines in production. To save who? Not to save the mines, not for a single minute, but to save the people of this country should we get into another war. As was well said by the gentleman from Wisconsin, peace, peace, there is no peace. The war is not ended. We needed this submarginal mine production during the war and we need it now as we never needed it before.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell you something else. I have listened to all these debates and I have learned that some know as little about mining as they know about the silver question. Not a dime was paid out of the Treasury on silver and I defy any man to find where the Treasury of the United States paid out any money. The Government has always made money on silver. The same thing is true here. Why, you would imagine we were buying this lead, copper, and zinc. Who is talking about buying it? We are talking about paying the difference between what the mine owner receives, who produces it, and the market price. You would think we were buying the whole outfit and everything the mine contains. That is not true. We are only paying a little marginal difference. If the price goes up and this submarginal mine finds it is producing at a profit, then this Government of ours, under this premium plan, does not pay the producer a single cent. Has that been mentioned? It certainly has not. All you are doing here this afternoon is to pay that little difference between what the cost of production is and what the man gets for his ore that he mines. Now, there is nothing unreasonable about that. We have to support some of these prices. You are bringing in the wool bill, and you are going to support it, and my guess is that it will pass. There are several other support-price bills that you have passed in this House. We are going out of a war economy and we are coming into a peacetime economy. And the operation of our economy, as of yesterday, may be entirely out of line with the necessities and the requirements of today.

I hope you will vote this amendment down and pass this bill just exactly like it has been introduced, or we might as well write the entire mine-support program off the books.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on section 2 and all amendments thereto do now close.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I demand to be heard on the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

Mr. BUCK. Are they attempting to impose a gag rule here?

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to modify my motion and move that all debate on section 2 and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, it does not make any difference if this bill is passed in its present form. You have got to go to the Committee on Appropriations and get an appropriation for this money. I think, perhaps, that the Committee on Public Lands intended that Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds be increased by the amount of the subsidy and also that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would be authorized to use the money raised in addition to its present loaning power for that purpose. But, now, let us take a ridiculous situation just to prove the point and assume that we provide that the Department of Labor be authorized and directed to make these subsidy payments, and then we authorize the appropriation of such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. In that case the Department of Labor would be merely the agency for the expenditure of the funds appropriated through the Committee on Appropriations by the Congress. So, unless you expand borrowing authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act in this particular, because of the express prohibitions in existing law against the RFC using existing moneys for this purpose, you merely make the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the agency for the expenditure of any moneys which are subsequently appropriated under the authorization of this act.

Now, I called the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to this fact before he introduced this amendment and suggested that he take the Reconstruction Finance Corporation out of this picture, because we had just cleaned up the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. As a matter of fact, at that time I thought the legislation was coming to the committee which had always handled this legislation—the Committee on Banking and Currency—but I did not know that this bill to establish this bureau within the Department of Commerce was pending, and I did not think for a moment that there would be any attempt to bypass the committee that has always been handling this legislation which, in fact, set up originally the authorization to make these premium payments. I know that the gentleman did not intend to bypass the Banking and Currency Committee, but I think the Committee on Banking and Currency should have been consulted, and without express authority for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to increase the amount of notes, bonds, or debentures which it could have

outstanding for this particular purpose, it would have to have an appropriation from this Congress to do the job.

Now, let us clean up the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the manner suggested by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, now I have heard everything. I now hear distinguished Members on the Republican side talking about continued emergencies that justify continuing hand-outs.

On this matter of the production of copper, lead, and zinc, I am reliably informed that there is a 20-percent shortage in the labor supply at the highly producing mines. If it is really desired to increase production of these commodities, this bill should be defeated to permit miners now working in low-production mines to move over into the more efficient mines, where more copper, lead, and zinc can be produced per man.

We have had some rather remarkable things said this morning and this afternoon with regard to this bill. Somebody, I believe my friend from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], said that this subsidy would actually save money for the consumer, that it would even save money on farmer's milk pails. Mr. Chairman, if we believe that, we should pay a subsidy on every commodity produced in America. Then, of course, we will accomplish the impossible feat of raising ourselves by our own bootstraps.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. We have had subsidies for producers of all kinds of commodities. Is it not about time that we had subsidies for the consumers of the gentleman's district and my district?

Mr. BUCK. I agree with the gentleman.

One last point I wish to make, and I am addressing myself to the gentleman from Colorado. He has pointed out that if prices go up sufficiently the Government will not be required to pay subsidies on these commodities Prices on copper, lead, and zinc have been rising. Has he not given a good reason why this bill should be continued for 1 year only? Continue it for 1 year, and if prices go up, and the indications are that prices will go up, then the bill will be unnecessary beyond the 1-year period. If they do not go up, and it is the will of the House to continue subsidies, then the bill can be renewed a year hence.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Take the price of copper, that under this bill would be 28 cents, when the OPA price was 13 cents. Can the gentleman see any reason why we should increase it now 15 cents a pound and make it 28 cents? Can the gentleman give me just one reason why it should be done?

Mr. BUCK. I cannot give any reason.

Mr. RICH. I wonder whether anybody else could. When you are talking to us about holding prices down, it does not seem sensible.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] primarily because of the impossibility of working out a really productive program on such a short time limit as he has provided in his amendment. We must face that as a real issue and decide it on the vote on this amendment. If we are going to preserve production or encourage production of the essential materials that are at issue in this bill, we are going to have to talk in terms longer than the time provided in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri. I want sincerely to give these marginal mines the encouragement they must have to survive.

I was deeply impressed by the comment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] when he told me that 40 percent of the production of zinc and lead in the southwest Missouri mines is from marginal mines. We just cannot afford to write off 40 percent of the production of lead and zinc I was also impressed very much by the total number of mines that are marginal and cannot exist without this assistance, also given us by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]. The high percentage of mines that will pass out of production is appalling to me.

Another point made that interested me very greatly was the percentage of ships that brought in metals during the recent war that were sunk. I believe he said it was 54 ships cut of 60.

I know how uncomfortable I was during the time we were hoping that these ships would come in with the supplies we needed. In my opinion, the soundest national defense in this field of minerals is in the development of our own production. We must look to the marginal mines to produce the big mines of the future.

I am glad that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] was successful in putting manganese in the bill by his amendment. We have been struggling for years to get greater domestic production of manganese. We have a very real problem in the production of manganese from our available supplies. Without giving too much information to our enemies, I suggest that you look up the resources of the world today of manganese and locate the principal sources and then assure me, if you can, that we can look to those countries for our future needs in manganese. We had better develop our own production and maintain our own self-sufficiency in that respect.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] as modified.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PLOESER) there were—ayes 27, noes 71.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: On page 7, line 2, strike out the words "Reconstruction Finance Corporation" and insert "Treasury of the United States."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California in making his unanimous-consent request to limit debate asked that all debate upon the pending amendments or amendments to the section terminate in 10 minutes. The Chairman when he put the question said that debate on all amendments to the section would close in 10 minutes. Is it my understanding that time for debate on the section and all amendments pending to the section has expired?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUCK) there were—ayes 40, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Commerce may select, employ, and fix the compensation of such engineers and other experts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have made this pro forma amendment merely to explain what the Committee of the Whole has done. This bill, the Allen bill, provides that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which has 1 year of life according to law, will pay subsidies for 2 years, according to this bill. I want to show you how carefully thought out this legislation is. Furthermore, it is necessary to get an appropriation bill before you have any money, because the bill specifically authorizes it, and I say again that you are paying subsidies for 2 years out of a corporation which has only 1 year of life.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. That is not very careful consideration of legislation, is it?

Mr. PLOESER. I just wonder if such careful consideration of the interests of the marginal mines is the apex of the ability of the Eightieth Congress.

Those who are truly interested want to see legislation properly drawn. It may be hoped that another body will make the necessary corrections.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. To the end that the provisions of this act be carried out in the simplest manner, the Director of the Office of Premium Price Plan, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, shall prescribe rules and regulations governing the operation of the premium-price plan, except with respect to the methods of disbursement of premium payments. All such rules and regulations shall be published in the Federal Register.

SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated sums sufficient to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] just gave you an idea of how carefully this legislation has been thought out. It seems to me, as a Member of the Eightieth Congress, that we ought to send this legislation back to the committee for further study. I am going to offer a motion to recommit this bill when the appropriate time comes, with the idea that they will give proper consideration to all the facts. I hope the membership of the House will let the committee have it and consider it for some time before they bring it back here, if they want legislation that is good for the American people and which will keep it from paying subsidies on all commodities from now until the day of judgment. Now is the time to stop them.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

I will say to my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], I know, of course, and we all know what he wants to do with this bill. I would say that the bill is perfectly drawn. I have every confidence in the one who advised me in writing this bill. I think those who favor this bill, who are sincere about wanting it passed, will agree that we can send it to the Senate and if there is any little difficulty, it is much easier for them to iron out any imperfection, in the event there is one—which I deny—than to send it back to the committee and kill it for this session of the Congress.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. Is what the gentleman from Missouri said true, that the RFC has but 1 year of life and we are giving them 2 years to pay?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Not according to my best information.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE of California. I understand with reference to the RFC, that the life of the RFC was extended for 1 year, that it will then be the duty of the Treasury Department to liquidate the business of the RFC, and this process of liquidation may go on for a good many years, at least until they clear up their existing legal obligations.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is definitely my understanding, and I repeat that those who are in favor of this bill can vote to pass it. Let it go to the Senate. Then if there be imperfections in it there still remain 2 or 3 days for action to correct them. I am sure the other body can take care of it.

If you vote to recommit this bill that definitely ends this matter for this session. It means the filling up of the mines, and it will take 7 years to dewater them.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose for which the gentleman from Vermont arises is to suggest to this Committee that if you wish to have any legislation which will aid small business you will vote for this bill, and you will vote against the motion to recommit.

Subsidy smells bad when some try to daub this bill with that name, but subsidy or no subsidy, I am for encouraging small business and individual enterprise, as against the tremendous monopolies who have shown their teeth in an attempt in the premises to crush any and all possible competition.

Especially am I for it, this bill, because it involves national defense and the development and exploration of sources of supply of vital metals and minerals which we have, and should not have to purchase outside our limits, nor to buy from monopolies in our own country.

The mines which now need help were opened and operated during the war because the big boys who now fight this bill could not deliver.

We never again should be caught in such a trap. If this be inconsistency make the most of it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. This act shall be known as the "Premium Price Plan Act of 1947."

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs upon the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has just announced that he intends to offer a motion to recommit H. R. 1602 to the Committee on Public Lands when we go back into the House, and since many Members were not here all through the debates I want to take this opportunity of urging the defeat of Mr. RICH's motion to recommit when and if it is made. H. R. 1602 is a highly important defense measure, as has been brought out by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] and other speakers. We must not permit it to be defeated at this late hour by a motion of recommittal.

In modern warfare, Mr. Chairman, strategic metals and minerals are of vital importance to victory and success. The past drain upon our larger mines has been so long continued and so great that it is imperative we keep active the smaller and the marginal mines which find it impossible to operate without such premium payments as are provided in this bill.

In addition to maintaining activity in the hundreds of small mines in this country which would become idle were H. R. 1602 to be recommitted to committee or defeated, Mr. Chairman, I desire to emphasize another even more important contribution which is made by this legislation. As pointed out in Report No. 311 of the Public Lands Committee, this measure provides a stimulus for the exploration and development of new mines, new mining and treatment processes, and new domestic sources of strategic materials. Report No. 311 includes this significant statement: "Encouragement of exploration programs especially is desirable, and those programs already in force should be expanded and extended." Mr. Chairman, H. R. 1602 provides for this expansion and extension, and it gives tangible encouragement to those moving forward with this program.

For example, Mr. Chairman, as has been pointed out repeatedly on this floor on many occasions by my colleague the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], by me, and by numerous others, manganese is one of the vitally essential critical materials required by the United States. It is a prerequisite in the manufacture of the steel which in turn is prerequisite to our whole industrial program. H. R. 1602 is now amended to include manganese. Thus for the life of this legislation manganese production in the United States will be given encouragement and stimulus. This is highly important to our economic welfare as well as our national defense. In large part we are now dependent upon foreign sources for our manganese. In time of war this might become a most alarming and crippling situation.

Manganese is found in small, isolated amounts in many places in the United States. In my own State of South Dakota we have what the experts tell us is the largest deposit of manganese in the entire world. For all practical purposes it is still an undeveloped asset due to the fact that it is of low grade, and under competitive conditions slow progress has been made in developing treatments of this product in order to bring it up to usable grades. Proper administration of H. R. 1602, however, can achieve great forward strides in the development of practical methods for treating the manganese as we have in South Dakota and in other parts of America so that it can be refined to usable grade.

Let me urge you all, therefore, in all seriousness, to join those of us who are supporting this legislation and to defeat Mr. RICH's motion to recommit.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOWELL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1602) to establish within the Department of the Interior a National Minerals Resources Division, pursuant to House Resolution 268, had reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RICH. I am, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RICH moves to recommit the bill H. R. 1602 to the Committee on Public Lands.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICH) there were—ayes 53, noes 115.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 114, nays 273, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 129]

YEAS—114

Abernethy	Hale	Pickett
Andrews, Ala.	Hand	Poage
Banta	Hardy	Rains
Blatnik	Harness, Ind.	Rankin
Boggs, Del.	Herter	Reed, N. Y.
Brehm	Heselton	Rich
Buchanan	Hess	Rizley
Buck	Hoffman	Rogers, Mass.
Buffett	Jenkins, Pa.	Rooney
Burke	Judd	Ross
Butler	Kean	Sarbacher
Celler	Kearney	Schwabe, Mo.
Chadwick	Keating	Scoblick
Clark	Kennedy	Scott, Hardie
Clason	Keogh	Scott,
Cole, N. Y.	Kilburn	Hugh D., Jr.
Colmer	Kirwan	Seely-Brown
Corbett	Knutson	Simpson, Pa.
Cotton	Kunkel	Smathers
Coudert	Latham	Smith, Va.
Crow	Lodge	Snyder
Dague	Lucas	Springer
Devitt	McConnell	Stanley
Eberharter	McDowell	Sundstrom
Elsaesser	McGarvey	Taber
Elston	MacKinnon	Tibbott
Fallon	Mahon	Towe
Fenton	Maloney	Vursell
Fisher	Meade, Md.	Wheeler
Fogarty	Miller, Conn.	Whitten
Fulton	Miller, Md.	Whittington
Gallagher	Miller, Nebr.	Wigglesworth
Gamble	Morton	Williams
Goodwin	Muhlenberg	Wilson, Ind.
Gore	Nodar	Wilson, Tex.
Gossett	Norblad	Winstead
Graham	O'Toole	Wolcott
Grant, Ala.	Owens	
Gwinn, N. Y.	Passman	

NAYS—273

Albert	Blackney	Chenoweth
Allen, Calif.	Bloom	Chiperfield
Allen, Ill.	Boggs, La.	Church
Allen, La.	Bolton	Clements
Almond	Bonner	Coffin
Andersen,	Bradley	Cole, Kans.
H. Carl	Bramblett	Combs
Anderson, Calif.	Brooks	Cooley
Andrews, N. Y.	Brophy	Cooper
Angell	Brown, Ga.	Courtney
Arends	Brown, Ohio	Cravens
Arnold	Bryson	Crawford
Auchincloss	Bulwinkle	Crosser
Bakewell	Burleson	Cunningham
Barden	Busbey	Curtis
Barrett	Byrne, N. Y.	Davis, Ga.
Bates, Ky.	Byrnes, Wis.	Davis, Tenn.
Bates, Mass.	Camp	Davis, Wis.
Battle	Canfield	Dawson, Utah
Beall	Cannon	Deane
Beckworth	Carroll	Delaney
Bell	Carson	D'Ewart
Bender	Case, N. J.	Dolliver
Bennett, Mich.	Case, S. Dak.	Dondero
Bennett, Mo.	Chapman	Donohue
Bishop	Chelf	Dorn
Doughton	Jonkman	Preston
Douglas	Karsten, Mo.	Price, Fla.
Drewry	Keefe	Price, Ill.
Durham	Kefauver	Priest
Eaton	Kerr	Rabin
Elliott	Kersten, Wis.	Ramey
Ellis	Kilday	Rayburn
Ellsworth	King	Rayfiel
Engel, Mich.	Klein	Redden
Engle, Calif.	Landis	Reed, Ill.
Evins	Lane	Rees
Feighan	Lanham	Reeves
Fernandez	Lea	Richards
Fletcher	LeCompte	Richlman
Folger	LeFevre	Riley
Foote	Lemke	Rivers
Forand	Lesinski	Robertson
Gary	Lewis	Robsion
Gathings	Love	Rockwell
Gavin	Lusk	Rogers, Fla.
Gearhart	Lyle	Rohrbough
Gillette	Lynch	Russell
Gillie	McCormack	Sabath
Gordon	McCowen	Sadlak
Gorski	McDonough	Sadowski
Granger	McGregor	St. George
Grant, Ind.	McMahon	Sanborn
Gregory	McMillan, S. C.	Sasscer
Griffiths	McMillen, Ill.	Schwabe, Okla.
Gwynne, Iowa	Mack	Scrivner
Hagen	Macy	Shafer
Hall,	Madden	Sheppard
Leonard W.	Manasco	Short
Harless, Ariz.	Mansfield	Sikes
Harris	Marcantonio	Simpson, Ill.
Hart	Martin, Iowa	Smith, Kans.
Havenner	Mathews	Smith, Maine
Hedrick	Merrow	Smith, Wis.
Heffernan	Meyer	Somers
Hendricks	Michener	Spence
Hill	Miller, Calif.	Stefan
Hinshaw	Mills	Stevenson
Hobbs	Mitchell	Stigler
Hoeven	Monroney	Stockman
Holifield	Morgan	Stratton
Holmes	Morris	Talle
Hope	Morrison	Taylor
Horan	Mundt	Teague
Howell	Murdock	Thomas, N. J.
Huber	Murray, Wis.	Thomas, Tex.
Hull	Nixon	Tollefson
Jackson, Calif.	Norrell	Trimble
Jackson, Wash.	O'Brien	Twyman
Jarman	O'Konski	Vail
Jenison	Pace	Van Zandt
Jenkins, Ohio	Patman	Vorys
Jennings	Patterson	Wadsworth
Jensen	Peden	Weichel
Johnson, Calif.	Peterson	Welch
Johnson, Ill.	Pfeifer	West
Johnson, Okla.	Philbin	Wolverton
Johnson, Tex.	Phillips, Calif.	Wood
Jones, Ala.	Phillips, Tenn.	Woodruff
Jones, N. C.	Ploeser	Youngblood
Jones, Ohio	Plumley	Zimmerman
Jones, Wash.	Poulson	

NOT VOTING—43

Andresen,	Fuller	Kelley
August H.	Gifford	Larcade
Bland	Goff	Ludlow
Boykin	Gross	Mason
Buckley	Hall,	Meade, Ky.
Clevenger	Edwin Arthur	Murray, Tenn.
Clippinger	Halleck	Norton
Cole, Mo.	Harrison	O'Hara
Cox	Hartley	Potts
Dawson, Ill.	Hays	Powell
Dingell	Hébert	Smith, Ohio
Dirksen	Javits	Thomason
Domengeaux	Johnson, Ind.	Vinson
Fellows	Kearns	Walter
Flannagan	Kee	Worley

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Harrison for, with Mr. Powell against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. August H. Andresen with Mr. Cox.
Mr. Gross with Mr. Larcade.
Mr. Halleck with Mr. Flannagan.
Mr. Cole of Missouri with Mr. Bland.
Mr. Dirksen with Mr. Kee.
Mr. Fellows with Mr. Walter.
Mr. Mason with Mr. Boykin.
Mr. Gifford with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.
Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Domengeaux.
Mr. Johnson of Indiana with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Murray of Tennessee.
Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall with Mr. Hays.
Mr. Clevenger with Mr. Kelley.
Mr. Fuller with Mr. Worley.
Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Dingell.
Mr. Kearns with Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Meade of Kentucky with Mrs. Norton.

Mr. O'TOOLE, Mr. FISHER, and Mr. MILLER of Nebraska changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

Mr. LEA, Mr. NORRELL, and Mr. SCRIVNER changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUCK) there were—ayes 175, noes 78.

So the bill was passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REFUND OF TAXES ILLEGALLY PAID BY INDIAN CITIZENS

Mr. WELCH submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 981) to amend section 2 of the act of January 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 21), relating to the refund of taxes illegally paid by Indian citizens.

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 981) to amend section 2 of the act of January 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 21), relating to the refund of taxes illegally paid by Indian citizens, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 2 and agree to the same.

RICHARD J. WELCH,
WESLEY A. D'EWART,
A. M. FERNANDEZ,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
ZALES N. ECTON,
CARL A. HATCH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 981) to amend section 2 of the act of January 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 21), relating to the refund of taxes illegally paid by Indian citizens, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: Provides for payment of interest at 4 percent, as proposed by the Senate, instead of 6 percent, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2: Inserts a provision, proposed by the Senate, to restrict payment of fees to attorneys and agents in connection with refunds of taxes.

RICHARD J. WELCH,
WESLEY A. D'EWART,
A. M. FERNANDEZ,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill H. R. 981 just filed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The conference report was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 364. An act to expedite the disposition of Government surplus airports, airport facilities, and equipment and to assure their disposition in such manner as will best encourage and foster the development of civilian aviation and preserve for national defense purposes a strong, efficient, and properly maintained Nation-wide system of public airports, and for other purposes; and

S. 1185. An act to provide for the disposal of materials on the public lands of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3123) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 16, 18, 39, 78, 104, 171, 177, and 179 to the above-entitled bill; agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 176, with amendments.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4106) entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 27 and 34 to the above-entitled bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an analysis.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. SMATHERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. O'KONSKI (at the request of Mr. HINSHAW) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I received permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $213, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Chicago Daily Tribune.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT OF 1947

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'National Science Foundation Act of 1947'.

"ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

"SEC. 2. There is hereby established in the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the National Science Foundation (hereinafter referred to as the 'Foundation').

"MEMBERSHIP OF FOUNDATION

"SEC. 3. (a) The Foundation shall have twenty-four members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The persons nominated for appointment as members (1) shall be eminent in the fields of the fundamental sciences, medical science, engineering, education, or public affairs; (2) shall be selected solely on the basis of established records of distinguished service; and (3) shall be so selected as to provide representation of the views of scientific leaders in all areas of the Nation. The President is requested, in the making of nominations of persons for appointment as members, to give due consideration to any recommendations for nomination which may be submitted to him by the National Academy of Sciences, Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities, Association of American Colleges, or by other scientific or educational organizations.

"(b) The term of office of each member of the Foundation shall be six years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and (2) the terms of office of the members first taking office after the date of enactment of this Act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, eight at the end of two years, eight at the end of four years, eight at the end of six years, after the date of enactment of this Act. Any person who has been twice appointed as a member of the Foundation shall thereafter be ineligible for appointment.

"(c) The President shall call the first meeting of the Foundation, at which the first order of business shall be the election of a chairman and a vice chairman.

"POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE FOUNDATION

"SEC. 4 (a) The Foundation is authorized and directed—

"(1) to formulate, develop, and establish a national policy for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences;

"(2) to initiate and support basic research in the mathematical, physical, medical, biolcgical, engineering, and other sciences, by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) for the conduct of such basic scientific research;

"(3) to initiate and support scientific research in connection with matters relating to the national defense by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) for the conduct of such scientific research;

"(4) to grant scholarships and graduate fellowships in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences;

"(5) to foster the interchange of scientific information among scientists in the United States and foreign countries;

"(6) to correlate the Foundation's scientific research programs with those undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups; and

"(7) to establish (A) a special commission on cancer research, (B) a special commission on heart and intravascular diseases, (C) a special commission on poliomyelitis and other degenerative diseases, and (D) such other special commissions as the Foundation may from time to time deem necessary for the purposes of this Act.

"(b) In exercising the authority and discharging the functions referred to in subsection (a) of this section, it shall be one of the objectives of the Foundation to strengthen fundamental research and education in the sciences, including independent research by individuals, throughout the United States, including its Territories and possessions, and to avoid undue concentration of such research and education.

"(c) The members of the Foundation shall meet at the call of the Chairman but not less

frequently than once each year. A majority of the members of the Foundation shall constitute a quorum. Each member shall be given notice, by registered mail mailed to his last-known address of record not less than fifteen days prior to any meeting, of the call of such meeting.

"(d) The Foundation shall elect its chairman and vice chairman biennially, who shall also serve as chairman and vice chairman of the executive committee. The vice chairman shall perform the duties of the chairman in his absence. In case a vacancy occurs in the chairmanship or vice chairmanship, the Foundation shall elect a member to fill such vacancy.

"(e) The Foundation shall render an annual report to the President for submission on or before the 15th day of January to the Congress, summarizing the activities of the Foundation and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate. Such report shall include in full the report of the Executive Committee to the Foundation provided for in section 5 (e).

"CREATION AND POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

"SEC. 5. (a) The Foundation shall elect biennially from its own membership an executive committee composed of nine members. The executive committee shall, except as otherwise provided by the Foundation, exercise the powers and duties of the Foundation. It is intended that the membership of the executive committee shall be representative of diverse interests and shall be so chosen as to provide representation, so far as practicable, for all areas of the Nation. In case a vacancy occurs on the executive committee, the Foundation shall elect a member to fill such vacancy. The executive committee may delegate or assign to officers, employees, and divisions, within the Foundation, any of its powers, duties, and functions.

"(b) The executive committee shall meet at the call of the chairman or at such times as may be fixed by itself, but not less than six times each year.

"(c) Five members of the executive committee shall constitute a quorum.

"(d) The executive committee may establish such advisory committees as may be necessary for the consideration of programs administered by the Foundation.

"(e) The executive committee shall render an annual report to the Foundation, summarizing the activities of the executive committee, making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate, and setting forth the recommendations of the divisional committees and special commissions. Minority views and recommendations, if any, of members of the executive committee, the divisional committees, and special commissions shall be included in such annual report.

"DIRECTOR OF FOUNDATION

"SEC. 6. The Foundation shall have a chief executive officer, who shall be known as the Director of the Foundation (hereinafter referred to as the 'Director'). The powers and duties of the Director shall be prescribed by the executive committee and shall be exercised and performed by him under the supervision of such committee. The Director shall be appointed by the Foundation and shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum.

"DIVISIONS WITHIN THE FOUNDATION

"SEC. 7. (a) There shall be within the Foundation a Division of National Defense, and such other divisions as the Foundation may, from time to time, deem necessary. Each such division shall exercise such powers and perform such duties as the Foundation may prescribe.

"(b) Until otherwise provided by the Foundation there shall be within the Foundation, in addition to the Division of National Defense, the following divisions:

"(1) a Division of Medical Research;

"(2) a Division of Mathematical, Physical, and Engineering Sciences;

"(3) a Division of Biological Sciences; and

"(4) a Division of Scientific Personnel and Education, which shall be concerned with programs of the Foundation relating to the granting of scholarships and graduate fellowships in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences.

"DIVISIONAL COMMITTEES

"SEC. 8. (a) There shall be a committee for each division of the Foundation.

"(b) Each divisional committee, except the Committee for the Division of National Defense, shall be appointed by the Foundation and shall consist of not less than five persons who may be members or nonmembers of the Foundation.

"(c) The Committee for the Division of National Defense shall consist of members in a number which is a multiple of twelve, to be fixed by the Foundation, but which shall be not less than twelve and not more than thirty-six. One-half of the members of such committee shall be civilians appointed by the Foundation, and the remaining half shall be representatives of the armed services, designated in equal numbers, respectively, by the Secretaries of the principal branches thereof. There shall be within the divisional committee for the Division of National Defense an executive committee of not more than six, consisting of the chairman of the divisional committee, as chairman; two civilian members of such committee elected annually by the civilian members thereof; a member of such committee representing each of the principal branches of the armed services and designated by the Secretary thereof. Such executive committee shall perform such functions as may be prescribed by the Committee for the Division of National Defense with the approval of the Foundation.

"(d) The term of each member of each divisional committee shall be fixed by the appointing or designating authority. Each divisional committee shall annually elect its own chairman from among its own members, and shall prescribe its own rules of procedure, subject to such restrictions as may be prescribed by the executive committee.

"(e) Each divisional committee shall exercise and perform the powers and duties of its division, shall have the power and duty to make recommendations to, and advise and consult with, the executive committee and the Director with respect to matters relating to the program of its division, and shall have such additional powers and duties as the Foundation may delegate or assign to it.

"(f) The executive committee, after receiving the advice of the Committee for the Division of National Defense, shall establish regulations and procedures for the security classification of information or property in connection with scientific research (having military significance) under this Act, and for the proper safeguarding of any information or property so classified.

"SPECIAL COMMISSIONS

"SEC. 9. (a) Each special commission established by the Foundation pursuant to section 4 (a) (7) shall consist of eleven members appointed by the Foundation, six of whom shall be eminent scientists and five of whom shall be from the general public. The members of each special commission shall serve for such time as may be prescribed by the Foundation. Each special commission shall choose its own chairman and vice chairman.

"(b) It shall be the duty of each such special commission to make a comprehensive survey of research, both public and private, being carried on in its field, and to formulate and recommend to the Foundation, at the earliest practicable date but not later than one year after the establishment of such special commission, an over-all research program in its field, and constantly to review the manner in which such program is being carried out.

"SCHOLARSHIPS AND GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS; REGISTER OF SCIENTIFIC PERSONNEL

"SEC. 10. (a) The Foundation is authorized to award, within the limits of funds made available pursuant to section 14, scholarships and graduate fellowships for scientific study or scientific work in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences at accredited nonprofit American or foreign institutions of higher education, selected by the recipient of such aid, for such periods as the Foundation may determine. Persons shall be selected for such scholarships and fellowships from among citizens of the United States, and such selections shall be made solely on the basis of ability; but in any case in which two or more applicants for scholarships or fellowships, as the case may be, are deemed by the Foundation to be possessed of equal ability and there are not sufficient scholarships or fellowships, as the case may be, available to grant one to each of such applicants, the Foundation shall award the available scholarship or scholarships or fellowship or fellowships to the applicants in such manner as will tend to result in a wide distribution of scholarships and fellowships among the States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia.

"(b) The Foundation shall maintain a register of scientific and technical personnel and in other ways provide a central clearing-house for information covering all scientific and technical personnel in the United States and its Territories and possessions. No individual shall be listed in such register without his consent.

"AUTHORITY OF FOUNDATION

"SEC. 11. The Foundation is empowered to do all things necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, and, without being limited thereby, the Foundation is specifically authorized—

"(a) to prescribe such rules and regulations as it deems necessary governing the manner of its operations and its organization and personnel;

"(b) to make such expenditures as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of this Act;

"(c) to enter into contracts or other arrangements for the carrying on, by organizations or individuals, including other Government agencies, of such scientific research activities as the Foundation deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act;

"(d) to enter into such contracts or other arrangements, or modifications thereof, without legal consideration, without performance or other bonds, and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C., sec. 5);

"(e) to make advance, progress, and other payments which relate to scientific research without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C., sec. 529);

"(f) to acquire by purchase, lease, loan, or gift, and to hold and dispose of by sale, lease, loan, or otherwise, real and personal property of all kinds necessary for, or resulting from, scientific research;

"(g) to receive and use funds donated by others, if such funds are donated, without restriction, other than that they be used in furtherance of one or more of the general purposes of the Foundation;

"(h) to publish or arrange for the publication of scientific and technical information so as to further the full dissemination of information of scientific value consistent with the national interest, without regard

to the provisions of section 87 of the Act of January 12, 1895 (28 Stat. 622), and section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (40 Stat. 1270; 44 U. S. C., sec. 111);

"(i) to accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and to pay the actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses (including, in lieu of subsistence, per diem allowances at a rate not in excess of $10) of such personnel incurred in the course of such services; and

"(j) to prescribe, with the approval of the Comptroller General of the United States, the extent to which vouchers for funds expended under contracts for scientific research shall be subject to itemization or substantiation prior to payment, without regard to the limitations of other laws relating to the expenditure of public funds and accounting therefor.

"PATENT RIGHTS

"SEC. 12. (a) Each contract or other arrangement executed by the Foundation which relates to scientific research shall contain provisions governing the disposition of inventions produced thereunder in a manner calculated to protect the public interest and the equities of the individual or organization with which the contract or other arrangement is executed: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize the Foundation by any contractual or other arrangement to alter or modify any provision of law affecting the issuance or use of patents.

"(b) No officer or employee of the Foundation shall acquire, retain, or transfer any rights, under the patent laws of the United States or otherwise, in any invention which he may make or produce in connection with performing his assigned activities and which is directly related to the subject matter thereof: *Provided, however*, That this section 12 (b) shall not be construed to prevent any officer or employee of the Foundation from executing any application for patent on any such invention for the purpose of assigning the same to the Government or its nominee in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Foundation may establish.

"INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

"SEC. 13. (a) The Foundation is hereby authorized, with the approval of the President and through the Department of State, to cooperate in any international scientific research activities consistent with the purposes or provisions of this Act and to expend for such international scientific research activities such sums within the limit of appropriated funds as the Foundation may deem desirable.

"(b) The Foundation may defray the expenses of representatives of Government agencies and other organizations and of individual scientists to accredited international scientific congresses and meetings whenever it deems it necessary in the promotion of the objectives of this Act.

"APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 14. (a) To enable the Foundation to carry out its powers and duties, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Foundation, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"(b) The funds hereafter appropriated to the Foundation, as herein authorized, shall, if obligated during the fiscal year for which appropriated, remain available for expenditure for four years following the expiration of the fiscal year for which appropriated. After such four-year period, the unexpended balances of appropriations shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury.

"INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE

"SEC. 15. (a) There is hereby established an Interdepartmental Committee on Science, to consist of the Director of the Foundation, as chairman, and the heads (or their designees) of such Government agencies engaged in or concerned with the support of scientific activity to a substantial degree as the President may from time to time determine. The interdepartmental committee shall meet whenever the chairman so determines, but not less than once a month.

"(b) The Interdepartmental Committee on Science shall gather and correlate data relating to the scientific research and scientific development activities of the Federal Government; and shall make such recommendations to the President, the Foundation, and other governmental agencies as in the opinion of the committee will serve to aid in effectuating the objectives of this Act and of other legislation providing for Federal support of scientific research and scientific development, and in preventing and eliminating unnecessary duplication of such activities by departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

"(c) The Interdepartmental Committee on Science shall submit to the President, for transmission to the Congress, an annual over-all report with respect to scientific research and development activities of the Federal Government and the activities of the Interdepartmental Committee in relation thereto, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable; and the Interdepartmental Committee may submit to the President, for transmission to the Congress, such special reports and recommendations as it may deem advisable. Minority views and recommendations, if any, of members of the Interdepartmental Committee shall be included in such annual reports and in such special reports and recommendations.

"GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 16. (a) The Director shall appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. Such appointments shall be made and such compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that, when deemed desirable by the Director, technical and professional personnel may be employed without regard to the civil-service laws or regulations, and their compensation may be fixed without regard to the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The Director, the Deputy Director hereinafter provided for, and the members of the divisional committees and advisory committees, shall be appointed without regard to the civil-service laws or regulations. Neither the Director nor the Deputy Director shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as such Director or Deputy Director as the case may be; nor shall the Director or Deputy Director, except with the approval of the Foundation, hold any office in, or act in any capacity for, any organization, agency, or institution with which the Foundation makes any contract or other arrangement under this Act.

"(b) The Director may appoint with the approval of the executive committee a Deputy Director who shall receive compensation at a rate of not to exceed $10,000 per annum.

"(c) The Foundation shall not, itself, operate any laboratories or pilot plants.

"(d) The members of the Foundation, and the members of each divisional committee, special commission, or advisory committee, shall receive compensation at the rate of $25 for each day engaged in the business of the Foundation pursuant to authorization of the Foundation, and shall be allowed actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses (including, in lieu of subsistence, per diem allowances at a rate not in excess of $10) when engaged, away from home, in the duties of their offices.

"(e) Persons holding other offices in the executive branch of the Federal Government may serve as members of the divisional committees, special commissions, and advisory committees, but they shall not receive remuneration for their services as such members during any period for which they receive compensation for their services in such other offices.

"(f) Service of an individual as a member of the Foundation, of a divisional committee, of a special commission, or of an advisory committee shall not be considered as service bringing him within the provisions of section 109 or section 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 18, secs. 198 and 203) or section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, unless the act of such individual, which by such section is made unlawful when performed by an individual referred to in such section, is with respect to any particular matter which directly involves the Foundation or in which the Foundation is directly interested.

"(g) The Office of Scientific Research and Development is abolished, and its affairs shall be liquidated by the Foundation, which shall be its successor agency. The property, records, funds (including all unexpended balances of appropriations or other funds now available), and contracts (and rights and obligations thereunder) of the Office of Scientific Research and Development are transferred to the Foundation. Such abolition and transfer shall take effect thirty days after the Director has taken office.

"(h) In making contracts or other arrangements for scientific research the Foundation shall utilize appropriations available therefor in such manner as will in its discretion best realize the objectives of (1) having the work performed by organizations, agencies and institutions or individuals, including Government agencies, qualified by training and experience to achieve the results desired, (2) strengthening the research staffs of organizations, particularly nonprofit organizations, in the States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia, (3) aiding institutions, agencies, or organizations which if aided will advance basic research, and (4) encouraging independent research by individuals.

"(i) The activities of the Foundation shall be construed as supplementing and not superseding, curtailing, or limiting any of the functions or activities of other Government agencies (except the Office of Scientific Research and Development) authorized to engage in scientific research or scientific development.

"(j) Funds available to any department or agency of the Government for scientific or technical research, or the provision of facilities therefor, shall be available for transfer, with the approval of the head of the department or agency involved, in whole or in part to the Foundation for such use as is consistent with the purposes for which such funds were provided, and funds so transferred shall be expendable by the Foundation for the purposes for which the transfer was made.

"(k) The National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel shall be transferred from the Department of Labor to the Foundation, together with such of the personnel, records, property, and balances of appropriations as have been utilized or are available for use in the administration of such roster as may be determined by the President. The transfer provided for in this subsection shall take effect at such time or times as the President shall direct.

"(l) The Foundation shall not support any research or development activity in the field of atomic energy, nor shall it exercise any authority pursuant to section 11 (f) in respect to that field, without first having obtained the concurrence of the Atomic Energy

Commission that such activity will not adversely affect the common defense and security. Nothing in this Act shall supersede or modify any provision of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946."

And the House agree to the same.

CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
CARL HINSHAW,
EVAN HOWELL,
J. PERCY PRIEST,
OREN HARRIS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ROBERT A. TAFT,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
ELBERT D. THOMAS,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and inserted an amendment in the nature of a substitute. The substitute agreed to in conference is substantially the same as the House amendment. Except for minor clarifying and clerical changes the differences are as follows:

In section 3 of the conference substitute there has been included a sentence from the Senate bill, as follows: "The President is requested, in the making of nominations of persons for appointment as members, to give due consideration to any recommendations for nomination which may be submitted to him by the National Academy of Sciences, Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities, Association of American Colleges, or by other scientific or educational organizations."

In section 5 (a) the following sentence has been included: "It is intended that the membership of the executive committee shall be representative of diverse interests and shall be so chosen as to provide representation, so far as practicable, for all areas of the nation."

In section 9 (a), a sentence has been included authorizing the Foundation to prescribe the period of time for which members of special commissions, appointed by the Foundation, shall serve.

Section 12 (a), relating to the inclusion in contracts or other arrangements of provisions governing the disposition of inventions produced thereunder, has been made to conform, so far as language is concerned, with the provision as it passed the Senate. In substantive effect, however, it does not differ from the corresponding provision in the House amendment.

In section 16 (a) a sentence has been included, as follows: "Neither the Director nor the Deputy Director shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as such Director or Deputy Director as the case may be; nor shall the Director or Deputy Director, except with the approval of the Foundation, hold any office in, or act in any capacity for, any organization, agency, or institution with which the Foundation makes any contract or other arrangement under this Act."

Section 16 (h) provides that in making contracts and other arrangements for scientific research the Foundation shall utilize appropriations available therefor in such manner as will best realize certain specified objectives. There has been added to these specified objectives the following, taken from the Senate bill with a clarifying change: "(3) aiding institutions, agencies, or organizations which if aided will advance basic research,".

CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
CARL HINSHAW,
EVAN HOWELL,
J. PERCY PRIEST,
OREN HARRIS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the reading of the statement indicates that few changes were made in the bill as it passed the House about a week ago. The few changes that were made were of a clarifying nature and strengthen the bill. I have heard of no objection to the changes that have been made.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my appreciation for the cooperation shown in conference by the managers on the part of the Senate and my colleagues who served with me as managers on the part of the House.

Except for minor clarifying and clerical changes the conferees agreed on language substantially the same as that agreed upon by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate, and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House.

The substantive differences from the act as passed by the Senate relate to section 6 wherein the Senate receded from the amendment made on the floor relative to the Director of the Foundation and restored the original section as it existed in the committee bill. Again in section 14 the Senate floor amendment relative to mandatory distribution of funds was receded from and additional language was added to further assure representation by all areas of the Nation.

I think the Congress has taken a great step forward in passing legislation to establish a National Science Foundation. I trust the President of the United States will approve it for the welfare of our Nation.

Congress should be asked to make a deficiency appropriation of $200,000 at this session for the purpose of providing funds to conduct the organizational work of the Foundation prior to its presentation of a full-scale budget at the next session.

The detailed reason for this is as follows:

First. An organization is created without implementing funds.

Second. After the acts become law, it will be necessary for competent people in the scientific field to plan the organizational set-up and comb the Nation for a list of, say, 100 names suitable for the 24 members of the Foundation. These 100 names would then be submitted to the President who would select his appointments to be confirmed at the next session of Congress. He may make interim appointments to avoid the atomic-energy controversy.

Third. The organization work necessary will entail a survey of the manpower suitable for the membership of the Foundation and an informal conversation with these people to see if they would be willing to serve.

The clerical staff and temporary office space should be planned.

The Bureau of the Budget and the General Accounting Office should be contacted to correlate with them the accounting and budgetary procedures to be used to meet their requirements.

Fourth. Preliminary conferences should be held with public and private agencies to insure the Foundation of a favorable reception in the new field and provide for their cooperation in the divisional structure of the Foundation.

Fifth. A preliminary survey of the scientific scholarship and fellowship needs and facilities should be made with educational authorities.

Sixth. Planning of the special commissions in cancer, heart, and polio should proceed at the earliest possible date.

Seventh. It is suggested that if this deficiency appropriation can be put through before the end of this session, the Foundation will get under way 6 months sooner.

Eighth. When the Foundation members are named, the organizational structure will be ready to function and an intelligent survey of the appropriation needed for the first full year of the Foundation can be made to Congress at the next session. Otherwise, the job will be hurried and inadequate.

Ninth. This procedure would free the executive branch of the Government from political pressure for positions on the Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the President will use the good offices of the National Academy of Sciences and Dr. Bush for this purpose. They have made some preliminary studies on the proposed Foundation and, as the scientific advisers to the Government, are equipped to carry on this organizational work during the recess of Congress.

Six months of invaluable scientific progress can be saved if organizational work is undertaken at once. When Congress reconvenes the Foundation could present a carefully documented budget covering its operational needs. This would probably be in the neighborhood of $25,000,000 for the first year.

It has been suggested that a $200,000 deficiency appropriation be made to the Foundation and that the National Academy of Sciences be asked to undertake the organizational work in order that the medical programs on cancer, heart, and polio be not delayed, and that national planning on postwar research get under way at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The bill still covers the possessions and Territories as it did when it passed the House?

Mr. WOLVERTON. Yes.

Mr. Speaker, if there is no desire on the part of anyone else to speak, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TEMPORARY CONGRESSIONAL AVIATION POLICY BOARD

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3587) to establish a National Aviation Council for the purpose of unifying and clarifying national policies relating to aviation, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3587) to establish a National Aviation Council for the purpose of unifying and clarifying national policies relating to aviation, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That it is the purpose of this Act to provide for the development of a national aviation policy adequate to meet the needs of the national defense, of the commerce of the United States, both interstate and foreign, and of the postal service, and to provide for the formulation and clarification of national policies relating to or affecting aviation, including policies relating to the maintenance of an adequate aeronautical manufacturing industry.

"SEC. 2. There is hereby established a temporary Congressional Aviation Policy Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board") which shall be composed of five Members of the Senate, not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party, to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives, not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"SEC. 3. It shall be the duty of the Board to carry out the purposes of this Act, and, in so doing, to study the current and future needs of American aviation, including commercial air transportation and the utilization of aircraft by the Armed Services; the nature, type and extent of aircraft and air transportation industries that are desirable or essential to our national security and welfare; methods of encouraging needed developments in the aviation and air transportation industry; and the improved organization and procedures of the government that will assist it in handling aviation matters efficiently and in the public interest. The Board shall report to the Congress, together with such recommendations as it deems desirable, on or before March 1, 1948.

"SEC. 4. (a) The Board shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. A vacancy on the Board shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection.

"(b) The Board is authorized to employ such experts, assistants, and other employees as in its judgment may be necessary for the performance of its duties. The Board is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the various departments and agencies of the Government to the extent that such services, information, facilities, and personnel, in the opinion of such departments and agencies, can be furnished without undue interference with the performance of the work and duties of such departments and agencies.

"(c) The Board shall have the power to hold hearings and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses, the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable.

"(d) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act the Board may seek information from such sources and conduct its studies and investigations at such places and in such manner as it deems advisable in the interest of a correct ascertainment of the facts.

"SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $50,000, as may be necessary to enable the Board to carry out its functions under this Act.

"SEC. 6. The members of the Board, and employees thereof, shall be allowed all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred while so engaged in the activities of the Board."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to provide for the establishment of a temporary Congressional Aviation Policy Board."

CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
CARL HINSHAW,
EVAN HOWELL,
A. L. BULWINKLE,
J. PERCY PRIEST,
Managers on the Part of the House.

OWEN BREWSTER,
A. W. HAWKES,
HOMER E. CAPEHART,
ED C. JOHNSON,
BRIEN MCMAHON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3587), to establish a National Aviation Council for the purpose of unifying and clarifying national policies relating to aviation, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate made two amendments to the bill passed by the House. One amendment struck out all after the enacting clause and inserted an amendment in the nature of a substitute. The other amendment changed the title of the bill.

The accompanying conference report contains the text of the substitute agreed to in conference, and the title of the bill is amended to conform to the provisions of the conference substitute.

THE BILL AS PASSED BY THE HOUSE

For the purpose of "formulating, unifying, and clarifying national policies relating to or affecting aviation, including policies relating to the maintenance of an adequate aeronautical manufacturing industry, and of monitoring and harmonizing the pertinent activities of the executive branch of the Government in accordance with such policies," section 1 of this bill as passed by the House established a National Aviation Council.

The Council was to consist of members representing agencies of the Government, referred to in the bill as "participating agencies." Each participating agency was to have one representative on the Council, such representative to be the head of such agency, but the member representing any agency was to designate an alternate.

The participating agencies specified were the State, War, Navy, Commerce, and Post Office Departments, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Civil Aeronautics Board. This section provided, however, that the President could from time to time designate as a participating agency any other agency of the Government which he found had a substantial and continuing interest in the field of aviation, and that he could terminate the participation of any agency.

Section 2 directed the Council to recommend to the appropriate agencies of the Government the adoption and carrying out of policies, plans, and procedures to aid in effectuating the purposes set forth in section 1, subject to certain limitations.

This section also authorized the Council to make recommendations to the President with respect to the establishment of policies, plans, and procedures or action which in its judgment would promote the public interest and aid in effectuating the purposes set forth in section 1.

The powers conferred under this section were to be exercised as to any particular matter only by unanimous concurrence of the representatives of the agencies participating. If the Council were unable to reach unanimous agreement it was directed that, upon the request of any member, the Council should submit such matter to the President.

Section 3 provided for an executive secretary of the Council, and authorized the Council to employ other personnel.

Section 4 authorized the Council to require reports and information from other Government agencies as to activities related to aviation. It also authorized the Council to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of other Government agencies.

Section 5 provided for an advisory board of the Council, to advise the Council on matters arising under the act.

The advisory board was to consist of 10 members to be appointed by the Council for terms of 2 years. The members were to represent the general public and the public interest, but at least one member was to be drawn from each of certain specified fields of activity.

Section 6 provided for an annual report by the Council, with recommendations; and the Council was authorized to submit special reports and recommendations.

Section 7 contained a definition of the term "agency of the Government".

Section 8 authorized the appropriation of such amounts as were necessary to carry out the provisions of the act.

THE SENATE SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT

The first section of the Senate amendment to the text of the bill declared that "it is the purpose of this Act to provide for the development of a national air policy adequate to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States, both interstate and foreign, of the national defense, and of the postal service and provide for the formulation and clarification of national policies relating to or affecting aviation, with respect to the maintenance of an adequate aeronautical manufacturing industry."

Section 2 created a Temporary National Air Policy Board to be composed of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Commerce, three Members of the Senate, three Members of the House of Representatives, and two members to be appointed by the President from individuals outside of the Government service.

Section 3 provided for a study by the Board of the status of the aviation industry in all its branches with respect to the maintenance of an adequate aeronautical manufacturing industry. It further provided for a report thereon, to be submitted within 5

months to the President and the Congress, together with recommendations.

Section 4 contained provisions with respect to the selection of a chairman and a vice chairman; the filling of any vacancies on the Board; the employment of personnel; the obtaining of assistance from Government agencies; and the holding of hearings and compelling by subpena the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents.

Section 5 authorized the appropriation of not to exceed $50,000 to enable the Board to carry out its functions.

Section 6 provided for the payment of a per diem allowance to those members of the Board designated by the President. It also authorized the payment of travel expenses of the Board while engaged in the activities of the Board.

Section 7 provided that nothing in the act should be considered as directing the Board (or any board established pursuant to its recommendations) to consider the consolidation or merger of the armed forces, and specifically directed that no consideration should be given to that matter.

THE CONFERENCE SUBSTITUTE

The substitute agreed to in conference provides, in section 1, that it shall be the purpose of the act "to provide for the development of a national aviation policy adequate to meet the needs of the national defense, of the commerce of the United States, both interstate and foreign, and of the postal service, and to provide for the formulation and clarification of national policies relating to or affecting aviation, including policies relating to the maintenance of an adequate aeronautical manufacturing industry."

Section 2 establishes a temporary Congressional Aviation Policy Board to be composed of five Members of the Senate, not more than three of whom shall be Members of the majority party, to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives, not more than three of whom shall be Members of the majority party, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. It will, therefore, be seen that, so far as the membership of the Board is concerned, the conference substitute follows the Senate amendment, except that no provision is made for appointment of members by the President or for inclusion of officers from the executive branch.

Section 3 provides that it shall be the duty of the Board to carry out the purposes of the act, and, in so doing, it is directed to study the current and future needs of American aviation, including certain specified matters relating to aviation. The Board is directed to report to the Congress, together with its recommendations, on or before March 1, 1948.

Section 4 relates to the selection of a chairman and a vice chairman; the filling of vacancies; the authority to appoint employees; the utilization of services, information, facilities, and personnel of Government departments and agencies; the holding of hearings; the authority to require by subpena the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; the authority to make necessary expenditures; and the conduct by the Board of its studies and investigations at such places and in such manner as may be deemed advisable.

Section 5 contains the same authority for appropriations which was contained in the Senate amendment.

Section 6 provides that members of the Board and employees thereof shall be allowed all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred while engaged in the activities of the Board.

CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
CARL HINSHAW,
EVAN HOWELL,
A. L. BULWINKLE,
J. PERCY PRIEST,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the conference report is a modification of the Senate bill. I know of no controversy in the matter.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, the conference report now under consideration represents a compromise between the broader, permanent legislation by which the House authorized a National Aviation Council, and a much more limited bill passed by the other body and directed largely to the question of maintaining an adequate aeronautical manufacturing industry.

The substitute, developed within the framework of the two proposals before the conferees, is of a somewhat temporary character, and authorizes a joint congressional board to make a study and report to the Congress on or before March 1, 1948.

Such a study as is proposed and authorized should prove extremely beneficial to the Congress and the country.

I wish to make it very clear that it was the understanding of the conferees that the temporary joint board authorized by the bill, is not to consider nor report on, the broad questions commonly referred to as the sea-air bill, and the chosen-instrument bill.

Committees of both Houses have spent weeks holding lengthy hearings on these two highly controversial proposals.

In my opinion, any effort by the joint board to go into those subjects would result in the bogging down of its program, and in failure to accomplish the greater objective of the board.

The regular standing committees of the House and the Senate are thoroughly capable of dealing adequately with the policy matters growing out of the sea-air and single-instrument proposals, and I am glad the conferees on this bill understand that this board is not to engage itself in that field.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL RESERVE BRANCH BANK BUILDINGS

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3592) to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the ninth paragraph of section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, as added by the act of June 3, 1922, and amended by the act of February 6, 1923 (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 522), is hereby amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a colon and by adding the following proviso: "*Provided further*, That the cost as above specified shall not be so limited as long as the aggregate of such costs which are incurred by all Federal Reserve banks for branch bank buildings with the approval of the Board of Governors after the date of enactment of this proviso does not exceed $10,000,000."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a similar Senate bill, S. 1519.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the ninth paragraph of section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, as added by the act of June 3, 1922, and amended by the act of February 6, 1923 (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 522), is hereby amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a colon and by adding the following proviso: "*Provided further*, That the cost as above specified shall not be so limited as long as the aggregate of such costs which are incurred by all Federal Reserve banks for branch bank buildings with the approval of the Board of Governors after the date of enactment of this proviso does not exceed $10,000,000."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of H. R. 3952 as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 3952) was laid on the table.

House Resolution 274 was laid on the table.

TERMINATING CONSUMER CREDIT CONTROLS

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 275 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 222) terminating consumer credit controls. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of House Joint Resolution 222 terminating consumer credit controls immediately upon the passage of the joint resolution. This is an open rule and provides for 2 hours of general debate.

This resolution comes to the House from the Banking and Currency Committee. It relates to what is known as regulation W of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. It is based on a Presidential Executive order issued August 9, 1941. It was purely a wartime measure and had for its purpose the restriction of installment buying.

Last December regulation W was revised. Restrictions on charge accounts and single-payment loans were eliminated. However, the control of installment loans on certain articles was continued. Included in the list are automobiles, stoves, refrigerators, washing machines, radios, and sewing machines. It will be noted that with the exception of automobiles the items covered are articles used in the furnishing of homes. I cannot see any good reason why such a regulation should be continued.

I have felt for sometime that these wartime controls should be abolished. It must be remembered that the war has been over for more than 2 years. Surely the time is here to get rid of these emergency regulations, unless it is contemplated they shall be made permanent. I am glad to see this resolution brought to the floor and I hope it will be adopted. The restrictions imposed by regulation W should be removed and these consumer credit controls terminated.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I cannot persuade myself that this resolution to eliminate all credit controls is in the best interest of our people or of the Nation.

Today more than 60,000,000 people are working, and the number is still increasing. While, in my opinion, the workers deserve more and better wages to offset price increases, at least the wages are fair and there was never so much money in circulation. People should be able to buy what they can afford for cash without being urged to buy on these "budget plans" with a high premium for extension of credit.

I am all too familiar with all these easy payment plans and budget plans for installment buying, and of the stranglehold of the chattel mortgage bankers and the commercial credit companies who discount the notes of the little people who, with small earnings, invariably can be pressured into buying goods on time because they do not recognize their own economic insecurity. Many economists have declared that excessive and unwise installment buying was one of the factors in plunging our country into the economic suffering and devastation of 1929.

PAY HIGH INTEREST FOR PRIVILEGE

Unfortunately, those who buy on the installment plan are forced to pay from 20 percent to 40 percent more for everything they buy on time, whether they realize it or not. When I oppose this short-sighted resolution I am trying to protect them from those shrewd installment merchants who so wrongly advertize throughout the Nation that their customers can buy on time for the same prices they would get on a cash basis.

Those statements simply are not correct. I have had a great deal of experience with the methods. You know and I know that even though the price tags may be the same, by the time the customer has paid all the fees and the interest on the contract he has paid through the nose for his purchases, and frequently has fallen into the clutches of the grim collectors for the commercial credit firms or the usurious small loan companies.

This system discriminates also against the small merchant—the little fellow who has no contracts with the big commercial credit concerns and no huge advertising budget to high-pressure the buying public. He cannot extend to his customers the same time contracts and consequently installment buying work always to favor the big merchants who can finance their sales by discounting the notes and installment contracts.

TOO SOON TO TAKE OFF ALL CONTROLS

Of course, I appreciate the fact that the paid spokesmen for the organized businessmen of the Nation say the merchants want no more Government restrictions on anything.

Well, they said that about OPA, and they said by repealing the Price Control Act and abolishing OPA the law of supply and demand would hold prices down and everybody would have enough of everything at no added cost. They said that abolishing OPA would mean that housewives could get more meat at lower prices, and that all foodstuffs would be more plentiful and no one would have to pay high prices for the abundant products.

But we all know that in spite of these easy promises from the industrial and mercantile leaders—who through their powerful and skillful lobbyists had been chiseling away at OPA to weaken it and finally brought about its end—that the moment the brakes of price control were off wholesale and retail prices shot up toward the sky, and are still trying to climb higher.

I know and you know that those promises were not made good, and it is too soon to take off the credit controls, for this resolution will just encourage inflationary pressures and increase unnecessary buying, with people of small means mortgaging their futures.

COUNSELS BUYING NECESSITIES ONLY

I know this Republican big interest resolution will be passed. You have the votes, and yes, the lack of a sense of interest in the little businessmen and the common people.

Nevertheless, I know what the situation means. I know what this resolution will do. The same kind of pressures forced the Federal Reserve System to end the 100-percent margin rule on stock buying, with the result that speculation began at once on the markets.

I think it would be better for all Americans who have to work for a living, and not too good a living, to desist from buying things they do not actually need just because they can buy on time, and paying exorbitant prices or credit charges, and thus fall into the clutches of some of these concerns without soul or sympathy or business ethics.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that this resolution is in the best interests of our country nor of the millions of men and women who will be persuaded to buy improvidently on some "pay in 10 easy payments" plan.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT].

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time on the rule in order to tell the House that I expect to offer an amendment to this bill to empower the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Bank to extend for a period of 9 months the regulations they now exercise over the sale of new and used cars.

The reason for this amendment is that the car market, both new and used, is in a very chaotic state. The supply of cars, both new and used nowhere begins to meet the demand. If, by repealing this regulation now, we superimpose a reckless installment demand for cars, we will be contributing to a very bad and inflationary situation.

Mr. Speaker, in general I am opposed to regulation, as my voting record shows. But at a time when we have the greatest inflationary pressures in the history of the Nation, when the amount of cash outstanding exceeds $28,000,000,000, when the bank deposits of the country exceed a hundred billions, when the use of credit is already at an all-time high in this country, when the automobile market is in such state that new cars are selling at a premium of from $500 to $1,500 each, I believe it would be wise for this House to at least allow the Federal Reserve Board to continue some kind of brake on this situation. I think we fail our duty to our people if we do not do so.

I have a letter in my pocket from the president of one of the largest independent finance companies in this country. He suggests that regulations should come off of installment selling generally, but he declares that we should not take the regulations off in the sale of new and used cars. We have a chaotic situation in that industry already.

If we take off all regulation we are going to accentuate an ugly situation in that industry, add to bad practice, and we are going to prolong a situation that is not good for the free enterprise system. So I ask your support for the amendment when the proper time comes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS].

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that so important a measure as this—and I do think it is tremendously important—should under the necessity of the closing hours almost of this session, have to be considered so briefly. I merely want to offer these observations.

The proposal before us is to remove all controls over consumer credit. We all want controls removed from everything possible and to get the Government out of the regulating business; that is natural. I am for removing all Government controls over consumer credit

as rapidly as it possibly can be done consistent with a sound national economy. But we must remember that we are still suffering from the aftermath, the economic upset, of the war. Some items in great demand are still in very short supply. With respect to about a dozen items, for example, automobiles, refrigerators, gas ranges, and the like, credit controls are in effect as prescribed by the RFC in what is designated as regulation W. The regulation, as you know, prescribes the amount of down payment that is required when these items are sold on credit, also the period of time over which installment payments may be spread. This regulation serves to limit consumer credit in the purchase of such items and to insure sound merchandising practices among the sellers.

Inflation of consumer credit is a most dangerous type of inflation. I would remind you that preceding the boom and bust of the late 1920's credit ran wild. Goods were sold a dollar down and a dollar when you catch the purchaser, to use the expression of that day. The result was that millions of people bought beyond their means of repayment and the merchants oversold on credit. This was a contributing factor to the crash of 1929 and added greatly to the severity of the losses sustained by our people as a result of it.

Following that crash many a little business house all over my section closed because they had oversold on credit. Here we are in a period of the greatest inflation in recent times when there are tremendous quantities of money seeking investment, preparing in one fell swoop to take off the control of regulation W affecting installment buying. This will invite unsound merchandising practices. One merchant will offer attractive terms. His competitor will feel it necessary to meet them in order to hold his business for the future.

I had a letter the other day from a small businessman down in my section expressing alarm at that prospect and he said:

Under that regulation—

Regulation W—

which requires the payment of at least 20 percent to one-third down in cash on certain articles in scarce supply, and the installments to be spread over a period of not to exceed 15 months, enables us to get enough payment on our goods and makes for sound business.

But—

Said he—

If you remove that regulation we small businessmen either must go out of business or be in competition with the big boys, oversell ourselves on credit and face possible bankruptcy.

That is what you will do to the small businessmen of this country if credit controls on certain items in short supply are too quickly removed. Present controls apply to only about a dozen items. The rules are flexible and can be removed by RFC when it is safe to do so, without any new law. But if by passage of this bill all credit controls are removed, we add to inflation now existing a new inflation of credit. If that happens and if the supply of scarce articles now under credit controls does not soon catch up with the demand, and there is no prospect that they will, we will find the little businessmen of this Nation oversold in order to stay in business. And when the crash comes you will have few little, independent businesses left in the Nation. The business will all be in the hands of the big chain boys and others who have sufficient resources to weather such a storm.

Some controls can be removed, no doubt. But to vote here to remove all controls now is dangerous. I cannot cast such a vote and I cannot but feel if this resolution becomes law we will invite a crash, a boom and bust. Much as we dislike controls, let us keep regulation W for the present.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I did not have the chance to hear the testimony on this bill and thus be able to obtain the views of all the experts who appeared before the committee. I regret I find myself in disagreement with my very dear friend from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], chairman of the committee.

To me the price level in this country at the present time is something that should concern all of us. A few days ago I sent a letter to some of the businessmen in my district and said to them in substance that which I am now going to say. If I were today running a business, manufacturing and selling goods, I would move heaven and earth to cut my margin of profit or profit margin on my mark-up and to reduce the selling price of the goods. I would sell to cash customers in every possible way and discourage the extension of credit in every way that I possibly could so as to put my firm, my customers, and my product on as substantial a foundation as possible; all looking forward to being on a firm foundation to meet the economic storms ahead.

I think margins of profit and prices in this country at the present time are absolutely ridiculous and indefensible in light of what is going on. We have 60,000,000 employed in this country, including pay-roll employees and proprietorships; but what of it? What about our production? Our production is probably no more than it was to take care of the number of people we had in 1939, and I am now speaking in tonnages. We have perhaps six, seven, or eight million more people to consume that production so the increased standard of living is not very excitable even with all of the high wages, high salaries, and high prices that now govern.

Now, what does all this have to do with the extension of credit? We can go out here at this particular moment when goods are moving out of this country to all the ports of the world through our gifts and our so-called credits, the price levels still advancing; we can remove these credit controls now exercised by the Federal Reserve Board and further stimulate prices and further cut the buying power of the men and women who live on fixed incomes, and further destroy the buying power of the savings of our people heretofore accumulated; we can do that by stimulating credit, by expanding installment loans, by making credit easier to those who do not understand these great economic forces that are now running, and who will spend every dollar they can get or borrow, simply because they have the privilege of doing it and because somebody will sell them goods at high prices on a credit basis.

Someone has made the statement here this afternoon to the effect that this kind of movement at this time would run contrary to the interest of the small merchant, and I certainly agree in that statement. This bill would help firms such as the Household Finance Corp., I think, perhaps, the biggest extender of consumer credit in the country. The big boys will get in on it. I do not want to demagog between the big boys and the little boys. I simply take the position that this is no time to further inflate prices by taking the steps advocated by this bill, so I am just fundamentally in disagreement in doing this particular thing at this time. I am not trying to sell anybody a bill of goods. Everybody, perhaps, has had their mind made up on this bill, and I simply wanted to be recorded in opposition to it. If the committee would see fit to put through a bill to remove these controls, say, 1 year from now, depending upon what the price-and-supply situation is at that time, that might be a wise course to pursue, but to remove these credit controls at this particular time when there is such an excess demand for goods on the one hand, and to encourage those who have big inventories to continually withhold the inventories by demanding higher prices, I think is an unsound proceeding for us to take.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL RESERVE BRANCH BANK BUILDINGS

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings by which the bill (S. 1519) to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes, as amended, was passed be vacated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill S. 1519.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the ninth paragraph of section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, as added by the act of June 3, 1922, and amended by the act of February 6, 1923 (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 522), is hereby amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a colon and by adding the following proviso: "*Provided further*, That the cost as above specified shall not be so limited as long as

the aggregate of such costs which are incurred by all Federal Reserve banks for branch bank buildings with the approval of the Board of Governors after the date of enactment of this proviso does not exceed $10,000,000."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TERMINATION OF CONSUMER-CREDIT CONTROLS

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 222) terminating consumer-credit controls.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 222, with Mr. REES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, regulation W of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, having to do with control of consumer credit, was promulgated under an Executive order, No. 8843, of August 9, 1941, which was issued under the authority contained in the Trading With the Enemy Act which, as you remember, was enacted during World War I. It was purely and simply a wartime measure, and served a very useful purpose during the war to control the demand for goods which were in short supply. Many claim that it is necessary at the present time to continue these controls as a hedge against inflation. Even the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board before our committee and before the Senate committee argued quite logically for the continuance of these controls to prevent inflation, but the statements and arguments for the continuance of these controls on the part of the Federal Reserve Board are completely belied by the action of the Board itself. We should ask the Federal Reserve Board if in its opinion it is necessary to continue these controls to prevent inflation, why they have been voluntarily removed on all but 12 commodities.

Credit which emanates from the sale of jewelry, credit which emanates from the sale of clothing, goes into the same credit pool and affects the volume and velocity of credit just as much as credit emanating from the 12 controlled commodities. So the committee decided that these controls and these powers have outlived their usefulness so far as World War II is concerned; that they became highly discriminatory against many, many veterans who were not able to build up their savings during the war and who were prevented by these regulations from furnishing homes even after this Congress took such very definite action as it did in making the homes themselves available to the veterans on very easy credit. In many instances a veteran can get a home today without much, if any, down payment, but after he acquires the home, then we find that we have prevented him, unless he has savings, from buying the refrigerators, the electric ironers, and the other household appliances mentioned in group B on page 2 of the report—sewing machines, washing machines, and so forth—things which are considered more or less necessary in the equipment of a modern home. So we decided it would avail a veteran nothing to give him an unlimited supply of credit with which to buy a home if we did not also remove the restrictions upon the furnishings for his home.

The gentleman from Nebraska says that he will offer an amendment to continue these controls on new and used cars. He should have in mind that under these controls a person who does not have the credit cannot buy a car at any price. Credit controls under regulation W do not have anything to do with the price of a car.

Under these controls, the veteran who wants to buy a car must pay in many instances $500 down and pay as high as $80 a month. A fellow who has some bonds or other savings can cash in his bonds or draw on his savings and get his $500 very easily. He can take the money from the savings that he has accumulated during the war as a result of high prices and high salaries, and the monthly payments of $80 do not hurt him very much. It is the fellow who was not able to save during the war because of low income that this discriminates against. The purpose of regulation W was to prevent an increase in the volume and velocity of credit to a point where through the acceleration of the velocity of credit there would be a cheapening of the value of our currency. In that respect, it has outlived its usefulness and becomes just an irritating control which should be removed if we are going to see justice done to all purchasers. It does not effectively slow up the demand for commodities any more. You can go to a bank today or you can go to a finance company and borrow the down payment, anything to the contrary, notwithstanding. You can borrow from the bank the down payment which you have to make on these commodities.

Suppose you have $500 in your pocket to make a down payment on a house. You go to the bank and you want to borrow $500 to make a down payment on household equipment. The bank says, "No, we cannot lend you this $500 with which to make a down payment on your household furnishings." So you take the $500 you have saved up to make a down payment on your house and you buy your household furnishings with that, and you borrow from the bank the $500 to make the down payment on your house. Also so long as you can buy a $500 diamond ring for 50 cents down and 50 cents a week for the rest of your life, it is perfectly silly to think that we are slowing up the acceleration of credit in any respect whatsoever by the continuance of these controls on only 12 commodities of the hundreds of thousands of commodities which are sold on credit in the United States.

I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT].

Mr. BUFFETT. Is it not true that under the present regulations a veteran or anybody else can buy a car or any one of the other items mentioned in this report with a down payment of one-third and 15 months to pay?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right. But because the period of amortization is limited to 15 months, the monthly payment is so large that the average GI cannot buy the car and meet his payments.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I understand that the Federal Reserve refuses to terminate this order on its own initiative.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; but it does not take an arbitrary attitude. In fairness to them, I must say that they have been very fair about this. And also, in that connection, the President has taken a very statesmanlike attitude in respect to this subject. He says in substance in a letter presented to the committee that he did not think he would be justified in continuing these wartime controls indefinitely into peacetime unless the Congress acted affirmatively to continue the controls, and if Congress did not act affirmatively to continue these controls in peacetime, then he would, on his own initiative, relinquish them or, in effect, rescind regulation W.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The categories under control were reduced from 36 to 12 on December 1, 1946, by the Board of Governors?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Only 12 categories are now under regulation?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is correct.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Is it not a fact that regulation W is now in effect under Executive order under the Trading With the Enemy Act?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right.

Mr. BUCHANAN. And unless the Congress sees fit to continue this, the Federal Reserve Board does not feel, nor does the President in his letter to the Chairman of the Board feel, that they should assume the responsibility.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is his attitude. I might say, to clarify this point, that this does not disturb the authority of the Trading With the Enemy Act to put these controls on again. But the President must make a new proclamation of a new emergency or we must be in another war before they can be again exercised.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Can the gentleman give us any idea as to the volume of credit

involved? That is, the volume of possible inflationary effect involved with referance to these 12 items, as opposed to the hundreds of thousands of things that are not so controlled?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I cannot tell you the correct amount because the total amount of credit outstanding is not known. It would be a gigantic job to get it all together, but there is a relatively small amount of credit now under the control of regulation W.

Mr. VORYS. Then, is it not a fact that this is a measure, at present, of exercising controls over what veterans and others should spend and what they should buy, and discouraging them from buying certain things, rather than a matter of credit?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. It operates, in effect, only as the Civilian Production Board controlled the allocation of materials. They think by exercising these controls that they can slow up the demand for these commodities.

Mr. VORYS. It is an example of a benevolent Government taking this method of telling certain poor people what they think they ought to buy? It seems to me it is time for this power to be taken away from the Government.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes, the objection is that, benevolent as the Government may be, they are at the same time discriminating against those whom the Congress does not want to discriminate against.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has again expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Suppose I am manufacturer A, with 100,000 refrigerators in my warehouse, which I am holding to get the price. I face the proposition where I sell those at a diminishing price, or if the Congress came along and removed all controls, so that I can sell them at an inflated price by reason of the fact that the customer is enabled to get credit: Does not this proposition encourage the manufacturers to maintain high prices and, perhaps, even to advance prices?

Mr. SPENCE. I do not think so. It probably would enable him to sell more refrigerators because more people would have credit to buy them which, I think, would be agreeable to both the seller and the purchaser.

Mr. Chairman, I have been one of those in favor of strict controls while the emergency existed. I think a great part of the perplexing problems that now present themselves to us have been due to a chiseling away and a weakening of the Price Control Act so it was no longer effective to consummate the purposes for which it was intended. I believe the present conditions with reference to housing and the cost of living is going to cause us great trouble. The weakening of the Rent Control Act made a travesty of it and it will not accomplish the purposes which were stated in the title but will rather encourage imposition on the tenant and ill relations between the landlord and tenant.

I have been in favor of controls during the emergency, and there still exist conditions which make for inflation; but I have also been in favor of the greatest personal liberty of the individual to spend his money as he pleased without direction from Washington unless control were absolutely necessary. We all know that credit is not based on capacity to pay, because many men who have plenty of money are poor credit risks. It is based upon character, and the best loan that can be made is a loan made to a man of character. He will pay.

It seems incongruous that credit should be regulated from Washington, that the man who has lived in his community all his life and established a credit and built up a character that justifies that credit should have his credit controlled from Washington. Such a condition should not exist unless there is the greatest emergency and it is absolutely essential to preserve our economy.

It is said that some of our veterans may be imposed upon if restrictions on credit are removed. That argument would mean that you should continue these controls indefinitely, because the improvident will always be imposed upon. It is said that the loan shark will take advantage of the veteran. I do not think there is a more contemptible character anywhere than the loan shark. Sir Francis Bacon says, "He who collects usury earns his bread in the sweat of another man's brow and ploweth on Sunday"; but how can you protect by law the improvident from imposition?

Is this an inflationary measure? There are thousands and thousands of articles that can be bought on credit but the Federal Reserve has exercised its authority on 12 major articles of household use that people need to furnish their homes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

I cannot conceive how the repeal of this authority at this time can be inflationary or weaken the economy of our Government. Men as a rule are more apt to extend their credit far beyond their means for other than necessaries. A man will be more apt to expend beyond his means on the purchase of a diamond ring or a fur coat than on a frigidaire. Credit used for these and hundreds of other luxuries is not regulated at all. Down payments and credit for the items upon which the Federal Reserve now exerts its authority under regulation W are a few necessary household articles which everyone who rents or purchases a home will need and which are absolutely necessary for the comfort and happiness of the family. Why should we be so anxious that the veteran and others should be properly housed and give them every opportunity to purchase a home under most favorable credit conditions and prevent them from using their credit to furnish that home? If you pass this act, the President may tomorrow declare an emergency and put back these controls.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I would like to quote from the testimony of Joseph Padway, general counsel of the American Federation of Labor, the following:

> The regulation as it stands now, in the postwar conditions, is discriminatory. People with a lot of money can get the things that they need, while those with less money, such as wage earners have found it in many instances impossible to obtain the things they need.

He further stated:

> Others have been compelled to cash their savings bonds in order to obtain things they cannot obtain otherwise, whereas if there were no regulation W, or regulations of that nature, they could retain those savings and holdings and obtain their credit and pay out over a period of time for the articles they need and still have their savings and their bonds.

Mr. SPENCE. The statement of Mr. Padway is obviously true. The regulation is discriminatory.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, these controls from Washington nullify the usefulness and the effectiveness of the character a man has built up in his community. It is a government of men and not laws, because the Federal Reserve can select by whim or caprice particular articles that it thinks consumer credit should not be exerted upon except under conditions prescribed and it seems to me that it is entirely incongruous that that condition should exist unless it is absolutely essential to our economy. I do not believe it is.

I realize that the forces of inflation still exist, but this is such a trivial thing. The exertion of this authority on 12 classes of articles would be like attempting to sweep back the tide with a broom. It is a restraint upon the people. The man who feels he is entitled to credit and the merchant who says he will give him the credit feel they are imposed upon because of this regulation. I cannot see how any harm will come to our economy or how it will affect in any degree the inflationary conditions that now exist. I think it is a restraint that should be removed from the people. The regulation is entirely incapable of enforcement in peacetime and a regulation or a law that is not obeyed by the people weakens our Government for government is obedience by whatever name it is called.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I cannot quite agree with either side that has expressed itself on regulation W here today. I do not think that repeal of regulation W is going to bring about uncontrolled inflation. Neither do I feel that the repeal of regulation W, effective now, is in good public policy. I am forced to agree with my chairman and with the ranking Democratic Member that it is a most difficult regulation to enforce.

It is a most difficult regulation to see that it is observed 100 percent.

In the last 2 weeks I have talked to more than two or three hundred businessmen, most of whom are well established retailers dealing in household appliances, furniture, and things of that nature, and I would say that more than 66⅔ percent of them are in favor of retaining regulation W for a little while longer.

They are, however, far from unanimous, and the hearings before the committee were far from conclusive that the general retail element of this country wanted to junk this almost last remaining inflation control that is still in the law.

I believe, not that you could describe the repeal of regulation W as being a force that would bring about uncontrolled inflation, but I believe you can truthfully say that it adds a few more pounds of steam pressure under an already overloaded boiler. I feel that with advancing wage cost and advancing living cost now current, that to take away this last vestige of control over selling on any kind of terms that the merchant advertises, would open up again a multitude of unsound selling practices.

Much can be said about the inequity of regulation W. You can buy gas ranges and you can buy electric refrigerators and other kitchen equipment that is attached to the house and finance that over a period of 20 to 25 years under FHA as the law now stands, but if you go into a store and buy on retail credit you are limited to a certain number of months and you are required to put up a maximum down payment of 20 percent on those appliances.

By repealing regulation W, however, I do not believe that the drive has been by the consumers to be allowed to purchase these things at a lower down payment.

Rather, I feel that the drive comes from merchandising men and loan-company men who feel that by cutting loose on unsound advertising, lending, and merchandising practices, the practices, if you please, of 1929, of advertising $300 or $400 worth of merchandise for $5 or $10 down and 24 or 36 months to pay, in a drive to pile more and more volume into that year's business, will overload the consumers of this country beyond their ability to pay. These consumers' income already, in real purchasing power, is being greatly cut down by the high cost of the necessities of living.

Throughout this country the newspapers have repeatedly called our attention to the fact that on thousands of used-car lots new automobiles are now selling from $500 to $1,000 above the manufacturer's list price. That is in the face of the fact that a down payment of 33⅓ percent is required to buy these "gray" market automobiles.

Now, if you reduce this down payment, if you reduce it down to 5 or 10 or 15 percent, the final ultimate result of these "gray" market automobiles will jump another $500, or perhaps another $1,000. Many, many people of this country desire merchandise that they have not been able to get during the war, and the price is no object to them. If they can buy on a little bit down, they will buy the cars regardless of price, and they will sign away their next year or 2 years' pay check in order to have the thing that they feel they must have at the moment.

You will be borrowing on next year's purchasing power and perhaps the year after next year's purchasing power, income that today is needed for sustaining an adequate living standard in the face of high living costs for the necessities of life. And you are adding more fuel to the fire of inflation. You will build up to the ultimate boom and bust that will come when you have these consumers overloaded with long-time, unsound installment credit.

I wish we could find a happy solution of this thing to insure the people of this country and to insure the merchants of this country that we do not want a permanent long-range Federal regulation of consumer credit. We are all against that. The businessmen of the country are all against permanent regulation of consumer credit, but I think that today automobiles, electric appliances, such as washing machines, electric refrigerators, electric mangles, and things of that kind, almost everything that yet remains on the regulation W list, with the one sole exception of furniture, are in extremely short supply.

As a long-time merchant, may I say that a 20-percent down payment is not an unreasonable down payment to expect on furniture, nor is 15 months an inadequate time on furnishing a house. I have been in business a long time, and I know that whenever you go in for unsound installment selling and financing, whenever you stretch the length of the terms far beyond the economic soundness of installment credit, someone must pay the bill for these unsound terms. You are going to find the customer is loaded with an excessive financing charge and is going to bear a pretty heavy expense for that additional unsound credit that has been extended to him.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Does not the gentleman believe the removal of these controls at this time might also have this effect: Under normal conditions, as the supply of these scarce items becomes adequate, the normal tendency would be for the price to come down. Is not that true?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is exactly right.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. If the premature removal of these controls on these scarce items results in a downward trend of credit terms, would not that tend to hold the prices up and increase the credit base at the bottom so that the prices would continue to increase?

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman is absolutely correct. In the furniture business alone the prices have begun to slip slightly since the high point that was reached about May or June of this year. If you remove all control over installment terms you will find a continuing spiral of prices starting again. I think it is inevitable if you remove the restrictions on electric refrigerators, gas ranges, and automobiles as well, because it opens up a much greater market when you start to sell for unsound down payments and extremely long terms. I believe that a proper policy would require an adequate down payment. If the business community were able to get into agreement among themselves and agree on what a sound installment policy would be, no one would want a greater stretchout of unsound terms.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the gentleman now is arguing exactly what I was arguing a while ago, that is, that a man with heavy supply, if he can find an expanded market by reason of installment selling, maintains his price.

Mr. MONRONEY. Or raises it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Or raises it. In most instances he can raise it. Take our rubber tire situation just recently. There was no installment selling of consequence. A great flood of tires came on the market. The manufacturers cut the price subsequently and the consumer benefited.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman is exactly correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. So we are simply planning here to further stimulate prices to hold where they are or advance as we move off these controls.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think the tendency will be toward an advance rather than a decline, because there are two elements in the selling of merchandise: One is the price of the merchandise and the other is how long they are going to have to pay for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

May I say to the gentleman that I think that as to what the gentleman from Michigan has brought out the facts belie the statement. Take table radios for example. The gentleman understands there are no credit controls on radios selling under $50. On table radios selling under $50 the price has been going down steadily. The price on radios above $50 has remained high. If it is true that the removal of the controls would cause the prices to go up, then of course the price of table radios would not be coming down, it would be going up. So I think in practice, although the theory advanced by the gentleman from Michigan might be somewhat idealistic, it just does not work out that way.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am sorry I disagree with my chairman. I have talked to many men that are in the radio business. They tell me the whole radio market is just as soft as putty, and that in merchandising radio sets is just good merchandising to promote a cheap radio, but if you go down with a hundred dollar bill in your pocket you can now probably come home with a $150 radio.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The continuation of this control is due to the soarcity of certain articles.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is one of the reasons.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. If that is the premise upon which it is founded, why did we take export controls off of automobiles?

Mr. MONRONEY. Have we taken export controls off of cars?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Perhaps the automobile industry is able to police its own exports. But whether or not that is the case, they export a very small number of automobiles because they have a great market here to supply.

I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Does the gentleman attribute any significance to the fact that the small loan companies are practically all in favor of the enactment of this law?

Mr. MONRONEY. I think it is perfectly obvious that the business people who are in favor of having sound credit terms are not nearly so unanimous in its favor. If you talk to your own merchants back home, I think you will find a difference of opinion among them.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS].

Mr. COMBS. Referring to the matter of radios and the fact that the cheap radios costing under $50, the table size, which are not under any control, have come down in price, is it not true that those are the small-model radios which are in plentiful supply, and only the higher-priced models are the ones that are in scarce supply and for which there is a great demand?

Mr. MONRONEY. I think there are many, many times more people manufacturing the small table models, and you have a keen competitive situation.

I am going to introduce an amendment, if I am permitted to do so, to postpone the effective date of the repeal of regulation W until February 1, 1948. Bear in mind under regulation W the Federal Reserve Board can reduce the down payments or discontinue the regulation if unneeded. It is a flexible thing. They can reduce these down payments and can take off any of the items which come in surplus supply.

I beg of the House at this time not to take away and sweep away the authority for necessary limitations on consumer-credit controls when we are in the face of an inflationary situation and an explosive price situation today.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, under the provisions of regulation W the situation strikes me something like this. Trying to control the entire price structure of this Nation by controlling 12 commodities is like a man standing at the bottom of Niagara Falls with a bucket and trying to stop the flow of the falls.

If there were an adequate mechanism designed to maintain prices at a certain level, that would be excellent, but these mechanisms do not exist, and the regulations are rather difficult to enforce without the proper machinery.

The question before us is whether consumer credit regulations should be a matter for the Congress to determine or whether an Executive order shall be continued for a certain period of time.

In this particular resolution, the assumption is that the Congress does not feel that they should control these 12 items in view of the fact that there are so many commodities and so many prices and items that are not under control today. The question of whether these consumer credit regulations should be a permanent regulation of the Government and the Federal Reserve authorities is the question under discussion. Opposition to the extension of consumer credit regulations is in line with the widespread desire to diminish or do away with all wartime controls. It should be remembered in this connection that the question of regulation of consumer credit is not one that arose solely during the war. The general regulation of the growth of credit has not been a Government policy for a long time.

Credit, as has been stated by a Member previously, is largely a personal question. At the present time, July 1, the total consumer credit outstanding, according to the Federal Reserve figures, aggregates almost $12,000,000,000. There is a potential of expansion of about $20,000,000,000. In other words, we are about two-thirds on our way at the present time. There still remains some eight or more billion that possibly could be extended before the situation would be reached that could be termed dangerous. By that time, of course, after 5 months' trial of this particular abolition, the entire field of price regulation and cost of living will have been under scrutiny and study by various committees of the Congress, and I am certain that if we find a situation by that time, February or March of 1948, that we could institute mechanisms of control, I firmly believe that we must face this situation soon. My point is that the mechanism does not exist for the effective and complete control of these particular 12 items.

In the case of automobiles you have a situation like this: There is an undercover or under-the-table market for the purchase of automobiles. That has existed, of course, because they are in short supply. Removing the feature of one-third down and 15 months to pay on automobiles certainly is not going to improve the production of automobiles and it certainly will not put anybody on a preferred list in order to secure an automobile. There is nothing in this regulation that determines the interest rate. That is a matter for the local area to determine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. In other words, if a person were determined to buy an automobile, the volume of credit and the amount of money would be equally affected; borrowing to buy a motor car has the same effect as selling a savings bond, which presumably would result in the Government having to borrow that much more from the banks. Therefore, if the proper mechanism existed for complete regulation and enforcement, I could go along with the idea that these controls should continue. But under the circumstances there is no well-organized or carefully administered plan for effectively regulating these 12 commodities under control of Regulation W. Therefore, on that particular premise I believe we should support the resolution.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. A lot of our returning veterans are not able to buy household furniture. Unless they have extended credit they cannot purchase it. I think that is unfair. The man who has the money can go out and get all the goods. But those are necessary things of life—furniture and things that go into a house. I think it is unfair, and I certainly think we ought to get away from regimentation as soon as possible. As a matter of fact, these 12 items will not have any effect, to amount to anything, on inflation. I think it is all bunk.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman from Georgia has stated a very good point. Those in the lower-income groups and especially the returning veterans, have not had an opportunity to accumulate savings. Therefore, there are many items of household necessity, in the line of furniture, in the line of household items, that are covered by these regulations, that are not within their purchasing sphere today. In a total purchase of some $600 for household items, let us say, similar to a radio or a washing machine or an electric refrigerator, the requirement of one-third down is quite a sum of money. Especially to those families in the lower-income groups. Should they—if their credit standing is acceptable to the retail merchant—be denied the right to purchase these needed household items? No; I do not think it entirely fair to these groups.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is only 20 percent. At most it would only make $120 down on a $600 bill of goods.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is correct. The terms on furniture are now 20 percent down and the balance would be repaid over a period of 15 months. On 10 household items, the down payment is one-third and the balance payable in 15 months.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I do not mean to be facetious or to belittle the position taken by anybody who opposes this resolution, but as I see it, I am just about in the position of having to apologize for taking the time of the membership of this committee to present this subject. When we read the list that is published of things to be kept under control as against a tremendous spiral of inflationary influences that might begin it seems to me that we have strained

at a gnat and swallowed a camel. Thirty-six items were under control in December, just 6 months ago. Twenty-four of those items were removed, but they seem to be excited that in the remaining items a great inflationary force might yet raise its head in danger to the people of this country. We leave controls on:

Cooking stoves and ranges, designed for household use.

Dishwashers, mechanical, designed for household use.

Ironers designed for household use.

Refrigerators, mechanical, of less than 12 cubic feet rated storage capacity—including food freezers.

Washing machines designed for household use.

Combination units incorporating any listed article in the foregoing classifications of this group B.

Air conditioners, room unit.

Radio-receiving sets, phonographs, or combinations.

Sewing machines designed for household use.

Suction—or as I have known them—vacuum cleaners designed for household use.

We insist upon leaving these under control as a guaranty against inflation. I am not mentioning this in a demagogic sense but calling your attention to the fact that probably of all the people affected in the United States by this retained regulation, the GI's who are back here crying for homes—and we are doing our dead level best to furnish them homes—are the ones most affected. We get them right up to the point where they get their house enclosed, a shelter on it, a door to enter the house, but we find not a stove, not a dishwasher, nor any of the things necessary to enable him to live in that house. Add to that, bless your soul, mattresses and beds. You have left them under control. Oh, you can buy them by paying 33⅓ percent down for some and 20 percent for some others; yet we want to be careful and say: "We cannot turn those loose, we cannot let you do as other people do with respect to other commodities in the name of inflation." It is a drop in the bucket as far as inflation is concerned. Would we make ourselves guardians of our GI's and others as to their purchase of essentials for their living—I cannot see it.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further request for time, the Clerk will read the resolution for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That after the date of enactment of this joint resolution the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall not exercise consumer credit controls pursuant to Executive Order No. 8843 and, except during the time of war beginning after the date of enactment of this joint resolution or any national emergency declared by the President after the date of enactment of this joint resolution, no such consumer credit controls shall be exercised hereafter.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUFFETT: Page 1, line 11, add a new paragraph as follows:

"*Provided, however*, That the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall be empowered to exercise consumer credit control on the retail sale of new and used cars until April 1, 1948, or such earlier date on which the Board finds the auto supply reasonably approaching demand."

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would have the effect of postponing the date upon which unlimited installment selling would take place in the automobile field.

However, it might be noted that the action of the President in carefully putting this problem in the laps of Congress is strangely at variance with his attitude on tax legislation and other matters. It may be that when the "bust" comes, this act will have provided him a scapegoat.

It seems to me here is one place where the Congress might exercise a little caution. You all know what the automobile marketing situation is. I do not believe there is anyone here who would contend that retail automobile selling is in anything except a chaotic state, when new cars are selling in every market in the country at premiums running from $100 to $2,000. It seems to me that we might go slow before we enact a resolution that would have the effect of intensifying that disorder.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. How much less money down will it require to buy an ordinary car under this new rule if this bill passes than at the present time?

Mr. BUFFETT. At the present time you can buy a car with one-third down and 15 months to pay the balance; so that installment selling is available in the car field. Under this resolution, as far as I can determine, you can make a contract to buy a car with anything from $1 down and X years to pay.

Mr. VURSELL. Is not the passage of this bill inflationary?

Mr. BUFFETT. The passage of this resolution is definitely inflationary to the extent that it expands the demand for cars from people who are unable to pay the one-third down payment required under the present regulation.

Mr. VURSELL. It will bring about a shortage of goods, is inflationary, and will be bad for the people?

Mr. BUFFETT. Certainly. To the extent that this bill intensifies the demand in areas of short supply, it is going to prolong the present inflationary situation and accentuate its evil consequences.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. The gentleman's amendment, as I understand, releases from the operation of regulation W 11 articles and only places it on one.

Mr. BUFFETT. Yes.

Mr. SPENCE. Would that be deflationary, or what effect would that have?

Mr. BUFFETT. That in itself will be inflationary only where demand exceeds supply. In the case of those 11 other categories the supply is generally meeting the demand. In most cities of this country you can go into stores and buy any of those other items. You do not have black-market conditions; you do not have under-the-table transactions.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Just what mechanism would be employed to effectuate this regulation?

Mr. BUFFETT. A continuation of the same Executive order.

Mr. BUCHANAN. In wartime it is rather easy to get people to cooperate, but in peacetime it is rather difficult, does the gentleman not assume that?

Mr. BUFFETT. Certainly.

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GRIFFITHS. The gentleman speaks about these under-the-table deals, and I presume he must know first-hand about them, of course. So I would like to know how in the world this will make an automobile sell for any less, because the fellow that comes in with as much as $500 or $1,000 that he wants to give you for the car would still have it, would he not?

Mr. BUFFETT. This will not clear up the present mess, but it will be intensified if this amendment is not adopted. Certainly the gentleman, who is an automobile dealer, is not in favor of seeing this situation made worse, is he?

Mr. GRIFFITHS. No. All I know about it is from reading in the papers. To be perfectly frank, we have never done any of this business. I do not think it comes from the dealers, but comes from the purchasers of the cars.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LESINSKI. The gentleman is talking about keeping control of automobiles. Does the gentleman realize that the day the retailer takes his car out it drops in price 25 percent, and there is not a company that will finance a car unless one-third is paid down, and the down payment has no effect at all on automobiles?

Mr. BUFFETT. Does the gentleman believe that if you buy a car today, and you take it out of the garage, that it drops in price 25 percent?

Mr. LESINSKI. Yes; because the retailer has a 25-percent profit, and, naturally, the value of the car drops 25 percent, and there is not a finance company that would give you any more money than two-thirds of the value of the car.

Mr. BUFFETT. I will suggest this to the gentleman, I wish he would find some new cars today at the 25-percent discount he speaks of.

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Does the gentleman know of any one single solitary car sale that was financed for $1,000 more than the factory said the delivered price was?

Mr. BUFFETT. No deal that meets the gentleman's precise specifications.

Mr. GRIFFITHS. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BUFFETT. Does the gentleman think there will not be a larger demand for cars if this regulation is wiped out now?

Mr. GRIFFITHS. It will not make any difference what kind of regulation you put on, you will sell all the automobiles you can get, and I also tell you that the dealer will certainly look over his buyer and sell it to him as a good financial risk, and he will sell it to him at the absolute factory price.

Mr. BUFFETT. Certainly, but there will be a larger demand, with consequent upward pressure on prices.

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Listen, my boy, at the present production you can sell anything you can get for the next 2 years without worrying about a time sale.

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman's argument for turning this thing loose is one of the very reasons the regulation should be retained, to keep pressure off of car prices.

Mr. Chairman, this committee is faced with the situation whereby it will accentuate or try to keep under some control a very unhealthy situation in the retail sale of automobiles. This amendment would, at least, put the Congress in the position of not adding fuel to that fire.

If the Congress wants to avoid adding to the inflationary spiral in the automobile field, it will take some salutary action. This amendment seeks to restrain the operation of loose credit practices in auto installment sales, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I never thought I would live to see the day when the gentleman from Nebraska would be advocating the continuance of Government controls. We have been fighting credit control on the part of the Federal Government ever since the original draft of the Banking Act of 1935. I think this bill is the clean-up legislation which gets the Government completely out of the credit-control field.

The gentleman has been arguing that to continue credit controls on automobiles would create a lesser demand for automobiles than there would be otherwise. Of course, if we follow that through to its logical conclusion, the same thing would apply to all commodities of which there is a short supply, including many of the basic items, clothing and all of the things which are now under regulation. So I do not see for the life of me why, if the gentleman from Nebraska wants to continue these controls for the purpose of slowing up the credit velocity, he does not insist that the Federal Reserve exercise the authority they have had ever since the directive of the President right across the board and control all installment buying.

I read from the testimony of Gary M. Underhill before the committee. He brings up quite a fundamental problem which confronts us. He speaks of the question of the social and political implications of such a policy, that is, the continuance of such controls. Then he advances this truism:

> A primary tenet of communistic doctrine, as expressed in Das Kapital, by Karl Marx, is that of the necessity for the central government to have control of credit in all its forms. It would be an unhappy day for the American way of life were Congress officially to sanction the power of a Federal agency to say on what terms and conditions consumer credit may be extended to individual American citizens in connection with their personal financial affairs.

Inasmuch as we are pledged to protect the American way of life and to restore it as fast as possible, I hope the gentleman's amendment will be defeated.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LESINSKI. Is it not a fact that in the automotive business all the high prices, above the regular price, are black-market prices, and must be paid in cash? They have no credit value of any kind.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Certainly. They have no trouble in getting cash for black-market operations in automobiles, the same as they did in meat and butter and everything else when those products were sold in the black markets.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. Does the gentleman contend that the supply and demand situation in any of the other categories is the same as it is in the automobile field?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not believe I speak with any more or less knowledge in these other categories than the gentleman does in respect to automobiles. I would say that the desire on the part of the Federal Reserve to continue the controls on the 12 categories is predicated upon a shortage of supply, which would apply as well, of course, to refrigerators, ironers, mangles, and radios as it would to automobiles. If there is justification for continuing these controls to slow up the acceleration of credit, as a control against the volume and velocity of credit, then of course these controls should be exercised right across the board. But until they do that then we must be suspicious that these controls are being used more to control the distribution of goods than the price of goods.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. MONRONEY: On page 1, line 3, after the word "after", strike out the balance of the line and insert "February 1, 1948."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment which postpones the revocation of regulation W until after the first of the year. It is somewhat in line with the action taken by the other body which did postpone the revocation of regulation W, but which provided for fixing the down payments at not less than 20 percent or stretching terms longer than 24 months.

This regulation is a flexible one. Under my amendment it would allow the Federal Reserve Board to set the limits below what they are now if they found that could be justified.

I yield to my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. RIZLEY. Did I understand correctly some statement which was made by a Member in the well of the House to the effect that even if we pass this legislation today the Chief Executive can make it effective again tomorrow?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is not true because of the provision that we have written in the bill.

Mr. RIZLEY. Someone, I understood, made that statement.

Mr. MONRONEY. That would not be true. I think the language of the bill adequately safeguards the bill and the wish of Congress would not be overridden in the matter.

Mr. RIZLEY. That is the reason I propounded that question. Someone, if I understood correctly, said that even though we pass this legislation the Chief Executive could make it effective tomorrow by declaring an emergency.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think he could declare an emergency, but this is such a small and insignificant thing that it is inconceivable that he would declare another international war emergency or something like that in addition to those that we already have on the books.

Mr. RIZLEY. Then the amendment of the gentleman postponing the date until February 1, of 1948, if the President has authority to deal with the situation without any legislation, is simply a gesture to him that Congress thinks we ought to get rid of it.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think it is a pretty good idea for Congress to speak so that we would give the country assurance that we do not want any permanent consumer credit regulation frozen into our system, and this is our way of doing it.

Mr. RIZLEY. I was wondering why the gentleman's committee does not write legislation if we are in favor of abolishing this credit regulation which would do that instead of leaving it up to the President to make such controls effective again by declaring an emergency.

Mr. MONRONEY. I still think that we ought to have this kind of legislation.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The inquiry of the gentleman from Oklahoma is answered in the letter of the President to the Chairman of the Board Eccles in which he made the following statement:

> If the Congress does not see fit to provide the necessary legislative authority, it is my intention to vacate the Executive order because I do not believe that such regulations should rest indefinitely in peacetime on emergency or war powers after the Congress has had ample opportunity to consider the subject.
>
> Very sincerely yours,
>
> HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The charge has been made that this regiments consumer credit. Let us be realistic about the situation. What actually regiments consumer credit is generally one or two big advertisers in the local community who fix by their big advertisements the down payments and the length of terms, and who make every dealer and every merchant who wants to merchandise and extend credit on an adequate and safe basis meet the lowest common denominator of credit term advertising.

It is unsound because it is going to load a great many small businesses up with long-time consumer-installment paper. When the break comes in prices the goods are going to go back to the dealer who sold them and then bounce back on the bank, just like we had at the conclusion of World War I, when we had a literal graveyard of small businesses.

I disagree with those who have said that the sole purpose of this legislation is to thin out or restrict the market. I think the main purpose of regulation W during the war and now is to try to keep our business economy on an even keel, to try to prevent the thousands of bankruptcies that occurred after World War I because of unsound credit expansion, and to try to span this troublesome dangerous period we are going into with sound business operations.

I hope my amendment is agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, of course the effect of the gentleman's amendment would be to negative the bill as it has been reported out. I think that all of the statements in the committee report, and in the hearings, and what has been said on both sides of the aisle bear out the fact that these controls should be removed immediately if we are going to restore business to the American way of life. We should resolve that henceforth, until a new emergency is proclaimed, or until we enter another war, we should restore the American way of doing business.

The amendment, of course, should be voted down.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me it would be very unwise to pass this resolution at this time. I feel that when the history of this Congress is written, the future will say that its chief failure has been that we have done absolutely nothing to control inflation. It seems to me that every action we have taken at this session has done something, however small it might have seemed at the time, to add to the fires of inflation.

Something has been said about protecting the veteran, and that the veteran is not able to make the down payment on furniture or on an automobile. We have just passed, and the Senate has now passed, a bill to permit the veterans to collect their terminal-leave-pay bonds in cash. So they all should have the necessary funds to make the down payment on their furniture and on their automobiles. That in itself is inflationary, but I think was justified, and I voted for the bill. Now, we come here and remove these controls and simply add more to the inflationary spiral.

A few days ago this House refused to appropriate money to allow veterans and other farm tenants to buy farms. How inconsistent, it seems to me, it is for this House to refuse to appropriate money to permit the veterans to buy farms, because we say that real-estate values are now inflated, and yet remove these controls and make it possible for him to buy an automobile at a terribly inflated price which he probably does not need nearly as badly as he needs a farm.

Somebody has said something about preserving the American way of life. I believe in that, but you are not going to do it by taking off all controls and permitting inflation to run away with our country. It cannot be done that way. If you want the American way of life destroyed, just let another period of depression come upon this country and you will see the people turning to some other form of government. Communism and socialism do not come from reasonable and sane restraints and regulations on our free-enterprise system. But these "isms" may come if we do not make our democracy work for the good of all. The only way we can preserve our Government from socialism or communism is to do something that will show that we can prevent these alternate periods of boom and bust. If we do not do it, we are lost.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Does not the gentleman feel that if the veteran had sense enough to fight and win the war he has sense enough to know whether he wants to buy a home or an automobile or a wheelbarrow with his terminal-leave money?

Mr. LANHAM. I think so. I think we ought to let him have the money to buy land too, if he wants to do it.

I am not in favor of keeping these controls to try to protect the veteran or any other class of purchasers, but because I know it adds to the fires of inflation and simply boosts prices higher and higher; and you mark my words, if we let this thing go on as it is now, we are due for the greatest depression we have ever seen. It may be 3 years, it may be 4, it may be 5, but when it comes—when it comes, who knows but that our way of life will be done for? And I do not want to see it done for. I want to see us exercise our judgment and try to control these forces of inflation and prevent the "bust" that is sure to come, unless we do.

I hope the House will adopt the amendment just offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. And yet I know you probably will not do it, but will pass the resolution.

I know my words are probably futile, and I do not like to disagree with the experienced members of the Committee on Banking and Currency. It pains me especially to disagree with the distinguished member of the committee, Mr. PAUL BROWN, my colleague from Georgia, but I feel so strongly on the matter of our failure to do anything to control inflation that I felt compelled to speak.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have the honor of serving as a member of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. During the past few weeks we have been holding hearings and practically every witness that has appeared before the committee has advocated that these controls be continued.

Mr. Arthur Whiteside, of Dun & Bradstreet, I remember specifically expressed alarm. Industrialists from the automobile and other manufacturers' groups were very much concerned for fear we might be working into another boom and bust period such as followed 1929, for if we remove these controls we are simply adding so many bidders for the articles available. Prices are bound to increase all along the line.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUBER. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. Were Dun & Bradstreet in favor of rent control and the control of prices such as we had under OPA during the past year?

Mr. HUBER. Some of the witnesses were somewhat apprehensive that perhaps we had removed the other controls too soon. Several mentioned that there was a possibility that we might have to restore some of these controls.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUBER. I yield.

Mr. BUFFETT. Is it true that the head of Dun & Bradstreet recommended a continuation of these controls?

Mr. HUBER. That is my impression of Mr. Arthur Whiteside's position.

Mr. BUFFETT. And that is the largest credit rating institution in the country, is it not?

Mr. HUBER. That is true.

Mr. BUFFETT. If anyone can speak with authority it is the head of that firm.

Mr. HUBER. I feel so. They were asked to send a questionnaire out to all the business leaders throughout the United States. Answers to those questionnaires came back and were very helpful to the committee. I think there is not a better qualified credit organization in the country.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope the House will vote down House Joint Resolution 222.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MONRONEY) there were—ayes 15, noes 83.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PETTS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 222, terminating consumer credit controls, pursuant to House Resolution 275, he reported the same back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk Senate Joint Resolution 148, to authorize the temporary continuation of regulation of consumer credit, and its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System is authorized to continue to exercise consumer credit controls pursuant to Executive Order No. 8843 until December 31, 1947: *Provided*, That no such regulation shall fix a maximum maturity of installment credit of less than 24 months, or require a down payment in excess of 20 percent of the purchase price.

SEC. 2. Except during any war beginning after December 31, 1947, or any national emergency proclaimed by the President after such date, no such consumer credit controls shall be exercised after such date.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That after the date of enactment of this joint resolution the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall not exercise consumer credit controls pursuant to Executive Order No. 8843 and, except during the time of war beginning after the date of enactment of this joint resolution or any national emergency declared by the President after the date of enactment of this joint resolution, no such consumer credit controls shall be exercised."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the title may be appropriately amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD with reference to House Joint Resolution 222.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CONSUMER-CREDIT CONTROLS ARE PART OF NEW DEAL PLANNED-ECONOMY PROGRAM

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 222, now under consideration, seeks to terminate consumer-credit controls, pursuant to Executive Order No. 8843, issued by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, except during the time of war, beginning after the enactment of this resolution, or during any national emergency declared by the President after the enactment of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, on March 11, 1947, I introduced H. R. 2498, which would absolutely and for all time terminate existing consumer-credit regulations, prescribed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. My bill was much more comprehensive and far-reaching than the resolution under consideration.

Regulation W, prescribed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, was issued pursuant to Executive Order No. 8843, entitled "Regulation of Consumer Credit," dated August 9, 1941. The First War Powers Act, 1941, section 301, is considered the statutory authority upon which regulation W and the Executive order are based. The 1941 act is an amendment to the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended.

Under regulation W, installment buying and credit arrangements are so curtailed and limited, that it is possible for the administration to discriminate between various classes and individuals who purchase durable goods in this country. Such discrimination has resulted most unfavorably against the laboring man and the GI. These people were not able to make the requisite down payment, and the installments or amortization payments had to be made within such a limited time that the credit was prohibitive to the average laboring man and the average GI. Hence, these people were not privileged to buy and pay for over a long-term period, the durable goods they wanted. It was ridiculous but true that terms of purchasing a house in which to live were quite reasonable, but the man of limited means with a small regular income could not purchase the furniture with which to furnish the house. The wealthier classes could purchase for cash or on this restricted installment-payment plan. Such was an unfair discrimination and should not be tolerated.

The administration is not willing to take the responsibility of placing all of the people of this country on the same level. Congress should assume this responsibility by passing this resolution. It is my humble opinion that Congress should go even further and repeal the Trading With the Enemy Act and all of its amendments, thus depriving the President of the authority or opportunity to issue further Executive orders which would discriminate in favor of some and against other citizens of this country.

This resolution is a step in the right direction and to the extent it goes New Deal planned economy is removed and consumer-credit controls terminated.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a short speech she expects to make in introducing a bill.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EMERGENCY RENT ACT

Mr. ALLEN of California submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3131) to extend for a period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended.

AMENDMENTS TO UNITED STATES HOUSING ACT OF 1937, AS AMENDED

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1361) to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit loans, capital grants, or annual contributions for low-rent-housing and slum-clearance projects where construction costs exceed present cost limitations upon condition that local housing agencies pay the difference between cost limitations and the actual construction costs.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 15 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(6) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (5) of this section, or of any other section of this act, the Authority is authorized to make capital grants, loans, or annual contributions for low-rent-housing or slum-clearance projects, in the full amount of any sums previously allocated pursuant to this act, to any public housing agency, at the request of such agency, upon condition that such agency will pay, or cause to be paid by the State or political subdivision, the difference between the cost limitations prescribed in subsection (5) of this section and the actual cost of construction per family dwelling unit or per room during the period of building construction. The receipt of capital grants, loans, or annual contributions by any public-housing agency pursuant to this subsection shall in no way prejudice or impair the rights or privileges of such agency to participate fully in other low-rent-housing or slum-clearance projects under this act or any other law. Nothing in this subsection shall prejudice the right of those public-housing agencies which can, by reason of lesser need, or would prefer to delay the starting of their proposed building operations until labor and material costs stabilize at levels consistent with the cost limitations prescribed in subsection (5) of this section."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, after the words "or cause to be paid by the State or political subdivision," strike out the remainder of the sentence and insert in lieu thereof the following: "such proportion of the total development cost of the project as the amount of the average actual cost per family dwelling unit of the items covered by the applicable cost limitations

prescribed in subsection (5) of this section in excess thereof bears to such average actual cost: *Provided*, That the amount of any such payment shall be excluded from the base on which the maximum amount of any capital grants, loans, or annual contributions authorized by this act are calculated."

Following section 1 of the bill add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 2. Section 2 (1) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by changing the period at the end of the second sentence to a colon and adding the following: '*Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Federal Public Housing Authority and all officers and employees thereof are hereby prohibited, during the period beginning on the effective date of this proviso and ending on February 29, 1948, (1) from initiating or maintaining any action or proceeding to recover possession of any housing accommodations administered by such Authority, if such action or proceeding is based upon the fact that the income of the occupants of such housing accommodations exceeds the allowable maximum, and (2) from in any manner requiring any State or local public housing agency to take any action to recover possession of any housing accommodations administered by such agency, if the basis for requiring the State or local public housing agency to take such action is the fact that the income of the occupants of such housing accommodations exceeds the allowable maximum, unless other adequate housing facilities are available for said occupants.'"

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of section 2 of this bill which has been worked out by those who are concerned with unreasonable evictions from federally owned and other low-cost housing projects. This provision restricts evictions unless "other adequate housing facilities are available"—and I submit that it would be inhumane to evict such tenants when they have no place to go and live—therefore, I wholeheartedly support this proposal and trust that the House will adopt it to prevent grave injustices.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AID

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 296 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas the importance and complexity of aid required by foreign nations and peoples from the resources of the United States is assuming increasing proportions; and

Whereas such aid directly affects every segment of the domestic economy of the United States; and

Whereas the problems relating to such aid are of a nature to lie within the jurisdiction of a number of the standing committees of the Congress; and

Whereas these problems should, in order to safeguard the resources and economy of the United States, be given the most careful consideration in relation to each other; and

Whereas an integrated and coordinated study should be most valuable to the standing committees of the Congress: Therefore be it

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee on foreign aid composed of 19 Members of the House of Representatives, who shall be appointed by the Speaker. The Speaker shall designate one of the members of the select committee as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the select committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to make a study of (1) actual and prospective needs of foreign nations and peoples, including those within United States military zones, both for relief in terms of food, clothing, and so forth, and of economic rehabilitation; (2) resources and facilities available to meet such needs within and without the continental United States; (3) existing or contemplated agencies, whether private, public, domestic, or international, qualified to deal with such needs; (4) any or all measures which might assist in assessing relative needs and in correlating such assistance as the United States can properly make without weakening its domestic economy.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) from time to time as it shall deem appropriate, but finally not later than March 1, 1948.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, either within or without the continental limits of the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to employ such personnel, to borrow from Government departments and agencies such special assistants, to hold such hearings, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 6, strike out "to employ such personnel, to borrow from Government departments and agencies such special assistants."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACKINNON].

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the bill just passed immediately preceding its passage.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I shall later yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. No one has said anything to me about calling this resolution up this afternoon.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I regret that very much.

Mr. RAYBURN. It certainly is to be regretted.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understood that the matter had been cleared with the leadership or it would not have been called up.

Mr. RAYBURN. Well, I have heard a good deal about resolutions that might be introduced by committees, and so forth, but I certainly did not know that this resolution was coming up. This is the first time I have ever seen it, to be frank with the gentleman. It may be all right, but I have never seen this resolution before.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It was on the agenda to be called up, and I did discuss the matter with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules. I did not discuss it with the leadership, because I presumed the minority leadership was aware of the schedule for today.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I certainly respect the situation of the distinguished minority leader. When the program for the week was announced I was quite careful to point out that we had a very considerable number of rules outstanding that we had to dispose of during the week; that it would be impossible to determine definitely and to assign days and particular times for their consideration. Now, I very likely have been in error in not suggesting to the gentleman from Texas that these particular matters might be called up this evening. However, I might suggest to the gentleman that I do not know that there is any substantial controversy about them, and if they are adopted, of course, there is the matter of arranging for money necessary to carry on the work. I also understood that the gentleman from Ohio had talked to the ranking Democratic member of the Committee on Rules, and that he knew it was coming up.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman from Indiana states the fact when he says he stated that these resolutions were coming up and that he could not at that time give the order in which they were to come, but this is a rather important resolution. It is very important. Maybe the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Illinois could explain it to me in such fashion that I would not have any doubt about it when they got through, but maybe not.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. So that there can be no misunderstanding, if the consideration of this resolution is completed in time, it is the intention—and it has been cleared with the gentleman from Illinois—to call up House Resolution 295, and then later to call up House Resolutions 297 and 298.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman does not mean today?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; depending on the length of time it takes to consider them.

Mr. RAYBURN. I know, but I think that around 5:30 we should quit work for the evening.

This is what I am afraid of, I will say to the gentleman frankly, and I think I have said this to the Speaker and the majority leader. I do not want this session of Congress to come to a close with us finding about 48 hours before we adjourn that we have too much time on our hands. I have seen that cause a lot of trouble.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I can certainly use a little time for the rest of the evening, and I am sure the other Members of the House can, too. It has been a rather strenuous day.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 296, reported by the Committee on Rules, provides for the establishment of a select committee of 19 Members of the House to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom shall be designated by the Speaker to serve as chairman, to make a thorough study of the various problems of foreign aid.

It seems to me, and I believe I am a reasonable individual, that if the Congress of the United States is to continue appropriating and spending many hundreds of millions, or perhaps billions, of dollars on foreign aid, if we are to be called upon to support or pass upon some other sort of foreign economic program in the future, to later be outlined by the President or the Secretary of State, that the Congress of the United States should be fully informed of what is going on in Europe. That would simply be using good common sense. I know of no way the Congress can obtain such information other than through the appointment of a committee of this type. We will follow later with another resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to make certain additional investigations as to foreign relations.

You may say that it is not necessary to have a select committee, yet there are at least half a dozen committees of this House, regular legislative committees, that are called upon at one time or another to exercise their judgment and to pass upon some facet, some particular angle, of this foreign-aid problem. So it has been determined that it would be wise to authorize the Speaker to select a special committee, upon which all these various standing committees may have representation, to make an over-all study, not only of what demands may be made upon the United States in the future for foreign aid, but also as to the ability, if you please, of the United States to meet such demands.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I think the resolution provides for a very distinct need, may I say to the gentleman, because it has been my observation that this program of foreign aid and relief comes before the Congress after the country is committed, and comes before us piecemeal, a bit at a time, so that we have no overall view of the entire picture.

Am I correct in the assumption that those who sponsor this resolution have in mind that we shall as a result of the action of this committee obtain an overall picture of what all of these demands may amount to in all fields and for all purposes so that the Congress may not be called upon to make these appropriations piecemeal, here and there, bite by bite?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman is exactly correct in his assumption. While I cannot answer for the Speaker, I believe I can say that in the information given to the Committee on Rules it was pointed out that various legislative committees dealing with this great problem, such as the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Committee on Agriculture, and all the other great committees of the House which are in one way or another involved in the legislative processes that are necessary to put into operation any kind of foreign-aid program, will be represented on this special committee and receive factual information from it.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman neglected to mention the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; I should have mentioned the Committee on Ways and Means, and I apologize to the member of that great committee.

I should mention also the Committee on Armed Services, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] suggests.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. From the gentleman's remarks, I gather it is the purpose of this resolution not to place this select committee over the standing committees of the House and ignore the standing committees of the House. This select committee will be supplemental to the standing committee structure of the House rather than in substitution of them.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is exactly right. In other words, the standing committees of the House, the regular legislative committees of this body, will continue to operate and function as usual in their particular fields, but each of the committees which deals with the foreign-aid program will have one or more representatives on this special select committee which will make an over-all study of the entire problem. Then each of the individuals from such committees will report back to them.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. LESINSKI. Will this committee also make a study of the displaced persons in Europe and the help that we are giving them?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I presume that is one of the many angles or facets of the problem of foreign aid. It certainly is in my opinion. I cannot speak for the committee and, of course, it will determine what it shall study.

Mr. LESINSKI. I would suggest that they investigate the State Department to find out how many aliens they are permitting to come here not in accordance with law.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am happy to have the gentleman's suggestion, and I am sure the committee will give proper attention to it.

I know of no objection to the authorization of this committee since it was first suggested. I have seen quite a number of favorable editorial comments upon the action which is proposed here, and of the necessity of Congress being informed and of the American people being given some knowledge of the demands that will be made upon them; what may be expected of them; what we may be able to do; and whether we should do it. Certainly, unless we are informed, unless we do have this committee as our agent out getting information for us; and furnishing us with facts, it will be very, very difficult for any of us to use proper judgment on future foreign-aid legislation.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Am I correct in stating that this resolution was sponsored by the very distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER]?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] is a very distinguished man in this particular field of endeavor.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I agree fully. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] is also a member of the Committee on Rules. He did not care to handle this resolution himself, as he is modest, and properly so, with respect to presenting his own resolution and, therefore, I am presenting it to this body as the spokesman for the Committee on Rules and hope it will be adopted.

GLOBAL TRAVELS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, originally I was under the impression that we would take up the Landis bill, but about 45 minutes ago I was informed that the Herter resolution and the Eaton resolution would both be called up in precedence to the Landis bill. It did not give me sufficient time to inform the minority leader, the former Speaker [Mr. RAYBURN] of the change in the program, which I regret. But they keep me rather busy and I do not know where to turn first.

As to the pending resolution, it is far reaching. I was under the impression, when the request was made, that the Eaton resolution, which was reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee, would be sufficient for all purposes. But the winning ways of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER], and his explanation and the knowledge he has displayed, somehow convinced the majority of the members of the committee that not only his resolution but also the Eaton resolution should be passed. I feel they are duplicative duplication. Of course, I have no objection to the Republican majority making all the investigations and all the mistakes they want to make. They are legislating themselves right out of their present majority.

JUNKETS WILL COST MILLION DOLLARS

Besides these two resolutions, we have four or five other investigative resolutions pending, all of them proposing to investigate somebody or something. I suspect, of course, that some of the special committees that have been appointed may take advantage of the opportunity to do rather more traveling than investigating. I am satisfied that it will cost the Government a great deal of money.

I find that we have already appropriated more than $600,000 for these investigating committees.

With the passage of these two resolutions and the others that are pending and sure of passage, I venture to say that it will cost more than a million dollars for House committees alone. This is in addition to the many resolutions passed

in another body to investigate a little bit of everything which may easily increase the cost of congressional investigations this year another half-million if not more.

I know that some of these investigating committees are going to reach a place where they will stop their investigations rather quickly, for they will find that some of the things complained of in former years are directly due to Republicans who held important positions where they could profit themselves or enable their friends to profit—when they get to that point they will stop. They will not be inclined to proceed when they discover that they will have to investigate Republican leaders, Republican manufacturers, Republican contractors, and that the contracts they are looking into were handed out by patriotic dollar-a-year men who were still on the pay rolls of their big companies, or knew their jobs were being held open for them, so that frequently their corporations were the beneficiaries of their official acts.

NO MINORITY REPRESENTATION

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we have plenty of investigations planned and plenty of committees to make them.

In view of the scope of the resolution to follow, House Resolution 295, this Herter resolution seems to me to be duplicative. It is a broader resolution, providing trips to all parts of the world for 19 members from various legislative committees. Originally only 15 members were included, but I understand that there were so many gentlemen who wished to travel the world over without personal expense that they were obliged to agree to increase the number to 19. It is noticeable that the resolution provides for no representation from the minority party; but it is to be hoped that in making appointments the Speaker will be guided by the precedents of the House from time immemorial.

All the committees from which it is planned to obtain representatives on this traveling investigation deal directly with legislation, and perhaps the information which they glean in Europe, Asia, Africa, and other far-flung quarters of the globe may be put to good advantage in shaping legislation in the future. Perhaps the Foreign Affairs Committee would not have been able to obtain the same information for itself, because it is more restricted as one of the standing committees of the House, and would not be willing to go as far afield as this special committee to be appointed by the Speaker.

I do not know how much this junket will cost.

I am inclined to think that by the time this committee completes all its trips and junkets under this world-wide travel cruise it may cost the country $100,000 or more.

Of course, I have faith that the Speaker will appoint to this roving commission gentlemen who have the interests of the country at heart, and who therefore will not overrun their authority under this resolution, which is so broad that they can investigate anything and everything, without any apparent limits to their jurisdiction.

CAN THEY REPORT BY MARCH?

The resolution provides that they shall make a report by March.

I do not see how they can make all the side trips which I hear are contemplated, and still be able to present a report to the Congress and to the country by that time which will be helpful or as comprehensive as their travels.

I have the highest personal regard for the attainments and the ability of the gentleman who introduced this resolution, and whose suave and smiling ways are almost irresistible. It has been very difficult for me to bring myself to oppose the resolution; but I felt it my duty, in spite of my affectionate regard for the gentleman, at least to call attention to what it aims to do.

I fully appreciate the fact that the gentlemen on my left—I do not want to call them leftists—have the votes and will pass this as they have passed many other similar and equally unnecessary and frivolous resolutions, regardless of cost to the taxpayers, and requiring the useless expenditure of large sums of money without consideration for the American taxpayer who will have to foot the bill.

Knowing this, seeing that the hour is late, and having no desire to delay consideration, or to keep Members here without just cause, I conclude my remarks, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, this resolution merits the unqualified support of every Member of the House. It provides us collectively and individually with the best possible means of meeting the tremendous responsibility which most certainly will face us in the immediate future as to the nature and extent of aid to other nations and peoples. Through this select committee on foreign aid, we will have the benefit of the invaluable experience and judgment of our colleagues who will be equipped with an understanding of the many phases of a foreign-aid program and their relation to the domestic economy of the United States. In the words of the resolution, "an integrated and coordinated study should be most valuable to the standing committees of the Congress." Obviously, such a study and the judgment of the members of the select committee will be invaluable to the individual Members of Congress. We have had the recent, unsatisfactory experience of having presented to us programs in the nature of completed action with substantially two alternatives. We could approve them as presented or we could reject them. But it would be difficult to point to any evidence that consideration had been given to the actual and prospective needs of the nations and peoples involved in these programs, to the resources available here with which they meet those needs, to the ability of existing agencies, private, public, domestic, or international, qualified to deal with those needs, or to the fundamentally important matter of the effects of those programs on a sound, domestic economy within this country which, if weakened by makeshift expedients, will surely jeopardize the possibility of any effective foreign aid.

In this connection Members will wish to read the portion of the midyear Economic Report of the President submitted to the Speaker on Monday. May I quote two sentences:

> The time has come now to put increased emphasis on programs that assure the restoration of a working world economy.
>
> In formulating new foreign-aid programs we must consider not only the requirements of foreign countries for our aid, but also our own resources and needs.

We are opposed in our efforts to devise such a program by those who count on their conviction that this country will not continue to try to establish a working world economy or, if it does, is so incapable of doing so, that we will collapse economically so that they can pick up the pieces. Their fatal mistake is their complete inability to understand the sincerity, integrity, and good faith of the American people in the determination to bring about conditions in this world under which decent people can live in peace. In meeting that challenge, we can make a beginning through the unanimous passage of this resolution which can be and, I am confident, will be as important and as significant as any resolution passed by this Congress since the declaration of war in 1941. As we united then in the great objective before that Congress, I hope we can unite today in this equally important objective. Some of those who then doubted our ability to realize that earlier objective now doubt our ability to realize the objective ahead of us at this time. But they will remember that we accomplished a miracle in the fight for that earlier objective because we were a united nation. This resolution gives us the best available means of acting as an informed, determined, and united nation in our effort to discharge the clear responsibilities we have in the world of today and of all the days to come.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SABATH. I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. There being no further requests for time, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3123) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1948, and for other purposes, with an amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 176, and concur in the same.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

> Senate amendment No. 176: In line 6 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "management" insert "now being performed in the District of Columbia."

And in line 7 of the matter inserted by said amendment after the word "bureau" insert "including tract books heretofore held and administered in the District of Columbia."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the purpose and intent of this amendment?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the purpose and intent of section 8 as approved by the House on July 21 are to prohibit the transfer or removal of any functions or duties performed in the District of Columbia prior to Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946 with respect to the handling and administration of the tract books which have always been kept in the District. In accepting the amendment made to the provision by the Senate, it is understood that the original purpose and intent will continue to prevail.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Appropriations Committee may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the Agriculture Department appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 295 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the Committe on Foreign Affairs was established in 1882, and by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (1) has been given jurisdiction as a standing committee over relations of the United States with foreign nations generally, and (2) is charged to exercise continuous watchfulness over the execution by the Department of State and other agencies of the United States Government of the laws relating to the relations of the United States with foreign nations generally; and

Whereas the foreign policy of the United States today assumes new importance in the operations of the entire economic system of the United States and conditions the survival of free institutions both at home and abroad; and

Whereas the Committee on Foreign Affairs has, by its reorganization in conformity with the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, by setting up the appropriate staff and subcommittee organization to deal with the heavy new burden imposed upon it to make recommendations to the House of Representatives on policy issues affecting foreign affairs and on the necessary legislative action: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittees, is authorized and directed to conduct studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee.

SEC. 2. That in projects for studies of matters concerning the foreign affairs of the United States which in the judgment of the Committee on Foreign Affairs require investigations by it abroad, the committee is authorized to include the services and travel of the requisite staff and clerical help, to accompany subcommittees of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on such investigations or study missions abroad.

SEC. 3. That in making such studies and investigations abroad, it shall be the duty of such subcommittees of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to keep current records and to make reports to the Committee on Foreign Affairs for appropriate legislative action, on the completion of any such mission, of the results of such studies and investigations, together with such recommendations as may be deemed desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittees thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places as the committee may determine, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or otherwise, and to take testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by such chairman. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 295 authorizes the Committee on Foreign Affairs to make the usual studies, either at home or abroad, of foreign policies and foreign programs coming directly under the jurisdiction of that committee. As I explained in my remarks on the previous resolution, the Foreign Affairs Committee has a special field to cover which is not included in the resolution appointing or naming the special committee on economic aid to Europe. I think this resolution is well understood by every Member of the House.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The Herter resolution that was just passed provides for the same functions as this resolution does, so far as foreign investigations are concerned, does it not?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am very sorry that the gentleman did not catch the distinction and the difference between the two resolutions when they were presented to the Committee on Rules, because there is a great difference. The Herter resolution does not grant the special committee authority over foreign affairs matters, but simply over economic aid to Europe. The Committee on Foreign Affairs does have a great many other responsibilities in the field of foreign relations. That is the difference.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I cannot yield further now.

Mr. RICH. Can I get time in order to let the House know something what I think about this resolution?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes. I am sorry that the gentleman did not understand the matter when it was before the Rules Committee, although he supported the resolution at that time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I understood, in explaining the Herter resolution, that there would be members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the Herter committee; is that right?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is right, and Members from other committees, such as the Committee on Banking and Currency that have to deal with the economic-aid problem. But this resolution is restricted to the responsibilities of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. RICH. I would like to direct my question to the gentleman from Ohio. If the Herter resolution, as I suggested in the Committee on Rules, is going to give permission to Members of Congress to travel in foreign countries, why could not we, as a matter of economy, permit the Members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to go with them in conjunction with the things that they are going to investigate, and thus save five or six Members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or other committees going over?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Oh, you could have one committee do everything that the Congress of the United States has to do in the next few months. But, of course, such a committee just simply would never get through with its duties and responsibilities. It could not cover the entire waterfront. That is the reason we have more than one committee in the House and in the Senate. There is too much work to do.

Mr. RICH. They cannot cover the world.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I exceedingly regret the discord among the Republican Members.

Mr. RICH. No discord whatever.

Mr. SABATH. But I do not blame the gentleman from Pennsylvania for trying to get some information. We know little of this matter, and when I say "little" I mean very little, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Unfortunately we were not able to obtain all the information that we sought or that we thought the Committee on Rules was entitled to.

Personally, Mr. Speaker, I am beginning to sympathize with you Republicans. You have promised the people that you will practice economy. Here we have two resolutions presented, each duplicating the work of the other, which will cost the taxpayers, before these committees are through, not less than $150,000, and perhaps as much as $250,000. According to my calculations, when these twin resolutions for foreign travel have been passed, you will have authorized the expenditure of between $950,000 and $925,000 for various investigations, most of which could be just as well made with a few good reference

books in the congressional reading room at the Library.

BUT A TRIFLE

Of course, to you gentlemen who promised the people of the country that you would cut the expenses of government with a meat ax this huge sum is but a trifle and will not sit on your consciences a moment.

But by the time we get through here, the people of this Nation are going to make the sad discovery that instead of reducing the cost of Government you have increased it.

I have not the slightest doubt that the total cost to the country of this Congress has been greatly increased, and when I have a couple of minutes to call my own I am going to find out how much money has been appropriated for the various committees and for other legislative expenses, and then determine how much we have actually saved under the Reorganization Act which was so well intended by my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. I fear that we will find that instead of making economies and obtaining greater efficiency, we have increased expenses.

But, coming to this resolution now before us, I am of the opinion that since we already have passed the Herter resolution this one becomes doubly unnecessary. In the Herter resolution we already have provided that on that committee of 19 the Committee on Foreign Affairs shall have representation.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs has some capable and outstanding members, and it should not be necessary to have a very heavy representation on that big committee of 19 to enable them to investigate properly all matters which come within the jurisdiction of the committee.

JURISDICTIONS OVERLAP

The jurisdiction of these two committees is just about the same, notwithstanding what my genial friend from Ohio has stated.

Both committees will travel all over the world.

I hope they will travel all over our own country first to familiarize themselves with the urgent needs at home for housing and flood control and price control and soil conservation and a thousand other urgent and crying needs before they go abroad to study the needs of foreign countries.

Certainly I am all for giving help to the devastated countries of Europe in their efforts to rehabilitate themselves; but I think our own country should come first at all times. The majority seems inclined to disregard our problems at home, and not to be very understanding about the real needs abroad.

I repeat, regardless of what I may say, or of what arguments I may present against this resolution, you have the votes. In this country we believe in majority rule, which is the way it should be. I hope it is always that way in our country. When you have the majority you will prevail and will have everything your way. I would not have it any other way.

However, in view of your constant disregard of the interest of the American taxpayer, and of the American public, the people will soon realize your irresponsibility and your inability to legislate intelligently in the interest of all the people and of the Nation's future. On the basis of information from all parts of the country, I am confident that the people, discontented with this Republican Congress, will again turn to us and entrust the Democratic Party with the needed legislative program of President Truman.

Then, I hope and I believe, the majority will be on this side. Then, I know, the majority will have always at heart the interests of the people and of the taxpayers, instead of devoting its time to traveling throughout the world.

I could take up my whole 30 minutes; but not even in 30 minutes could I exhaust my indignation at this waste of time and money. I could not begin to say all that I might say about the unfairness and lack of justification for passing these twin resolutions at this time.

However, it is growing late, so I shall take no further time.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 293, to authorize the Committee on Ways and Means to continue its investigation and study of the internal revenue laws, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Ways and Means, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to continue its full and complete investigation and study of the need for amendment and revision of the internal revenue laws.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings, as it deems necessary.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. This resolution does not authorize the employment of any investigators or advisers nor the expenditure of any money, does it?

Mr. HERTER. That is quite correct.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It only permits the Committee on Ways and Means to sit and continue its studies and to act during the recess or adjournment of Congress?

Mr. HERTER. That is correct.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 298, authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to make studies and investigations into matters relating to agriculture, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct studies, investigations, and to inquire into any matter within its jurisdiction, including but not limited to the study of long-range problems affecting agriculture and forestry; the study of the operation and effectiveness of measures taken pursuant to Public Law 8, Eightieth Congress, to control foot-and-mouth disease or rinderpest; to study and make investigations into the existence and causes of shortages and surpluses of food and other agricultural commodities; to study the current and prospective demand for food and other agricultural commodities at home and abroad, and the effect thereof upon domestic agriculture.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the Committee on Agriculture, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to make such inspections or investigations, to take such testimony, and to use any governmental facility without reimbursement, as it deems necessary.

SEC. 3. The committee shall issue such reports as it deems desirable, including reports to the House of Representatives, with recommendations for legislation or otherwise.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, so far as I know, this matter was unanimously approved by the Committee on Rules and no objection was raised to it.

I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution authorizes the Committee on Agriculture to make an investigation which I have been demanding for 6 months. It directs the committee to try to find out the reasons for the terrific increase in the cost of living. I have no objection to the resolution if the committee will make a real investigation and discover the real reasons for the discrepancy between the prices that the farmer obtains and the prices that the consumer is held up for when he goes to buy food or any of the necessities of life.

I am satisfied that if the committee is honest and sincere and industrious they are bound to come to the conclusion that you made a mistake in forcing the repeal of OPA, as I have said so often on this floor, for just as soon as the Office of Price Administration was abolished and the controls were taken off the prices shot up and the cost of living rose terribly.

The midyear economic report of the President declares:

Price and income adjustments stand foremost in need of attention.

FOOD PRICES AT 190 PERCENT

The same report shows that from the end of price control to the present time food prices have shot up to 190 percent

of the 1935–39 average and are still climbing. Are the gentlemen aware that bacon is now selling at 89 cents per pound, and stewing beef is priced at 69 cents a pound?

Clothing prices are within a few points of being just as high, while the average of all costs stands at 160 percent of the 1935–39 average.

All this is in the face of the greatest production of foods and of everything the consumer has to buy in all history.

This is not the operation of the so-called law of supply and demand.

It is the operation of the law of "git while the gettin's good" and "let the buyer beware."

All you have to do is see how prices started going up just as soon as decontrol set in, and how they leaped with the removal of all controls. The big increase in prices took place in less than 3 months.

FIND WHO IS TO BLAME

If the committee will discover and bring to the knowledge of the House the reasons for all this, and tell us who is to blame, I shall have no objection. That is what I have been asking for.

On March 6, 1947, more than 4 months ago, I introduced House Resolution 133, asking that the Department of Agriculture carry out just this kind of investigation. This is the text of that resolution:

Whereas prices of foodstuffs have increased more than 50 percent since June 30, 1946, and all standard indexes for cost-of-living commodities have reached the highest points in all history; and

Whereas the upward trend in all cost-of-living prices became most pronounced with the temporary suspension of price controls on June 30, 1946, and was immediately accelerated with the virtual surrender of all price controls in October 1946, so that legal prices now have reached levels even above so-called black-market prices made possible by manipulations in certain industries; and

Whereas the steady and rapid rise of prices has made it virtually impossible for American citizens and homemakers of fixed incomes, whether workers, clerks, professionals, annuitants, or pensioners, to maintain a living at levels of decency; and

Whereas every standard index shows greater profits in every business and industry, with the ratio of increased prices to increased costs in many industries running from 25 percent to more than 400 percent; and

Whereas there is a tremendous pressure campaign for removal of the last remaining price controls which would inevitably cause prices to rise rapidly, with consequent hardship on consumers: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to investigate the basic causes for increases in the prices of foodstuffs, with special reference to meats, dairy products, fruits, and vegetables, and to report to the House within 60 days from the date of the enactment of this resolution and to make such interim reports and recommendations as it may deem advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. Subpena shall be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee, or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

I hope the committee will also investigate manipulation in grains, butter, eggs, and other commodities gambled in on the big exchanges to hike up the prices for the benefit of insiders and all at the expense of the consumers.

I myself have tried hard enough, Mr. Speaker, to bring about a thorough investigation of the meat packers and the dairy trust and the lobbies. You remember that last spring I asked for an investigation of the American Meat Institute. Here is the text of my resolution, which I introduced on April 30, 1946; perhaps if this investigation had been undertaken, you would not have been so anxious to swallow the packers' propaganda and abolish price control:

Whereas the American Meat Institute, representing the major packing companies in the United States, has disseminated information, issued releases, and published advertisements and statements charging the Office of Price Administration with being responsible for black-market conditions; and

Whereas there is postive evidence that the packers are endeavoring to discredit the Office of Price Administration and have disseminated misleading information to bring that about; and

Whereas it appears that the packers have gone on a "sit-down" strike to weaken and destroy not only the effectiveness of the administration of the Price Control Act but the confidence of the public in the Government's forced operation of the packing plants, and that they actually have brought about conditions which are aiding the black market: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized and directed to make an immediate and thorough investigation of the activities of such groups, individuals, and organizations engaged in dissemination of propaganda tending to influence legislation, including any groups, organizations, and persons employed by them to carry out such activities. The committee shall ascertain the amounts of moneys contributed and collected by such groups, organizations, and persons, from whom contributed and collected, and an accounting of the expenditures of such funds. The committee shall investigate the underlying causes and reasons for the action of the large packers in discontinuing direct purchases from farmers, feeders, and cattle dealers and obtain evidence as to why they have failed to purchase in normal quantity when reports showed that livestock was available in the Chicago stockyards. The committee shall investigate the effects of the reduced purchases and production by the large packers with respect to byproducts which their plants are equipped to manufacture and shall ascertain whether the reduced production of byproducts is tending to create a shortage of same to consumers. The committee shall ascertain whether these activities are intended to discredit the Government's forced operation of large packing plants and whether there is a deliberate agreement between the packers to create a meat shortage which has been of aid to the black market. The committee shall investigate all unfair practices and tactics and acts of omission and commission and ascertain if they are directed with a view to discrediting the Office of Price Administration or other Federal agencies. The committee shall ascertain whether the action of the packers in reducing their purchases of livestock and amount of slaughtering is due to the protection afforded them against loss through guaranty of refund of 1945 excess-profits taxes covering any losses incurred in 1946, and shall investigate such other matters as the committee deems appropriate.

The committee shall report to the House (or the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems desirable.

The said committee is hereby authorized to request and secure, for the purposes of this resolution, the cooperation of, the production of records and rules and regulations of, and the assistance of such personnel of any department or bureau, as may be deemed necessary by the committee.

For the purposes of this resolution, the said committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is sitting or has recessed or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books or papers or documents or vouchers by subpena or otherwise, to take such testimony and records, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the Speaker of the House at the request of the chairman of the committee and shall be served by the Sergeant at Arms of the House or by such person or persons as may be designated by him. The chairman of the committee or any member of the committee may administer oaths to witnesses. Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committee or any subcommittee thereof, or having been required to produce necessary books or papers or documents or vouchers by authority of said committee or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the study and investigation heretofore authorized, or who fails to produce such books or papers or documents or vouchers as required by subpenas, shall be held to the penalties provided in section 102 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 192), as amended.

Because of speculation in grains, bread is up almost 50 percent, and many other foodstuffs are even higher. The farmers are getting the highest prices in history; but, even so, the speculators and profiteers are adding their unconscionable profits on top of that before the consumers eat what the farmers raise.

I say it is an outrage that this country of ours should permit the trusts and combines to hold up the consumers of this Nation and force the people, especially those in the white-collar class and those with small means, to have to deny themselves actual needs for maintaining their little ones.

That is all I have to say.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FLOOD-CONTROL WORKS ON LITTLE SIOUX RIVER

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4111) authorizing the construction of flood-control works on the Little Sioux River and its tributaries in Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the project for flood control on the Little Sioux River and its tributaries, recommended in the report of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, in House Document No. 275, Eightieth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of $3,320,000, is hereby adopted and authorized, and shall be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plan recommended in that report and subject to the conditions of local cooperation set forth therein.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be needed to carry out the provisions of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPOSITION OF FARM-LABOR CAMPS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 4254) providing for the disposition of farm-labor camps to public or semipublic agencies or nonprofit associations of farmers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture whether this will authorize these associations to have priority claims over farmers who had once owned this land before it was condemned by the Government.

Mr. HOPE. This does not deal with land as such. The gentleman understands this is the disposition of farm-labor camps, some of which have been in operation since 1935. I do not think there is any question involved as to the rights of any prior owners to obtain the land.

Mr. MONRONEY. If I understand the distinguished chairman, the title to the land on which these camps are located is not involved in this legislation?

Mr. HOPE. That is correct. I do not think any of these camps are located on land acquired by condemnation. It was all purchased by the Government agencies which erected the camps.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 (d) of the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946 and section 43 (d) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as added by the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946, the Secretary of Agriculture may dispose of any labor supply center, labor home, labor camp or facility referred to in said sections and any equipment pertaining thereto or used in the Farm Labor Supply Program (hereafter referred to as "facilities") for such prices and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may determine reasonable, after taking into consideration the responsibilities to be assumed by the purchaser, to any public or semipublic agency or any nonprofit association of farmers in the community who will agree to operate and maintain such facilities for the principal purpose of housing persons engaged in agricultural work and to relieve the Government of all responsibility in connection therewith. In disposing of such facilities, the Secretary shall give due consideration to the ability of the applicants to maintain and operate such facilities for housing agricultural workers.

SEC. 2. In order that such public or semipublic agencies or nonprofit associations of farmers may have adequate time to make necessary arrangement for authorizations and funds to acquire such facilities, the authority to dispose of such facilities to such agencies is to continue until June 30, 1949. After January 30, 1948, and pending sale thereof, no facility shall be continued in operation except under contractual arrangements with responsible public or semipublic agencies or nonprofit associations of farmers who will agree to operate such facilities for the principal purpose of housing persons engaged in agricultural work and to relieve the Federal Government of all financial responsibility in connection with the operation of such facilities. Any facility with respect to which no such contractual arrangement has been made by January 30, 1948, shall be liquidated as expeditiously as possible under the provisions of this act or section 43 (d) of the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946, and in any event not later than June 30, 1949. Any facility which is continued in operation after January 30, 1948, pursuant to a contractual arrangement with a public or semipublic agency or nonprofit association of farmers and which remains unsold on June 30, 1949, shall be disposed of as expeditiously as possible under the provisions of section 43 (d) of the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946.

SEC. 3. The funds made available under the item "Farm Labor Supply Program" in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947 (Public Law No. 76, 80th Cong.), are also hereby made available until expended for carrying out the purposes of this act and in addition thereto, there is authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be necessary.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTROL OF EXPORTS OF GASOLINE AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4042) to control the export to foreign countries of gasoline and petroleum products from the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL]?

Mr. RAYBURN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I want to inquire of the gentleman from Indiana if this is the last bill.

Mr. HALLECK. It is.

Mr. SABATH. Reserving the right to object, what does this bill aim to do? What is the purpose of the bill?

Mr. HALLECK. The bill came out of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee with a unanimous report. It is called up after the matter was cleared with the ranking member on the Democratic side. It is a bill that seeks to have certain determinations by the Secretary of Commerce with respect to the export of oil as that might affect the national security and national defense of this country.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no gasoline, Diesel oil, bunker oil, lubricating oil, nor any petroleum products whatsoever, shall be moved or transported from the United States to a foreign country, unless the Commerce, Navy, and War Departments shall certify in writing that any such gasoline, Diesel oil, bunker oil, lubricating oil, or petroleum products to be moved or transported from the United States will not prejudice nor impair the national defense nor the continuous nonrestricted use of gasoline, Diesel oil, bunker oil, lubricating oil, or petroleum products by the people of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That no gasoline, Diesel oil, bunker oil, nor lubricating oil shall be moved or transported from the United States to a foreign country, unless the Secretary of Commerce shall certify to the President in writing that any such movement or transportation of gasoline, Diesel oil, or lubricating oil will not impair the national defense, endanger the national security, nor impair the civilian use of gasoline, Diesel oil, bunker oil, or lubricating oil by the people of the United States.

"SEC. 2. That the Secretary of Commerce make a monthly report of such petroleum products exported, to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House.

"SEC. 3. That this act shall expire March 31, 1948."

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WEICHEL to the committee amendment: On page 2, line 9, after the words "Diesel oil" insert the words "bunker oil."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial on the subject of taxes.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a radio address.

Mr. TIBBOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. CARSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from Sports Afield.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE DEADLY PARALLEL

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, as the crisis between this country and Russia becomes ever more tense, I think that it is time for the Congress, the Cabinet, and the people as a whole to take stock of our position in the world and to be apprised of just what is confronting them. In this understanding—or estimate—there are two important factors which may largely determine our fate. The first and most important of these is the state of our own intelligence, and the second is the intelligence or espionage nets which the Russians are operating against us.

There is good ground for the definite but regrettable conclusion that there is a concerted, well-organized, well-thought-out, and definite plan to destroy all semblances of American intelligence. We all realize that espionage, or snooping on our neighbors, is by our very nature anathema to the American people; but we also realize that in the hard-boiled, modern, realistic world intelligence is essential, nay vital, to any nation which is to survive.

The history of American intelligence and counter intelligence up until the beginning of World War II was not a pretty picture. Only in 1940 did we begin to create an American intelligence and counter intelligence unit worthy of the name. That unit was created in the War Department by Maj. Gen. Sherman Miles, who had been our military attaché in England and who visited the French Army on the Continent before the break-through of the German Army and the fall of France. General Miles was so imbued with the power of the German and Communist fifth columns in France that he bent every effort to spare America a similar fate.

Unfortunately for General Miles, as the Pearl Harbor hearings will show, intelligence took the rap for the inexcusable failure of the high command of the Army and Navy and the late President Roosevelt to accept, believe in, and act on the intelligence which was available to it and which clearly and definitely pointed not only to the immediate incidence of war, but actually to the attack on Pearl Harbor itself. General Miles was summarily relieved by our present Secretary of State, then Chief of Staff, George C. Marshall, because he had the temerity to put in writing a memorandum which set forth what happened in Gen. George C. Marshall's office on the fatal morning of December 7, 1941. Despite this, the organization which General Miles had started to build grew of its own momentum into a worth-while intelligence and counter-intelligence organization.

General Miles' successor, the late Gen. George V. Strong, made the fatal mistake of being an honest, true, patriotic American citizen. He gave his organization its head and told it to go after all subversive elements, either Fascist or Communist. It was this latter which resulted in the failure to keep General Strong on active duty after his retirement and lost to this Government his tremendous knowledge of international affairs. The chief spearhead of this attack on Strong, due solely to his active and aggressive action against Communists and his refusal to commission Communists in the Army and to exclude them from sensitive places, was the then Assistant Secretary of War, John J. McCloy, who used for his purpose Lt. Gen. Joseph T. McNarney, then Deputy Chief of Staff and now a four-star general and American representative on the military committee of the United Nations.

Even before the degrading and discrediting of General Strong, he and his organization were ordered to desist and refrain from all punitive action against Communists, and the fight to prevent the commissioning of Communists in the Army was overruled and all official records of subversives held by the War Department were ordered destroyed. This latter was prevented by an eleventh hour action on the part of the members of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate, who confronted Secretary of War Stimson and Chief of Staff Marshall and demanded the revocation of an order which both of them denied having had any knowledge of its issuance. From that day down to the present, intelligence in the United States has been practically nonexistent.

As purely sop to Congress, and without any intention of creating a really truly American organization, President Truman in January 1946, created the Central Intelligence Group. He, however, practically insured its failure by placing at its head Reserve Admiral Sidney Souers, a St. Louis boy, formerly head of a defunct insurance organization, a man with absolutely no knowledge of the mechanics and technique of espionage or counter espionage. After a few months in office, Admiral Souers was succeeded by Lt. Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, a brilliant young airman. Vandenberg's regime will be remembered for his using the weight of his office and White House influence to take the FBI out of the intelligence field in Latin America and to order the dissolution of the War Department's remaining secret intelligence net.

The present incumbent, Admiral Roscoe Hillenkoetter, has been in office too short a time to give evidence of what may be expected of him; but it will take a strong, determined man to correct the failures and to eliminate the Communist elements which I am reliably informed are carry-overs from the old OSS and FBIS organizations which the Central Intelligence Group absorbed.

On the other hand, we are confronted with a Russian espionage net in this country which is without parallel in history. Operating today in the United States, with the full knowledge of the Administration, are the Soviet Purchasing Commission, the Tass News Agency, Amtorg Trading Co., the delegation to the United Nations, Artkino, which is very powerful and influential in Hollywood, and of course the Embassy and diplomatic consuls in Washington, New York, San Francisco, and elsewhere. In almost all of these there are Russian citizens, citizens of satellite nations, American Communists, American Fellow-Travelers, deluded and misguided American citizens who believe that communism is nothing more than another political party and not an organization bent on the destruction of this Nation.

We have a great parallel today in what transpired in Germany and what is transpiring today in Russia—see following table. Also, we see a parallel of the actions of Hitler in the fall of France and Stalin in the fall of America. In France, highly respectable people were seduced by appeal in the name of "order" which was designed to prove that order could only be restored by the negation of what had previously been done by due process of law. In America, highly respectable people are now being seduced by a false interpretation of the meaning of freedom, liberty, democracy, individual rights, and are lending their names and influence toward destroying the very things that have made America great, initially.

In France, Hitler created disunity in the Government, prevented its preparing adequately for war, and made relationships which could still be maintained when actual conflict came and which could be used to secure France's defeat. In America, Stalin is creating disunity in the Government by his stooges in high governmental positions even here in the Congress. He was behind the movement to render impotent and innocuous our armed forces. He has fomented strikes in industry and has delayed our reconversion.

In France, Hitler used every means possible to build up psychological channels through which his dominating ideas could be imprinted in French minds. He organized the Comite France-Alemagne to maintain social and cultural contacts between the two countries. He organized joint meetings of French and German war veterans, using for that purpose the rightist veterans organization headed by violent reactionary Jean Goy. A Brown House was established in Paris where influential French heads were entertained lavishly and convinced that the Nazis were not so bad after all.

In America, Stalin has used every means possible to build up psychological channels through which communism can be imprinted in American minds. He has organized the National Council for Soviet-American Friendship to serve as an official apologist for Soviet aggression and tyranny. He has organized in New York, Washington, and elsewhere, joint gatherings of Russian and American veterans, and our own Secretary of War and

Chief of Staff have lent their names to the furtherance of the aims of this organization. There is more than one Red House here in Washington today where influential American citizens are entertained lavishly and are becoming convinced that the Communists are not so bad after all.

In France Hitler employed simultaneously the more outstanding means of preparing an enemy for the kill, the operation of spies, secret agents, agitators, saboteurs, and traitors. He also used open threats and intimidations. On the one hand, the upper crust of France was being courted by the suavists and most urbane members of the Nazi group. On the other hand, there were thundered threats from Hitler, but Hitler always took pains to make it clear that the threats were for those unworthy Frenchmen who were allowing their country to sink deeper into the morass and was wooing those clear-sighted Frenchmen who agreed with the Nazis.

In America Stalin is today employing the more outstanding means of preparing the enemy for a kill. He also is using the operation of spies, secret agents, agitators, saboteurs, and traitors. On the one hand, the upper crust of America is being courted by the suavists and most urbane of the Communist group. Many of these are lending their names and influence for the political prestige, power, and authority which may accrue. On the other hand, behind the scenes, Communists whisper and thunder the threats of what to expect when we are finally crushed. Not long ago, at a meeting of the district board of the Communist Party held in one of our large cities, a high official of the Communist Party, a member of its national board, made substantially the following statement:

> There must be an intensive organization in every unit of the trade-union movement to use every means to destroy and drive from industry the Red baiters. It must be made so that it is not possible for anyone to Red bait and hold his job or his health. Communists must see to it from this time forward that Red baiting is no longer a harmless pastime but that it entails actual physical peril.

But Stalin also is at great pains to make it clear that these threats are for those unworthy Americans who are resisting the coming of the new order and who are trying to make America follow the pattern envisaged by the founding fathers and their worthy successors.

In France, Hitler used the technique of simultaneous threat and inducement. He would present the alternative: Follow me and you will be happy, strong, and prosperous; refuse me and I will strike you down. In many instances in France, French papers, French politicians, and private but influential citizens would openly oppose and campaign against inclusion in the cabinet or similar positions of certain men because they feared it would offend Hitler.

In America, Stalin is today using the same technique of simultaneous threat and inducement. Many organizations known to all in this body today are offering the alternative to politicians, business executives, and men in position: Follow us and you will become prosperous and influential; refuse us and we will purge you. There are cases in recent months where men have been rejected for appointment to governmental and public positions because they were not acceptable to the Communists in America and to Stalin and the Politbureau in Moscow.

Time does not permit me to go on, as I could, with parallel cases, but I want to make it clear from this floor today that to understand the technique and pattern of Russian espionage, coercion, threat, and smear techniques and activities, it is absolutely necessary to understand that this activity is based on totally different premises from similar activities carried on by the nations of the west, or even those nations which have absorbed more than the sheerest veneer of western civilization and culture. It is also essential that he who concerns himself with matters of this nature needs, by all means, some sort of inner contact with the spiritual make-up of the Russian people in order not to miss out on essential details.

There are, of course, many ways in which this problem may be met and solved. Others will occur to those Members of this body who, like myself, are greatly disturbed by the inept and amateurish manner in which our national intelligence requirements are being met. If I may presume to offer suggestions to correct our very obvious deficiencies, I would list them in the following order:

First. Make Intelligence a career in the Army, the Navy, the Air Forces, and not only make it possible for intelligence officers of the armed services to attain high command positions but require intelligence and experience before an officer can be selected for high command.

Second. Take the appointment of the Director of Central Intelligence out of politics, not only proscribe that he be a civilian as this House has done with the passage of the armed services unification bill last Saturday, but also specify that he be responsible directly to the Congress and with a 15-year tenure of office. Limit his activities to the preparation of national intelligence policy estimates, based on information and intelligence collected by State, War, and Navy Departments.

Third. Create under the Secretary of National Defense, after unification is passed, an intelligence collecting agency to serve him and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which agency shall be responsible for the operation of all secret intelligence collection, and for all domestic and foreign counter-espionage operations, thus leaving the Federal Bureau of Investigation free and unfettered to devote its entire time and energy to the problem of domestic law enforcement, a field in which it is preeminent; thus freeing the Central Intelligence Agency to act as a high level evaluation agency for the Federal Government and rendering totally unnecessary the wasteful duplication of effort which now exists; and finally restricting the intelligence agencies of the armed forces to Military Intelligence in the broader sense of that term.

Fourth. The Congress must take an active interest in our national intelligence problem and prevent the Central Intelligence Agency, and any new agency we may create, from becoming the dumping ground of the services, where, as recently charged editorially by one of our local newspapers, it becomes a haven of refuge for superannuated colonels of G–2 and burnt-out Navy captains.

Fifth. And, most important of all, the Congress must take steps to insure that all our intelligence agencies are free from the taint and stench of communism, for these agencies are in fact our first line of defense.

The deadly parallel

German	Soviet
Mein Kampf.	Communist teachings—world revolution against capitalism.
Hitlerism—absolute control.	Stalinism—absolute control.
Movement into the Ruhr.	Movement into Baltic states.
Attack on Czechoslovakia.	Attack on Finland.
Occupation and division of Poland.	Occupation and division of Poland.
Pact with Soviets 1939 (to gain time).	United Nations Charter (to gain time).
One party system.	One party system.
Gestapo.	MVD Ministry of International Affairs.
Nationalization of industry (closed economy).	Nationalization of industry (closed economy).
Fifth columns (bunds).	Fifth columns (Communist Party).
Build-up of war potential after World War I. 4-year plan of 1936 with emphasis on military development.	Build-up of war potential after World Wars I and II. Three 5-year plans, with emphasis on military development; continued emphasis on military training after World War II and new 5-year plan.
Infiltration of South America (bunds).	Infiltration of South America and all other continents. (Communist Party and trade-union movement).
Denial of democratic liberties at home and in countries occupied.	Denial of democratic liberties at home and in countries occupied and "liberated."
Seizure of all opportunities to increase power of Germany.	Seizure of all opportunities to increase power of the USSR.
United States nonrecognition of Nazi-created changes which were labelled "aggression."	United States nonrecognition of Soviet-created changes (i. e. Baltic states).
Intensive propaganda to excuse actions as "peaceful" aims.	Intensive propaganda to excuse actions as "security against future aggression."
Exploitation of "Pan Germanism," herrenvolk and volksdeutsch.	Exploitation of Pan Slavism and theory of superiority of Soviet accomplishment.
Propaganda to influence German groups throughout the world (once a German—always a German).	Propaganda for same purpose plus forced repatriation.
Actions taken without regard to rights of other nations and in violation of existing agreements.	Actions taken without regard to rights of other nations and in violation of existing agreements (unilateral action).
Progress toward federation of Europe under Nazi control.	Progress toward federation of Europe under Communist control.
Concealment of world events from own people and twisted interpretations of those revealed.	Same plus increased restrictions on Soviet contact with foreign visitors.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a newspaper article from the Washington Times-Herald of July 17, and also two brief articles, one from the magazine Illustrated Science, and one from the Kiplinger Letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SMEARING THE SCIENTISTS: BACKHANDED ATTEMPT TO DISCREDIT CIVILIAN ATOMIC-ENERGY CONTROL

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in the last few weeks we have seen a renewal of attempts to discredit the scientists who worked on the atomic bomb, but these have all exploded. Instead of secrets leaking out by way of scientists under the civilian commission, it has been shown that the recently discovered leak was due to two Army men working during the period of Army control at Los Alamos—a leak which was not discovered until a year later when the civilian commission took over.

DR. E. U. CONDON SMEARED

Last week there was another smear published in a local newspaper and directed at Dr. E. U. Condon, a distinguished scientist, Director of the National Bureau of Standards, and scientific adviser to the Special Senate Committee on Atomic Energy, which last year drafted the Atomic Energy Act establishing the Atomic Energy Commission.

When this article was called to my attention, I was amazed. Last year at this time Dr. Condon and I became very well acquainted when we were serving together on the President's Evaluation Board for Operation Crossroads at Bikini. If this were just an isolated smear, I would not think it worthy of notice. But it begins to appear that someone is making a concerted effort to discredit the atomic-bomb scientists and in particular those scientists who last year supported the President in his program for establishing a Civilian Atomic Energy Commission.

As a member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, I took considerable interest in this article and summoned Dr. Condon for questioning. I then made an analysis of this article paragraph by paragraph.

The article appeared on page 1 of the Washington Times-Herald for July 17, 1947. I want to go through it, reading first a paragraph of the article and then commenting on the errors in that paragraph:

HOUSE UNIT TO QUIZ DR. CONDON ON RED'S A-BOMB KNOW-HOW—BUREAU OF STANDARDS HEAD BELIEVED QUALIFIED BY KNOWING PRO-RUSS SCIENTISTS

(By James Walter)

Dr. Albert U. Condon, who played an important role in development of the atom bomb before taking his present job as head of the United States Bureau of Standards, where vital information concerning American industrial methods is accumulated, will be called before the House Un-American Activities Committee for questioning about Russian A-bomb know-how, this newspaper learned last night.

Dr. Condon's first name is Edward, not Albert. He has not thus far been asked to appear. On July 9, having read an article by Congressman THOMAS in the American Magazine for June in which it was said that he was to be subpenaed, he wrote to Congressman THOMAS saying that he would be glad to help the committee in any way he could.

The article continues:

Dr. Condon will be quizzed because the committee feels his contacts with Russian scientists and pro-Communist sympathizers in this country qualify him to discuss Soviet atom research, according to Representative THOMAS, Republican, of New Jersey, chairman of the Un-American Affairs Committee.

This paragraph of the article should be read in the light of the following quotations from a letter written on June 24 by Dr. Frank B. Jewett, president of the National Academy of Sciences, to George Merck, chairman of the finance committee of the Republican Party in New Jersey, on the subject of the American Magazine article and another one in Liberty for June 21: "* * * I think it is high time that some of you in the New Jersey Republican high command let THOMAS know that articles like these are harmful and do neither the Nation nor the Republican Party any good. I am particularly incensed at his—Dr. Condon's—treatment by THOMAS in these articles. He—Condon—is a distinguished scientist, the director of a great national institution, and some-time adviser to the other legislative body's committee on atomic policy matters. By no stretch of the imagination is he a Communist or an unloyal American."

In the Washington Post of July 18, Congressman THOMAS is quoted in an International News Service dispatch as saying that statements that Condon would be questioned about Soviet atomic bomb activities were merely rumors.

The article continues:

This newspaper learned that after Condon left as head of research department of the Westinghouse Electric Co. in Pittsburgh to join the Manhattan project, his leftist associations were under continuous scrutiny by military intelligence personnel.

Dr. Condon did not leave Westinghouse to join the project; he was assigned to it by Westinghouse in connection with the company's work on the project. Dr. Condon was not head, but associate director of the Westinghouse Research Laboratories. All persons of any importance connected with the project were under constant scrutiny, or should have been.

The article continues:

Before coming to Washington he directed atom-smashing experiments with the Westinghouse cyclotron, only instrument of its kind owned by an industrial laboratory in this country.

The Westinghouse equipment at East Pittsburgh was not a cyclotron but a Van de Graaf electrostatic generator.

The article continues:

He worked on the A-bomb project three times and later the Soviet Government violated diplomatic courtesy by secretly inviting him to the two hundred twentieth anniversary of the Russian Academy of Sciences in Moscow, but permission for him to leave this country was refused upon request of the Army.

The three times is correct. They were:

First. Service on the S-1—Uranium—Committee of the National Defense Research Committee, of which Dr. Lyman J. Briggs was chairman, during the fall of 1941, when the studies were made leading to the decision to recommend a large-scale atomic effort to the Government.

Second. One month at Los Alamos in March 1943, before the laboratory was formally opened, helping to get it organized. During this period Dr. Condon wrote a basic manual on the theory of the atomic bomb which was known as the Los Alamos Primer, but he did not retain, does not now have, and has never subsequently seen a copy of it. Dr. Condon returned to Westinghouse because he was in charge of the radar program of that company, which could not be neglected.

Third. From September 1943 to February 1945 Dr. Condon worked at the University of California in Berkeley on a Westinghouse assignment on that phase of the project. He severed all connection with the project on completion of his part of the work in February 1945.

Dr. Condon was not invited by the Russians, secretly or in any other way. The Russians invited various scientific organizations to send delegates, although some individuals may have been invited by name. He was chosen as a delegate of, first, the science committee of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship; and, second, the American Institute of Physics. He was vice president of the American Physical Society at the time.

His passport was initially issued by the State Department with full knowledge of the nature of the trip. In a letter dated June 18, 1945, Ruth Shipley, chief of the Passport Division, thanks him for the return of the passport and says:

I desire to confirm to you the statement I made in asking that the passport be returned; namely, that in denying you permission to depart from the United States, neither the action of the military authorities, nor that of the Passport Division cast any reflection whatsoever on your integrity, your loyalty, or your character.

The article continues:

At that time a group of scientists in this country was vigorously attempting to wrest control of scientific secrets from the Army. The request to keep Dr. Condon "at home" presumably came from Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, who masterminded the Manhattan or A-bomb project in New Mexico.

During the summer of 1945, prior to the use of the first bomb, there was a good deal of interest in the political and social problems of atomic energy displayed by the scientists who worked on the project. Dr. Condon had no part in any of this. From the early spring of 1945 until coming to Washington he was mostly in Pittsburgh, working on industrial electronic research. When the bomb was tested in New Mexico, he was unaware that the bomb had been successfully developed and was driving his

family home from California by car, riding through Wyoming or Montana. He took no interest in public discussion of this subject until after Congressman Andrew Jackson May introduced an Army-sponsored bill providing for peacetime control of atomic energy.

There is no question about the part that General Groves had in this "at home" request. But the decision was not a sensible one, for the sudden withdrawal from the party of the only nuclear physicist in the group caused a good deal of comment by the Russians. In this way it is fair to say that General Groves unwittingly gave the Russians advance reason to suspect the existence of our work on the atomic bomb.

DR. LANGMUIR OF GENERAL ELECTRIC

In this connection the testimony of Dr. Irving Langmuir, associate director of the research laboratory of the General Electric Co., before the Special Senate Committee on Atomic Energy on Friday, November 30, 1945, is revealing:

As an example of the ineffectiveness of military security regulations even during the wartime, I should like to tell of an experience of my own. I had had only a trivial connection with the atomic bomb in some consultations I had at two of the laboratories during 1942 or 1943. I had been invited to Russia in May 1945, had accepted through the Soviet Embassy, had received my passport, and was told that the American delegation would be taken to Rusisa on a C-54 plane with transportation arranged by the State Department and by the President. The day before we were scheduled to leave, two Army officers who did not know on what grounds the request was based, asked me to decline to go to Russia. This would have meant that I would have had to invent excuses on my own responsibility. Since there appeared to be direct conflict between the War Department and the State Department, I refused to withdraw my acceptance at the request of the War Department and demanded that the matter be taken up with the State Department canceling my passport if necessary. I wholly disapproved of the manner in which this matter was handled. When others interceded and the War Department was made to realize how little I knew of the atomic energy project, I was finally allowed to go. Other Americans, however, who had been invited, were not permitted to go after having accepted. This, of course, the Russian Embassy knew. They knew also that no physicists were among those who accepted the invitations.

The article continues:

Of this contemplated trip, Dr. Condon told the Times-Herald:

"Other scientists were permitted to take the trip to Russia, but the military thought it best that I remain here."

While Groves would not admit direct intervention in the Condon case, he did tell the Times-Herald:

"I would have been remiss in my duty if I had consented at that time to let anyone who knew about the possibilities of the Manhattan project go to such a meeting so soon before the bomb was to be used."

It is important to remember that the trip had official White House sponsorship in that the President ordered the Army to fly the party to Teheran.

It is well known among scientists that General Groves extended his jurisdiction even over England and that his direct intervention with Winston Churchill was responsible for the last-minute cancellation from the trip of eight prominent British scientists, some of whom had had no connection with the project. Dr. Langmuir's testimony is again pertinent:

When I reached Russia I was told by the English group that eight British scientists, who had accepted the Russian invitation, had had their passports canceled after they had reached the airport ready to fly to Moscow. All of the scientists and the whole of the British delegation were much incensed at these tactics. They believed that the passports were canceled because these men had worked on the Tuballoy project, which is the equivalent of our Manhattan project. I also heard the opinion expressed that this action must have been taken at the request of the American Government because no one outside the American Army could be so stupid.

The English newspapers gave great publicity to the cancellation of the passports and called Prime Minister Churchill to account before the House of Commons. This was all known in Russia, but it was never published in American newspapers.

I believe—

Continued Dr. Langmuir—

that these attempts to maintain secrecy resulted in giving to the Russians the very information which the Army most wished to keep from them. Any sensible Russian scientist knowing of these facts would have believed that we were developing an atomic bomb and were keeping it secret from the Russians.

The article in the Times-Herald continues:

The visit, it developed, was to have been made just 30 days before A-bombs were dropped on Nagasaki and Hiroshima, to force the end of the Japanese-American war in the summer of 1945.

As mentioned before, Dr. Condon was completely unaware of the fact that bombs had been made or were to be used until public announcement was made in August 1945.

The article continues:

The Un-American Activities Committee also is interested in hearing Dr. Condon for the following reasons:

1. Condon, while working for Westinghouse, also served on the science committee of the American-Soviet Friendship Society.

This latter statement presumably refers to the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. In the years 1944 and 1945, when Russia was our ally, many prominent people were interested in promoting better relations with the Russians. The National Council included in its distinguished list of sponsors Hon. Elbert D. Thomas, Senator from Utah; Hon. Arthur Capper, Senator from Kansas; Hon. Leverett Saltonstall, Senator from Massachusetts; Harold L. Ickes; Fiorello H. LaGuardia; Bishop W. J. Wells; the Reverend Joseph F. Fletcher; Bishop Malcolm E. Peabody; Mrs. J. Borden Harriman; and such distinguished educators and scientists as Dr. Frank Aydelotte, then director of the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton; Dr. Karl T. Compton, president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Albert Einstein; and Dean Christian Gauss of Princeton University.

The article in the Times-Herald continues:

2. During this same time his wife, Emilie, a native of Czechoslovakia, was corresponding secretary for the Pittsburgh council, American-Soviet Friendship Society.

Mrs. Condon is a native of Chicago, born of Czech-American parents who are naturalized citizens, and was brought up on an Oregon farm. During the war she was very active in Pittsburgh on sewing projects for the Red Cross, the British War Relief, and for the Russian War Relief which was headed by Winthrop W. Aldrich of the Chase National Bank.

The article continues:

3. After moving to Washington, Dr. and Mrs. Condon attended a meeting of scientists at the home of Mr. and Mrs. J. Terry Duce, 3014 Woodland Drive NW., where Mrs. Condon's expressions of admiration for Russia were so strong that she was taken to task by one Member of the Senate and two Members of the House.

This was an evening social gathering to which Mr. Duce invited a rather large group. Mr. Duce is a State Department adviser on petroleum policy. Mrs. Condon was not taken to task by anybody for expressions of admiration for Russia on this or any other occasion.

The Times-Herald article continues:

4. Condon was a close friend of Dr. Harlow Shapley, named in 11 Communist-front organizations, among them the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, 16 of whose members have been convicted of contempt of Congress.

Dr. Condon is a friend of Dr. Shapley. Dr. Shapley is perhaps America's most distinguished astronomer, director of the Harvard College Observatory, and is this year president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. He is the recipient of a medal from the Vatican for his researches, and of many other honors.

The article continues:

5. Condon also was a close friend and occupied the New York apartment of Edwin S. Smith, named in 21 pro-foreign groups by the House Un-American Activities Committee, which had him under fire in 1940 for reputed Communist sympathies while he served on the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. Smith was one of the group which went to Russia and was employed by the distinguished group of sponsors of the National Council already mentioned as its working secretary. Dr. Condon first met him a few days before the group left for Russia. Mr. Smith kindly put him up in his apartment for two nights at that time because he was caught without a hotel room during the great crowding in New York of that period.

The Times-Herald article continues:

6. Condon was constantly checked by military authorities for security reasons at the same time, but not as frequently as Dr. Frank Oppenheimer, card-carrying member of the Communist Party, whose brother, Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, led the team of physicists who exploded the first atom bomb in the western desert.

Presumably everyone was constantly checked, unless General Groves is to be regarded as having been remiss in his duty. The important thing is, what did the constant checking reveal? Obviously nothing serious in Dr. Condon's case, for he worked for such a long time on the atomic-bomb project, to say nothing of such other projects as the radar program and the rocket program. One physicist who got tired of being tailed everywhere

by a clumsy operative telephoned to General Groves to suggest that manpower and rationed gasoline would be saved if the operative were assigned to him as chauffeur, but the general did not want to play it that way.

The article continues:

Oddly, Condon was born March 2, 1902, at Alamogordo, N. Mex., not far from the scene of the atom-bomb experiments. He quit his $15,000-a-year job with Westinghouse to work for the Government at a little more than $9,000. He was eased into his job as head of the Bureau of Standards under the aegis of Henry Wallace.

Some readers might get the impression from this that there is something sinister or foolish about a man's being willing to make a personal sacrifice to serve his Government, yet it is not the first time in history that this has occurred.

The appointment was made in the normal way by President Truman, followed by unanimous Senate confirmation. Dr. Condon was also appointed by the President as a member of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. At the same time he was also appointed scientific adviser to a congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. This committee produced the present Atomic Energy Act which passed the Senate unanimously. With that work finished, Dr. Condon was appointed by the President to serve on the President's Evaluation Board for Operation Crossroads, the Navy atomic bomb tests at Bikini, and it gives me great pleasure to say that I served with Dr. Condon on that Board. I got to know him well and proudly claim him as a personal friend.

The article continues:

Thomas said last night that because of Condon's record of reputed Communist sympathies his activities had been under surveillance for a long time by committee investigators, who would continue their inquiries.

Dr. Condon knows nothing of these alleged Communist sympathies. He will welcome all fairly conducted investigations. As mentioned before, Dr. Condon wrote on July 9, to Congressman THOMAS, offering his full cooperation to the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The Times-Herald article continues:

The American-Soviet Friendship Society with which Condon served is listed by the Un-American Activities Committee as a Red-front group. At one time it solicited $500 each—a total of $22,500—from 45 American corporations to pay for publication and distribution in Russia of certain books.

Dr. Condon does not know which societies are listed by the committee nor does he know what listing means. The above listing probably refers to the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. This should not be confused with the American-Soviet Science Society, of which Dr. Condon is a member. The American-Soviet Science Society has not solicited funds from American corporations as stated.

ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION BACKS SOCIETY

The American-Soviet Science Society was backed in June 1946 by a $25,000 grant from the Rockefeller Foundation, whose trustees include Winthrop W. Aldrich, K. T. Compton, John Foster Dulles, and others of like stature. A statement of the aims of the society is to be found in the annual report for 1946 of the Rockefeller Foundation by Raymond Fosdick, its president. Its primary purpose has been to secure translations and abstracts of Russian scientific articles and make them available to Americans, and although its activities have been quite limited it has been able to render services requested by the Army and Navy.

The purpose of the Rockefeller Foundation in making the award is best given by a quotation from the Review for 1946 of the work of the Rockefeller Foundation by Raymond Fosdick:

It is important that Russian scientific thinking should be brought into the international stream. A grant toward this general goal was therefore made to the American-Soviet Science Society, which is a liaison agency serving the interests of American scientists by helping to keep them informed of scientific developments in the Soviet Union, and aiding Soviet scientists in their relations with their fellow scientists in the United States, through the interchange of periodicals and publications.

It is important to remember that Americans are handicapped in their utilization of possibly useful Russian works by their unfamiliarity with a difficult language, so that we are in danger of overlooking much Russian material, whereas the Russians, like most Europeans, are more adept at languages and are thus able to capitalize on the generally available books and magazines of this country.

The Times-Herald article continues:

Efforts of the Un-American Activities Committee to get at books and records of the American-Soviet Friendship Society proved as difficult to get as those of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee. As a result the Reverend Richard Morford, executive secretary of the A. S. F. S., has been indicted and is awaiting trial for contempt of Congress.

Here the evident confusion between the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship and the American-Soviet Science Society is continued. The officers of the latter have never been asked for any information by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, according to Dr. Duncan MacInnes, of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, member of the National Academy of Sciences, and acting chairman of the society.

The membership of the society includes such men as Dr. E. O. Lawrence, of the University of California, prominent on the atomic-bomb project and famous for cyclotron work and who is also a foreign associate of the Russian Academy of Sciences; Dr. R. A. Millikan, recently retired president of the California Institute of Technology; Dr. W. D. Coolidge, of the General Electric Co.; Dr. Saul Dushman, of the General Electric Co.; Dr. Gustav Egloff, of the Universal Oil Products Co.; Dr. Irving Langmuir, associate director of research for the General Electric Co.; and many others of like distinction. The officers of the society are quite willing to supply all information to any congressional committee.

The Times-Herald article continues:

A little more than a year ago the Communist-owned New York Daily Worker carried stories about Condon and others headed "U. S.-Soviet scientists swap information." Condon was quoted as welcoming the cooperation for peaceful and constructive purposes.

Dr. Condon knows nothing of this, since he does not read the Daily Worker.

The article continues:

Condon also was closely associated with the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, listed by the Un-American Activities Committee as a Communist group in which Wallace also was active.

The close association consists of once having allowed his name to be used as a sponsor of a local dinner of this group. Dr. Condon had never heard of this group until a telephone call was made by a member of the group requesting the use of his name. After having been assured that a Member of the other body from Oregon, Mrs. Gifford Pinchot, Mrs. Wiley Rutledge, and Mrs. J. Borden Harriman were also sponsors, Dr. Condon permitted the use of his name.

What a story.

CONDON'S AMAZING WAR WORK

Dr. Condon has worked with great energy and competence throughout the war on scientific developments of the utmost importance. In this connection he was investigated not once but many times as to his loyalty and integrity, as was everyone of any importance who worked on such projects. His services were in great demand throughout the war. In the fall of 1940 he helped to organize the Government-sponsored radiation laboratory at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and was a member of its staff throughout the war. At that time he was associate director of research for the Westinghouse Electric Corp. In 1941 he was put in charge of that company's research program of microwave radar which made many important contributions to this vital work. He served on the National Defense Research Committee's special group which studied the possibilities of rocket developments and helped make the recommendation which led to a major program of work in this field at the California Institute of Technology. In the summer of 1941 he was appointed to the S–1 committee of the National Defense Research Commission, which made the studies leading to the Government's decision to establish, and back on a large scale, the program which resulted in the atomic bomb. This was the Government's most secret development and he was accepted for this position of trust by such responsible men as Dr. Vannevar Bush, Dr. James B. Conant, and Dr. Karl T. Compton, of the wartime Office of Scientific Research and Development. Dr. Compton in particular had known him personally for more than 15 years when this was done. Later in the war Dr. Compton sought the services of Dr. Condon for his field service work in getting new scientific apparatus in effective

use at the front, but his work on the atomic bomb project was considered too vital for him to be released to Dr. Compton.

In the spring of 1943 Dr. Condon was called to Los Alamos to assist in the organization of the laboratory where the atom bomb was developed and while there wrote a little manual or textbook on the design of the bomb which became known as the Los Alamos Primer and was used for indoctrination of the scientific staff. He returned to Westinghouse after a month at Los Alamos because of the critical need for his services on the radar program.

In September, 1943, he was assigned by Westinghouse to work at the University of California. That laboratory did the development work for apparatus that was made by Westinghouse. Dr. Condon was in charge of the group which solved difficult mathematical design problems on the equipment for one of the major plants at Oak Ridge. This work kept him very busy until February, 1945, when the success of the project being assured he returned to Pittsburgh to take a leading part in planning the industrial electronics research program of that company.

The chairman of another body on atomic energy sent a number of telegrams to scientific leaders of the country asking for nominations for a suitable person to act as scientific adviser. The many replies were almost unanimous in naming Dr. Condon.

All of the distinguished members of that Senate committee worked with Dr. Condon almost daily during the long period in the winter and spring of 1946 when the Atomic Energy Act was being developed. This bill finally was reported out unanimously by the committee and passed unanimously by the other body. I do not think there is a single member of that committee who does not have the highest regard for Dr. Condon's scientific ability, integrity, loyalty, and devotion to duty.

KEY FIGURE IN SCIENCE AND GOVERNMENT

Let us recapitulate. Dr. Condon is Director of the National Bureau of Standards, the principal agency of the Federal Government for fundamental research in physics, chemistry, and engineering, by Presidential appointment and Senate confirmation. He is a member of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics and of the President's Evaluation Board for Operation Crossroads, by Presidential appointments. He is chairman of the Federal Specifications Board, responsible for development of purchase specifications of Government supplies. He is a member of the board of directors of the American Standards Association. He is a member of the National Academy of Sciences, and of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences of Boston, both of these being honorary distinctions. He is a past president of the American Physical Society and a member of the governing board of the American Institute of Physics. He is a member of the scientific advisory board of the Brookhaven National Laboratory of the Atomic Energy Commission. He is a member of numerous other scientific and engineering societies, among others being an honorary member of the Institute of Aeronautical Sciences.

CHARACTER ASSASSINS SHOULD PUT UP OR SHUT UP

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to allow these unwarranted attacks to pass unnoticed. I have talked with Dr. Condon about them. He has nothing to conceal. He wishes to cooperate fully with any fair and proper investigation of his work and activities. My feeling is that if there is anyone in America who has any serious evidence to present against him, that person is almost guilty of treason in not having come forward in a responsible way to present it to the President or to the Congress of the United States. The fact that this has not happened in all these years, and in spite of his prominent association with these various activities convinces one that there is no such evidence to be brought forward. Let me repeat again that whoever has any such evidence, if any such exists, is guilty of a most serious dereliction of duty as a citizen for not having brought it forward in a responsible way as soon as it came to his possession. Rumor-mongering character assassins should put up or shut up.

JEWETT PROTESTS VIOLENTLY

I call your attention particularly to the statement made by Dr. Frank B. Jewett, former president of the National Academy of Sciences and of the Bell Telephone Laboratories, a Republican and a distinguished American. He writes, "By no stretch of the imagination is he (Dr. Condon) a Communist or an unloyal American." This statement is contained in a letter which Dr. Jewett wrote to Mr. George Merck protesting against some oblique attacks on Dr. Condon contained in articles appearing in the American magazine for June and in Liberty for June 21 which were printed under the signature of a Member of this House. These articles were reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages A2676 and A2729.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is only fair to have the RECORD include an article on the other side of the picture. It comes from one of the most conservative magazines in America, and deals with Dr. Condon and the splendid work he is doing at the National Bureau of Standards. It is from Science Illustrated for December 1946, a magazine put out by the great McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.:

A SALUTE TO EDWARD U. CONDON

Today there is a new breeze blowing through the wide stone corridors of the National Bureau of Standards. From the upper-floor office of the Director comes a new spirit of energy, of enthusiasm, of imagination. Within the range of that breeze the Bureau will not remain chiefly the supreme arbiter of engineering and industrial standards that it has been, but will assume leadership in creative research.

Well out on Washington's Connecticut Avenue, in a spread of 90 formal buildings, the Bureau looks for all the world like a university. Its solid dignity, however, represents a foundation stone of American industry.

In the Bureau are treasured the national and international standards of length and measures, of weights, and of a myriad of instruments. Almost every industrial operation is based on its standards of quality, performance, and practice; including the measurement of materials, temperance, electricity, pressure, and power. It serves engineers of all types by testing instruments, by devising methods of testing and of analysis. For over 40 years the Bureau has been the last word in precision, and is the authority of the Government in scientific and engineering matters.

STAND-BY OF SCIENCE, INDUSTRY

Like the Bureau itself, the directors have been men of dignity, integrity, and precision. But now the scope of governmental research, both civilian and military, is being enlarged, and the qualities of leadership displayed in the Bureau of Standards are increasingly important to American industry and science.

The cheerful air, crackling imagination, and irresistible enthusiasm that refresh the halls and offices of the Bureau today come from the new director, Dr. Edward U. Condon.

It is almost a shock to see Ed Condon in a staid office surrounded by many models of things past. In shirt sleeves, when seated behind his unlittered desk, with his neck and almost his face overflowing beyond his collar, he is the picture of a powerful farm boy: young, heavy, firm, strong. But when he speaks it is with a smile; when he outlines a project he bursts into joviality. His keen eyes flash; it is apparent that his mind is leaping ahead. His swift and cheerful thinking strikes a new note for Bureau chiefs.

Ed Condon was born near the scene of the first atomic bomb explosion; at Alamagordo, N. Mex., not 45 years ago. His training in physics was at California. He taught a year at Princeton, a year at Minnesota, and then 7 years at Princeton, as an active professor of atomic structure and nuclear physics, not as an engineer. Then the unexpected happened and he was called to the Westinghouse Research Laboratory at Pittsburgh to be associate director. That was in 1937, when he was only 35. Westinghouse had long-range plans in atom smashing and in the search for atomic power.

Inevitably the war involved Ed Condon. What he did for the atomic bomb and radar has not been told, but Science Illustrated salutes him for his service to the Congress during the frantic days when the United States first realized the enormity of its responsibility in holding atomic power within its grasp.

He became a professor again and gave to struggling Senators and Congressmen that essential understanding of atoms and nuclei, of chemistry and physics, that their nineteenth-century education had shamefully ignored. They got clear, intensive education in the realities from Dr. Condon. Those realities include the possibility of cataclysmic atomic warfare, but Ed Condon's mind characteristically turns to the alternatives: the era in which uranium chain reactions, releasing vast quantities of heat, will be used to make power for homes and industries. Said he recently: "There is every indication that power from this source will have an important effect on the economy of ship propulsion, and also in the power supply of communities having neither water power nor a convenient coal supply."

Today the old Bureau of Standards is geared to the atomic age. And this young, keen scientist has cheerfully taken the lead in keeping the Government up to the minute in a race that will go to the quick, the strong, the happy, and the well-trained.

Another tribute to Dr. Condon appeared in the Kiplinger magazine for May 1947, when he is characterized as "primarily a businessman's scientist, and the first Director—of the National Bureau of Standards—to be recruited from industry."

As an indication of the scientific level and company in which Dr. Condon is to be found, let me quote from an article in Fortune for June 1946, page 240, which discusses the need for a science foundation:

"The basic deficiency in the United States, intensified by war, is basic research—fundamental science. To those who think the United States is the most scientific country in the world this may come as an incredible shock. To those who look about at the great technical proficiency and towering material achievements of the American scene and think these are science it may seem strange, yet the achievements are almost wholly engineering, technology, gadgetry. In two centuries of a free society the United States contributions of great basic discoveries can be counted on the fingers of the hands. There was Ben Franklin in electricity, Joseph Henry on electrical induction, Willard Gibbs in thermodynamics, Michelson-Morley for experiments on the speed of light, Millikan for the electrical nature of the electron, Morgan for the gene theory of heredity, Anderson for discovery of the positron, Davisson-Germer for wave properties of electrons, Condon for the theory of alphaparticle radioactivity, and Stanley for discovery of crystalline protein virus. Beyond these, it is hard to find really basic United States discoveries, though a good number of border-line cases exist."

The people of America are fortunate indeed that they have a man of such distinction in this high Government post. He has accepted that post at a considerable personal financial sacrifice, and the least we can do is to protect him against such attacks as have been made, and, as I feel, certain people intend to keep on making.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3961. An act to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to Spanish War and Civil War veterans and their dependents; and

H. R. 4017. An act to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide that bonds issued under such act shall be redeemable at any time after September 1, 1947, to permit settlement and compensation under such act to be made in cash, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 23, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

957. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of the proposed transfer of donations from the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

958. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation for the Civil Service Commission in the form of an amendment of his submission of May 9, 1947, now contained in House Document 242 (H. Doc. 411); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

959. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting report of proposed transfer of equipment to the Los Angeles Girl Scout Council; to the Committee on Armed Services.

960. A letter from the Assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide extra compensation for certain employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

961. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting report of proposed transfer of equipment to the Mariners' Museum; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1025. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1026. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1027. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1028. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1029. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. VAN ZANDT: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4247. A bill to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the National Convention of the American Legion to be held in New York, N. Y., August 28 to 31, 1947; with amendments (Rept. No. 1031). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELSTON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 108. A bill to authorize the conveyance of the United States military reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., to the State of New York for use as a maritime school, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1032). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELSTON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2575. A bill to amend the Articles of War to improve the administration of military justice, to provide for more effective appellate review, to insure the equalization of sentences, and for other purposes with amendments (Rept. No. 1034). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4308. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662), as amended, relating to the acceptance of decorations, orders, medals, and emblems by officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations, neutral nations, or other American Republics, without amendment (Rept. No. 1037). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 4115. A bill to quiet title and possession with respect to certain land in the town of Cheverly, Prince Georges County, Md.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1033). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 4322. A bill to provide for 26 days' annual leave and 15 days' sick leave for employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 4323. A bill to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, gas, and sulfur on lands acquired by the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 4324. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RABIN:

H. R. 4325. A bill to allow inflated construction costs of rental dwellings to be deducted, for income-tax purposes, over a period of 60 months; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 4326. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACKINNON:

H. R. 4327. A bill to amend section 22, subsection (b) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to exclusions from gross income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 4328. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 4329. A bill to define the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. R. 4330. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to perform certain consular-type functions within the United States and its Territories and possessions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POTTS:

H. Con. Res. 109. Concurrent resolution relative to the Palestine situation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 319. Resolution to provide additional funds for the expenses of the study and inspection authorized by House Resolution 120; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 4331. A bill for the relief of Bertha M. Rogers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

H. R. 4332. A bill for the relief of Archie Hamilton and Delbert Hamilton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 4333. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Morton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 4334. A bill for the relief of David Dortort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JULY 23, 1947

(Legislative day of Wednesday, July 16, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Albert Joseph McCartney, D. D., minister emeritus, Covenant-First Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Grant, O Father, that we may go about this day's business with an ever-present remembrance of the great traditions in which we stand and the great responsibilities with which our office has entrusted us. Grant us every equipment for this service to our country—calm minds, sound judgment, and understanding hearts. God bless the people of the United States, to whom we are accountable, and fulfill for each of us the promise of the Scripture: "As thy days so shall thy strength be."

We ask this in the name of Jesus. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 22, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on July 22, 1947, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 179. An act for the relief of Maj. Ralph M. Rowley and First Lt. Irving E. Sheffel; and

S. 1360. An act for the relief of Eric Seddon.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 706) for the relief of William D. McCormick, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate severally, with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 358. An act to provide for settling certain indebtedness connected with Pershing Hall, a memorial in Paris, France;

S. 1361. An act to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit loans, capital grants, or annual contributions for low-rent-housing and slum-clearance projects where construction costs exceed present cost limitations upon condition that local housing agencies pay the difference between cost limitations and the actual construction costs; and

S. J. Res. 148. Joint resolution to authorize the temporary continuation of regulation of consumer credit.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 479. An act relating to the income-tax liability of members of the armed forces dying in the service;

H. R. 625. An act for the relief of (1) William R. Dohnt, administrator of all and singular, the goods, chattels, and credits which were of Margaret E. Dohnt, deceased; (2) Joseph A. Hauser, individually and as guardian of Florence Hauser, an infant of the age of 19 years; (3) Richard Adams, Sr., individually and as guardian of Richard Adams, Jr., an infant of the age of 16 years; (4) William P. Novotny, Sr., individually and as guardian of William Joseph Novotny, Jr., an infant of the age of 18 years; (5) William P. Novotny, Sr., individually and as guardian of Bernadette Novotny, an infant of the age of 20 years; (6) Grace Swiadek, individually and as guardian of Stanley Swiadek, an infant of the age of 18 years; and (7) Joseph F. Krotz, Sr., individually and as guardian of Joseph F. Krotz, Jr., an infant of the age of 18 years;

H. R. 648. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfreida Sakowsky Passant, alias Elfreida Sakowsky, alias Elfreida Pogue;

H. R. 718. An act for the relief of Clarence J. Wilson and Margaret J. Wilson;

H. R. 1131. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim or claims of Charles L. Baker;

H. R. 1155. An act for the relief of the estate of W. H. Rodgers, deceased;

H. R. 1534. An act for the relief of Graff, Washbourne & Dunn;

H. R. 1645. An act for the relief of Mrs. Leona McMinn Winkler;

H. R. 1781. An act for the relief of Annie L. Taylor and William Benjamin Taylor;

H. R. 1916. An act for the relief of Filiberto A. Bonaventura;

H. R. 2012. An act for the relief of Mrs. Pearl Cole;

H. R. 2192. An act for the relief of the Massman Construction Co.;

H. R. 2347. An act for the relief of Mrs. Akiko Tsukado Miller;

H. R. 2891. An act for the relief of Mattie A. Horner;

H. R. 3088. An act for the relief of William Dudley Ward-Smith;

H. R. 3111. An act for the relief of Louis H. Deaver;

H. R. 3499. An act for the relief of Petrol Corp.;

H. R. 3696. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Daniel Broken Leg;

H. R. 3754. An act for the relief of Oscar and Anna Carlblom;

H. R. 4042. An act to control the export to foreign countries of gasoline and petroleum products from the United States;

H. R. 4111. An act authorizing the construction of flood-control works on the Little Sioux River and its tributaries in Iowa;

H. R. 4257. An act to provide an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses;

H. R. 4254. An act providing for the disposition of farm labor camps to public or semi-public agencies or nonprofit associations of farmers; and

H. R. 4259. An act to amend sections 3404 (d), 3406 (a) (4), and 3443 (a) (3) (A) (i) of the Internal Revenue Code;

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 108) to provide for the creation of a joint committee to prepare a plan for the participation by the United States in the observance and celebration in Cuba of the fiftieth anniversary of American and Cuban victories in the war with Spain, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 479. An act relating to the income-tax liability of members of the armed forces dying in the service;

H. R. 4257. An act to provide an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses; and

H. R. 4259. An act to amend sections 3404 (d), 3406 (a) (4), and 3443 (a) (3) (A) (i) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 625. An act for the relief of (1) William R. Dohnt, administrator of all and singular, the goods, chattels, and credits which were of Margaret E. Dohnt, deceased; (2) Joseph A. Hauser, individually and as guardian of Florence Hauser, an infant of the age of 19 years; (3) Richard Adams, Sr., individually and as guardian of Richard Adams, Jr., an infant of the age of 16 years; (4) William P. Novotny, Sr., individually and as guardian of William Joseph Novotny, Jr., an infant of the age of 18 years; (5) William P. Novotny, Sr., individually and as guardian of Bernadette Novotny, an infant of the age of 20 years; (6) Grace Swiadek, individually and as guardian of Stanley Swiadek, an infant of the age of 18 years; and (7) Joseph F. Krotz, Sr., individually and as guardian of Joseph F. Krotz, Jr., an infant of the age of 18 years;

H. R. 648. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfreida Sakowsky Passant, alias Elfreida Sakowsky, alias Elfreida Pogue;

H. R. 718. An act for the relief of Clarence J. Wilson and Margaret J. Wilson;

H. R. 1131. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim or claims of Charles L. Baker;

H. R. 1155. An act for the relief of the estate of W. H. Rodgers, deceased;

H. R. 1534. An act for the relief of Graff, Washbourne & Dunn;

H. R. 1645. An act for the relief of Mrs. Leona McMinn Winkler;

H. R. 1781. An act for the relief of Annie L. Taylor and William Benjamin Taylor;

H. R. 1916. An act for the relief of Filiberto A. Bonaventura;

H. R. 2012. An act for the relief of Mrs. Pearl Cole;

H. R. 2192. An act for the relief of the Massman Construction Co.;

H. R. 2347. An act for the relief of Mrs. Akiko Tsukado Miller;

H. R. 2891. An act for the relief of Mattie A. Horner;

H. R. 3088. An act for the relief of William Dudley Ward-Smith;

H. R. 3111. An act for the relief of Louis H. Deaver;

H. R. 3499. An act for the relief of Petrol Corp.;

H. R. 3754. An act for the relief of Oscar and Anna Carlblom; and

H. R. 3999. An act to authorize the Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims resulting from evacuation of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3696. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Daniel Broken Leg; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 4042. An act to control the export to foreign countries of gasoline and petroleum products from the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4111. An act authorizing the construction of flood-control works on the Little Sioux River and its tributaries in Iowa; to the Committee on Public Works.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Myers
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Conor
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hill	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hoey	Overton
Bricker	Holland	Pepper
Brooks	Ives	Reed
Buck	Jenner	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kem	Saltonstall
Cain	Kilgore	Smith
Capehart	Knowland	Sparkman
Capper	Langer	Stewart
Chavez	Lodge	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Cooper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Downey	McFarland	Tydings
Dworshak	McGrath	Umstead
Eastland	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ecton	McMahon	Watkins
Ellender	Magnuson	Wherry
Ferguson	Malone	White
Flanders	Martin	Wiley
Fulbright	Maybank	Williams
George	Millikin	Wilson
Green	Moore	Young
Gurney	Morse	
Hatch	Murray	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

STATUE OF COMMODORE JOHN BARRY—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 23, 1947.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE PRO TEMPORE:

Public Law 109, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved June 10, 1941, authorized and directed the President of the United States to present to Eire a statue of Commodore John Barry in honor of the bicentenary of his birth in 1745. The act authorized an appropriation of not to exceed $20,000 and provided for the selection of a sculptor by a committee of three members appointed by the President.

Before action could be taken, the United States was at war. Because of the shortage of bronze it became necessary to defer the project until after the end of the war. During the past year alternative plans for carrying out Public Law 109 have been investigated, and it has been ascertained by the Commission of Fine Arts that a sum of not less than $30,000 now will be needed to procure a suitable statue of John Barry. In view of this fact, it seems to me proper that the entire matter should be presented to the Congress for consideration as to the desirability of enacting legislation which will provide sufficient funds to enable the President to make the presentation to Eire.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

NATIONAL CAPITAL SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under Public Law 203 to provide for the appropriate commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the seat of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia, the President pro tempore must appoint three Senators to the Commission known as the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission. The Chair appoints the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

JOINT COMMITTEE TO ATTEND CELEBRATION OF ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF REPUBLIC OF LIBERIA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Speaker of the House has appointed a committee of 10 to attend the one hundredth anniversary celebration of the Republic of Liberia, which will be held on the Capitol Grounds on Saturday, July 26, at 6 p. m. The Speaker of the House heads the House celebration.

The President pro tempore has been requested to make appointments for the Senate, and he hands down the following appointments, which will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The President pro tempore of the Senate [Mr. VANDENBERG], and Messrs. WHITE, BARKLEY, WHERRY, LUCAS, MCKELLAR, CAPPER, MILLIKIN, GREEN, and MCMAHON.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

RESIDENCE OF REPRESENTATIVE OF UNITED STATES AT SEAT OF UNITED NATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the furnishing of an official residence to the representative of the United States at the seat of the United Nations, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SPECIAL ASSISTANTS, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the special assistants employed during the period from January 1, 1947, to June 30, 1947, under the appropriation "Compensation of special attorneys, etc., Department of Justice" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

DONATIONS BY NAVY DEPARTMENT TO NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, a list of veterans' organizations who have requested donations from the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF CERTAIN NAVAL VESSELS

Two letters from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Los Angeles Girl Scout Council, Los Angeles, Calif., and the Mariners' Museum, Newport News, Va., each had requested the Navy Department to transfer to them a personnel landing craft; to the Committee on Armed Services.

RIGHTS-OF-WAY OVER CERTAIN INDIAN LANDS

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to empower the Secretary of the Interior to grant rights-of-way for various purposes across lands of individual Indians or Indian tribes, communities, bands, or nations (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman and members of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the second semiannual report of that Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PEPPER:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Memorial 6

"Memorial requesting Congress to make an appropriation for the purpose of completing as expeditiously as possible the projected dam on the Apalachicola River near Chattahoochee, Fla.

"Whereas the projected dam on the Apalachicola River near the town of Chattahoochee, Fla., will be of great benefit to the people of the adjoining areas and of indirect benefit to all the people of Florida, and it is of the utmost importance that this dam be completed at the earliest possible date: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida:*

"1. That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to make a sufficient appropriation to complete the construction of the projected dam on the Apalachicola River near the town of Chattahoochee, Fla., and to adopt such other measures as may be appropriate to insure the completion of said dam as expeditiously as possible.

"2. That the secretary of state of Florida be, and he hereby is, directed to transmit a duly certified copy of this memorial to the Senate of the United States and one to the House of Representatives of the United States, and copies to the Members of said Senate and House of Representatives from this State.

"Became a law without the Governor's approval.

"Filed in office of secretary of state June 16, 1947."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BALL (for Mr. BRIDGES), from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 4268. A bill making supplemental appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; without amendment; and

H. R. 4269. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 689).

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

From the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 4069. A bill to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II; with amendments (Rept. No. 693); and

H. J. Res. 238. Joint resolution to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930; with an amendment (Rept. No. 692).

From the Committee on Public Lands:

H. R. 1602. A bill to stimulate exploration, development, and production from domestic mines by private enterprise, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 709).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution authorizing attendance of Members of Congress at a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association in the Bahamas beginning December 28, 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 690); and, under the rule, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

S. 1648. A bill to authorize the expenditure of income from Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for training of Federal prisoners; without amendment (Rept. No. 691).

By Mr. WHITE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

H. R. 673. A bill to repeal certain provisions authorizing the establishing of priorities in transportation by merchant vessels; without amendment (Rept. No. 697);

H. R. 859. A bill to provide for the exploration, investigation, development, and maintenance of the fishing resources and development of the high-seas fishing industry of the Territories and island possessions of the United States in the tropical and subtropical Pacific Ocean and intervening seas, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 698);

H. R. 1238. A bill to permit vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and points in the continental United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 699);

H. R. 2054. A bill to amend the act of April 14, 1930, to provide increased retired pay for certain members of the former life-saving service; without amendment (Rept. No. 700);

H. R. 3043. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 701);

H. R. 3541. A bill to define the functions and duties of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 702); and

H. R. 3619. A bill relating to the sale of the Mission Point Lighthouse Reservation, Grand Traverse County, Mich.; without amendment (Rept. No. 703).

By Mr. HAWKES, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

H. R. 72. A bill to increase the number of authorized aviation stations operated by the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 694).

By Mr. CAPEHART, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 1653. A bill to control the export to foreign countries of gasoline and petroleum products from the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 695); and

H. R. 4042. A bill to control the export to foreign countries of gasoline and petroleum products from the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 696).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Civil Service:

H. R. 1714. A bill to exclude certain interns, student nurses, and other student employees of hospitals of the Federal Government from the Classification Act and other laws relating to compensation and benefits of Federal employees, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 707).

By Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on Civil Service:

H. R. 1350. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a National Archives of the United States Government, and for other purposes"; without amendment (Rept. No. 706).

By Mr. BUCK, from the Committee on Civil Service:

S. 1015. A bill to amend section 7 of the act of June 25, 1910, as amended, to reduce the interest rate on postal-savings deposits to 1 percent per annum; with amendments (Rept. No. 705).

By Mr. BALDWIN, from the Committee on Civil Service:

S. 1064. A bill relating to the payment of travel expenses of officers and employees of the Post Office Department and postal service; without amendment (Rept. No. 704); and

H. R. 4084. A bill to authorize the creation of additional positions in the professional and scientific service in the War and Navy Departments; without amendment (Rept. No. 708).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILEY (by request):

S. 1702. A bill to provide extra compensation for certain employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 1703. A bill for the relief of Lorraine Burns Mullen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 1704. A bill for the relief of Ezra Butler Eddy, Jr., and wife, Marie Claire Lord Eddy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 1705. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended, so as to increase to 6 percent the interest rate on bonds issued pursuant to such act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. WILEY (by request) introduced Senate bill 1706, to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States with respect to counsel in certain cases, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 1707, to carry into effect certain parts relating to patents of the treaties of peace with Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania, ratified by the Senate on June 5, 1947, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF CRIMINAL CODE RELATING TO COUNSEL IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill which has been forwarded to me by the Attorney General. I request that there be printed in the RECORD in connection with the bill a letter from the Assistant to the Attorney General addressed to me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1706) to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and Section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States with respect to counsel in certain cases, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The letter presented by Mr. WILEY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, the Judiciary.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, July 23, 1947.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed is a draft of a bill to exempt Special Assistant to the Attorney General Richard K. Phelps from certain statutory prohibitions precluding Government officers and employees from handling cases against the Government.

Mr. Phelps is a former Assistant United States Attorney who was active in all of the prosecutions of the so-called Pendergast election cases in Kansas City, Mo. He also served as United States Attorney from April 5 until September 30, 1940. He was appointed as Special Assistant to the Attorney General on June 17, 1947, with full and complete authority to prosecute any Federal law violations arising out of the alleged irregularities in the primary elections of August 6, 1946, in the Fifth Congressional District, Kansas City, Mo.

The bill would exempt Mr. Phelps from Sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and from Section 190 of the Revised Statutes. Section 109 of the Criminal Code (18 U. S. C. 198) forbids officers of the United States to aid or assist in the prosecution of claims against the United States. Section 113 (18 U. S. C. 203) forbids officers and employees of the United States to receive any compensation for services rendered in connection with any proceeding or other matter in which the United States is interested before any administrative body. Section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99) makes it unlawful for former officers or employees to prosecute any claim against the United States that was pending in the Department employing them for a period of two years after employment has ceased.

It is in the public interest to retain Mr. Phelps as Special Counsel in the cases involved, and it is only fair that he be exempted from the operation of the statutes named in the proposed bill. Similar bills have been enacted in the past with respect to Special Counsel in other important Government litigation.

The Department urgently requests the enactment of the proposed bill.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS W. MCGREGOR,
The Assistant to the Attorney General.

PATENTS OF THE TREATIES OF PEACE WITH ITALY, BULCARIA, HUNGARY, AND RUMANIA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to carry into effect certain portions relating to patents

of the treaties of peace with Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania, ratified by the Senate on June 5, 1947, and I request that a letter addressed to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, from the Department of State, together with a memorandum from the Department of Commerce, United States Patent Office, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1707) to carry into effect certain parts relating to patents of the treaties of peace with Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania, ratified by the Senate on June 5, 1947, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The letter and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Honorable EARL C. MICHENER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. MICHENER: The Department of State wishes to urge strongly the passage of H. R. 4070, a bill "to carry into effect certain parts relating to patents of the treaties of peace with Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania, ratified by the Senate on June 5, 1947, and for other purposes."

The importance and appropriateness of the bill may be indicated by reference to the terms of the treaty of peace with Italy. Parallel provisions are contained in the treaties with Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania.

Annex XV of the treaty of peace with Italy, dealing with industrial, literary, and artistic property, looks toward the reestablishment of normal peacetime relations in this field between Italy on the one hand and the Allied and Associated Powers and other United Nations on the other. Thus, for example, article 1 of annex XV allows a period of 1 year from the coming into force of the treaty for the performance by the Allied and Associated Powers and their nationals of "all necessary acts for the obtaining or preserving in Italy of rights in industrial, literary, and artistic property which were not capable of accomplishment owing to the existence of a state of war," and provides further for a similar extension of rights of priority (under art. 4 of the Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property) which would otherwise have lapsed. Article 4 of the same annex states that the "provisions concerning the rights in Italy of the Allied and Associated Powers and their nationals shall apply equally to the rights in the territories of the Allied and Associated Powers of Italy and its nationals." The annex contains no statement, however, concerning the present status of the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, which defines the rights of nationals of one country in the jurisdiction of another with respect to patent matters. It is this question to which section 1 of H. R. 4070 addresses itself.

Section 1 declares that the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property is considered to be in full force and effect between the United States and Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania from the date of the enactment of the bill; in particular, section 1 states that the nationals of Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania "may hereafter apply for and obtain patents in the United States for their inventions and enjoy the rights and privileges thereof as provided in article 2 of said convention." However, in accordance with annex XV A of the treaty of peace with Italy, article 6 of annex IV of the treaty of peace with Bulgaria, article 6 of annex IV A of the treaty of peace with Hungary, and article 6 of annex IV A of the treaty of peace with Rumania, the bill contains the proviso that "patents shall not be applied for or obtained, or if obtained, shall not be valid, for inventions relating to war material" as specified in the treaties.

The purpose of section 2 of H. R. 4070 is to clarify the relationship between the peace treaties and sections 11 and 14 of the Boykin Act (Public Law 690, 79th Cong.) by explicitly providing that the privileges of sections 1 and 3 of the act are available to nationals of Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania until February 29, 1948. The Boykin Act specifies a termination date of August 8, 1947, but H. R. 4070 is predicated on the assumption that the Boykin Act will be amended to change that date to February 29, 1948. A bill to accomplish that purpose, H. R. 2953, passed the House on July 7, 1947.

The Department of State is interested in securing, for nationals of the United States, privileges in Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania analogous to those contained in the Boykin Act. The treaties of peace provide, however, that those countries are not required to accord to the United States and its nationals more favorable treatment than they and their nationals receive here. Accordingly, extension of the privileges of the Boykin Act to the nationals of the four countries, as provided for in H. R. 4070, will have the effect of making possible similar privileges for United States nationals in those countries.

Section 3 of H. R. 4070 is designed to encourage the resumption of trade with Germany and Japan by making available to nationals of those countries the protection of the United States patent laws. Expansion of German and Japanese exports, which patent protection in this country would encourage, is essential by reason of the critical dollar-exchange position of those countries. The strengthening of the economies of Germany and Japan by stimulating their foreign trade would have the effect of lessening the costs to the United States of occupation.

Until a later date it will be necessary to continue to subject German and Japanese patents to such controls as are required by the economic foreign policy of the United States. Accordingly, section 3 contains the proviso that patents obtained by nationals of Germany and Japan shall be subject to any conditions and limitations with respect to duration, revocation, utilization, assignment, and licensing which may be imposed by Congress or the President. Section 3 also provides that German and Japanese nationals may not apply for or obtain patents in the United States for any invention made, or upon which an application was filed, before January 1, 1946, in Germany or Japan or in the territory of any other of the Axis Powers, or in any territory occupied by the Axis forces. This confirms a policy adopted by the Executive Committee on Economic Foreign Policy on July 3, 1946, and approved by the President on September 17, 1946.

The Department is grateful for the opportunity to express its views on H. R. 4070. The Department believes that it is extremely important that H. R. 4070 be enacted at the current session of the Congress.

Memorandum to: The Secretary of Commerce.
From: The Commissioner of Patents.
Date: July 8, 1947.
Subject: H. R. 4070, a bill to carry into effect certain parts relating to patents of the treaties of peace with Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania, ratified by the Senate on June 5, 1947, and for other purposes.

The Patent Office feels that legislation of some sort to resume relationship with respect to patents with the countries with which treaties of peace have been signed is essential and that legislation fixing the rights of the other enemy countries is now desirable.

Section 1 of the proposed bill provides that the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property is considered as reestablished between the United States and Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania, and the nationals of these countries may hereafter apply for and obtain patents in the United States and enjoy the rights and privileges thereof as provided in article 2 of said Convention. Article 2 of the Convention provides that nationals of each of the countries which adhere thereto are entitled in all of the other countries to the same rights with respect to patent matters as the country grants to its own nationals. In other words, article 2 requires equal treatment of foreigners by each of the countries that adhere to the Convention. Our activities during the war with respect to patents and inventions of the enemy countries has proceeded on the basis that the International Convention is suspended or abrogated during the war, subject to subsequent resumption. Although the opening phrase of section 1 of the bill may not be absolutely essential, nevertheless, it contains a positive declaration that the Convention is reestablished with respect to the four countries mentioned, and amounts to a declaration that normal patent relationships are resumed for the future, and is considered necessary according to our treatment of enemy patents during the war.

The proviso at the end of section 1 of the bill is based on article 6 of the part of the peace treaties relating to patents. By this proviso the patenting of inventions relating to war material is prohibited. There is no time limitation in this proviso, and hence the operation will continue indefinitely in the future. An amendment to page 2, line 2, by inserting "heretofore made," after the word "inventions" may be considered in this connection. Article 6 does not actually require that such patenting be barred, but only provides that nothing in the patent provisions of the treaties shall be construed as entitling nationals of the four countries to such patents. This article may have had reference only to such inventions made during the war.

The annexes relating to patents in each of the four treaties are identical in terms, and hence it is necessary only to mention one of them by name in the discussion. Article 1 provides that Italy shall accord nationals of the Allied countries certain extensions of time for doing various things with respect to patents. These correspond in a general way to the extensions which are provided by our Public Law 690, which, however, excludes nationals of enemy countries from its operation. Article 4 goes on to provide that the foregoing provisions shall also apply to the rights of Italians in the Allied countries, but they shall not be entitled to more favorable treatment than is accorded to allies. The last phrase of article 4 turns the whole thing into a reciprocal matter, for its provides that Italy shall not be required to accord to any of the allies or their nationals more favorable treatment than Italy or its nationals receive in the territory of such powers. Consequently, unless the United States takes some action, and this action will have to be by legislation, citizens of the United States will not be entitled to any of the rights provided in article 1 of this annex. As a matter of fact, however, citizens of the United States have been accorded such rights in Italy with the expectation that they will receive similar rights. Section 2 of the bill extends the operation of Public Law 690 to the four countries mentioned for the period ending February 29, 1948, and in this respect grants them substantially the same rights given to allies. By this enactment citizens of the United States will accordingly be entitled to

rights specified by the peace treaty in each of the four countries mentioned.

The actual number of patents obtained in the past by citizens of the four countries in the United States has not been very large. During the years 1930 to 1937, inclusive, the United States issued an average of 111 patents per year to residents of Italy, an average of 36 per year to residents of Hungary, an average of 5 per year to residents of Rumania, and an average of less than 1 per year to residents of Bulgaria. Assuming that the same proportion will be true in the future, enactment of these provisions will entail very little on the part of the United States.

Section 3 of the bill relates to a different subject, and this is the resumption of patent relations with Germany and Japan. Here there are no peace treaties as yet, and the same formula is not adopted. There is no declaration that the International Convention is considered reestablished and the provisions of Public Law 690 are not extended to these countries. The section permits Germans and Japanese to obtain patents for their inventions in the future, but such patents are to be subject to conditions which may be imposed either by Congress or by the President in the future. This proviso will enable conditions to be enacted or promulgated whenever it is felt that they are necessary and will retain a control over patents which may be obtained on inventions of Germans or Japanese. In addition, patents may not be obtained in the United States for inventions made before January 1, 1946. Enactment of such a proviso is considered necessary, since it will prevent the patenting of inventions made during the war, in fact, of all inventions made before January 1, 1946, many of which were brought to this country by our operations after hostilities ceased and were published and given freely to the American public.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF MANUSCRIPT ENTITLED "TOWARD PEACE," A HANDBOOK ON AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, 1941–47

Mr. VANDENBERG submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 28), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the manuscript entitled "Toward Peace," a handbook on American international relations, 1941–47, be printed as a Senate Document, and that 1,000 additional copies shall be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1948—AMENDMENT

Mr. O'DANIEL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4269) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

At the proper place insert the following: "*Provided, however*, That no funds appropriated for the War Department shall be used to establish, foster, supervise, or continue any commercial monopoly either in the United States or in any occupied country or countries."

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS OF SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1948

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 4269) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 27, after line 10, to insert the following new item:

"BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

"COLORADO RIVER DAM FUND

"Boulder Canyon project: For payment to the Boulder City School District as reimbursement for instruction during the 1947–48 school year in the schools operated by said district, of each pupil who is a dependent of any employee of the United States, living in or in the immediate vicinity of Boulder City, in the sum of $50 per semester per pupil in average daily attendance at said schools, payable after the term of instruction in any semester has been completed, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary, $33,300, payable from the Colorado River Dam Fund."

Mr. McCARRAN also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4269, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1948, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Hampshire, in accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 4269) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely, on page 21, after line 6, insert:

FARM-LABOR-SUPPLY PROGRAM

Supply and distribution of farm labor: That part of the authority and funds with respect to providing an adequate supply of workers for the production, harvesting, and preparation for markets of agricultural commodities by the recruitment and placement of domestic agricultural workers as provided by the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act of 1944, as amended and supplemented, are hereby continued through June 30, 1948, and in addition to the amount hereby continued available, there is hereby appropriated the sum of $1,350,000 for such purposes, to be merged with the funds hereby continued available: *Provided*, That not less than $1,250,000 of such additional funds shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner and for the purposes specified in section 2 of said act: *Provided further*, That (except as provided in Public Law 40, 80th Cong.) no part of the funds appropriated or heretofore appropriated shall be available for the payment of transportation, housing, or subsistence of agricultural workers.

Mr. BALL (for Mr. BRIDGES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BRIDGES to House bill 4269, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1948, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notices.)

RÉSUMÉ OF THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY IN FIRST SESSION OF EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I believe that my colleagues and constituents, as well as many others, would be interested in a brief résumé of the work of the Senate Judiciary Committee in this first session of the Eightieth Congress, in particular concerning the impact of the legislative reorganization law upon our committee's jurisdiction and activities. I therefore ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the final Appendix of the RECORD, to be published shortly after the recess of Congress, a summary on this subject which I am now having prepared by the staff.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

A UNIVERSAL APPROACH—ARTICLE BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A Universal Approach," prepared by him and published in the Arizona Stockman of the issue of July 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

SEPARATE PEACE TREATIES WITH GERMANY AND JAPAN—DIGEST OF DEBATE WITH SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a digest of a debate on a CBS People's Platform, June 1, 1947, between him and James Burnham, professor of philosophy, New York University on the subject Should the United States Make Separate Peace Treaties With Germany and Japan, which appears in the Appendix.]

UTAH CENTENNIAL—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Utah Centennial," published in the Washington Evening Star of July 21, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CONSTITUTION—ARTICLE BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the United States Constitution, written by him, and published in the magazine Think for July 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

NAMING OF ANTARCTIC GEOGRAPHICAL FEATURES

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him on the subject of naming various geographical features of the Antarctic, which appears in the Appendix.]

POTATO PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM—ARTICLE BY J. M. ELEZAER

[Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article discussing the potato price-support program, by J. M. Elezaer, extension information specialist of the Clemson A. & M. College, Clemson, S. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

WILLIAM D. McCORMICK

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 706) for the relief of William D. McCormick, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That in the administration of the immigration laws William D. McCormick shall, upon application at a port of entry into the United States, be admitted for permanent residence without an immigration visa, provided he meets all the other requirements of the immigration laws. Upon his admission into the United States, the Secretary of State shall deduct one number from the quota for India for the year in which the admission occurs or from the quota of the first available succeeding year.

Mr. BREWSTER. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

CAPITAL GRANTS FOR CERTAIN LOW-RENT-HOUSING AND SLUM-CLEARANCE PROJECTS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1361) to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit loans, capital grants, or annual contributions for low-rent-housing and slum-clearance projects where construction costs exceed present cost limitations upon condition that local housing agencies pay the difference between cost limitations and the actual construction costs, which were, on page 2, to strike out all after line 6 down to and including "construction" in line 10, and insert "such proportion of the total development cost of the project as the amount of the average actual cost per family dwelling unit of the items covered by the applicable cost limitations prescribed in subsection (5) of this section in excess thereof bears to such average actual cost: *Provided*, That the amount of any such payment shall be excluded from the base on which the maximum amount of any capital grants, loans, or annual contributions authorized by this act are calculated"; and on page 2, after line 20, to insert:

SEC. 2. Section 2 (1) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by changing the period at the end of the second sentence to a colon and adding the following: "*Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Federal Public Housing Authority and all officers and employees thereof are hereby prohibited, during the period beginning on the effective date of this proviso and ending on February 29, 1948, (1) from initiating or maintaining any action or proceeding to recover possession of any housing accommodations administered by such Authority, if such action or proceeding is based upon the fact that the income of the occupants of such housing accommodations exceeds the allowable maximum, and (2) from in any manner requiring any State or local public housing agency to take any action to recover possession of any housing accommodations administered by such agency, if the basis for requiring the State or local public housing agency to take such action is the fact that the income of the occupants of such housing accommodations exceeds the allowable maximum, unless other adequate housing facilities are available for said occupants."

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. CAIN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, and Mr. SPARKMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONSUMER-CREDIT CONTROLS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 148) to authorize the temporary continuation of regulation of consumer credit, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That after the date of enactment of this joint resolution the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall not exercise consumer credit controls pursuant to Executive Order No. 8843 and, except during the time of war beginning after the date of enactment of this joint resolution or any national emergency declared by the President after the date of enactment of this joint resolution, no such consumer credit controls shall be exercised hereafter.

And to amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution terminating consumer credit controls."

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia, and Mr. MAYBANK conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF PLANT QUARANTINE ACT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 338) to amend the Plant Quarantine Act approved August 20, 1912, as amended, which were on page 1, line 4, to strike out "adding thereto a new section," and insert "substituting a colon for the period at the end of section 1 and by adding there a new proviso"; on the same page, to strike out all after line 5, down to and including "States" in line 9, and insert "*And provided further*, That"; on the same page, line 10, to strike out "and bulbs"; on the same page, line 11, to strike out "to that needed for propagation purposes,"; on page 2, line 3, to strike out "and bulbs"; on the same page, line 6, to strike out "or bulbs"; on the same page, line 8, to strike out "or bulbs are" and insert "is", and to amend the title so as to read "An act to amend the Plant Quarantine Act approved August 20, 1912, as amended, by adding a new proviso to section 1."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

JULIAN M. THOMAS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 358) to provide for settling certain indebtedness connected with Pershing Hall, a memorial in Paris, France, which were in line 4, to strike out "from the Pershing Hall memorial fund" and insert "out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated," and to amend the title so as to read "An act for the relief of Julian M. Thomas."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of the Senate the calendar is now to be called for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection. The Chair would like to make a suggestion to the Senate, with its indulgence. There are on the calendar 202 measures. Even if they are cared for at the rate of 1 a minute, it will take 3½ hours to conclude consideration of all the measures. Under the circumstances the Chair suggests that as the calendar is called all Senators endeavor to live up to rule VIII, which limits any Senator to one speech and not more than 5 minutes on any calendar order. It seems to the Chair that in fairness to Senators with measures at the end of the calendar all should cooperate today in attempting to live up to the rule. The Chair will take the liberty of enforcing the rule within reason.

In the opinion of the Chair, nothing is in order but the call of the calendar.

THE DREDGE "AJAX"—MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. OVERTON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. OVERTON. May I make a motion to reconsider the vote by which a bill was passed yesterday?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator may enter his motion.

Mr. OVERTON. I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which it passed House bill 4229, to provide that the Canadian-built dredge *Ajax* and certain other dredging equipment owned by a United States corporation be documented under the laws of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's motion will be entered for subsequent consideration.

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is it in order to ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee may sit during the session of the Senate today?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks it is.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to hold a hearing while the Senate is in session today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Naval Affairs of the Armed Services Committee, conducting public hearings on the Annapolis Naval Academy Airport bill, may be excused during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, as acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I ask permission that the committee may meet at 5 o'clock today to consider the civil functions appropriation bill, and that the committee be allowed to file a report on the bill after the Senate takes its recess today, should the committee approve the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to sit during this session of the Senate to hear testimony on and consider the question of the confirmation of the nominees to the National Labor Relations Board.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the first order of business on the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 27) to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of gold and silver mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war, was announced as first in order.

Mr. GREEN. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

PROTECTION AGAINST IMPORTATION OF GARBAGE

The bill (H. R. 597) to protect American agriculture, horticulture, livestock, and the public health by prohibiting the importation of garbage derived from products originating outside of the United States, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over temporarily, to be returned to later.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be passed over temporarily.

Mr. CAPPER subsequently said: Mr. President, I hereby submit an amendment to H. R. 597.

As I stated to the Senate yesterday, this amendment is the result of an agreement between the Public Health Service and the Department of Agriculture with respect to the administration of the proposed legislation. The Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, on behalf of the Public Health Service, has suggested the possibility that the bill might create some confusion between the administration of its provisions and the administration of the Public Health Service Act, which gives the Public Health Service authority in the field of garbage disposal as it affects the spread of disease in this country and among the States. The Acting Administrator, Mr. Maurice Collins, has written me that the amendment I am submitting would be adequate to preserve the existing authority of the Public Health Service, and would also assure cooperation between his organization and the Department of Agriculture.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received and lie on the table. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 865) to provide for the striking of medals in lieu of coins for commemorative purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

BONUS PAYMENTS ON WHEAT AND CORN

The bill (S. 669) to provide for the payment of a bonus of 30 cents per bushel on wheat and corn produced and sold between January 1, 1945, and April 18, 1946, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in regard to the bill just called, I think it is identical with a bill which was on the calendar in the last Congress, which went over because of an emergency situation existing in the Senate at that time, with some degree of assurance on my part, as majority leader, at that time, that the bill would be considered. I realize that it is a bill that may arouse some controversy, and therefore involve some discussion. But in view of my previous commitment, when I occupied a different status here in the Senate, I hope that whatever the Senate may wish to do about the bill itself, there will be given an opportunity to consider it before the adjournment of Congress.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 25) amending rule XXII relating to cloture, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 354) to incorporate the Federal City Charter Commission, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 866) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective and to provide for the coordinated execution of such policy through a National Housing Commission, and for other purposes.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 637), to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 408), to repeal section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act, to amend section 13 of the said act, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

MINING OF COAL AND OTHER MINERALS ON LANDS ACQUIRED BY THE UNITED STATES

The bill (S. 1081) to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, gas, and sulfur on lands aquired by the United States was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to know what is in the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia asks for an explanation.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTLER. In the absence of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] I will say very briefly that the purpose is to centralize the management of minerals in all Federal lands in the hands of one department, as recommended by the Secretary of the Interior in his annual report last year, and likewise by a special Senate committee investigating petroleum resources, in its recommendations dated January 21 of this year.

The bill does not relate to deposits of metals, as it is felt this matter should be handled by separate legislation. It does not apply at all to the question of title to "tidelands or submerged lands." It does not alter the disposition of receipts for mineral leases on these lands.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, does the bill involve any subsidy or any cost to the Government?

Mr. BUTLER. It does not.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. HATCH. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

VETERANS' HOUSING PROGRAM—REDUCTION OF AUTHORIZATION OF PREMIUM PAYMENTS

The bill (S. 1154) to amend the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may we have a brief explanation of that bill?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the bill is to reduce by $325,000,000 an authorization previously made. The money is not needed. I shall read a letter which is in the report, from Frank R. Creedon, Housing Expediter.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Since this bill was recommended, is it not true that the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act has been entirely repealed by the Rent Control Act?

Mr CAPEHART. It has been repealed almost entirely. I am not certain though but what the bill should be passed. I read a portion of a letter addressed by Frank R. Creedon, Housing Expediter, to the Chairman of the RFC:

> Under these circumstances it is apparent that a substantial portion of the amount authorized by Congress for premium payments will not be needed between now and December 31, 1947, which is the expiration date of the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act. Accordingly, I wish to advise you that $335,000,000 of the original authorization of $400,000,000 will not be required. Of the $65,000,000 retained, $50,000,000 represents the estimated cost of the premium payment plans and $15,000,000 the cost of the access roads program.

Mr. BARKLEY. May I ask the Senator the date of that letter, whether before or after the Senate took action repealing the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act?

Mr. CAPEHART. The date of that letter is March 21, 1947.

Mr. BARKLEY. In any event, I suppose if that act was repealed it would do no harm to enact this bill. It is a Senate bill, and if the act has been repealed, the House would not take any action, I assume.

Mr. CAPEHART. I see nothing wrong with passing the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with an amendment, in line 5, to strike out "$100,000,000," and to insert "$75,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 11 (a) of the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946 is amended by striking out "$400,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$75,000,000."

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 299) to extend the reclamation laws to the State of Arkansas, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 309) designating American Indian Day, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

CONVENTION OF WORLD'S WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION

The bill (H. R. 1179) to aid in defraying the expenses of the seventeenth triennial convention of the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union to be held in this country in June 1947 was announced as next in order.

Mr. McGRATH. Over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator who objected to withhold the objection for a moment.

Mr. McGRATH. Very well.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I hope that objection will not be made to the passage of this bill. I do not want to detain the Senate longer than a moment, to call to the attention of Senators the fact that the bill provides for a very small appropriation—a token appropriation, more or less, which is a courtesy to the prominent foreign women who visited this country to attend the convention of the WCTU. It would be a discourtesy, as I see it, to these foreign women, were the bill to be rejected. It is a matter in which a precedent has been set. The last time the world convention of the WCTU was held in Washington, in 1937, a small appropriation was made. The convention has been held, and the WCTU has expended funds. In this particular instance, Mr. President, the bill would reimburse them for the expenditure of those funds. The foreign women who visited this country would feel that a discourtesy had not been done them; in fact, they would feel that a courtesy had been done them. I hope the Senator who asked that the bill go over will withdraw his objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I originally objected to the passage of the bill because I felt it would perpetuate a bad precedent, if it does not establish one. There are many organizations which bring national delegates to conventions held in the United States. I do not believe we should embark upon a course, especially now when we are becoming the capital of the world, under which the Government will defray a part of the expenses of these organizations, however worthy their purpose, their cause, and their practices. The organization in question is a private organization fostering issues with which many of us agree and with which some may disagree. I cannot help but feel, however, that it is no part of the business of the Government of the United States to enter into the sponsorship of such matters. Therefore, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1125) to amend the act entitled "An act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia," approved December 24, 1942, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, may I, as one interested in that bill, ask that it be temporarily laid aside, with the hope that we may come back to it later today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be temporarily passed over.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE

The bill (S. 1032) for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill, which is identical with House bill 3726, Calendar No. 593?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California asks for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this is one of a series of bills which have been considered by previous Congresses which would have the effect of reimbursing certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States for losses of personal property by reason of war conditions prevailing in the world during recent years.

Similar bills relating to other individuals were passed in both the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses and became, respectively, Private Law 145 and Private Law 13.

The committee has amended the bill to remove therefrom the claim of Douglas Henderson whose household effects were pilfered between July 1943 and March 1944, in shipment from New Orleans to Cochabamba, Bolivia, being of the opinion that presumably this is unrelated to enemy activity.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has called attention to the fact that the Senate bill is identical with House bill 3726. Is there objection to substituting the House bill for the Senate bill and to immediate consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3726) for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin to the fact that an amendment of the bill should be made, inasmuch as the Senate bill strikes out on line 16, page 2, "Douglas Henderson, $790.50." Therefore the House bill should be amended in that respect.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, to House bill 3726, on page 2, line 16, to strike out "Douglas Henderson, $790.50."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 1032 is indefinitely postponed.

PRINTING OF SENATE PROCEEDINGS IN THE RECORD

The resolution (S. Res. 121) prohibiting under certain conditions the printing in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of matter offered as a part of the remarks of a Senator, was announced as next in order, and was read as follows:

Resolved, That hereafter no written or printed matter shall be offered or received for printing in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of the remarks of any Senator unless such matter (1) shall have been read orally by such Senator on the floor of the Senate, or (2) is offered and received for printing in such manner as will indicate clearly that the contents thereof were not read orally by such Senator on the floor of the Senate. No request shall be entertained by the Presiding Officer to suspend by unanimous consent the requirements of this resolution.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over!

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senators who ask that the resolution be passed over to withhold their objection until I can explain the resolution. The resolution came to the Committee on Rules and Administration as a suggestion to benefit the RECORD. The resolution relates to two matters. First it provides that nothing shall

be printed in the RECORD unless it shall have been read orally from the floor, or unless it is offered and received for printing in such manner as will indicate clearly that the contents thereof were not read orally by the Senator on the floor of the Senate. It would have the effect, for one thing, of reducing the bulk of the RECORD and therefore the printing cost. The resolution was agreed to unanimously in the Committee on Rules and Administration. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who was for many years chairman of the Committee on Printing and who has had much experience with this particular subject, approved the resolution. No change would be made in the rules by the resolution, but it would result in the Senate rules in regard to printing matter being followed more closely than they have recently been.

We submitted Senate Resolution 121 to Mr. Murphy, Official Reporter of Debates of the Senate, who thought it was defective in some respects and needed a slight addition. So a new resolution, Senate Resolution 127, was drawn, approved by the full committee, and reported to the Senate. Senate Resolution 121 is Calendar No. 242. Senate Resolution 127 is Calendar No. 398. I should like to have Senate Resolution 127 substituted for Senate Resolution 121.

Mr. RUSSELL. Are the two resolutions identical?

Mr. JENNER. No. Senate Resolution 127 is in somewhat better form and provides that the rules of the Joint Committee on Printing shall be adhered to, so that matter which should be printed in 6½-point type, the smaller type, shall not be printed in 7½-point type, which is the larger, regular RECORD type in which all speeches actually delivered on the floor, not including insertions, are printed. I will read Senate Resolution 127. It is as follows:

Resolved, That hereafter no written or printed matter shall be received for printing in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of the remarks of any Senator unless such matter (1) shall have been read orally by such Senator on the floor of the Senate, or (2) shall have been offered and received for printing in such manner as to indicate clearly that the contents thereof were not read orally by such Senator on the floor of the Senate. All such matter shall be printed in the RECORD in accordance with the rules prescribed by the Joint Committee on Printing. No request shall be entertained by the Presiding Officer to suspend by unanimous consent the requirements of this resolution.

As I have stated, both resolutions have been approved by the full Committee on Rules and Administration; but it is thought that Senate Resolution 127 is in better form.

Mr. RUSSELL. If I correctly understand the resolution, it would in substance continue in effect the practice which is followed at the present time. It would not abrogate any rule of the Senate. I know of no way in which a Senator can have anything printed in the RECORD except by saying "I ask unanimous consent to have such and such matter printed in the RECORD." I notice that under (2) of Senate Resolution 121 it is provided that nothing shall be received for printing in the body of the RECORD unless such matter "is offered and received for printing in such manner as will indicate clearly that the contents thereof were not read orally by such Senator on the floor of the Senate."

I see no difference between that provision and the procedure which we now follow in the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair be permitted to make an observation, inasmuch as the Chair thinks he had something to do with instigating the movement? The Reporters have been under considerable embarrassment from time to time when Senators have sought to have material which they have prepared in the form of speeches printed in the body of the RECORD as though the speeches had been delivered on the floor. The practice heretofore, of course, has been that any Senator can insert anything in his speech for publication he wishes, but it is published in small type instead of in regular type.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the practice we follow at the present time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The sole purpose of the resolution, as the Chair understands, is to emphasize and make formal the rule or procedure which we try to follow, but which the Reporters sometimes are embarrassed to discover they are asked to avoid and evade.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I presume the resolution does not deal with a matter which is mentioned by the Chair, which I think ought to have some attention at the earliest possible date. We incorporate in the body of the RECORD something that we feel is of particular importance, instead of putting it in the Appendix of the RECORD, but under the rule it is printed in such fine type that no one can read it. I have always had a feeling that anything important enough to go in the body of the RECORD ought to be printed in the same type in which we print the proceedings. While the resolution does not deal with that subject, I hope that at an early date the committee will give consideration to the propriety of printing anything we think worthy to go in the body of the RECORD in the same type in which our own remarks appear.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if Senate resolution 127 be adopted, I assume Senate resolution 121 will not be considered. Am I correct in that?

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if I may have unanimous consent of the Senate to renew my objection to the consideration of the resolution if any further amendment of the rules is offered by amendment of the resolution, I shall not object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not understand the Senator's statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am reluctant to open up the whole question of amending the rules of the Senate by permitting the resolution to become the unfinished business. If I may have the right to interpose objection to its consideration if an amendment to the resolution be offered, I have no objection to its consideration.

Mr. JENNER. There is no purpose and no desire to do aught but to have the resolution considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of Senate Resolution 121.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the explanation made by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is there objection to substituting Senate Resolution 127 for Senate Resolution 121 and to considering Senate Resolution 127?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 127) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That hereafter no written or printed matter shall be received for printing in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of the remarks of any Senator unless such matter (1) shall have been read orally by such Senator on the floor of the Senate, or (2) shall have been offered and received for printing in such manner as to indicate clearly that the contents thereof were not read orally by such Senator on the floor of the Senate. All such matter shall be printed in the RECORD in accordance with rules prescribed by the Joint Committee on Printing. No request shall be entertained by the Presiding Officer to suspend by unanimous consent the requirements of this resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate Resolution 121 is indefinitely postponed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 544) to further amend section 3 of the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska will withhold his objection for a moment, I should like to say a word in explanation of the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I withhold it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. This is a bill to raise the maximum which can be allowed to a Federal employee for subsistence when traveling anywhere in the United States from $6 to $8. The average daily expense, as discovered through a spot check made a short time ago, is $8.04. Every Federal employee sent out on business is obliged to pay the expense himself in any amount over $6.

The bill has been carefully prepared. It was objected to first by the War and Navy Departments. It has been prepared by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY]. In the name of simple justice to the employees of the United States Government, it ought to be passed. I do not believe that any Member of the Senate who is accepting the $2,500 expense allowance which was given him this year ought to object to a Federal employee getting actual costs so long as they do not exceed $8 a day.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, as I understand, the bill as now printed, and on the calendar, contains no provision with respect to the Army and Navy.

Mr. AIKEN. There is an amendment already prepared which will delete that provision, and an agreement has been reached with the Army and Navy.

Mr. GURNEY. Will the amendment be offered?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. I think the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] has the amendment.

Mr. GURNEY. If that amendment is offered, I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I made the objection on behalf of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. He is not in the Chamber at this time. I shall be glad to have the bill passed over temporarily.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over temporarily.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 140) to create an executive department of the Government to be known as the Department of Health, Education, and Security was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

PROTECTION AGAINST IMPORTATION OF GARBAGE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, when House bill 597, Calendar No. 28, was previously called, I objected. I now ask unanimous consent to recur to that bill, and I ask for an explanation of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate will recur to House bill 597, Calendar No. 28, which was temporarily passed over. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 597) to protect American agriculture, horticulture, livestock, and the public health by prohibiting the unauthorized importation into, or the depositing in the territorial waters of, the United States of garbage derived from products originating outside of the continental United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the bill is not in my charge. However, a Member of the House of Representatives from my State introduced it.

I merely wish to say to the Senate that I have some amendments which I think will clear some of the objections which have previously been raised by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

I also hold in my hand a copy of a letter written by the Secretary of Agriculture to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. CAPPER]. The Secretary says:

> Further reference is made to your letter of February 12, 1947, requesting a report on H. R. 597, a bill to protect American agriculture, horticulture, livestock, and the public health by prohibiting the unauthorized importation into, or the depositing in the territorial waters of, the United States of garbage derived from products originating outside of the continental United States, and for other purposes.
>
> The proposed legislation would provide authority not now available, to control the handling of garbage derived from products originating outside of the continental United States in manners which would remove the risk of such garbage being a means of introducing pests into our country.

The Secretary goes on to point out, in the following paragraph, that—

> The outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease which occurred in California in 1929 was traced to trimmings of fresh meat brought into the country as stores by a merchant steamship. The outbreak of the same disease which took place in California in 1924 was associated with foreign garbage, containing meat scraps, which was removed and fed to hogs.

I wish to point out to the Senate that already we have appropriated $15,000,000 to try to prevent hoof-and-mouth disease in Mexico from being brought into this country. Some of the estimates which have been made by Members of the Senate who went down to investigate the situation were to the effect that it might cost as much as $75,000,000 to $100,000,000 to eradicate this disease and prevent its getting into the cattle herds of the United States.

For that reason I have prepared some amendments, which are on the desk. Printed copies are on the desks of Senators. The amendments clearly indicate that the bill refers only to garbage brought in from outside the United States, and has nothing to do with the domestic situation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I objected to the bill originally because, as drafted, it would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to set up a vast garbage-collection service covering the entire United States. It would cover all garbage of every description.

Furthermore, the bill is rather elaborately drawn. It seems to me that it is subject to many legal objections. If it is to be passed for the worthy purpose stated by the Senator from California, I think both section 3, which tries to create a presumption from one fact to another which is not at all a necessary presumption, and section 5, which places all authorized garbage collectors under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, should be eliminated. Under section 5 all garbage collectors, apparently, would have to take orders from the Secretary of Agriculture and go just where he tells them to go, or else go to jail. It seems to me that is a rather curious method. If the Senator in charge of the bill is willing, in addition to the amendments to be offered by the Senator from California, to eliminate sections 3 and 5, I think he would retain all the necessary features of the bill, making criminal the importation of garbage without disposing of it in closed containers, either on ships or on railroad cars. That feature would remain in the bill, and the remainder of it would be eliminated.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I offer the several amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The first amendment offered by the Senator from California will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 16, after the word "vehicles", it is proposed to insert "entering the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next amendment offered by the Senator from California will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 21, after the word "vehicle", it is proposed to insert "entering the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next amendment offered by the Senator from California will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, line 4, after the word "garbage", it is proposed to strike out "on vessels, railway cars, aircraft, or other vehicles within" and insert "within the United States on vessels, railway cars, aircraft, or other vehicles entering."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next amendment offered by the Senator from California will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, line 10, it is proposed to strike out the first comma and the words "for consumption therein" and insert in lieu thereof "arriving in the United States for consumption in such vessel, railway car, aircraft, or other vehicle."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. If a section is amended, can it then be stricken out?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It can.

Mr. TAFT. I move that section 3 be stricken out.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. I move that section 5 be stricken out.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there is another amendment, submitted by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER].

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add a new section as follows:

> SEC. 10. Nothing in this act shall be construed as in any way affecting the authority of the Surgeon General under part G of title III of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 264–272).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr.

AIKEN, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. WILSON, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. ELLENDER conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: Further reference is made to your letter of February 12, 1947, requesting a report on H. R. 597, a bill "To protect American agriculture, horticulture, livestock, and the public health by prohibiting the unauthorized importation into, or the depositing in the territorial waters of, the United States of garbage derived from products originating outside of the continental United States, and for other purposes."

The proposed legislation would provide authority, not now available, to control the handling of garbage derived from products originating outside of the continental United States in manners which would remove the risk of such garbage being a means of introducing pests into our country. The bill proposes that the owner or operator, or the master or other person in charge, of any vessel, railway car, aircraft, or other vehicle which has garbage aboard shall handle or dispose of it under provisions which will provide protection against the introduction or dissemination of pests or diseases that may be contained in the garbage. The proposed legislation would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to designate employees of the United States Department of Agriculture and other agencies of the Government to enforce the provisions of the bill, and to license garbage collectors who would have authority to collect and dispose of garbage under provisions designated to provide appropriate safeguards.

It is well established that garbage derived from products originating outside of the continental United States contains living disease organisms and living insect pests which do not occur within our country. The introduction and establishment of such diseases or pests would be inimical to agriculture and public health and could easily be the cause of excessive expenditures and losses. Reference to a single disease of livestock, the foot-and-mouth disease, illustrates the need for the control of garbage as would be authorized by the proposed legislation. The outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease which occurred in California in 1929 was traced to trimmings of fresh meat brought into the country as stores by a merchant steamship. The outbreak of the same disease which took place in California in 1942 was associated with foreign garbage, containing meat scraps, which was removed and fed to hogs. Some 110,000 animals were slaughtered as part of the effort to eliminate the 1924 outbreak of this destructive disease of livestock.

The authority and procedures that are prescribed in the proposed legislation would permit reducing to a minimum the risk of introducing diseases and insect pests that may be contained in garbage. The carrying out of these practices would afford a maximum and much-needed protection to our agriculture and public health. With the authorization and procedures proposed and by using cooperative practices between various governmental agencies that could be carried out to provide the necessary safeguards in handling and disposing of garbage, the needed protection could be secured without unreasonable increased cost. The provisions to provide for enforcement of the proposed legislation could be added to the duties of existing agencies and under the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture find leadership, coordination, and responsibility for administration with units of the Department engaged in the enforcement of plant and animal quarantines.

It is suggested that, by reason of the present status of the Philippine Islands, it may be desirable to strike from the definition of the term "United States" on line 22 of page 2 of the bill the words "Philippine Islands and the."

The Department considers the legislation proposed in H. R. 597 to be in the public interest, the operational procedures provided to be practicable, and it recommends that the bill be enacted.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has advised that if the bill is amended by including a new section as suggested by the Federal Security Agency, an addition which is also acceptable to this Department, there would be no objection by the Bureau of the Budget to the enactment of the proposed legislation. The new section would provide that, "Nothing in this act shall be construed as in any way affecting the authority of the Surgeon General under page G of title III of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 264–272)."

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary.

MINING OF COAL AND OTHER MINERALS ON LANDS ACQUIRED BY THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a moment ago when Senate bill 1081, Calendar No. 162, was called, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] made objection.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I objected on behalf of another Senator. He has since entered the Chamber, and I withdraw the objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate will recur to Senate bill 1081, Calendar No. 162. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1081) to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, gas, and sulfur on lands acquired by the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Public Lands was, in section 2, page 1, line 9, after the word "extended", to insert "including such lands acquired under the provisions of the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961, 16 U. S. C., sec. 552)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, on page 2, line 9, after the word "Acts", to insert "'Lease' includes 'prospecting permit', unless the context otherwise requires."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, on page 2, line 12, after the numeral "3", to strike out "All" and insert "Except where lands have been acquired by the United States for the development of the mineral deposits, by foreclosure or otherwise for resale, or reported as surplus pursuant to the provisions of the Surplus Property Act of October 3, 1944 (50 U. S. C., sec. 1611 and the following), all"; and in line 18, after the word "or", to insert "may hereafter be."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 7, on page 4, line 24, after the word "lands", to strike out the comma and the words "shall furnish to him", and insert "and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 9, on page 5, line 25, after the words "the time of", to strike out "its" and insert in lieu thereof "their"; and on page 6, line 1, after the word "lease", to strike out "and who has filed an application for lease of such lands, and whose application was pending on March 1, 1947, shall be entitled to a preference right over others to a lease of such lands under the provisions hereof" and insert "who, on the date of this act, had pending an application for an oil and gas lease for any lands which on the date the application was field was not situated within the known geologic structure of a producing oil or gas field, shall have a preference right over others to a lease of such lands without competitive bidding."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 10, on page 6, line 19, after the word "laws", to insert "to the extent that they are applicable."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, for the benefit of Senators who may be interested, I will say that the bill makes the rules which are now applicable to public lands applicable to acquired lands under the domain of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. To what extent, if any, does this measure affect the title to lands in controversy in California?

Mr. BUTLER. The bill does not affect at all the question of title to tidelands or submerged lands.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It affects them in no possible way in any State?

Mr. BUTLER. That is correct. That is stated in the report accompanying the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I rather think there is some error in that statement. After this bill passed the House there was a decision of the Supreme Court which changed the considerations involved in this bill. I have consulted the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] and the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT]; and, at the request of the Department of the Interior, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, may I inquire if the Senator is referring to order No. 265, House bill 174?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senate is considering order No. 162, Senate bill 1081.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sorry. I was told that order No. 265, House bill 174, was being considered. I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of Senate bill 1081.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands."

SEC. 2. As used in this act, "United States" includes Alaska; "acquired lands" or "lands acquired by the United States" include all lands heretofore or hereafter acquired by the United States to which the mineral leasing laws have not been extended, including such lands acquired under the provisions of the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961, 16 U. S. C., sec 552); "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior; "mineral leasing laws" shall mean the act of October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741; 48 U. S. C., sec. 432); the act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437; U. S. C., sec. 181); the act of April 17, 1926 (44 Stat. 301; 30 U. S. C., sec. 271); the act of February 7, 1927 (44 Stat. 1057; 30 U. S. C., sec. 281), and all acts heretofore or hereafter enacted which are amendatory of or supplementary to any of the foregoing acts. "Lease" includes "prospecting permit" unless the context otherwise requires.

SEC. 3. Except where lands have been acquired by the United States for the development of the mineral deposits, by foreclosure or otherwise for resale, or reported as surplus pursuant to the provisions of the Surplus Property Act of October 3, 1944 (50 U. S. C., sec. 1611 and the following), all deposits of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, sodium, potassium, and sulfur which are owned or may hereafter be acquired by the United States and which are within the lands acquired by the United States, exclusive of such deposits in such acquired lands as are situated within incorporated cities, towns, and villages, national parks or monuments, or set apart for military or naval purposes, may be leased by the Secretary under the same conditions as contained in the leasing provisions of the mineral leasing laws, subject to the provisions hereof. The provisions of the act of April 17, 1926 (44 Stat. 301), as heretofore or hereafter amended, shall apply to deposits of sulfur covered by this act wherever situated. No mineral deposit covered by this section shall be leased except with the consent of the head of the executive department, independent establishment, or instrumentality having jurisdiction over the lands containing such deposit, or holding a mortgage or deed of trust secured by such lands which is unsatisfied of record, and subject to such conditions as that official may prescribe to insure the adequate utilization of the lands for the primary purposes for which they have been acquired or are being administered.

SEC. 4. Nothing herein contained shall be deemed or construed to (a) amend, modify, or change any existing law authorizing or requiring the sale of acquired lands, or (b) empower any commission, bureau, or agency of the Government to make a reservation of the minerals in the sale of any acquired land: *Provided*, That any such sale or conveyance of lands shall be made by the agency having jurisdiction thereof, subject to any lease theretofore made, covering the mineral deposits underlying such lands.

SEC. 5. Where the United States does not own all of the mineral deposits under any lands sought to be leased and which are affected by this act, the Secretary is authorized to lease the interest of the United States in any such mineral deposits when, in the judgment of the Secretary, the public interest will be best served thereby; subject, however, to the provisions of section 3 hereof. Where the United States does not own any interest or owns less than a full interest in the minerals that may be produced from any lands sought to be leased, and which are or will be affected by this act and where, under the provisions of its acquisition, the United States is to acquire all or any part of such mineral deposits in the future, the Secretary may lease any interest of the United States then owned or to be acquired in the future in the same manner as provided in the preceding sentence.

SEC. 6. All receipts derived from leases issued under the authority of this act shall be paid into the same funds or accounts in the Treasury and shall be distributed in the same manner as prescribed for other receipts from the lands affected by the lease, the intention of this provision being that this act shall not affect the distribution of receipts pursuant to legislation applicable to such lands.

SEC. 7. Upon request by the Secretary, the heads of all executive departments, independent establishments, or instrumentalities having jurisdiction over any of the lands referred to in section 2 of this act shall furnish to the Secretary the legal description of all of such lands and all pertinent abstracts, title papers, and other documents in the possession of such agencies concerning the status of the title of the United States to the mineral deposits that may be found in such lands.

Abstracts, title papers, and other documents furnished to the Secretary under this section shall be recorded promptly in the Bureau of Land Management in such form as the Secretary shall deem adequate for their preservation and use in the administration of this act, whereupon the originals shall be returned promptly to the agency from which they were received. Duly authenticated copies of any such abstracts, title papers, or other documents may, however, be furnished to the Secretary, in lieu of the originals, in the discretion of the agency concerned.

SEC. 8. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to affect the rights of the State or other local authorities to exercise any right which they may have with respect to properties covered by leases issued under this act, including the right to levy and collect taxes upon improvements, output of mines, or other rights, property, or assets of any lessee of the United States.

SEC. 9. Nothing in this act shall affect any rights acquired by any lessee of lands subject to this act under the law as it existed prior to the effective date of this act, and such rights shall be governed by the law in effect at the time of their acquisition; but any person qualified to hold a lease who, on the date of this act, had pending an application for an oil and gas lease for any lands which on the date the application was filed was not situated within the known geologic structure of a producing oil or gas field, shall have a preference right over others to a lease of such lands without competitive bidding. Any person holding a lease on lands subject hereto, which lease was issued prior to the effective date of this act, shall be entitled to exchange such lease for a new lease issued under the provisions of this act, at any time prior to the expiration of such existing lease.

SEC. 10. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as are necessary and appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act, which rules and regulations shall be the same as those prescribed under the mineral leasing laws to the extent that they are applicable.

GOVERNMENT OF ALASKA

The bill (H. R. 174) to amend section 26, title I, chapter 1, of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska," and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this is the measure which I thought was under consideration when I sent an amendment to the desk a few moments ago.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I take it from the remarks which have been made that this bill relates only to Alaska.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. And it has no effect on any existing State.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It has no effect on any State. I now offer the amendment which inadvertently I suggested in connection with the previous bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the appropriate place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

Any rights or privileges acquired hereunder with respect to mining operations in land, title to which is transferred to a future State upon its admission to the Union and which is situated within its boundaries, shall be terminable by said State, and the said mining operations shall be subject to the laws of such State.

SEC. 2. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to affect or to impair any valid claims, rights, or privileges, including possessory claims, under the first proviso of section 8 of the act of May 17, 1884 (23 Stat. 26), arising under any other provision of law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN WAR POWERS

The bill (S. 1297), to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Over.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I make a brief statement with reference to this measure?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITE. This bill would accomplish two things. It would extend the definite authority of the Director of the Office of Defense Transportation over the movement of cars within the United States, for the ultimate purpose of making the widest distribution possible of transportation facilities, and would extend that authority only until next January.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I objected to it only because I understood it was covered in a bill already passed. The bill extending the War Powers Act contained this provision.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 829) to provide for control and regulation of bank-holding com-

panies and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. DOWNEY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL AT MONTEREY, CALIF.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 229) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif., which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "authorized", to strike out "and directed to provide by contract or otherwise for the construction of", and to insert "to acquire 606.592 acres of land upon which the United States of America now has an option with buildings thereon at Monterey, Calif., for the establishment of"; on line 9, to strike out "at Monterey, Calif."; on line 10, after the word "necessary", to insert "construction and alterations to provide"; on line 3, page 2, to strike out "$28,750,000", and insert "$2,500,000"; and to strike out sections 2 and 3, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to acquire 606.592 acres of land upon which the United States of America now has an option with buildings thereon at Monterey, Calif., for the establishment of a naval postgraduate school, including the necessary construction and alterations to provide school facilities, quarters, and collateral facilities and equipment, including the acquisition of the necessary land, at a cost not to exceed $2,500,000: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into without regard to the provisions of section 3709, Revised Statutes.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I have just noticed that the House bill 1379, which follows Senate bill 229, provides for the establishment of a naval postgraduate school. I am wondering if it is the same matter.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, Senate bill 229 authorizes the purchase of a property on a specific location at an immense saving to the Government over the building of a new school. The Navy has an option on the buildings at Monterey, which is only for the physical requirements of the school. House bill 1379 proposes to establish the professorships and curriculum of the school.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator whether this postgraduate course is taken after graduation from the Naval Academy at Annapolis?

Mr. GURNEY. It is after the Annapolis graduation. After the students have had a certain tour of duty they return and are appointed to this school.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it open to students other than those who have graduated from the Naval Academy?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes. The Reserves commissioned in the Navy are just as eligible as are graduates of the Naval Academy.

Mr. BARKLEY. But they must have reached a certain status in education and experience in order to qualify for this school?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. How long a course is it?

Mr. GURNEY. From 2 to 3 years; after they have had 3 years of duty after being commissioned in the Navy.

Mr. CONNALLY. How many students is it planned to have?

Mr. GURNEY. There are approximately 1,500 in the line and 500 in the engineering service of the Navy.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is there any sort of temporary establishment like this at this time?

Mr. GURNEY. Such a course is now being conducted at Annapolis, but it is overcrowded, and at Annapolis they do not have the benefit of a law establishing the curriculum, and so forth, for the postgraduate course.

Mr. CONNALLY. Do they not have a school at Newport?

Mr. GURNEY. It is a line school at Newport, and it is not affected in any way or duplicated in any way.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thought the Senator said that half the students were in the line, and half in the engineering service.

Mr. GURNEY. The line schools are at Newport and Annapolis presently. This bill takes the one at Annapolis and moves it to Monterey Point and enables the Navy to carry on the kind of program they feel they must have and which our committee unanimously supported.

Mr. CONNALLY. What I am getting at is this: How many students are there?

Mr. GURNEY. Five hundred in the line and 500 in the engineers.

Mr. CONNALLY. So this would be a duplication if the men were not graduated from Annapolis?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. So it is desired to move to Monterey?

Mr. GURNEY. To move the postgraduate course from Annapolis to Monterey; that is correct.

UNITED STATES NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

The bill (H. R. 1379) to establish the United States Naval Postgraduate School was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 18) to establish uniform qualifications of jurors in Federal courts, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 489) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, to preserve nationality of naturalized veterans, their wives, minor children, and dependent parents, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR AMERICAN CITIZENS TO RETURN FROM ABROAD

The bill (S. 518) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens who were unable to return to the United States prior to October 14, 1946, was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Over.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that bills similar to Senate bill 518 have passed various sessions of the Congress. The purpose of this bill is to give American citizens who are abroad and unable to return to this country an opportunity to do so until October 14, 1948. We extended the period of time because of the war, and since the expiration of the war we have again extended it. I have a number of letters in my files which indicate that for very good and substantial reasons some American citizens have been unable to return to this country. This gives them another year or so in which to return. It has the full support and approval of the Departments affected.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have given considerable thought to the merits of this proposed legislation. On two occasions the Congress has extended the time for these persons to return to the United States, particularly inasmuch as it has been said that they have not had an opportunity to obtain transportation by means of which to return. The Government has done all it could to expedite the repatriation of any American citizen who wishes to return to this country.

In my judgment, this bill will benefit a small group of people who are enjoying and profiting by dual citizenship and by failing to comply with the nationality law which requires them to return after a certain period.

The time for their return has been extended twice since the cessation of hostilities in Europe. On the last occasion the committee served notice that it would not again report a bill extending this period.

Therefore I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection until I can make a statement on this subject?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to have the Senator make a statement, but I shall insist that the bill go over.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am quite familiar with the provisions of this measure, Mr. President. Under the nationality law, if a person who has become a naturalized citizen leaves the United States and remains away for a period of 5 years, as I recall, he loses his citizenship; it is then automatically revoked and ended; and thereafter if he wishes to return to the United States, he can return only under the quota as an alien.

Of course, during the war there were a number of our citizens who could not return. As the Senator has stated, there were extensions of the time for their return, up until December 1946. But I remind the Senate that up until that time

there was still considerable difficulty in obtaining transportation on shipboard.

A number of cases, although not a great many, are affected by this situation, and would be affected by this bill, if enacted. This measure would simply extend the provision so that those who could not return by that time might still have an opportunity to return to the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection has been heard, and the bill is passed over.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I have a statement to make, which I think should be in the RECORD. I have before me a letter from the National Catholic Welfare Conference, in which the director of its bureau of immigration refers to the case of an Italian woman who came to this country in 1926, at the age of 15, and acquired American citizenship through her father's naturalization in 1928. In September 1937 she went to Italy and married an Italian. It was the intention of the young couple to come to the United States following the marriage, but they were obliged to delay their plans due to the illness of the husband's parents. Again, in 1938, they hoped to sail, but the wife found that she was to have a child, and could not risk an ocean voyage. The child was born in June 1939, and by the time they could plan again to return they were prevented from doing so by the Second World War.

Upon the termination of hostilities, the wife petitioned for a preference status for her husband, which was approved; and the child, being considered an American citizen, was to travel on her mother's passport. However, another child was born, and apparently was not considered an American citizen, since the mother was advised by the consul to petition for nonquota status for the second child. The petition for the second child was still pending when the consuls were authorized to grant passports to all naturalized American citizens so that they might return to the United States before the dead line of October 14, 1946.

However, at that time the second child was only 5 months old, and the approved petition did not come through in time to make it possible for the wife to get back to the United States in order to retain her citizenship. This was especially sad, inasmuch as the second child died in January 1947.

The husband and wife and remaining child are still in Italy, and at the present time there is no possibility of their returning to the United States unless a bill such as this one is passed.

Mr. President, I have referred to just one instance, as pointed out by the National Catholic Welfare Conference. I feel that there are several hundred other meritorious cases, not involving persons who did not wish to return, but involving persons who, because of the terrors of war, were unable to return; and then, after the end of the war, they were not able to return to the United States before the deadline in 1946.

I understand that objection has been made to the present consideration of the bill, but I think a record should be made.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I would have the RECORD show that all these special cases that appeal to our sympathies can be provided for in special bills, if Senators are interested in those special cases; but when it is proposed to open the door to a great many people, by providing by a general law for the return of all such people, I object.

If the Senator is interested in special cases, let him introduce a bill for their relief, and no objection will be interposed.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I only point out that the Senate itself passed a general bill extending the time; and I know that the Senator, who is interested in all these cases which have great merit, is familiar with that fact. I only followed what the Senator had done in extending the time to 1946. I think it should be extended further. Since the Senator himself was in favor of extending the time for all cases, I do not think he should complain too bitterly when another Senator endeavors to extend the time for another year.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there was a sound reason for making the extension, namely, because of the war. Because the war had been going on, these people could not get out of Europe. However, it has been 2 years since then, and these people have had an opportunity to return.

If there are hardship cases, we should take care of them specially, and not by passing a general law.

Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the objection, the bill is passed over.

The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

SHIPMENT AND BURIAL OF REMAINS OF WORLD WAR II DEAD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3394) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the evacuation and return of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States," approved May 16, 1946, in order to provide for the shipment of the remains of World War II dead to the homeland of the deceased or of next of kin, to provide for the disposition of group and mass burials, to provide for the burial of unknown American World War II dead in United States military cemeteries to be established overseas, to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire land overseas and to establish United States military cemeteries thereon, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 2, in line 17, after the word "War", to insert "except as expressly reserved to the American Battle Monuments Commission by section 9 of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the end of the bill to insert:

SEC. 9. The American Battle Monuments Commission shall be solely responsible for the permanent design and construction of the cemeteries to be established in foreign countries under section 5 of this act and of all buildings, plantings, headstones, and other permanent improvements incidental thereto. The Secretary of War is authorized to undertake such temporary construction as will be necessary for the accomplishment of this act and to maintain such cemeteries in a suitable condition until such time as the functions of administration thereof shall pass to the American Battle Monuments Commission in accordance with section 12 of Public Law 456, Seventy-ninth Congress, or any other law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

TRANSFER OF ARMY REMOUNT SERVICE—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3484) to transfer the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Let the bill go over.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, if the Senator will withhold his objection, I wish to make a very brief statement with regard to this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The questions raised by this bill were considered on the floor of the Senate about 3 days ago, and took about an hour and a half of the time of the Senate.

This bill has to do with the future use of military reservations heretofore used for remount stations. The War Department has decided that it has no further use for the propagation of horses for the Army or for military purposes. Therefore, the Army is recommending that the land in these four reservations be taken from under the Army's jurisdiction, and, of course, the Army does not care what becomes of the land, per se. The bill provides that these four reservations shall be transferred to the Department of Agriculture.

In the House of Representatives, after the Committee on Armed Services passed on the bill, the committee recommended that the bill be referred to the Committee on Agriculture for its consideration before being acted upon in the House.

Mr. President, now that the War Department is through with these reservations and now that the Department of Agriculture is to have jurisdiction, I think the bill should be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for further consideration and report. I ask unanimous consent to have that done.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma that House bill 3484 be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that the Senator from Oklahoma is correct in his observation that this matter was discussed at some length the other day. I think it is perfectly obvious that it cannot be passed today under the unanimous-consent rule.

The Senator from Nebraska will join with me at a later hour in endeavoring to get this bill before the Senate and passed, but to do so by way of motion, because I think it is perfectly clear from the record that this bill should be passed.

if we want to save a good many million dollars of Federal Government investments, and if we desire to perpetuate a horse-breeding program in which I think the Government has a great interest, and which I think should be preserved.

I wrote to the Secretary of Agriculture in regard to the Department of Agriculture's position in this matter.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I did not yield the floor. I have a few more statements to make. I have no objection to having the Senator from Oregon make whatever statements he pleases to make, but I should like to complete my statement first.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Oregon later.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, to the unanimous-consent request, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon was speaking under his right to object.

Does the Senator object?

Mr. MORSE. I certainly object now.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, of course there are two courses which we can follow: Either agree to the unanimous-consent request that the bill be referred to the Committee on Agriculture, or consider the bill at this time and amend it while it is under consideration.

In connection with the second possibility, let me say that there is an amendment which is printed and lying on the table, and I shall urge its adoption.

At the present time, in support of the amendment, not in speaking to the unanimous-consent request to have the bill referred to the Committee on Agriculture, I desire to introduce for the RECORD a number of telegrams supporting the amendment. One of them comes from the commander of the American Legion in Oklahoma. Another comes from the commander of the American Legion post at El Reno, Okla. There is one from the Veterans of Foreign Wars, one from the Canadian County Farm Bureau Federation, one from the President of the State Board of Agriculture of Oklahoma, one from the editor of the Oklahoma Farmer-Stockman, and one from the mayor of Reno. I submit these in support of the amendment.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PONCA CITY, OKLA., *July 17, 1947.*

Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Oklahoma American Legion urges enactment your bill converting Fort Reno into farms for veterans but opposes its use as an experimental stock ranch.

CHARLES B. DUFFY,
Department Commander, American Legion.

EL RENO, OKLA., *July 17, 1947.*

Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Senate Office Building:

We are informed by El Reno chamber of commerce that Department of Agriculture desires to retain Fort Reno Reservation for continuation of horse-breeding program hitherto conducted by Remount Department of the Army instead of proceeding with your proposal of cutting it up into farm tracts for veterans. Since opportunities for veterans to acquire farms is extremely limited we urge you to oppose the Department of Agriculture proposal and to insist upon use of area for veterans' farms. We consider continuation of horse-breeding program an obsolete and extravagant plan and register our strenuous objection to the idea. We still favor your bill as best for interests of veteran.

EL RENO POST, NO. 34, AMERICAN LEGION,
ARTHUR SENCE, *Commander.*

EL RENO, OKLA., *July 18, 1947.*

Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

If Fort Reno Reservation is turned over to Department of Agriculture we wish to oppose changing plan of disposition from terms of your bill to plan to continue horse-breeding program of Army. Veterans of this vicinity are anxious to see land cut up into veteran farms as proposed in your bill and we urge you to stand pat on your original proposal.

EL RENO POST, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS.

EL RENO, OKLA., *July 17, 1947.*

Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Senate Office Buiding,
Washington, D. C.:

Canadian County Farm Bureau considers Department of Agriculture plan of continuing horse-breeding program at Fort Reno as impractical, extravagant, and obsolete. We are backing you in your bill to cut tract up into farms for veterans. The day of the horse is over for both military and agricultural purposes and the land is sorely needed for young veterans wanting to make a start as farmers.

E. G. JEFFREY,
Canadian County Farm Bureau.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *July 22, 1947.*

Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Senate Office Building:

I have failed to reconcile the desire of the United States Department of Agriculture to produce light draft horses for exhibition at fairs with the agricultural needs of the State due to the desire on the part of farmers for mechanical farm equipment. The future indicates less need for draft horses on farms; personally I would be very much in favor of subdividing land at Fort Reno remount station and making it available to ex-servicemen for farming purposes.

JOE C. SCOTT,
President, Oklahoma State Board of Agriculture.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *July 22, 1947.*

ELMER THOMAS,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building:

Replying your telegram re Fort Reno, consider Agriculture Department proposal purposeless as stated. Current proposal to subdivide into small acreages also objectionable and subject to criticism. Relatively large tracts are needed for farming or ranching that area. 1945 census showed 70 percent Canadian county farms were 140 acres or over and average-size farm was 234.5 acres. Veterans on small acreages face bankruptcy and cannot diversify or rotate crops sufficiently to control erosion and maintain soil fertility. Further study before decision is essential.

FERDIE DEERING,
Editor, Farmer Stockman.

EL RENO, OKLA., *July 22, 1947.*

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Reply your telegram July 22. Advise offer of Department of Agriculture unacceptable because of impossibility of enforcement. Willing to stand with you on your amendment to Case bill. Telegrams released to you by air mail.

HERMAN MERVELDT,
Mayor of El Reno.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. May I ask the Senator from Oklahoma if his amendment seeks to keep intact some remount stations in his State?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. No. The bill provides that these remount stations shall be turned over to the Department of Agriculture, and shall be directed and retained and maintained for the horse-breeding program. In my State I want the remount station subdivided and made available to ex-servicemen who are certified under the terms of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. I do not want to have a horse-racing establishment in my State. It is illegal in my State to race horses, and I do not want to have an institution raising race horses when they cannot be run in Oklahoma.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is not illegal to raise them; it is only illegal to race them. [Laughter.]

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I say, in fairness, that the last statement of the Senator from Oklahoma does not present an accurate picture of the Remount Service. It is not a racing establishment, and I think the Senator from Oklahoma knows it. At a later time I shall be glad to place in the RECORD communications from the State of Oklahoma in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

At this time I wish to read into the RECORD a letter which was sent to the Senator from Oklahoma by the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, with whom I have been in communication with regard to the Department's support of the bill from the House which I am supporting. It reads as follows:

This has reference to H. R. 3484, a bill to transfer the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture, now before the Senate for consideration, and to your proposed amendments to that bill which are similar to the provisions of S. 718—

Which is the bill of the Senator from Oklahoma—

a bill to provide for disposition of the lands comprising the Fort Reno Military Reservation in Canadian County, Okla.

It is evident that there is considerable interest within the State of Oklahoma relative to the disposition of the Fort Reno Reservation as proposed in S. 718. On the other hand, there appears to be much concern in the State regarding the continuation of the remount program, as evidenced by Resolution No. 16, memorializing the Congress to enact legislation transferring the Remount Service to the Department of Agriculture adopted by the Senate of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma the first day of May 1947 (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 6, 1947, p. 4553).

Thus we see that the senate of the State of Oklahoma does not agree with

the position taken by the Senator from Oklahoma on the bill. I think the views of the Oklahoma State senate are entitled to more weight than telegrams from persons who seek a special benefit from the Senator's bill S. 718. I continue the reading:

The Fort Reno Military Reservation is one of the most important of the four breeding stations now being operated as a part of the Remount Service by the War Department, and is the only one in the whole southwestern area of the United States. It is our considered judgment, therefore, that in the event of the enactment of H. R. 3484, the Fort Reno Military Reservation should be continued as an essential part of the Remount Service under the jurisdiction of this Department. In good conscience we could hardly recommend approval of the liquidation of this station—

And that, of course, is the purpose and effect of the Senator's amendment—

if we are to operate a remount service. On the other hand, we have considerable sympathy for the objectives of your bill, S. 718, and greatly desire to further its aims to the fullest extent possible in line with our conclusions as to the proper operation of the Remount Service. After serious consideration of the problems involved, we believe that the following plan of operation would permit substantial compliance with all objectives.

A preliminary survey of the facilities of the Fort Reno Reservation indicates that there are lands and buildings which will be surplus to the needs of the Remount Service under the jurisdiction of this Department. Immediately after the transfer to this Department, we will be glad to start negotiations with the appropriate officials of the city of El Reno or of Canadian County with a view to granting a permit or license to the city or county for the use of the barracks building on the reservation for the purposes of a hospital. We would also start a survey to determine with accuracy how much of the lands on the reservation would be needed for the purposes of the remount program and the amount and exact location of lands which would be surplus to our needs and which might be dedicated to other purposes. These actions could then be the basis for a bill similar in substance to S. 718. In this way, the city or county would have its hospital, the Department of Justice would secure permanently the land adjoining the reformatory which it needs, and a considerable quantity of land could be made available under title I and section 43 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act for subdivision into small farm units for the benefit of veterans.

It is hoped that the foregoing will provide a basis for resolving a problem which is causing this Department grave concern. If any additional information is desired, we will be glad to give prompt consideration to your inquiry.

Sincerely,

N. E. DODD,
Acting Secretary.

I close, Mr. President, by saying that the Armed Services Committee of the Senate by unanimous vote supported the position taken by the junior Senator from Oregon in connection with the bill cosponsored by a good many other Senators from farm States. Furthermore, we can accomplish the objectives, the legitimate objectives, which the Senator from Oklahoma has in mind, without liquidating the most important of all the remount stations, which is the one at Fort Reno, Okla.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the junior Senator from Oregon at a later hour will urge action on the bill, by motion, and therefore the junior Senator from Oregon objects to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will go over, and the clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

REGULATION OF LIFE INSURANCE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 612) to amend section 35 of chapter III of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," was announced as next in order.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Over.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I wonder if I could make a statement in an attempt to overcome the objection?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I made the objection because there has been no opportunity to examine the bill. The passage of any bill regulating life insurance in the District of Columbia will probably be regarded as a model of what Congress desires to have the States do. Therefore, this being a matter of grave importance to many million people, I am firmly of the opinion that the measure should not be passed upon the unanimous-consent calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming objects, and the bill will go over.

The bill (H. R. 1634) to amend section 1 and provisions (6), (7), and (8) of chapter 3, and provision (3) of section 47 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," was announced as next in order.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Over.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, if I may offer an explanation of the bill to the Senator who objected, the bill is merely to modernize the mortality tables of life-insurance companies in the District of Columbia, making them exactly the same as the tables which are used in every State in the Union, with the exception of Oklahoma and Arizona.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Do I understand the Senator to say that the only effect of the bill is to adopt for the District of Columbia the modernized mortality tables?

Mr. BUCK. That is its principal purpose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There are some other purposes, are there not?

Mr. BUCK. They are less important. The committee held public hearings on the bill, and the District Insurance Commissioner gave the bill his full approval.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest to the Senator, then, Mr. President, that the bill be withheld for the moment. I shall examine the report, and before the call of the calendar is completed, I shall consult with him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be temporarily passed over.

The bill (H. R. 1633) to amend section 16 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," was announced as next in order.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This bill, too, should go over, Mr. President.

Mr. BUCK. May I undertake to offer an explanation to the Senator who objects?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. BUCK. The bill applies to insurance companies operating in the District of Columbia. It provides that where the beneficiary predeceases the insured, the principal, upon the death of the insured, shall go to the estate of the insured and not to the estate of the beneficiary.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I shall endeavor to examine the report, as in the case of the preceding bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be temporarily passed over.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

The bill (S. 1038) to amend the Federal Airport Act, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GURNEY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, may I ask that the objection be withheld for a moment?

Mr. GURNEY. I withhold it.

Mr. BREWSTER. I make the request not with any idea that we shall successfully consider this bill today, because there is a considerable controversy about it, but I should like to make clear the main purpose of the bill. Minor amendments have been reported to the bill. I think all but two sections are entirely noncontroversial. One of the sections was the subject of a great deal of deliberation in the Senate a year ago, at which time the Senate voted in favor of the States' control of the allocation of funds.

I want to put in the RECORD at this point a resolution adopted by the latest conference of Governors, held in Salt Lake City, about which we have been reading some accounts, although not concerned with airport matters. The Governors again took action emphasizing very strongly their interest, and the resolution adopted by them indicates the very great interest of the States in the passage of this measure. The resolution reads as follows:

The governors' conference has repeatedly urged that Federal grants-in-aid for airport construction be expended in the States only upon receiving the approval of State aviation agencies, such agencies having been established by all the States to foster the development of aviation and airports.

The States have been so concerned with the presently constituted Federal Airport Act, which permits direct Federal grants to thousands of political subdivisions, that approximately half of the State legislatures have recently taken action requiring that Federal grants for local airport projects be channeled through State aviation agencies.

There are now pending in the Congress of the United States S. 1038—

That is the bill which I am now discussing—

and H. R. 4165, which measures would require Federal agencies administering airport construction grants to work with and through the States.

Therefore the governors' conference hereby urges the Congress of the United States to take immediate and favorable action on the pending measures to provide for State

participation in the Federal-aid airport program in accordance with the long-established, successfully operated pattern of Federal, State, local cooperation; and be it further

Resolved, That the governors' conference reaffirms its previous statements urging the States to take appropriate action to insure that their State aviation agencies will be adequately empowered to participate in the Federal-aid airport program.

I wanted to incorporate that in the RECORD. I realize that we shall not have time for the consideration of the bill today, and probably not during the remainder of this session; but I hope that Senators, as they return to their several States, will look into this matter very carefully, so that in the new session we may be able to give to it the consideration which in my judgment its importance warrants.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am inclined to believe, from what I read in the press, that the governors' conference was so busy with other matters that they did not give very serious consideration to this matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) creating a joint committee to investigate certain matters affecting agriculture, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

CONSOLIDATION OF GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILLS

The resolution (S. Con. Res. 6) to include all general appropriation bills in one consolidated general appropriation bill, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Over. I may say that I make objection at the request of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL].

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the most forceful argument I have seen in behalf of consolidating appropriation bills is the testimony offered before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, by the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], in which he said:

If all Federal expenditures were annually reviewed and appropriated after an adequate presentation of facts to the Congress there would still be another weakness in congressional appropriation procedure. This might be termed the piecemeal method of passing appropriation bills. Each of the appropriation bills is now considered individually when presented by the Appropriations Committees. There are no facilities to establish a limit for all appropriation totals so that it might conform either to estimated tax yields or the needs of the taxpayers. Present procedure does not secure comparative measurement of the needs covered by one appropriation bill with the needs of the others. Relatively unimportant projects may be appropriated for in one bill and relatively important projects rejected in another. As a matter of fact, the two Appropriations Committees themselves operate through subcommittees whose knowledge and understanding largely determine the presentation and decision respecting the items in a bill. Therefore, little over-all consideration by the entire committee is given. The lack of this over-all control encourages deficiency and supplemental appropriations which still further weaken congressional control.

The former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the late Mr. Harold D. Smith, testifying before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, said:

Short of bringing together the consideration of general tax and expenditure policy, a more consistent congressional policy could probably be achieved in appropriations by consolidating all annual appropriation bills into a single measure. The present practice of dealing with individual bills over a long period of time is not conducive to uniformity of policy; it also contributes to the excessive length of the period between the submission of budget estimates and the beginning of the fiscal year. The consolidation of appropriation bills would have to be accompanied by more stringent rules against the inclusion of legislative provisions in appropriation acts.

The pending resolution, Mr. President, was prepared and considered, with the assistance of the fiscal experts of the Treasury Department, the Bureau of the Budget, the General Accounting Office, and the Senate legislative drafting counsel. The feasibility of the resolution as now drafted was testified to affirmatively before the Subcommittee on Rules by Mr. Robert W. Maxwell, Commissioner of the Bureau of Accounts, United States Treasury Department, by Mr. Frederick Lawton, Assistant Director, Bureau of the Budget, and Mr. S. L. Brown, Assistant Chief, Administrative Planning Division, General Accounting Office.

It has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and, at the first opportunity, I shall ask that the resolution be considered by the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been made, the resolution will be passed over.

DISSEMINATION OF TECHNOLOGICAL AND SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION

The bill (S. 493) to provide for the coordination of agencies disseminating technological and scientific information, was announced as next in order.

Mr. FERGUSON. Over.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the objection may be withheld for a moment, I should like to offer a few remarks on this subject.

Mr. FERGUSON. I withhold it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In regard to Senate bill 493, I desire to point out that the bill was first introduced last year, and since then it has been greatly changed. Representing the War Department, Maj. Gen. Henry S. Aurand, Director of the Research and Development Division of the General Staff, testified in favor of the bill, as now written. About all the bill now provides for is a clearing house for information about new developments in science. I may say that the Congress, without this legislative authority, appropriated sufficient money to enable the Department of Commerce to handle the work temporarily, with regard to new inventions brought out in Germany, but I want to read one short statement of General Aurand:

The wide dissemination of scientific and technical information is the cornerstone of scientific progress. At the present time there is no central clearing house either in the Government or in private life for the broad field of scientific and technical information. Government or private research organizations in instituting new projects must sometimes spend considerable sums on preliminary documentary research in order to obtain background material from many different technical libraries and document collections throughout the United States.

He goes on to develop that thought. Practically the same thing is said by Rear Adm. Paul F. Lee, Chief of Naval Research, who stated:

I believe the establishment of a centralized agency in the Government, having full information on all inventions and discoveries, patented or unpatented, which results from current research and development, would be desirable, so long as military information vital to national security is protected.

I might say the bill has for its primary purpose the protection and promotion of small business. The only person objecting to the bill is Mr. Blood, a member of the patent committee of the National Association of Manufacturers. It is my belief that the purpose of the bill is completely misunderstood, and I think that not one-tenth of the membership of that association would object to the bill if they knew what its purpose was. The original bill provided for assistance to research, which was offensive to certain private research people. That has been eliminated, but it has been so difficult to get the attention of the National Association of Manufacturers that they have persisted in their opposition to the bill, I believe. I think the bill would be very valuable to small business, which it was originally designed to promote. In addition, it has the full and unqualified support of the Research and Development Division of the War Department, and of the Navy. I think it is a great disservice to the country, and especially to small business, to delay action on the bill further. As I said, it has been before the Congress now well over a year.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in view of the fact that I am a member of the committee which dealt with the matter I should like to make a statement as to the reason why I object. I wish to make the statement not only for myself, but on behalf of other Senators.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The junior Senator from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. The bill would simply create another bureau, a large agency in the Department of Commerce, without any restraint as to certain activities which I will now describe. The bill would authorize the Secretary of Commerce "to establish and maintain within the Department of Commerce a clearinghouse for the collection,"—hear me, Senators—"for the collection, dissemination, and exchange of scientific, technical, and engineering information, and to this end to take such

steps as he may deem necessary and desirable."

In other words, all engineering information in the United States could be collected, disseminated, and exchanged, under the terms of the bill.

Then under paragraph (a) of section 2, the Department of Commerce is given the right—

To search for, collect, classify, coordinate, integrate, record, and catalog such information from whatever sources, foreign and domestic, that may be available.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall yield in a moment. The bill would allow the Department of Commerce to have agents all over the world, not only in the United States, but in every factory, in every organization all over the world, collecting technical information and engineering information. There would not be a plant in the United States into which they could not go to obtain information, because the bill would authorize them to go into such plants. I think the terms of the bill are too broad. I think many of its provisions are not necesasry.

We have the Patent Office now. We have the greatest library in the world, in the Library of Congress. We have every means of collecting such information. It is not a question of objecting because the National Manufacturers Association objects. The reason for objection is that the bill, if passed, would build up a new organization, a new bureau upon which there would be no limitation, and we would find that in a very short time we would be spending millions of dollars upon it.

The Senate committee bill does not vary much from the House bill. Under the House bill offices could be established in every county and every city of the United States to help in the development of patents and in research. The Senate bill would do practically the same thing by allowing the agents of the Department of Commerce to go into every business organization and obtain, or try to obtain the information desired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to point out that the Department of Commerce is already doing most of this work in Germany with the present force. The testimony shows that the "bureau," as the Senator calls the organization, would be practically self-sustaining. I think it would be under the present operation. Inquiries for the information in question are now running at the rate of approximately 8,000 a month. The organization is self-sustaining, paying its cost to the Government. The idea that agents would go into every factory in the world is nonsense. They would go into only those which have the data we do not have, which in the present instance are in Germany. That is the only country I know of, aside from the United States, where any of this work is being done. Certainly we are not going to Indochina or to Timbuktu, or any other place I can now think of. The bill does not involve any great expense. The testimony is very clear on that point. The bureau, which is proposed to be set up, is already in existence in the Department of Commerce, and is doing at this moment, what the legislative authority sought under the bill provides shall be done. The bill would not create anything other than is now in the Department of Commerce. It would not result in any cost, in view of the fact that the organization would be self-sustaining, or if there were any cost to the Government it could only be a very small amount.

Mr. President, I cannot understand how such an organization would cost all the millions of dollars suggested unless the Congress should appropriate such amounts for it. I do not understand such an argument at all, because unlimited funds are not asked for the organization. I think the Senator from Michigan is entirely in error about the organization being a great new bureau which would cost a tremendous amount of money.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, as a member of the Appropriations Committee I am familiar with such matters, and I know what happens after such an organization is set up. Its representatives will later come to Congress and say "You have authorized thus and so. Are you now going to restrict the operations?"

Mr. President, I have no objection to collecting all the information desired in Germany. The War Department has been doing that. If a bill is drafted along that line I certainly shall vote for it. But that is not the idea behind the pending bill at all. This was an idea conceived by Mr. Wallace when he was Secretary of the Department of Commerce. It has been somewhat narrowed from the original idea, but the bill would provide about the same authority previously sought.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired. Under objection, the bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1389) to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PEPPER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1486) to provide for payment of salaries covering periods of separation from the Government service in the case of persons improperly removed from such service, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. At the request of the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, did the Senator from Ohio object to consideration of Senate bill 1486?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I made the objection at the request of the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL].

Mr. THYE. I am sorry the senior Senator from Minnesota is not present at the moment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, perhaps we can pass the bill over temporarily until the senior Senator from Minnesota returns.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be temporarily passed over.

PAYMENT OF OVERTIME COMPENSATION TO CERTAIN SUPERVISORY EMPLOYEES

The bill (S. 697) to provide for payment of overtime compensation to supervisory employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, the House has passed a bill identical with the Senate bill. I ask unanimous consent that the House bill be subsituted for the Senate bill, and that the House bill be considered and passed, so the measure may become law without any further parliamentary procedure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The House bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3075) to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the classification and compensation of employees of the postal service, so as to provide proper recompense in the form of compensatory time for overtime performed by supervisors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to substituting the House bill for the Senate bill and to its present consideration?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3075) to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the classification and compensation of employees of the postal service, so as to provide proper recompense in the form of compensatory time for overtime performed by supervisors, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 697 will be indefinitely postponed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1393) to increase the permitted rate of allowance and compensation for training on the job under Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement or two in regard to Senate bill 1393. I ask my good friend from Ohio——

Mr. TAFT. I will say that I intend to bring it up just as soon as we can after the call of the calendar is completed.

Mr. MORSE. With that understanding I shall not make any further comment on the bill at this time other than that I think it should be passed.

The bill (H. R. 3309) to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico was announced as the next in order.

Mr. BREWSTER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT OF DISABLED VETERANS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 999) to amend the Veterans'

Preference Act of 1944 with respect to preference accorded in Federal employment to disabled veterans, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Civil Service with an amendment, on page 3, after line 2, to strike out:

SEC. 3. Section 7 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. The names of preference eligibles shall be entered on the appropriate registers or lists of eligibles in accordance with their respective augmented ratings, and the name of a preference eligible shall be entered ahead of all others having the same ratings: *Provided*, That, except for positions in the professional and scientific services for which the entrance salary is over $3,000 per annum, the names of all qualified 10-point preference eligibles whose service-connected disability has been rated by the Veterans' Administration to be 30 percent or more at the time of the examination process shall be placed at the top of the appropriate civil-service register or employment list, in accordance with their respective augmented ratings."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 (1) of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 (Public Law 359, 78th Cong., 58 Stat. 387) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) those ex-service men and women who have served on active duty in any branch of the armed forces of the United States and have been separated therefrom under honorable conditions and who have established the present existence of a service-connected disability which is compensable under public laws administered by the Veterans' Administration or who are receiving disability retirement benefits by reason of public laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, the War Department, or the Navy Department;".

SEC. 2. Section 3 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. In all examinations to determine the qualifications of applicants for entrance into the service 10 points shall be added to the earned ratings of those persons included under section 2 (1), (2), and (3), and 5 points shall be added to the earned ratings of those persons included under section 2 (4) of this act: *Provided*, That such points shall be added only to earned ratings which are equal to or greater than the minimum rating for qualification as announced by the Civil Service Commission for the particular examination: *Provided further*, That in examinations for the positions of guards, elevator operators, messengers, and custodians, competition shall be restricted to persons entitled to preference under this act as long as persons entitled to preference are available and during the present war and for a period of 5 years following the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President or by a concurrent resolution of the Congress for such other positions as may from time to time be determined by the President."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 472) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

LEASING OF SEGREGATED COAL AND ASPHALT DEPOSITS OF CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW INDIAN NATIONS IN OKLAHOMA

The bill (H. R. 2005) to amend the act of April 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 88), entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of the segregated coal and asphalt deposits of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indian Nations in Oklahoma, and for an extension of time within which purchasers of such deposits may complete payments," was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 249) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

SALE OF TIMBER OF TONGASS NATIONAL FOREST

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 118) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell timber within the Tongass National Forest, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to ask the Senator, who objected, to withhold his objection for a moment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I object to the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. As I understand, the bill has to do with the Tongass National Forest in Alaska. Unless the bill is passed, or a similar bill is passed, it will be impossible for the Interior Department to start any newsprint mills in Alaska. There is a dire newsprint shortage in the world. We are importing 80 percent of our newsprint from foreign countries and are producing only 20 percent ourselves. There is a possibility of a production in Alaska of at least 1,000,000 tons a year. Today in this country we are consuming a little more than 4,000,000 tons a year, and importing 80 percent of it. If we can develop newsprint production in Alaska, we can get an additional production of possibly 1,000,000 tons a year. It will be impossible to proceed in respect to this activity in Alaska until some legislation is passed clearing up certain titles to lands. I consider the bill most important. I believe that any Senator who is as familiar as I am with the newsprint shortage would agree that our only possibility of getting an increased newsprint production lies in Alaska.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I appreciate everything the Senator from Indiana is saying. I believe that he is familiar with the pulp industry.

I also believe that the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] probably knows more about the conditions in Alaska than does any Senator.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator please repeat his statement?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I say I appreciate what the Senator from Indiana has to say about the shortage of pulp, and I want to help him along. I also appreciate the fact that there is a companion measure in the House, which was introduced by the Delegate from Alaska. I feel that the Delegate from Alaska knows more about Alaska than I do. He states in writing that the Senate joint resolution is very damaging to certain persons in Alaska. Hence I shall object to the present consideration of that measure. When House Joint Resolution 205, Calendar No. 596, comes before us for consideration I may change my mind.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator is perfectly willing to dispose of the timberland on some basis, as I understand.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I want to go along.

Mr. CAPEHART. It is purely a question at the moment of the best method of doing it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am willing to work out some arrangement. I am willing to help as much as I possibly can. But when a man in whom I have confidence, who represents the people of the Territory of Alaska, objects to the Senate bill, I must pay some attention to him.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from New Mexico for a moment. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has just left the Chamber. He is very anxious to be present when this measure is taken up. So I concur in the objection of the Senator from New Mexico, with the understanding that the joint resolution may be taken up a little later.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, that is not the understanding which I have. I stated that when we reach Calendar No. 596, House Joint Resolution 205, I may have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator can maintain his objection.

WOMEN'S CORPS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, in order to accommodate the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], who must leave to preside at a hearing, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 1641, calendar 585, in advance of its being reached on the call of the calendar, so that the Senator may attend his meeting.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1641) to establish the Women's Army Corps in the Regular Army, to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1947."

TITLE I

ESTABLISHMENT OF WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS, REGULAR ARMY

SEC. 101. Effective the date of enactment of this title, there is established in the Regular Army a Women's Army Corps, which shall perform such services as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War.

SEC. 102. (a) The authorized commissioned, warrant, and enlisted strengths of the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army shall, from time to time, be determined by the Secretary of War, within the authorized commissioned, warrant, and enlisted strengths of the Regular Army, but shall not exceed 2 percent of such authorized Regular Army strengths, respectively.

(b) There is authorized a strength of 51,000 active list commissioned officers in the Regular Army, exclusive of the numbers authorized by law for the Army Nurse Corps, the Women's Medical Specialist Corps, professors of the United States Military Academy, and any numbers authorized by special provisions of law providing for officers in designated categories as additional numbers.

SEC. 103. (a) From the officers permanently commissioned in the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army, the Secretary of War shall select to serve during his pleasure, but normally not to exceed 4 years, one officer to be Director of the Women's Army Corps who shall be adviser to the Secretary of War on Women's Army Corps matters, and who, without vacation of her permanent grade, shall have the temporary rank, pay, and allowances of a colonel while so serving; one officer to be Deputy Director thereof, who if permanently commissioned in a lower grade shall, without vacation of her permanent grade, have the temporary rank, pay, and allowances of a lieutenant colonel while so serving; and from among officers of the Women's Army Corps (including Women's Army Corps officers of the Army of the United States or any component thereof serving on extended active duty) the Secretary of War shall select to serve during his pleasure such number of officers as he may determine necessary to fill positions designated by him in the administration and training of the Women's Army Corps, who, if permanently commissioned in a lower grade shall, without vacation of permanent grade, have the temporary rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenant colonel or major while so serving, as the Secretary of War may determine: *Provided*, That after July 1, 1952, such officers shall be selected from among commissioned officers in the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel or major, except the Director and Deputy Director who shall be selected from among officers in the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel: *And provided further*, That prior to July 1, 1952, the Secretary of War may extend that date one time until such later date as he may select for that purpose but such later date shall not be later than July 1, 1956.

(b) Unless entitled to higher retired rank or pay under any provision of law, each such commissioned officer who shall have served for 4 years as Director or Deputy Director of such corps shall upon retirement be retired with the rank held by her while so serving, shall receive retired pay at the rate prescribed by law computed on the basis of the base and longevity pay which she would receive if serving on active duty with such rank, and if thereafter recalled to active service shall be recalled in such rank.

SEC. 104. (a) Commissioned officers of the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from female citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 21 years and who possess such qualifications as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War.

(b) Except as modified or otherwise provided by express provisions of law, original appointments of officers in the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army shall be made from among qualified female persons in the manner now or hereafter prescribed by law for appointment of male persons in the Regular Army except as may be necessary to adapt said provisions to the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army.

(c) Officers shall be permanently commissioned in the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army in grades from second lieutenant to lieutenant colonel, inclusive. The authorized number in permanent grade of lieutenant colonel shall be such as the Secretary of War shall from time to time determine but shall not exceed 10 percent of the total authorized commissioned strength of such corps.

(d) (1) During the interim between the date of enactment of this title and January 1, 1948, officers of the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army shall be promotion-list officers as contemplated in Public Law 281, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved December 23, 1945, as amended. Effective January 1, 1948, the names of all active list commissioned officers of the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army shall be carried on a separate promotion list known as the Women's Army Corps promotion list and such officers shall be promotion-list officers as that term is defined under the laws then in effect. On January 1, 1948, the Women's Army Corps promotion list hereinabove described shall be established by entering thereon the names of the officers concerned without change in the order of their precedence on the promotion list contemplated in Public Law 281, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved December 28, as amended.

(2) Except as otherwise prescribed in this title or some other express provision of law, the respective provisions of law now existing or hereafter enacted relating (1) to the procurement, promotion, and elimination from the active list by retirement or discharge of promotion-list officers and (2) to promotion lists as the terms "promotion-list officers" and "promotion list" are from time to time defined by law, are hereby made applicable to the officers of the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army and to the Women's Army Corps promotion list, respectively.

(3) Effective January 1, 1948, and within the limitations prescribed in this title, the Secretary of War shall prescribe the authorized numbers in each of the several commissioned grades in the Women's Army Corps promotion list under the provisions of law applicable to promotion lists generally. Officers of the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army shall be permanently promoted to the grades of first lieutenant, captain, and major, as now or hereafter prescribed for promotion to such grades of promotion-list officers as that term is from time to time defined by law, including any special provisions pertaining to promotion to fill initial requirements in such grades on or about July 1, 1948. Officers of the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army shall be promoted to and appointed in the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the Regular Army only when a vacancy exists in the number of lieutenant colonels authorized for the Women's Army Corps promotion list and such officers shall be appointed in that grade only when selected and recommended for that grade by a selection board under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War.

(4) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War any selection board convened to consider and recommend officers of the Women's Army Corps for promotion to any grade may contain officers of the Women's Army Corps holding permanent or temporary appointment in any grade above major.

(5) Officers of the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army shall be eliminated from the active list and retired or separated, as the case may be, under the provisions of law now or hereafter applicable to promotion-list officers generally, and they shall receive retired pay or severance pay, whichever is applicable, computed as provided under such law for promotion-list officers generally: *Provided*, That any officer of the Women's Army Corps in the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be retained on the active list until that date which is 30 days after the date upon which 30 "years' service" is completed: *Provided further*, That any officer of the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army in the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel, who is serving in the temporary grade of colonel by virtue of occupying the position of Director of said corps, may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be retained on the active list while serving in such temporary grade: *Provided further*, That on and after June 30, 1953, each officer of the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army, heretofore or hereafter appointed in the permanent grade of major who is not retired or separated at an earlier date under other provisions of law, shall be eliminated from the active list on that date which is 30 days after the date upon which she completes 25 "years' service," unless she is appointed in the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the Regular Army before that date: *And provided further*, That the term "years' service" as used in this paragraph shall be construed to include the identical service defined by law to be included in that term under the law now or hereafter applicable to eliminations from the active list of promotion-list officers generally.

(e) The Secretary of War shall prescribe the military authority which commissioned officers of the Women's Army Corps may exercise, and the kind of military duty to which they may be assigned.

(f) The Secretary of War under the circumstances and in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President, may terminate the commission of any officer appointed in the Women's Army Corps.

SEC. 105. Under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, female citizens of the United States may be appointed in the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army, in the permanent grade of warrant officer (junior grade) and in the permanent grade of chief warrant officer under the provisions of law now or hereafter applicable to appointment of male persons in such permanent warrant officer grades in the Regular Army.

SEC. 106. (a) Original enlistments and reenlistments in the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army, from among female persons who possess such qualifications as the Secretary of War may prescribe, may be accepted under applicable provisions of law which govern original enlistments and reenlistments in the Regular Army of male persons except as may be necessary to adapt said provisions to the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army: *Provided*, That no person shall be enlisted in the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army who has not attained the age of 18 years: *And provided further*, That no person under the age of 21 years shall be enlisted in such corps without the written consent of her parents or guardians, if any.

(b) The Secretary of War, under such regulations as he may prescribe, may terminate the enlistment of any enlisted woman in the Women's Army Corps, and each person whose enlistment is so terminated shall be discharged from the Army.

SEC. 107. Except as otherwise specifically provided, all laws now or hereafter applicable to male commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Regular Army; to former male commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Regular Army; and to their dependents and beneficiaries, shall in like cases be applicable respectively, to commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted women of the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army, to former commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted women of the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army, and to their dependents and

beneficiaries except as may be necessary to adapt said provisions to the Women's Army Corps: *Provided*, That the husbands of women officers and enlisted personnel of the Regular Army shall not be considered dependents unless they are in fact dependent on their wives for their chief support, and the children of such officers and enlisted personnel shall not be considered dependents unless their father is dead or they are in fact dependents on their mother for their chief support.

SEC. 108. Effective the date of enactment of this title, Public Law 281, Seventy-ninth Congress (approved December 28, 1945; 59 Stat. 663), as amended (Public Law 670, 79th Cong., and Public Law 61, 80th Cong.), is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) Section 4 of said act is amended by changing the period at the end of said section to a colon and adding after said colon the following: "*Provided*, That female citizens of the United States may be appointed as officers of the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army under like conditions as those prescribed herein for appointment of male persons as officers in the Regular Army except that they may be appointed in the grades prescribed in section 5 of this act even though such grades be higher than those in which they served as officers in the Women's Army Corps of the Army of the United States."

(b) So much of section 5 of said act as reads "(a) Persons appointed in arms or services of the Regular Army, the officers of which are on the promotion list," is hereby amended to read: "(a) Persons appointed in arms or services of the Regular Army, the officers of which are on the promotion list, including persons appointed in the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army."

SEC. 109. (a) Effective the date of enactment of this title, the appointment of women in the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States and the enlistment of women in the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States shall be authorized.

(b) Except as otherwise specifically provided, all laws now or hereafter applicable to male commissioned officers and former commissioned officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps, to enlisted men and former enlisted men of the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and to their dependents and beneficiaries, shall in like cases be applicable, respectively, to female commissioned officers and former commissioned officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps, to enlisted women and former enlisted women of the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and to their dependents and beneficiaries, except as may be necessary to adapt said provisions to the Women's Army Corps in the Officers' and Enlisted Reserve Corps: *Provided*, That the husbands of women officers and enlisted personnel of any of the Reserve components of the Army of the United States shall not be considered dependents unless they are in fact dependent on their wives for their chief support, and the children of such personnel shall not be considered dependents unless their father is dead or they are in fact dependent on their mother for their chief support.

(c) Appointments of women in the Officers' Reserve Corps may be made by the President in grades from lieutenant colonel to second lieutenant, inclusive, from female citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 21 years and who possess such qualifications as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That any person who has served satisfactorily as the commanding officer (Director) of the Women's Army Corps established by act of July 1, 1943 (57 Stat. 371), or as the Director of the Women's Army Corps created by this title, may, if otherwise qualified, be appointed in such Reserve Corps in the grade of colonel: *And provided further* That women specialists (such as scientists and technical experts) who possess such qualifications as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War may be initially appointed in the Officers' Reserve Corps in such grades as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War in accordance with regulations prescribed by him.

(d) Enlistments of women in the Enlisted Reserve Corps may be accepted under the provisions of law now or hereafter applicable to enlistments of male persons in the Enlisted Reserve Corps, under such regulations, in such grades or ratings, and for such periods of time as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War.

(e) The President may form any or all female members of the Officers' Reserve Corps and the Enlisted Reserve Corps into such organizations and units as he may prescribe.

TITLE II

ENLISTMENT AND APPOINTMENT OF WOMEN IN THE REGULAR NAVY AND MARINE CORPS AND THE NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS RESERVE

SEC. 201. All laws or parts of laws which now or hereafter authorize enlistments in the Regular Navy and which now or hereafter authorize appointments of commissioned and warrant officers in the Regular Navy shall, subject to the provisions of this title, be construed to include authority to enlist and appoint women in the Regular Navy: *Provided*, That no woman shall be enlisted in the Regular Navy or Naval Reserve who has not attained the age of 18 years: *And provided further*, That no woman under the age of 21 years shall be enlisted in the Regular Navy or Naval Reserve without the written consent of her parents or guardians, if any.

SEC. 202. The number of enlisted women on the active list of the Regular Navy at any one time shall not exceed 2 percent of the enlisted strength now or hereafter authorized for the active list of the Regular Navy. The number of commissioned and warrant women officers on the active list of the Regular Navy at any one time shall not exceed 10 percent of the authorized number of enlisted women of the Regular Navy.

SEC. 203. Women commissioned in the Regular Navy under the provisions of this title shall not have permanent commissioned grade or rank on the active list of the Regular Navy above that of commander. The number of women officers on the active list of the line of the Regular Navy in the permanent grades of commander and lieutenant commander shall not exceed 10 percent and 20 percent, respectively, of the number of women officers on the active list of the line of the Regular Navy above commissioned warrant grade at any one time. Computations to determine such numbers shall be made as of January 1 of each year. Upon determining such numbers, the Secretary of the Navy may further determine the number, which may be a lesser number, of women officers on the active list of the line of the Regular Navy which may serve in each of such grades and the numbers so further determined shall be held and considered as the authorized numbers until subsequent computations and determinations are made. No woman officer of the Regular Navy shall be reduced in grade or pay, or be separated from the active list, as the result of any such computation or determination.

SEC. 204. All original appointments of women to commissioned grade or rank in the Regular Navy above the grade of commissioned warrant officer, other than appointments effected pursuant to the act of April 18, 1946 (60 Stat. 92), as now or hereafter amended, shall be in the grade or rank of ensign or lieutenant (junior grade) at the discretion of the President. Such appointees shall be female citizens of the United States who on July 1 of the year in which appointed are over 21 and under 30 years of age. No person shall be appointed pursuant to this section until she shall have established her mental, moral, educational, professional, and physical qualifications to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Navy.

SEC. 205. From the women officers serving in the grade or rank of lieutenant commander or above, one woman officer may be detailed to duty in the Bureau of Naval Personnel as an assistant to the Chief of Naval Personnel. She shall have the rank of captain while so serving, and shall be entitled to pay and allowances as are now or may be hereafter prescribed by law for a captain of the Regular Navy, and her regular status as a commissioned officer in the Navy shall not be disturbed by reason of such detail.

SEC. 206. (a) Except as otherwise prescribed in this title, the respective provisions of law now existing or hereafter enacted relating to the promotion by selection of line officers of the Regular Navy not restricted in the performance of duty and to the advancement by selection of staff officers of the Regular Navy which are not inconsistent with the provisions of this title are hereby made applicable to women officers of the Regular Navy.

(b) A woman officer of the grade or rank of ensign in the Regular Navy shall be eligible for promotion or advancement to the grade or rank of lieutenant (junior grade) on the third anniversary of the date of rank stated in her appointment to the grade or rank of ensign.

(c) Selection boards for the recommendation of women officers of the Regular Navy for promotion in grade or for advancement in rank shall consist of nine officers of the line or appropriate staff corps of the Regular Navy. The Secretary of the Navy shall determine the composition of such boards.

(d) Women lieutenant commanders, lieutenants, and lieutenants (junior grade) of the line of the Regular Navy shall become eligible for consideration by a selection board for promotion to the next higher grade in the fiscal year on June 30 of which they will have completed 4, 4, and 3 years, respectively, of service in their grades and shall retain such eligibility until recommended for promotion in the approved report of a board on selection or until separated from the active list. In computing such service in grade, an officer appointed pursuant to the act of April 18, 1946 (60 Stat. 92), as now or hereafter amended, shall be credited in the grade to which so appointed with all active service from the date of rank stated in her appointment in that grade while an officer of the Naval Reserve, exclusive of service in such grade under a temporary appointment which, by its terms, was for a period of limited duration; in each other instance, service in grade shall be computed from the date of rank stated in the appointment to the grade concerned.

(e) Women officers of the staff corps of the Regular Navy shall have as their running mates women officers of the line of the Regular Navy who shall be assigned in the manner prescribed by law now existing or hereafter enacted relating to the assignment of running mates to male staff officers of the Regular Navy.

(f) A woman staff officer of the Regular Navy shall become eligible for consideration for recommendation for advancement to the next higher rank when the President approves the report of a line selection board in which the running mate of such staff officer or a woman line officer junior to such running mate is recommended for promotion to the next higher rank above that held by the staff officer.

(g) The recommendations of the selection boards in the cases of women officers of the line of the Regular Navy shall be based upon their comparative fitness for the duties to which they are assigned in the line of the Regular Navy.

(h) The recommendations of the selection boards in the cases of women officers of each of the respective staff corps of the Regular Navy shall be based upon their comparative fitness for the duties to which they are assigned in each of the respective staff corps of the Regular Navy.

(i) The number to be furnished the appropriate selection board in respect to the promotion of women officers of the line of the Regular Navy to the grades of commander and lieutenant commander shall be determined by the Secretary of the Navy as of the date of the convening of the board and shall be equal to the number of vacancies existing for such officers in the grade concerned plus the estimated number of such vacancies which will occur during the ensuing 12-month period and minus the number of such officers then on the promotion list.

(j) The number to be furnished the appropriate selection board in respect to the promotion of women line officers of the Regular Navy to the grade of lieutenant shall be determined by the Secretary of the Navy as of the date of the convening of the board and shall be equal to the number of women line officers of the Regular Navy of the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) who are eligible for consideration by such board. The board shall recommend such of the eligible officers who, in the opinion of at least two-thirds of the members of the board, are qualified for promotion and shall so certify in its report. Women line officers recommended for promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the approved report of a board on selection shall become eligible for promotion to that grade on July 1 following the date of approval of the report of the board and, upon promotion, shall be entitled to the pay and allowances of the higher grade from the date of their eligibility for promotion.

(k) Each selection board appointed to recommend women staff officers of the Regular Navy for advancement to the rank of commander or lieutenant commander shall recomend for advancement to the rank concerned in the corps for which it was appointed such eligible officers, in number not to exceed the number furnished it by the Secretary of the Navy, who, in the opinion of at least two-thirds of the members of the board, are best fitted to assume the duties of the next higher rank. The number furnished the appropriate board for each such rank in each corps shall be a fraction of the number of women officers in the next lower rank of the corps concerned who in that fiscal year first become eligible for consideration for recommendation for advancement to the next higher rank; the numerator of such fraction shall be a number equal to the total number of women line officers recommended for promotion to the rank concerned in the approved report of the immediately preceding line selection board; the denominator shall be a number equal to the number of women line officers eligible in the fiscal year concerned for consideration for recommendation for advancement to the rank concerned, exclusive of those previously passed over in selection for promotion to that rank and of those junior in lineal rank to the junior woman line officer recommended for promotion to that rank in the approved report of the immediately preceding line selection board; if the number so determined be a mixed number and the fraction thereof be one-half or greater, the fraction shall be regarded as a whole number; if such computation produces no whole number, the fraction shall be regarded as a whole number.

(l) Each selection board appointed to recommend women staff officers of the Regular Navy for advancement to the rank of lieutenant shall recommend such of the eligible officers who, in the opinion of at least two-thirds of the members of the board, are qualified for advancement.

(m) Upon promotion to the grade of commander or lieutenant commander, a woman officer of the line of the Regular Navy shall be entitled to the pay and allowances of such grade from the date of the occurrence of the vacancy to which she is promoted to fill.

(n) Each woman staff officer of the Regular Navy recommended for advancement in rank in the approved report of a board on selection shall become eligible for advancement to the rank for which recommended on the date that the line officer who is to be her running mate in such rank becomes eligible for promotion to that rank and, upon promotion, shall be entitled to the pay and allowances of the higher rank from the date upon which she becomes eligible for advancement thereto.

(o) Women officers of the line or staff corps of the Regular Navy shall not increase the authorized number of commissioned officers of the line or staff corps concerned nor shall women officers of the grades of chief pay clerk, pay clerk, and acting pay clerk increase the authorized number of officers of those grades. Women line officers of the Regular Navy above the grade of commissioned warrant officer shall be carried in their respective grades as in excess of the numbers otherwise authorized in those grades.

(p) The provisions of law now existing or hereafter enacted relating to the promotion of male warrant officers and to advancement to higher pay periods of male commissioned warrant officers shall apply in like manner to women warrant and commissioned warrant officers.

SEC. 207. (a) All provisions of law now existing or hereafter enacted relating to retired officers of the Regular Navy and to the retirement or separation from the active list of officers of the Regular Navy, except those provisions relating to the same subject matter provided for in the following subsections of this section, are hereby made applicable to women officers of the Regular Navy.

(b) Each woman officer of the grade or rank of commander in the Regular Navy, or a woman officer serving as an assistant to the Chief of Naval Personnel with the rank of captain, who attains the age of 55 years or completed 30 years' active commissioned service in the Regular Navy and the Naval Reserve, whichever is earlier, shall be retired by the President on the first day of the month following that in which she attains such age or completes such service, and except as otherwise provided by law, shall be placed on the retired list in the permanent rank held by her at the time of retirement: *Provided*, That a woman commander or lieutenant commander who serves as an assistant to the Chief of Naval Personnel with the rank of captain and who attains the age of 50 years while so serving may be retired by the President on the first day of the month following that in which she ceases to serve as such assistant to the Chief of Naval Personnel, and if so retired may be placed on the retired list in the rank authorized by subsection (d).

(c) Each woman officer of the Regular Navy who attains the age of 50 years while serving in the grade or rank of lieutenant commander or below shall be retired by the President on the 1st day of the month following that in which she attains such age, and, except as otherwise provided by law, shall be placed on the retired list in the permanent rank held by her at the time of retirement: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not apply to an officer of the grade or rank of lieutenant commander who is on a promotion list for the grade or rank of commander or to one while serving as an assistant to the Chief of Naval Personnel with the rank of captain.

(d) Any woman officer of the Regular Navy, who may be retired for any reason while serving as an assistant to the Chief of Naval Personnel under section 205 of this title, or who subsequent to such service may be retired for any reason while serving in a lower rank, may, if she shall have served 2½ years or more as such assistant, be placed on the retired list, at the discretion of the President, in the rank held by her while serving as such assistant to the Chief of Naval Personnel: *Provided*, That the commissioned officer first detailed to duty in the Bureau of Naval Personnel as an assistant to the Chief of Naval Personnel, pursuant to this title, shall without limitation as to the time she shall serve in such capacity, upon retirement be retired with the rank held while so serving, and shall receive retired pay at the rate prescribed by law computed on the basis of the base and longevity pay she would have received if serving on active duty with such rank.

(e) Each woman officer of the Regular Navy who is placed on the retired list in her permanent rank pursuant to subsection (b) or (c) of this section shall receive retired pay at the rate of 2½ percent of the active-duty pay to which entitled at the time of retirement, multiplied by the number of years for which entitled to credit in the computation of her active duty pay.

(f) Each woman officer of the Regular Navy retired because of physical disability incurred in line of duty shall, if placed on the retired list in a rank higher than her permanent rank, receive retired pay equal to 75 percent of the active-duty pay, at the time would be entitled if serving, at the time of of retirement, on active duty in the rank in which placed upon the retired list.

(g) Each woman officer of the Regular Navy retired for other than physical disability incurred in the line of duty shall, if placed on the retired list in a rank higher than her permanent rank, receive retired pay equal to 2½ percent of the active-duty pay to which she would be entitled if serving, at the time of retirement, on active duty in the rank in which placed upon the retired list, multiplied by the number of years for which entitled to credit in the computation of her active duty pay, not to exceed a total of 75 percent of said active duty pay.

(h) In any instance in which retired pay is computed pursuant to subsections (e) and (g) of this section, a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years by which the rate of 2½ percent is multiplied.

(i) Women officers of the grade or rank of lieutenant commander in the Regular Navy whose names, on June 30 of the fiscal year in which they complete 20 years' active commissioned service in the Regular Navy and the Naval Reserve, are not then on a promotion list for advancement to the next higher grade or rank shall be placed on the retired list on that date.

(j) Women officers of the grades or ranks of lieutenant and lieutenant (junior grade) in the Regular Navy whose names on June 30 of the fiscal year in which they complete 13 and 7 years' active commissioned service, respectively, in the Regular Navy and the Naval Reserve are not then on a promotion list for advancement to the next higher grade or rank shall be honorably discharged from the Navy on that date with a lump-sum payment computed on the basis of 2 months' active-duty pay at the time of their discharge for each year of commissioned service, but not to exceed a total of 2 years' pay: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this subsection a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years commissioned service upon which to base such lump-sum payment.

(k) The retired pay of a woman officer of the Regular Navy who is commissioned in the Regular Navy pursuant to the act of

April 18, 1946 (60 Stat. 92), as now or hereafter amended, shall not be less than 50 percent of her active-duty pay at the time of retirement.

SEC. 208. All provisions of law now existing or hereafter enacted relating to male personnel of the Navy, except those provisions relating to the same subject matter specifically provided for in this title, shall, where applicable, be construed to include women.

SEC. 209. The Secretary of the Navy may prescribe the quantity and kind of clothing and equipment which shall be furnished annually to enlisted women of the Regular Navy, including that required upon their first reporting for duty, and the amount of a cash allowance to be paid to such enlisted women in any case in which such clothing and equipment is not so furnished to them.

SEC. 210. The Secretary of the Navy may prescribe the manner in which women shall be trained and qualified for military duty in the Regular Navy, the military authority which they may exercise, and the kind of military duty to which they may be assigned.

SEC. 211. All provisions of law relating to pay, leave, money allowances for subsistence and rental of quarters, mileage and other travel allowances, or other allowances, benefits, or emoluments, of male personnel of the Regular Navy are hereby made applicable to women personnel of the Regular Navy: *Provided*, That the husbands of women officers and enlisted personnel of the Regular Navy shall not be considered dependents unless they are in fact dependent on their wives for their chief support, and the children of such officers and enlisted personnel shall not be considered dependents unless their father is dead or they are in fact dependent on their mother for their chief support.

SEC. 212. Title V of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (56 Stat. 730), as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out sections 501 to 508, inclusive, thereof, and substituting therefor the following:

"SEC. 501. Women may be enlisted or appointed in the Naval Reserve under the provisions of this act, as now or hereafter amended, in such appropriate ratings, grades, or ranks as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy in the same manner and, except as otherwise provided in this title, under the same circumstances and conditions as men are enlisted or appointed in the Naval Reserve.

"SEC. 502. The Secretary of the Navy may prescribe the manner in which women enlisted or appointed in the Naval Reserve shall be trained and qualified for military duty, the military authority they may exercise, and the kind of military duty to which they may be assigned.

"SEC. 503. The provisions of this act, as now or hereafter amended, which relate to pay, leave, money allowances for subsistence and rental of quarters, mileage, and other travel allowances, or other allowances, benefits, or emoluments, for male personnel of the Naval Reserve, shall also apply to women personnel of the Naval Reserve: *Provided*, That the husbands of women personnel of the Naval Reserve shall not be considered dependents unless they are in fact dependent on their wives for their chief support, and the children of such personnel shall not be considered dependents unless their father is dead or they are in fact dependent on their mother for their chief support.

"SEC. 504. The Secretary of the Navy may prescribe the quantity and kind of clothing and equipment to be furnished annually to enlisted women of the Naval Reserve, including that required upon their first reporting for active duty, and he may prescribe the amount of cash allowance to be paid to such enlisted women in any case in which such clothing and equipment is not so furnished to them.

"SEC. 505. All members of the Women's Reserve enlisted or appointed under the act of July 30, 1942 (56 Stat. 730), as amended, are hereby transferred to the appropriate components of the Naval Reserve in the same temporary and permanent ratings, grades, or ranks, with the same effective dates and dates of precedence, which they held in the Women's Reserve on the effective date of this act, and such transfer shall be for the unexpired period of their current enlistments or appointments in the Women's Reserve."

SEC. 213. (a) Women may be enlisted or appointed in the Regular Marine Corps under the provisions of this title, and the provisions of this title (except as may be necessary to adapt said provisions to the Marine Corps) are hereby made applicable to women enlisted or appointed in the Regular Marine Corps in the same manner as such provisions apply to women enlisted or appointed in the Regular Navy.

(b) The number of enlisted women on the active list of the Regular Marine Corps at any one time shall not exceed 2 percent of the enlisted strength now or hereafter authorized for the active list of the Regular Marine Corps.

(c) The number of commissioned and warrant women officers on the active list of the Regular Marine Corps at any one time shall not exceed 10 percent of the authorized number of enlisted women of the Regular Marine Corps.

(d) From the women officers serving in the grade of major or above in the Marine Corps, one officer may be detailed to duty in the Personnel Department of the Marine Corps as an assistant to the Director of Personnel, Marine Corps. She shall have the rank of colonel while so serving, and shall be entitled to the pay and allowances as are now or may be hereafter prescribed by law for a colonel of the Regular Marine Corps, and her regular status as a commissioned officer in the Marine Corps shall not be disturbed by reason of such detail. The provisions of section 207 of this title shall apply in the same manner, and under the same relative conditions, to women officers of the Regular Marine Corps who have or shall have served as an assistant to the Director of Personnel of the Marine Corps.

SEC. 214. (a) The Secretary of the Navy, under the circumstances and in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President, may terminate the commission of any woman officer commissioned in the Regular Navy or Marine Corps pursuant to this title.

(b) The Secretary of the Navy, under such regulations as he may prescribe, may terminate the enlistment of any enlisted woman in the Regular Navy or Marine Corps, and each such person whose enlistment is so terminated shall be discharged from the service.

SEC. 215. The provisions of this title shall not be construed to apply to women officers of the Navy Nurse Corps.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD a statement relative to Senate bill 1641, dealing with the Wacs and Waves.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

STATEMENT ON THE BILL S. 1641 (WACS AND WAVES)

This legislation provides for the appointment and enlistment of women in the Regular Army and Navy and in their Reserve components. It is designed to care for the overall requirements of the services now and in the future. Experience gained during the present war has demonstrated that the services of women are needed and their skills are as important to the efficient operation of the Naval Establishment during peacetime as they were during the war years. Existing legislation permits women in the Reserve components only, and this authority expires shortly after the present war is officially ended.

The advantages of including women in the permanent structure of the Army and Navy is based primarily on several considerations. Women will directly and immediately aid in our efforts to increase the over-all efficiency of the services. Their retention as regular personnel will provide a flexible and well-trained permanent nucleus which will permit the rapid mobilization of large numbers of women and their inclusion in the permanent Reserves will make possible the building of an essential reservoir of womanpower.

During the war women were actively employed in all the duties for which they were found qualified, making available large numbers of men for combat. Not only were they equally efficient in many of the duties previously performed by men, but in certain types of the work they proved to be more efficient and psychologically better fitted. This was particularly true in the field of hospital, supply, aviation specialties, and communications activities. The conclusions are based on observation and study of their services during nearly 5 years in various fields of operations throughout the world. They served in practically all ranks and ratings except those from which they were excluded because of physical limitations, combatant nature, or seagoing requirements.

The fact must be acknowledged that in any future war it will be mandatory to have at our command immediately all possible resources. Womanpower is one of these. Since this is true, it is essential that a permanent nucleus of women be maintained in the Regular services in order to avoid the unacceptable delays incident to the calling to active duty and the assimilation of a reserve force. We must provide careers for women in the Regular Army and Navy if we are to establish the necessary continuity in the utilization of their services. The Reserve is a counterpart of the Regular service; either program alone is incomplete. At the present time we have available the necessary personnel and experience to carry out our basic future plans for women. To lose these would be to discard a weapon of known value. More than 6 months of World War I had elapsed before legislation was passed, and another 6 months was required to train and assign these women to active duty. If our country is threatened again we will not have such a year of grace.

I have stated the country's need for the services of women in the Army and Navy and I have outlined some of the reasons for that need. The need for legislation to permit women to become a permanent part of the armed services is in accordance with our fundamental policy of preparedness. The measure is needed to carry out that policy in the most effective manner.

This legislation has the wholehearted endorsement of the Armed Services Committee and its immediate passage is earnestly recommended.

LEASES OF REAL AND PERSONAL PROPERTY BY THE WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, also for the purpose of accommodating the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 1198, Calendar No. 659.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1198)

to authorize leases of real or personal property by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, S. 1198, a bill to authorize leases of real or personal property by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes, is designed to furnish legislative aid to the War and Navy Departments for their industrial stand-by reserve program. As an integral part of the industrial mobilization plan of the Nation, the military services plan to retain in Government ownership a limited number of strategically important industrial plants and shipyards, the productive capacity of which would be urgently and immediately needed in the event of a future emergency. This strategic industrial reserve constitutes only a small portion of the tremendous investment made by the Government during the last war in industrial, munitions, and shipyard facilities and it is considered essential that the Government preserve this nucleus of essential productive capacity in order that its availability for war-production purposes may be at all times assured.

The bill is an essential aid to this stand-by program in three important respects:

First. Section 1 of the bill extends in a manner which the Armed Services Committee considers to be necessary the existing peacetime statutory authority of the War and Navy Departments to lease real and personal property. This is done in order to permit the Departments to make available to private industry to the fullest extent possible on a rental basis for the benefit of the civilian economy those stand-by industrial plants and facilities which are not surplus to the respective Departments but which for the time being are not needed for use by the Government. Under present peacetime laws the Departments may lease real property only for periods of 5 years or less and revocable at any time. Section 1 of the bill would authorize the Secretaries of War or the Navy to negotiate leases for longer periods and to omit the provision for revocation, except in case of national emergency, where necessary to induce private industry to utilize such property for commercial purposes. Private business could not be expected to lease these stand-by industrial properties, thereby producing rent for the Government, increasing employment, aiding the reconversion process, and reducing the Government's costs of maintenance, where such leases will have only a limited duration and will be subject to revocation at any time. Section 1 further makes clear that lessees of these stand-by properties may be required to protect, maintain, and repair them as part of the consideration for the lease, a provision which is designed to make the maintenance of this industrial reserve in large part self-sustaining.

Second. Sections 3 and 4 of the bill aid in the industrial stand-by program by permitting the transfer to the War and Navy Departments of certain industrial plants, title to which is now in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as successor to Defense Plant Corporation. It is presently contemplated that eight plants will be so transferred, the retention of which is considered essential for national-defense purposes. In addition, section 3 will permit certain machine and cutting tools presently in the possession of Reconstruction Finance Corporation or War Assets Administration to be transferred from surplus stocks to the custody of the War and Navy Departments. The retention of a small stock pile of strategic machine tools and essential war-production equipment is considered of vital importance in the light of the critical bottleneck which developed in machine tools during World War II. The committee is satisfied that the transfer of these tools will not interfere with the disposition of War Assets Administration of its surplus property and that only those machine tools will be transferred which are not in short supply in the civilian economy. Although transferred to the custody of the War and Navy Departments for retention, section 1 will permit such plants and equipment to be leased to industry if and to the extent needed. Section 4 provides that transfers to be made under section 3 must be approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and that they may be made without charge or reimbursement except for handling and transportation costs.

Third. Section 5 of the bill affords statutory recognition of a present practice of the War and Navy Departments and of War Assets Administration in disposing of certain strategically important plants and shipyards only upon terms which will insure their continued availability for the production purposes for which they were built or acquired by the Government during the war. Section 5 permits the Government to retain a nominal interest in certain industrial properties, the production of which may be necessary in a future emergency, in a manner which will insure their productive availability to the Government should future circumstances so require. War Assets Administration has, at the request of the War and Navy Departments, sold a number of industrial plants subject to such terms and conditions and favorably endorses this section of the bill.

Section 6 expressly provides that the lessee's interest in property leased under the bill may be the subject of taxation by State or local authorities. It further provides that should such leased property itself be subsequently rendered taxable by State or local governments through any future action of Congress, any lease made under the authority of the bill shall be subject to reopening. This provision was inserted in order to prevent a lease from the Government being made a vehicle for tax avoidance.

Constituting as it does an essential legislative aid to the industrial mobilization program of the Nation the Armed Services Committee unanimously recommends the enactment of S. 1198.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does this bill in any way affect the authority of the Government to lease plants or property from private individuals, as distinguished from leasing it to them?

Mr. BALDWIN. No; it does not cover that phase at all. It merely gives the War and Navy Departments authority to lease plants which they now have to private individuals. It does not cover the other situation.

Mr. BREWSTER. As I understand, the provision with respect to leases by the Government of real estate for the Government remains in effect, and such leases must be submitted to the Armed Services Committee. Is that still the law?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I can answer that question. That is still the law.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It would be entirely in the discretion of the Secretary whether or not to lease the plant. There is no overall industrial plan, as I understand.

Mr. BALDWIN. As I understand, there are only about eight plants involved out of the vast number built during the war.

Mr. TAFT. The authority seems to be general.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I should like a further explanation. I merely wish to know how broad this power is. From the hurried examination I have made of the bill, it seems to include full general power to lease real estate. There are no limitations whatever upon that power. In certain States there are vast tracts of land, thousands of acres, under the control of the War Department, with respect to which leases might be made for various purposes—perhaps even including mineral, oil, and gas lands.

Mr. BALDWIN. This bill specifically excludes mineral and oil lands, and applies only to real estate used in connection with industrial plants.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I am very much interested in the bill and very favorable to its general objective as expressed by the Senator from Connecticut. However, I should like to address this question to the Senator: At the present time the Navy and the Army may lease these plants. That has been done, has it not? That authority exists?

Mr. BALDWIN. I do not think it has been done.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I know of instances where it has been done. I am merely asking the able Senator why this legislation is necessary. Is it to formulate a general policy?

Mr. BALDWIN. In the first instance, it is necessary to formulate a general policy, and, as I understand, the present law gives authority only up to 5 years, which would not make it possible for the departments to lease these plants which they want to preserve and want to keep operating and not withdraw from the civilian economy. Under this bill the leases which may be made pursuant to the bill contain a revocation clause to the effect that if the property is needed in the case of a national emergency it shall immediately be made available to

the Government. The purpose of this legislation is to preserve the basis of these plants and the tools which are vital to their operation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say to the Senator that I am very much in favor of this plan, because I have been advised that it is much better to use these plants than to discontinue them.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendments.

The amendments were on page 3, line 11, after the word "lands", to insert "The Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, shall submit to the Congress on the 1st day of January and the 1st day of July of each year, following the enactment of this law, a report of all leases entered into in accordance with the provisions of this act"; and at the end of the bill to add sections 5 and 6; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy shall deem it to be advantageous to the Government he is authorized to lease such real or personal property under the control of his Department as is not surplus to the needs of the Department within the meaning of the act of October 3, 1944 (58 Stat. 765), and is not for the time required for public use, to such lessee or lessees and upon such terms and conditions as in his judgment will promote the national defense or will be in the public interest. Each such lease shall be for a period not exceeding 5 years unless the Secretary of the Department concerned shall determine that a longer period will promote the national defense or will be in the public interest. The Secretary of the Department concerned may include, among other terms and conditions in the lease, a right of first refusal in the lessee to purchase the property in the event of the revocation of the lease in order to permit sale thereof by the Government, but this section shall not be construed as authorizing the sale of any property unless the sale thereof is otherwise authorized by law. Each such lease shall contain a provision permitting the Secretary of the Department concerned to revoke the lease at any time, unless the Secretary shall determine that the omission of such provision from the lease will promote the national defense or will be in the public interest. In any event each such lease shall be revocable by the Secretary of the Department concerned during a national emergency declared by the President. Notwithstanding section 321 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412; U. S. C., title 40, sec. 303b), or any other provision of law, any such lease may provide for the maintenance, protection, repair, or restoration by the lessee, of the property leased or of the entire unit or installation where a substantial part thereof is leased, as a part or all of the consideration for the lease of such property. In the event utilities or services shall be furnished by the Department concerned to the lessee in connection with any lease, payments for utilities or services so furnished may be covered into the Treasury to the credit of the appropriation or appropriations from which the costs of furnishing any such utilities or services to the lessee was paid. Except as otherwise hereinabove provided, any money rentals received by the Government directly under any such lease shall be deposited and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. The authority herein granted shall not apply to oil, mineral, or phosphate lands. The Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, shall submit to the Congress on the 1st day of January and the 1st day of July of each year, following the enactment of this law, a report of all leases entered into in accordance with the provisions of this act.

SEC. 2. The act of July 28, 1892, as amended (27 Stat. 321; 45 Stat. 988; U. S. C., title 40, sec. 303), is hereby repealed. So much of the Naval Appropriation Act of August 29, 1916, as is contained under the heading "Lease of naval lands," as amended (39 Stat. 559; 45 Stat. 990; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 522), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all right, title, and interest of Reconstruction Finance Corporation in any plants or facilities, and the machinery, equipment, and other personal property accessory thereto, acquired by Defense Plant Corporation or Reconstruction Finance Corporation in accordance with authority contained in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act (U. S. C., title 15, secs. 601–617) pursuant to undertakings by the War Department or the Navy Department to reimburse Defense Plant Corporation or Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the extent of the unrecovered cost thereof in the event Congress authorizes such reimbursement by making appropriations therefor, shall be transferred by Reconstruction Finance Corporation (or by War Assets Administration, if such property has been declared surplus) to the War Department or the Navy Department upon certification by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy made within 6 months after the enactment hereof, that the retention of such plants or facilities, and the machinery, equipment, and other personal property accessory thereto, by the War Department or the Navy Department, as the case may be, is necessary for the maintenance of an adequate Military or Naval Establishment including industrial reserve.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all right, title, and interest of Reconstruction Finance Corporation or War Assets Administration in any machinery or equipment shall be transferred by the agency having control thereof to the War Department or the Navy Department upon certification by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy made within 6 months after the enactment hereof, that the retention of such machinery or equipment by the War Department or the Navy Department, is necessary for the maintenance of an adequate Military or Naval Establishment, including industrial reserve.

SEC. 4. Any transfer made pursuant to section 3 of this act shall be approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to the extent and in the manner determined by him and shall be made without charge or reimbursement from the funds available to the War Department or the Navy Department, except for costs of packing, handling, and transportation of machinery and equipment transferred under section 3 (b) hereof.

SEC. 5. (a) Whenever in the opinion of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, the interests of national defense require assurance of the continued availability for war-production purposes of the industrial capacity of shipyards, plants, and equipment which are surplus to the needs of their respective Departments or of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation within the meaning of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, they are authorized to direct the imposition of such terms, conditions, restrictions, and reservations in the disposition of such property by the disposal agency under said act as will in the opinion of the Secretary concerned be adequate to assure such continued availability.

(b) In the event the disposal agency is unable to dispose of any such industrial plants and equipment subject to such terms, conditions, restrictions, or reservations as have been imposed, within a reasonable time and after such property shall have been offered for sale and reasonable efforts made to dispose of the same, the Department imposing such terms, conditions, restrictions, or reservations shall (1) modify them to the extent necessary to permit the sale or lease of such property, (2) withdraw the property from surplus, or, in the case of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation property, request a transfer thereof in the manner provided in sections 3 (a) and 4 of this act, or (3) eliminate and waive the requirement for the imposition of any terms, conditions, restrictions, or reservations made under the authority of this section.

SEC. 6. The lessee's interest, made or created pursuant to the provisions of this act, shall be made subject to State or local taxation. Any lease of property authorized under the provisions of this act shall contain a provision that if and to the extent that such property is made taxable by State and local governments by act of Congress, in such event the terms of such lease shall be renegotiated.

SEC. 7. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1502) to authorize a contribution to the international children's emergency fund was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over at the request of the present occupant of the chair.

The bill (S. 176) to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to dental diseases and conditions was announced as next in order.

Mr. BREWSTER. Over.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, may I request that the Senator withhold his objection for a moment.

Mr. BREWSTER. I made the objection because of the absence from the floor of the Senator who has the bill in charge.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, Calendar No. 450, Senate bill 1454, will depend on the action taken on a companion bill, and therefore I ask that it go over temporarily.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be temporarily passed over.

MEDICAL DEPARTMENTS OF THE ARMY AND NAVY

The bill (H. R. 3215) to revise the medical department of the Army and the medical department of the Navy, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to this bill, which has been agreed to by the Army and the Navy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair first ask whether there is any objection to considering the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LODGE. My amendment is to insert at the end of line 1, on page 2, the words "Sanitary Engineering Section,".

The amendment has been cleared with the Army and Navy, with the chairman

of the House committee, and I have also taken it up with the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] who is in charge of the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I think it is a good amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendments reported by the committee.

The first amendment was, on page 3, line 25, after the word "Surgeon", to strike out the word "General:".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, to strike out lines 1 to 7, inclusive, and to insert "General, and each person appointed and commissioned an officer of the Medical Service Corps who at the time of appointment holds a degree of doctor of philosophy or comparable degree recognized by the Surgeon General in a science allied to medicine may, subject to regulations as prescribed by the Secretary of War, be credited at the time of appointment with an amount of service equal to 3 years."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, to strike out line 25 on page 11 and lines 1 to 18, inclusive, on page 12, and to insert:

Hereafter the authorized strength of the Hospital Corps of the Navy shall equal 3½ percent of the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy and Marine Corps. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized, in his discretion, to establish such grades and ratings in the Hospital Corps as he may deem necessary in the proper administration of such corps: *Provided*, That enlisted men of other ratings in the Navy and in the Marine Corps shall be eligible for transfer to the Hospital Corps, and men of that corps to other ratings in the Navy and the Marine Corps.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, to strike out lines 6 to 9, inclusive, and to insert "The Secretary of the Navy may hereafter appoint as many warrant officers in the Hospital Corps, as may be deemed necessary, from the rating of chief petty officer or petty officer, first class, in the Hospital Corps: *Provided*, That no person shall be appointed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD, immediately following the action on House bill 3215, Calendar No. 478, an important letter addressed to me under date of July 21, 1947, by Mr. Robert P. Fischelis, secretary of the American Pharmaceutical Association, together with a copy of the War Department press release of Friday, July 5, 1946, captioned "Additional duties planned for Pharmacy Corps officers."

There being no objection, the letter and press release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., July 21, 1947.

The Honorable LISTER HILL,
Committee on Armed Services,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HILL: The report of the Senate Committee on the Armed Services (No. 464), Calendar No. 478, prepared by you is an excellent presentation of the essence of this legislation.

We were glad to note that you included the letters from Surgeon General Bliss and Surgeon General Swanson to Major Einbeck in the record. However, in doing so, a serious oversight occurred which should be corrected when H. R. 3215 is considered.

You will note the following sentence in the letter from General Bliss at the bottom of page 12 of your report:

"I replied that I am in complete agreement with the outline of duties planned for Pharmacy Corps officers, as set forth in the press release from the War Department, dated July 5, 1946, and a copy of this release is attached. I now wish to assure you that it shall be my policy to effectuate as completely as possible the letter and spirit of the blueprint of duties of pharmacy officers as set forth in the foregoing press release."

Unfortunately the press release referred to, although attached to the general's letter, was not printed with the letter. This is an unfortunate and very serious omission. We believe it was unintentional, but we cannot stress too greatly the importance of having it made a part of the record.

If, as we understand, you will handle this bill on the floor of the Senate, we hope you will read the omitted press release, of which a copy is enclosed, into the RECORD.

In case you do not handle the bill on the floor of the Senate, we respectfully request that you arrange to read the press release into the RECORD in view of the fact that you are the author of the committee report from which the press release was inadvertently omitted.

We shall greatly appreciate your aid in this matter as the pharmacists of your State, as well as others, are deeply concerned about having the correspondence with the Surgeon General recorded in its entirety.

Respectfully yours,
ROBERT P. FISCHELIS, *Secretary.*

[From War Department, Public Relations Division, Press Section, July 5, 1946]

ADDITIONAL DUTIES PLANNED FOR PHARMACY CORPS OFFICERS

Additional duties for pharmacists in the Army Medical Department were outlined today in plans submitted to the War Department General Staff by Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk, the Surgeon General.

In General Kirk's plan legislation will be sought to organize a Medical Service Corps which will place Pharmacy, Sanitary, and Medical Administrative Corps under one table of organization. Provisions are made for a pharmacist officer to serve in the office of the Surgeon General. That officer will act as adviser to the Surgeon General on all pharmacy matters and will direct pharmaceutical activities of the Medical Department.

Utilizing pharmaceutical training and aptitudes to the utmost, pharmacist officers will be charged with the purchase, examination, shipment, storage, and standardization of the drugs and medical supplies required by the Army. They will coordinate the preparation of supply tables and aid in preparation of standards of drugs and medical supplies.

In command functions, they will be placed in charge of all types of medical supply depots as well as subordinate positions in the depot. And they will be named assistants to surgeons in battalions and regiments, as commanders of headquarters and medical battalion units, adjutants, medical and general supply officers and laboratory officers in medical and general laboratories.

No little part of their future duties will be instructing at training schools. Pharmacy officers will be especially sought in Regular Army commissioned ranks for duty in the postwar army which will require three officers of their capabilities for every thousand men. It is thought that additional duties given pharmacists will release other Medical Department officers from administrative duties.

Further, pharmacists will be qualified to serve in multitudinous hospital capacities as pharmacy officer, executive officer, adjutant, supply officer, mess officer, registrar, evacuation officer, hospital detachment commander, and detachment of patients commander. They will compound and dispense medicines in units as large as general hospitals and hospital centers.

In combat organizations, the pharmacists will assume more authority than ever before. They will serve as medical and general supply officer to medical groups and battalions and command ambulance units.

In procurement jobs they will deal with contracts, purchase, inspection, shipment, storage, testing and standardization of medical equipment. Further, pharmacists are playing vital roles in administrative positions in the office of the Surgeon General.

General Kirk stated that pharmacy officers will receive the same pay, emoluments and retirement benefits as other officers of similar grade and length of service of the Regular Army. Promotions in field grades will, as in the case of other branches, be consistent with the needs of the service.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1481) to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District, was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERTON. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

RIO GRANDE BORDER FENCE PROJECT

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 46) authorizing appropriations for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the western land boundary fence project and the Rio Grande border fence project, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the joint resolution?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is chairman of the subcommittee which held hearings on this joint resolution. It provides for the erection of a fence along the Mexican boundary. A portion of the fence has already been constructed in the western part of New Mexico and in Arizona. It is proposed to build a fence from the uncompleted portion of the line along the Rio Grande. The purpose is to aid the enforcement of our immigration laws, and it will do so very materially. It will assist in preventing smuggling. It will also help to keep out animals which may bring into the United States contagious diseases, such as the

foot-and-mouth disease, and diseases of that kind. The resolution has been reported unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I think that all the departments of the Government affected by it are in favor of it. I hope there will be no objection.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it an authorization?

Mr. CONNALLY. It is a joint resolution authorizing an appropriation of $300,000 for 1947 to be made available to the Boundary Commission.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the total appropriation?

Mr. HATCH. The $300,000 is already available, and the Department could go ahead and spend it, but, in order to keep faith with the Congress, they wanted this measure passed.

Mr. WHERRY. I think that is a worthy attitude. But what is the total appropriation?

Mr. CONNALLY. The total appropriation is $1,000,000 for the western end of the project and $1,000,000 for the Rio Grande end in Texas.

Mr. WHERRY. So that the net amount would be $2,000,000, less $300,000?

Mr. CONNALLY. I think it would be $2,000,000 plus $300,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendments.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 6, after the word "appropriations", to insert "to the Department of State"; on page 3, line 2, after the word "Congress" to insert "*Provided*, That the total cost of the said projects shall not exceed $4,000,000"; on page 4, lines 19 and 20, strike out "forty-first" and insert the numerals "41"; and on page 5, line 22, after the word "law", to insert "*Provided further*, That, where portions of such fence are to be built within the right-of-way lines of existing State, county, or other public roads or highways, the United States Commissioner is authorized to accept, and the Attorney General is authorized to approve, rights-of-way, easements, or licenses from any such State, county or other public agency having jurisdiction thereover, subject to such conditions and limitations as may be required by State or municipal law or regulation, including, but not limited to, conditions requiring the removal of said fence, or portions thereof, to points outside of the right-of-way lines or to such points within the right-of-way lines as may not be objectionable to the State, county, or other public agency concerned, where considerations of widening said roads or highways, or other considerations of public necessity, make such removal necessary, and when, in the opinion of the United States Commissioner, the interests of the United States will not thereby be unduly jeopardized. The opinion of the attorney general of the State wherein such rights-of-way, easements, or licenses are granted, if such opinion be obtained, shall be conclusive as to the right or authority of the State, county, or other public agency concerned, and of the officials thereof, to grant any such right-of-way, easement, or license", so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That the United States section, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, is hereby authorized to expend, out of any unencumbered balance of appropriations to the Department of State for construction for the fiscal year 1947 under the heading "International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico" (Public Law 490, approved July 5, 1946), a maximum of $300,000 for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the western land boundary fence project and $300,000 for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Rio Grande border fence project.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated for said projects, or expended therefor out of appropriated funds for construction projects, for the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, for fiscal year 1948, the additional sums of $1,000,000 for each of said projects. The said sums may be appropriated specifically for said projects, or may be included with the appropriation for all construction projects of said United States section. The expenditures and appropriations herein authorized shall not be construed as placing a limitation on funds which may be hereafter appropriated for the completion of said projects, or the operation and maintenance thereof. The United States Commissioner, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 665), sections 3732 and 3733 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 11 and 12), or any other law, may enter into contracts beyond the amount actually appropriated for so much of the work on each of said projects as the physical and orderly sequence of construction or considerations of expediting said work make necessary or desirable, such contracts to be subject to and dependent upon future appropriations by Congress: *Provided*, That the total cost of the said projects shall not exceed $4,000,000.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any contrary provisions of appropriation or other acts applicable to said projects, the United States section is authorized to acquire by purchase, exercise of the power of eminent domain, or by donation any real or personal property which may be necessary for such projects, as determined by the United States Commissioner, including rights-of-way not exceeding 60 feet in width, as may be necessary for such boundary fences and roads parallel thereto required for the patrol and maintenance thereof.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any contrary provisions of law, any executive department, independent establishment, or other agency of the United States is authorized to transfer to the United States section, without payment or reimbursement therefor, (a) any equipment, supplies, or materials which any of these agencies may have and which may be needed for the construction, repair, operation, or maintenance of such boundary fence projects by the United States section; and (b) any existing fences, or portions thereof, on or along the United States-Mexican boundary, which may be under the jurisdiction of such other Federal agency. The United States section is hereby authorized to expend out of funds made available for boundary-fence construction, any sums of money which may be necessary for the reconstruction, repair and operation and maintenance of boundary fences so transferred.

SEC. 5. The United States Commissioner, in his discretion, is authorized to employ personnel for the survey, inspection, construction, and supervision of construction of such fence projects without regard to personnel ceilings otherwise imposed, and without regard to the civil-service laws or regulations or laws or regulations requiring the employment of American citizens: *Provided*, That such employment shall not be for a period longer than that required for the completion of construction of such fence projects, nor in any event for a period in excess of 2 years from the effective date of this joint resolution.

SEC. 6. Said fence projects may be constructed by contract or by force account, or partly by contract and partly by force account, in the discretion of the United States Commissioner; and in either event the provisions of 41 United States Code 5, and other laws and regulations relating to advertising for proposals for purchases and contracts for supplies or services for departments of the Government and laws and regulations placing limitations upon the purchase of passenger-carrying or other motor-propelled vehicles shall be inapplicable to purchases and contracts for equipment and supplies or services for the survey, construction, or supervision of said fence projects.

SEC. 7. The opinion of the Attorney General in favor of the validity of the title to any tract of land or easement therein to be acquired for right-of-way for said fence projects shall not be required as a condition precedent to construction thereon when, in the opinion of the United States Commissioner, such requirement would unduly delay the construction program and the interest of the United States are not jeopardized by a waiver of such requirement: *Provided*, That proceedings for the acquisition of such tracts or easements therein by purchase, exercise of the power of eminent domain, or condemnation have been commenced, and the consent of the record or apparent owner or owners of any such tract has been secured for the immediate occupancy thereof, or appropriate orders have been entered therefor in eminent domain proceedings: *Provided further*, That the United States Commissioner shall proceed, as expeditiously as may be possible, to secure title to such tracts or easements therein in the manner and to the extent required for the approval of the Attorney General in accordance with existing law: *Provided further*, That where portions of such fence are to be built within the right-of-way lines of existing State, county, or other public roads or highways, the United States Commissioner is authorized to accept, and the Attorney General is authorized to approve, rights-of-way, easements, or licenses from any such State, county, or other public agency having jurisdiction thereover, subject to such conditions and limitations as may be required by State or municipal law or regulation, including, but not limited to, conditions requiring the removal of said fence, or portions thereof, to points outside of the right-of-way lines, or to such points within the right-of-way lines as may not be objectionable to the State, county, or other public agency concerned, where considerations of widening said roads or highways, or other considerations of public necessity, make such removal necessary, and when, in the opinion of the United States Commissioner, the interests of the United States will not thereby be unduly jeopardized. The opinion of the attorney general of the State wherein such rights-of-way, easements, or licenses are granted, if such opinion be obtained, shall be conclusive as to the right or authority of the State, county, or other public agency concerned, and of the officials thereof, to grant any such right-of-way, easement, or license.

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2298) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. REED. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

INTERNAL REVENUE COLLECTIONS ON ARTICLES PRODUCED IN THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1014) to provide for the disposition of internal revenue collections on articles produced in the Virgin Islands, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That subchapter B of chapter 28 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by adding to section 3350 thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Disposition of internal revenue collections: The Secretary of the Treasury shall determine the amount of all taxes imposed by and collected during the previous month under the internal-revenue laws of the United States on articles produced in the Virgin Islands of the United States and transported to the United States. The amounts so determined, less 1 percent and less the estimated amount of refunds or credits, shall be transferred and paid over each month to the government of the Virgin Islands and shall be available to the Virgin Islands for expenditure as the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands may provide: *Provided*, That the total amount so transferred and paid over in any one calendar year shall not exceed $500,000."

SEC. 2. This act shall become effective on and after the 30th day following the date of the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF VETERANS' PREFERENCE BENEFITS TO CERTAIN WIDOWS

The bill (S. 416) to extend veterans' preference benefit to widowed mothers of certain ex-servicemen was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], I send forward an amendment to Senate bill 416, and ask that it be stated and agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The first question is whether there is objection to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. BALL. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, can we not have the amendment adopted first? Would there be any objection to that?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Minnesota object to consideration of the bill for the purpose of perfecting it?

Mr. BALL. I do not see any point to be served by that, Mr. President. I have objected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being heard, the bill is passed over.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] was watching this bill for the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], but was called from the Chamber just now. He asked that in the event that the bill was reached, that it be passed over temporarily until he returned. Is that agreeable?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I want it passed over permanently.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 84) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Let the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT TO CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT

The bill (H. R. 2109) to amend section 1003 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. WHITE subsequently said: Mr. President, may I inquire what action was taken on House bill 2109, Calendar No. 531?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That bill was passed over.

Mr. WHITE. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to that bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate will return to House bill 2109, Calendar No. 531, to which the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] previously objected.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a brief explanation?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, indeed.

Mr. WHITE. I think perhaps my colleague from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] can more fully and completely describe the situation than I can. I shall be glad to have him do so.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to provide through rates between air carriers.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have considered the bill, and some of those who are advocating its passage have been to see me; but I am still objecting.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1372) authorizing the Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma to sell tribal cemetery was announced as next in order.

Mr. CAPPER. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

DONATION OF FARM LABOR CAMPS

The bill (S. 1555) providing for the donation of farm labor camps to public or semipublic institutions or organizations was announced as next in order.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, there is a companion bill, which is House bill 4254.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 4254) providing for the disposition of farm labor camps to public or semipublic agencies or nonprofit associations of farmers, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4254) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 1555 is indefinitely postponed.

Mr. WHERRY subsequently said: Mr. President, what happened to Senate bill 1555, Calendar No. 582?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. House bill 4254 was passed in lieu of that Senate bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent for the reconsideration of the vote by which the bill was passed; and I should like to have an explanation of the bill. I should like to know what is involved and what the expense will be.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the vote by which House bill 4254 was passed, is reconsidered, and the bill is before the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now ask for an explanation.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am glad to give one. This bill grows out of the discontinuation by the Federal Government of its previous support of the farm migratory labor camps which were established, some in Florida and some in other States, where there are seasonal crops. There was also a hospital in Florida at which free medical care was furnished to such farm workers.

The Congress has discontinued Federal support of this program. Then question arose relative to what to do with the labor camps and the hospital. The House and the Senate Committees on Agriculture favorably reported bills on this subject, and the House of Representatives has passed the House bill, which is now before the Senate, providing that the United States Department of Agriculture may dispose of these properties either to a public or a semipublic agency or to organizations of farmers, whichever the Department may regard as being best fitted to serve the purposes of housing migratory farm labor and furnishing hospital care principally to farm labor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for the explanation. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4254) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As previously announced, Senate bill 1555 is indefinitely postponed.

BOARD OF REGENTS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION—ROBERT V. FLEMING

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 250) to provide for the appointment of Robert V. Fleming as a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a

third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I offer, and ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, a brief biographical sketch of Mr. Fleming.

There being no objection, the biographical sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Robert Vedder Fleming, born in Washington, D. C., November 3, 1890, is one of the outstanding citizens of Washington. Educated at George Washington University, from which school he holds the honorary degree of doctor of laws, he entered the service of Riggs National Bank and is now president and chairman of the board of that institution.

Dr. Fleming is a trustee and chairman of the board of George Washington University, trustee and treasurer of the National Geographic Society, member of the board of trustees of the endowment fund of the American Red Cross, a member of the Federal Advisory Council to the Board of Governors of the Federal Feserve System of Fifth Federal Reserve District, and has a long list of other similar connections. He has served as president of the American Bankers Association, as a trustee of the Community Chest of Washington, D. C., as a member of the war finance committee for the District of Columbia, and in many similar capacities. He is a commander in the United States Naval Reserve.

In 1933 he was awarded the Cosmopolitan Club medal and citation, as the citizen of Washington who performed the most outstanding civil service in that year. In 1937 he was given the certificate of merit of the Society of Natives of the District of Columbia as Washington's outstanding citizen in point of service to the community. His many cultural and civic interests and his business acumen especially fit him for the position of regent of the Smithsonian Institution.

QUITCLAIM TO LAND NEAR MUIRKIRK, MD.

The bill (H. R. 2511) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim 2 acres of land near Muirkirk, Md., to the Queens Chapel Methodist Church was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO BOISE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

The bill (S. 1505) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Boise, Idaho, to the Boise Chamber of Commerce was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, this bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to restore to the Boise Chamber of Commerce the title to certain land which in 1939 was made available for use by the Department of Agriculture. The land was not used, however. It was donated by the local chamber of commerce, which now asks for restoration of the land to it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have one or two questions, and I ask these questions because the Committee on Armed Services is confronted with a similar problem in regard to the disposal of certain Federal land. We are trying to work out a uniform policy with regard to the handling of such land and its disposition by the Federal Government. I think there should be a uniform policy because, in my opinion, it is bad practice to have such land disposed of by means of individual bills, resulting in a great disparity of practices.

As I understand, this land belongs to the Federal Government, and is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. DWORSHAK. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. What is the value of the land?

Mr. DWORSHAK. The value is questionable, but it cost the Federal Government nothing. In 1939, the Federal Government wanted the use of land adjoining a local Department of Agriculture reservation; and the chamber of commerce made available, through donation, this tract of land. It has never been used. It never was purchased by the Federal Government. It was simply donated by the chamber of commerce.

The Department of Agriculture says it has no use for the land. So it does not fall within the category to which the Senator from Oregon has referred.

Mr. MORSE. I simply wished to make that clear, so that our action in this matter will not be regarded as a precedent which would stand against others.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I have stated the situation.

Mr. MORSE. I would not want our action in this matter to be regarded as a precedent affecting cases in which it is proposed that the Federal Government give away land for which the people of the United States have paid money, and in which they have made an investment.

Mr. DWORSHAK. It could not be considered as such a precedent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry. In the report on the bill, I notice that suggestion is made by the Department that lines 8 and 9 be stricken out. They read as follows:

Upon payment of a purchase price equal to the price paid by the United States in acquiring such lands.

Inasmuch as the United States paid no price, that language might be ambiguous.

If satisfactory to the Senator, I would suggest that those two lines be stricken from the bill, and that the bill as thus amended be passed, so that there will be no ambiguity.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I have no objection to that amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I move that the bill be amended by striking out lines 8 and 9, which I have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1505) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the Boise Chamber of Commerce, Boise, Idaho, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to lots 1 to 9, inclusive, in block 2 of Riverside Park addition to Boise City, Ada County, Idaho.

ORGANIZATION OF THE NAVY DEPARTMENT

The bill (S. 1252) making certain changes in the organization of the Navy Department and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for an explanation?

Mr. McCARRAN. Certainly.

Mr. GURNEY. Briefly, the bill gives legislative background and authority for the organization the Navy has found to be the best for the operation of the Navy. It does not create any additional positions or ranks, it does not cost additional money, it merely gives legislative authority to set up the Navy now in the way it should have been set up prior to the passage of the unification bill.

The Committee on Armed Services, not only on the recommendation of Admiral Nimitz, but of all other Navy Department representatives, approved the bill unanimously. I therefore hope the Senator from Nevada will withhold his objection, and allow the bill to be passed at this time.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The only thing the bill does is to put into law what is already being done.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Without any cost.

Mr. McCARRAN. What does the Senator mean by saying what is already being done?

Mr. MAYBANK. It is being done at this time.

Mr. GEORGE. It is impossible for one to see why there should be a law, if it does not add anything in the way of officers or anything else, and they are now doing what could be done. It looks as if the Navy can do some things without a law.

Mr. GURNEY. They presently have, under law, the pre-war organization of the Navy. They are operating now under Executive order. An Executive order now authorizes their present organizational set-up. The war powers of the President will soon expire, and the Navy will revert back to their pre-war organization if this bill is not passed.

Mr. McCARRAN. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

Mr. GURNEY subsequently said: Mr. President, on the call the Senator from Nevada made objection to Senate bill 1252, when it was reached. Since then, he has read the report and has informed me that he withdraws his objection. I ask unanimous consent to return to a consideration of that bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1252), making certain changes in the organization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That as used in this act—

(a) The term "Naval Establishment" means naval sea, air, and ground forces—vessels of war, aircraft, auxiliary craft, and auxiliary activities, and the personnel who man them—and the naval agencies necessary to support and maintain the naval forces and to administer the Navy as a whole; the Marine Corps, and in time of war or when the President shall so direct, the Coast Guard are parts of the Naval Establishment.

(b) The term "Navy Department" means the executive part of the establishment at the seat of the Government.

(c) The term "operating forces" means the several fleets, sea-going forces, sea-frontier forces, district forces, and such of the shore establishment of the Navy and other forces and activities as may be assigned to the operating forces by the President or the Secretary of the Navy.

CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

SEC. 2. (a) There shall be a Chief of Naval Operations who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of not more than 4 years, from among the officers of the active list of the line of the Navy who are eligible for the exercise of command at sea and not below the grade of rear admiral. The Chief of Naval Operations shall take rank above all other officers of the naval service.

(b) It shall be his duty to command the operating forces and be responsible to the Secretary of the Navy for their use, including, but not limited to, their training, readiness, and preparation for war, and plans therefor. In addition, the Chief of Naval Operations shall be the principal naval adviser to the President and to the Secretary of the Navy on the conduct of war, and the principal naval adviser and naval executive to the Secretary of the Navy on the conduct of the activities of the Naval Establishment.

VICE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

SEC. 3. A flag officer of the active list of the line of the Navy, eligible for the exercise of command at sea, shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to be Vice Chief of Naval Operations. The Vice Chief of Naval Operations shall exercise such executive authority with respect to the Naval Establishment as the Chief of Naval Operations may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy, delegate to him, and in case of the death, resignation, absence, or sickness of the Chief of Naval Operations shall, until otherwise directed by the President as provided by section 179 of the Revised Statutes, perform the duties of the Chief of Naval Operations until his successor is appointed or such absence or sickness shall cease. All orders issued by the Vice Chief of Naval Operations in performing duties assigned him shall be considered as emanating from the Chief of Naval Operations and shal have full force and effect as such.

DEPUTY CHIEFS OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

SEC. 4. There shall be in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations not more than six Deputy Chiefs of Naval Operations, who shall be detailed by the Secretary of the Navy from among the flag officers of the active list of the line of the Navy. The Deputy Chiefs of Naval Operations shall be charged, under the direction of the Chief of Naval Operations, with the execution of the functions of their respective divisions. All orders issued by the Deputy Chiefs of Naval Operations in performing duties assigned them shall be considered as emanating from the Chief of Naval Operations and shall have full force and effect as such.

ASSISTANT CHIEFS OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

SEC. 5. Officers of the active list of the line of the Navy or Marine Corps, in numbers considered by the Chief of Naval Operations to be appropriate and necessary, shall, with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy, be detailed as Assistant Chiefs of Naval Operations. The Assistant Chiefs of Naval Operations shall perform such duties as the Chief of Naval Operations may prescribe.

NAVAL INSPECTOR GENERAL

SEC. 6. In addition to the divisions herein created, there shall be in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations the Office of the Naval Inspector General. The Naval Inspector General shall be a flag officer of the active list of the line of the Navy. The Naval Inspector General shall be charged, when directed, with the inquiry into, and the report upon, any matter which affects the discipline or military efficiency of the Naval Establishment. He shall make such inspections, investigations, and reports as may be directed by the Secretary of the Navy or by the Chief of Naval Operations. He shall propose, periodically, programs of inspections to the Chief of Naval Operations and he shall recommend additional inspections and investigations as may from time to time appear appropriate.

CHIEF OF NAVAL MATERIAL

SEC. 7. (a) There is hereby established in the Navy Department an Office of Naval Material which shall be headed by a Chief of Naval Material, who shall be detailed by the Secretary of the Navy from among officers on the active list of the Navy not below the rank or grade of rear admiral. He shall be entitled to receive the pay, allowances, and the privileges of retirement as are now or may hereafter be prescribed by law for chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department.

(b) The Chief of Naval Material shall, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, effectuate policies of procurement, contracting, and production of material throughout the Naval Establishment, and plans therefor, and his orders shall be considered as emanating from the Secretary of the Navy and as having full force and effect as such.

VICE CHIEF OF NAVAL MATERIAL

SEC. 8. An officer on the active list of the Navy may be detailed as Vice Chief of Naval Material, and such officer, in case of the death, resignation, absence, or sickness of the Chief of Naval Material, shall, until otherwise directed by the President as provided by section 179 of the Revised Statutes, perform the duties of such Chief until his successor is appointed or such absence or sickness shall cease.

COORDINATING DUTIES

SEC. 9. In order that military operations and the support thereof shall be effectively coordinated, the Chief of Naval Operations, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, shall determine the personnel and material requirements of the operating forces, including the order in which ships, aircraft, surface craft, weapons, and facilities are to be constructed, maintained, altered, repaired, and overhauled, and shall coordinate and direct the efforts of the bureaus and offices of the Navy Department as may be necessary to effectuate availability and distribution of the personnel and material required where and when they are needed. The Chief of Naval Material, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, shall determine the procurement and production policies and methods to be followed by the Naval Establishment in meeting the material requirements of the operating forces, and shall coordinate and direct the efforts of the bureaus and offices of the Navy Department in this respect.

SEC. 10. During the temporary absence of the Secretary of the Navy, the Under Secretary of the Navy, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air; the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Vice Chief of Naval Operations in that order, shall be next in succession to act as the Secretary of the Navy.

SEC. 11. The Vice Chief of Naval Operations, the Deputy Chiefs of Naval Operations, the Naval Inspector General, and the Chief of Naval Material may have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances provided under any provision of law heretofore or hereafter enacted which authorizes such grade, rank, pay, and allowances for officers so designated by the President to perform any special or unusual duty or duty of great importance and responsibility.

SEC. 12. (a) That portion of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1915, which reads as follows: "There shall be a Chief of Naval Operations, who shall be an officer on the active list of the Navy appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among the officers of the line of the Navy not below the grade of captain for a period of four years, who shall, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, be charged with the operations of the fleet, and with the preparation and readiness of plans for its use in war" (38 Stat. 929), is hereby repealed.

(b) Section 2 of the act entitled "An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1940 (54 Stat. 494), is hereby repealed.

(c) That portion of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1915, which reads as follows: "During the temporary absence of the Secretary and the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Naval Operations shall be next in succession to act as Secretary of the Navy" (38 Stat. 929), as amended by the act entitled "An act to amend the provision contained in the act approved March 3, 1915, providing that the Chief of Naval Operations, during the temporary absence of the Secretary and Assistant Secretary of the Navy, shall be next in succession to act as Secretary of the Navy," approved February 11, 1927 (44 Stat. 1086), is hereby repealed.

(d) The act entitled "An act to provide for an Assistant to the Chief of Naval Operations," approved May 27, 1930 (46 Stat. 430), is hereby repealed.

VISIT OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE SENATE

The President of the United States entered the Senate Chamber and took the seat formerly occupied by him, Senators rising and applauding.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There are few situations in the life of the Senate for which there is not some available precedent. The present happens to be one, however, for which no precedent is known.

The Chair is very happy to welcome the former Senator from Missouri to his old seat in the Senate. The Chair cannot make the welcome permanent to that seat because of his regard for the other Senators from Missouri, who prefer to retain their seats. But to the President of the United States, on behalf of Senators on both sides of the aisle, the Chair

expresses the warmest welcome to the old environment where he served with such honor, integrity, and dignity. To the President of the United States, on behalf of the Senate, I extend our best wishes for health, happiness, and success. [Great applause.]

The ex-Senator from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES. Mr. President, you are very kind to me. In fact, I have never received a more cordial reception anywhere—and I have been many places since I left this great body.

I think I am also breaking a precedent. The Senate never invites anyone to speak in the Senate but Senators, and you are exceedingly kind to me to give me an opportunity to reply to the gracious words you have just uttered.

I sometimes get homesick for this seat. I spent as a Member of the Senate what I think of as the best 10 years of my life. I made friendships and had associations which I can never forget.

Once in a while I take pleasure, on invitation, in coming to the Senate and having lunch with a few of the Senators. I saw a great many Senators today with whom I was closely associated. They dared me to come into the Senate and take my old seat, and see what would happen. I am very happy I did so. I thank you very much. [Great applause.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I rise to express for myself and for Senators on my side of the Senate Chamber, and I believe, for the entire Senate, our thanks for the gracious greeting extended a few moments ago to the President of the United States by the President pro tempore of the Senate, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

I recall that when Woodrow Wilson came before a joint session of the Congress in 1913 to deliver in person his message to the Congress for the first time since the days of Thomas Jefferson, he said there ought not to be any island of isolation occupied by the executive branch of the Government or the legislative branch of the Government, which must operate in a cooperative spirit under the Constitution of the United States. The President of the United States served here for 10 years. I am sure he meant it when he said that the best 10 years of his life were spent in this Chamber.

The President pro tempore in welcoming him back to his old seat, which is now occupied by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], expressed the sentiments of the Members of this body without regard to politics. The Senator from Maine a moment ago stepped across the aisle and said to me that it was a happy interlude in the serious routine of the Senate Chamber. I join in the expression that it was a happy interlude for the President of the United States and for the Senate of the United States.

I merely wanted to take this opportunity to express to the President pro tempore our united thanks for the gracious way in which he received a former Senator of this body who has been honored to be the President of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thanks the Senator from Kentucky.

AMENDMENT OF ARMED FORCES LEAVE ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3501) to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to offer some amendments to the bill. The amendments have the approval of the War Department, and they have one purpose only, namely, to prevent a great injustice being done Reserve officers and reserve enlisted personnel in the matter of the computation of terminal-leave pay. All of us know the magnificent contribution made by our Reserves to the winning of the last war. We could never have made the great effort we did make in that war had it not been for the Reserves—officers, and the enlisted personnel.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. I know there is no better friend of the Reserves, none more indefatiguable in his efforts in their behalf, than the distinguished Senator from South Carolina who is in charge of the bill and I take pleasure in yielding to him.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I appreciate very much what the distinguished Senator from Alabama has said. The bill not only affects the Reserve officers, but the Reserve enlisted men as well.

Mr. HILL. It affects all the Reserve components, and I desire to offer the amendments which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The first amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 18, it is proposed to strike out "excluding" and insert "and."

Mr. WHERRY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. On what calendar number are we now working?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Order of business 587, House bill 3501.

Mr. WHERRY. I reserve the right to object until I have an explanation, to see whether or not a certain matter has been corrected in the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that the amendments to be offered by the Senator from Alabama have the approval of all the departments of the Government concerned, the budget, the War Department, and the Navy Department, and I think it is the intention of the Senator from Alabama to explain the amendments.

Mr. HILL. Briefly, Mr. President, referring now to a letter from the head of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, in its present form the pending bill will result in great discrimination against more than a hundred thousand patriotic Reserve officers and a large number of Enlisted Reserve personnel who have remained on active duty at the request of the War Department, by curtailing the monetary benefits to which they are entitled on terminal leave, and also by causing them to lose active-duty credit for the same period.

Mr. WHERRY. I make the point of order that the Senate is not in order, and I should like to hear what the distinguished Senator has to say about the amendments he is about to offer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. HILL. The bill in its present form will result in great discrimination against more than 100,000 patriotic Reserve officers, and a large number of Enlisted Reserve personnel, who have remained on active duty at the request of the War Department. This discrimination would result in curtailing the monetary benefits to which these Reserve officers and Reserve enlisted personnel are entitled to receive on terminal leave, and also cause them to lose active-duty credit for the same period.

As we know, Mr. President, the rank of a Reserve officer or member of the Enlisted Reserve is determined in part by his active-duty service. The benefits which the amendment would accord to Reserve officers and Reserve enlisted men in the Army today on active duty have already accrued. These benefits are already being enjoyed, or have been enjoyed, by some 800,000 officers and the Reserve enlisted personnel who have been previously separated from the service. The amendments merely let these Reserve officers and enlisted men compute their terminal-leave pay and compute their active service on the same basis on which Regular officers and enlisted men are allowed to make the computations, and on the same basis the Reserves previously discharged from the Army were allowed to make their computations.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Do Regular officers who remain on duty receive terminal pay?

Mr. HILL. They do not, until they finally leave the service.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is what I mean.

Mr. HILL. No; they do not, now.

Mr. CONNALLY. The bill, though, would entitle the Reserve officers to receive the same terminal pay?

Mr. HILL. It would let the men now in the service have that pay which those who have gone before them have enjoyed.

Mr. CONNALLY. In other words, those who have left the service received terminal-leave pay?

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is not allowed to those who remain on duty?

Mr. HILL. It will not be allowed to the Reserves now on active duty unless the amendments are adopted.

Mr. MAYBANK. It only affects the minority—those who remain, because the War Department asked them to remain. That is all it does.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope there is some reason other than that the War Department requested it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Certainly there is.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think it is just and fair, and I am for it; but I do not want

the RECORD to show that I am voting for it merely because the War Department requested it.

Mr. MAYBANK. No; I did not suggest that. I know the Senator from Texas too well for that. I merely meant it had the approval of the War Department.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the amendments of the Senator from Alabama have not yet been read. I do not object to hearing the amendments read, but I should like to reserve the right to object after hearing them read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the amendments.

The CHIEF CLERK. After the word "discharge" on page 3, line 19, it is proposed to insert "including for enlisted persons the allowances as provided for such enlisted persons in subsection (a) of this section; and on page 5, after line 16, to strike out section 3.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Alabama if his amendments eliminate all discrimination. I have a memorandum here from the National Guard Association complaining about discrimination shown in the bill. Does the amendment cure what I think is the objection of the National Guard and the Reserve Officers?

Mr. HILL. I can assure the Senator that the amendments would cure all the discriminations to which our attention has been called.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to say that so far as the bill is concerned, when it was before the Armed Services Committee, I received the same letters as those received by the Senator from Nebraska. I think the amendments eliminate all the discriminations against enlisted men, reserve officers, and the National Guard. It was for that reason that I agreed to accept the amendments of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that the very purpose of the amendments is to remove the discriminations to which he refers.

Mr. WHERRY. This bill was not handled in cooperation with the reserve components of the United States Army, contrary to the provisions of section 1?

Mr. MAYBANK. The reserve components of the Army came to me and to other Senators on the Armed Services Committee. It was not so handled originally; that is correct. But since then it has been. I may say that General Evans, who is in charge here, stated to me in person that he was sorry he did not know that the bill was being considered at the time, and that that was the reason he did not contact the committee.

Mr. HILL. The amendments would remove the discriminations.

Mr. WHERRY. With that assurance, Mr. President, I withdraw any objection.

Mr. MAYBANK. I assure the Senator from Nebraska that that is the fact.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, one more question: What cost will the bill entail, in the event it is passed? Is there an estimate?

Mr. HILL. Can the Senator from South Carolina furnish an estimate?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, in keeping with the laws, and the handling of these matters today, it will represent a considerable saving, over a period of years.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate that.

Mr. MAYBANK. It will not cost anything, but it will save in the future, on the terminal leave pay.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Alabama.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

REPAIR AND REHABILITATION OF CERTAIN IRRIGATION WORKS

The bill (S. 1639) authorizing the repair and rehabilitation of irrigation works damaged by flood and the prevention of flood damage in Fort Sumner irrigation district was announced as next in order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, this is a temporary measure, designed to protect against a possible flood which might arise before permanent legislation can be enacted. All the bill does is to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to aid and assist the local Fort Sumner irrigation district in preventing flood damage, and to permit it to expend for that purpose not more than $60,000; but it is provided that before any expenditure is made, the district itself shall enter into contract for the repayment of any sums that might be so expended.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, it appears to me from the description of the bill set forth on the calendar that it is for the prevention of flood damage to an irrigation district. As I understand it, an irrigation district is an area of land. The prevention of flood damage would come ordinarily under a bill containing provisions for general flood control. It strikes me as rather unusual that a special bill would be offered dealing with the subject of flood control and flood prevention, entirely outside the usual legislative course.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if I may interrupt the Senator, I will say, if the Senator wants to object to the bill, let him go ahead and do so.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I will say to the Senator from New Mexico that all I am asking is an explanation. I ask that the bill go over temporarily.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over temporarily.

Mr. HATCH subsequently said: Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator wish to ask a question concerning a bill on the calendar?

Mr. HATCH. I do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, while the Senator from West Virgina is on the floor, I should like to return to Calendar 588, Senate bill 1639, to which objection was made a while ago by the Senator from West Virginia. I misunderstood the Senator from West Virginia at that time, and I think he also misunderstood the purpose of the bill. We have discussed the matter since then. I think the Senator understands it, and is now willing to withdraw his objection.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I may say that I raised the objection because the description of the bill contained in the calendar used the words "the prevention of flood damage." I find, in discussion with the Senator from New Mexico, and after further consideration of the bill, that it simply authorizes the expenditure of a sum not exceeding $60,000 from any fund previously appropriated for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation. It is therefore a reclamation project and not a flood-control project, and I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico has asked unanimous consent that the Senate revert to Senate bill 1639, Calendar 588. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1639) authorizing the repair and rehabilitation of irrigation works damaged by flood and the prevention of flood damage in Fort Sumner irrigation district, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of aiding and assisting the Fort Sumner irrigation district in New Mexico to protect its diversion dam and the existing works of said irrigation district from flood damage, in the event the Secretary of the Interior determines that flood damage is or appears to be imminent, he, the Secretary of the Interior, is hereby authorized to cooperate with such district and to perform such flood preventive work, repair and rehabilitation upon the diversion dam and the irrigation works of said irrigation district as may be necessary or proper: *Provided*, That, prior to the initiation of such work under this authorization, a repayment contract in pursuance of the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws has been executed with said district.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be expended not to exceed $60,000 from any funds previously appropriated for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation for use in said prevention work, the rehabilitation, reconstruction, and repair of the existing works of such irrigation district, in accordance with the relief program hereinbefore authorized.

SEC. 3. Nothing hereinbefore contained shall be construed as a determination of or in any

way to prejudice any rights involving the use of the waters of the Pecos River, or any part thereof.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

RESOLUTION AND BILL PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 150) to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 116 was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 966) to amend section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. At the request of the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], I object to the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

EXTENSION OF MISSING PERSONS ACT TO CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE MILITARY FORCES OF THE PHILIPPINES

The bill (H. R. 3191) to amend Public Law 301, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved February 18, 1946, so as to extend the benefits of the Missing Persons Act, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, to certain members of the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, during the war about 86,000 members of the Philippine Army fought with our forces. Money was appropriated to take care of those who were missing and have still remained casualties. In other words, they have not been found among the missing persons. An obligation was recognized by the United States Government, and actually some 2,500 accounts were settled under the authority of the Missing Persons Act.

In February 1946 a bill was passed which took away certain United States veterans' benefits from former members of the Philippine Army. Unhappily and inadvertently missing persons were included. Money to pay the obligations under the Missing Persons Act to these Filipinos was appropriated not quite 2 years ago. The Army would like to continue with the payment of these absolute obligations of the United States. It cannot do so because of the law passed in 1946. The money is on hand in the War Department for the purpose. The committee approved the bill unanimously and recommends its passage.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3191) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANNUITIES FOR CERTAIN INVESTIGATORY PERSONNEL OF THE BUREAU OF NARCOTICS

The bill (S. 1089) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide annuities for investigatory personnel of the Bureau of Narcotics who have rendered at least 20 years of service was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. During the present session of Congress Senate bill 715 was passed, but we failed to include it in the Bureau of Narcotics. That bureau should have been included in the bill. It was one agency which was left out of the bill previously passed, which should have been included.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) Any agent, agent in charge, field supervisor, district supervisor, assistant to the Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner or Commissioner of the Bureau of Narcotics of the Department of the Treasury, who is not less than 50 years of age and has rendered 20 years or more of service in one or more of the positions enumerated, may, on his own application and with the consent of the Secretary of the Treasury, retire from the service. Any such person shall upon retirement be entitled to an immediate annuity equal to 2 percent of his average basic salary for the 5 years next preceding the date of his retirement, multiplied by the number of years of such service, not exceeding 30 years."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I desire to object to Senate bill 1089.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator refer to the bill which was just passed?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the vote by which the Senate bill 1089 was passed will be reconsidered, and the bill will go over.

INVESTIGATION OF IMMIGRATION SYSTEM

The resolution (S. Res. 137) to make an investigation of the immigration system was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky temporarily reserve his objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. I reserve my objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to say in behalf of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who is not able to be present at the moment, that he asked that the bill be temporarily passed over even though Senators who objected should withdraw their objection.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I had a conversation with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and it is entirely agreeable, as I was going to state, that the resolution be passed over until after the conclusion of the call of the calendar, and that it then be called up for consideration.

I desire to say for the RECORD that the purpose of the resolution is to authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to set up a special staff for the investigation of the immigration question in all its phases. The necessity for the resolution can readily be understood when I call the Senate's attention to the fact that during the present session of the Congress 22 general bills dealing with the subject of immigration have been introduced. That does not include the numerous special bills dealing with specific cases. Among those 22 bills there are proposals to bar all immigration for a period of 5 years. There are two proposals of that nature. There are proposals to bar persons under certain circumstances such as while there is unemployment in this country to the extent of 1,000,000 persons. On the other side there are bills to lift the immigration restrictions as to certain aliens. Then there is the subject of displaced persons, which was first brought before the committee, as I recall, on July 2 of this month. So I say, Mr. President, that unless the resolution is adopted we will be very much handicapped in gaining information about the various bills dealing with the all-important subject of immigration in its different phases.

It has been stated by some individuals who have completely misunderstood the purpose of the resolution that Senate Resolution 137 is a delaying measure or would delay the consideration of proposals involving displaced persons. Nothing could be further from the truth. Nothing could be more misleading to the people than such an assertion. Such an assertion has never been made, so far as I know, by any Member of the Senate, but I know that an organization which operates throughout the country has told the people that Senate Resolution 137 would delay such action. That representation is misleading. I know that such misleading information has been spread broadcast by reason of the fact that there have come to the Members of the Senate telegrams stating that Senate Resolution 137 would delay consideration of the subject of displaced persons. I have received two or three such telegrams asking me not to favor the resolution. Any doubt existing in the minds of the people of the country that the resolution would cause delay should be removed. There have been open hearings held in the House of Representatives, which are now going on, upon a bill generally termed "the Stratton bill," which deals with the subject of displaced persons. The record of that hearing is still open. The subcommittee itself has not reported on the subject to the full committee.

The members of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary have gained some

knowledge of the subject and have done the best they could with the staff at their command, but it is absolutely essential that to set up the special staff provided for by the resolution, so it can make inquiries during the interim between this session and the next session of Congress, or we will find ourselves in the very same situation we are in today.

I understand that there are proposals to make some changes and to submit some amendments to the resolution. It is proposed that the subject of displaced persons be taken up first, which is entirely satisfactory to me. A provision has been written into the resolution that a report must be made by March 1. It has been suggested to me by the Senator from Michigan that the date be changed to January 10 respecting displaced persons. That is entirely agreeable to me and I have so stated: The amendments in question will be offered.

I make the statement at this time to call the attention of the Senate to the imperative need of the adoption of the resolution, if we are going to be advised upon the subject of immigration when the Congress reconvenes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Would this resolution give the Senate Judiciary Committee any power which is not already conferred on it by the Reorganization Act?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Absolutely none. It gives no additional power whatsoever, but it permits the establishment of a staff to carry on the work and expedite it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement with reference to this situation, to explain why I am impelled to join in asking that the resolution go over.

As the Chair knows, and as the majority leader and others know, I reveal no confidence when I say that a week ago last Monday the President of the United States called together a conference of Members of both sides of the Senate and House on the question of displaced persons. We know that in Europe there are approximately 1,000,000 people who are designated as displaced persons. Most of them are still in concentration camps, not under the same circumstances which existed at the time of the occupation of the Hitler concentration camps, but they have been compelled to leave their homes and their countries.

Many of the countries of Europe have accepted a certain number of displaced persons. I think Belgium has accepted 100,000. I believe Great Britain has accepted 200,000. France probably 100,000, and other countries a certain number.

The President asked Congress to enact legislation permitting the admission of 400,000 displaced persons, over a period of years, to be charged in some respects to unused quotas from the various countries involved. I reveal no confidence—because the press has carried the statement—when I say that those present at the conference at the White House advised the President that there was no possibility of securing enactment at this session of the Congress of the recommendation which he made.

The suggestion was made by Members of the other body that a small joint committee, with a modest sum of money to pay their actual expenses, be created to visit Europe, to visit the camps, and visit the displaced persons in order to find out, in the first place, what their condition is, and in the second place, the type of people we might bring into this country if 400,000 were to be allowed to come in over a period of from 3 to 4 years. I believe that it would be better in the immediate future, to show our own good faith, to set up a small joint committee authorized—and even instructed, if necessary—to visit the camps in Europe, visit the environment of the displaced persons, in order that they might report to the Congress and to the American people, first, whether we should admit them, and, in the second place, the type of people we would get if we were to admit them.

I have conferred with Members of the House, and I think there is a fair prospect that before we adjourn such a joint committee may be established, whose only duty it would be to investigate the environment of the displaced persons, as well as the persons themselves, and determine the desirability of permitting a certain number to come in, the committee to report at the next session of the Congress.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does not the Senator know that a resolution similar to the one now on the calendar is pending in the House and is before the Committee on Rules of that body?

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator for that information. I did not know that. However, let me say in that connection that the resolution which we are now considering and the one in the House require an investigation of the entire immigration system, which goes far beyond the question of displaced persons. It goes beyond the emergency created by the situation with which we have been asked to deal.

I have no objection to an investigation, at the leisure of any committee, of the entire immigration situation and system. But the problem of displaced persons is an immediate, urgent problem. I believe that a joint committee of the two Houses ought to be created to deal with that subject and investigate and report its recommendations at the earliest possible date in the next session.

For that reason I dislike to have that problem tangled up with a general investigation of the entire immigration system, which may require a long time and may require the Senate and the House to deal not simply with an emergency, but with a long-time program of immigration.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I may say to the able Senator that he can remove from his mind any doubt on that subject. The resolution which is pending will be amended so that the first subject touched upon will be the subject of displaced persons. A report is required to be made not later than the 10th day of January next. So there is no question of delay on that score.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is an improvement; but I will say to the Senator from West Virginia that I believe this investigation ought to be made by a joint committee of the two Houses. I believe that on that committee there ought to be Members aside from the members of the judiciary committee, in order that there might be a cosmopolitan viewpoint of the entire problem, not because a committee has jurisdiction of immigration per se, but because it is a human problem. I believe that members of other committees ought to be included on such an investigating committee. I do not intend any reflection on the Judiciary Committee; but we must all pass upon this problem. We must approach it from the standpoint of a broad national, as well as humanitarian, problem; and I think it would be more satisfactory if the two Houses could form a small joint committee and give them a modest sum of money so that they could go in person to Europe. I believe that other Members of the Senate and House ought to be included, besides members of the committee dealing with the subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

SALE OF TIMBER WITHIN TONGASS NATIONAL FOREST

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 205) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell timber within the Tongass National Forest was announced as next in order.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let the joint resolution go over.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this is not the Senate joint resolution to which the Senator from New Mexico previously objected. It was my understanding that the Senator from New Mexico was in agreement with the House joint resolution.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I understand what is going on. This is House Joint Resolution 205, Calendar 596. That is the one I object to. It is a House joint resolution. I am not ready to have that measure considered at this particular time, until I am fully satisfied that it is the measure which is to be accepted, and that there will be no substitution for it. If the Senator can obtain unanimous consent to accept the House joint resolution, and can give assurances that Senate Joint Resolution 118, Calendar No. 445, will not be considered or substituted for it, I will withdraw my objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As I understand, Calendar No. 596, House Joint Resolution 205, which is before the Senate, is the House measure relating to the Tongass National Forest.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate the Senator's attitude. I thought he was in favor of the House version.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am in favor of the House version, but I do not want to take a chance, after giving my consent to the consideration of the joint resolution, that the Senate joint resolution will be substituted for it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know that any attempt will be made to substitute the Senate measure.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am taking no chances.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in order that there may be no misunderstanding, let me say that House Joint Resolution 205, Calendar No. 596, is identical with the measure which was introduced in the Senate and which was given prolonged consideration by the Senate Committee on Public Lands.

Upon the recommendation of the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], who is chairman of the subcommittee on Indian Affairs, and upon the recommendation of numerous members of the Committee on Public Lands, several amendments were added to the Senate joint resolution. The joint resolution as amended, was reported favorably, and it is now upon the calendar. To pass House Joint Resolution 205 as it came to the Senate from the House would mean to reject all the amendments which were inserted in the Senate measure by the Senate Committee on Public Lands. Therefore it would be a repudiation of the action of the Senate Committee on Public Lands.

In order that the Senate may know the issue with which we are dealing, let me say that section 1 of both the House joint resolution and the Senate joint resolution define the phrase "possessory rights." That means the possessory rights of the aborigines of Alaska, or, in other words, the Indians of Alaska. As defined by law now upon the statute books, it means possessory rights to land and to timber.

Section 2 of the joint resolution——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me finish my statement in order that it may be perfectly plain. Section 2 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to sell timber on the unpatented, unappropriated lands of Alaska, notwithstanding these possessory rights.

Another provision authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to sell these lands, notwithstanding the possessory rights.

In other words, the House joint resolution and the joint resolution which the Senate first considered, provided that although the Congress of the United States, by law and by custom, had recognized certain possessory rights to timber and to land in the aboriginal inhabitants of Alaska, nevertheless officials of the Government were to be authorized to sell such lands and the timber without regard to those possessory rights. The Senate Committee on Public Lands was unwilling to deal fast and loose with the possessory rights of the Indians in Alaska thus recognized by law, and it inserted certain amendments designed to protect those possessory rights and to make certain that the lands upon which the Indians are living, on which they have their villages and their homes, should not be sold out from under them, but that the timber lands which they have possessed and which they may be using shall not be disposed of contrary to law. I believe, Mr. President, that the Senate Committee on Public Lands was absolutely right. We cannot afford idly to toss away the possessory rights of the Indians in Alaska which have been recognized by custom and by law.

I now yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I thought I had the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was under that assumption myself.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And I thought I had objected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Washington has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. My time has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator from Washington may speak in my time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Wyoming. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The only question I was going to ask was whether or not the Senate measure and the House measure used the same definition of possessory rights.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They use exactly the same definition of possessory rights, but the amendments which have been inserted in the Senate joint resolution, and certain other amendments which I should like to propose, will, I think clear away the difficulty and will protect the Indians.

Mr. LUCAS. One other question: Is the Senate measure as reported by the committee now on the calendar?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is. It was passed over a little earlier in the day until we should come to the House joint resolution.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I want to make a brief statement. I appreciate that there has been a great deal of conflict regarding the possessory rights of the Indians as between the House and the Senate joint resolutions. I do not quite agree with the version of the House measure as stated by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. As a matter of fact, there is not a Member of this body from the Pacific Northwest, including my colleague from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the able Delegate from Alaska, who wants to pass any legislation which might interfere with the equitable possessory rights of the Indians. All of us, from the Secretary of the Interior to the Senators from Washington, the Washington delegation, the Delegate from Alaska, and many of the Indians, are in the position of trying to allow the sale of certain portions of the timber in the great forests in order that Alaska may have a substantial industry. That industry is the pulp and paper industry. Much of the timber is ripe. Many of the possessory rights of the Indians will never be exercised by them. The Indians will find some work in this industry when it is established. We all want to protect them.

I appreciate that there is a great deal of difference in the legal interpretation of the term "possessory rights." What we should like to do—and I am sure that my colleague will agree, as will the Delegate from Alaska, who is in the Chamber—is to sell the timber, protect the Indians, and give Alaska a needed pulp and paper industry. That is all it amounts to.

Many of the Indian lawyers downtown who have made their living for years off the Indians, want to justify their existence by telling their clients that they were always protecting their rights, and that they are objecting to this measure. But everyone concerned, in the Pacific Northwest and Alaska, including the Indians themselves, want to get this industry established. I hope we can come to some agreement. I appreciate the Senator's position with regard to the matter. My only hope was that we might pass the House joint resolution and accomplish something. That is the only position of those who represent the Territory of Alaska.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has again expired.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, for the moment I still object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1366) to facilitate procurement of supplies and services by the War and Navy Departments and for other purposes was anounced as next in order.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be temporarily passed over, until an interested Senator can return to the Chamber.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over temporarily.

INVESTIGATION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AND POLICE ADMINISTRATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The resolution (S. Res. 144) authorizing an investigation of law enforcement and police administration in the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, if the Senator will withhold his objection I should like to make a brief statement of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, Senate resolution 144 proposes an appropriation of $25,000 to make an investigation of law enforcement and police administration in the District of Columbia. It is before the Senate by unanimous vote of the Committee on the District of Columbia and by the unanimous vote of the Committee on Rules and Administration which considered it from the point of view of the appropriation which is proposed. The Committee on the District of Columbia is charged with a grave responsibility in connection with the administration of the departments of government in the District of Columbia. It has been a long time since there

has been an adequate investigation looking into the affairs of the police administration of the District of Columbia. Recently all of us have seen sufficient evidence in the public press to arouse our suspicion that conditions might be better than they are. Certainly the Committee on the District of Columbia cannot hope to fufill its duty unless it be given the means with which to fulfill it. We do not know what such an investigation might uncover. We rather hope that it will reintroduce a spirit of confidence into the people of the District of Columbia that the administration of their Police Department is adequate and efficient.

However, I do not think the Senate can hope to place the responsibility for law enforcement upon its own committee, and fail to give the committee the means which it unanimously feels it should have at this time in order to serve adequately the people of the District of Columbia.

After all, Mr. President, the District of Columbia is the National Capital; and not only are we responsible for the life and well being of those who live here, but by our very presence we are inviting thousands upon thousands of our fellow citizens to come to this city every day, and they have a vital interest in the quality of law enforcement which is had here. It seems to me that it is our duty to make this investigation.

I wish to say to the Senators who have objected that those who have proposed this investigation have done so with no preconceived ideas. We are aiming at nothing except to reestablish confidence in the people of the District of Columbia and in the people of the United States, for that matter, that proper law enforcement will be provided in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Rhode Island has expired.

Objection having been made, the resolution is passed over.

INVESTIGATION OF THE SOCIAL-SECURITY PROGRAM

The resolution (S. Res. 141) authorizing an investigation of the social-security program was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance, or any duly constituted subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of old-age and survivors insurance and all other aspects of the existing social-security program, particularly in respect to coverage, benefits, and taxes related thereto, for the purpose of assisting the Senate in dealing with legislation relating to social security hereafter originating in the House of Representatives under the requirement of the Constitution.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the Committee on Finance, or any duly constituted subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

SEC. 3. The committee is authorized to designate and appoint an Advisory Council to study, assist, consult with, and advise the Committee on Finance or its duly authorized subcommittee, and the committee is further authorized to designate and appoint such other officers, experts, or assistants as it deems necessary for the performance of the investigation directed by this resolution.

SEC. 4. The compensation of persons assisting the committee in the investigation directed by this resolution shall be fixed by the committee at such amounts or rates as the committee deems appropriate, but such amounts or rates shall not exceed the amounts or rates payable for comparable duties prescribed by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

SEC. 5. The committee or its duly constituted subcommittee is authorized, with the approval of the Committee on Rules and Administration, to request the use of the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government in the performance of its duties under this resolution.

SEC. 6. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $25,000 shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the chairman.

INVESTIGATION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—FURTHER INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

The resolution (S. Res. 145) further increasing the limit of expenditures in the investigation of the national defense program was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 71, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, agreed to March 1, 1941, and resolutions supplemental thereto and amendatory thereof, including Senate Resolution 46, Eightieth Congress, first session, agreed to January 22, 1947 (relating to the investigation of the national defense program), is hereby increased by $25,000.

INVESTIGATION OF OPERATIONS OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION AND SUBSIDIARIES

The resolution (S. Res. 132) to investigate the operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete inquiry into the operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date but not later than March 1, 1948.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3342) to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of the interchanges of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Let the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

FURTHER INCREASE IN EXPENDITURES OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

The resolution (S. Res. 142) increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on Rules and Administration for the employment of temporary assistant and making certain expenditures was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I, also, would like to have an explanation.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, the resolution was unanimously reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration. The resolution calls for an increase of $95,000 in the amount of the funds previously authorized, for the purpose of conducting investigations in connection with the election cases in the States of Maryland and West Virginia.

The budget in connection with the resolution provides for a staff of 12 investigators, 4 clerks and stenographers and 1 chief counsel. The resolution was unanimously approved by the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures authorized under Senate Resolution 54, Eightieth Congress, agreed to January 17, 1947 (authorizing the expenditure of funds and the employment of asistants by the Committee on Rules and Administration in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by subsection (o) (1) (D) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate), as increased by Senate Resolution 114, Eightieth Congress, agreed to May 21, 1947, is hereby further increased by $95,000.

SALE OF PAXON FIELD, FLA.—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1582) relating to the sale of Paxon Field, Duval County, Fla., was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation, please?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, Paxon Field is a small, supplemental airfield located outside the city of Jacksonville, Fla. One hundred seventy-three acres of land are involved—not nearly sufficient for permanent use as an airfield.

Before the war, the land belonged to the Farm Credit Administration. During the war the Navy Department was operating a large station close to Jacksonville, Fla., and it asked that a supplemental field be located on this land, for use in connection with the Jacksonville field.

This measure has been reported unanimously by the committee. It permits the sale of the land in question to the school authorities of Duval County, Fla., at 50 percent of the appraised value, for the purpose of enabling the location on

the land of a kindergarten, elementary school, junior high school, junior college, and an administration building, together with recreational facilities, all of which will be erected by the school authorities.

I understand that this matter has received the approval of all Government authorities having anything to do with it, and I know that this area is badly needed for development for school purposes in the area of Jacksonville, where additional school facilities are badly needed at the present time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have no doubt that there is need for it; but we have pending before various committees, bills providing for the disposition of other property, some of which is also sought by schools. For instance, I may refer to the Fort Douglas area, at Salt Lake City, a portion of which is very much needed for the University of Utah. But the difficulty is that we are disposing of Federal property by a catch-as-catch-can procedure, and we have not reached any conclusion as to what the uniform policy should be. Of course there is danger that without such a uniform policy, these measures will be resolved into "pork barrel" propositions.

In these cases we are dealing with property belonging to all the people of the United States; and I think it is incumbent upon the Congress of the United States to reach some agreement as to a uniform policy applicable to all cases of the disposition of Federal property, so that one group will not get one parcel of land at 5 cents on the dollar, and another group at 50 percent of the appraised value.

Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to make a further brief statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator may do so. He has already made one statement.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to say that, as stated in the committee report, the disposal of this property at 50 percent of its appraised value would permit the United States Government to receive all the money which it paid originally for the purchase of the property.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection has been heard, and the bill is passed over.

The clerk will state the next measure on the calendar.

INCOME TAXES OF PRISONERS OF WAR AND INTERNEES

The bill (H. R. 3444) to amend section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADDITIONAL RELIEF FOR NONPROCESSING SLAUGHTERERS

The bill (S. 1429) to amend Public Law 88, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved June 23, 1945, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, this bill deals with the subsidies paid to nonprocessing slaughterers of cattle. The Office of Economic Stabilization established certain rules and regulations for the interpretation of the Subsidy Act, providing that slaughterers would be paid a subsidy under certain conditions if they bought the cattle at the farm, slaughtered it for meat, and sold the meat nonprocessed. A number of slaughterers felt that the interpretation was discriminatory and not proper.

At a later date the Office of Economic Stabilization was convinced that the objecting slaughterers were right, and thereupon amended the rules so as to bring these certain slaughterers under the program, which was designed to increase the production of beef. But they failed to make their action retroactive.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean it brought them under Federal inspection or State inspection?

Mr. McCARTHY. No; it brought them under the rules which allow them to collect a subsidy. In other words, the slaughterer paid the farmers so much for a cow, and if he wanted to sell it at the ceiling placed upon meat, it was decided he had to have a subsidy or he would be losing money, and consequently would quit buying from the farmer.

Mr. WHERRY. What does the bill accomplish?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Office of Economic Stabilization finally acceded to the demands of the slaughterers and changed the rules to what they considered to be fair rules. However, in doing that they did not make the rules retroactive to the date of the original rule.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. Due to the fact that the members of the Committee on Armed Services must go to a conference considering the unification bill, and there are bills on the calendar reported from that committee, if there is no one here to explain the bills they may be temporarily passed over so that they may be explained later in the afternoon.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I shall be glad to tell him that our committee went rather fully into this matter. In just two instances, one in California and one in Florida, has question arisen over the beef subsidy, growing out of the question whether or not the slaughterhouse had slaughtered for others or slaughtered its own cattle.

The testimony before us was to the effect that there was a technicality, and a different ruling adopted subsequently, under which the two slaughterhouses referred to, one in California and one in Florida, would have qualified for the subsidy, but they had been in business a few months prior to the change in the ruling, and that eliminated them. Our committee was unanimous in the feeling that justice dictated that two slaughterhouses which had made their full contribution to the war effort, and had given to the war effort their entire output, should be treated on a par with the other slaughterhouses.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Is this one of the cases where there would have to be specific legislation so that the door would not be open thereafter for some administrative officer to determine there were 9, 12, or 2,000 who could come within the classification for reasons different from those which exist in the two cases?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. We went into that, and have been assured that, so far as anybody knew, so far as any claim has been presented, there are only two cases. It is my recollection we amended the Pepper bill to include the California case. I will ask the Senator from Wisconsin if that was not what we did.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the Senator has accurately stated the situation.

Mr. CORDON. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I hope the Senator will let the bill go over. If he will prepare an amendment which at least will put a time limit upon the life of the act, if the bill should be enacted, so that it will expire by virtue of its own terms, I shall have no objection, but I believe an amendment to that effect should be placed in the bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. It relates only to the two specific cases. I think it would be difficult to get general legislation through affecting the action, because it was not an act, but a bureau regulation. That is the difference.

Mr. CORDON. If the Senator will yield, my suggestion is that the pending bill be amended by adding to it a provision that claims must be filed within a specified time, so that when that time has elapsed no other claims can be brought forward, and the legislation can be terminated.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. So far as I am concerned, that would be satisfactory, but the proponent of the bill can speak for himself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. CORDON. I ask that the bill go over temporarily.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that I did not have an opportunity to explain the bill fully to the Senator from Nebraska, I should like to have 3 minutes of my own time to do that.

Mr. WHERRY. In order to get the distinguished Senator out of his difficulty, as to his time having expired, I should like to ask the Senator a question in my own time, that is, if objection has not been made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin why it is that the Committee on Banking and Currency are handling two claims which it seems to me should have gone to the Committee on the Judiciary; if this is a claim on what basis a payment is to be made retroactively to two slaughtering houses which would not apply to any other slaughtering houses.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me first say to the Senator from Nebraska that the bill does not involve any Wisconsin slaughterhouse.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that.

Mr. McCARTHY. It relates to one in California and one in Florida. We felt that these two slaughterhouses were being penalized on account of bad administration. If I may have 2 minutes——

Mr. WHERRY. It is O. K. It is on my time.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Office of Economic Stabilization issued a rule to the effect that if a slaughterhouse was operated during all of 1942 slaughtering animals which they themselves owned they would come under the rule. There was objection to that on the part of certain slaughterhouses which would not come under the rule.

Later, after going over this matter for about 16 months, the administration decided that apparently their original rule was not a wise one. They then said that even if a man were not slaughtering his own cattle during the particular base period, if he were slaughtering cattle for someone else but selling on his own, he would come under the rule and that instead of taking 1942 as a base period they would take from January 1, 1941, to the date of the enactment of the act as the base period.

In adopting the rule they did not make it retroactive to those men who had been buying cattle from the farmers and who had been paying the same price as the subsidized buyers had paid, and who, of course, were suffering from the necessity of either quitting buying cattle or taking a loss. They took the loss, assuming that the matter would later be rectified. As I have said, all we are doing by the bill is putting those men in the position they would have occupied had there been efficient administration.

Mr. WHERRY. Were they small packers, licensed under the State or under the Federal Government, or did they have inspection by State or Federal Government, and did they comply with all the provisions of the law?

Mr. McCARTHY. Oh, yes. It was determined later that they came under the law and should have been paid. There was no question of inspection, and no question at all that they should have come under the regulation originally.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill has been temporarily passed over. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4075) to regulate commerce among the several States, with the Territories and possessions of the United States, and with foreign countries, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 48) to provide for the demonstration of public library service in areas without such service or with inadequate library facilities, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

ON-FARM TRAINING

The bill (H. R. 2181) relating to institutional on-farm training for veterans, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Over.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, may I inquire who lodged the objection to the bill?

Mr. TAFT. I objected to any extension of on-the-job training. The bill will be brought up on motion.

Mr. GEORGE. This does not provide for on-the-job training, but on-farm training. The principal purpose is to prevent it being regarded as on-the-job training.

Mr. TAFT. The bill will be brought up after the call of the calendar, together with other on-the-job training bills.

Mr. GEORGE. I give notice that I shall move to take it up, because it is very much needed in my State and in all the Southeastern States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill goes over under objection, and the clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

ALLOWANCE FOR REHABILITATION IN SERVICE-CONNECTED CASES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1236) to increase the minimum allowance payable for rehabilitation in service-connected cases, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and to insert:

That effective on the first day of the second calendar month subsequent to the date of enactment of this act, paragraph 3 of part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"3. While pursuing training prescribed herein, and for 2 months after his employability is determined, each veteran pursuing a course under this part, shall be paid a subsistence allowance of $65 per month, if without a dependent or dependents, or $90 per month, if he has a dependent or dependents: *Except*, That each veteran pursuing a full-time institutional course under this part shall be paid a subsistence allowance of $75 per month, if without a dependent or dependents, or $105 per month, if he has one dependent, or $120 per month, if he has more than one dependent: *Provided*, That the minimum payment of such allowance, plus any pension or other benefit, shall be, for a person without a dependent, $115 per month; and for a person with a dependent, $125, plus the following amounts for additional dependents: (1) $15 for one child and $7 additional for each additional child, and (2) $15 for a dependent parent: *Provided further*, That the rates set out herein shall not be subject to the increases authorized by Public Law No. 312, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved May 27, 1944: *And provided further*, That when the course of vocational rehabilitation furnished to any person as herein provided consists of training on the job by an employer, such employer shall be required to submit monthly to the Administrator a statement in writing showing any wage, compensation, or other income paid by him to such person during the month, directly or indirectly, and based upon such written statements, the Administrator is authorized to reduce the subsistence allowance of such person to an amount considered equitable and just."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this bill increases the allowances for disabled veterans who are taking vocational training, increase being approximately 15 percent. The cost of the bill will be approximately $30,000,000 a year. However, I think there is a general desire to grant the increase, particularly as it goes to disabled veterans. I merely wish to say that the bill is a part of the general program which I presented a few days ago, and I think the bill should be passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ORGANIC ACT

The bill (S. 1026) to amend section 101 (b) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I ask for a brief explanation of the bill by the Senator from Kansas?

Mr CAPPER. Mr. President, the reasons for the legislation proposed are found in a letter written by the Honorable Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, to the President pro tempore of the Senate, which letter will be found in the report. In that letter, the Secretary of Agriculture states:

Pursuant to the 1935 statute, the national poultry improvement plan was made effective on July 1, 1935, under an appropriation for the Bureau of Animal Industry of $40,000. Participation in the plan by hatcheries and other flock owners is on a voluntary basis, as is cooperation by the State authorities in formulation and administration of the plan. The plan consists of two phases: One for the improvement of the breeds of poultry, and the other for control and eradication of pullorum disease. The plan has now been adopted by 47 of the 48 States, and 3,952 hatcheries with an egg-hatching capacity in excess of 250,000,000 eggs—or about 50 percent of the total egg-hatching capacity in the United States—participate in the program. There are approximately 92,000 hatching-egg flock owners and 345 specialized trap nest pedigree breeders participating in the advanced breed improvement phase of the program. The effectiveness of the disease-control phase of the plan is demonstrated by the fact that the incidence of pullorum disease has decreased from an average of 3.7 percent in the 4,000,000 birds officially tested during the first year of the operation of the national poultry improvement plan to less than 1.84 percent in the 25,000,000 birds officially tested in 1945–46.

Poultry officials in Hawaii and a hatcheryman in the District of Columbia have now

indicated their desire to participate in the national poultry improvement plan, and it is anticipated that the poultry industry and authorities in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Alaska would also like to take part in the cooperative program for the improvement of poultry, poultry products, and hatcheries. This is not possible, however, under the authority presently vested in the Secretary of Agriculture by the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944, since that statute provides for cooperation only with State authorities.

Accordingly, there is transmitted herewith for reference to the appropriate committee of the Senate a proposed amendment to the organic act of 1944 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the authorities of the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, as well as the several States, in the administration of regulations for the improvement of poultry, poultry products, and hatcheries.

The Bureau of the Budget advises this Department that it has no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if I understand the Senator from Kansas and the letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, this is a bill to amend the organic act. That means the act setting up the Department of Agriculture. The purpose, as I understand, is that the Secretary of Agriculture shall cooperate with all the States and Territories in the improvement of the breed of chickens and in efforts to increase the production of eggs. It is some sort of plan by which it is desired that the Department of Agriculture cooperate with Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, in order to obtain increased production of eggs, and to improve the breed of poultry. Is that correct?

Mr. CAPPER. I think the recommendation is sound and practical. In his letter, addressed to the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Secretary of Agriculture gives it his unqualified approval.

Mr. BARKLEY. I could not object to any bill designed to improve the breed of poultry and to increase the production of eggs in this country or in the Territories. I thank the Senator from Kansas for his explanation of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1026) to amend section 101 (b) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 101 (b) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 734) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate with State authorities and with the authorities of the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, in the administration of regulations for the improvement of poultry, poultry products, and hatcheries."

REDUCTION-IN-FORCE REGULATIONS

The bill (S. 1188) to provide that consideration shall be given, in establishing retention preference regulations, to employees permanently injured in line of duty, and to permit exemption of such employees from the regulations, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio requests an explanation. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, the bill as it came from the committee is a new bill, resulting from hearings on two bills before the committee, one introduced by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, the other by the junior Senator from West Virginia. The purpose of the bill is better stated by reading the amended title:

A bill to authorize the Civil Service Commission, in the promulgation of reduction-in-force regulations, to give consideration to employees who have incurred injuries resulting in occupational handicaps.

The Commission is not now able to do so. It seems in the public interest, as well as in justice, it should be permitted to do this, for by so doing it may relieve a community by enabling it to remove from the relief rolls people still capable of useful work, who can obtain payment therefor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The bill would appear to give the Civil Service Commission complete power to tell every office the order in which employees must be dismissed, if they are to be dismissed. That is to say, employees must be released in accordance with Civil Service Commission regulations, giving effect to tenure of employment, military preference, and so forth. The Civil Service Commission, it seems to me, may minimize the allowance for military preference. Does not the bill, in effect, nullify the advantages given to veterans by the various laws which have been enacted?

Mr. FLANDERS. My understanding is that it makes no difference in the effect of existing regulations, on tenure of employment, military preference, or military service, length of service, and efficiency ratings. It simply adds, "nondisabling occupational handicap resulting from injury or disease." The Civil Service Commission is given the right to determine its own ratings in decisions as to retention of employees.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Will this bill have any effect on the situation which I outlined last week whereby civil-service employees with excellent ratings are being discharged while those with inferior ratings are retained?

Mr. FLANDERS. I suppose, Mr. President, that theoretically that might happen. The alternative is to give some percentage rating for various degrees of disability. I am confident that the Civil Service Commission would not use this measure for such purpose. The number of employees involved in this matter is very small. I do not remember the figures, but a very small number indeed is involved.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. I understand that the present law does not spell out the exact number of points which should be given for various preferences, the leeway which should be allowed with respect to service efficiency rating, and so forth, and we see no way of spelling it out in this legislation. Our only purpose was that in the case of those who are not entirely disabled but are injured and handicapped because of their Federal service as the result of which it is impossible for them to get employment elsewhere the handicap suffered by them shall be taken into consideration in the matter of retention or discharge of employees.

The Senator from Ohio mentioned that it might in effect interfere with some of the preference granted to employees. I do not believe so, because it is my understanding that the Commission has set up certain regulations, but that the law itself does not indicate how many points are to be given for each preference.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The committee report says—and this is what raised the question in my mind:

The committee does not believe that the enactment of S. 1188 would in any manner detract from the effects of any types of existing preferences such as veterans', veteran widows', wives of veterans', etc.

I do not quite see why the committee comes to that conclusion. Now a new law is proposed to be passed. Perhaps it would be the reenactment of an old law, but if the bill becomes law it supersedes laws which have heretofore been passed, and provides that employees "shall be released in accordance with Civil Service Commission regulations." It seems to me the bill gives unlimited power to the Civil Service Commission to make new regulations with respect to dismissal of employees.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, the wording of the bill was designed to follow completely the wording of the Veterans' Preference Act, with the single exception of inserting the new clause relating to nondisabling handicaps. So the bill appears to have any virtues and any faults which may inhere in the original act.

Mr. TAFT. I am only suggesting that when a bill is passed which reenacts an old statute, and also contains new rules, even the old rules become of greater significance in superseding Federal legislation which may have been passed since the passage of the old statutes.

Mr. LODGE. Would not the bill weaken or diminish somewhat the veterans' preferences?

Mr. FLANDERS. No. It simply allows the Civil Service Commission to consider nondisabling occupational handicaps in reduction of personnel, following, in importance, tenure of employment and military service.

Mr. LODGE. It puts the nonveteran on a par with the veteran if the nonveteran has been disabled?

Mr. FLANDERS. No.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time on the bill has expired.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1188) to provide that consideration shall be given, in establishing retention preference regulations, to employees permanently injured in line of duty, and to permit exemption of such employees from the regulations, which had been reported from the Committee on Civil Service with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to insert "so much of"; in line 4, after the numerals "1944" to strike out "is" and insert "as precedes the first proviso in such section is"; in line 5, after the word "amended" to strike out "by adding at the end thereof the following" and insert "to read as follows:"; on page 1, beginning in line 7, to strike out " 'In establishing regulations providing preference in retention of employees in case of a reduction in personnel, the Commission shall give due consideration to employees who have been permanently injured in line of duty and who are capable of performing the duties of their positions. The Commission is authorized to exempt such employees from the application, in whole or in part, of such regulations' "; and at the end of the bill to insert a new section 12, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of section 12 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 as precedes the first proviso in such section is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 12. In any reduction in personnel in any civilian service of any Federal agency, competing employees shall be released in accordance with Civil Service Commission regulations which shall give due effect to tenure of employment, military preference, nondisabling occupational handicap resulting from injury or disease caused by Federal civilian or military service, length of service, and efficiency ratings;."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Civil Service Commission, in the promulgation of reduction in force regulations, to give consideration to employees who have incurred injuries resulting in occupational handicaps."

ADDITIONAL RELIEF FOR CERTAIN NONPROCESSING SLAUGHTERERS

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate revert to Senate bill 1429, Calendar No. 607, which was passed over temporarily a moment ago. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] desires to offer an amendment to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1429), to amend Public Law 88, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved June 23, 1945.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I now ask that the companion bill, House bill 3738, be substituted for the Senate bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3738) to amend Public Law 88, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved June 23, 1945.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the House bill, to delete the period at the end of the bill and to add a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That claims for benefits hereunder must be filed within 6 months after enactment of this act."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read a third time and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 1429 will be indefinitely postponed.

SALE OF PAXON FIELD, DUVAL COUNTY, FLA.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate revert to Senate bill 1582, which was passed over a few moments ago, because I believe the objections heretofore made will be withdrawn. Since the bill was passed over I have discovered the following facts with reference to the situation. The Government paid for the property $18,000. The present appraised valuation is $40,000. The county would be obliged to pay $20,000, which would show a profit of $2,000 to the Federal Government on its investment. Under those circumstances, I hope the distinguished Senator from Oregon will not renew his objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida that the Senate revert to Senate bill 1580, Calendar No. 605?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement in regard to the matter of principle and policy involved in such cases. We have had pending before the Armed Services Committee for some weeks the full problem of the disposal of Federal property to various Government agencies, such as the Fort Wayne property at Detroit, the Fort Douglas property at Salt Lake City, and some 105 pieces of military property alone which will have to be disposed of in one way or another, and in conformance with some policy adopted by the Congress. We have taken the position in the Armed Services Committee that we do not think it is proper for us to sit there and in effect give away a single dollar of the Federal taxpayers' money and property without having some uniform policy on the basis of which we can act.

I have talked to the Senator from Florida and he gives me assurance that by acting favorably upon the bill the school authorities in this case will be giving back to the Federal Government the money the Federal Government has invested in the property. If the Federal Government is not losing any money on this proposal, then the problem I have raised is not applicable. But it does illustrate again, Mr. President, the importance of the Congress of the United States reaching some agreement and adopting some policy in regard to the disposal of Federal property. I do not see how we can sit here and in one case give away property for 5 cents on the dollar, and in another case 25 cents on the dollar, and in another case 75 cents on the dollar, because such a procedure will resolve itself, if we do not watch out, into a back-scratching proposition and a pure pork-barrel practice.

What I want, and what some of my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee want is the establishment of a definite policy. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are only some of the Senators, members of the Armed Services Committee, who have joined with me in this matter. I raised my objection before, because it was my understanding that we were making a gift of at least something to the school authorities of Florida, I withdraw my objection. If it is true, and the Senator from Florida assures me that it is true, that the Government is getting its money back, that we are not voting this afternoon to take out of the pockets of the American taxpayers some money or property and donating it to somebody in Florida, I care not how worthy the proposal may be.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1582) relating to the sale of Paxon Field, Duval County, Fla., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 or of any other law, the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to sell all that tract or parcel of land described as part of the northwest quarter and the north half southwest quarter section 8, township 2 south, range 26 east, Duval County, Florida, described as follows:

Beginning at an iron stake six hundred and seventy-two feet east of the northwest corner of section 8 and on the north line of said section; thence east one thousand three hundred and twenty-four and seven-tenths feet to an iron; thence south no degrees fifty minutes east three hundred and thirty feet to an iron; thence east six hundred and thirty feet to an iron, set in concrete on the west side of Melson Avenue; thence south no degrees fifty minutes east along west side of said avenue one thousand nine hundred and eighty-five and two-tenths feet to an iron; thence west six hundred and thirty feet to an iron; thence south no degrees fifty minutes east three hundred feet to an iron on the north line of Louisa Street; thence west one thousand three hundred and sixty-one and one-tenth feet to an iron; thence north two thousand six hundred and sixteen and two-tenths feet to place of beginning, containing one hun-

dred and nine and thirty-eight one-hundredths acres, more or less; also

Beginning at an iron, six hundred and seventy-two feet east and two thousand six hundred and seventy-six and two-tenths feet south of the northwest corner of section 8; thence east one thousand nine hundred and ninety-two and two-tenths feet to a concrete monument on the west side of Melson Avenue; thence south zero degrees fifty minutes east along the west side of said avenue one thousand three hundred feet to an iron; thence west one thousand four hundred and eleven and three-tenths feet to an iron; thence north fifty feet to an iron; thence west six hundred feet to an iron; thence north one thousand two hundred and fifty feet to place of beginning, containing fifty-nine and eight-tenths acres, more or less, and being the same land as shown as tracts 1 and 2 on plat recorded in plat book 13, page 82, public records of said county, and containing one hundred and sixty-nine and eighteen one-hundredths acres, more or less; also

Part of south half southeast quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter, section 8, township 2 south, range 26 east, Duval County, Florida, bounded and described as follows: Beginning at a stone monument at the northwest corner of section 8, township 2 south, range 26 east; thence along west line of said section 8, south one degree sixteen minutes east two thousand six hundred and forty-six and four-tenths feet to a point; thence east one thousand nine hundred and seventy-four and three-tenths feet to a point; thence north zero degrees fifty minutes west thirty feet to an iron stake in the north line of Louisa Street for a place of beginning of lands to be described; from said place of beginning run east along the north line of Louisa Street six hundred and thirty feet to an iron stake in the west line of Melson Avenue; thence along the west line of Melson Avenue north zero degrees fifty minutes west three hundred feet to an iron stake; thence west six hundred and thirty feet to an iron stake; thence south zero degrees fifty minutes east three hundred feet to place of beginning.

Recorded in deed book 700, at page 497, of the current public records of Duval County, Florida, containing one hundred and eighty acres of land, more or less, together with all buildings, structures, and improvements thereon (known as Paxon Field), in the manner and subject to the terms and conditions provided in the act entitled "An act to authorize the sale of Federal buildings," approved August 26, 1935 (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 40, sec. 345b).

VETERANS' HOSPITAL, CLARKSBURG, W. VA.

The bill (S. 1369) to authorize the Veterans' Administration to acquire certain land as a site for proposed Veterans' Administration facility at Clarksburg, W. Va., and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This bill is the same as House bill 3739, Calendar No. 616.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the Senate bill is the same as Calendar 616, House bill 3739, with the exception of two amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. After conference with the Member of the House who introduced the House bill, I have learned that he believes that his bill will go as far as would the amended Senate bill. Therefore I prefer that the House bill be considered, rather than the Senate bill, in order to keep it out of conference between the Senate and the House. The bill involves a Veterans' Administration facility. No cost to the Government is involved. I want the Veterans' Administration to get the larger site, if it can. Speed is of the essence, because the program involves the construction of a hospital.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator desire to have House bill 3739 amended?

Mr. KILGORE. No; it is my desire that the Senate consider House bill 3739 instead of Senate bill 1369, in order to expedite the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia asks that the House bill be substituted for the Senate bill? Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3739) to authorize the Veterans' Administration to acquire certain land as a site for the proposed Veterans' Administration facility at Clarksburg, W. Va., and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 1369 is indefinitely postponed.

G. R. BELOW

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 795) for the relief of G. R. Below, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of" to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to G. R. Below, of Seattle, Wash., the sum of $1,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries and loss of earning power sustained by him as a result of having been hit, while engaged in the pursuit of his occupation as a fisherman, by a bullet fired during target practice at the naval section base, Port Angeles, Wash., on May 16, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

JUAN LLONA

The bill (S. 192) for the relief of Juan Llona was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Juan Llona, of Boise, Idaho, shall be held and considered to have lawfully entered the United States for permanent residence on July 11, 1926, the year of his actual entry into the United States, upon payment by him of the visa fee of $10 and the head tax $8; and the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings which may have been commenced in the case of Juan Llona upon the ground of unlawful residence in the United States.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available Spanish immigration quota.

MR. AND MRS. HAROLD T. PROSSER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 970) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Harold T. Prosser, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$595."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Harold T. Prosser, of Charlestown, R. I., the sum of $595 in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for compensation for damage to their land resulting from a fire started by a flare dropped by a United States Navy airplane: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF GEORGE WESLEY HOBB, A MINOR

The bill (H. R. 2607) for the relief of the legal guardian of George Wesley Hobb, a minor, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT F. PARKS

The bill (S. 1181) for the relief of Robert F. Parks was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert F. Parks, of Stanley, Va., the sum of $1,800, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement for personal funds deposited with the finance officer, Visayan-Mindanao force, on June 16, 1942, at Malaybalay, Bukidnon, Philippine Islands, for use in purchasing food necessary to supplement the ration provided to prisoners of war by the Japanese Army: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

CHARLES W. TAYLOR, JR.

The bill (H. R. 821) for the relief of Charles W. Taylor, Jr., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INDUCEMENTS TO PHYSICIANS, ETC., TO ENTER A MILITARY CAREER

The bill (S. 1661) to provide additional inducements to physicians, surgeons, and dentists to make a career of the United States military, naval, and public-health services, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have prepared a brief explanation. Let me say first that the bill comes to the Senate with the unanimous approval of the Armed Services Committee.

The armed services and the Public Health Service are currently experiencing great difficulty in securing and retaining an adequate number of physicians, surgeons, and dentists. This bill proposes to alleviate the shortage by offering as an inducement a salary increase of $100 per month to all active medical and dental officers of the Regular Establishments and to all non-Regulars who are now on duty on a volunteer status, or who voluntarily come on active duty during the 5-year period following the effective date of this section for a period of 1 year or longer. It also provides authority to appoint qualified dentists and doctors of medicine in the Army and Navy in grades up to that of colonel in the Army and captain in the Navy.

EXPLANATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The bill has two essential features. Title I provides that commissioned medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, and Public Health Service shall be given extra pay at a rate of $100 per month in addition to their base and longevity pay. There is a proviso that not more than $36,000 may be paid to any one officer under this authority. That is under the so-called 30-year plan. The increase applies to all grades uniformly, and affects all active Regular officers and all non-Regulars now on voluntary active duty, or who come on at least a year's voluntary active duty during the 5-year period following the enactment of this title. No differentiation is made between Regular, Reserve, or National Guard officers. The title becomes effective on the first day of the first calendar month following its enactment, and is permanent law with no wartime suspension clause.

Title II permits the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make original appointments to permanent commissioned grades not above that of colonel in the Medical and Dental Corps of the Army, and captain in the Medical and Dental Corps of the Navy. This authority is subject to existing limitations governing Army and Navy strength, so it does not involve any increase over totals otherwise established. The appointments may be made only from qualified dentists and doctors of medicine having such qualifications as the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe. The title is not made applicable to the Public Health Service, which already had adequate authority in this regard.

HISTORY OF THE BILL

This bill extracts the most urgent provisions of several similar bills which were referred to the committee for consideration.

Title I of the bill favorably reported by the House committee is retained unchanged excepting that the eligibility period is extended from 2 to 5 years. The committee substituted for title II of the House bill a completely different title. The House proposal to provide a 25-percent increase to physicians and surgeons who can qualify as specialists is a long-term project rather than an urgent procurement of medical officers, the committee recommend as title II the appointive authority outlined earlier in this discussion. The committee feel that the other measures recommended by the Departments are not urgent, and can be considered to better advantage at a later session. This matter is discussed in detail in the committee report.

I can assure you that the shortage of doctors and dentists in the armed services and the Public Health Service is acute. It is so serious that unless prompt action is taken to make the career of the uniformed doctor more attractive, 2 years from today will find us facing a shortage of over 50 percent in their ranks.

The cause of this shortage is due to the fact that private practice is far more attractive financially than is a career in the uniformed services. This unfavorable financial pattern is made still more adverse when it is considered that the medical student must not only pay more for his education, but since his education takes 5 years longer, he loses the income that the average college graduate is making during the same 5-year period. Actually, therefore, the $36,000 additional salary paid the medical officer under the provisions of this bill serves mainly to compensate him for the additional cost of his education and for the 5 years of lost earning power which resulted from his longer period of academic training.

The Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War and their principal advisers appeared before the committee and testified in detail. The problem is an urgent one and it is one which will persist for some years to come. This bill is considered the minimum action that can be safely taken at this time.

Let me say to the Senator from Ohio that the bill has been very carefully studied statistically. What it really does is to cover the expense of medical-college training for doctors. It is already covered in the case of graduates of Annapolis and West Point, so far as the line officers are concerned.

It is the unanimous opinion of the committee that there is great economy in making this approach, rather than in trying to establish a medical college for the training of Army and Navy doctors. The situation is an emergency and a serious one, because both the Army and Navy are losing their doctors at a very rapid rate. They are resigning because, of course, they can do much better in private practice at the present time.

We have studied the bill very carefully. I can assure the Senator from Ohio that if we look at it from the long-term viewpoint, it is an economical measure, and is one which will give to the Army and Navy the doctors which they think they need.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. How are these students to be selected? Are they to be selected in the same manner as students at Annapolis or West Point?

Mr. MORSE. The bill applies only to doctors who are accepted for enlistment.

Mr. WHERRY. How is the selection made?

Mr. MORSE. The Army or Navy selects them at the time of their enlistment.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the selection prorated over the country?

Mr. MORSE. Oh, no.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I have received a letter from the American Osteopathic Association which calls attention to the fact that last year Congress enacted Public Law No. 604, section 41 of which reads as follows:

SEC. 41. The President, in his discretion, is authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, graduates of reputable schools of osteopathy as commissioned medical officers in the Navy, in such numbers as the President should determine to be necessary to meet the needs of the naval service for officers trained and qualified in osteopathy.

Am I to understand that if this bill is enacted it will repeal that provision?

Mr. MORSE. I am very glad that the Senator from Montana has raised that point, because I intended to mention it and overlooked it.

In answer to his question, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I received this morning from the legal counsel of the American Osteopathic Association.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 22, 1947.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This morning the Surgeon General of the Navy, Admiral Clifford A. Swanson, informed me that he favors changing to "physicians" the words "doctor of medicine" in lines 8, 12, and 16, page 4 of S. 1661, Calendar No. 624, and that he will request such changes by the conferees unless previously effected.

Very truly yours,

L. L. GOURLEY,
Legal Counsel,
American Osteopathic Association.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am in no position to accept any such change, because I have charge of the bill on the floor. We went into this subject in great detail in the committee. Two of us, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] who is not present, and I, favored such a change,

but we were voted down, and went along with the bill in its final form. I think the committee is entitled to have placed in the RECORD at this point a statement of its position on the point raised by the Senator from Montana.

This is the position of the committee:

This bill is exclusively an emergency procurement measure. It can be justified on no other basis. It has therefore been limited exclusively to those classes of personnel who are in short supply. To make title II of this bill include any category of personnel not in serious short supply would not only be unjustified, but would seriously upset the overall procurement program of personnel in the armed services.

For that reason title II is carefully restricted to dentists and doctors of medicine.

That is the position of the committee. If the Senator from Montana desires to offer an amendment to carry out his suggestion, there is nothing I can do about it; but as the Senator in charge of the bill, I am obliged to support the position of the Senate committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask one more question. Are these trainees or students required to enlist before they obtain the benefits of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. This bill does not cover the trainees. In fact, it does not cover the V-12 trainees who have received great benefits from the Army and Navy in connection with their medical courses. The bill covers only the pay of doctors once they enter the Army or Navy.

Mr. WHERRY. After they have enlisted in the armed services they then obtain the benefits.

Mr. MORSE. Yes. It is an inducement to doctors to make a career in the armed services. The object is, first, to stop the many resignations which are now daily being received; and, second, to induce young doctors to enlist in the Army or Navy Medical Corps.

Mr. WHERRY. Are they to be farmed out to other schools to obtain this training? As I understand, they are not to receive their training at Annapolis or West Point. Are they to get it at other professional schools?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. For how many years will they receive $100 a month—as long as they remain in the service?

Mr. MORSE. As long as they stay in the service, if within the next 5 years they enlist in the Medical Corps.

Mr. CONNALLY. What will they do in that 5 years?

Mr. MORSE. The restriction in the bill as to the 5-year provision is that the inducement will end at the end of 5 years. The Army and Navy feel that if this measure is put into effect they will have all the doctors they need within less than 5 years.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me suggest that the Senator might well prepare at the next session to see all the other Army and Navy officers requesting an increase of $100 a month, using this as a precedent.

Mr. MORSE. The committee does not think so.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas has seen such things occur several times since he has been a Member of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. I understand the Senator's point of view; but we do have special pay inducements available to other branches of the services, and they have not become uniform. A good, sound argument can be made for not spreading or extending it to the other officers.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. Is there any provision for doctors remaining in the service for any length of time receiving special consideration?

Mr. MORSE. Only the provision which I have been discussing.

Mr. HAWKES. I understand that; but I thought possibly the Senator would think it wise to make provision so that members of the armed services will get the benefit of which the Senator is speaking.

Mr. MORSE. I understand the Senator's point of view, but the Army and Navy feel that if they can give this financial inducement they will not have to worry about having a sufficient number of doctors remain in the service. I think it would be a very bad policy to say to men in the armed services, "You come in as a doctor, and no matter what circumstances may develop, you will have to stay for 10 or 12 or 15 years." I do not think that would be a very good policy.

Mr. HAWKES. Does the Senator think it would be a bad policy if the Army and Navy had a call on their services for a few years longer than the period in which they are given special consideration?

Mr. MORSE. They become members of the Reserve. Furthermore, the point should not be overlooked that for every month of service they give the Army and Navy they are earning every cent the Army and Navy is paying them. In other words, it is the position of the Army and Navy that they are not receiving what their services are worth, and in order to give them what their services are worth, we ought to give them the extra $100 a month. I see no reason why we should attempt to place upon them an obligation for remaining in the service for any particular period of time.

Mr. HAWKES. I agree that they should be getting a quid pro quo.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the bill?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Do I correctly understand that the osteopathic profession was represented at the hearing, advanced objections to the bill in its present form, and, that the committee refused to accept their recommendations?

Mr. MORSE. Their point of view was made clear to the committee, but they did not appear as witnesses, because formal hearings were not held on the bill. The committee went into the documents it had available. It had plenty of information from the osteopaths. Their point of view was understood by the committee, and, as I said a few moments ago, a motion was made to accomplish what the osteopaths wanted, but it was not agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY. Does the Senator recognize that the bill in its present form would vitiate the act of Congress which was passed last year?

Mr. MORSE. No; I do not think it would vitiate it at all, if we take into account the conditions. After all, this is a piece of emergency legislation to cover a particular procurement requirement.

Mr. MURRAY. They take the position that that is the effect of it, and, as they expressed it, it is a slap in the face to their profession, if we proceed to enact this bill into law, ignoring the law which was enacted last year.

Mr. MORSE. I understand their position. I personally would vote for an amendment, and did vote for an amendment in the committee, but it was not agreed to.

I think that the real objective of the bill is too important to our armed services for us to jeopardize its passage at this time simply because of the objection raised by the Senator from Montana, unless he wishes to offer an amendment to the bill.

Mr. MURRAY. Does the Senator believe that the defect, if it be that, should be remedied at some time in the near future? Should we bring the matter up at the next session of Congress?

Mr. MORSE. I personally do, but, again, I am fighting for the committee bill at this time. The one thing we should not do, I may say to the Senator from Montana, is to go over the summer leaving the Army and the Navy medical services in the emergency in which they now find themselves. They must have doctors. They do not have a sufficient number of doctors on the job. I can recall only some of the statistics, but I think the record will show that these men are resigning on an average of 10 a day. We cannot train a sufficient number of men to permit that rate of resignation to continue. The measure was worked out after conference, and whatever objections there may be I do not think they should imperil the passage of the bill.

Mr. MURRAY. Would the Senator support an effort to have this corrected at the next session?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; as an individual Senator I will support it; but as the Senator in charge of the bill I must present the committee's point of view.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which was suggested.

Mr. BALDWIN. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Montana yield? He has only 5 minutes.

Mr. BALDWIN. May I make a statement in my own time, then?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Montana yield the floor?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield the floor, but I should like to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. I do not have it in typewritten form. It is along the lines explained by the Senator from Oregon a moment ago. It was suggested at the committee hearings. I shall prepare the amendment. I ask that the matter be passed over.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think that what the Senator wants to do is to amend the bill to change the words "medical doctor" to "physician."

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is that the amendment the Senator from Montana wishes to offer?

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I wish to urge the Senator not to press his amendment at this time. This is a very urgent bill. The thing which it provides for is greatly needed in both the Medical Corps of the Army and the Navy. We went over the matter very thoroughly in the committee. It was decided that we had to make some future provision for caring for the problem of additional doctors and attracting additional medical men into the Medical Corps of the Army and the Navy. The committee is keenly alive to the situation; but in the time allowed, it was not possible for the committee to deal completely and adequately with the whole subject. This bill was agreed to as a measure to meet the present emergency.

I am very fearful that if we get into a discussion of what is included in various terms we may lose the bill altogether. It is a matter which should be taken care of.

I assure the Senator that, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, that in the committee I shall urge consideration of his amendment with all the vehemence of which I am capable.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, cannot we expedite the matter by having the Senator in charge of the bill take the amendment to conference? I think that would be a proper way to handle it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to do that, but I do not think I can take it to conference, due to the very positive action which was taken on it by the committee.

So I do not think the Senator should ask me to take it to conference. I suggest that we pass the bill as it has been reported. Then, as the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] has suggested, in January we can go into the whole subject thoroughly, and can see at that time if we can work it out.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I accept the suggestion, with the understanding that the Senator will assist me in bringing up this matter in January.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The objection is withdrawn.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1661), to provide additional inducements to physicians, surgeons, and dentists to make a career of the United States military, naval, and public health services, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947."

TITLE I

PAY OF PHYSICIANS, SURGEONS, AND DENTISTS

SEC. 101. The Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 359), as amended, is hereby further amended by inserting immediately after section 1 thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 1A. (a) The term 'commissioned officers,' as used in this section, shall be interpreted to mean only (1) those commissioned officers of the Medical and Dental Corps of the Regular Army and Navy and commissioned medical and dental officers of the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service who are on active duty on the effective date of this section; (2) those officers who are hereafter commissioned in the Medical and Dental Corps of the Regular Army and Navy or as medical and dental officers of the Regular corps of the Public Health Service during the 5-year period immediately following the effective date of this section; (3) such officers, now or hereafter commissioned in the Medical and Dental Corps of the Officers' Reserve Corps, the Naval Reserve, the National Guard, the Army of the United States, or as medical and dental officers of the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service, who may, during the 5-year period immediately following the effective date of this section, volunteer and be accepted for extended active duty of 1 year or longer; (4) general officers appointed from the Medical and Dental Corps of the Regular Army, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard, or the Army of the United States who are on active duty on the effective date of this section; (5) general officers who may hereafter be appointed from those officers of the Medical and Dental Corps of the Regular Army, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard, or the Army of the United States who are included in (1), (2), or (3) above.

"(b) In addition to any pay, allowances, or emoluments that they are otherwise entitled to receive, commissioned officers as defined in subsection (a) of this section shall be entitled to pay at the rate of $100 per month for each month of active service following the date of enactment of this section: *Provided*, That such sum shall not be included in computing the amount of increase in pay authorized by any other provision of law or in computing retired pay: *Provided further*, That the total amount which may be paid to any one officer under the authority contained in this section shall not exceed $36,000: *And provided further*, That the commissioned officers described in subsection (a) (3) of this section shall receive the pay provided by this subsection only during periods of volunteer service."

SEC. 102. This title shall become effective on the first day of the first calendar month following its enactment, and the payments herein provided shall not accrue for any period prior thereto.

TITLE II

ORIGINAL APPOINTMENTS OF MEDICAL AND DENTAL OFFICERS

SEC. 201. Subject to any limitation of the commissioned strength of the Army and Navy prescribed by law the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is hereby authorized to make original appointments to permanent commissioned grades, with rank not above that of colonel in the Medical and Dental Corps of the Army, and not above that of captain in the Medical and Dental Corps of the Navy in such numbers as the needs of the services may require. Such appointments shall be made only from qualified civilian doctors of medicine and dentists who are citizens of the United States, and who shall have such other qualifications as the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe for their respective services. The doctors of medicine and dentists so appointed in the Navy shall be carried as additional numbers in rank, but shall not increase the authorized numbers of commissioned officers of the Medical and Dental Corps of the Regular Navy. The doctors of medicine and dentists so appointed in the Army shall be credited for purposes of promotion with the minimum number of years of service now or hereafter required for promotion of officers of the Medical and Dental Corps to the grade in which appointed.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are authorized to prescribe from time to time such regulations as may be necessary for the administration of this title within their respective departments.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have certain questions and answers printed at this point in the RECORD, in further explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the questions and answers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Question. Doesn't title II of this bill prevent osteopaths from being appointed as commissioned officers?

Answer. No. Title II in no way interferes with the normal procurement policy of bringing personnel in at the lowest grade. It simply permits "dentists and doctors of medicine" to be taken in at higher grades, without any prejudice to any other class or classes of personnel as now treated under existing routine procurement procedures.

Question. Why is a 5-year eligibility period written into this bill?

Answer. That is frankly a compromise. We cannot be sure that this program will be effective in procuring doctors and dentists. It may be that some different approach must be developed. The eligibility period has therefore been inserted so as to get the program under way immediately, because it's urgent. It can be resurveyed during the next 5 years, and a decision made whether to retain it or to abolish it. However, there are over 6,000 young doctors who were trained at Government expense and who are now serving with, or will soon be serving with, the armed services. This program is aimed at offering them an attractive enough career in the uniformed services to keep them in uniform permanently, and must be gotten under way without delay if it is to succeed.

Question. Does this bill propose to pay to those young doctors who were deferred during the war, and educated at Government expense, this $100 bonus during the 2-year period of obligatory service that is required of them?

Answer. No. This required period of service is not considered as being "voluntary" military service. As a consequence these young doctors could not qualify under this bill until after their 2-year period of obligatory service is completed.

Question. Does this bill apply to officers who are on duty for a limited period?

Answer. No. It will be noted that the bill applies only to those who are on duty on a voluntary status for a period of 1 year or longer.

Question. Does this extra pay to doctors apply to wartime as well as peacetime conditions?

Answer. Yes. Under present policies it has been customary to retain peacetime "extra pay" during wartime. As example, flying pay, jump pay, submarine pay. It would therefore have been obviously discrimina-

tory to depart from this policy in this particular instance.

Question. Why did this bill omit the 25-percent extra pay for certified specialists?

Answer. The committee felt that the specialty program contemplated by the uniformed services is not primarily a procurement measure.

Furthermore, it is a long-term program, and is recognized to have no immediate urgency.

This bill is intended to concentrate on providing procurement machinery which will alleviate the present acute shortage of physicians, surgeons, and dentists. Any long-term program aimed at improvement rather than procurement can be solved in a more intelligent and a more orderly manner at a later time, and for that reason items of that category have been omitted.

Question. We can't get doctors in the uniformed services because private practice is far more remunerative. Is it seriously thought that a bonus of $100 per month will attract many established doctors from civil life?

Answer. This extra pay may attract a few such individuals, but that is really incidental. The main purpose of this extra pay is to retain doctors who are now in the services, and to attract as many of the six to eight thousand ASTP (Army specialist training program) and V-12 graduates as possible. These young doctors are still with the Army and Navy, or will soon enter upon their 2-year service period. It is hoped that this program will attract them, not the established private practitioner.

Question. How much will this bill cost?

Answer. The cost of this bill is obviously dependent upon how successful it is in getting doctors and dentists into the armed services. Based upon maximum success as a procurement instrument, this bill would cost $15,740,800 annually. A detailed cost table appears on page 5 of the report.

CONVERSION OF CERTAIN NAVAL VESSELS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

The bill (S. 1215) to authorize conversion of certain naval vessels was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, at the present time the Navy desires to develop vessels of certain categories in accordance with the Navy's technological and other developments relative to naval warfare. Instead of proposing to build new vessels, the Navy seeks to convert certain old vessels for this purpose.

It would be cheaper for the Government to have that done, rather than to have new hulls and new vessels built. The Navy feels that it has authority to do this now under existing law, but in beginning a peacetime program of this sort it thinks it should obtain specific authorization from Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, does the bill call for an authorization or an appropriation?

Mr. HILL. It calls for an authorization. Of course, the Congress will subsequently have to appropriate the money.

Mr. WHERRY. What will the amount be?

Mr. HILL. It will not amount to anything in the coming fiscal year. In the next fiscal year it will amount to approximately $5,030,000. However, I wish to be fair to the Senator and state that that will not be the final cost. The cost will step up in following years.

Mr. WHERRY. Can the Senator give us the final cost?

Mr. HILL. The final, total cost, when all 16 vessels have been converted and when the job is finally done, will be approximately $55,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. That will be done over a period of how many years?

Mr. HILL. Over a period of 4 or 5 years.

Mr. WHERRY. How much would the appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 be?

Mr. HILL. For 1948, it would be $5,030,000.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator that there is no question that the Navy has the power at the present time to make the kind of conversions which it has in mind. However, in order to make sure, the Navy wishes to have this proposed legislation enacted.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that this bill is simply for the purpose of authorizing the conversion of certain naval vessels from one type to another, in order to take advantage of certain new instruments, developments, and gadgets that are not on these ships at the present time.

Mr. HILL. That is correct. In other words, instead of obtaining 16 new vessels, the Navy simply plans to modernize 16 old vessels in this way.

Mr. LUCAS. This bill will save the taxpayers millions and millions of dollars.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is this to be done for the benefit of our own Navy, or for the navy of some other nation?

Mr. HILL. We are doing this for the benefit of the Navy of the United States of America.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1215) to authorize conversion of certain naval vessels was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of improving the military characteristics of combatant and auxiliary vessels of the United States Navy, the President of the United States is hereby authorized to convert such vessels as he may consider best suited for the purposes of national defense without limitation on expenditures for any one vessel within the total sum appropriated for the purpose.

ADDITIONAL TIME FOR PAYMENT FOR PORT NEWARK ARMY BASE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

The bill (S. 1581) to provide additional time to the city of Newark, N. J., for paying certain installments on the purchase price of the Port Newark Army Base, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, this bill is just what it purports to be, as stated in the title. The best way to explain it in greater detail is to read some of the statements which appear in the report on the bill. From the report, I read the following:

Public Law 730 of the Seventy-fourth Congress authorized the Secretary of War to sell to the city of Newark, N. J., the right, title, and interest of the United States in the Port Newark Army base for the sum of $2,000,000, of which $100,000 should be paid in cash and the balance in annual installments, on or before August 1 of each succeeding year, of $100,000 a year for the first 5 years and $200,000 a year thereafter.

For the benefit of the Senator from Nebraska, I might shorten the statement by saying that in the contract the Army had with the city of Newark there was a proviso under which the Army could take back the property in case of necessity.

The report further states:

On April 10, 1942, in accordance with paragraph 9 of the contract, a national emergency having arisen, the United States took possession of the property and the annual payments were suspended during the war.

The United States Government notified the city of Newark that it was ready to return the property to the city on the 30th of June of this year.

Under the terms of the contract, an installment of $200,000 will become due on August 1, next.

By reason of the fact that the city of Newark has lost earnings from the property during the past 5 years, and by reason of the further fact that considerable repairs and alterations are necessary in and about the premises, the city has made request to the Secretary of War that it be permited to continue to make installment payments of $100,000 a year for 4 years more, thus extending the payment of the full purchase price from August 1, 1953, until August 1, 1955.

Under the bill, the city of Newark will be permitted to make installment payments of $100,000 a year for the next 4 years, which will complete the payment of $1,000,000, and thereafter the city will make installment payments at the rate of $200,000 a year.

The bill does not provide for any reduction in price, but simply for a slight postponement.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1581) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act entitled "An act to provide for the sale of the Port Newark Army Base to the city of Newark, N. J., and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1936, is amended by striking out "of which $100,000 shall be paid in cash and the balance in annual installments, on or before August 1 of each succeeding year, of $100,000 per year for the first 5 years and $200,000 per year thereafter" and inserting in lieu thereof "of which $100,000 shall be paid in cash and the balance in annual installments of $100,000 on or before August 1 of each of the first 9 years in which the city of Newark or its lessee has possession and of $200,000 on or before August 1 of each of the next 5 years in which the city of Newark or its lessee has possession."

SEC. 2. The Secretary of War is authorized to execute a supplement to the contract of sale entered into with the city of Newark, N. J., pursuant to the act of June 26, 1936, in order to make effective the amendments made to such act by this act.

LIMITATION ON CONSTRUCTION OF FAMILY QUARTERS FOR THE ARMY—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1116) to provide a limitation on the construction of family quarters for the Army, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, because I wish to have an explanation, and because, as I understand, the chairman of the committee has requested that the bill be passed over temporarily if no one is present to make an explanation of the bill at the time when it is called on the calendar, I suggest that the bill be temporarily passed over at this time.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, let me explain the bill in this way: Heretofore there has been a dollar limitation on the construction of quarters for married enlisted men and married officers. As a result of the fluctuations in prices, the quality of such quarters has gone up and down. I remember that after the First World War, in many cases it was necessary to erect what were practically shanties for married personnel to live in.

The purpose of this bill is to place the construction on a sound basis, by providing that, according to various categories, a certain number of cubic feet cannot be exceeded, instead of providing that in certain categories, a certain number of dollars cannot be exceeded.

That is the sum and substance of the bill. It permits the Army to proceed with the construction of such quarters in the face of rising costs, but still leaves with Congress the power to say in the appropriation bill how much money can be spent for this purpose.

Mr. TAFT. In other words, the bill removes the limitation in regard to the cost of quarters built for married officers and married personel; is that correct?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes. The bill also applies to quarters for married enlisted men. It provides that the dollar limitation shall be removed, and it provides a limitation in terms of cubic feet. It provides, as I recall, that not more than 1,082 cubic feet can be provided for married enlisted personnel, and it provides for a slightly larger amount for married warrant officers, and an increased amount for married commissioned officers.

Mr. TAFT. To judge from the title, one would suppose that the bill was providing a limitation, whereas it seems to me that actually it removes an existing limitation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1116) to provide a limitation on the construction of family quarters for the Army, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, at the end of the bill to insert the following:

SEC. 3. Family quarters for personnel of the Navy heretofore, herein, or hereafter authorized shall not be of greater net floor area per unit than the following:

For flag officers, 2,100 square feet.

For captains, 1,670 square feet.

For commanders and lieutenant commanders, 1,400 square feet.

For warrant officers, commissioned warrant officers, and commissioned officers through the rank of lieutenant, 1,250 square feet.

For enlisted personnel and noncommissioned officers, 1,080 square feet.

For the purposes of this act net floor area is defined as all floor space inside the exterior walls, excluding basement (or service space in lieu of basement), attic, garage, and porches.

The above area allowances shall supersede the limitations contained in the act of July 8, 1946 (Public Law 492, Seventy-ninth Congress), and may be increased by not to exceed 10 percent for all quarters outside continental United States and by not to exceed 10 percent for quarters of commanding officers of stations or installations over and above that to which his rank would entitle him. Quarters for civilians shall be limited to conform to the allowances for officers or men of comparable status according to responsibility, rating, and pay, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy to be appropriate.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums of money as may be necessary for the purposes of this act but not to exceed $67,300,000 for public works in continental United States, including $3,000,000 for the correction of deficiencies in existing or approved facilities, for emergency projects authorized by the Secretary of the Navy, and repairs incident to casualties thereto and $60,500,000 for public works outside continental United States, including $3,000,000 for the correction of deficiencies in existing or approved facilities, for emergency projects authorized by the Secretary of the Navy, and repairs incident to casualties thereto for the fiscal year 1948. Any such appropriation shall be available, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for expenses incident to construction, including administration, overhead, planning, and surveys, and shall be available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there to be no limitation on the amount of money that can be spent on such family quarters?

Mr. KILGORE. There are always limitations in the appropriation bills.

Mr. WHERRY. But is there to be no limitation in this bill?

Mr. KILGORE. There is a space limitation. Under present conditions, it is simply impossible to provide adequate quarters on the basis of the dollar limitation.

Mr. WHERRY. Under this bill, will there be no dollar limitation?

Mr. KILGORE. There will be none.

Mr. WHERRY. The amount expended will have to be watched in connection with the appropriation bills?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being heard, the bill is passed over.

PROCUREMENT OF SUPPLIES FOR PUBLIC INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

The bill (S. 1574) to authorize any agency of the United States Government to furnish or to procure and furnish materials, supplies, and equipment to public international organizations, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object, will not the distinguished Senator from Michigan please explain the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. With the indulgence of the Senate the present occupant of the chair will state that the bill provides merely for procurement service, made available for the United Nations and its branches at the New York headquarters. It is to be entirely without expense to the Government of the United States.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, in view of the statement just made, I wish to call attention to the provision in section 3 which provides for a period of 4 years from the effective date of the act that "any Government agency may, upon the request of any international organization and its agreement to pay the cost and expenses thereof by advancement of funds or reimbursement, furnish or may procure and furnish materials, supplies, and equipment to such international organization."

Am I to understand this applies only to the international organizations with headquarters in New York? Did I understand the Chair to say that?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The understanding of the Senator is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The bill proceeds further:

Provided, That, to the extent deemed necessary and appropriate by the Government agency concerned, such international organization indicate its actual needs for and intended use of such materials, supplies, and equipment.

That, of course, is a good provision from my viewpoint. It continues:

Provided further, That when reimbursement is made, it shall be credited either to the appropriation, fund, or account utilized in incurring the obligation, or to the appropriate appropriation, fund, or account which is current at the time of such reimbursement.

Whose appropriation fund or account is to be credited?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is not sure he follows the Senator's inquiry. The Chair would say that if, for instance, supplies and typewriters are sought from the War Department, the War Department would get the reimbursement.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I was about to say that it means the appropriations made for the various agencies would be reimbursed. It is really desirable that all the materials and supplies be secured through the Government's procurement service.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In other words, in summary, anything they get they pay for?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Oh, yes.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. And it is credited to the particular account which may properly be credited with it?

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "International Organizations Procurement Act of 1947."

SEC. 2. When used in this act—

(1) The term "Government agency" means any department, independent establishment, or other agency of the Government of the United States, or any corporation wholly owned by the Government of the United States;

(2) The term "international organization" means any public international organization entitled to enjoy, in whole or in part, the privileges, exemptions, and immunities authorized by and in accordance with the International Organization Immunities Act (59 Stat. 669).

SEC. 3. Until the expiration of 4 years from the date of enactment hereof, any Government agency may, upon the request of any international organization and its agreement to pay the cost and expenses thereof by advancement of funds or reimbursement, furnish or may procure and furnish materials, supplies, and equipment to such international organization: *Provided*, That, to the extent deemed necessary and appropriate by the Government agency concerned, such international organization indicate its actual needs for and intended use of such materials, supplies, and equipment: *Provided further*, That when reimbursement is made, it shall be credited either to the appropriation, fund, or account utilized in incurring the obligation, or to the appropriate appropriation, fund, or account which is current at the time of such reimbursement.

NATURALIZATION OF SANG HUN SHIM

The bill (S. 521) to permit the naturalization of Sang Hun Shim, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to have the bill explained.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, the bill provides, not for the naturalization of Sang Hun Shim, but to allow him to remain in this country. It is not a naturalization bill. This man came here when a very young child. He is not a Japanese, he is a Korean, and came here as a student. He went to my State, where he has lived, and he is vouched for by many of the most prominent citizens of Connecticut. He has behaved himself, is working in Connecticut, and he is a good individual.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and to insert:

That, for the purpose of the immigration laws, Sang Hun Shim, Weston, Conn., shall be held and considered to have been legally admitted to the United States for permanent residence on June 18, 1926, upon payment by him of the visa fee of $10 and the head tax of $8; and the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings which may have been commenced in the case of Sang Hun Shim upon the ground of unlawful residence in the United States.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available Japanese immigration quota.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INFORMATION AS TO ALIEN IMMIGRANTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1463) to amend section 12 of the Immigration Act of 1917, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That section 12 of the act entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to, and the residence of aliens in, the United States," approved February 5, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 882; U. S. C., title 8, sec. 148), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 12. That upon the arrival of any alien, United States citizen, or national, by water at any port within the United States on the North American Continent from a foreign port or port of Guam, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, or other insular possession of the United States, or at any port of the said insular possessions from any foreign port, from a port in the United States on the North American Continent, or from a port of another insular possession of the United States, it shall be the duty of the master or commanding officer, owners, or consignees of the steamer, sailing, or other vessel, having said alien, United States citizen, or national on board to deliver to the immigration officers at the port of arrival typewritten or printed lists or manifests made at the time and place of embarkation of such alien, United States citizen, or national on board such steamer or vessel, and such lists or manifests shall be in such form and contain such information as the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, with the approval of the Attorney General, shall by regulation prescribe as necessary for the identification of the persons transported and for the enforcement of the immigration laws. That it shall further be the duty of the master or commanding officer of every vessel taking passengers from any port of the United States on the North American Continent to a foreign port or a port of Guam, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, or other insular possession of the United States, or from any port of the said insular possessions to any foreign port, to a port of the United States on the North American Continent, or to a port of another insular possession of the United States to file with the immigration officials before departure a list of all aliens, United States citizens, or nationals, taken on board, said list to be in such form and to contain such information as the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, with the approval of the Attorney General, shall by regulation prescribe as necessary for the identification of the persons transported and for the enforcement of the immigration laws. No master or commanding officer of any such vessel shall be granted clearance papers for his vessel until he has deposited such list or lists with the immigration officials at the port of departure and made oath that they are full and complete as to the information required to be contained therein. Any neglect or omission to comply with the requirements of this section shall be punishable as provided in section 14 of this act: *Provided*, That in the case of vessels making regular trips to ports of the United States the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, with the approval of the Attorney General, may, when expedient, arrange for the delivery of lists of outgoing aliens, United States citizens, or nationals at a later date: *Provided further*, That it shall be the duty of immigration officials to record the following information regarding every resident alien and citizen or national leaving the United States by way of the Canadian or Mexican borders for permanent residence in a foreign country: Names, age, and sex; whether married or single; calling or occupation; whether able to read or write; nationality; country of birth; country of which citizen or subject; race; last permanent residence in the United States; intended future permanent residence; and time and port of last arrival in the United States; and if a United States citizen, or national, the facts on which claim to that status is based."

Mr. WHERRY. May we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, since this bill is to amend one of the sections of the Immigration Act of 1917, I wish to say in the very beginning that the bill in no way lessens or removes any of the bars to immigration. It grows out of the fact that the act which governs travel by ship was enacted in 1917, and rather inflexibly provided for documentation in connection with persons arriving in and leaving the United States. Air travel has been regulated by subsequent acts, and the Attorney General has recommended the amendment of the law. The purpose of the bill is to put air travel and ship travel on exactly the same basis and it has no other purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF REUBEN MALKIN

The bill (H. R. 341) for the relief of the estate of Reuben Malkin, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RUTH A. HAIRSTON

The bill (H. R. 2434) for the relief of Ruth A. Hairston, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELMER A. NORRIS

The bill (H. R. 2390) for the relief of Elmer A. Norris, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

A. E. McCARTNEY AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 629) for the relief of A. E. McCartney and others, which had been reported from the Committee on the

Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 3, after the figures "$3,688.69", to insert "the sum of $930.75 to Joseph Natali, Stanolind Oil & Gas Co., and Farmers' Land & Canal Co., and the sum of $1,004.06 to J. E. Fournier, Stanolind Oil & Gas Co., and Farmers' Land & Canal Co.,".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of A. E. McCartney and others."

MRS. GEORGIA LANSER

The bill (H. R. 1091) for the relief of Mrs. Georgia Lanser, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HARRIET TOWNSEND BOTTOMLEY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2389) for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$7,790" and insert "$2,335."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3830) to provide for the promotion and elimination of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. May we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, this is one of the bills the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] asked to have passed over temporarily. I know that in addition to the committee amendment, the Senator from South Dakota has an amendment he desires to offer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over temporarily without prejudice.

FIDELITY TRUST CO., OF BALTIMORE, MD.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 892) for the payment of claims of the Fidelity Trust Co. of Baltimore, Md., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

The first amendment of the committee was on page 1, line 5, after the word "allow", to insert "without interest."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, to add a proviso at the end of the bill, as follows:

Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 20 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and any such payment shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Internal Revenue be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to receive, consider, and allow without interest the claims as hereinafter set forth for the refund of bankers' special taxes paid under the War Revenue Act of June 13, 1898, and under the Emergency Revenue Act of October 22, 1914, and later held to have been erroneously and illegally collected by the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the *Fidelity & Deposit Co.* v. *United States* (259 U. S. 296) and the *United States* v. *Fidelity & Deposit Co.* (266 U. S. 587), which claims are covered by the findings of fact made on June 5, 1944, by the United States Court of Claims and reported at pages 13, 14, and 15 of Senate Document No. 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, as follows:

17767. Fidelity Trust Co. of Baltimore, Md., $2,116.86.

17768. Maryland Trust Co., successors to Continental Trust Co., Baltimore, Md., $3,323.30.

17769. Baltimore Trust Corp., liquidating agent of Baltimore Trust Co., Baltimore, Md., $3,409.34.

17770. Safe Deposit & Trust Co. of Baltimore, Baltimore, Md., $66.

17771. Union Trust Co. of Maryland, Baltimore, Md., $867.67.

17772. Citizens National Trust & Savings Bank of Los Angeles, successors to Citizens Trust & Savings Co., Los Angeles, Calif., $1,108.92.

17773. Wells Fargo Bank & Union Trust Co., successors to Union Trust Co. of San Francisco, San Francisco, Calif., $1,074.90.

17774. International Trust Co., Denver, Colo., $993.50.

17775. Phoenix State Bank & Trust Co., successors to State Bank, Hartford, Conn., $397.42.

17776. Stamford Trust Co., Stamford, Conn., $636.17.

17778. Citizens Bank & Trust Co., Tampa, Fla., $323.50.

17779. Harris Trust & Savings Bank, Chicago, Ill., $4,219.80.

17780. Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, successors to Continental and Commercial Trust & Savings Bank, Chicago, Ill., $5,179.17.

17781. Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, successors to Hibernian Banking Association, Chicago, Ill., $2,170.

17782. Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, successors to Illinois Trust & Savings Bank, Chicago, Ill., $9,512.

17783. Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, successors to Illinois Trust & Savings Bank, Chicago, Ill., $10,706.23.

17784. Peoples Trust & Savings Co., Fort Wayne, Ind., $155.04.

17785. Security Trust Co., Indianapolis, Ind., $153.34.

17786. First National Bank & Trust Co., successors to Phoenix and Third Trust Co., Lexington, Ky., $104.

17787. State Bank & Trust Co., Richmond, Ky., $154.50.

17789. Franklin County Trust Co., Greenfield, Mass., $75.99.

17790. Security Trust Co., Lynn, Mass., $148.26.

17791. Berkshire Trust Co., formerly Berkshire Loan & Trust Co., Pittsfield, Mass., $117.99.

17792. Springfield Safe Deposit & Trust Co., Springfield, Mass., $170.67.

17793. Detroit Trust Co., successors to Security Trust Co., Detroit, Mich., $1,392.50.

17794. Union Guardian Trust Co., successors to Union Trust Co., Detroit, Mich., $440.50.

17795. Mercantile Commerce Bank & Trust Co., formerly Mercantile Trust Co., St. Louis, Mo., $197.49.

17796. Mercantile Commerce Bank & Trust Co., formerly Mercantile Trust Co., St. Louis, Mo., $9,283.50.

17797. Mississippi Valley Trust Co., St. Louis, Mo., $8,223.84.

17799. Hudson Trust Co., Union City, N. J., $2,036.25.

17800. Paterson Savings Institution, Paterson, N. J., $2,438.

17802. Morristown Trust Co., Morristown, N. J., $2,737.45.

17803. Cumberland National Bank of Bridgeton, successors to the Cumberland Trust Co. of Bridgeton, Bridgeton, N. J., $100.46.

17804. Brooklyn Trust Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., $1,525.

17805. Kings County Trust Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., $2,864.57.

17806. National City Bank of New York, successors to Peoples Trust Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., $570.50.

17807. Marine Trust Co. of Buffalo, successors to Buffalo Trust Co., Buffalo, N. Y., $101.

17808. Marine Trust Co. of Buffalo, successors to Bankers Trust Co., Buffalo, N. Y., $878.51.

17809. Chemical Bank & Trust Co., successors to United States Mortgage & Trust Co., New York City, N. Y., $3,845.50.

17810. Title Guarantee & Trust Co. of New York City, N. Y., successors to Manufacturers Trust Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., $3,798.

17811. Bank of New York, successors to Bank of New York & Trust Co., successors to New York Life Insurance & Trust Co., New York City, N. Y., $16,502.52.

17812. Bank of New York, successors to Bank of New York & Trust Co., successors to New York Life Insurance & Trust Co., New York City, N. Y., $7,300.

17813. Lawyers Trust Co., successors to Central Realty Bond & Trust Co., New York City, N. Y., $1,078.75.

17814. United States Trust Co. of New York, New York City, N. Y., $15,706.50.

17816. First Trust & Deposit Co., successors to Trust & Deposit Co. of Onondaga, Syracuse, N. Y., $1,555.17.

17817. First Trust & Deposit Co., successors to City Bank Trust Co., successors to Central City Trust Co., Syracuse, N. Y., $132.11.

17818. First Trust & Deposit Co., successors to City Bank Trust Co., successors to Central City Trust Co., Syracuse, N. Y., $438.67.

17819. City Savings Bank & Trust Co., Alliance, Ohio $226.32.

17820. Fifth Third Union Trust Co., successors to Union Savings Bank & Trust Co., Cincinnati, Ohio, $1,836.33.

17821. Central National Bank, successors to Central United National Bank, successors to the United Banking & Trust Co., Cleveland, Ohio, $0.00.

17822. Central National Bank, successors to United Banking & Trust Co., Cleveland, Ohio, $1,297.99.

17823. Union Trust Co., successors to the Broadway Savings & Trust Co., Cleveland, Ohio, $734.01.

17824. Union Trust Co., successors to the State Banking & Trust Co., Cleveland, Ohio, $565.67.

17825. Toledo Trust Co., formerly Toledo Savings Bank & Trust Co., Toledo, Ohio, $622.67.

17826. Easton Trust Co., Easton, Pa., $502.67.

17827. Central Trust Co., Harrisburg, Pa., $210.01.

17828. Harrisburg Trust Co., Harrisburg, Pa., $545.50.

17829. Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Co., successors to Logan Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa., $1,706.81.

17830. Germantown Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa., $459.33.

17831. Girard Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa., $10,859.33.

17832. Liberty Title & Trust Co., successors to German American Title & Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa., $1,147.03.

17833. Liberty Title & Trust Co., successors to German American Title & Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa., $1,794.

17834. United Security Trust Co., formerly United Security Life Insurance & Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa., $0.00

17835. United Security Trust Co., formerly United Security Life Insurance & Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa., $8,136.61.

17836. Integrity Trust Co., successors to the West Philadelphia Title & Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa., $932.83.

17837. Fidelity Trust Co., formerly Fidelity Title & Trust Co., Pittsburgh, Pa., $1,932.94.

17838. Miners' National Bank of Wilkes-Barre, successors to Wyoming Valley Trust Co., Wilkes-Barre, Pa., $805.16.

17839. First National Bank, successors to Sunbury Trust & Safe Deposit Co., Sunbury, Pa., $416.66.

17840. Wakefield Trust Co., Wakefield, R. I., $669.

17841. Zion's Saving Bank & Trust Co., Salt Lake City, Utah, $712.

17843. Lynchburg Trust & Savings Bank, Lynchburg, Va., $162.90.

17844. Spokane & Eastern Trust Co., Spokane, Wash., $426.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the claims allowed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue pursuant to the preceding section of this act: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 20 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and any such payment shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

DR. ALMA RICHARDS AND MRS. MARY BLOCK

The bill (H. R. 348) for the relief of Dr. Alma Richards and Mrs. Mary Block was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MYRON R. LEARD

The bill (H. R. 893) for the relief of Myron R. Leard was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF GEORGE W. COOMBS

The bill (H. R. 1497) for the relief of the estate of George W. Coombs was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF RALPH STANFIELD, A MINOR

The bill (H. R. 1535) for the relief of the legal guardian of Ralph Stanfield, a minor, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT NO. 1, OF COWLITZ COUNTY, WASH.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2693) for the relief of Public Utility District No. 1 of Cowlitz County, Wash.

Mr. HATCH. May we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, in 1940 the Public Utilities District of Cowlitz County in the State of Washington purchased, under condemnation, utilities of a private power company. The public utility district paid into the Treasury of the Federal Government, through its district court in that region, something more than $6,000,000 of purchase money. Under the then Federal statute the purchaser had to pay a fee of 1 percent of the purchase price as a service charge for the handling and the distribution of the moneys to the persons to whom they were paid, and $62,299 was paid as a 1 percent fee.

In 1943 Congress revised the statute, relieving States and their subdivisions of payments of this character, it being obvious to the Committees on the Judiciary of both the House and the Senate that such fees were out of proportion to the services rendered. The pending bill merely repays Cowlitz County, in the State of Washington, the fee of $62,299, which was previously paid.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. How long ago was it that the money was paid?

Mr. CAIN. It was paid in 1940.

Mr. LUCAS. The Congress passed this act in 1943?

Mr. CAIN. In 1943. It so happens that the Cowlitz public utilities district is the only public body which previously had been affected by the loan, which since has been revised as of 1943.

Mr. LUCAS. I was merely wondering how many other claimants of this kind there might be, if we are to pass a retroactive act?

Mr. CAIN. The report states that this public utility district is the only subdivision of government involved in such a situation.

Mr. HATCH. Is it the only one that had to pay fees?

Mr. CAIN. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. Then there will be no other claim of this kind.

Mr. CAIN. The report shows that there will be no other claims, and so far as I know, there will be none. I might say that there is only one, in my opinion, for the reason that public-utility districts are of recent origin in the State of Washington.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I object to the bill, until I have had an opportunity of examining it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina objects, and the bill will go over.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, as a member of the Judiciary Committee I reviewed this matter, and I would like to point out to Senators who are objecting that what the Senator from Washington has said is true. It is the only agency that we know that would be affected. Furthermore, although the statute required payment into the Treasury of the sum of 1 percent of the contemplated condemnation price, it was never intended by the Congress that it should be paid. It was set up merely as a means of meeting the actual expense to which the district court would be placed in handling a condemnation proceeding. In the particular instance cited, it was a perfectly friendly proceeding. No work was done by the court. There was no disagreement between the parties. They were not private parties; they were governmental agencies, dealing with one another. No work whatever was to be done, and $63,000 seems like an unconscionable amount to take from the people in the PUD, to be paid into the United States Treasury merely for the privilege of being able to file a few papers in a United States Court. It is an extremely large amount, because the condemnation price was $6,000,000. I think it only fair and just, and within the spirit of the act passed by Congress, that the money be refunded to the Public Utilities District. With that explanation, I hope that the Senator may see fit to withdraw his objection.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am still going to insist on my objection. I want to read the report, to see what it is all about.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over, on objection.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to give notice of my intention to ask that the bill be brought up again at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one other question on this subject?

Mr. CAIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In order to make the RECORD clear, will the Senator explain again what Public Utilities District No. 1, of Cowlitz County, Wash., actually is? It might be thought by some that it is a public utility of some kind that is owned by private enterprise.

Mr. CAIN. In recent years, public-utilities districts have been authorized by the Legislature of the State of Washington. It is a public body, which has the power of condemnation over private power facilities and utilties situated within the public-utilities district. It actually results in citizens of a district determining for themselves what they desire to take over in the way of private power facilities situated in their area.

Mr. LUCAS. I was certain that was correct, but I do not think the RECORD explained it clearly enough. One reading it could get the notion that a private power company of some kind was involved in the claim.

Mr. CAIN. As the Senator from Illinois knows, it happens to be precisely the reverse.

SOUTHWEST POWER ADMINISTRATION ITEM IN INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL—CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a correction in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, while the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Wyoming are in the Senate Chamber. The correction is on page 9812 of the daily RECORD for July 22. I refer to an answer that I gave in colloquy with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] relative to an amendment adopted in the conference report on the Interior Department appropriations bill, which had to do with what is known as the Southwest Power Administration.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] asked me a question, which is found in the third column at the top of page 9812 of the daily RECORD; as follows:

I should like to ask the Senator if the conference committee had in mind the provision of law contained in the Reorganization Act of 1946, section (c), which is as follows.

The Senator from Oklahoma then read the provision.

In reply, I pointed out that the Senate language was an exception to the provision in the public law. That was the reason the amendment had to be adopted. The issue involved was, would the conferees agree that the unexpended balance, whatever it might be, could or should be used by the administration for work or construction that had not already been commenced? I thought I made it plain to the Senator, in the early part of the colloquy, that that is exactly what it could be used for; near the conclusion of the colloquy, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] asked:

But as to the work, it has to be physically commenced before this appropriation can be applied?

My answer was:

I think that is correct.

The answer was incorrect, if that is what I said. What I meant to say—and I should like to have the Senator from Oklahoma verify it, and see if I do not speak the sense of the conferees—that if there is an unexpended balance of the 1947 appropriations it can be used for the purposes set out in the Senate amendment as adopted by the conferees.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I did not participate in the colloquy yesterday, but as I understand, the ruling of the Comptroller General is that if a contract is made prior to June 30, not only must the contract be made in every form to make it legal, but physical work must be started; and if the physical work has not been started, the contract of itself is not enough.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not disagree with what the Comptroller General said, but I will ask the distinguished Senator if what I stated was not in the mind of the conferees, namely, that the unexpended balance could be used for that purpose?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It was the intention of the conferees that the Southwest Power Administration could use the money.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next measure on the calendar.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, before we proceed with the calendar I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska a question. After reading the colloquy which took place between the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Oklahoma I do not have a clear understanding of what was meant. I understood the Senator from Nebraska to say that it was the contention of the committee that the money would be expended if it could be legally expended. What does the qualification mean? Is there any doubt in the mind of the Senator from Nebraska whether it will be legal to expend the funds for the completion of the line in question?

Mr. WHERRY. I think the question came up after the conference report was adopted, by reason of a ruling of the Comptroller General. All I wanted to say was that it was the intention of the conferees, as set forth in the language which appears on page 9809 of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 22—and there was total agreement among the conferees on this point—that the unexpended balance for 1947 could be used for any purposes within the provisions of the amendment. I wish to make that clear. Whether there has been a ruling since that time that it cannot be done legally does not have anything to do with what was done by the conferees. I answered the question which the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] asked, which appears in the middle of the third column on page 9812 of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 22. The Senator from Oklahoma said:

But as to the work, it has to be physically commenced before this appropriation can be applied?

My answer was:

I think that is correct.

I want to say that I now think the answer was in error. I do not so understand it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator should have said it was "incorrect."

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator desires to put it that way.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And the money can be used for the purposes provided by the amendment regardless of what the Comptroller might have said about it? Is that the Senator's view of it?

Mr. WHERRY. It was the unanimous opinion of the conferees that the provision with respect to the Southwest Power Administration was that the unexpended portions of the appropriation for 1947 could be used for any purposes within the provisions of the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then, to make it positive, the law itself and the amendment specifically authorize expenditures for projects other than those which have been physically commenced, do they not?

Mr. WHERRY. I am quite satisfied that was the consensus of opinion of the conferees, and that is what I tried to make plain before the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] took the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I might offer a further word of explanation. As I understand, my colleague the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] has made a very thorough investigation into the law with respect to these contracts which are made with money provided by Congress. I am further advised that the Comptroller General is trying to establish a rule which will prevent Federal agencies from making contracts at the last moment, on June 30, or a few days prior, thereby seeking to obligate appropriations, and therefore carry those obligations in contracts. I understand from the Senator's investigating that the Comptroller General is refusing to make payments on contracts let in the last few days of a fiscal year if no actual work has been done under those contracts. It is an effort on the part of the Comptroller General to save public funds.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not want to interrupt Senators, but would like to say that he thinks the present discussion is entirely out of order under the rule under which the Senate is now operating.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the point was raised by the Senator from Nebraska, and leaves a doubt in some of our minds with respect to the interpretation to be placed on the measure. I did not raise the point. I think the matter certainly ought to be clarified because it seems to me some confusion exists. I cannot imagine that a ruling of the Comptroller General can be above the action taken by the Congress. Yet there seems to be that inference from what the Senator from Oklahoma said. I should think the action taken by the Congress is the last word, regardless of what the Comptroller General may have said about the matter, because the amendment was accepted, agreed to, and was contained in the bill, as passed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I asked unanimous consent to have the matter taken up at this time. I did not know this would involve any controversy. I simply wanted to correct my statement, which certainly was incorrect, based on the consensus of opinion of the conferees.

Mr. President, I now ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

SECONDARY MARKET FOR VETERANS' HOME MORTGAGES

The bill (S. 1543) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. TAFT. I withdraw my objection until explanation is made.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to give the RFC continuing authority to purchase GI housing loans from the original mortgagees. Under the measure extending the RFC, as passed by the Senate, this

power was continued. The House, however, omitted the provision, and it was omitted in the final conference report.

When the committee began consideration of the bill which I had introduced, Senate bill 1543, we had hearings at which appeared representatives of the Veterans' Administration, the RFC, as well as other service organizations. We had considerable discussion in the committee, as a result of which we amended the bill and placed in it safeguards which we think make the bill good.

One of those safeguards is the limitation as to the amount the RFC can purchase, which is $350,000,000. Another safeguard is that the maximum amount of any mortgage purchased shall not exceed $10,000, and that it must be purchased within the first 6 months of the life of the mortgage, and it must be a mortgage which has been taken since July 1 of this year. That prevents the purchase of any old paper, or any paper which was taken at a time when the objection may have been valid that these loans were not sufficiently screened.

The bill also provides that the purchase price shall not exceed the unpaid principal balance, with any interest that may be accrued at the time, and furthermore that the loan must not be in default at the time of purchase.

So far as the screening is concerned, these loans receive the same attention that the ordinary GI loans receive. Furthermore, when a bank sells these loans to the RFC, the bank or lending institution must certify, under section 35 of the Criminal Code, that it knows of nothing that makes the loan bad.

I submit, Mr. President, that these loans are given just as careful scrutiny as can be given, and that if we refuse to allow the RFC to continue this secondary market for such loans it will mean the denial to veterans in many sections of the country—not in all sections, but in many—of any place in which they can sell their mortgages.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I discussed this matter somewhat the other day on the floor, because I had received advices from my State, from both veterans and banks—one being from one of the largest banks of my State—that the banks could no longer make GI loans in the State of New Mexico because they had no market for such loans except the RFC, and unless the authority were extended there would be no more loans made to the GI's in the State of New Mexico.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator for his contribution. The same thing is true in Alabama and a great many other States, particularly States which are largely rural rather than urban.

I have received a letter from a bank in my district—I have received a great many letters from all over the country, but I happen to recall this particular letter—in which the writer stated, in effect:

> We have total deposits amounting to a little in excess of $3,000,000. We have taken $450,000 worth of these mortgages. We have sold $50,000 to the RFC. We are carrying the other $400,000, and will continue to carry that much, but we cannot take another one. It would not be good business for us to do so.

Another safeguard in the bill is the provision that the RFC shall not buy more than 50 percent of the amount issued by any lending institution at any time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Alabama has expired.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, my objection to the bill arises from the fact that these loans are perfectly good investments. There is no reason in the world why the Government should have to buy them. To begin with, they are guaranteed by the Government, and therefore they are entirely good loans.

The only question is whether the market arrangements as yet are quite what they should be. If the RFC is merely to buy these loans, there is no reason why it should not sell them. They are an investment which any good house would buy. I doubt if the Government ought to go into the money-lending business. That was the opinion when we passed the bill providing that the RFC should not continue its general lending powers.

There is one further question of policy which leads me to think that consideration of the bill should be postponed at least until I can explore it further. Apparently—for some reason which I do not know—these expenditures are counted as budget expenditures. They increase the Federal budget. The budget will be increased by $350,000,000 if we pass this bill. Whether that should be so, I do not know. I am not perfectly certain that it is.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator temporarily withhold his objection?

Mr. TAFT. I shall continue to object today. I had not seen the bill until I read it a few minutes ago. I think possibly the $350,000,000 might be reduced to $100,000,000. Then the RFC could buy up the small bank loans and find a place to sell them, using only $100,000,000 on the turn-over. That might be a possible method of meeting the difficulty. But it seems to me that it is something that is purely accessory, and it ought not to be an expenditure of the Federal Government, coming out of taxes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will withhold his objection, my colleague from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] was cut off before he had finished. I should like, on my time, to have him finish his explanation, which I thought was very good. I think the secondary market for the GI loans is very important. I should like to ask the able Senator from Alabama if he will complete the explanation in my time. I ask him to continue his explanation, if that is possible under the rules.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the generosity of the distinguished Senator from California. I do not know that I have a great deal more to say, except in reply to what the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has said.

I do not believe that the $350,000,000 which is authorized affects the Federal budget in any way. After all, it is a purchase which the RFC is authorized to make. When I introduced the bill I set the figure at $500,000,000, but the committee reduced it to $350,000,000. During the time the RFC has been purchasing these mortgages it has purchased $143,000,000 worth. Let me say that of the $143,000,000 worth that it has purchased, only 28 of the loans are in arrears a single dollar. Only a few thousand dollars of the total amount is in arrears. If we do not provide this program, it simply means that the market will be completely jammed in a great many sections of the country and the GI loans cannot go through.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I ask the Senator from Alabama if it is not true that the RFC has been buying these loans, and that by some regulation passed in an appropriation bill we stopped the practice which had been previously followed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The situation was this: About a year ago an act was passed giving the RFC authority to buy. That act was for the life of RFC. The RFC expired on June 30, except for the new act which we passed, and in the new act which we passed there was no provision to continue this practice. I was one of the conferees. The objection in the conference was that the mortgages were being bought without being properly screened. That is exactly the reason why we have written into this bill various provisions for the same type of screening that the ordinary GI loans get, or even a higher degree of screening.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama a question.

Is it not a fact that the Senate passed a bill more or less in the same form as this bill is reported, and the House refused to agree? The conferees brought back a report eliminating this provision. As I understand, the Senator now seeks, by this amendment, to meet the objection which was raised by the Members of the House. Is not that correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct; and I should like to add that the Senator will remember that that conference agreement was reached in the closing hours of the fiscal year. We simply did not have time to work out this kind of an arrangement, or we might have done it in conference.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator agree with me that in the event this measure is not passed and this power is not given to the RFC, the housing situation in America so far as the veterans of World War II are concerned will be further demoralized, and relief will be postponed indefinitely?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is exactly correct. The market in a great many sections of the country will be paralyzed so far as veterans are concerned, because there will simply be no market for these mortgages.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to make one additional observation. At the present

time we have little or no housing program in this country. We have utterly failed to give the veterans what we promised them. The least we could do would be to help them with what they have at the present time by giving the RFC the power to continue to do what it has been doing so far as the purchase of these loans is concerned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Objection has been made, and the bill will be passed over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to say that he would not permit the bill to be passed today. I should like to have his attention for a moment, if I may have it. I tried to interrupt him to ask a question.

A banker in Denver placed this situation before me: He stated that he had accumulated $150,000 worth of these loans, and that he could not take any more. He was prevented from taking any more because that was all he was permitted to carry. I presume there is some limitation under the banking regulations. He asked me to find out if anything could be done. So at his request I took the matter up with the American Bankers' Association, and was told that they were taking the matter up with the insurance companies in New York in an effort to find someone who would buy these mortgages. They were unable to find anyone. They were unable to find any market whatsoever. So when the Senator says that he thinks the bill should go over until January, I should like to suggest that there is an emergency——

Mr. TAFT. I did not say anything about January. I said until tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is different.

Mr. TAFT. Until I can check up two or three features involving important questions of policy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I misunderstood the Senator. The emergency is an immediate one. I have no doubt that the Senator from Ohio would say that these mortgages are all good and that someone will want them. It is only a matter of time until a market can be established for them. If we can have a temporary market for a few months I am sure someone will come into the market and take them. I have no basis for that statement except what I have been told by bankers and others. I took it up with every department I could think of in Washington, and was told that they hoped within a few months that someone would come into the market and buy these mortgages.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On objection, the bill is passed over.

DISPOSITION OF OBSOLETE ORDNANCE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3127) to provide for the loan or gift of obsolete ordnance to State homes for former members of the armed forces, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, on page 2, line 3, to insert "or scientific."

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to reject the amendment. I should like to say in connection with the amendment that the words "or scientific" were put into the bill on the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] when the bill came from the House. He has just come from the committee and has told me that my request is agreeable to him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator simply wishes to disagree to the committee amendment?

Mr. HAWKES. That is the idea.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THOMAS M. FARLEY AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 405) for the relief of Thomas M. Farley and others was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT NO. 1 OF COWLITZ COUNTY, WASH.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to revert to Calendar No. 643, House bill 2693, and withdraw my objection for its consideration.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2693) for the relief of Public Utility District No. 1 of Cowlitz County, Wash., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, may I express my appreciation of the thoughtful consideration given to the bill by the Senator from South Carolina.

MRS. MARY JANE SHERMAN AND W. D. SHERMAN

The bill (H. R. 704) for the relief of Mrs. Mary Jane Sherman and W. D. Sherman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MACK GENE ODOM, A MINOR

The bill (H. R. 2550) for the relief of Mack Gene Odom, a minor, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

P. L. (SPUD) MURPHY

The bill (H. R. 1492) for the relief of P. L. (Spud) Murphy, owner and manager of Spud's Tailors, Laundry & Dry Cleaning Works, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CORDON subsequently said: Mr. President, may I request that the Senate return to Calendar No. 649, House bill 1492, in order that I may ask a couple of questions?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, that may be done.

Mr. CORDON. I should like to have an explanation of the bill for the relief of P. L. Murphy. I have hurriedly glanced at the report, and it would appear to be not at all conclusive in establishing a basis for the justness of the claim. I should like to have an explanation of it.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as indicated in the report, this is a case in which the claimant, P. L. Murphy, was engaged in the tailoring, laundering, and dry-cleaning business in Honolulu. He did an extremely large business. He filed his claim for approximately $20,000, based upon these facts: He did his business with the boys on the ships of the Navy, and others, and established quite a list of customers. The war came on, and Government officials asked him to destroy his list of names of customers. A congressional committee investigated the facts in connection with his claim for $20,000, and felt that it was sustained, but he having taken a loss in his income tax, they deducted $10,000 and left a balance of $9,540.48.

That is my recollection of this particular claim.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I have just been reading the report of the Navy Department made at the request of the committee, and I notice this statement in the report:

> It is the opinion of the Navy Department that this change in claimant's record—

It was a blotting out of the name of the ships on which the several creditors were registered, and not a blotting out of their names—

> did not cause his bad debt losses, but those losses are a direct result of his failure to follow the rules of good business practice in his method of granting credit to and identification of his creditors.

That is the statement made by the Navy Department. I am wondering if the committee had any evidence of its own on that subject.

Mr. WILEY. This particular claim, as I recall it, came to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary late this month. It was also referred to another member of the committee, who reported to the committee the facts substantially as I have related them. He felt that in view of the fact that the House sent a special group which had gone to Hawaii, investigated the claim, and reached the conclusion that the Government had brought about the destruction of the evidence on which he could have based his authenticated claim, and in view of the further fact that there was not any question about his doing a good business, which ran up to approximately $150,000 a year, this amount was due the claimant.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Do I correctly understand the Senator to say that the House of Representatives sent a subcommittee of three Members all the way to Honolulu to investigate a $20,000 claim?

Mr. WILEY. I am not so sure that this was the only matter they investigated last year, or whenever it was. However, it is my recollection that they had a committee which went into this item. At least that is what I recall.

Mr. LUCAS. Evidently it does not take much to authorize such a group to travel that far out of this country.

Mr. WILEY. I have no grounds for prejudging my fellow Members of Con-

gress in the House of Representatives. I am stating the facts as I recall them.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, in view of the fact that there appears to be, at least on the face of the report, some doubt as to the justice of any claim and some doubt as to the amount, I ask that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered and the bill passed over, so that the committee may be given a further opportunity to examine into the facts.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? There being no objection, the vote is reconsidered and the bill will be passed over.

BARRETT & HILP

The bill (H. R. 2507) for the relief of the firm of Barrett & Hilp was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LUCAS subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar 650, House bill 2507, and I ask for an explanation of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. WILEY. The purpose of the bill is to pay the sum of $20,000 to the claimants in full settlement of claims against the United States for property damage sustained as the result of an explosion at the naval ammunition depot in Port Chicago, Calif. It was one of those cases in which, after the explosion took place, there was a Government investigation. A commission was authorized to investigate it, and the amount of damage claimed was determined to be the proper amount. It was for a loss which was sustained because of an explosion in Port Chicago, Calif.

Mr. LUCAS. Was the Government negligent?

Mr. WILEY. Yes. Not only that, but the element of damage was sustained by a special commission appointed to determine the loss not only of this group but of a number of other persons.

TIVOLI BREWING CO.—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 551) for the relief of the Tivoli Brewing Co. was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Tivoli Brewing Co., of Detroit, Mich., the sum of $12,646.45, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for a refund of tax paid by such company on 29,040 cases of fermented malt liquor sold to the War Department, during the month of January 1942, for consumption by members of the armed forces of the United States serving outside the jurisdiction of the internal-revenue laws of the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. LUCAS subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we revert to the consideration of Senate bill 551, Calendar No. 651, a bill for the relief of the Tivoli Brewing Co., and I should like to have an explanation of the bill. For that purpose, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none. Without objection, the vote is reconsidered, and the bill is before the Senate.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in response to the request for an explanation, let me say that the purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay the sum of $12,646.45 to the Tivoli Brewing Co. in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for a refund of tax paid on 29,040 cases of fermented malt liquor sold to the War Department during the month of January 1942.

It appears that during the period between December 31, 1941, and January 16, 1942, the Procurement Division, Army Exchange Service, issued purchase orders to the Tivoli Brewing Co., of Detroit, Mich., covering shipments of a total of 29,040 cases of beer to Army post exchanges located outside of the jurisdiction of the internal-revenue laws of the United States.

The brewing company was advised that "the ultimate destination cannot be revealed, as it is a military secret." The order was placed on December 31, 1941, for delivery in New York on January 3, 1942. The brewing company, in order to meet the delivery date, operated on New Year's day and shipped the beer by truck from Detroit to New York. Export packages were not on hand so the order was filled from tax-paid stock.

The urgency of the order necessitated the canning of beer on New Year's Day and shipping the beer by truck to New York. Additional expense was incurred through canning beer on a holiday, together with the additional expense incurred by trucking the beer to New York instead of shipping it by freight. The beer got to New York on the date specified and it is apparent that the company made almost a superhuman effort to meet the requirements of the Army in maintaining the morale of its overseas troops.

It is the opinion of the committee that this company should not be penalized because of a technical provision of the law when it clearly was motivated only by its efforts to meet the request of the War Department.

I may say that this is another bill which was referred to a member of my committee whom I do not see on the floor at the present time. He, in turn, reported it to the committee, and it was approved by the committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I believe that a representative of the Attorney General wrote a letter dated July 7, objecting to the payment of this claim. Apparently the committee overruled that objection.

Mr. WILEY. That is not unusual.

Mr. LUCAS. I know it is not. However, Mr. President, I ask that this bill be passed over until I can obtain a little further information about it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being made, the bill will be passed over.

GEORGE CORENEVSKY

The bill (H. R. 914) for the relief of George Corenevsky was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WALTER R. AND KATHRYN MARSHALL

The bill (H. R. 406) for the relief of Walter R. and Kathryn Marshall was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VETERANS' PREFERENCE

The bill (S. 1494) to amend section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first proviso of section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 387) is hereby amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That such preference eligible shall have the right to make a personal appearance, or an appearance through a designated representative, in accordance with such reasonable rules and regulations as may be issued by the Civil Service Commission; after investigation and consideration of the evidence submitted, the Civil Service Commission shall submit its findings and recommendations to the proper administrative officer and shall send copies of the same to the appellant or to his designated representative, and it shall be mandatory for such administrative officer to take such corrective action as the Commission finally recommends."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1644) to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, so as to admit rescission of prior agency action, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object to that bill on the request of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

ATTENDANCE OF MARINE BAND AT NATIONAL CONVENTION OF AMERICAN LEGION

The bill (S. 1633) to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the national convention of the American Legion to be held in New York, N. Y., August 28 to 31, 1947, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 6, following the figures "1947", it is proposed to substitute a comma for the period and insert "and to attend and perform in the parade of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in Cleveland, Ohio, on a date between September 4 to 9, 1947, to be selected by the Veterans of Foreign Wars"; on page 1,

line 8, it is proposed to strike out before the comma "the parade", and substitute "such parades."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to permit the band of the United States Marine Corps to attend and perform in the parade of the American Legion to be held in New York, N. Y., on August 30, 1947, and to attend and perform in the parade of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in Cleveland, Ohio, on a date between September 4 to 9, 1947, to be selected by the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of defraying the expenses of such band in attending and performing in the parade, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sufficient sum to cover the cost of transportation and pullman accommodations for the leaders and members of the Marine Band, and allowance not to exceed $6 per day each for additional traveling and living expenses while on duty, such allowances to be in addition to the pay and allowance to which they would be entitled while serving their permanent station.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the National Convention of the American Legion to be held in New York, N. Y., August 28 to 31, 1947, and the National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, September 4 to 9, 1947."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3051) to amend the act of July 19, 1940, and to amend section 2 and repeal the profit-limitation and certain other limiting provisions of the act of March 27, 1934, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

INACTIVE DUTY TRAINING PAY FOR THE ORGANIZED RESERVE CORPS

The bill (S. 1174) to provide for inactive duty training pay for the Organized Reserve Corps, to provide uniform standards for inactive duty training pay for all Reserve components of the armed forces, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That section 1 of the National Defense Act, as amended, be further amended by striking out the words "the Officers Reserve Corps, the Organized Reserves, and the Enlisted Reserve Corps," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "and the Organized Reserve Corps".

SEC. 2. That section 37a of the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, is amended by deleting therefrom the following sentence: "A reserve officer shall not be entitled to pay and allowances except when on active duty."

SEC. 3. That section 14 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 14. Reserve and National Guard personnel: (a) Officers, warrant officers, and enlisted personnel of the reserve components of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, when on active duty in the service of the United States, shall be entitled to receive the same pay and allowances as are authorized for persons of corresponding grade and length of service in the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or Public Health Service.

"(b) Officers, warrant officers, and enlisted personnel of the reserve components of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, when participating in full-time training or other full-time duty (provided for or authorized in the National Defense Act, as amended, or in the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, or in other provisions of law, including participation in exercises or performance of the duties provided for by sections 94, 97, and 99 of the National Defense Act, as amended) shall receive the same pay, and allowances as are authorized for persons of corresponding grade and length of service in the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or Public Health Service: *Provided*, That they may be given additional training or other duty as provided for by law, without pay, as may be authorized by the head of the Department concerned, with their consent, and when such authorized training or other duty without pay is performed they may in the discretion of the head of the Department concerned, be furnished with transportation to and from such duty, with subsistence en route, and, during the performance of such duty, be furnished with subsistence and quarters in kind or commutation thereof at a rate to be fixed from time to time by the head of the Department concerned.

"(c) Under such regulations as the head of the Department concerned may prescribe, and to the extent provided for by law and by appropriations, officers, warrant officers, and enlisted personnel of the National Guard of the United States, Organized Reserve Corps, Naval Reserve, and Marine Corps Reserve, shall receive compensation at the rate of one-thirtieth of the monthly base pay, including longevity pay, authorized for such persons when on active duty in the armed forces of the United States, for each regular period of instruction, or period of appropriate duty, at which they shall have been engaged for not less than 2 hours, including those performed on Sundays and holidays, or for the performance of such other equivalent training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties as may be prescribed by the head of the Department concerned: *Provided*, That personnel required to perform aerial flights, parachute jumping, glider flights, or submarine duty shall receive the increases in pay provided for by law for personnel in such status: *Provided further*, That for each of the several classes of organizations prescribed for the National Guard of the United States, the Organized Reserve Corps, Naval Reserve, and Marine Corps Reserve, the rules applicable to each of which services and classes within services may differ, the head of the Department concerned: (1) Shall prescribe minimum standards which must be met before an assembly for drill or other equivalent period of training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties may be credited for pay purposes, which minimum standards may require the presence for duty of officers and enlisted personnel equal to or in excess of a minimum number of percentage of unit strength for a specified period of time with participation in a prescribed character of training; (2) shall prescribe the maximum number of assemblies, or periods of other equivalent training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties, which may be counted for pay purposes in each fiscal year; (3) shall prescribe the maximum number of assemblies, or periods of other equivalent training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties which can be counted for pay purposes in lesser periods of time; and (4) shall prescribe the minimum number of assemblies or periods of other equivalent training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties, which must be completed in stated periods of time before the personnel of organizations or units can qualify for pay: *And provided further*, That the provision of this paragraph shall not apply when such persons are entitled to receive full pay and allowances as provided for in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section.

"(d) In addition to pay provided in paragraph (c) of this section, officers of the National Guard of the United States, Organized Reserve Corps, Naval Reserve, and Marine Corps Reserve, commanding organizations having administrative functions connected therewith shall, whether or not such officers belong to such organizations, receive not more than $240 a year for the faithful performance of such administrative functions under such regulations as the head of the Department concerned may prescribe; and for the purpose of determining how much shall be paid to such officers so performing such functions, the head of the Department concerned may, from time to time, divide them into classes and fix the amount payable to the officers in each class: *Provided*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not apply when such persons are entitled to receive full pay and allowances as provided for in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section."

SEC. 4. That section 55a of the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 55a. Organized Reserve Corps—Organization and training: The Organized Reserve Corps shall include the personnel and units of the Officers Reserve Corps, the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and the Organized Reserves. The Secretary of War shall prescribe all necessary and proper regulations for the recruiting, organization, government, administration, training, inspection, and mobilization of the Organized Reserve Corps, and shall detail such officers and enlisted personnel of the Regular Army and Organized Reserve Corps, and shall make available such material, uniforms, arms, supplies, equipment, and other facilities of the Army, or procured from funds appropriated for the purpose as he may deem necessary and advisable for the development, training, instruction, and administration of the Organized Reserve Corps and the care of Government property issued to the members and units of the Organized Reserve Corps. Any or all members of the Organized Reserve Corps may be formed into military organizations, which in turn may be sponsored by civilian organizations as affiliated units.

"Organized Reserve Corps units will be of three classes, varying in degree of organization, as follows:

"1. Those combat and service type organized with a full complement of officers and men: *Provided*, That there will be included in this category only those units which are considered necessary for prompt mobilization.

"2. Those combat and service types generally organized with a full complement of officers and an enlisted cadre.

"3. Those combat and service types generally organized with a full complement of officers only.

"Under such regulation as the Secretary of War may prescribe, personnel of the Organized Reserve Corps shall assemble for drill, training, instruction, or other duty and shall participate in encampments, maneuvers, or other exercises: *Provided*, That assemblies for

such duty under such regulations for members of the Organized Reserve Corps assigned to fully organized units shall be on the same minimum basis as now or hereafter prescribed for the National Guard: *Provided further*, That other units of the Organized Reserve Corps may be assembled, under such regulations, for such duty; however, personnel of these units may not receive pay in any one fiscal year for a total number of regular periods of instruction, or periods of appropriate duty, at which they shall have been engaged for not less than 2 hours, or for the performance of such other equivalent training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War in accordance with subsection (c), section 14, Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, in excess of 50 percent of the number of such assemblies authorized for personnel assigned to similar positions in the National Guard: *Provided further*, That members of the Organized Reserve Corps not assigned to table of organization units may be required to perform duties as prescribed by such regulations and, receive credit for regular periods of instruction or duty, for pay purposes, up to the same maximum as prescribed herein for members of units of the Organized Reserve Corps, other than fully organized type units: *And provided further*, That members of the Organized Reserve Corps classified in scientific or specialist categories, or members of the Organized Reserve Corps, whether or not assigned to a unit, who, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War, are designated for a mobilization day assignment, may be required to perform duties as prescribed by such regulations and receive credit for regular drill periods for pay purposes on the same minimum basis as prescribed herein for members of the Organized Reserve Corps in fully organized type units.

"Under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, personnel of the Organized Reserve Corps may receive compensation as provided in section 14 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, for attending periods of instruction, or periods of appropriate duty, duly prescribed under the authority of the Secretary of War, including those performed on Sundays and holidays, or for the performance of such other equivalent training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties, as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War.

"Members of the Organized Reserve Corps in receipt of pay for the performance of drills, or other equivalent training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties, may be required to perform such active duty or training duty, not to exceed 15 days annually, as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That they may be given additional training or other duty, either with or without pay, as may be authorized, with their consent, by direction of the Secretary of War: *Provided further*, That when authorized training or other duty without pay is performed by members of the Organized Reserve Corps they may in the discretion of the Secretary of War be furnished with transportation to and from such duty, with subsistence en route, and, during the performance of such duty, be furnished subsistence and quarters in kind or commutation thereof at a rate to be fixed from time to time by the head of the department concerned."

SEC. 5. (a) That section 92 of the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, be further amended by changing the period at the end of said section to a colon and adding the following: "*Provided further*, That members of the National Guard of the United States may be given additional training or other duty, either with or without pay, as may be authorized, with their consent, by direction of the Secretary of War: *And provided further*, That when authorized training or other duty without pay is performed by members of the National Guard of the United States they may in the discretion of the Secretary of War be furnished with transportation to and from such duty, with subsistence en route, and, during the performance of such duty, be furnished subsistence and quarters in kind or commutation thereof at a rate to be fixed from time to time by the Secretary of War."

(b) That the portion of section 109 of the National Defense Act, as amended, which precedes the final proviso of such section, be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 109. Pay for National Guard officers: Under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, officers and warrant officers of the National Guard of the United States may receive compensation as provided in section 14 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, for attending regular periods of instruction, or periods of appropriate duty, duly prescribed under the authority of the Secretary of War, including drills performed on Sundays and holidays, or for the performance of such other equivalent training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties, as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War."

(c) That the portion of section 110 of the National Defense Act, as amended, which precedes the first proviso of such section, be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 110. Pay for National Guard enlisted men: Under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, enlisted men of the National Guard of the United States may receive compensation as provided in section 14 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, for attending regular periods of duty and instruction duly prescribed under the authority of the Secretary of War, including those performed on Sundays and holidays."

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1675) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TAFT. May we have an explanation, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair suggests that the bill be passed over temporarily, without prejudice, in response to the request made by the Senator from South Dakota before he left the floor.

The bill (S. 1676) to authorize the Secretary of War to proceed with construction at military installations, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest that we adopt the same procedure as to this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In accordance with the procedure on the preceding bill, this bill will be passed over temporarily, without prejudice.

ROMAN TOPOROW

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am required to leave the Chamber to go to the Rules and Administration Committee. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1674, Calendar No. 690, a bill for the relief of Roman Toporow. It is an immigration bill, and there is a companion House bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 3243) for the relief of Roman Toporow, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask that the House bill be considered at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3243) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 1674 will be indefinitely postponed.

RETURN OF RETIREMENT DEDUCTIONS FROM COMPENSATION OF EMPLOYEES SEPARATED FROM THE SERVICE

The bill (H. R. 1995) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the return of the amount of deductions from the compensation of any employee who is separated from the service or transferred to a position not within the purview of such act before completing 10 years of service was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. May we have an explanation of the bill, Mr. President?

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to provide that employees in the civil service who are separated from the Government service and who have not completed 10 years of service, may withdraw their contributions to the retirement fund.

Mr. TAFT. How would the bill change the present law?

Mr. O'CONOR. The present law provides a limit of 5 years. Under this bill, those who have served between 5 and 10 years would be eligible. The result would be a saving to the country, because otherwise such persons would have a right to receive an annuity.

Mr. TAFT. Would they receive interest?

Mr. O'CONOR. Yes; at 4 percent.

Mr. TAFT. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1995) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALE OF LAND IN POLSON, MONT.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1507) authorizing the sale of undisposed of lots in Michel addition to the town of Polson, Mont., which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert the following:

That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to sell, under existing rules and regulations, the undisposed of lots in blocks 3, 4, and 5 in the Michel addition to the city of Polson, Mont., said lots being embraced in the trust allotment of Angeline Michel, deceased, Flathead allottee No. 1914.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAY OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES OF THE PANAMA RAILROAD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1416) to amend section 203 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph 1, section 203, of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 be amended by adding after "(U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, sec. 673c)" the following: "*Provided further*, That such employees of the Panama Railroad Company on the Isthmus of Panama shall have their basic rates of pay adjusted in accordance with the act of March 28, 1934 (title II, sec. 23)."

Mr. WHERRY. May we have an explanation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The bill affects only the railroad employees of the Panama Railroad in the Canal Zone.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado has an amendment at the desk.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I call up the amendment. It is a technical amendment that does not affect the scope of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 8, after the word "adjusted", it is proposed to insert "(so as to provide rates not lower than necessary to restore the full weekly earnings of such employees in accordance with the full-time weekly earnings under the respective wage schedules in effect on June 30, 1945, plus any increases in such rates granted subsequent to such date)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLAIMS FOR PREFERENCE UNDER CIVIL SERVICE LAW

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1493) to amend section 19 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944, and for other purposes, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the final period in section 19 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 387), be changed to a semicolon and that the following be added thereto: "*Provided*, That any recommendation by the Civil Service Commission, submitted to any Federal agency, on the basis of the appeal of any preference eligible, employee or former employee, shall be complied with by such agency."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota give us an explanation of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this provides for a case where a veteran or any other civil-service employee having a preference right makes an appeal, and the Civil Service Commission makes an order. It provides that the order shall be complied with by the Federal agencies.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. TAFT subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to order of business 665, Senate bill 1493. I find that I have been requested by the Senator from Minnesota to object to the bill, and I do object to it now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the votes by which the bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, are reconsidered, and the bill will be passed over.

COMMEMORATIVE OF SERVICES OF GEN. MAURICE ROSE

The bill (S. 1614) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the patriotic service of Gen. Maurice Rose, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to commemorate the life and the gallant military services of the late Gen. Maurice Rose, who sacrificed his life for the American victory against the Nazis in World War II, and to aid in constructing and equipping the General Rose Memorial Hospital, in Denver, Colo., as a national patriotic shrine, there shall be coined by the Director of the Mint not exceeding 500,000 silver 50-cent pieces of standard size, weight, and fineness and of a special appropriate design to be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, but the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the models for master dies or other preparations for their coinage.

SEC. 2. The coins herein authorized shall be issued at par and only upon the request of the General Rose Memorial Hospital Association founded for the purpose of perpetuating the patriotic services of Gen. Maurice Rose and the construction and maintenance of said hospital as a patriotic shrine.

SEC. 3. Such coins may be disposed of at par or at a premium by such banks or trust companies, or other financial institutions, selected by the General Rose Memorial Hospital Association, and all proceeds thereof shall be used to maintain and preserve as a suitable memorial the General Rose Hospital, at Denver, Colo., and as may be decided upon by the General Rose Hospital Association.

SEC. 4. The coins authorized herein shall be issued in such numbers, and at such times, as shall be requested by the General Rose Memorial Hospital Association, and upon payment to the United States of the face value of such coins: *Provided*, That none of such coins shall be issued after the expiration of the 5-year period immediately following the enactment of this act.

SEC. 5. That all laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same; regulating and guarding the process of coinage; providing for the purchase of material, and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of the coins; for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting; for security of the coin; or for any other purposes, whether said laws are penal or otherwise, shall, as far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein directed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not know that I care to object to any of these coinage bills, but it seems to me the practice is going to an extent that we cannot justify. Of course, many want special coins struck off because they make money out of them. They get the 50-cent piece and sell it for a dollar, and those who get the benefits, who are running the shows or celebrations, no matter how meritorious, make a profit of 50 cents. So long as that is being done, we are going to be flooded with applications of this kind. I think that if we send them all over to the House, the House will turn them all down, but I think it is a little unjust to put the burden on the House.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator that if we start such a procedure as that contemplated by bills of this character on the calendar there will never be an end to it, because every community throughout the Nation will come forward and ask for this kind of preference so far as coinage is concerned. I think it is an exceedingly bad precedent.

Mr. TAFT. If we should pass a law providing that any profit should be returned to the Government, and the communities would merely have the benefit of having a silver 50-cent piece to commemorate some important occasion, I do not think there would be any such demand for the coinage. It is because a profit is to be made on the sale of the coins that a large demand is made for them.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, the suggestion was made that if we once started this practice there would be no end to it. I wish to say that we have already started it.

With regard to the cost to the Government, there is no cost, because the seigniorage element in the coinage of silver more than reimburses the cost, and provides the Government a comfortable profit on the transaction.

I may say that personally I am disturbed by the fact that we did begin this practice. I held my thumb in the dike as long as I could, but it got too cold or too hot for me, I forget which; the dike is broken, and the bills are coming through.

There is no good reason for refusing any of them if we permit one to go through. The Senate has already passed three such bills. I do not see how it can refuse to pass the other six, and leave the matter in the hands of the President of the United States.

COIN COMMEMORATING ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ORGANIZATION OF MINNESOTA AS A TERRITORY

The bill (S. 1304) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the organization of Minnesota as a Territory of the United States was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the organization of Minnesota as a Territory of the United States, there shall be coined not to exceed 150,000 silver 50-cent pieces of standard size, weight, and composition, and of a special appropriate design to be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury; but the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the necessary dies and other preparations for such coinage.

SEC. 2. The coins herein authorized shall bear the date of the year in which they are minted, shall be legal tender to the amount of their face value, and shall be issued only upon the request of the Minnesota Historical Society, the duly authorized representative of the State of Minnesota, or its legal representatives, upon the payment by it of the

par value of such coins. Such coins shall be issued in such numbers and at such times during the calendar year 1949 as shall be requested by such Minnesota Historical Society and may be disposed of at par or at a premium, and the net proceeds shall be used for the observation of the centennial as directed by the Minnesota Historical Society or its legal representatives.

SEC. 3. All laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same; regulating and guarding the process of coinage; providing for the purchase of material, and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of coins, for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting; for the security of the coins, or for any other purpose, whether such laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein authorized.

MOUNT RUSHMORE NATIONAL MEMORIAL

The bill (S. 1042) to provide for the completion of Mount Rushmore National Memorial and the financing thereof by issuance of a special coin was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to complete the Mount Rushmore National Memorial and to commemorate the lives and perpetuate the ideals of the four Presidents of the United States there sculptured—George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt—there shall be coined by the Director of the Mint not to exceed 2,000,000 silver 50-cent pieces of standard size, weight, and fineness and of a special appropriate design carrying a replica of the memorial to be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of the Interior. The United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the models for master dies or other preparations for this coinage but may accept the services to be provided by the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Society therefor and may accept such other services as may be contributed in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 2. The coins herein authorized shall be issued at par, and only upon the request of the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Society, incorporated under the laws of the State of South Dakota.

SEC. 3. Such coins may be disposed of at par or at a premium by banks or trust companies selected by the said Mount Rushmore National Memorial Society or at the studio of the Mount Rushmore National Memorial, and all proceeds therefrom shall be used for the following purposes: (1) To provide additional parking space in the Mount Rushmore Reserve and adequate comfort and sanitary facilities for visitors; (2) to complete the monument as originally conceived by the sculptor Gutzon Borglum as specified by the models in the administration building maintained by the National Park Service at the memorial, such completion to be under the direction of Lincoln Borglum under the general supervision of the National Park Service; (3) to remove debris at the base of Rushmore Mountain; all such expenditures and construction to be under the supervision of the National Park Service.

SEC. 4. All laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same; regulating and guarding the process of coinage; providing for the purchase of material; and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of coins; for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting; for the security of the coins, or for any other purpose, whether such laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein authorized.

SEC. 5. The coins authorized herein shall be issued in such numbers and at such times as shall be requested by the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Society and upon payment to the United States of the face value of such coins: *Provided*, That none of such coins shall be issued after the expiration of a 10-year period immediately following the enactment of this act.

OREGON TRAIL COMMEMORATIVE COINS

The bill (S. 722) to authorize the issuance of Oregon Trail commemorative 50-cent pieces to the Oregon Trail Monument Association, Idaho Unit, Inc., was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to add a word to what has been said about these coinage bills. The Senator from Vermont a few days ago opposed all these bills, if I understood him correctly. I thought he was getting ready to object today. Is it his position now that since we passed one for Wisconsin we should pass every one that is submitted?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I shall be glad to submit a statement of the circumstances regarding the interesting situation in which we find ourselves.

The Committee on Banking and Currency held up all these bills. The House passed a bill for the issuance of a coin to celebrate the hundredth anniversary of the admission of Wisconsin into the Union. The Committee on Banking and Currency voted to report the bill. Having done that, it did not seem to me to be right, just, or defensible to hold up the other bills.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It was done over the opposition of the Senator from Vermont, as I recall.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of Senate bill 722?

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of the act entitled "An act to prohibit the issuance and coinage of certain commemorative coins, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1939, the Director of the Mint is authorized and directed to coin and to issue to any duly authorized representative of the Oregon Trail Monument Association, Idaho Unit, Inc., the unissued balance of the 50-cent pieces authorized to be issued by the act of May 17, 1926 (44 Stat. 559), providing for the coinage and issuance of Oregon Trail commemorative 50-cent pieces.

SEC. 2. Except as otherwise provided in this act, the provisions of such act of May 17, 1926, shall apply to the coining and issuing of 50-cent pieces issued under authority of this act.

COIN COMMEMORATING TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF READING, PA.

The bill (S. 342) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Reading, Pa., was announced as next in order.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I object.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I object to all of them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, objection has been made to Senate bill 342. Let me say that in the beginning of this session I introduced this bill, and when I was informed by the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency that certain bills had been reported favorably by the committee, I asked if my bill could be reported, and it was reported by the subcommittee. Thereafter I was informed by the chairman of the subcommittee that when the bills went to the full committee they were all referred back, and that medals were to be struck instead of 50-cent pieces. Thereafter I did not press my bill. But when I saw on the calendar a few days ago three or four similar bills providing for the coinage of special 50-cent pieces——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not realize that all these bills were on the calendar. I ask unanimous consent that we return to all these coinage bills that have been passed. I think this practice is silly. I did not know we were getting down to villages and individuals. I remember the argument that was advanced by the senior Senator from Wisconsin, that they were going to limit it to only hundredth anniversaries of the entrance of States into the Union. I was not on the subcommittee, and this is the first I have heard of this bill for the issuance of a coin to commemorate the founding of Reading, Pa. How many cities are there in the country of the size of Reading? I agree with the Senator from Ohio that in a way it is becoming ridiculous.

Mr. MYERS. My time is limited——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask unanimous consent that we may return to all the bills.

Mr. MYERS. I have not yielded for that purpose, and since I am limited in my time, I will say to the Senator from Arkansas that we passed several similar bills a few days ago, and it is too late to return to those bills. I would certainly think that at this moment discrimination would be practiced if, after allowing the other bills to go through, and objection should be made to similar bills which come before the Senate. There is no way to get back the bills which were passed some days ago.

The Senator from Arkansas may think that merely because the bill affects a city in Pennsylvania a special 50-cent piece should not be struck to celebrate its two hundredth anniversary, but I would say that Reading is a city, not a village. Reading is one of the great cities of Pennsylvania. Since similar bills were passed last week, or earlier this week, I certainly think it would be rank discrimination, when we cannot go back and

adopt the same rule for all such bills, to object to these bills.

I stated in the beginning, Mr. President, that I willingly accepted the ruling of the committee. It was only when I saw similar bills on the calendar this week that I asked the committee to report my bill. Since the others were reported and passed, I certainly feel that all the bills should be passed, and that all should be put upon the same plane.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move that we return to Calendar No. 666, Senate bill 1614, and reconsider the vote by which it was passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas asks unanimous consent that the Senate return to Calendar 666.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is my intention to make a motion with relation to all the special coinage bills.

Mr. FLANDERS. I object.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not ask unanimous consent. I move. Can I not move that the Senate return to that order of business? I move to reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 1614 was passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator can enter his motion to reconsider at the present time, but that is all that can be done.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I also enter the same motion as to Senate bill 1304, Senate bill 1042, and Senate bill 722. I want to treat them all impartially.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's motion will be entered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is that all of them, or are there two more, Senate bill 342, and Senate Joint Resolution 48?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senate bill 342 and Senate Joint Resolution 48 have not yet been passed on.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I may be a little vague as to just "where we are at," but I should like to give a famous translation of an ancient Latin motto, "Fiat justitia, ruat coelum." The English translation is, "Let justice be done though the heavens fall."

I shall stand by that maxim, so far as I am concerned, in this particular matter.

I call the Senate's attention to the fact that Calendar No. 45, Senate bill 865, was passed over—a bill which I strongly favor. I hope that during the first days of the second session of the Eightieth Congress Senate bill 865 will be considered and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 483. An act to relocate the boundaries and reduce the area of the Gila Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes; and

S. 1368. An act to amend section 2455 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to increase the size of isolated or disconnected tracts or parcels of the public domain which may be sold, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2938) to amend section 1 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 497, 5 U. S. C., sec. 488), fixing the price of copies of records furnished by the Department of the Interior.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3055) to permit the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War to supply utilities and related services to welfare activities, and persons whose businesses or residences are in the immediate vicinity of naval or military activities and require utilities or related services not otherwise obtainable locally, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 1361) to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit loans, capital grants, or annual contributions for low-rent housing and slum-clearance projects where construction costs exceed present cost limitations upon condition that local housing agencies pay the difference between cost limitations and the actual construction costs, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. GAMBLE, Mr. KUNKEL, Mr. TALLE, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, and Mr. PATMAN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3131) to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 to the bill.

The message also announced that the House had insisted upon its amendment to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 148) to authorize the temporary continuation of regulation of consumer credit, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. GAMBLE, Mr. KUNKEL, Mr. TALLE, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, and Mr. PATMAN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3999) to authorize the Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims resulting from evacuation of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military orders, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 254. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Glenna J. Howrey;

S. 323. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to allow credits to and relieve certain disbursing and certifying officers of the War and Navy Departments in the settlement of certain accounts;

S. 512. An act to extend provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to the Virgin Islands;

S. 616. An act to authorize the creation of a game refuge in the Francis Marion National Forest in the State of South Carolina;

S. 1180. An act to authorize the issuance of a special series of commemorative stamps in honor of Gold Star Mothers;

S. 1185. An act to provide for the disposal of materials on the public lands of the United States;

S. 1220. An act to transfer jurisdiction of certain lands comprising a portion of Acadia National Park, Maine, from the Department of the Interior to the Department of the Navy, and for other purposes;

S. 1348. An act to provide for the addition of certain revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands to the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project, in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes;

S. 1497. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of cottonseed and cottonseed products, and for other purposes," approved August 7, 1916;

S. 1515. An act to make surplus property available for the alleviation of damage caused by flood or other catastrophe;

S. 1519. An act to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3123. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3587. An act to provide for the establishment of a temporary Congressional Aviation Policy Board; and

H. R. 4106. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenue of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 48) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BUTLER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wonder if I can place all these bills in the same position, as being subject to a motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion of the Senator to reconsider is entered.

MINERAL LEASING ACT

The bill (S. 1006) to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended, so as to increase the acreage of sodium leases which may be issued in any State to a person, association, or corporation, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 27 of the act entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public

domain,' approved February 25, 1920, as amended (U. S. C., title 30, sec. 184), is amended to read as follows:

"No person, association, or corporation, except as herein provided, shall take or hold coal or phosphate leases or permits during the life of such leases in any one State, exceeding in the aggregate acreage 2,560 acres for each of such minerals; no person, association, or corporation, except as herein provided, shall take or hold at one time oil or gas leases exceeding in the aggregate 15,360 acres granted hereunder in any one State; and no person, association, or corporation, except as herein provided, shall take or hold sodium leases or permits during the life of such leases exceeding in the aggregate acreage 15,360 acres in any one State."

SALE OF LAND TO CATHOLIC SOCIETY OF ALASKA

The bill (H. R. 185) to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Catholic Society of Alaska for use as a mission was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SESSION LAWS OF HAWAII

The bill (H. R. 3376) to ratify and confirm Act 10 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1947, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRANSFER OF SCHOOL BUILDING TO PETERSBURG, ALASKA

The bill (H. R. 197) to transfer part of block 14 and the school building thereon of Petersburg town site, Alaska, used for school purposes, to the town of Petersburg, Alaska, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TAYLOR GRAZING ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1367) to amend section 10 of the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1273), as amended June 26, 1946 (49 Stat. 1978; 43 U. S. C., sec. 315i), which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the first sentence of section 3 of the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1270; 43 U. S. C., sec. 315b), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to issue or cause to be issued permits to graze livestock on such grazing districts to such bona fide settlers, residents, and other stock owners as under his rules and regulations are entitled to participate in the use of the range, upon the payment annually of reasonable fees in each case to be fixed or determined from time to time, and in fixing the amount of such fees the Secretary of the Interior shall take into account the extent to which such districts yield public benefits over and above those accruing to the users of the forage resources for livestock purposes. Such fees shall consist of a grazing fee for the use of the range, and a range-improvement fee which, when appropriated by the Congress, shall be available until expended solely for the construction, purchase, or maintenance of range improvements. Grazing permits shall be issued only to citizens of the United States or to those who have filed the necessary declarations of intention to become such, as required by the naturalization laws, and to groups, associations, or corporations authorized to conduct business under the laws of the State in which the grazing district is located."

SEC. 2. Section 10 of the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1273), as amended June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1978; 43 U. S. C., sec. 315i), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Except as provided in sections 9 and 11 hereof, all moneys received under the authority of this act shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, but the following proportions of the moneys so received shall be distributed as follows: (a) 12½ percent of the moneys collected as grazing fees under section 3 of this act during any fiscal year shall be paid at the end thereof by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State in which the grazing districts producing such moneys are situated, to be expended as the State legislature of such State may prescribe for the benefit of the county or counties in which the grazing districts producing such moneys are situated: *Provided*, That if any grazing district is in more than one State or county, the distributive share to each from the proceeds of said district shall be proportional to its area in said district; (b) 25 percent of all moneys collected under section 15 of this act during any fiscal year when appropriated by the Congress, shall be available until expended solely for the construction, purchase, or maintenance of range improvements; and 50 percent of all moneys collected under section 15 of this act during any fiscal year shall be paid at the end thereof by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State in which the lands producing such moneys are located, to be expended as the State legislature of such State may prescribe for the benefit of the county or counties in which the lands producing such moneys are located: *Provided*, That if any leased tract is in more than one State or county, the distributive share to each from the proceeds of said leased tract shall be proportional to its area in said leased tract."

SEC. 3. The first two sentences of section 11 of the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1273), are hereby amended to read as follows:

"That when appropriated by Congress, 33⅓ percent of all grazing fees received from each grazing district on Indian lands ceded to the United States for disposition under the public-land laws during any fiscal year shall be paid at the end thereof by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State in which said lands are situated, to be expended as the State legislature may prescribe for the benefit of public schools and public roads of the county or counties in which such grazing lands are situated. And the remaining 66⅔ percent of all grazing fees received from such grazing lands shall be deposited to the credit of the Indians pending final disposition under applicable laws, treaties, or agreements."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from Wyoming to the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4079, order of business 719. I may say that the House bill is identical with the Senate bill as amended.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4079) to amend the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), as amended June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1976), was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senate bill 1367 will be indefinitely postponed.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK MORTGAGES

The bill (H. R. 3448) to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska requests an explanation.

Mr. BUCK. The bill permits the Federal home loan bank to invest in 25-year mortgages, whereas they are now limited to investing in 20-year mortgages. That is all it does.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I have no objection.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1426) to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Civil Service, with an amendment, on page 5, after line 11, to strike out:

(b) The provisions of the acts of April 21, 1902, and May 27, 1908 (39 U. S. C. 423), relating to the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other similar devices shall be applicable to appropriations made for the pneumatic-tube service in Boston, Mass., in the annual appropriations for the Post Office Department so far as not inconsistent with such appropriation acts.

And insert:

(b) Notwithstanding any provisions of law to the contrary, the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to extend the present contract for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or similar devices at Boston, Mass., to July 31, 1948, at the present rental of $24,000 per annum, without advertising for bids.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be in the Post Office Department four Assistant Postmasters General, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be expended, from the appropriations for compensation to postmasters in the annual Post Office Department Appropriation Acts, compensation, at the rate provided by law for such services, to persons who, pending the designation of an acting postmaster, assume and properly perform the duties of postmaster upon the occurrence of a vacancy in the office of postmaster of the third or fourth class.

SEC. 3. The Postmaster General is hereby authorized to employ at summer and winter post offices auxiliary clerk hire and to compensate them from the appropriation for clerks at first- and second-class post offices carried in the annual Post Office Department Appropriation Acts.

SEC. 4. The Postmaster General, under such regulations as he shall prescribe, is authorized to provide village-delivery service in towns and villages where free-delivery service has not been authorized to the extent of annual appropriations that may be made therefor.

SEC. 5. The Postmaster General is authorized to sell to the public post-route maps and rural-delivery maps or blueprints at the cost of printing and 10 percent thereof additional.

SEC. 6. In the purchase of lawbooks and books of reference the Postmaster General is authorized to transfer and exchange, as consideration or part consideration, lawbooks and books of reference no longer needed.

SEC. 7. The Postmaster General is authorized to make expenditures of such sums as may be annually appropriated for carfare and bicycle allowance, including special-delivery carfare, cost of transporting carriers by privately owned automobiles to and from their routes at rates not exceeding regular streetcar or bus fare, and for the purchase, maintenance, and exchange of bicycles.

SEC. 8. The Postmaster General is authorized, in the disbursement of the appropriations for vehicle service made in the annual appropriations for the Post Office Department, to apply a part thereof to the leasing of quarters for the housing of Government-owned motor vehicles at reasonable annual rentals for terms not exceeding 10 years each.

SEC. 9. The Postmaster General is authorized to contract for telephone service in public buildings under his administration by means of telephone switchboards or equivalent telephone switching equipment jointly serving in each case two or more governmental activities, where he determines that joint service is economical and in the interest of the Government, and to secure reimbursement for the cost of such joint service from available appropriations for telephone expenses of the bureaus and offices receiving the same.

SEC. 10. The actual and necessary expenses of officials and employees of the Post Office Department and the postal service, when traveling on official business, may be paid from the appropriations for the service in connection with which the travel is performed, including per diem allowances in lieu of actual expenses of subsistence, and appropriations for each fiscal year shall be available therefor.

SEC. 11. The Postmaster General is authorized to establish and maintain mail equipment shops for the manufacture and repair of mail bags, mail locks, and other necessary equipment. He is also authorized to expend not exceeding $15,000 annually from appropriations made for the maintenance of the equipment shops in Washington, D. C., for the purchase of material and the manufacture in the equipment shops of such small quantities of distinctive equipment as may be required by other executive departments and for service in Alaska, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and other island possessions.

SEC. 12. The Postmaster General is authorized to pay rewards for detection, arrest, and conviction of post-office burglars, robbers, highway mail robbers, and persons mailing or causing to be mailed any bomb, infernal machine, or mechanical, chemical, or other device or composition which may ignite or explode, out of such sums as may be appropriated therefor: *Provided*, That rewards may be paid in the discretion of the Postmaster General when an offender of any of the classes mentioned was killed in the act of committting the crime or in resisting lawful arrest: *Provided further*, That no part of the appropriated sum shall be used to pay any rewards at rates in excess of those specified and officially published by the Post Office Department as offers of reward: *And provided further*, That such amounts as may be appropriated not to exceed $20,000 may be expended in any fiscal year in the discretion of the Postmaster General for the purpose of securing information concerning violations of the postal laws and for services and information looking toward the apprehension of criminals.

SEC. 13. (a) The provisions of the acts of April 21, 1902, May 27, 1908, and June 19, 1922 (39 U. S. C. 423), relating to contracts for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other similar devices shall not be applicable to appropriations made for the pneumatic-tube service in New York, N. Y., in the annual appropriations.

(b) Notwithstanding any provisions of law to the contrary, the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to extend the present contract for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or similar devices at Boston, Mass., to July 31, 1948, at the present rental of $24,000 per annum, without advertising for bids.

SEC. 14. (a) If the revenues of the Post Office Department in any fiscal year shall be insufficient to meet the expenditures authorized by appropriations for the operation of the Post Office Department and the postal service for that fiscal year, a sum equal to such deficiency shall be paid, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply such deficiency, and the sum or sums needed shall be advanced to the Post Office Department upon requisition of the Postmaster General.

(b) If the revenues of the Post Office Department for any fiscal year shall exceed the expenditures of the Post Office Department and the postal service for that fiscal year, the excess of revenues shall be deposited in the general funds of the Treasury as surplus postal receipts.

SEC. 15. The Postmaster General is authorized to expend from the appropriations for the rural-delivery service carried in the annual appropriations for the Post Office Department, such sums as are necessary for auxiliary carriers, clerks in charge of rural stations, tolls and ferriage, and for other incidental expenses of the rural-delivery service.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, would the distinguished Senator from North Dakota tell us about the bill?

Mr. LANGER. The bill involves the pneumatic-tube services in Boston and New York City. In Boston the pneumatic-tube service is owned by a private corporation. The tube is 1 1/10 miles long. The committee thinks the company has been receiving very good pay for its service. However, they want an increase of 66 percent. The result is, we recommended the pending measure, which provides that the contract shall be renewed for 1 year at the present rate. If the company does not care to take it, they can discontinue their pneumatic-tube service, so far as we are concerned. In the meantime, an investigation is to be made of the pneumatic-tube services in New York and in Boston. In New York they also ask an increase. The pneumatic-tube service in New York extends for 22.3 miles. The contract in that city does not expire for about 9 months, perhaps 8 1/2 months, now. We are also going to investigate that tube service. Upon the recommendation of the Post Office Department, the committee reported the bill, pending an investigation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES PAY ACT

The bill (S. 1562) to amend section 102 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 to exclude certain experts and consultants from the coverage of the act was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 102 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 295) is hereby amended by deleting the word "and" before clause (6) thereof, by substituting a semicolon for the period at the end of that clause, and by the addition of the following: "and (7) persons engaged by contract or otherwise under authority of section 15, act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law No. 600, 79th Cong.), and provisions of appropriation acts enacted pursuant thereto."

CHARLES HOWARD RICHARDS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 939) for the relief of Charles Howard Richards, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles Howard Richards, of Eugene, Oreg., the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him on December 14, 1941, while serving as a volunteer guard, Office of Civilian Defense, on duty at the Bonneville substation, Bonneville power project, north of Eugene, Oreg.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OFFICIAL AND PENAL BONDS

The bill (H. R. 1567) to codify and enact into positive law title 6 of the United States Code, entitled "Official and Penal Bonds," was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FLAG AND SEAL, SEAT OF GOVERNMENT, AND THE STATES

The bill (H. R. 1566) to codify and enact into positive law title 4 of the United States Code, entitled "Flag and Seal, Seat of Government, and the States," was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

GENERAL PROVISIONS OF UNITED STATES CODE

The bill (H. R. 1565) to codify and enact into positive law title 1 of the United States Code, entitled "General Provisions," was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

OWEN R. BREWSTER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R.1737) for the relief of Owen R. Brewster, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, in line 6, to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,500."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Maine explain the bill? [Laughter.]

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Texas and, without disparagement of the gentleman whose name is on the claim, who says that he is located in Texas, may I say that the largest county in Texas is named Brewster, and that it is a Republican county. That is the most I can say in favor of the bill. [Laughter.]

Mr. CONNALLY. That is why we want relief. [Laughter.] Mr. President, we are very happy indeed to have present the Senator from Maine [Mr. OWEN BREWSTER]. This is an act which provides for payment to Mr. Owen R. Brewster of $5,000 for the death of his daughter, who was killed by an Army truck. The War Department recognizes liability and approves the bill. It was passed by the House in the amount of $5,000. The Senate committee has reduced it to $3,500. My appeal is to reject the amendment and restore the sum of $5,000, as provided by the House.

The young lady was killed as the result of an accident for which she was in no wise to blame. An Army truck, on official business, had carried a group of bandmen from Camp Hood, Tex., to Lampasas, Tex. Upon the return trip the driver of the truck drove out of the park where the band had been playing. Without stopping to look for other cars that might be approaching, the driver made a left turn and continued on the left-hand side of the roadway, until the driver of the car in which the young lady was a passenger, coming on the right-hand side of the road, where the car had a right to be, collided head-on with the truck, killing the young lady. She was 14 years of age. She came from a fine family. Her father is in humble circumstances. He is a sheep herder. The Senator from Maine referred to Brewster County, Tex., where there are a great many sheep.

My appeal is to reject the amendment and pass the House bill, providing for the payment of $5,000. There are numerous precedents in comparable cases, where the sum of $5,000 was authorized by the Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the——

Mr. CONNALLY. I oppose the amendment, and I hope the Senate will reject it.

Mr. BREWSTER. I join with the Senator. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I ask the chairman of the Judiciary Committee a question? If he is absent from the floor at the moment, may I inquire of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sure I shall be able to answer the Senator's questions.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the usual amount authorized by the Committee on the Judiciary in the case of a person who is killed under circumstances similar to those in the present case? Is there any rule?

Mr. CONNALLY. There is no real standard, I may say to the Senator from Nebraska, but I could cite several precedents showing that $5,000 has been paid in similar cases.

Mr. WHERRY. In the absence of any of the members of the Judiciary Committee, will the distinguished Senator from Texas give the reason for the action of the committee in reducing the amount in this instance?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am a member of the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not presume to speak for the chairman. I did not handle the bill. The chairman has handled the personal claims, with the aid of a subcommittee. The question of the measure of damages in the death of a minor child is a difficult one. There is no uniform rule throughout the United States. There are States in which no recovery is allowed for mental suffering as the result of the loss of a minor child, where there is no support proved, and none of the usual measures of damage.

In the absence of the chairman I make the statement—there may be further reasons, but I see no other members of the committee present—that this is more or less of an arbitrary amount which has been agreed upon in cases where there are no well-established measures of damage, and I think the amount in question has been allowed in practically every other case which has arisen involving the death of a minor child. That is my understanding of the situation.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean the amount of $3,500, or $5,000?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Three thousand five hundred dollars is the amount provided in bills which I handled when I was chairman.

Mr. President, I see another member of the committee present who can explain the matter.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I am not on the subcommittee dealing with claims, but I am a member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is not on the floor. He usually serves as chairman of the Claims Committee. I feel that before any change is made he should be present to explain thoroughly why that amount was arrived at. May I suggest, if the Senator insists upon his amendment, that the bill be temporarily passed over?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I can explain why the amount of $3,500 was provided, if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I feel that the Senator from Wisconsin should be present.

Mr. CONNALLY. Have him sent for.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am perfectly willing to do so.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I think the matter is made quite clear in the report. There is quite an extended report covering it. Considerable discussion took place. I took an interest in it for reasons which will be understood. It is only a question of what might fairly be provided, and the reason why I would urge that it might be favorably considered is that at this time, the House having acted on it, if it goes to conference, probably there will be no action at the present session. Whether the amount should be $3,500 or $5,000 is a matter which anyone should be able to determine. The death in this case was not instantaneous. The child lived for a time, so that element enters into the equation; such a consideration is taken into account in cases of this nature.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I will say that I have asked the chairman of the Judiciary Committee to come to the floor and if the bill can be passed over temporarily I shall be glad to have that done.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over temporarily.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I desire to explain why the sum of $3,500 is in the bill, if I may. The bill passed the House containing $5,000. The bill was referred to the War Department, and the record shows that the War Department in its reply admitted liability, but suggested the sum of $3,500 instead of $5,000. The reason for the amount of $3,500 is that some officer in the War Department suggested $3,500.

Mr. President, I have in my hand two or three precedents in similar cases for the amount of $5,000. Nearly all the State law reports, if it is desired to talk about law, go back to the proposition that in the case of the death of a minor child it is very difficult to establish any standard of compensation; that at most it is speculation, and more or less arbitrary, and that so long as the courts and juries award amounts which are at all reasonable they will not be disturbed. So it seems to me that in a case of this nature, where death ensued, and where the Government was liable, for the truck was on the wrong side of the street, the father ought to receive $5,000.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I rather think the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin was absent a part of the time while we were discussing these claims. We went into the matter completely. It was unanimously agreed by the Committee on the Judiciary that the sum of $5,000 was reasonable, even though it was somewhat arbitrary.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, may I inquire why the amount of $3,500 was placed in the bill, if the committee has agreed that $5,000 is an appropriate amount? In view of the statement just made, I think in absolute fairness to the Committee on the Judiciary, the chairman of the committee, who is also the chairman of the Subcommittee on Claims, should be present. I am not objecting to the amount, but I wish to protect the committee and the position taken by the chairman of the committee. So I ask again that the bill be temporarily passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill has been passed over temporarily, without prejudice.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. What is meant by the bill being passed over temporarily?

Will it be taken up at the conclusion of the call of the calendar?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; or any time any Senator requests that it be reverted to, that can be done.

Mr. WHERRY. I think it is very unfair to postpone action.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

ADELBERT E. TULLER

The bill (S. 535) for the relief of Adelbert E. Tuller was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CODIFICATION AND ENACTMENT OF TITLE 9 OF UNITED STATES CODE, ENTITLED "ARBITRATION"

The bill (H. R. 2084) to codify and enact into positive law, title 9, of the United States Code, entitled "Arbitration," was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CODIFICATION AND ENACTMENT OF TITLE 17 OF UNITED STATES CODE, ENTITLED "COPYRIGHTS"

The bill (H. R. 2083) to codify and enact into positive law title 17 of the United States Code, entitled "Copyrights," was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 5 OF HOME OWNERS' LOAN ACT OF 1933

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2800) to amend section 5 of Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after the word "amendment", to insert "(except business loans provided by section 503 thereof and not secured by a lien on real estate)."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BRICKER. The bill amends section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, by permitting Federal Savings and Loan Associations to make loans under the National Housing Act and the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, the GI bill of Rights. The loans are guaranteed by the Federal Government under the two acts and are made wholly to servicemen.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 2800) was read the third time and passed.

NATURALIZATION OF CERTAIN UNITED STATES ARMY PERSONNEL—YUGOSLAV FLIERS

The bill (H. R. 1652) to provide for the naturalization of certain United States Army personnel—Yugoslav fliers, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HARLEY SHORES

The bill (H. R. 640) for the relief of Harley Shores was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

YONEO SAKAI

The bill (S. 257) for the relief of Yoneo Sakai was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record Yoneo Sakai as having entered the United States on October 10, 1926, for permanent residence. The said Yoneo Sakai shall not be subject to deportation by reason of such entry.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any warrants of arrest or orders of deportation which may have been issued, and to discontinue any deportation proceedings which may have been commenced, in the case of said Yoneo Sakai.

CONVEYANCE TO STATE OF DELAWARE OF PORTION OF PEA PATCH ISLAND

The bill (S. 1480) authorizing the conveyance to the State of Delaware of a portion of Pea Patch Island, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the State of Delaware all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to Pea Patch Island, situated in the Delaware River, near Delaware City, Del., except that portion of the island lying northeastwardly of a straight line just northeastwardly from the northeast outside wall of the Fort Delaware moat and 80 feet northeastwardly at right angles from triangulation station "Torpedo" from a point in the southeasterly high-water line to a point in the northwesterly high-water line of the island, reserving to the United State a perpetual easement to construct and operate on the east fire-control station of the fort parapet a navigational light and fog signal with necessary appurtenances, and a perpetual easement to construct and maintain a submarine cable from the water on the southeasterly side of the island to the light and fog-signal apparatus.

ANDREW C. EXTROM AND HARRY C. PEARSON

The bill (H. R. 3495) for the relief of Andrew C. Extrom and Harry C. Pearson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEWIS H. RICH

The bill (H. R. 434) for the relief of Lewis H. Rich was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INCORPORATION OF FRANCO-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS

The bill (S. 1356) providing for the incorporation of the Franco-American War Veterans was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, this bill is similar to the one which we passed at the last call of the calendar granting a Federal charter to the AMVETS, and similar to two other bills on the calendar, one for the Catholic War Veterans and one for the Jewish War Veterans. The bill provides for the granting of a charter to the veterans in this country who are Americans of French descent. The organization has been in existence since World War I. It has 12,000 or 13,000 members, a good many of them in New England. I think there are some in Wisconsin and Minnesota, but of that I am not sure. The organization has filed its financial statement and has met all the requirements which the Committee on the Judiciary demands of an organization which is to receive a Federal charter.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] asked me to object to the bill temporarily.

Mr. LODGE. I can tell the Senator that the reason the Senator from Missouri made that request was because at the time the financial statement of the organization had not been received. I received it about an hour ago. That was the only objection the Senator from Missouri had.

Mr. WHERRY. In view of the fact that the Senator from Missouri made that request, would the Senator from Massachusetts object to having the bill passed over temporarily until the Senator from Missouri can come to the floor? He is attending a committee hearing now.

Mr. LODGE. I will say to the Senator that I know what the objection of the Senator from Missouri was, and I have the material with which to meet it.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not doubt that in the least, but I still should like, if the Senator does not object, to have the bill go over temporarily, and when the Senator from Missouri comes to the floor I shall ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. LODGE. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be temporarily laid aside without prejudice.

The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

CLAIMS ARISING FROM DEATH OF NORMAN RAY PEDRON AND CARL FRANKLIN MORRIS

The bill (S. 609) conferring jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claims arising out of the death of Norman Ray Pedron and Carl Franklin Morris was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claims against the United States arising out of the deaths of Norman Ray Pedron and Carl Franklin Morris, late of Hope, Ark., who were killed April 15, 1944, at Hope, Ark., by the explosion of a 37-millimeter shell of the type used by the United States Army.

SEC. 2. In the determination of such claims, the United States shall be held liable for damages, and for any acts committed by any of its officers or employees, to the same extent as if the United States were a private person.

SEC. 3. Suit upon such claims may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claims, and appeals from and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be in the same

manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph "Twentieth" of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

J. RUTLEDGE ALFORD

The bill (H. R. 3361) for the relief of J. Rutledge Alford was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 430) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to make such act applicable to officers and employees of national farm-loan associations and production credit associations was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, what became of House bill 1544, Calendar 697?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That bill apparently is not at the desk. No action was taken on it. Apparently it has not arrived from the Printing Office.

The bill (H. R. 1426) to extend veterans' preference benefits to widowed mothers of certain ex-servicemen was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. This House bill is similar to a Senate bill which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] requested me to object to. At his request, I object to the consideration of the House bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may I ask what happened to Senate bill 430, Calendar No. 700?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill was passed over under objection by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The bill (S. 1557) to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask that that bill be temporarily passed over until the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] comes to the floor of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be temporarily passed over.

INSTITUTE OF INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

The bill (S. 1678) to provide for the reincorporation of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, and for other purposes, was considered ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there be, as of the date of enactment of this act, created as an agency of the United States of America a body corporate with the name of "The Institute of Inter-American Affairs" (in this act called the "Institute").

SEC. 2. The purposes of this corporation are to further the general welfare of, and to strengthen friendship and understanding among, the peoples of the American Republics through collaboration with other governments and governmental agencies of the American Republics in planning, initiating, assisting, financing, administering, and executing technical programs and projects, especially in the fields of public health, sanitation, agriculture, and education.

SEC. 3. The Institute, as a corporation—

(a) Shall have succession for a period of 5 years unless sooner dissolved by an act of Congress.

(b) May adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed.

(c) May make and perform contracts with any individual, corporation, or other body of persons however designated, whether within or without the United States of America, and with any government or governmental agency, domestic or foreign.

(d) Shall determine and prescribe the manner in which its obligations shall be incurred and its expenses allowed and paid.

(e) May, as necessary for the transaction of the business of the Institute, employ officers, employees, agents, and attorneys in accordance with the provisions of the civil service and classification laws, except that the Institute may, without regard to the civil service and classification laws, employ, and fix the compensation of, officers, employees, agents, and attorneys of the Institute employed for service outside the continental limits of the United States: *Provided*, That the salary of any person thus employed shall not exceed the maximum salary established by the classification laws, and that the Institute may require bonds of any employee and pay the premiums of such bonds: *Provided further*, That no person who is a citizen of the United States not presently employed by the Institute of Inter-American Affairs or the Inter-American Educational Foundation, Inc., shall be employed under authority of this paragraph (e) until such person has been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation: *Provided further*, That no person not a citizen of the United States shall be employed under authority of this paragraph (e) for service in any American Republic of which such person is not a citizen except with the specific approval of the Government of the American Republic concerned.

(f) May acquire by purchase, devise, bequest, or gift, or otherwise, lease, hold, and improve such real and personal property as it finds to be necessary to its purposes, whether within or without the United States, and in any manner dispose of all such real and personal property held by it and, use as general funds all receipts arising from the disposition of such property.

(g) Shall be entitled to the use of the United States mails in the same manner and on the same conditions as the executive departments of the Government.

(h) May, with the consent of any board, corporation, commission, independent establishment, or executive department of the Government, including any field service thereof, avail itself of the use of information, services, facilities, officers, and employees thereof in carrying out the provisions of this act.

(i) May accept money, funds, property, and services of every kind by gift, devise or bequest, or grant, or otherwise, and make advances and grants to any individual, corporation, or other body of persons, whether within or without the United States of America, or to any government or governmental agency, domestic or foreign, when deemed advisable by the Institute in furtherance of its purposes.

(j) May sue and be sued, complain and defend, in its corporate name in any court of competent jurisdiction.

(k) Shall have such other powers as may be necessary and incident to carrying out its powers and duties under this act.

SEC. 4. Upon termination of the corporate life of the Institute all of its functions shall be liquidated and, thereafter, unless otherwise provided by Congress, the assets shall be transferred to the United States Treasury as the property of the United States.

SEC. 5. (a) The management of the Institute shall be vested in a board of directors (hereinafter referred to as the "Board") of not less than five in number, each of whom shall be appointed by the Secretary of State from among the officials and employees of the Department of State, and in the discretion of the Secretary of State and with the consent of the chiefs of other departments or agencies respectively concerned from among the officials and employees of other United States Government departments and agencies: *Provided*, That no person shall be appointed as a director under authority of this paragraph (a) until such person has been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(b) The Secretary of State shall designate one director as Chairman of the Board.

(c) The directors shall hold office at the pleasure of the Secretary of State.

(d) The directors shall receive no additional compensation for their services as directors but may be allowed actual necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as directors.

(e) The Board shall direct the exercise of all the powers of the Institute.

(f) The Board may prescribe, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which the business of the Institute may be conducted and in which the powers granted to it by law may be exercised and enjoyed: *Provided*, That a majority of the Board shall be required as a quorum.

(g) In furtherance and not in limitation of the powers conferred upon it, the Board may appoint such committees for the carrying out of the work of the Institute as the Board finds to be for the best interests of the Institute, each committee to consist of two or more of the directors, which committees, together with officers and agents duly authorized by the Board and to the extent provided by the Board, shall have and may exercise the powers of the Board in the management of the business and affairs of the Institute.

SEC. 6. The Institute shall be a nonprofit corporation and shall have no capital stock. No part of its revenue, earnings, or other income or property shall inure to the benefit of its directors, officers, and employees and such revenue, earnings, or other income, or property shall be used for the carrying out of the corporate purposes herein set forth. No director, officer, or employee of the corporation shall in any manner directly or indirectly participate in the deliberation upon or the determination of any question affecting his personal interests or the interests of any corporation, partnership, or organization in which he is directly or indirectly interested.

SEC. 7. When approved by the Institute, in furtherance of its purposes, the officers and employees of the Institute may accept and hold offices or positions to which no compensation is attached with governments or governmental agencies of the other American Republics.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of State shall have authority to detail employees of the Department of State to the Institute under such circumstances and upon such conditions as he may determine: *Provided*, That any such employee so detailed shall not lose any privileges, rights, or seniority as an employee of the Government by virtue of such detail.

SEC. 9. The principal office of the Institute shall be located in the District of Columbia, but there may be established agencies, branch offices, or other offices in any place or places within the United States or the other American Republics in any of which locations the Institute may carry on all or any of its operations and business under bylaws or rules and regulations.

SEC. 10. The Institute, including its franchise and income, shall be exempt from taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, or any Territory, dependency, or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority.

SEC. 11. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved. If any clause, sentence, paragraph, or part of this act shall for any reason be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of this act, but shall be confined in its operations to the clause, sentence, paragraph, or part thereof directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment shall have been rendered.

SEC. 12. The Institute of Inter-American Affairs and the Inter-American Educational Foundation, Inc., two Government corporations caused to be created under the laws of the State of Delaware on March 31, 1942, and September 25, 1943, respectively, by the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, shall, within 10 days following the enactment of this act, transfer to the corporation created by this act all necessary personnel, the assets, funds, and property—real, personal, and mixed—and all debts, liabilities, obligations, and duties, and all rights, privileges, and powers subject to all restrictions, disabilities, and duties of the two said corporations, and the corporation created by this act, shall accept full title to and ownership of all the assets, funds, and property—real, personal, and mixed—and all debts, liabilities, obligations, and duties, and all rights, privileges, and powers subject to the said restrictions, disabilities, and duties of the two said corporations and all such debts, liabilities, obligations, and duties of the two said corporations shall henceforth attach to the corporation created by this act and may be enforced against it to the same extent as if said debts, liabilities, obligations, and duties had been incurred or contracted by the corporation created by this act: *Provided*, That all citizens of the United States presently employed by the Institute of Inter-American Affairs or the Inter-American Educational Foundation, Inc., and transferred under authority of this section 12 to the corporation created by this act shall be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation within 6 months following the date of enactment of this act: *Provided further*, That no person not a citizen of the United States presently employed by the Institute of Inter-American Affairs or the Inter-American Educational Foundation, Inc., for service in an American Republic of which such person is not a citizen, and transferred under authority of this section 12, shall be retained in such service for a period exceeding 3 months from the date of enactment of this act except with the specific approval of the Government of the American Republic concerned.

SEC. 13. The Institute shall be subject to the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act (Public Law 248, 79th Cong.).

SEC. 14. There are authorized to be appropriated, at a rate not to exceed $5,000,000 annually, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this act.

This act may be cited as the "Institute of Inter-American Affairs Act."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1375) to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America was annuonced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be temporarily passed over until the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] returns to the Chamber.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be temporarily passed over.

EXPENSES OF UNITED STATES PARK POLICE FORCE—REIMBURSEMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (H. R. 2471) to provide for periodical reimbursement of the general fund of the District of Columbia for certain expenditures made for the compensation, uniforms, equipment, and other expenses of the United States Park Police force was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RETIREMENT OF PUBLIC-SCHOOL TEACHERS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (H. R. 3852) to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia," approved August 7, 1946, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3978) to provide for the temporary advancement in ranks and increase in salary of lieutenants in the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia, serving as supervisors of certain squads, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. At the request of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

RECOVERY OF CERTAIN HOUSING ACCOMMODATIONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1590) to amend the District of Columbia rent control law so as to provide that schools and universities may recover possession of housing accommodations in certain cases, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) of section 5 of the act entitled "An act to regulate rents in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved December 2, 1941, as amended, is amended by (1) striking out the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the word "or", and (2) adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(6) The landlord, being a recognized school or an accredited nonprofit university, has a bona fide need for the premises for educational, research, administrative, or dormitory use."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill from the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the bill applies only to educational institutions of the District of Columbia. Those institutions have certain housing accommodations which are now rented to tenants. They desire to recover possession for educational purposes. The bill is to make that possible. It applies only to educational institutions in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

APPLICABILITY OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AND INTERNAL REVENUE CODE TO NEWSPAPER VENDORS

The bill (H. R. 3997) to exclude certain vendors of newspapers or magazines from certain provisions of the Social Security Act and Internal Revenue Code was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRIORITY FOR PAYMENT OUT OF GERMAN SPECIAL DEPOSIT ACCOUNT

The bill (H. R. 4043) to change the order of priority for payment out of the German special deposit account, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER DAM

The bill (S. 1624) granting the consent of Congress to Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Susquehanna River was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This bill is the same as House bill 3334, Calendar No. 723. The House bill is the same as the amended Senate bill. Is there objection to the consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3334) granting the consent of Congress to Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. to construct, maintain and operate a dam in the Susquehanna River was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 1624 will be indefinitely postponed.

POLLUTION IN WATERS OF NEW ENGLAND STATES—INTERSTATE COMPACT

The bill (S. 1418) granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to control and reduction of pollution in the waters of the New England States was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent and approval of Congress is hereby given to an interstate compact relating to the control and reduction of pollution of the streams and waters of the New England States negotiated and entered into or to be entered into under authority of Public Resolution 104, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved June 8, 1936, and now ratified by the States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island, which compact reads as follows:

"NEW ENGLAND INTERSTATE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL COMPACT

"Whereas the growth of population and the development of the territory of the New England States has resulted in serious pollution of certain interstate streams, ponds, and lakes, and of tidal waters ebbing and flowing past the boundaries of two or more States; and

"Whereas such pollution constitutes a menace to the health, welfare, and economic prosperity of the people living in such area; and

"Wheras the abatement of existing pollution and the control of future pollution in the interstate waters of the New England area are of prime importance to the people and can best be accomplished through the cooperation of the New England States in the

establishment of an interstate agency to work with the States in the field of pollution abatement;

"Now, therefore, the States of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont do agree and are bound as follows:

"ARTICLE I

"It is agreed between the signatory States that the provisions of this compact shall apply to streams, ponds, and lakes which are contiguous to two or more signatory States or which flow through two or more signatory States or which have a tributary contiguous to two or more signatory States or flowing through two or more signatory States, and also shall apply to tidal waters ebbing and flowing past the boundaries of two States.

"ARTICLE II

"There is hereby created the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission (hereinafter referred to as the Commission) which shall be a body corporate and politic, having the powers, duties, and jurisdiction herein enumerated and such other and additional powers as shall be conferred upon it by the act or acts of a signatory state concurred in by the others.

"ARTICLE III

"The Commission shall consist of five commissioners from each signatory State, each of whom shall be a resident voter of the State from which he is appointed. The commissioners shall be chosen in the manner and for the terms provided by law of the State from which they shall be appointed. For each State there shall be on the Commission a member representing the State Health Department, a member representing the State water pollution control board (if such exists), and, except where a State in its enabling legislation decides that the best interests of the State will be otherwise served, a member representing municipal interests, a member representing industrial interests, and a member representing an agency acting for fisheries or conservation.

"ARTICLE IV

"The Commission shall annually elect from its members a chairman and vice chairman and shall appoint and at its pleasure remove or discharge such officers. It may appoint and employ a secretary who shall be a professional engineer versed in water pollution and may employ such stenographic or clerical employees as shall be necessary, and at its pleasure remove or discharge such employees. It shall adopt a seal and suitable bylaws and shall promulgate rules and regulations for its management and control. It may maintain an office for the transaction of its business and may meet at any time or place within the signatory States. Meetings shall be held at least twice each year. A majority of the members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, but no action of the Commission imposing any obligation on any signatory State or on any municipal agency or subdivision thereof or on any person, firm, or corporation therein shall be binding unless a majority of the members from such signatory State shall have voted in favor thereof. Where meetings are planned to discuss matters relevant to problems of water-pollution control affecting only certain of the signatory States, the Commission may vote to authorize special meetings of the commissioners of the States especially concerned. The Commission shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements and shall make an annual report to the Governor and the legislature of each signatory State setting forth in detail the operations and transactions conducted by it pursuant to this compact, and shall make recommendations for any legislative action deemed by it advisable, including amendments to the statutes of the signatory States which may be necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of this compact. The Commission shall not incur any obligations for salaries, office, administrative, traveling, or other expenses prior to the allotment of funds by the signatory States adequate to meet the same, nor shall the Commission pledge the credit of any of the signatory States. Each signatory State reserves the right to provide hereafter by law for the examination and audit of the accounts of the Commission. The Commission shall appoint a treasurer who may be a member of the Commission, and disbursements by the Commission shall be valid only when authorized by the Commission and when vouchers therefor have been signed by the secretary and countersigned by the treasurer. The secretary shall be custodian of the records of the Commission with authority to attest to and certify such records or copies thereof.

"ARTICLE V

"It is recognized, owing to such variable factors as location, size, character, and flow and the many varied uses of the waters subject to the terms of this compact, that no single standard of sewage and waste treatment and no single standard of quality of receiving waters is practical and that the degree of treatment of sewage and industrial wastes should take into account the classification of the receiving waters according to present and proposed highest use, such as for drinking water supply, industrial and agricultural uses, bathing and other recreational purposes, maintenance and propagation of fish life, shellfish culture, navigation, and disposal of wastes.

"The Commission shall establish reasonable physical, chemical, and bacteriological standards of water quality satisfactory for various classifications of use. It is agreed that each of the signatory States through appropriate agencies will prepare a classification of its interstate waters in entirety or by portions according to present and proposed highest use and for this purpose technical experts employed by State departments of health and State water-pollution control agencies are authorized to confer on questions relating to classification of interstate waters affecting two or more States. Each signatory State agrees to submit its classification of its interstate waters to the Commission for approval. It is agreed that after such approval all signatory States through their appropriate State health departments and water pollution control agencies will work to establish programs of treatment of sewage and industrial wastes which will meet standards established by the Commission for classified waters. The Commission may from time to time make such changes in definitions of classifications and in standards as may be required by changed conditions or as may be necessary for uniformity.

"ARTICLE VI

"Each of the signatory States pledges to provide for the abatement of existing pollution and for the control of future pollution of interstate inland and tidal waters as described in article I, and to put and maintain the waters thereof in a satisfactory condition consistent with the highest classified use of each body of water.

"ARTICLE VII

"Nothing in this compact shall be construed to repeal or prevent the enactment of any legislation or prevent the enforcement of any requirement by any signatory State imposing any additional condition or restriction to further lessen the pollution of waters within its jurisdiction. Nothing herein contained shall affect or abate any action now pending brought by any governmental board or body created by or existing under any of the signatory States.

"ARTICLE VIII

"The signatory States agree to appropriate for the salaries, office, administrative, travel and other expenses such sum or sums as shall be recommended by the Commission. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts obligates itself only to the extent of $6,500 in any one year, the State of Connecticut only to the extent of $3,000 in any one year, the State of Rhode Island only to the extent of $1,500 in any one year, and the States of New Hampshire, Maine, and Vermont each only to the extent of $1,000 in any one year.

"ARTICLE IX

"Should any part of this compact be held to be contrary to the constitution of any signatory State or of the United States, all other parts thereof shall continue to be in full force and effect.

"ARTICLE X

"The Commission is authorized to discuss with appropriate State agencies in New York State questions of pollution of waters which flow into the New England area from New York State or vice versa and to further the establishment of agreements on pollution abatement to promote the interests of the New York and New England areas.

"Whenever the commission by majority vote of the members of each signatory State shall have given its approval and the State of New York shall have taken the necessary action to do so, the State of New York shall be a party to this compact for the purpose of controlling and abating the pollution of waterways common to New York and the New England States signatory to this compact but excluding the waters under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Sanitation Commission (New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut).

"ARTICLE XI

"This compact shall become effective immediately upon the adoption of the compact by any two contiguous States of New England but only insofar as applies to those States and upon approval by Federal law. Thereafter, upon ratification by other contiguous States, it shall also become effective as to those States."

SEC. 2. Without further submission of the compact, the consent of Congress is given to the States of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont, and to the State of New York pursuant to article X of the compact, to enter into the compact as a signatory State and party thereto.

SEC. 3. Nothing contained in this act or in the compact herein approved shall be construed as impairing or affecting the sovereignty of the United States or any of its rights or jurisdiction in and over the area or waters which are the subject of the compact.

SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved.

Mr. WHERRY subsequently said: Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. What was the disposition of Senate bill 1418, Calendar No. 712?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill was passed.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to recur to Calendar 712, Senate bill 1418. Was an explanation given?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, the bill simply grants the consent of Congress that certain States in the New England area may enter into compacts between themselves with respect to their interstate streams, in dealing with the subject of stream pollution. The bill involves no obligation on the part of the Federal Government. It simply grants the consent necessary under the Constitution that the States may contract with one another.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I have no objection.

AMENDMENT OF FLOOD CONTROL ACT—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3146) to amend section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved August 28, 1937, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, the bill is in charge of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Committee on Public Works. The bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make certain surveys with respect to the conservation of land, in conjunction with flood control. I understand that that was done in the past, but in some amendments which have been made to the act that authority was omitted, and there is some doubt as to the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make such reports. The bill deals with a report which is to be made to the proper committees of Congress with respect to conservation of land affected by flood-control projects.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LUCAS subsequently said: Mr. President, may I inquire what happened to Calendar No. 713, House bill 3146?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill was passed.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask unanimous consent to recur to that bill. It was passed while I was consulting with one of my colleagues. I did not know that it was being called.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate will recur to House bill 3146, Calendar 713. Without objection, the vote by which the bill was ordered to a third reading and passed is reconsidered.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I object to the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1663) to prohibit the payment of retirement annuities to former Members of Congress convicted of offenses involving the improper use of authority, influence, power, or privileges as Members of Congress was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 232) providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission and authorizing an appropriation therefor was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the joint resolution be passed over. The printed report is not yet available, and I have not had an opportunity to examine it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 231) providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Caribbean Commission and authorizing an appropriation therefor, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. For the same reasons as stated in connection with House Joint Resolution 232, I ask that this joint resolution be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

OWEN R. BREWSTER

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to recur to calendar No. 684, House bill 1737, for the relief of Owen R. Brewster. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. WILEY] has since entered the Chamber.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,500."

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. Is the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] the one referred to in the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No. In the Senator's absence that subject was scrupulously explored. The Senator from Maine is not guilty. [Laughter.]

Mr. DONNELL. I withdraw the parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has spoken to me about this bill. While I shall not oppose the position which he has taken, I think it is fair to say that I feel that a very brief statement should be made in relation to what may be called the law of damages.

Most of us who have practiced law know that there are compensatory damages, and in many States there are statutes which provide for recovery because of loss of companionship. The experience we have had this year in the Judiciary Committee has, I am sure, caused the members of that committee to reach the conclusion that probably next year we should try to lay down some definite rules in relation to damage.

No one would say that $5,000 was excessive damages from the standpoint of the element of companionship. On the other hand, I have tried lawsuits involving the death of minors. In one case, involving an automobile accident, I had to prove that there was direct loss, and not merely loss of companionship. That is the rule in many States. In one case I have in mind I sustained a judgment of $3,200 only because I could show that the widowed mother of a 14-year old son who was electrocuted depended for her support upon the son's earning capacity. If I had not been able to make that showing, I could not have obtained anything under the rule of law as it then was. Since then my own State has changed the law so as to permit the awarding of damages for the loss of companionship—I believe up to $3,000.

It was on that basis that the committee arrived at its decision. I realize that unless the committee amendment is rejected probably no bill will be enacted this year. So while I raise no objection, I leave it to the judgment of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, let me say again that I asked that the bill be temporarily passed over a few minutes ago, because the chairman of the Judiciary Committee was absent from the Chamber. I have no objection to the change in the amount if it is approved by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, who is also chairman of the Subcommittee on Claims.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 968) to authorize the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia to limit the number of taxicabs licensed and operated in the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, what happened to the intervening bills?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The other bills have not reached the desk from the Printing Office.

That concludes the calendar.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest that the call of the calendar be not concluded, because of the fact that a number of bills were temporarily passed over, particularly the military bill. The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services [Mr. GURNEY] is in the conference on the unification bill. I think perhaps if we take a recess in the midst of the call of the calendar and resume the calling of the calendar tomorrow, we can return to the bills which have been passed over and conclude action on those which may be taken up at that time.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, we have been almost 6 hours working on the Legislative Calendar. It seems to me it

has been work well done, and at least it has been laboriously done. I have the feeling that at this time we should consider the Executive Calendar.

Therefore, Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Is the motion debatable?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is not debatable. The Chair assumed that the Senator from Maine was withholding his motion for the time being.

Does the Senator from Maine press his motion?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHITE. For what purpose?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that if this motion is carried, with the result that the Senate proceeds to the consideration of executive business, if subsequently a motion to recess is agreed to, then when the Senate convenes tomorrow the legislative calendar will be the unfinished business; in other words, the legislative calendar will be the order of business when the Senate resumes its session tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, it seems to me that we should proceed to the consideration of executive business. Therefore, I press my motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Maine that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion is not debatable.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LODGE. After the executive business is concluded, will it be in order to revert to the consideration of a bill on the Legislative Calendar which was temporarily passed over?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That could be done, if such a course were determined upon by the Senate.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I had intended to say——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am not debating the motion. I am discussing the Legislative Calendar. I wish to inquire of the Senator from Ohio whether upon the resumption of the consideration of the Legislative Calendar tomorrow, the bills to be considered will include Calendar 449, Senate bill 176.

Mr. TAFT. The bills considered under the call of the calendar tomorrow will include all bills which were temporarily passed over today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the opinion of the Chair that when the Senate resumes its session tomorrow, the status at that time will be precisely that which exists at the moment, which will bring the entire legislation calendar within the purview of the Senate.

The question now is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business. The motion is not debatable.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WHITE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Burton N. Behling, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term expiring June 22, 1952.

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Civil Service:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. William Weston Bessell, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), to be professor of mathematics at the United States Military Academy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. WHITE. I ask unanimous consent that the Navy nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Navy nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. (temporary) William P. T. Hill to be brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Philip B. Perlman, of Maryland, to be Solicitor General of the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that the nomination be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be passed over.

UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hon. EVAN HOWELL to be judge of the United States Court of Claims.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of LEO F. RAYFIEL, of New York, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of New York.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of United States attorneys.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of United States marshals.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED NATIONS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles E. Bohlen, of Massachusetts, to be counselor of the Department of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of David K. E. Bruce, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of W. A. Ayres, of Kansas, to be Federal Trade Commissioner.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hugh H. Earle, of Salem, Oreg., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Oregon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. WHITE. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. WHITE. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations also be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all confirmations of nominations.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. WHITE obtained the floor.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President——

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. McGRATH. I wish to state a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McGRATH. Now that the Executive Calendar has been concluded, inasmuch as one appointment has been passed over, I should like to inquire whether we shall again be taking up the Executive Calendar prior to adjournment on Saturday.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, so far as I understand the situation, I believe there will be another call of the Legislative Calendar, and there will be a further call of the Executive Calendar before the adjournment comes.

Mr. McGRATH. Then I am satisfied.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that in his judgment it will be almost indispensable to have an additional call of the Executive Calendar because of some additional diplomatic nominations that are coming in.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say that yesterday, over the opposition of some of us, the Senate passed the National Science Foundation bill. I did not expect to hear quite so soon from those in opposition to the action taken by the Senate. I wish to have inserted at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a letter I have received from Prof. Karl Dittmer, associate professor of chemistry, in the department of chemistry, University of Colorado.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO,
Boulder, Colo., July 21, 1947.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We appreciated very much your strong stand in getting the amendment to the Science Foundation bill which designates the distribution of funds. I hope that you will insist on this amendment when the bill comes back to the Senate for final approval.

The enclosed clippings from the July 20 Denver Post touch on most of the reasons why we feel that such a distribution of funds is imperative.

Sincerely yours,

KARL DITTMER,
Associate Professor of Chemistry.

Mr. MORSE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article on the same subject from the Denver Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMPIRE COLLEGE PRESIDENTS WORRIED OVER SCIENCE-AID BILL—CONGRESS GETS MULTIMILLION-DOLLAR QUESTION

(By Gene Lindberg)

Presidents of Rocky Mountain Empire universities and colleges Saturday were asking Congress for a straight answer to a multimillion-dollar scientific question.

Will their State and public land-grant colleges, in common with other smaller educational institutions throughout the Nation, be helped or hurt by the National Science Foundation legislation that now has passed in both Houses of Congress?

Their chief concern is that the huge bulk of Federal funds to promote scientific research will go to the big established centers of Massachusetts Tech, University of Chicago, Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Pennsylvania, and the like, while only a trickle will flow to the little centers elsewhere in the Nation.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, championed the cause of the smaller public colleges and universities. He put through his Morse amendment to the Senate version of the Science Foundation bill, passed in May. But the House of Representatives in Washington Friday passed its version of the proposed Federal act without the Morse amendment.

This amendment specified that not less than 25 percent of Federal aid research funds should go to State university and land-grant college research programs—two-fifths of that to be shared equally among the States, the rest to be apportioned among them according to population.

The Senate and House measures are now up to a joint conference for ironing out of differences. Senator ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey, sponsor of the Senate bill, predicts final approval of the bill early next week—without the Morse amendment.

Senator MORSE warned Saturday that the bill as it now stands is a blow against the development of a sound research program on State college campuses. He states bluntly that it will have the effect of freezing research in the hands of those who have controlled it so long.

"This is no mere battle for political plums," Dr. Reuben G. Gustavson, president of the University of Nebraska at Lincoln, told the Denver Post by telephone Saturday. "It goes to the heart of what Congress is trying to do by passing the measure. The intent is to keep American science strong; to increase the edge we now have on the rest of the world; to promote and speed up new basic research in all branches of science; and—vitally important—to train new crops of scientists for the future.

"That's where our smaller institutions shine. We must keep them shining, or else. America points with pride to Dr. Ernest O. Lawrence, of California, builder of the cyclotron. But where did he come from originally? From the University of South Dakota. Where did Harvard's great astronomer, Harlow Shapley, get his start? Missouri."

President Gustavson is a case in point, himself. As a young Denver University biochemist, he gained international notice for his research in sex hormones. He went to the University of Colorado, served as wartime acting president there, then went for a time to the University of Chicago, and now heads Nebraska's State University.

Dr. Michael Pijoan, who is Garvan professor of chemistry at the University of Colorado, and director of research for the Chemical Foundation of New York, said Saturday he is thoroughly in agreement that the National Science foundation must be set up, with the safeguards of the Morse amendment included.

However, he pointed out that State legislatures, private individuals and groups, and industrial organizations who benefit directly by State and regional research programs, must contribute more toward research development on their own home grounds.

Dr. Walter O. Roberts, director of the Harvard-Colorado high-altitude observatory at Climax, said:

"While my work is a joint enterprise of Harvard and the University of Colorado I am not on the fence in my convictions regarding Nation-wide distribution of National Science Foundation funds. Our smaller State universities and colleges must have a fair share. If they do not, science will be hindered, not helped."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the Denver Post, bearing out a good many of the things I presented in my argument yesterday.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"BUSH LEAGUE" SCIENCE

Science is like baseball. To keep it alive, we must have more than huge Yankee stadiums of higher learning. We must have sandlots and bush leagues, too, for science is everybody's business.

This homely comparison is drawn by Dr. Reuben G. Gustavson, formerly of Colorado, now president of Nebraska University. It explains in a nutshell why presidents and faculty men of State universities and land-grant colleges throughout the Nation are demanding that the Morse amendment be included in the National Science Foundation legislation now before Congress. The lower House version of the proposed act does not include the Morse provisions.

What is the Morse amendment? A vital safeguard written into the Senate bill by Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, assuring State universities and other tax-supported institutions of higher education at least one-fourth of the Federal funds to be appropriated for research activities by the proposed Foundation. Funds expressly appropriated for national defense are excluded.

What is the National Science Foundation? As proposed in bills passed by both Houses of Congress and now under discussion in joint conference, it will be headed by a 24-man board appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. It will formulate national policy for scientific education and fundamental research. It will initiate and support basic research with Government appropriations; grant scholarships and fellowships; foster international interchange of science information; correlate its research programs with those of individuals, public and private research groups.

How will these Federal funds for research be distributed, and to whom? Unless the Morse safeguard goes in, there is grave danger that the vast bulk of Federal aid will flow to Massachusetts Tech, Chicago, Harvard, Princeton, Columbia, Yale, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Cornell, and other big university research centers. Unless a reasonable share is earmarked for Nation-wide distribution among our smaller institutions, they may expect only a mere trickle.

Colorado University, including its medical school in Denver; State universities of other Rocky Mountain empire States, and the West in general will suffer. It will be "easy pickings" for larger institutions to pirate good men from small colleges.

"We need to keep on all of our faculties exceedingly able scientists," said Senator MORSE, "because, after all, they are not only research men themselves, but they are teachers and inspirers of young scientific minds

who catch a vision from those great teachers, and then dig in to do graduate work in science and later themselves become great scientists."

Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey, Senate sponsor of the National Science Foundation bill, Saturday predicted quick, final approval of the measure shorn of the Morse amendment. Even as he spoke, protests from educators all over America were pouring in to Washington. But this isn't their fight alone. Manufacturers, engineers, doctors, hospital officials, public-health officers, regional industries have a stake in it. The time to act is now, while the measure is still in joint conference.

"As it stands now," warns Senator MORSE, "the bill is a blow against development of a sound research program on campuses of State colleges. It freezes research in the hands of special interests who have controlled it so long."

ON-THE-JOB TRAINING

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, two telegrams bearing on the on-the-job-training program.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *July 22, 1947.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please do everything possible to secure vote on the job ceilings before adjournment. I feel these measures are more vital than investigation of vote fraud. Cost of living won't stop rising while an investigation is being conducted. Without ceiling increase I must drop training.

Ex-Staff Sgt. LYNN RUSSELL.

BALTIMORE, MD., *July 21, 1947.*

Senator MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on your part to increase only jobs veterans training from the present $175 a month for single veterans to $200 and from $200 to $250 for those who are married. Please do your utmost in presenting your bill before this Congress convenes. Thank you.

JOHN M. HESTER.

BROOKLYN PARK, MD.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I close by expressing my regret that at this time, Wednesday evening, at about 5 minutes to 6, we are about to take a recess, instead of having a night session, when we still have on the calendar some bills of vital importance to the veterans, bills which should be passed upon before we adjourn.

PRIORITY FOR PAYMENT OF GERMAN SPECIAL DEPOSIT ACCOUNT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to inquire about Calendar No. 710, House bill 4043.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That bill was passed.

Mr. LANGER. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which that bill was passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota that the Senate reconsider the vote by which House bill 4043, Calendar No. 710, was passed?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to be sure which bill the Senator has reference to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is House bill 4043, Calendar No. 710. It is a bill to change the order of priority for payment of the German special deposit account, and for other purposes.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not have any objection, if the chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], does not object.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object to the interjection of this matter at this time. It can be taken up tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

INCORPORATION OF FRANCO-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if there is no further executive business——

Mr. LODGE and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maine yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, during the call of the Legislative Calendar, about 20 minutes ago, the Senator from Nebraska objected to the consideration and passage of Senate bill 1356, Calendar No. 696, and he did so on behalf of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL]. The Senator from Missouri now has returned to the Chamber. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate revert at this time to Senate bill 1356, Calendar No. 696.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, at this stage of the day's proceedings, inasmuch as all bills that have been passed over will be eligible for consideration on tomorrow, I hope the Senator will not insist that we return to that point on the calendar. There are three or four such bills, all in the same category, and they are likely to involve some discussion. So I hope we shall not be precipitated into that situation at this hour of the day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In any event, it would be necessary to return to legislative session in order to do so.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, let me say that out of deference to the wishes of the Senator from Maine, I shall not press the matter at this time, but shall do so tomorrow.

RECESS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if there be no further executive business, I move, as in legislative session, that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, July 24, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 23 (legislative day of July 16), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Rudolf E. Schoenfeld, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Rumania.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

John A. Bovey, Jr., of Minnesota.
Ernest E. Ramsaur, Jr., of California.
James R. Ruchti, of Wisconsin.
Ralph S. Saul, of New York.
Miss Louise Schaffner, of New York.
Richard W. Sterling, of New York.
Robert M. Winfree, of the District of Columbia.
Robert W. Zimmermann, of Minnesota.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 2, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Charles F. Baldwin, of Maryland.
John Lammey Stewart, of Pennsylvania.
Ben H. Thibodeaux, of Louisiana.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Ralph B. Curren, of Wisconsin.
Jerome T. Gaspard, of Virginia.
Oscar E. Heskin, of Florida.
Philip W. Ireland, of Illinois.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Turner C. Cameron, Jr., of Alabama.
Harry Conover, of New Jersey.
Robert C. Creel, of New York.
Ridgway B. Knight, of New York.
Eric Kocher, of New York.
William Henry Lawrence, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Frank G. Siscoe, of New Jersey.

James R. Gustin, of Wisconsin, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 5, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Robert A. Aylward, of Massachusetts.
Howard L. Boorman, of California.
William D. Brewer, of Connecticut.
Edward West Burgess, of Wisconsin.
Stephen A. Comiskey, of Colorado.
William B. Dunn, of Texas.
Seymour M. Finger, of New York.
Walter P. Houk, of California.
Vernon V. Hukee, of Minnesota.
Joseph E. Jacques, of Rhode Island.
Robert L. James, of California.
Edward J. Krache, Jr., of Minnesota.
Edward T. Long, of Illinois.
Francis N. Magliozzi, of Massachusetts.
Parke D. Massey, Jr., of New York.
Everett K. Melby, of Illinois.
Alfred E. Moon, of Illinois.
Curtis W. Prendergast, of California.
Herbert F. Propps, of Wisconsin.
Lowell G. Richardson, of Wisconsin.
Jordan T. Rogers, of South Carolina.
Howard René Stephenson, of New York.
Kenneth P. T. Sullivan, of Massachusetts.
Edward J. Trost, of New York.
Wayland B. Waters, of Michigan.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARIZONA

Wilson C. Fritz, North Rim, Ariz. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

ARKANSAS

Willard C. Wall, Coal Hill, Ark., in place of H. M. Shrigley, retired.

Albert A. Hill, Scranton, Ark., in place of S. M. Heim, transferred.

CONNECTICUT

Joseph John Miskavitch, Poquonock, Conn., in place of J. T. Collins, deceased.

FLORIDA

Cecil E. Rawls, Alachua, Fla., in place of J. A. Williams, retired.

ILLINOIS

Jess Y. Shroyer, New Windsor, Ill., in place of H. B. Shroyer, retired.

INDIANA

Henry O. Kipfer, Grabill, Ind., in place of G. R. Woods, resigned.

Richard B. Miller, Rushville, Ind., in place of W. L. Newbold, removed.

IOWA

Vernon M. Zylstra, Bussey, Iowa, in place of Z. P. Way, resigned.

Elvera E. Scott, Chapin, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Frank E. Orwan, Lorimor, Iowa, in place of N. T. Nixon, deceased.

LOUISIANA

Leola M. Many, Geismar, La., in place of M. L. Geismar, resigned.

Anna S. Daniel, St. Francisville, La., in place of R. V. Shipes, deceased.

MAINE

Frank C. Creteau, Sanford, Maine, in place of L. J. Emery, deceased.

MINNESOTA

Henning O. Mickelson, Carson Lake, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Charlotte C. Keniston, Champlin, Minn., in place of H. A. Smith, transferred.

MISSOURI

Willis R. Tapscott, Knox City, Mo., in place of C. M. Ecff, transferred.

MONTANA

Joseph Kelly, Glendive, Mont., in place of D. J. O'Neil, resigned.

NEBRASKA

Walter A. Aregood, Rising City, Nebr., in place of P. W. Barker, transferred.

Myrtle C. Stewart, Whitney, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

NEW YORK

Paul W. Sugg, Bowmansville, N. Y., in place of G. P. Sugg, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA

F. Earl Auman, West End, N. C., in place of N. C. Markham, resigned.

OKLAHOMA

Derrell B. Hogue, Stuart, Okla., in place of A. M. Lewis, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

David T. Herlehy, Glassport, Pa., in place of W. P. Kohler, resigned.

Clarence K. Kratz, Silverdale, Pa., in place of Herman Gerstlauer, resigned.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Lottie O. Thornton, Enoree, S. C., in place of W. W. Thornton, resigned.

Clarence E. Catterton, Ridgeland, S. C., in place of W. W. McTeer, Jr., transferred.

TEXAS

Lillie Waldine Reeves, Carlton, Tex., in place of Elmer Carlton, retired.

Rosalind O. McFarland, Goldsmith, Tex., in place of I. B. Dunn, resigned.

VERMONT

Nellie F. Trask, Rochester, Vt., in place of E. M. Martin, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 23 (legislative day of July 16), 1947:

UNITED NATIONS

TO BE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SECOND SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS, TO BE HELD IN NEW YORK, N. Y., BEGINNING SEPTEMBER 16, 1947

Warren R. Austin
Herschel V. Johnson
Mrs. Anna Eleanor Roosevelt
John Foster Dulles

TO BE ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SECOND SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS, TO BE HELD IN NEW YORK, N. Y., BEGINNING SEPTEMBER 16, 1947

Charles Fahy
Willard L. Thorp
Francis B. Sayre
Adlai E. Stevenson
Virginia C. Gildersleeve

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Charles E. Bohlen to be counselor of the Department of State.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

David K. E. Bruce to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John Carter Vincent to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Switzerland.

Henry S. Villard to be a Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consul general, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Morris N. Hughes to be a consul general of the United States of America.

Milton K. Wells to be a consul of the United States of America.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

W. A. Ayres to be Federal Trade Commissioner for a term of 7 years from September 26, 1947.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Hugh H. Earle to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Oregon.

UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

Hon. EVAN HOWELL to be judge of the United States Court of Claims.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

LEO F. RAYFIEL to be United States district judge for the eastern district of New York.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Joseph T. Votava to be United States attorney for the district of Nebraska.

Irving J. Higbee to be United States attorney for the northern district of New York.

Ward Hudgins to be United States attorney for the middle district of Tennessee.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

George E. Proudfit to be United States marshal for the district of Nebraska.

Carl J. Werner to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Illinois.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTED IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Brig. Gen. William Weston Bessell, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), to be professor of mathematics at the United States Military Academy, with rank from date of appointment.

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY

To be ensigns, with rank from June 6, 1947

Hoyt N. Burns
John A Winslow
Bill A. Dodge

To be assistant paymasters, with the rank of ensign from June 6, 1947

Jerry W. Bates
Darrel N. Coba

To be assistant paymaster, with the rank of ensign

Max E. Hency

To be assistant civil engineers, with the rank of ensign

Arley E. McCoy, Jr.
Kenneth F. Ward

To be ensigns

Barr, Capers G.
Bensen, John R.
Holm, John R.
Johnson, Peter (n), Jr.
McGrane, Clarence V., Jr.
Rawson, Charles E.
Smith, Bertram C.
Zieber, George M., Jr.

To be assistant paymasters, Supply Corps, with the rank of ensign

Findlater, William J. P.
Murray, Paul T.

To be assistant civil engineers, Civil Engineer Corps, with the rank of ensign

Connolly, Daniel E.
Dunnels, Robert E.
Goetzke, George A.
Mix, Robert W.
Rowson, Russell J.
Stapelfeld, Johann F.
Woods, Kenneth O.

To be assistant dental surgeon, Dental Corps, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade)

Peters, Jerome F.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Maj. Gen. (temporary) William P. T. Hill to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from February 1, 1944, and to be a major general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from April 1, 1945, while serving as the Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps.

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Van Tyson, Atkins.
Jack B. Carter, Elkins.

CALIFORNIA

Helen L. Hellwig, Bodega Bay.
Alleene L. Quigley, Lucerne.
Martin E. Gross, Orick.

COLORADO

William A. Russom, Bristol.
Alfred H. Sandercook, Hayden.

FLORIDA

Lindsay J. Moody, Valrico.

GEORGIA

William C. Griffin, Tunnel Hill.

HAWAII

Helen T. Moritsugu, Kaneohe.

ILLINOIS

Eugene Elliott, Lake Zurich.
Gustave J. Frech, Lenzburg.
Harold C. Carson, Pocahontas.

INDIANA

Clay B. Hushaw, Attica.
James F. O'Neal, Crane.
Bert W. Postill, Mexico.
Henry T. Cain, Remington.
Myrle T. Keller, Stilesville.
Deloris B. Bock, Sulphur Springs.
Lawrence J. Etnire, Williamsport.

IOWA

Evelyn M. Chalus, Clare.
Willard G. Spangler, Everly.
Ralph Wentzel, Malcom.
George C. Brauch, Marengo.
Lloyd G. Anderson, Nora Springs.

KANSAS

Lloyd Bacon, Rexford.

KENTUCKY

Joseph D. Scholtz, Louisville.
Louise McKinney, Midway.
Bess L. Hope, Tompkinsville.

LOUISIANA

Murray B. McCarley, Baton Rouge.

MINNESOTA

Russell McCormack, Garden City.

MISSISSIPPI

Robert M. Fisher, Jr., Bucatunna.
Sadie I. Still, Clarksdale.
Robert L. Gray, Corinth.
Hubert B. Scrivener, Maben.

MISSOURI

Gertrude L. Duke, Dadeville.
Lester F. Bain, Fornfelt.
Robert W. Rodgers, Hornersville.
James E. Karr, Iberia.
Paul A. Davidson, Illmo.
Helen E. Jameson, McFall.
Edgar W. Holt, Ozark.
Carl B. Hardin, Raymondville.
Charles N. Bruton, Rosebud.
Frank S. Evans, South West City.
Adrian J. D. Ockerby, Wentworth.
Edna M. Duckett, Williamsville.

MONTANA

Philetus C. Lapham, Malta.

NEBRASKA

Frank C. Diehl, Bassett.

NEW JERSEY

Harry L. Willits, Beach Haven.

NEW YORK

Alice M. Maloney, Ausable Chasm.
John M. Keyes, Buffalo.
William A. Bramer, Clyde.
Mary N. Seamans, East Pembroke.
Charles J. O'Connell, Elmira.
Jeanette R. Bye, Highland Lake.
Evelyn B. Dailey, Prospect.
James P. Boyd, Ray Brook.
William G. Britton, Rensselaerville.
Catherine G. Rieger, Shenorock.
David L. Hoy, Sidney Center.
Margaret Zimmons, Somers.
Constant L. Proskine, South Kortright.
Jennie M. James, Tomkins Cove.
Henry W. Haynes, Whiteface.

NORTH CAROLINA

Harry L. Adams, Lake Lure.
W. Henry Lomax, Linwood.

OHIO

Ned Stiger, Bradner.
Robert J. Schwing, Cleves.
Thomas E. Sexton, Groveport.
Olive A. Ruble, Haydenville.
Mary E. Derry, Jaite.
Howard R. Poole, Londonderry.
Edison Blackburn, Malta.
Stewart K. Nighswander, Maple Grove.
Marjorie C. Rees, Medway.
Elaine D. Severn, Mendon.
Frank Edwin Treon, Miamisburg.
Joseph Yanka, New Washington.
Ruth E. Sherwood, Oregonia.
Herald W. Mougey, Rittman.
Hobart E. Morehead, Rushville.
Paul F. Spillman, Waynesfield.
Warren E. Snyder, West Alexandria.
James F. Smith, Wilmington.
Edwin E. Rawdon, Windsor.
J. Paul Orsborn, Zanesfield.

OKLAHOMA

Kinley Case, Paden.

OREGON

Robert E. Richter, Camas Valley.
Alma M. Elliott, Chiloquin.

PENNSYLVANIA

Albert Elton MacKissic, Parker Ford.

RHODE ISLAND

Bruce J. Stokes, Forestdale.
LeRoy E. Davis, Greene.
Hazel E. Durand, Hope.
Bertha J. Huntley, Longmeadow.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Edmund P. Grice, Jr., Charleston.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Wenzel G. Huebl, White Lake.

TENNESSEE

Sam P. Gammon, Fordtown.
Robert B. Pitts, Hixson.

TEXAS

John D. Hendricks, Cooper.
Hardy R. Hancock, Jasper.
Jeff T. Graham, Knox City.
Donald M. Hackney, Sunset Heights.

VERMONT

Vera R. Perkins, Quechee.

VIRGINIA

Daniel William Moffett, Warrenton.

WEST VIRGINIA

Bernice B. Turley, Longacre.
Brady F. Randolph, Sutton.

WISCONSIN

Edward H. Belz, Athens.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JULY 23, 1947

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. S. R. Pitts, S. J., principal of St. Joseph's College High School, Philadelphia, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Lord, we know that You are the God of peace. This You have told us in many ways. On the first Christmas night the angels sang Your message, "On earth peace to men of good will." The Divine Son told us, "Peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you. Let not your heart be troubled nor let it be afraid."

But our hearts are troubled by the break-up of so many American homes, by the unrest that exists among so many of our youth, by the strife that separates employer from employee, and by war and the rumor of war that troubles the nations.

Humbly do we beg divine guidance and strength upon our President and these our legislators in the midst of such anxieties. May the blessing of Almighty God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit descend upon them and remain with them forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 682. An act to regulate the interstate transportation of black bass and other game fish, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1317) entitled "An act to give to members of the Crow Tribe the power to manage and assume charge of their restricted lands, for their own use or for lease purposes, while such lands remain under trust patents," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CORDON, Mr. ECTON, and Mr. HATCH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3587) entitled "An act to establish a National Aviation Council for the purpose of unifying and clarifying national policies relating to aviation, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate, having had under consideration House Concurrent Resolution 51, entitled "Concurrent resolution against adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of May 27, 1947," it was—

Resolved, That the above-entitled concurrent resolution be not agreed to.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 254. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Glenna J. Howrey; and

S. 526. An act to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

AMENDING THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3613) to amend sections 1802 (a), 1802 (b), and 3481 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1802 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by deleting the period at the end of the next to the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ": *Provided further*, That where such certificates (or shares, where no certificates are issued) are issued in a recapitalization, the tax payable shall be that proportion of the tax computed on such certificates or shares issued in the recapitalization that the amount dedicated as capital for the first time by the recapitalization, whether by a transfer of earned surplus or otherwise, bears to the total par value (or actual value if no-par stock) of such certificates or shares issued in the recapitalization."

Section 1802 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after the first proviso the following: "*Provided further*, That upon any transfer of an interest in a partnership owning shares or certificates of stock, the tax shall be limited to an amount equal to that percentage of a tax computed on the transfer of all of such shares or certificates of stock owned by the partnership as the interest transferred bears to the total interests in the partnership of all the partners:".

Section 1802 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting in the second proviso following the word "deposited" a comma and the words "nor upon mere loans of stock."

Section 3481 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after "*Provided*" the following: "*further*, That upon any transfer of an interest in a partnership owning such instrument, the tax shall be limited to an amount equal to that percentage of a tax computed on the transfer of all of such instruments owned by the partnership as the interest transferred bears to the total interests in the partnership of all the partners: *Provided further*."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 20, strike out "*further*."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill would correct certain inequities in the law providing for stamp and documentary taxes on capital stock and bonds.

It comes with a unanimous report from the Ways and Means Committee and the approval of the Treasury Department.

At present, if a corporation recapitalizes, all stock—old and new—bears a stamp tax. Under this bill, the tax would apply only to the new capital introduced.

Again, in case of the death or withdrawal of a partner, all securities owned by the firm are subject to a stock-transfer tax even if his interest in the firm is only a minor one. Under this bill the tax would apply only to a share of the partnership securities which is proportional to his interest in the firm.

Again, the bill exempts from the tax mere loans of stock. New York State, where most security transactions take place, has never seen fit to tax such loans.

The present law penalizes many persons selling stock who, owing to the distance of their home from the New York Stock Exchange, cannot make physical delivery promptly.

The tax was imposed in 1932 before there was any Securities and Exchange Commission in an effort to discourage short selling, but it has had no such effect and has proved just a nuisance.

The Securities and Exchange Commission which now has responsibility for these matters has no objection to the passage of the bill. I quote from a letter received by me, dated June 19, 1947, from Robert K. McConnaughey, Acting Chairman of the Commission:

> It is our opinion that the tax, which aggregates no more than 5 or 6 cents per share, does not have any significant effect in deterring short sales, and that its repeal would not have any significant effect in encouraging short sales. We regard the bill, therefore, as a revenue measure not involving policy considerations under the statutes we administer.

Passage of this bill will cause but an insignificant loss of revenue and will remove inequities.

GILA FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 1597) to relocate the boundaries and reduce the area of the Gila reclamation project, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in reference to this bill I took the matter up with the Department of the Interior, and find out that there are 110,000 acres which the gentleman from Arizona is going to have released if they take on these 75,000 acres on this project, and they will not expect the Federal Government to take and irrigate the 110,000 acres, and I would like to have the gentleman, if this bill goes through by unanimous consent, make that statement on the floor in order that the Department of the Interior may know that they are not supposed to take and irrigate the 110,000 acres which they are now giving up.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is correct. Under the terms of this bill the 110,000 acres in the original project lying higher up on the mesa near Yuma will be eliminated from the project, and in lieu thereof 75,000 acres of bottom land will be substituted for the larger area eliminated, thus making a better project.

Mr. RICH. That is correct, and that is what the Department of the Interior would like to have accomplished.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of reclaiming and irrigating lands in the State of Arizona and other beneficial uses, the reclamation project known as Gila project, heretofore authorized and established under the provisions of the reclamation laws, the act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 195), and various appropriation acts, is hereby reduced in area to approximately 66,000 irrigable acres of land situate on the Yuma Mesa and within the North and South Gila Valleys and as thus reduced is hereby reauthorized and redesignated the Yuma Mesa division, Gila project, and the Wellton Mohawk division, Gila project, comprising approximately 75,000 irrigable acres of land situate within the Wellton, Dome, Roll, Texas Hill, and Mohawk areas, is substituted for the land eliminated from the Yuma Mesa division and hereby authorized: *Provided, however*, That the waters to be diverted and used thereby, and the lands and structures for the diversion and storage thereof, shall be subject to the provisions of the Boulder Canyon Project Act of December 21, 1928, and subject to and controlled by the provisions of the Colorado River compact signed at Santa Fe, New Mexico, November 24, 1922.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is hereby authorized to acquire in the name of the United States, at prices satisfactory to him, such lands, interests in lands, water rights, and other property within or adjacent to the Gila project, which belongs to the Gila Valley Power District or the Mohawk Municipal Water Conservation District, as he deems appropriate for the protection, development, or improvement of said project: *Provided, however*, That the prices to be paid for the lands owned by the Gila Valley Power District, of Arizona, and heretofore officially appraised at the direction of the Commissioner of Reclamation, for the existing facilities of said district and of the Mohawk Municipal Water Conservation District, of Arizona, heretofore officially appraised at his request and determined by him to be useful to said project, shall not, in the aggregate, exceed $380,000, and no portion thereof shall be paid until said districts have made arrangements satisfactory to the Secretary for the liquidation of their respective bonded, warrant, and other outstanding indebtednesses.

SEC. 3. The Secretary is hereby authorized, to the extent, in the manner, and on such terms as he deems appropriate for the protection, development, or improvement of the Gila project, to sell, exchange, or otherwise dispose of the public lands of the United States within said project, the lands acquired under this act, and any improvements on any such lands and to lease the same during the presettlement period only, provided such lands shall be disposed of to actual settlers and farmers as soon as practicable; to establish town sites on such lands; and to dedicate portions of such lands for public purposes. Contracts for the sale of such lands shall be on a basis that, in the Secretary's judgment, will provide the return in a reasonable period of years of not less than the appraised value of the land and the improvements thereon or thereto. Such lands may be disposed of in farm units of such sizes as the Secretary determines to be adequate, taking into consideration the character of soil, topography, location with respect to the irrigation system, and such other factors as the Secretary deems relevant: *Provided*, That the area disposed of to an individual shall, so far as practicable, not exceed 160 acres. Sales to any individual shall be of no more than one farm unit. Any sums received by the United States from the disposition of said lands and improvements shall be covered into the reclamation fund, and credited to construction costs.

SEC. 4. Beginning at such date or dates and subject to such provisions and limitations as may be fixed or provided by regulations which the Secretary is hereby authorized to issue, any public lands within the Gila project and any lands acquired under this act shall be, after disposition thereof by the United States by contract of sale and during the time such contract shall remain in effect, (i) subject to the provisions of the laws of the State of Arizona relating to the organization, government, and regulation of irrigation, electrical, power, and other similar districts, and (ii) subject to legal assessment or taxation by any such district and by said State or political subdivisions thereof, and to liens for such assessments and taxes and to all proceedings for the enforcement thereof, in the same manner and to the same extent as privately owned lands: *Provided, however*, That the United States does not assume any obligation for amounts so assessed or taxed: *And provided further*, That any proceedings to enforce said assessments or taxes shall be subject to any title then remaining in the United States, to any prior lien reserved to the United States for unpaid installments under land sale contracts made under this act, and to any obligation for any other charges, accrued or unaccrued, for special improvements, construction, or operation and maintenance costs of said project.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the general repayment obligation of any organization which may hereafter enter into a contract with the United States covering the repayment of any portion of the costs of construction of the Gila project may be spread in annual installments over such reasonable period of years as the Secretary may determine. For the purpose of predicating the repayment obligations of the various lands within said project on their respective ability, as determined by the Secretary, to share the burdens thereof, he may provide for the equitable apportionment of said general repayment obligation to the lands benefited on a unit basis in accordance with the extent of the benefit derived from the project, the character of soil, topography, and such other factors as he deems relevant, and he may provide for a system of variable payments under which larger annual payments will be required during periods of above-normal production or income and lesser annual payments will be required during periods of subnormal production or income.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such moneys as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 7. The Secretary is authorized to perform such acts, to make such rules and regulations, and to include in contracts made under the authority of this act such provisions as he deems proper for carrying out the provisions of this act; and in connection with sales or exchanges under this act, he is authorized to effect conveyances without regard to the laws governing the patenting of public lands. Wherever in this act functions, powers, or duties are conferred upon the Secretary, said functions, powers, or duties may be performed, exercised, or discharged by his duly authorized representatives.

SEC. 8. This act shall be deemed a supplement to and part of the reclamation law. Nothing in this act shall be construed to amend the Boulder Canyon Project Act of December 21, 1928, as amended by the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of July 19, 1940.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That for the purpose of reclaiming and irrigating lands in the State of Arizona and other beneficial uses, the reclamation project known as Gila project, heretofore authorized and established under the provisions of the reclamation laws, the act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 195), and various appropriation acts, is hereby reduced in area to approximately 40,000 irrigable acres of land (25,000 acres thereof situated on the Yuma Mesa and 15,000 acres thereof within the North and South Gila Valleys), or such number of acres as can be adequately irrigated by the beneficial consumptive use of no more than 300,000 acre-feet of water per annum diverted from the Colorado River, and as thus reduced is hereby reauthorized and redesignated the Yuma Mesa division, Gila project, and the Wellton-Mohawk division, Gila project, comprising approximately 75,000 irrigable acres of land, or such number of acres as can be adequately irrigated by the beneficial consumptive use of no more than 300,000 acre-feet of water per annum diverted from the Colorado River, situate within the Wellton, Dome, Roll, Texas Hill, and Mohawk areas, is substituted for the land eliminated from the Yuma Mesa division and is hereby authorized: *Provided, however,* That the waters to be diverted and used thereby, and the lands and structures for the diversion, transportation, delivery, and storage thereof, shall be subject to the provisions of the Boulder Canyon Project Act of December 21, 1928, and subject to the provisions of the Colorado River compact signed at Santa Fe, N. Mex., November 24, 1922: *And provided further,* That the above limitations contained in this section are for the sole purpose of fixing the maximum acreage of the project and shall not be construed as interpreting, affecting, or modifying any interstate compact or contract with the United States for the use of Colorado River water or any Federal or State statute limiting or defining the right to use Colorado River water of or in any State.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is hereby authorized to acquire in the name of the United States, at prices satisfactory to him, such lands, interests in lands, water rights, and other property within or adjacent to the Gila project, which belongs to the Gila Valley Power District or the Mohawk Municipal Water Conservation District, as he deems appropriate for the protection, development, or improvement of said project: *Provided, however,* That the prices to be paid for the lands owned by the Gila Valley Power District, of Arizona, and heretofore officially appraised at the direction of the Commissioner of Reclamation, for the existing facilities of said district and of the Mohawk Municipal Water Conservation District, of Arizona, heretofore officially appraised at his request and determined by him to be useful to said project, shall not, in the aggregate, exceed $380,000, and no portion thereof shall be paid until said districts have made arrangements satisfactory to the Secretary for the liquidation of their respective bonded warrant and other outstanding indebtedness.

SEC. 3. The Secretary is hereby authorized, to the extent, in the manner, and on such terms as he deems appropriate for the protection, development, or improvement of the Gila project, to sell, exchange, or otherwise dispose of the public lands of the United States within said project, the lands acquired under this act, and any improvements on any such lands and to lease the same during the presettlement period only, provided such lands shall be disposed of to actual settlers and farmers as soon as practicable; to establish town sites on such lands; and to dedicate portions of such lands for public purposes. Contracts for the sale of such lands shall be on a basis that, in the Secretary's judgment, will provide the return in a reasonable period of years of not less than the appraised value of the land and the improvements thereon or thereto. Such lands may be disposed of in farm units of such sizes as the Secretary determines to be adequate, taking into consideration the character of soil, topography, location with respect to the irrigation system, and such other factors as the Secretary deems relevant: *Provided,* That the area disposed of to an individual shall, so far as practicable, not exceed 160 acres. Sales to any individual shall be of not more than one farm unit. Any sums received by the United States from the disposition of said lands and improvements shall be covered into the reclamation fund, and credited to construction costs.

SEC. 4. Beginning at such date or dates and subject to such provisions and limitations as may be fixed or provided by regulations which the Secretary is hereby authorized to issue, any public lands within the Gila project and any lands acquired under this act shall be, after disposition thereof by the United States by contract of sale and during the time such contract shall remain in effect, (i) subject to the provisions of the laws of the State of Arizona relating to the organization, government, and regulation of irrigation, electrical, power, and other similar districts, and (ii) subject to legal assessment or taxation by any such district and by said State or political subdivisions thereof, and to liens for such assessments and taxes and to all proceedings for the enforcement thereof, in the same manner and to the same extent as privately owned lands: *Provided, however,* That the United States does not assume any obligation for amounts so assessed or taxed: *And provided further,* That any proceedings to enforce said assessments or taxes shall be subject to any title then remaining in the United States, to any prior lien reserved to the United States for unpaid installments under land-sale contracts made under this act, and to any obligation for any other charges, accrued or unaccrued, for special improvements, construction, or operation and maintenance costs of said project.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the general repayment obligation of any organization which may hereafter enter into a contract with the United States covering the repayment of any portion of the costs of construction of the Gila project may be spread in annual installments over such reasonable period, not exceeding 60 years, as the Secretary may determine. For the purpose of predicating the repayment obligations of the various lands within said project on their respective ability, as determined by the Secretary, to share the burdens thereof, he may provide for the equitable apportionment of said general repayment obligations to the lands benefited on a unit basis in accordance with the extent of the benefit derived from the project, the character of soil, topography, and such other factors as he deems relevant, and he may provide for a system of variable payments under which larger annual payments will be required during periods of above-normal production or income and lesser annual payments will be required during periods of subnormal production or income.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, from time to time, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such moneys as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 7. The Secretary is authorized to perform such acts, to make such rules and regulations, and to include in contracts made under the authority of this act such provisions as he deems proper for carrying out the provisions of this act; and in connection with sales or exchanges under this act, he is authorized to effect conveyances without regard to the laws governing the patenting of public lands. Wherever in this act functions, powers, or duties are conferred upon the Secretary, said functions, powers, or duties may be performed, exercised, or discharged by his duly authorized representatives.

SEC. 8. This act shall be deemed a supplement to and part of the reclamation law. Nothing in this act shall be construed to amend the Boulder Canyon Project Act of December 21, 1928, as amended by the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of July 19, 1940.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

RELOCATE BOUNDARIES AND REDUCE AREA OF GILA FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 483) to relocate the boundaries and reduce the area of the Gila Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of reclaiming and irrigating lands in the State of Arizona and other beneficial uses, the reclamation project known as Gila project, heretofore authorized and established under the provisions of the reclamation laws, the act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 195), and various appropriation acts, is hereby reduced in area to approximately 40,000 irrigable acres of land (25,000 acres thereof situated on on the Yuma Mesa and 15,000 acres thereof within the North and South Gila Valleys), or such number of acres as can be adequately irrigated by the beneficial consumptive use of no more than 300,000 acre-feet of water per annum diverted from the Colorado River, and thus reduced is hereby reauthorized and redesignated the Yuma Mesa division, Gila project, and the Wellton-Mohawk division, Gila project, comprising approximately 75,000 irrigable acres of land, or such number of acres as can be adequately irrigated by the beneficial consumptive use of no more than 300,000 acre-feet of water per annum diverted from the Colorado River, situate within the Wellton, Dome, Roll, Texas Hill, and Mohawk areas, is substituted for the land eliminated from the Yuma Mesa division and is hereby authorized: *Provided, however,* That the water to be diverted and used thereby, and the lands and structures for the diversion, transportation, delivery, and storage thereof,

shall be subject to the provisions of the Boulder Canyon Project Act of December 21, 1928, and subject to the provisions of the Colorado River compact signed at Santa Fe, N. Mex., November 24, 1922: *And provided further*, That the above limitations contained in this section are for the sole purpose of fixing the maximum acreage of the project and shall not be construed as interpreting, affecting, or modifying any interstate compact or contract with the United States for the use of Colorado River water or any Federal or State statute limiting or defining the right to use Colorado River water of or in any State.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is hereby authorized to acquire in the name of the United States, at prices satisfactory to him, such lands, interests in lands, water rights, and other property within or adjacent to the Gila project, which belongs to the Gila Valley Power District or the Mohawk Municipal Water Conservation District, as he deems appropriate for the protection, development, or improvement of said project: *Provided, however*, That the prices to be paid for the lands owned by the Gila Valley Power District of Arizona, and heretofore officially appraised at the direction of the Commissioner of Reclamation, for the existing facilities of said district and of the Mohawk Municipal Water Conservation District of Arizona, heretofore officially appraised at his request and determined by him to be useful to said project, shall not, in the aggregate, exceed $380,000, and no portion thereof shall be paid until said districts have made arrangements satisfactory to the Secretary for the liquidation of their respective bonded warrant, and other outstanding indebtedness.

SEC. 3. The Secretary is hereby authorized, to the extent, in the manner, and on such terms as he deems appropriate for the protection, development, or improvement of the Gila project, to sell, exchange, or otherwise dispose of the public lands of the United States within said project, the lands acquired under this act, and any improvements on any such lands and to lease the same during the presettlement period only, provided such lands shall be disposed of to actual settlers and farmers as soon as practicable; to establish town sites on such lands; and to dedicate portions of such lands for public purposes. Contracts for the sale of such lands shall be on a basis that, in the Secretary's judgment, will provide the return in a reasonable period of years of not less than the appraised value of the land and the improvements thereon or thereto. Such lands may be disposed of in farm units of such sizes as the Secretary determines to be adequate, taking into consideration the character of soil, topography, location with respect to the irrigation system, and such other factors as the Secretary deems relevant: *Provided*, That the area disposed of to an individual shall, so far as practicable, not exceed 160 acres. Sales to any individual shall be of not more than one farm unit. Any sums received by the United States from the disposition of said lands and improvements shall be covered into the reclamation fund, and credited to construction costs.

SEC. 4. Beginning at such date or dates and subject to such provisions and limitations as may be fixed or provided by regulations which the Secretary is hereby authorized to issue, any public lands within the Gila project and any lands acquired under this act shall be, after disposition thereof by the United States by contract of sale and during the time such contract shall remain in effect, (i) subject to the provisions of the laws of the State of Arizona relating to the organization, government, and regulation of irrigation, electrical, power, and other similar districts, and (ii) subject to legal assessment or taxation by any such district and by said State or political subdivisions thereof, and to liens for such assessments and taxes and to all proceedings for the enforcement thereof, in the same manner and to the same extent as privately owned lands: *Provided, however*, That the United States does not assume any obligation for amounts so assessed or taxed: *And provided further*, That any proceedings to enforce said assessments or taxes shall be subject to any title then remaining in the United States, to any prior lien reserved to the United States for unpaid installments under land-sale contracts made under this act, and to any obligation for any other charges, accrued or unaccrued, for special improvements, construction, or operation and maintenance costs of said project.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the general repayment obligation of any organization which may hereafter enter into a contract with the United States covering the repayment of any portion of the costs of construction of the Gila project may be spread in annual installments over such reasonable period, not exceeding 60 years, as the Secretary may determine. For the purpose of predicating the repayment obligations of the various lands within said project on their respective ability, as determined by the Secretary, to share the burdens thereof, he may provide for the equitable apportionment of said general repayment obligation to the lands benefited on a unit basis in accordance with the extent of the benefit derived from the project, the character of soil, topography, and such other factors as he deems relevant, and he may provide for a system of variable payments under which larger annual payments will be required during periods of above-normal production or income and lesser annual payments will be required during periods of subnormal production or income.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, from time to time, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such moneys as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 7. The Secretary is authorized to perform such acts, to make such rules and regulations, and to include in contracts made under the authority of this act such provisions as he deems proper for carrying out the provisions of this act; and in connection with sales or exchanges under this act, he is authorized to effect conveyances without regard to the laws governing the patenting of public lands. Wherever in this act functions, powers, or duties are conferred upon the Secretary, said functions, powers, or duties may be performed, exercised, or discharged by his duly authorized representatives.

SEC. 8. This act shall be deemed a supplement to and part of the reclamation law. Nothing in this act shall be construed to amend the Boulder Canyon Project Act of December 21, 1928, as amended by the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of July 19, 1940.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURDOCK: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of the bill H. R. 1597 as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 1597) was laid on the table.

RECORDS FURNISHED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2938) to amend section 1 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 497, 5 U. S. C., sec. 488), fixing the price of copies of records furnished by the Department of the Interior, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, lines 10 and 11, after "distribution." insert "The money received for copies under this section shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the appropriations then current and chargeable for the cost of furnishing copies as herein authorized."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, one under the title of "The West Against Itself" and the other "Conservation of Our Natural Resources."

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short article.

Mr. LYNCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects.

Mr. STIGLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram on the wool bill.

THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the new Speaker of the House for having the national deficit cut down so that we have a credit balance of $753,000,000 this year—the first time in 16 years. I have kept a record of the Treasury statements—here they are, several hundred of them. If there are any doubting Thomases around here, I have the proof for these statements. They come from the Treasury Department. Never in the history of our country or any other country in the world have we seen anything like the spending and the debt we have piled up since 1931. I am placing here a table showing, since 1914, the total net receipts and the total expenditures—each year since 1914—the public debt, and the amount of the deficits. It will be interesting to many of you to go back over that record. In the future, the gentleman from Massachusetts,

Speaker MARTIN, and the Republican Party, are going to do everything possible to cut down and wipe out the national debt that has been created in the last 14 years.

TABLE 1.—*U. S. Government budget receipts, expenditures, and public debt, 1914–47*

[Amounts in millions]

Year ended June 30—	Total net receipts	Total net expenditures	Net surplus or deficit (—)	Public debt June 30
1914	$735	$735	0	$1,188
1915	698	761	—$63	1,191
1916	782	734	48	1,225
1917	1,124	1,977	—853	2,976
1918	3,664	12,697	—9,033	12,244
1919	5,152	18,515	—13,363	25,482
1920	6,695	6,403	292	24,299
1921	5,625	5,116	509	23,977
1922	4,109	3,373	736	22,963
1923	4,007	3,295	712	22,350
1924	4,012	3,049	963	21,251
1925	3,780	3,063	717	20,516
1926	3,963	3,098	865	19,643
1927	4,129	2,974	1,155	18,512
1928	4,042	3,103	939	17,604
1929	4,033	3,299	734	16,931
1930	4,178	3,440	738	16,185
1931	3,190	3,652	—462	16,801
1932	2,006	4,535	—2,529	19,487
1933	2,080	3,864	—1,784	22,539
1934	3,116	6,011	—2,895	27,053
1935	3,800	7,010	—3,210	28,701
1936	4,116	8,666	—4,550	33,779
1937	5,029	8,177	—3,148	36,425
1938	5,855	7,239	—1,384	37,165
1939	5,165	9,027	—3,862	40,440
1940	5,387	9,297	—3,910	42,968
1941	7,607	13,765	—6,158	48,961
1942	12,799	34,290	—21,491	72,422
1943	22,282	79,702	—57,420	136,696
1944	44,149	95,573	—51,424	201,003
1945	46,457	100,398	—53,941	256,682
1946	43,038	63,714	—20,676	269,422
1947	43,258	42,506	755	255,857

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I am not a doubting Thomas, but there is one thing I do not doubt; that is, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is one of the most diligent, useful, and consistent Members of this House.

Mr. RICH. I thank the gentleman very much. His statement is appreciated, I am sure. All I want to do is try to cut down the debt and balance the budget, so we can pay this great debt. I also add here, too, table 2, showing the budget and comparison for 1939 and 1948:

TABLE 2.—*Budget expenditures by major programs*

[Amounts in millions]

	1939	1948
National defense	$1,074	$11,256
Veterans' service and benefits	559	7,343
Interest on the public debt	941	5,000
International affairs and finance	19	3,510
Refunds of tax receipts	68	2,655
Social welfare, health, and security	3,995	1,634
Transportation and communication	512	1,530
General government	856	1,492
Agriculture and agricultural resources	1,198	1,284
Natural resources	274	1,101
Housing and community facilities	164	539
Finance, commerce, and industry	52	426
Labor	11	118
Education and general research	44	88
Reserve for contingencies		25
Adjustment to daily statement basis	[1] 63	
Total expenditures	9,027	37,526

[1] Excess of credits, deduct.

We must cut down on our expenditures. Be wise and economize.

VETERANS' SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, this Congress is preparing to close Saturday. We still have some very important veterans' legislation pending. I refer especially to the legislation involving subsistence allowances. I have been hammering away all during the last Congress and this one to do something about increasing the subsistence allowances of veterans going to school under the GI bill. We have reported this legislation out of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Now that the other body has acted on this matter, I am wondering if this House is going to adjourn without taking action upon this very important question.

I offered a bill last year to increase the subsistence allowances for students and I reintroduced my bill this year. The Veterans' Affairs Committee has held exhaustive hearings on the subject and formally reported one bill to increase the allowances and today reported another bill, which latter bill, I understand, is exactly in line with the bill on the same subject which passed the Senate last Saturday.

The high cost of living has made it difficult, and in some cases perhaps impossible, for veterans who do not have independent means to go to school. I want all veterans who are eligible under the GI bill to get the fullest possible benefits of the educational feature of the act. That is why I have so consistently and persistently sought to get the subsistence allowance increased.

This Congress ought not to adjourn without passing this legislation. The chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee indicates that she is ready to call this legislation up for action at any time, if the House leadership will recognize her for that purpose. I sincerely hope that the distinguished Speaker will recognize the chairman of the committee to call up this legislation. The time is very short and I appeal to the leadership to see that this legislation is passed and sent to the White House before adjournment.

LOYALTY INVESTIGATION

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, before this Congress adjourns Saturday, I think the Committee on Appropriations should bring in and pass money for the President's loyalty investigation. The sum of $25,000,000 has been asked for to complete this effort to remove Communists and other subversive elements from the pay roll of the United States Government.

President Truman asked for these investigative funds to carry out this housecleaning more than 3 months ago—but so far none have been appropriated for this extremely important work to safeguard our Government from these subversive groups.

This work is going forward but in a limited way. With adequate funds available, far more progress can be made and the job can be properly done. It cannot progress any further now unless these funds are appropriated before the Congress adjourns.

If we mean business in getting rid of these Reds, I think the least we can do is give the President's committee on loyalty the money necessary to conduct these investigations. If we do not, since the loyalty bill the House passed the other day will not become law for at least 6 or 8 months, we will be delayed for six or more precious months.

Give the President the money to start this work, even though this legislation, which was passed by the House recently, has not become law.

Numerous editorials in the New York Times, the Washington News, the New York Herald Tribune, and other papers have cast doubt on the wisdom of the legislation passed by the House. Lack of adequate safeguards for old employees of the Government who are loyal have been challenged in the House bill.

Little criticism has been heard of the President's loyalty investigative program because of the adequate safeguards it provides. It was a carefully worked out program, designed not only to ferret out the Reds, but also to protect the rights and the good names of the loyal and innocent workers from slander and irresponsible gossip.

This program is under way—it is now in operation. It will cease to function unless funds are appropriated before adjournment. The danger of a 6- or 8-month delay to await action on the doubtful House-passed measure is a risk this Nation cannot afford to take at this critical time.

SUBVERSIVE AND DISLOYAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I agree thoroughly with the gentleman from Oklahoma that we should appropriate money for the President to carry out his loyalty program.

I submit also that whenever a man is fired from the Federal payroll for disloyalty his name should be sent to the Congress of the United States. What right have we to throw these Reds out of the State Department or other departments, and turn them loose and let them go back and get on the State pay rolls or in other responsible positions and continue their subversive activities?

All these men who have been thrown off the Federal pay roll for disloyalty or for subversive activities should be known to the American people, because

unless that is done they will go right back into the various States and continue their subversive activities.

I hope we will not only appropriate the money the President asked for, but also money to carry out the loyalty legislation that we pass, and at the same time, I hope the administration will send to the Congress the name of every person who is thrown off the Federal pay roll for disloyalty or for subversive activities.

MUCH-NEEDED LEGISLATION

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to add my two-bits, for whatever it may be worth, to emphasize and heartily concur in the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. May I insist also, that we refuse to recess or adjourn until we have passed each of the other 11 important pieces of national legislation.

I want to call attention to the cartoon which appeared in the Post a couple of days ago depicting Congress getting out of an automobile that it had been driving called Needed Legislation with three or four beautiful ladies called Pieces of Needed Legislation in it. As the train was bearing down the track upon them the chauffeur tipped his hat and said, "This is my train" and left them to their death.

I submit that we have no right to quit until we do our job.

ELECTION TO A COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, House Resolution 320, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That TOM PICKETT, of the State of Texas, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Public Works.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by W. G. Vollmer.

THE UNIFICATION BILL

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I placed in the RECORD in the Appendix at page A3702 an editorial of the Chicago Daily Tribune with respect to the unification bill. I desire to read one paragraph of the editorial which I would like very much to have the Members read in full. The paragraph is as follows:

Third, the Executive order by which President Truman proposes to implement the legislation provides for the use of "such missions and detachments for service in foreign countries as may be required to support the national policies and interests of the United States." Language so vague is subject to alarming constructions. There is no authorization here that Congress is to be consulted if the President is persuaded by the Army and Navy to get into military adventures and nondeclared wars anywhere on earth.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that steps should be taken to remedy that situation.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. And that is in line with the suggestion contained in the amendment which the gentleman offered at the time of the debate last week.

Mr. OWENS. Yes; it is. I am not trying to die hard on the voice vote, but I believe that, with respect to the amendment which I offered—as a matter of fact, I think the Chair should have decided in favor of it—some action should be taken to the end that Congress will not close its own avenue to information.

RETIREMENT PRIVILEGES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time because I see my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] on the floor. He is chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. On July 11 the President approved the bill in relation to retirement for agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. We are all acquainted with that.

I notice the bill H. R. 4127 passed the House the other day. It has been called to my attention that the provisions of that bill might raise legal complications in relation to agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I know that is farthest removed from the minds of any of us, and particularly the gentleman from Kansas. When the matter goes to conference or in the other body, I hope that language which will clarify that situation will be inserted in H. R. 4127.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to my friend from Kansas.

Mr. REES. I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts that some question has been raised as to whether or not the retirement bill will affect that legislation. In any event, the gentleman from Kansas has been before the Senate committee and explained the situation there, and in the event the retirement bill is passed by the Senate, which we expect it will do, an amendment will be included to take care of the particular problem to which the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts has called attention.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FOOTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD with reference to a bill he is introducing today.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include an article.

Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

LOYALTY COMMITTEE INVESTIGATION

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to second the suggestion made by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] with regard to providing funds, that the President long ago requested, to implement his program of loyalty investigation.

As chairman of a subcommittee in the Civil Service Committee in the last Congress, of which the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] were members, our studies and the recommendations of the Civil Service Committee, of which the Hon. Jennings Randolph was then chairman, led to the promulgation of that order of the President. This report will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, July 20, 1946, on page 9601.

The Presidential order sets up adequate machinery for screening employees and prospective employees of the Government. It would empower the Civil Service Commission to investigate prospective employees and the FBI to make name checks and investigate persons already in the employ of the Government suspected of disloyalty. The order sets up adequate safeguards for the public interest or the one hand and the rights of Government employees on the other. A uniform system of procedures with adequate rights of appeal and review are provided in the order. To carry on the work properly will require an enlargement of the investigative staffs of both the Civil Service Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The President long ago requested an appropriation of $25,000,000 to defray the cost of this work. We ought to implement his program by providing the funds before this Session of Congress adjourns and I trust that it will be done.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

INVITATION TO ATTEND THE BAHAMAS HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY,
Bahamas, July 4, 1947.

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
Member of Congress, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Speaker's Office, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., U. S. A.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER MARTIN: As Speaker of the House of Assembly of the Parliament of Bahamas and joint president of the Bahamas Branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association, I am writing to you to extend an invitation for four Members of your House of Representatives to visit the Bahamas for a period of about 10 days from December 28 next, as guests of the Bahamas branch of the association.

During that time the Bahamas branch will be the hosts in the Colony to delegations of members of all parties from the Parliaments of the United Kingdom and the Dominion of Canada. It is hoped also to have representatives of the Parliaments of the Australian Commonwealth, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa.

The Bahamas branch of the association were much impressed with the success of the informal parliamentary gathering which took place in Bermuda last year, at the invitation of the Bermuda branch of the association. The value of the parliamentary contacts and interchange of views which took place in Bermuda, and also in Washington, when the delegates visited the Capitol as the guests of the Congress of the United States, were fully appreciated by members of this legislature; and they would propose, if this invitation is accepted, to provide opportunities during the visit to Nassau for the discussion of some matters of common interest at informal conferences.

I can assure you that if it is found possible to accept this invitation, which I very much hope will be the case, the representatives of your House will receive a warm welcome from the Parliament and people of these islands.

I take the opportunity of expressing to you my feelings of deep respect and of extending to you my most cordial greetings.

Yours sincerely,
(Sgd.) ASA H. PRITCHARD,
Member, House of Assembly; Speaker, House of Assembly; and Joint President of the Bahamas Branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I submit a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 110) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Senate and the House of Representatives hereby accept the invitations tendered by the President of the Legislative Council and the Speaker of the House of Assembly of the Bahamas Government to have four Members of the Senate and four Members of the House of Representatives attend a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association to be held in the Bahamas beginning December 28, 1947. The President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives are authorized to appoint the Members of the Senate and the Members of the House of Representatives, respectively, to attend such meeting and are further authorized to designate the chairmen of the delegations from each of the Houses. The expenses incurred by the members of the delegations appointed for the purpose of attending such meeting, which shall not exceed $5,000 for each of the delegations, shall be reimbursed to them from the contingent fund of the House of which they are Members, upon submission of vouchers approved by the chairman of the delegation of which they are members.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Is this resolution debatable?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may reserve the right to object.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice arrangements are being made to send committees of Congress all over the world to try to find out what is going on. I make the suggestion that we make arrangements to get Members to go back home and see what the American people are having to go through now, and find out what they are thinking about.

This running around all over the globe to find out what somebody else is thinking beyond the boundaries of the United States, and particularly behind the iron curtain, is just about worn threadbare. It seems to me the Members of the Congress should go back home and find out what the American people are thinking about.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 22, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Please accept this as my resignation from the House Committee on Agriculture.

Very truly yours,
CLIFF CLEVENGER.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 23, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Respectfully,
ROBERT F. JONES,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 22, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Public Works Committee of the House.

Appreciating the many courtesies extended, I am

Most sincerely,
WAT ARNOLD,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 321) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That CLIFF CLEVENGER, of Ohio, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Appropriations.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 322) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That WAT ARNOLD, of Missouri, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Agriculture.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 323) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That RUSSELL V. MACK, of Washington, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Public Works.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include a statement by Joseph A. Engelhard, and in the other to include a historical sketch. The latter might exceed the limit under the rules, but notwithstanding that fact, I ask that it be printed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on flood control.

EXTENDING THE PERIOD FOR PROVIDING ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN WAR-INCURRED SCHOOL ENROLLMENTS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 279, providing for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3682) to extend the period for providing assistance for certain war-incurred school enrollment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3682) to extend the period for providing assistance for certain war-incurred school enrollments. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]. At this time I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 279 makes in order the consideration of H. R. 3682 under an open rule and provides for 1 hour general debate. The bill, H. R. 3682, is a measure to extend the period for providing assistance for certain war-incurred school enrollment.

The necessity for this assistance is not as great as it has been in the past, but due to the great housing shortage that has persisted in this country we do have, near many of the former war plants and Army and Navy installations throughout the country, great Government-owned housing projects which have brought with them a tremendous increase in the enrollment in the schools in those particular portions of our districts. During the war, and since the war, these school children have been attending the schools in many particular districts which have much less tax income than before the war simply because much of the taxable property of the township or the school district, as I am sure many of you know from your own experiences, has been taken over by the Government and is no longer taxed. So, today we have quite a number of school districts where the pupil enrollment is much greater than it has ever been before, while at the same time the tax income of the school district is much lower than it has ever been before. In order to take care of this temporary situation during the war we did spend considerable money out of the Federal Treasury to help support those schools and to take care of the children of war workers and Army and Navy personnel.

There has been a great decline in that assistance need, but, as I said a moment ago, because of the housing shortage many of these publicly owned housing facilities are still being occupied, even though the war plant itself may have been shut down or reconverted to some other sort of production. We have instances where men who have found employment as far as 50 or 60 miles away, still having to have a home for their children, are still residing in these war-housing installations. It is not thought it will take a great deal of money—in fact, this bill limits the total expenditure to $5,000,000—to continue this aid to these particular school districts where the need therefor still exists.

It is the belief, I am sure, of the education committee, at least, and it is the impression of the Committee on Rules, that the total expenditure will not reach $5,000,000 during the next year, but it is necessary to take this action and extend this law or authority, in this reduced manner, in order to take care of those school districts which still remain uncared for because of the emergency created by the present housing shortage.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I might say to the gentleman from Ohio that in my district we have two or three places where exactly the situation that the gentleman describes obtains, and those schools could not possibly operate unless they get some help. That is a condition which has resulted from the war effort in the metropolitan area of Detroit. There is no other way of solving it than the passage of this type of legislation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am hoping that these Government-owned housing facilities will be sold, if they are of permanent construction, and go back on the tax rolls soon.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. I just wanted to say that I congratulate the gentleman's committee that brought this piece of legislation up. It is greatly needed, and in some instances the need is even greater than it ever has been at the peak of Federal employees in those districts.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; in some instances families have moved in where only military and naval personnel were located before, which has actually brought about a greater problem. This seems to be a rather noncontroversial measure. We have a heavy schedule today, and I do not care to take further time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BUCK. On the question of noncontroversiality, it was a divided report from the Committee on Education and Labor, and a minority report was filed.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes, I think there was a very minor minority report filed, if I remember.

Mr. BUCK. There were six persons who signed the minority reports.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did not understand such to be the case.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it comes mighty hard to me to call attention frequently to rules that are being brought to this House making in order legislation which calls for more and more of the taxpayers' money. Unfortunately, many of my friends have some of these schools in their districts, and they, I know, are in favor of this bill, which will cost somewhere between five and seven million dollars to take care of the schools in the districts where the War Department erected plants and factories away from districts and sections of our country where we had plenty of schools and facilities.

GHOST TOWNS

You older Members will remember that for 4 or 5 years I objected to the War and Navy Departments' real estate experts recommending purchase of sites miles away from populated sections where there was available a plentiful supply of labor, manufacturing facilities, schools, and housing recommendations. I pointed out that the experts who were recommending these sites were disregarding the tremendous cost that was entailed to the Government in the future, because they required the construction not only of many buildings and homes for the workers but also of schools, streets, sewers, places of entertainment and many other facilities.

I stated that as soon as the war was over these cities that had been built up surrounding and adjoining the plants would naturally become ghost towns and after the war it would be necessary to dismantle them at great loss to the Government. I realize that due to the shortage of housing many former war workers are still retaining their homes around these plants, despite the fact that they are obliged to travel from 20 to 50 miles to work in their new employment, these plants being closed. I call attention to that fact because I feel that the committee did not receive the information it was entitled to.

LOW-COST LAND

The localities and the school districts have not lost a great deal of tax income, as the gentleman from Ohio stated, due to the Government taking over some of the land and the school districts being deprived of their tax money, because most of the land that was acquired by the Government was extremely low-cost or cheap land and the taxes on such vacant property did not amount to very much. On the other hand, the moment the Government started to construct towns around the section, the workers that moved in and were receiving good pay started to spend their money in that locality, and those districts and the mushroom towns that were built actually benefited the local governments. They have not lost anything whatever, because the tax benefits they derived out of the thousands of people that moved in were far greater than the few dollars the

county, the township, or the school district was deprived of in taxes because of the Government taking over the property.

I call attention to the fact that two of the Members stated in the minority views filed with the committee report:

We voted against reporting out H. R. 3682 because of the lack of adequate information about, and specifications of, projects for which school funds should be provided.

HOUSE NEEDS MORE FACTS

The minority report is signed by Mr. McCONNELL and by Mr. KENNEDY. I have not been and am not a member of that committee and I did not have the hearings. All I ever am able to obtain are the few words when the Members appear or the chairman of the committee appears before the Committee on Rules and in a few brief remarks say, "Well, the committee reported this out, and we ought to have a rule."

While I was chairman of the Committee on Rules I always endeavored to obtain some information that would justify the granting of a rule, so that I could be able to say after a legislative committee reported a bill out that I thought it should receive clearance and that the House was entitled to pass upon it. But at the same time the House is entitled to some facts. I know in these last few days of the session there is a great rush of the Members to get home, and I do not blame them. I am going to join them as soon as I can get through here; but we should not be too hasty in reporting out and passing resolutions to investigate this, that, and the other thing, and appropriate money which, of course, adds to the burden of our taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS].

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois knows that I have the highest regard for him, and I feel certain that he would not want to take his seat and leave any misinformation with us intentionally. With regard to the length of the hearings, may I make this observation?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I have yielded to the gentleman.

Mr. COMBS. This question has been studied and hearings have been held on it since early in the year by the Committee on Education and Labor. They held extensive hearings. With regard to the scattering of these industries over the Nation, if that had not been done, if all manufacturing and things of that kind, the building of airplanes and tanks and everything else and ships, had been concentrated in our heavily populated centers, they would have been more overloaded, and schools and transportation facilities would have been overtaxed and we would not have been able to get the job done. What actually happened was that every place in the Nation had its factories and its installations and altogether we did a job that amazed the world. Without that, we could not have done it.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I fully appreciate that, but I stated then, and I repeat now, that it was not necessary to go 25 and 30 and 50 miles from nowhere where you had to build access roads from the main highways, streets, sewers, schools, churches, and places of amusement, saying nothing as to the homes that had to be built for the war workers running into costs of millions of dollars. That is one reason there is such a shortage of homes now—tens of thousands of homes had to be built for the war workers. I was interested in saving money for the Government and making it easier for the worker so that they would not be obliged to travel a long distance to go to work.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. I, too, always had great esteem for the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Again, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois that you are citing isolated instances. You are citing facts that do not exist, and you are leaving an impression on the floor of the House that a man of your standing should certainly retract.

Mr. SABATH. If the gentleman has any real information and will be honest, he would not dare to make that statement.

Mr. RIVERS. I have it right here and I am going to make a speech on it.

Mr. SABATH. I know about the conditions and I called attention to them for 4 or 5 years. If the gentleman had been in the House when I frequently called attention to the mistakes that the War Department was making in following the advice of these so-called real-estate experts on designating available localities, and what additional unnecessary expense such localities would entail, he would not ask that I retract my statement, but he would be obliged to confirm every statement that I have made.

I suppose the gentleman has one or two of these schools in his district. I have none. I am interested in school children and I want them to have an education. But I call attention to the unnecessary expenditures, at times reckless expenditures. However, that is water over the dam. Still I have a right to call attention to it. I should dislike very much to deprive any of the gentlemen who have some of these plants in their districts, and who need additional funds to maintain the schools, but I feel they could easily do without this aid of five or six million dollars in view of the revenue that the towns and townships derived from the spending of millions of dollars by the millions of war workers in these school districts.

I felt it my duty to call attention to these things. I assure the gentleman I know a great deal about it. If he will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD he will be satisfied that I do know, and that I have repeatedly called attention to departmental extravagances, notwithstanding the fact that it was being done under a Democratic administration, but by a War Department that is always extremely reckless with the taxpayers' money.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, on July 17, 1947, the Secretary of the Treasury addressed a communication to the Speaker of the House requesting the introduction of a bill "for the more economical operation of the general-supplies fund of the Bureau of Federal Supplies, Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes." A copy of the proposed bill was enclosed.

This communication was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. We now find it should have been referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of this communication and that it be referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3682, known as the Landis bill, is of supreme importance to the State of Georgia. In several sections of the State, notably at Brunswick, at Columbus in Muscogee County, and Marietta in Cobb County, the location of the huge Bell bomber plant which turned out great quantities of B–29's, there was an influx of workers with their families. Great housing projects were built for the wartime workers. This put a terrible strain upon the school facilities of these and other counties in the State. The Congress recognized its responsibility in helping the local school communities to meet their problem and enacted what has come to be known as the Lanham Act. But for the help given under the Lanham Act, the schools in many of our counties in Georgia would have broken down almost entirely. The problem was simply more than the State and local communities could meet unaided.

I am more familiar with the situation at Marietta, in Cobb County, than with the situation at Brunswick and Columbus, because Cobb County is located in the Seventh District, which I represent. The situation in this county was made much more acute by the fact that the Government owns quite a large amount of real estate in the county. For instance, there is Kennesaw National Park, which has taken from the tax rolls of the county 2,882 acres of the valuation of $72,050. The Bell bomber plant took from the tax rolls 2,350 acres at a valuation of $58,750. The Allatoona Dam has taken from the county's tax rolls 3,950 acres of a total value of $98,750. There is an Army air base located in the county which has taken 603 acres from the tax rolls of a total value of $15,075. This makes a total of 9,785 acres owned by the Government in the county of a total value of $144,625. All of this has been taken

from the tax assessment rolls of the county.

This situation in Cobb County illustrates also the tremendous increase in enrollment of pupils in the county schools. In the school year 1942–43, the total enrollment was 5,290 in the schools of the county. In 1946–47, the total enrollment was 6,844, and an expected enrollment for the school year 1947–48 is 7,169.

The reason for the continued enrollment since the plant is no longer in operation is due to the fact that because of the housing shortage, all of the housing built for the workers in the Bell bomber plant is still occupied by people who work in Atlanta and other nearby cities. The children are still living in the county and must be taken care of by the local schools.

To show that the local community and the State have done everything possible to meet the situation, I need only recite the figures. For the school year 1943–44, the local tax rate was 5 mills. This raised a total of $49,280.50. The State's contribution for the same period was $184,840.02. During that year the Federal Works Agency contributed Lanham funds in the total amount of $18,028.78, and there was miscellaneous income of $6,528, making a total of $258,677.30. In the school year 1946–47 the amount raised by a local tax of 15 mills was $143,000. For the same period the State contributed $341,973. Lanham fund contributions were $80,027, which, with $10,000 miscellaneous income made the total expenditures for the year $575,000.

It is readily seen from the above that the Cobb County school system is overburdened with a war-incurred enrollment of approximately 2,000 more students than during its last normal year. The local government has gone its limit in trying to meet this responsibility, having increased the rate of taxation from 5 to 15 mills, as stated above, along with an increase in property valuations. It is to be noticed that the State has almost doubled its contribution. If this bill is not passed and Federal aid extended for one more year, the county will simply have to cut its school term from 9 to 7 or possibly 5 or 6 months. This situation is definitely caused by the war and its aftermath and is, therefore, a Federal responsibility.

A somewhat similar, though not quite so severe, situation exists in Polk County, Ga., of which Cedartown is the county seat. Here are located many textile plants which were in operation at full speed making textiles for clothing and tire fabric as its contribution to the war effort. Before the war the Polk County schools had an enrollment of approximately 3,500. For the current school year, that is, the 1946–47 school year, the average daily attendance was 4,202.

The county and State have made a tremendous effort to meet this influx of children into the schools caused by the war effort. For the school year 1941–42 the State contributed to the county $95,718 while the county and districts contributed $37,765. In the school year 1946–47, the State aid had been raised more than double and amounted to $245,000 and the county and school districts had practically doubled their contribution making a total as their contribution for that year of $72,600. Even with the assistance of the Federal Government through Lanham funds, the county has not been able to maintain its schools at a normal level. In 1941 all of its teachers had at least 2 years of college preparation. In the school year just closed the system had 45 teachers of a total of 170 who had less than 1 year of college work. Unless this bill, the Landis bill, is passed, which in effect extends Lanham fund aid, the Polk County Board of Education will have to cut off 28 school teachers and crowd the children into fewer classrooms or reduce the length of the term to 6 or 7 months instead of the present 9-month school term. Moreover, the schools will have to be operated without janitors and janitor supplies.

The same sort of condition exists in Floyd County in which is located the city of Rome. The entire county is largely industrial and contributed the products of its factories and foundries to the war effort. I will not quote statistics for this county but substantially the same state of affairs exists in Floyd County as in the other two counties in the district to which I have already referred.

I plead with you to pass this bill so that these children who are not to blame for the situation may not be denied the benefit of an education.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, if you will read the minority report accompanying this bill, you will find that a year ago the communities which were receiving assistance were told that was the last year they would receive assistance, and they all agreed they would get out from under this load and take care of these communities themselves—the local communities in the States.

I tell you there are a lot of dilatory tactics being practiced in the various locations where these communities exist. It seems to me, if we are going to give $5,000,000 of the taxpayers' money for inefficiency back in the States, it is about time we called a halt to it and tell these communities to tend to their own knitting. They are not expected to come in here and ask us for $5,000,000 to pay for the inefficiency of the local people.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that we were also told that a housing authority was going to dispose of these properties. That has not been done. Therefore, the revenues derived from taxation on these properties is not being received by the communities.

Mr. RICH. The quicker they sell these properties to the local communities the better off the people of this country are going to be.

Mr. BARDEN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. It is past time that the Government got out of business. We have been having too much of the Government getting into all kinds of business. It just makes me sick because we have so much inefficiency in our Government. The employees are inactive. They do not do the things they should. If anyone should get out and stir these people up, it is the Congress. The only way we can stir them up is to stop these appropriations. Then they will act.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I ask the gentleman to yield to point out the fact that this bill returns $5,000,000 of the taxpayers' money which has been paid into the Federal Treasury, returns it to the school districts, so that the taxpayers get the benefit of it, including several areas in the gentleman's own State.

Mr. RICH. I want the people in my district to get on their toes and get busy. I do not want any more fooling around. I want to stop these appropriations for inefficiency back in the States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am wholeheartedly supporting this resolution and hope that it will be passed, and I am also supporting the bill which it makes in order for consideration. I know it will be contended by some that this work should be ended, now that the war is over, and communities should take care of their own school problems in their own way. It is not so simple as that, nor can we, by wishing, return at once to the prewar conditions. The war did complicate the domestic school problem greatly and to such an extent that it will take some time to work out a solution.

I have heard some gentlemen complain about war installations, feeling that war plants were often built not near their large cities but in remote rural communities where housing and school facilities had to be improvised throughout. I distinctly remember that during the period of preparation that the majority of Members were seeking one kind of military installation or another and hoping to get war plants located within their districts, not only from the patriotic motive of wishing to help in the war effort but also hoping, no doubt, that such wartime installations might prove an economic aid to their communities. Since the war I have heard some of my colleagues declare that they now wish there had been no such military or defense establishments located within their district. The aftermath and the headaches caused by the dislocations are extremely painful and difficult of solution.

One reason why I favor the bill which we shall take up on the adoption of this rule is that I know personally of several communities in Arizona adjacent to war plants which are struggling with their overcrowded school conditions and carrying an almost unbearable burden of debt and financial obligation. I am fairly well acquainted with the schools and the school authorities in Arizona. I have received numerous communications from school superintendents and school boards, urging that something be done under the former Lanham Act plan to assist them. Let me take a case or two for example.

Before the recent war, the Isaac School District, lying in a rich agricultural community west of the city of Phoenix but not far from it, was a typical high-class consolidated rural school. I have known J. B. Sutton, the superintendent, for a long time, and I know that he had few worries of a professional or financial nature concerning his school prior to the outbreak of the war. Then what happened? A big war plant was established in his community. Thousands of war workers flocked to this plant. Hastily constructed housing was furnished, and the enrollment of Isaac School expanded enormously. And now that the war is over, what is the situation? Many of those families are still residing in property that pays no local taxes. The district is bonded and taxed to the limit, and since—in the case of this school as in the case of other Arizona school districts—a large share of the financial support is derived from a local ad valorem tax. This community cannot raise enough by local taxation to pay for the cost of the schooling of the children who have been there, many of them, for 4 or 5 years, and are still enrolled.

I can cite other cases similar to the Isaac School District, not only on the outskirts of Phoenix but also on the outskirts of Tucson, and still other districts more remote from good-sized cities. The presence of these children in those school districts is a result of the war. The cost of taking care of their education is as much an obligation of the Federal Government as are most of the other continuing expenses occasioned by the war. This legislation may be but a stop-gap and temporary, but it is to be hoped that it will be enacted for immediate need and followed by a more permanent program such as may be required.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3682) to extend the period for providing assistance for certain war-incurred school enrollments.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3682, with Mr. LEONARD W. HALL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, under this bill the Federal Works Administrator is authorized to continue Federal assistance to those schools that are still overburdened with war-incurred school enrollments and which are unable through local revenue and from State contributions to provide schooling for this increased enrollment.

The amount will not exceed the sum of $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948. The program cost fourteen million in 1945–46 and seven million in 1946–47.

This is not a bill for foreign aid but for American school children. It provides Federal assistance for a pressing problem that has arisen out of the war and its aftermath. During the war period thousands of war workers and their families migrated into war areas, greatly increasing school attendance and imposing severe financial burdens on local school systems. During the war the Government recognized its responsibilities to these communities and granted assistance under the Lanham Act.

Without such assistance many of these schools will have to close down or cut their school term to 4 to 6 months. The State aid pays only a part of the total costs of maintenance and operations of schools. The local school agencies have made a strenuous effort to meet this problem by increasing substantially the amount of local funds for school purposes. This increase in State and local revenues, however, has not been sufficient to meet the double burden of this increased enrollment and the loss of tax revenues.

The Federal Government has acquired and now owns considerable land in numerous communities. This land has been removed from the local tax rolls. Last year 76 schools received assistance because of the problem of tax-exempt federally owned property. Another 26 communities were provided school services for residents of nontaxable Army- or Navy-owned reservations and 65 areas faced the problem of Federal-owned war housing.

Defense housing continues to be occupied at capacity levels. The problem is intensified by the shortage of housing and the increased need for veteran housing.

The early enactment of this bill is urgent. The local school districts must hire their teachers for the 1947–48 school year.

It is true the Federal Public Housing Authority has failed to dispose of the houses, stores, and other property. Why, I do not know. According to an act of Congress they must dispose of them by December 31, 1948. I hope it will be possible to dispose of this property by June 30, 1948. The Public Housing Administration has collected $274,760,000, but only a net income from rents of $111,130,000.

It is true the Federal Works Commissioner testified last year they would be able to close out the program in one more year. I also believe Mr. Fields wants to be relieved of this emergency problem. But the problem is still with us, the Government still owns this property, and the States are not able to furnish enough State aid to handle the situation.

The minority report says the evidence presented covers less than a dozen communities. But according to evidence which I have from the Federal Works Administration, 132 schools from 35 States have requested financial aid. It will take approximately $5,000,000 to take care of this program.

Congress has made arrangements to give and loan $20,000,000,000 to foreign countries and much more will be demanded to take care of the children and people in these foreign lands.

I am surprised and disappointed to learn that some people who favor these gigantic gift-loans to foreign nations oppose this $5,000,000 bill to help educate our own American children.

I believe it is about time to make some cuts in these foreign gifts and make some provisions for Americans in the way of better pensions for our elders and better minimum wages for our underpaid workers.

I would like to make this observation, that in these 193 schools there was an increase of 127,000 pupils in average daily attendance.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I want to commend my colleague from Indiana for the foresight and initiative that prompts him to bring this measure before the House. I have within one of the counties in the district I represent an ordnance plant of several thousand acres that was taken off the local tax rolls, bringing with it that great influx of residents and overcrowded population in our schools, and we realize very much the need for this continued help, and I am glad to support the measure.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MATHEWS. Do I understand correctly that this bill does not affect communities like, for instance, Wrightstown, in my own district, near Fort Dix, which is a permanent installation and which has been increased during the war? It does not affect that, does it?

Mr. LANDIS. Unless it is on the list. The gentleman can check the list and see if it is on it.

Mr. MATHEWS. The list is not in the report.

Mr. LANDIS. They are not all listed in the report.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

I would like to make one more point. The national average cost last year per pupil was $135. In these areas, the average is $90, and all this bill does is add $14 per pupil in these 132 school districts. There have been 132 requests in 35 States, which will amount to $5,000,000. Of course, the chief objection to this bill was that last year the Federal Works people said that it was only going to last last year, and that would conclude it. But, we cannot help it because the Federal Works Administration made a mistake, and that these houses are still there. Some of the civilians have moved out of these houses and veterans have taken their places. In these houses today over half of the people are veterans and their families, and over half of the total are veterans' children. There are 367,000 children in these housing areas that must be taken care of. They will either have to close the schools or limit the school term to from 4 to 6 months.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BURKE. I should like to add my support to this measure. In my district, Wright Field and Patterson Field have been encroaching upon the taxable areas and have reduced the amount of the school district income.

Mr. LANDIS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. The local and State funds in these supported school districts have increased more than $15,000,000 this year.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it was with reluctance that I voted in favor of reporting this legislation to the House because I am personally in favor of the Government getting out of this war-incurred educational program as quickly as possible. I can assure the Members of this House that I gave much thought to every provision of this bill and would not have voted in favor of reporting it out of our committee had not the present committee amendments been adopted.

This bill, as amended, extends the period of time to June 30, 1948, for providing emergency educational assistance for certain war-incurred school enrollments and limits the amount authorized to be appropriated to $5,000,000. It makes available Federal assistance for immediate needs arising out of the war emergency and provides for contributions for the operation and maintenance of school facilities to local school agencies requiring assistance provided they received assistance during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, which was the termination date under the provisions of the Lanham Act that Federal assistance could be given to schools coming within the classification provided by this legislation.

During the hearings before the Committee on Education and Labor on H. R. 3682 and bills of similar character testimony was presented to the committee that indicated that unless Federal aid was continued in certain school districts, the schools would not be able to operate more than 4 to 6 months from their own funds and that it would be impossible with the present teacher shortage to induce competent teachers to accept positions in these school districts.

During the war period it was necessary under our all-out war program to establish plants, shipyards, and Army and Navy installations all over our country and in a great many instances there were no houses available for the in-migrant workers who were employed at these installations. Under title I of the Lanham Act temporary housing to meet the needs of these in-migrant workers and their families was authorized and under title II of the act community facilities that were necessary to carry on the community life of these various housing centers were established.

The Lanham Act also provided that this housing should be disposed of within 2 years after the termination of the war. However, due to the housing and material shortage, as well as the difficulty of finding homes for our returning veterans, it has not been possible to dispose of these temporary-housing projects. In fact, testimony was presented to our committee that the occupants of some of these projects were more than 50 percent veterans. There are many reasons why these projects should be sold or turned over to local authorities immediately, but as that is not the subject under consideration, I will not take up the time of the House to discuss that phase of the housing program.

However, there is another phase of the housing program that I wish to discuss briefly, and that directly concerns the war-incurred educational program. The Federal Public Housing Authority is obligated under law to turn back to the local authorities payments in lieu of taxes sums equivalent to those that would have been received had the property been privately owned.

The real difficulty is that the Housing Authority is collecting the rents from these housing projects and bringing them back to Washington to make a good showing for the Federal Public Housing Authority. The sums they pay to the local governments in lieu of taxes are not sufficient to meet the expenses incident for the normal operations of the schools, fire department, police department, and other community facilities as provided by title II of the Lanham Act.

In brief, the Federal Public Housing Authority, in order to make a good showing for themselves in Washington, are in reality robbing the local authorities of the funds necessary to educate the children in the communities this bill is designed to assist. It is because of these conditions that I was reluctant to support this legislation.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. The gentleman has made a very correct statement. Does he believe we should permit that situation to continue?

Mr. LESINSKI. It is up to the Congress to correct. Personally, I cannot do it myself, but I am bringing it to the attention of the Congress.

It is for that reason that I deem it desirable to pass this emergency stopgap legislation with its limitations of time and money until Congress in its wisdom remedies that phase of the housing program.

Mr. Chairman, I was convinced by the testimony presented to our committee that there are school districts in the United States that require emergency educational aid. I was also convinced after a careful study of all the facts that the Federal Public Housing Authority in many instances was not giving the local governments a square deal in the sums they are paying in lieu of taxes. However, the most important factor to consider at this time is that the first of September—the beginning of the school year—is almost at hand. That, coupled with the fact that this session of Congress will shortly adjourn—in my humble opinion—is the reason why this legislation should be enacted into law in order that children residing in school districts, burdened with war-incurred enrollments, will be assured of a full term education beginning this fall.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr Chairman, I was perfectly astonished to hear the eminent gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] stand in the well of the House a few minutes ago and say that this bill is noncontroversial. His memory is surprisingly short.

The bill came out of the Committee on Education and Labor on a divided vote. A number of members of the committee signed a minority report and then some of us appeared before the Committee on Rules. In the Committee on Rules the first action, according to my information, was that the rule be denied. Then, on subsequent consideration, the rule was granted. That is hardly the history of a noncontroversial piece of legislation.

Everyone who has had to do with education not only admits that education is a State function but will fight to the last ditch to assure that education does remain a State function. If it is admitted that education is a State responsibility, why was it that the States, on notice a year ago that this Federal aid would terminate, sit back and do absolutely nothing? The States had 1 year's notice that they would get no more of this Federal aid. Yet here it is almost the 1st of August, and we are told that unless the Federal Government passes this legislation many children in the States will have no education. The States lie back and attempt to shift their responsibility to the Federal Government, probably because they think the Federal Government is easy, and I am beginning to agree with that interpretation.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] hit the nail on the head a few moments ago when he said that unless the Federal Government passes this bill there is no other source of money for this education. In other words, he is telling us that this will not be the last year but that it will go on and on and on until we get our backs up and let the States take the responsibility which is theirs.

Let us examine for a minute the housing situation. There are two types of housing which are involved in this Federal aid.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR].

Mr. MCGREGOR. I concur with the statement of the distinguished gentleman from New York as a member of the committee which formerly handled Lanham Act funds. If my memory serves me correctly, this is about the third time that this group has come before the committee and asked for an extension or a continuation of these funds with relation to this program. I definitely feel that the time has come, perhaps not this year, but most assuredly next year, when the Congress should stop this kind of program.

Mr. BUCK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. This seems to me to be the most outrageous kind of pork-barrel legislation that I have ever seen. Everybody is trying to get their hands into the grab bag. I think it is high time to put a stop to it. Personally, I am disgusted with this type of legislation and I am going to continue to vote against it.

Mr. BUCK. I thank the gentleman. I want to turn briefly to the types of housing which furnish the excuse for this legislation. There are two kinds of housing for which it is claimed that the Federal Government has responsibility. One is the permanent Army and Navy installation. Can anyone conceive of the Government attempting to take away a navy yard or an Army post and not have the chamber of commerce, the mayor of the city, and all the first citizens come down here with tears in their eyes to ask us to save that facility for their community? Yet, having that benefit, they now come here and ask the Federal Government to help educate the children that accompany that installation.

The second type affected is temporary housing. I say to you that any community which has this temporary housing with which to provide homes for its returning veterans and for others during the housing shortage is indeed blessed. I wish I had five or ten thousand more temporary houses in my own community, and then possibly we could accommodate veterans who need housing so badly. Yet that is given as an excuse. The very communities that have the advantage of this surplus housing, into which veterans and their families can move, are the ones who are coming here and asking nutriment from the Federal nipple in order to educate the children who live in those houses.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] has expired.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. BUCK. The time has come to decide whether this sort of Federal aid to education is to end or is to go on indefinitely. As has been pointed out, we have three times said it was the end. If this bill is enacted the States will never take over the responsibility which is genuinely theirs. The bill should be defeated, and at the proper time I will offer a motion to recommit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] has again expired.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I have complete confidence in the sense of fairness of the Members of the House, and if the Members understand this problem I do not believe there will be a single vote against this bill.

There are two of these projects in the district I serve. I would like to refer to them. Our Government went out into a cotton field and constructed one of its great air depots. There are only eleven in the Nation. They constructed the depot and a majority of the homes for 30,000 employees. It is there today in operation. It is in a small country county. The small amount the Government pays in lieu of taxes is inconsequential, compared with the need of teachers for educating the children who came there from nearly every State in this Union. There is a State responsibility, I think, referred to by the gentleman from New York. My State is trying, as best it can, to fulfill its part, but it does seem to me that under these circumstances, where the State contributes only a part of the cost of education in our respective States, where there is a small country county that has no possibility of realizing revenue adequate to educate these children, as long as that establishment is operating, as long as those hundreds and hundreds of children are there, it should not only be the pleasure but it should be the duty of the Federal Government to contribute toward their education.

We have a similar situation in Muscogee County, Ga., in which is located our greatest military establishment, Fort Benning. You are all familiar with the enormous expansion at Fort Benning during the war. At times there were nearly a hundred thousand troops in training there. This naturally required great increases in civilian personnel. It also required an expansion of the reservation, to a total of 45,000 acres, of which 20,000 acres were formerly a part of Muscogee County and is now tax-exempt.

To meet this situation the Government constructed an enormous housing project, known as Baker Village. It also constructed school buildings. There are 1,142 housing units in the village with 900 children attending school. At $72 for each pupil it is costing the State and county $64,800 to operate this school, but the amount paid in lieu of taxes is only $16,000. The county is now levying a tax of 12 mills but it is not adequate to provide the teachers to instruct these children.

And in addition to that the Federal Works Agency is now demanding that the county purchase the high school building. It has no funds for that purpose.

The end of the war has not reduced this problem. In the county the school enrollment in 1942 was 3,982, during the 1945–46 term the enrollment was 7,695, and during the 1946–47 term the enrollment increased to 7,949.

Certainly the Federal Government has a direct and inescapable obligation to Muscogee County to contribute toward the cost of educating these children. I am confident your sense of fairness will prompt you to authorize and require the Government to do so through the passage of this bill.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Chairman, if there ever was a case where the people have the capacity to pay for the education of their own children, those are the special housing projects given to the people at low rent, with everybody in those places, like the one just described by the gentleman from Georgia, well employed at high wages, around airports, and in air construction and in the industrial centers; full employment, with high wages, and yet the alleged incapacity to pay the tuition cost of educating their own children.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. Does the gentleman realize that regardless of the high wages the floating population of those communities received, that the taxes paid to meet the expenses of educating their children must come from the land and the ad valorem taxes levied on it?

Mr. GWINN of New York. That is not quite true as I understand the situation. The fact is that the wealth is there. The States have had 2 years within which to adjust their own machinery to collect the necessary funds from the people who have the money. The local assessor could assess the taxes necessary because under the law the Federal Housing Authority that still owns these properties must turn back to the local school districts enough money to take care of these children.

All that the local tax assessor has to do is to assess these properties, the real estate, the houses, the stores, the gas stations, to raise enough money so that the Housing Authority, which is really the deficient Federal arm here at fault, will have to pay these funds back to the communities to educate these children.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Is there any testimony to support this amount of $5,000,000?

Mr. GWINN of New York. There is no testimony to support any special sum, any special amount. The only people who appeared before this committee added up their claims to a little over a million, and yet this committee is inviting the communities as a whole not to pay for their own education but to come to Washington and ask for $5,000,000. In effect this bill says: "Here it is, take it away."

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield.

Mr. COMBS. I know the gentleman does not want to leave any misinformation concerning the right to tax. The gentleman knows, if he will stop and think, that these Federal housing projects cannot be taxed one dime. What the Congress has done is to authorize payment to the local communities by the Federal Government of what taxes would be levied on these little temporary shacks were they privately owned.

Mr. GWINN of New York. In order to arrive at the amount the assessor under the law is required to indicate what the amount of the assessment would be. Then the Federal Housing Authority takes a part of the rents collected from these people and turns it back to the school district. There it is, there is the money, there are the people with the money, if they will only collect it and apply it. The States have built these houses, given them to the people. The

property is there. The value is assessable; yet people in New York and other States are asked to continue to educate the children. They have plenty of property with which they could educate their own children. This amounts to a double gift that the people of this country are asked to send to these communities.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from New York would not want to leave the impression with the Congress that the local communities have not raised their own taxes. They have been raised in the case of these properties to the extent of $15,000,000. The Congress is asked to assume a little less than 30 percent of the load to help in this education problem.

Mr. GWINN of New York. The fact is that these particular communities are not making their contribution, but should.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, there has been ample testimony and ample evidence given to the great Committee on Education and Labor and the Rules Committee justifying the passage of this legislation. If you can picture the brass hats who built a lot of these housing projects going into a community and taking everything they could take, building these projects, and under the law being required to give back to the school districts a certain amount of money which they did not do, and their rights under the law should be equal, and assessing these districts as though they were cornfields and not a housing project, leaving them absolutely helpless, you get an accurate picture of the conditions that the gentlemen from Georgia, Mississippi, and Texas have told you about.

We have one community in our district of 40,000 war workers. They built housing projects so large you get lost in them. They have not turned them back. I agree with the gentleman from New York, in discussing this matter, they should have been turned back, but they have not been turned back and until they are turned back we are absolutely without help to run these districts. In one little county in my district I know of they have raised the school levy 23 mills, which is taking all the property from the people practically. I will tell you something else they have done about some of these housing projects. The gentleman from New York told you that the war workers get these fabulous salaries and are given low rents. That does not exist in my part of the country. In every housing project in my district they have raised the rent, yet they are not giving the money to the school districts in accordance with the law.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDIS. As long as the Government collects the rents and controls the houses it ought to pay the school district?

Mr. RIVERS. Why, that is an obvious obligation.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Just to clarify and emphasize the situation, is it not a fact that whatever rent is collected on these housing projects goes into the Federal Treasury?

Mr. RIVERS. Of course it does and if they were honest about this thing we would not have to pass this legislation. We have sent the money to Washington and I do not think it is remiss of us to ask you to send it back to us.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACKINNON. The gentleman does not wish to create the impression that these projects are self-sustaining?

Mr. RIVERS. No. I mean to say, though, that if these housing projects were run right and the schools got their proportionate part, we would not be coming in here asking for this legislation. The gentleman from Michigan told us in a very masterly way they are trying to make a racket for themselves in Washington instead of meeting their direct obligation.

Mr. MACKINNON. The gentleman has put his finger right on the problem.

Mr. RIVERS. Whenever you want to take them back, I am with you.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Does the gentleman know that in many instances these housing projects are on federally owned land, part of which is a military reservation that has been taken off the general tax rolls within the school district, yet the children are brought there and it puts an added burden on the school district?

Mr. RIVERS. I know of one housing project in one of my very congested areas down there of over 400 units owned by the Navy and they do not put 5 cents back into the district. We owe this obligation and I hope we will dispense it here today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate there are so many missing in the Committee of the Whole when an important argument is in progress; however, we hope that those who are present will have a message to deliver to those who are now absent when they are ready to vote on the issue.

I feel that the most important thing in our life in America has been local autonomy, the strength of the local municipalities in America. Therein lies the reason we in America have been able to rise to meet each emergency, even to the extent of coming from a peace-loving nation and going through two wars, being able to equip ourselves in time to meet the challenge of those who would attempt to rule the world.

Now, next to the municipality, of course, is the State, and as a municipality has strength and as a group of municipalities have strength, so the States have strength. It is just like the character of an individual. If the individuals of a municipality have character, then the municipality has character and the States—in which such municipalities are located—have character. What have we been doing by paying out these moneys through the years? Only weakening that character and weakening the backbone of the Nation. I have given consideration to this matter in committee, and it is a thing to which I directed my main attention and my questions.

Now, let us analyze these projects. During the war there were people occupying those houses who had swollen incomes each week. They were paying money to the Federal Public Housing Authority for rent and they were spending the balance of their money throughout those towns and villages which were close by.

No arrangement appears to have been made for a sales tax or the taking of any other steps which would provide a fund for these schools, nor has the Federal Public Housing Authority, which has taken that money, made proper arrangements to give it back to the communities as they should, as has been pointed out by the preceding speaker. Does that mean that we in Congress are going to continue to dip into the Treasury of the United States, not only to pay those funds but, as I said before, to weaken the strength of the people? I agree, as I said, that if they were told that they could not continue this housing project any longer, so that those people would not have the money to spend in those villages, they would object to the closing. But, they say, "No; we want to keep them there." However, they are not willing to make any plans in regard to paying their way. They say, "The Army wants us to remain there." Well, if the Army wants them to remain there, then the Army should foot the bill; that would take care of that proposition. If the Federal Public Housing Authority is to continue for the next year, they should foot the bill.

Right now we are preparing to make an investigation throughout America with respect to racketeering in housing. I am beginning to believe that it does not concern business and labor only but even concerns our public offices and public officers, and one of the first investigations that should be made is right in the Federal Public Housing Authority to see why they have been taking that money and building up that agency to the detriment of those people in those communities. Insofar as I am concerned, I believe the real thing for us to do here is to cast a vote which shows that we are not in favor of having this continued. Naturally, none of us feels, when we have the facts set before us now, when they are asking for help for another year on the theory that it is going to end at that

point, that we want to hurt them and have it end right now, if it is really going to hurt them in that way, but I believe the only way we can show our purpose is to cast a vote against this type of legislation right now in order to give the people of America the thought that they should rely upon themselves, and not constantly be coming to the Federal Government for aid. What it does is to encourage the citizens of States which have low incomes to oppose all Federal income-tax reductions in order that money might be available to pay the subsidies which are being handed out for every conceivable purpose. Continuance of Federal aid to certain localities of the country is not fair to the other sections thereof which do not receive such aid. Let us be just before we are too generous.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I hope that in the consideration of this bill no one will confuse the problem before us this morning with the general question of Federal aid to education. The two have nothing in common and are entirely separate. This is a simple problem of carrying out commitments which were made during the war period. What do I mean by that? I mean simply that the Federal Government brought these people from all parts of the country into communities, in many instances small communities, it gathered them there to perform a specific wartime act. This resulted in overtaxing the school and other facilities of these communities. Unfortunately, when the guns ceased firing on the front these people did not leave these communities. They are still there in most instances.

I think I could best illustrate this by citing the case of my own home town of Pascagoula, Miss. I live in what was a community of 6,000 people in the prewar days. The Federal Government came in there and built sufficient housing to take care of a population which suddenly was accelerated to 40,000. This was necessitated by the construction of ships. Those people are still there.

What are you going to do about it? My friends on the other side who oppose this say, "Let the communities, let the local governments take care of it." Over 70 percent of the children who attend the public schools in my home town come from this housing project. If my community, which has already taxed itself to the limitation of the law, got the permission of the State legislature to increase its taxation 1,000 percent, that still would not meet the situation. We have already taxed ourselves to the statutory limit but we cannot meet that situation.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield in my brief time to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Under the citation that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] mentioned, the Housing Authority must turn back whatever money the assessor says is necessary to meet the taxes on these very houses.

Mr. COLMER. I am glad I yielded to the gentleman for I want to answer that question. Provision was made under the Lanham Act, and if the gentleman will pardon a self-serving declaration, it was put in there at my suggestion to try to help that situation. But the trouble is that the amount allowed is insufficient to anything like meet the situation.

This is a real problem and one that must be met if these children are to receive education. Moreover, I repeat that this is a war incurred obligation of the Federal Government. I believe that this Congress believes in fair play. I have confidence that this body will go along with those of us who are sponsoring this legislation.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS].

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to question the accuracy of the statement of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS], which I am sure he made quite inadvertently. But the fact is that a list of the communities affected by H. R. 3632 is not included in the report on the bill.

However, since asking the question which gave rise to this statement, I have been shown a mimeographed list and find that there are included communities in or near which there are permanent establishments of the Army or Navy.

I am opposed to the constant attempts to gradually socialize this Nation through Federal grants-in-aid, loans with Federal bossism attached, increasing Federal jurisdiction over States, municipalities, and the people thereof, whether these things be under the guise of education, lunches for children, or similar appealing designations.

But this bill deals with a totally different situation. It deals with a condition created by the Federal Government in carrying on a war and, therefore, it is a matter of justice that the Federal Government should not leave the municipalities affected in the position of alone bearing the burden of that condition.

There has been advanced as an argument against this bill, the fact that the executive branch of the Federal Government has not complied with the intent and meaning of acts passed by this Congress with reference to the disposal of certain structures erected under the Lanham Act, the theory apparently being that since the executive branch of the Federal Government had not done what it should do, the result of this negligence should be borne by the municipalities. I can find neither reason nor logic in such a contention.

And certainly a condition like this could have no bearing on a situation in which a permanent establishment of the armed services had grown quite large as the result of the war and its aftermath of increased defense forces. The problem of the education of the children of people living upon or near such reservations which is forced upon the nearby communities is one which the Federal Government, in all fairness and justice, must help that community solve for a little while until some permanent solution is worked out.

In the State of New Jersey we have no income tax, sales tax, or similar method whereby money which this added population might spend in the communities can be taken. The bulk of taxes for school purposes raised by the communities is from real-estate taxes, and real property, whether owned by the Federal Government or otherwise, which is exempt from taxation, naturally, does not furnish any financial assistance. Usually, too, in such communities, there is additional expense for increased police and, sometimes fire protection, which must be borne by the municipality.

For these reasons and because the bill now before us is designed only to assist municipal authorities which are still overburdened with war-incurred school enrollments, I shall vote for the bill. In the name of plain and simple justice, this bill should be passed.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, whatever is the cause of the unhappy situation in reference to housing and the various postwar problems of the country, certainly they are not the responsibility of a few communities. There was placed in my district one of the largest naval-ammunition depots in the country. It took out of taxation one-fourth of one county. I have a letter here from one of the schools involved, which states:

> We are educating about 500 from the Spencer Park area. Our only source of help for this is about $15,000 Federal Public Housing pays in lieu of taxes. The personal tax from this area is almost negligible. Our per pupil cost in Hastings this past year is $120.52. This means that we get about $15,000 FPHA money to apply on an approximate $60,000 expense.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment the projects under consideration today may be described as war casualties. I have two of them in my district. They would not have been there except because of activity created by war conditions.

I appreciate the position of the gentlemen who oppose this legislation on the general proposal that they do not favor Federal aid to education. The projects under consideration today do not come under that category. I call attention to the fact that the Government is now collecting from the project in my district known as Planeview, at the rate of about $500,000 a year. We are only asking that the Government return a part of that fund to be used for the support of education of the children in that project. There are about 2,500 children who must have school facilities. The State, the county, and the district are contributing all they can under the law. We are asking for the return of a part of the $500,000 in rent that goes to the Federal Treasury and is paid by the people who live in the community.

If you follow the plan submitted by some of the members by taking the project away, it means that someone is going to assume the responsibility for selling

these houses and sending the people back to the States and communities from whence they came. The people are there—half of the families are veterans' families. We have told veterans we were going to provide houses for them. Until other homes are provided, the best we can do is to let them use the temporary housing now in existence.

It is said we should tax the property. The fact is the property has little tax value. The project I have in mind is far removed from any city. It was put there where people could live while employed in war industry. They do pay a small amount of taxes that are applied on the cost of running the school.

I respect very much the views of the distinguished gentleman from New York, but the top figure involved is $5,000,000. I am just as much in favor of saving $5,000,000 as anyone on the floor of the House, and I agree that the House has been extravagant in some of its expenditures. Only a few days ago this House was very liberal in appropriating funds for other purposes. I am not criticizing those items now, and I do not compare this proposal with them. This proposal must stand on its own merits. I just want to say that it is rather inconsistent to oppose this legislation, which after all is simply asking the Federal Government to return about 20 to 25 percent of the rent that it collects from the people who live in these projects, so that a program of education for the children may be continued.

Again, let me say I am in favor of the counties, the States and the districts doing their full share. They are doing it in this particular case. I join too with those who say that this legislation should be temporary. We will hope at least that the situation may be adjusted so these people may be able to secure homes without the necessity of living in Government-owned temporary houses.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, this is not a local problem, although many of us have a local interest in it. It involves 367,000 school children in this country in 35 States. Only 127,000 of those 367,000 are there because of the war. The rest of the students were residents of little districts that were existing and sustaining themselves pretty well until this war bulge came to their areas. This increased their enrollment in many districts as high as 80 to 90 percent. For the 193 schools affected it boosted total enrollment by more than 45 percent.

Now, what do we do if we fail to give this aid that is asked today? We not only penalize the 127,000 students who are war-located, but we penalize all the rest of the 367,000 students, the permanent students, by giving them all only a 5- or 6-month term. Uncle Sam is solely responsible for the placement of all of this added enrollment in these small communities.

In my own community, if this war installation had been located within Oklahoma City, a city of 250,000 population, we would not have had to ask for any help whatever. But because of war restrictions they had to build this war housing area 8 miles out of the city, separated from other school districts of the city, and place it in a little farming community, and we thus had this unusual war burden there.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York who has worked so hard on this proposition.

Mr. GWINN of New York. I wonder if this property which is in Oklahoma is of such little taxable value that the Governor and the county affected would like to see it moved away.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not think they would, because we feel we are still making a great contribution in servicing B–29 airplanes at this locality. Much has been said about the failure of these communities to do anything about financing their own problem. Yet $15,000,000 a year additional revenue has been raised by these little districts to carry not only their own load but the load that Uncle Sam placed on them.

The tax burden has gone up more than 34 percent, as a national average, on all of these school districts that are affected. In my own community, I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman, we have raised our ad valorem tax by 25 percent. We are trying to do our job. We have increased our school income from the State of Oklahoma from automobile licenses by 26 percent. We have raised from the State aid funds to this school district another increase of 34 percent.

I still say the locality is doing a mighty good job in trying to solve this problem themselves. But they cannot meet and solve this problem overnight. They could not build commercial enterprises in this place because materials were limited. Every man knows that unless you have some business which you can tax, in addition to residence property, you cannot maintain school districts, because revenue from a residential community only, without business taxation cannot give you the revenue for the type of education you must have.

You may say, "Cut down the amount you are spending for schools." The State of Oklahoma recognized the great deficiency in State teachers' salaries, and made it mandatory that we raise the teachers' salaries in every school district. They are still too small, but in order to qualify as a regular school, we had to increase the cost of operating this small school outside of Oklahoma City in order to pay the teachers enough salary. We are asking for only $5,000,000 to take care of this war-born emergency for one more year for these 367,000 children affected.

I hope the House will support this measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I heartily endorse and recommend the passage of H. R. 3682, known as the Landis bill. This bill which proposes to extend the period for providing assistance for certain war-incurred school enrollments should be and must be passed immediately in order that the school districts under consideration in this bill may continue to stay in operation and educate the children in their respective districts. Without this aid a lot of the schools will have to curtail their teaching to a period of 4 or 5 months while others may not be able to operate at all.

To give some justification for the existence and passage of this bill it is necessary to understand the problems of the various school districts involved and the hardships under which they have been laboring and are laboring.

In its all-out war effort the United States Government built huge housing projects and developments near large shipyards, airplane factories, powder plants, and so forth, in an attempt to attract badly needed workers to the various yards and plants. Other housing projects were built in communities near Army, Navy, and marine installations to house the families of the servicemen and the civilian employees at the bases. These housing developments were Federal projects and as such, could not be taxed by the local communities. With the removal of large tracts of land from the tax books and with the sudden influx of large families of workers and service personnel, it is easy to visualize the magnitude of the impact of this situation upon the financial set-ups of the school systems in the affected areas.

In one area alone, Mobile, Ala., the sudden migration of shipyard workers into the Mobile area with their families resulted in the attendance in the schools increasing from 20,510 to 30,252. One district, Planeview, Kans., had no school district before the war; in 1943–44 the district had over 2,500 children in school. This same situation occurred in 408 different communities all over the Nation.

The Federal Government realized the burden placed on these communities and under a bill known as the Lanham Act agreed to pay these communities certain sums of money in lieu of taxes. The bill which we have under consideration merely extends for 1 year the provisions of the Lanham Act.

The school authorities in the several States were told last year that they should not expect the extension provided in this act since it was contemplated at that time, that the FPHA units would be disposed of before another school year started. If these units had been disposed of and placed in the hands of private owners there would be no need for the passage of H. R. 3682 but the fact of the matter is that they have not been disposed of and therefore still pose a serious problem involving the absence of large amounts of property from local tax books. As long as this property is owned by the

Federal Government it will be the duty of the Congress of the United States to provide in some way for the education of children living in these projects.

It has been intimated that the same request embodied in the Landis bill will be repeated next year but I would like to call to your attention the fact that this Congress has ordered all FPHA projects to be disposed of by the last day of next year. When this is done there will be no further need for this kind of legislation.

Local authorities have done everything possible to take care of this situation by raising local taxes to the legal limit. It is a local problem but it is a Federal obligation. I am in favor of economy in government as my record in this Congress will indicate but I am not willing to effect economy at the expense of children who are in need of education and who find themselves in a situation where the local authorities cannot take care of their needs. This legislation is a part of the cost of World War II and Congress should take care of its obligation by passing this bill.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS].

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, I can but believe that those Members who are opposing this small appropriation to assist in the education of children in these war-burdened areas are doing so under a misapprehension of the facts. They have their facts all wrong.

My State of Texas, in proportion to its size at least, probably has fewer communities that have this problem than most of the States. However, we do have a few. I have some in my own district. They are the French Independent School District, the Vidor School District, the Orange Independent School District, and the Groves Independent School District.

I think I can best help those of you who are not familiar with the problem to understand it by taking a typical example of what these communities have to overcome; and this situation exists throughout the Nation in at least 35 States. I will take that of Orange, Tex. The argument is made that when more industries settle in a place they have great property values there and that the States and communities ought to finance this burden by themselves. All right; let us see what happened.

In about 1940 the Consolidated Steel Corp. of California came down to Orange and they found the combination of deep-water facilities and other things they needed to carry on their great operations. They put in a great shipyard and during the war turned out some of the finest destroyers, destroyer escorts, and other types of naval ships, and they employed over 20,000 workers in these yards. Two other yards there expanded and as a result this small city of some 15,000 or 20,000 people found itself suddenly swelled to 60,000 with no increase in the taxable wealth of the community. Before the war the Orange Independent School District had a scholastic population of 2,000. At present it has 6,200. During the war, as a result of the naval-building program, the FPHA constructed about 3,500 public housing units which now house naval personnel, civilian employees, and veterans. Approximately 45 percent of the school-age population of this independent school district live in this housing project. FPHA pays, in lieu of taxes, about 25 percent of the cost of education of these children. The other 75 percent, except for the State apportionment, must be borne by the Orange Independent School District. Due to war restrictions on building there has been comparatively little expansion of privately owned business within the school district. And in addition to that, the Navy has acquired a considerable portion of the waterfront property that was formerly privately owned and subject to taxation and thus removed it from the tax rolls. Such business expansion as is now taking place is largely outside the school district.

Let me show you what the community has done. In an effort to meet the educational emergency the people of Orange increased their tax levy for school purposes from $1 to $1.50 on the $100, the constitutional limit within 25 cents of the ad valorem tax levied in the District of Columbia for all purposes. In addition to that, their board of equalization raised the property value, for school purposes, to approximately 100 percent of actual value. Thus, they have done everything within their power to meet their problem. Nevertheless, unless they receive aid this coming year their school term will be reduced from its normal 9 months to approximately 6 months. As pointing up this problem of the plight of children temporarily living in these communities which have a war-swollen population, I should like to read from a very fine editorial appearing in the Orange, Tex., Leader, recently. It was written by Mr. J. Cullen Browning, its editor. The editorial is too long for me to read in full in the brief time that I have. It starts out by saying:

> The other evening one of my neighbors came over to chat for a while and during the conversation brought up a subject which is bothering a lot of people in Orange and a number of other places these days. His thought on the matter, I believe, will be of interest.
>
> This neighbor is a young fellow, not long out of the Navy. He is a native of an Eastern State who was stationed here for some time before receiving his discharge. Before being separated from service he moved his family, a wife and a 6-year-old daughter to Orange. While in uniform here he got a lot of experience in helping to prepare for lay-up some of the 130 ships of the Navy stationed here as part of the Atlantic reserve fleet. When he was discharged, the Navy still needed that experience so he accepted a civil-service position and now supervises a crew of men working on the ships.
>
> My neighbor doesn't know just how much longer he will be needed in his present job—there's much talk of further expansion of the berthing operation here—but he wants to stay on and help to finish the task because he knows that one day he may be called back into service to man one of the very ships he is now laboring to protect from deterioration. He is anxious to do everything he can to be sure that if these vessels are needed again they will be in shape to go forth to battle as good as they were the day they began their maiden voyage.
>
> This desire to help finish an important task in the proper manner is strong with my neighbor—very strong, in fact, but it has its limitations. Right now the principal limitation is centered around the 6-year-old blond cherub who is the pride and joy of this veteran and his wife; but my neighbor and his wife hear, with considerable degree of accuracy, that because of reduction in Federal contributions to the school system here with no means provided for compensating revenue, the next school term may have to be reduced from 9 to 6 months. So they face a big problem: Shall they stay on here and gamble on passage by the Congress of the Lanham Act extension, or shall they seek a means of livelihood in some community where a full term of school is assured.

The editorial then goes on to say:

> All agree, that given time, we can work out our schools' financial problems and carry our own burden, which we prefer to do. But before we can stand on our own feet in this respect, we're going to need a little help, else we're going to wobble a bit at first. This assistance can come from only one source, the Federal Government, the activities of which placed us in our present embarrassing position.

To sum up, the State of Texas and the people of Orange have done a tremendously fine job in providing funds for supporting the public free schools. The Legislature of Texas, at its recent session, increased the appropriations for public free schools in Texas from about $35 to $55 per pupil. Those funds are allocated for the benefit of the children living in this Government housing project on exactly the same basis it is to the children of permanent status. The city of Orange and its school district have done everything possible within the law in raising taxation to the limit. But the city of Orange, like many communities in Texas, maintains a very fine public school system and the cost is about $110 per pupil. And because so large a percentage of the entire school population lives in this Federal housing project their school term will be reduced from 9 months to 6 months unless Federal aid is extended. All this bill would do is provide for the Federal Government to supplement the available funds of the school district so they can operate their normal 9 months of school.

In conclusion I would remind you that only yesterday this House passed a bill which will have the effect of subsidizing lead, copper, and zinc mines of the Nation which are so far depleted they cannot be economically operated without such help. The subsidy will total more than $70,000,000 annually. That was done because for the safety and defense of this country it was felt it was necessary for these mines to continue to operate. But I want to say that we have another war-produced problem of educating 367,000 children scattered around over this Nation by reason of war activities—it is a national problem. While we are subsidizing privately owned mines let us not withhold a little subsidy to educate these school children of the Nation.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to the debate on

this bill. I am not so sure but what it has gone a little far afield. I think I am probably as tight as any Scotchman in this House, especially when it comes to the point of spending Federal money, but I am not willing to pinch pennies when it involves the future of our children for whom we all must assume responsibility.

In this particular situation the Federal Government brought about these conditions. I do not think there is one person within the sound of my voice who would question for 1 minute the responsibility of the Government in this instance. We can theorize all we please, we can think up any kind of hypothetical picture we might want to, but the responsibility remains. May I say that so far as I know there is not one dollar of this money going into my district, but I do know something about things that have taken place there. I know that the concentration of these large numbers of floating population has brought about a very serious situation in some of these poor school districts. You can say that the Housing Authority ought to pay so much money or that the law says so-and-so, but they do not do it, but the fact remains that the burden of taxes to provide for these schools must rest on the property, and property owners, and it can reach destructive proportions.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. What about these communities the gentleman speaks of that did not get their contracts placed before the war ended under the Lanham Act and have had to go out and build their schools with bond issues?

Mr. BARDEN. Let me say whether they got the contracts completed or not, whether the population that exists there is making good money or whether the salaries are good or whether the chamber of commerce wants them there has no bearing on the existing facts and conditions. That is the thing I am looking at. My district is chock full of New York and other auto licenses right now and they are not even willing to buy a license, much less pay an ad valorem tax or pay a tax for the support of schools unless somebody chokes it out of them. You have heard me in the well of this House say that this floating population is constantly bringing about problems. What I want to do is live long enough to see the Federal Government get out of my district as far as owning houses and renting to people are concerned. I want the homes in my district owned by people who live there or owned by private citizens; then according to our tax structure they can make their normal proper and expected contributions to the community and to the community projects, such as schools and so forth. But so long as the Housing Authority or any other branch of the Federal Government goes in there and continues to own these houses and rent them, then pinch off a few pennies and drop them into the General Treasury, we are going to be confronted with the very problems we are confronted with right now, except more of them.

This bill strikes me as being the fair and proper thing for the Federal Government to do. It is a fair contribution for the Federal Government to make. The matter of Federal support of schools has no place in the argument.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCOWEN].

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Chairman, those who are interested in my opinion on this question will find my remarks on pages 248 and 249 of the hearings. I want to say that I am strongly in favor of this bill and I hope it passes. It is only children who will suffer if we fail to pass it.

This is strictly a Federal Government responsibility. In congested school districts the relief for which is intended to be provided in this bill, the children in large numbers were brought in by their parents who went to the location to do war work. Thousands of these children are still in the same location. The result is a "hang-over" from the war effort. The Lanham act that did provide Federal money for such schools to some extent during the war was passed by the Congress as the right thing to do. Since these parents displaced by the war effort are still in the location and the children are there too it naturally follows that this financial support must be tapered off, that is, not abruptly stopped; and relief should be given at this time for this one additional year.

The need of such school districts in many instances is great. If this bill is not passed, teachers cannot be hired, the school term will be shortened, and the education of thousands of children will suffer. This is a direct and definite harm to a part of the citizenship of our country and to these children now deprived of educational opportunity. Many of the school districts congested by the war effort were barely able to finance their own school responsibilities before the war even though in many cases they were taxing themselves to the extreme limit under the law. The influx of so many children increased the school's responsibility for these districts far beyond their financial ability to provide educational opportunity. This condition remains in a number of school districts, hence the authorization of money for financial relief to such districts should be enacted into law as provided by the bill now under discussion.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 3682 which extends the period for providing assistance for certain war-incurred school enrollments is a good bill which I shall support and vote for. It supplies a very urgent need in my district which felt the full impact of the war effort. Many thousands of war workers with their families moved into the Puget Sound area of the great State of Washington to become employed in war industries. The local schools were required to extend their services to thousands of additional children. This increased burden required Federal financial aid; and Congress, recognizing that fact, passed the Lanham Act which provided the needed funds.

Although the hostilities have been over for approximately 2 years the need for Federal aid in certain areas still remains. The housing projects are occupied by former war workers and war veterans whose children attend the local schools. Children of military personnel residing on military reservations also attend these schools, overtaxing their facilities. While local school districts are doing everything they can within the limits of State law it is not enough. They need this Federal aid urgently, and I trust that the House will pass this legislation.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 3682. This bill provides relief of a very bad situation in my State, and my district particularly, which was incurred by the tremendous war effort. The shipyards and Boeing plant in Seattle and the Navy yard at Bremerton, where 23,000 units of housing were built and the population increased from 25,000 to 85,000 in less than 3 years, the assessed valuation of the county has not increased accordingly. The naval installations being exempt from taxation, it is absolutely necessary for the provisions of H. R. 3682 to become law in order for our school system to exist.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, owing to war conditions, the Government moved great numbers of people into various areas where school facilities were not available. In my own district in southern California the population doubled between 1940 and 1946. Great public housing projects were built. Thousands of children attended schools which the Government helped to build and to maintain.

Now, with the war a thing of the past, and with the communities concerned still not getting normal taxes from the wartime population, which shows no indication of returning to their former homes, some provision must be made for the education of the children concerned. It seems to me to be the duty of the Government to help in this matter.

I am wholly in favor of this proposed legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to enable authorities which are still overburdened with war-incurred school enrollments to meet their needs during the transition from war- to peace-time conditions, the Federal Works Administrator is authorized to continue to make during the fiscal years ending June 30, 1948, and June 30, 1949. Contributions for the operation and maintenance of school facilities to local school agencies requiring assistance that have received during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, Federal contributions administered by him for the maintenance and operation of their school facilities. Appropriations and existing appropriations heretofore authorized (to the Federal Works Administrator) for similar purposes are hereby authorized to carry out the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "years" and insert "year".

Page 1, line 8, strike out "and June 30, 1949. Contributions" and insert "contribution".

At the end of the bill insert "The amount hereinbefore authorized shall not exceed the sum of $5,000,000 for the year ending June 30, 1948."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

My colleagues, I am a little bit amused to still see people worried about the threat of Federal intervention in the cause of education when, as a matter of fact, this Congress has authorized and is now spending about $1,800,000,000 this year in the field of education to educate the GI's in accordance with the terms of the so-called GI bill. But, being somewhat of a realist, after listening to the rather emotional appeals on both sides in behalf of little children, I would like to call your attention to what appears to me to be the nub of this situation.

The report on this bill, on page 2, says:

It is estimated that approximately 103 schools will still be unable to provide normal school services during the 1947–48 school year without this assistance.

That means that the assistance will have to start to flow at the beginning of the school year, or before, in order that the teachers may be hired and the schools be in readiness for the fall term. If you pass this bill will these funds be available? Is there any way that you can get this money and get it into circulation and get it out to these schools that you say need it to keep them going? If you are not able to get the money, then there will not be any education, as you say, for these little children.

Now, let us see what the facts are. I just called up the Federal Works Agency in order to find out what the condition of their present available funds are. On June 30 they had available $2,248,092 of unexpended balances. By virtue of the passage of the Independent Offices appropriation bill $500,000 of that sum was transferred for the purpose of liquidation of this agency, and $5,100,000 was rescinded so that there will be available for expenditure on the passage of the independent offices bill—and I may say that there is no dispute between the Senate and House with respect to this item, so it will be in the bill—by the Public Works Agency $648,092 as soon as that bill gets the President's signature, and that $648,092 has been allocated for expenditure by the Federal Works Agency in order to carry out contracts and commitments already made. Therefore there is no money and will be no money available to carry out this legislation in order to make it available for expenditure at the beginning of the next school year unless you are able to get this bill passed by this body and get it passed by the Senate and get a supplemental estimate up before the Committee on Appropriations and get that passed by this body and by the Senate.

As I told you yesterday, if this House is going to adjourn Saturday night, and I believe it will, despite all the tears and all the emotional appeal that has been made this morning on behalf of the little children who need an education, the realistic, practical thing facing us here is, how are we going to get this money and have it made available to the Public Works Agency? This seems to be a situation where, as far as the merits of this proposition are concerned, it comes too late. I consulted with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and, knowing the decision that has been made heretofore in that committee, I am of the opinion it will be impossible to get this bill passed by the other body and get a budget estimate up here to be considered by the Deficiency Committee in time to have it included in the final supplemental bill that will come before this Congress today or tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for four additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it not perfectly clear, therefore, that this bill comes before the Congress too late to effectuate the purposes you have in mind? It seems to me this is the greatest and grossest illustration of the lack of harmony that exists between the legislative committees of this House and the Committee on Appropriations. The Public Works Agency had $6,248,092 available when the independent offices bill came in here. I did not hear a single man from this committee question the advisability of rescinding $5,100,000 of that appropriation, which was carried in the bill. As the result, that rescission has taken place, and there will not be any money available to carry out the purposes of this act.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDIS. How will the committees that are going to travel abroad get their money? If they can get their money to go abroad, we can get this money.

Mr. KEEFE. That is a very academic thing for my friend to ask. Having been in this Congress now nearly 10 years, he understands the appropriation machinery. I am calling attention to a reality, to a fact. I am doing it because I want the schools of this Nation that will be affected—and mind you I am making no argument against this bill—and the school children that will be affected by the lack of money to carry this program out to know that we are not holding out a false hope to them that they are going to have funds available, when, as a matter of fact, I personally can see no way in which, if this Congress is going to adjourn on Saturday night, you can make these funds available.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. How much time is usually required in order to obtain an estimate from the Bureau of the Budget on a matter of this sort?

Mr. KEEFE. That can be accomplished very rapidly. If the House and Senate wanted to work their will it could be done. But may I say that I do not believe the Committee on Appropriations is just going to come in here with a blanket appropriation for $5,000,000 to implement this program without holding any hearings to show what is necessary, at least in the face of the strong minority report on this bill. I cannot speak for the committee, but I can speak for myself as an individual member of that committee. I think we just do not have the time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I agree there is much in what the gentleman says in that this bill is being considered late. Of course, those of us who sponsored it started early enough, and it is unfortunate that we have just been able to bring it to the floor. But getting down to the gentleman's question, and I am sure he is trying to be helpful, if this bill passes the House today and if the other body passes it, cannot the other body make provision in the supplemental deficiency bill to take care of that situation?

Mr. KEEFE. All things are possible, may I say, in the late hours of any Congress. I have learned that since I have been here. It is very possible you have the persuasive power to go to the other body and get them to pass this bill before they take action on the supplemental estimate that is over there. You might be able to put this in although they have not had any hearings on it. I understand their hearings are complete. Perhaps the gentleman knows that procedure better than I do because he has been here a long time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin, as always, is interested in not only expressing a hope for action but in

carrying out that hope. I realize there is much truth in what the gentleman says.

I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. LANDIS. Is not this practically the same thing as we had in the mineral bill?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is largely true. The situation we find ourselves in here is that this bill came up early in January, and the proponents of the bill have been seeking to bring about a satisfactory compromise between the many elements affected. The particular compromise bill was introduced by the chairman on the 2d of June and was reported to the House on the 20th of June. We have had considerable time to get to it, but I realize the exigencies of a crowded program.

I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The thing that surprises me, may I say to my friend, is that with the knowledge on the part of the Public Works Agency of the existence of this bill, and I assume that they examined it and must have made a report on it, it is rather impossible for me to understand why the Federal Works Agency did not offer some resistance to the rescission of $5,000,000 of their unobligated funds.

Mr. MONRONEY. I believe I can explain that to the gentleman and to the House. The $5,000,000 was earmarked for the construction of municipal and school facilities. This bill is not connected with construction. This is only for current school operation. That money was rescinded and we had no authority under law by which we can appropriate $5,000,000 or transfer $5,000,000 of funds and we were merely living up to the rules of the House in not seeking to appropriate without a proper authorization.

I am sure the gentleman will find that to be the absolute case. Therefore, we could not transfer those funds without legislative authority.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman realizes, of course, that I have raised a question here of vital importance.

Mr. MONRONEY. It is a most important question.

Mr. KEEFE. If you are going to get this through and do anything about it, it must receive some hasty action. Otherwise, you are going to fool these school boys.

Mr. MONRONEY. I appreciate that. The gentleman has been very helpful. Those of us who are interested in this vital program have been pressing for action for weeks trying to get this matter up. Regardless of whether Congress adjourns without making this $5,000,000 appropriation, if it now authorizes the $5,000,000, these schools will start their sessions in the middle of September. Then we will have half of September, October, November, and December before Congress comes back. That is 3½ months.

If we authorize this appropriation, almost every one of these schools will have courage and will have the hope that Congress will vitalize the authorization with an appropriation in January.

And if that does not happen, then they can cut back their schedules after January. But if we adjourn now without this authorization and come back in January, the schools will be out before Congress could even authorize this money, let alone appropriate it. So, I say we are not making an idle gesture.

The Committee on Appropriations may be able to get this into a supplemental bill, but if they cannot it can still be vitalized by a deficiency appropriation in January when only 3 or 3½ months of the school year has expired.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to supplement what the gentleman from Wisconsin said.

The Federal Works Agency is not only in liquidation, it has no personnel by which it can administer this fund if the $5,000,000 should be granted. They have already said in a letter to the committee dated June 17, 1947, by Mr. P. F. Seward, Federal Works Commissioner, as follows:

> As Mr. Field explained to the committee, our bureau had not anticipated carrying forward this program during the 1947–48 school year. As a result we had not contacted the school districts to procure estimates as we did not want the school districts to feel that there was any probability of a continuation of this program

Now, here is the Federal Works Agency that has administered this fund up until this time, in contact with the facts in each district, and they did not believe they ought to lead the people to think that they could have this fund any longer. They had notified the communities to make their own arrangements. They have had 2 years within which to do it. The thing is over as far as the Federal Works Agency is concerned.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. If you pass this bill you have to find some agency to administer it and pay the expense of administration. The gentleman says that the Federal Works Agency did not anticipate this. I hold in my hand a breakdown from the Federal Works Agency giving every penny that would be spent on every project, the average attendance, and the whole history of the case.

Mr. GWINN of New York. The gentleman may realize that that has to do with the past year. They have no data for this year.

Mr. WHEELER. They have estimated the deficit.

Mr. GWINN of New York. They appeared before our committee and made no suggestion that they were ready to administer this fund.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. I am sure the gentleman wants to be fair and I know he would not make a misstatement about this matter.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Thank you.

Mr. COLMER. But it so happens that I have just been talking with Mr. Seward of the Public Works Agency, to whom the gentleman referred, and they are prepared to carry out and administer this bill.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Even though they are in liquidation?

Mr. COLMER. Even though they are in liquidation. They are making their plans.

Mr. GWINN of New York. And in spite of this letter I have just read, saying that they had made no inducements and had already told the people they should not expect further funds.

Mr. COLMER. Let me answer the gentleman to this extent: It is not the function of the Federal Works Agency to go out and tell people what to do, or to tell Congress what to do. This proposition emanated from the Congress and not the Federal Works Agency.

Mr. GWINN of New York. But it is the function of the Federal Works Agency to carry out the instructions of Congress last year, which was to notify these people that there would be no more funds—no more dipping into the Federal Treasury.

Mr. COLMER. It is the duty of the Federal Works Agency to administer this act if Congress passes it.

Mr. GWINN of New York. And the Federal Works Agency thought they had administered it, and the work was over, and it ought to be over.

Mr. COLMER. They will administer it if we pass it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] has expired.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not disturbed or alarmed about these two straw men that have been constructed this morning in an attempt to prevent the passage of the pending legislation.

First of all, the Federal Works Agency is not going to be liquidated. It will be in process of business next year.

Second, I am not disturbed about the fact that there may not be any funds for payment to the schools, under the provisions of this bill. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I want to say to you that if this Congress passes authorizing legislation saying that the Appropriations Committee shall make available $5,000,000 in Federal funds for the payments under provisions of the proposed bill, your Appropriations Committee will function accordingly, and will present to this House an appropriation bill providing the money.

We are servants of the House. I think the bill should be passed with probably some amendments. If Congress cannot provide the funds before we adjourn and if we do not have a special session, the Congress will convene on January 3, 1948, and I am certain that if there is authorizing legislation the money will be made available for use during the next school year, and that is the period of time the pending bill covers.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, if the Congress does pass an authorizing piece of legislation it does not bind the Appropriations Committee; the Appropriations Committee may or may not act. That should be under-

stood. I think, however, one or two facts about the history of this legislation may help to clarify the situation. Some of these facts may have been related already but unfortunately I have had to be in a committee hearing and do not know just what has been said here.

The reason the Federal Works Agency did not prepare some estimates is because under the terms of the legislation passed last year which limited this program to 1 year, it would not have been proper for them to do so.

In the minority report which is before us I notice the Members who sign it say that a little over $1,400,000 is needed. Perhaps that is all that is required, I do not know. Personally, I do not believe that $5,000,000 will be required. I think it will be somewhere between one and a half and three million dollars.

The reason the Federal Works Agency did not prepare some estimates in addition is because it is true I think, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK], said, that Congress had said it did not want to carry on this program this year. The Federal Works Agency is not an educational agency. The first legislation introduced in this Congress to deal with this problem dealt with a broader problem than the one now before us, dealt with the children of parents who were employed on Federal reservations of various kinds, in the national parks and forests, on the grounds of the Atomic Energy Commission, where the atomic energy plants are in operation, and on military and naval establishments.

As a matter of fact today the children of parents who live on the grounds of the atomic energy plants and work there are having their children's education paid for by Federal funds and the children are being treated on a much more generous scale than children who live on a normal military reservation or in one of these war-created housing projects. The children of employees of the Navy are taken care of because last year the Congress passed an omunibus bill to authorize certain appropriations for the Navy Department and it contained a provision authorizing appropriation for the education of children who live on naval reservations. Funds were carried in the Navy appropriation bill this year for that purpose.

To fail to take care of children who happen to live on military reservations or who happen to live on Federal property in these war-housing projects would be an unfair discrimination the way the situation rests today.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. RIZLEY. I agree with everything the gentleman has said. I think the necessity in this case demands that we pass this legislation but I think the gentleman is perhaps making a distinction that is not quite in keeping, because in the case of military reservations and so forth the children taken care of are children of people employed in connection with the reservation, whereas the parents of children in these projects may be working for the gentleman's business or my business, anyway, some private business. They are living in this housing that was constructed during wartime when the houses were used for people employed on work for the Federal Government, but they are no longer so employed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the gentleman makes a point in which there is some merit. The difficulty is that this war housing may be the only housing available.

The particular project in which I happen to be interested, however, is where children are living on a military reservation and the parents are working for the Government. In this school district which embraces this military reservation there are 12 children of parents who live outside the military reservation, and over 500 who live on the military reservation. Obviously, the parents of 12 children, the people who live on a few farms around this isolated military reservation cannot dig up taxes enough from the 12 farms to provide schooling for five-hundred-odd children who live on the military reservation. That indicates the general merit of this proposal.

I join with other members who urge passage of this bill, at this time, and, at the same time, urge that legislation be enacted to meet the problem in the future. Perhaps we can make a portion of the rents collected directly available for school purposes.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHURCH: Page 1, line 10, page 2, line 1, after the word "assistance" on page 1, line 10, strike out the words "that have received during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947."

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to H. R. 3682 in its present form. If it is to pass, my amendment, being the same as the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, should be adopted. Other Members have indicated the need of this kind of legislation. I desire to call attention to a situation in my district.

North Chicago School District No. 64 received no funds from the Federal Works Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947. This amendment would permit North Chicago School District No. 64 to make application for funds through the Bureau of Community Facilities, Federal Works Agency, to take care of additional costs for schooling of children of veterans living on a portion of the Great Lakes Naval Training Center property.

Since the end of the war, two of the Great Lakes Naval Training Center camps formerly occupied by naval personnel have been remodeled by the State Housing Authority to provide homes for former GI's. This is still Federal property, but leased to the State.

North Chicago School District No. 64 includes three elementary schools, with a normal enrollment of 600 children. The increase in enrollment due to the housing project will be approximately 200 children of GI's, or a 33-percent increase. It will be necessary to employ 8 additional teachers and provide space of 8 classrooms. The district must also provide transportation for these children coming from the housing project, a distance of 1½ miles, but within the boundaries of the school district.

It is estimated that the loss of revenue from taxes by school district No. 64 is approximately $20,000 a year due to acquisition of this land by the Federal Government.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the gentleman just strike out the language referring to June 30, 1947?

Mr. CHURCH. If you will look at the bottom of page 1, line 10, my amendment reads: "Strike the words 'that have received during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947'." That is all.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman leaves in the requirement they must have previously qualified for these Federal funds.

Mr. CHURCH. No. I strike no other words out of the bill. The school district must be able to qualify.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment with great reluctance. I have considerable sympathy for the problem of the gentleman from Illinois, and if his amendment were confined to his particular project, his particular school there, I would not object. But what his amendment does is open up the whole field to all schools that at any time received the benefits of the Lanham Act. In other words, under the bill as written, no school, that is, a school that was not eligible for benefits this year, can qualify, but if his amendment is adopted, any school that had received benefits back in the war period could apply and receive funds.

Now, what does that mean? That means that this $5,000,000 that the bill limits the appropriation to would have to be spread out so thin that the schools really requiring aid would not get it. It would not go very far. I have just taken it upon myself before opposing this amendment, because I did not want to oppose it unless it was necessary, to discuss this matter with the authorities in the Public Works Administration over the telephone, and they tell me that it would make it most difficult of administration; that it would have to be spread out so thin that they did not know whether the schools that were really entitled to it and needed it most would get it, and they are opposed to it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. May I say to the gentleman that I have just examined the amendment as it is at the desk, and if the amendment should be adopted as is, it would do violence to the English language, because it would leave hanging in the air a phrase like this, "contributions for the operation and maintenance of school facilities to local school agencies requiring assistance,

Federal contributions administered by him for the maintenance and operation."

Mr. COLMER. It makes no sense whatever. I did not comment on that, although I observed the same thing.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois merely struck out the words "during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947" it would make some sense. It might still be hard to administer, for then it would leave in the words "that have received Federal contributions."

Mr. COLMER. I assumed that that is what the gentleman from Illinois had in mind.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified in accordance with the suggestion of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. I understood what the gentleman was driving at, but that still does not alter the difficulties of administration. Not only that, but if the gentleman's amendment is adopted, then the figure "$5,000,000" ought to be stricken, and it either ought to be left without a figure or it ought to be increased to $10,000,000. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the 5 minutes, but I would like to get some information from the chairman of the committee. Can the gentleman tell us how the towns that are listed to receive benefits from this act were selected?

Mr. LANDIS. I could not say how they were selected, except that the ones that received it last year have made the request for next year.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. What is bothering me is that there are many communities in the State of Connecticut that have housing projects built under the Lanham Act. There are several in my congressional district. In the whole State of Connecticut there is only one town, the town of Groton, in the district of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN] that is on this list.

Mr. LANDIS. During the war all these areas were investigated by the Federal Works Agency, and those that were in need were given assistance such as is here provided.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The thing I am afraid of is that some towns have moved a little more rapidly than others. I know the communities involved. Certainly the city of Groton is as well able financially to deal with the problem, as are several other towns that have Lanham housing. I cannot see any justification for appropriating for the town of Groton in the State of Connecticut and leaving out every other town that has Lanhan housing.

I want to be correct about this. Do not these towns and cities receive from the Lanham Act projects a sum of money in lieu of taxes?

Mr. LANDIS. That is right.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I cannot see any difference whether these be Government-owned projects or privately owned projects, they are taxed on the same basis. Everybody knows that a so-called bedroom community has difficulty raising tax money for education and other purposes. It does not complicate the situation just because these projects are owned by the Government. I can see no justification for this $5,000,000.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACKINNON. The problem the gentleman points out is one about which I think a great many Members of the House are confused. It goes to the very kernel of this problem, as to how the problem is created. It is created this way: When you apply the traditional tax rates to the values of these properties and make these communities live within tax limitations and tax revenues that were intended to be applied to housing units and commercial properties of much higher per capita cost, you do not get sufficient amounts of money to run the schools and educate children in conformance with our traditional standards. It is very easy to use an extreme situation and arrive at the same result. Suppose that all the residents of a school district lived in tents. I think the gentleman can well understand that such a situation would necessitate substantial adjustments to existing tax rates and tax limitation laws.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I cannot yield further. I get the gentleman's point. But that is exactly the same thing in any privately owned property such as medium-cost housing, the so-called suburban bedroom community.

Mr. MACKINNON. Except that the disparity in tax values is greater in these cases.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. It is exactly the same, I may say to the gentleman. The housing is just as valuable or just as cheap, whichever way you look at it, whether it is owned by the Government or by private individuals. It does not change the situation one iota. In the community in which I live there is a project built under the Lanham Act of 120 families. It matters not to that community whether those houses are owned by the Federal Government or by private individuals, the dollar income to the town is the same.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Where you have military or naval reservations and the housing is on those reservations there is no provision whatsoever for making any contribution to the school district in lieu of taxes, because no levy can be made there.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That is right. However, the communities about which I am concerned are not on Government reservations, it is war housing. From the list I have seen, most of the cities included on the list are cities that have war housing projects, not military reservations. I cannot see any justification for this appropriation of this $5,000,000; certainly none have been presented either on the floor of the House or in the report.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by me be returned to the form in which I offered it. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], I feel, has misunderstood it. The amendment as offered by me is in the proper form. The gentleman from South Dakota overlooks the fact that the comma is not stricken by my amendment and remains between the word "assistance" and the words "Federal contributions" and the gentleman failed to read the language in lines 3 to 8 preceding the word "contribution" in line 8. Of course, I did not prepare the bill and it is difficult to amend on the floor in its present form. Of course, I now understand that both the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] are opposed to my amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, and I am not going to object, I will say that if you adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois and someone, some way, straightens out the sentence so that it does not have a tortured meaning, you are opening the door to schools which never qualified for this aid before. You would be eliminating what the committee sought to do when it reported this legislation, which was to shrink this program and gradually extinguish it as the school districts take over and meet the problem themselves.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be restored to its original form as offered by me.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consen that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, no one will ever accuse me of taking this floor to urge Federal contributions for local expenses. If I did not believe that a real and difficult problem existed as a reasonable aftermath of the war, I would not be in favor of this bill. I am in favor of the bill and shall support it.

I want to present to the House an example of what happened in one area of

my congressional district. I believe there are others in the Detroit, Mich., metropolitan area. I have a unit known as the Livonia Township School District which is contiguous to the city of Detroit. It is an area in close proximity to very large industrial plants which were engaged in the production of war materials during the war. The population of that district increased 42 percent during the war years. That district now has 441 high-school students who are being sent to 10 different high schools outside of the district. It does not have the means nor the taxable property to build a high school within the district at the present time. The people are taxing themselves to the limit of the law allowed in Michigan. If you were a member of the school board of that township, what would you do to provide reasonable school facilities for the children who have moved into that district because of the war effort?

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN], for whom I have the highest respect.

Mr. GWINN of New York. As a school man, you know that the people in Detroit in that particular district are sending their children to other high schools, and they can pay and do pay tuition. That is the way we handle it. Is that not so?

Mr. DONDERO. I am glad the gentleman brought that up. This school board has already been notified by the different high schools to which these children were sent that they no longer will be able to provide for them. That will return the problem to the local school district. The Government already has recognized that the problem in this district is one which has been created by the war effort because Federal funds have been granted in two or three previous years.

There is the situation and unless some relief is granted by a bill such as this one, there is no way in which the school board in that area can provide reasonable, educational facilities for these children.

I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Would the gentleman tell us how long he thinks such a condition would continue—how many years does he think it might continue?

Mr. DONDERO. I do not think that I can tell you, but I would say that I am not in favor of permanent legislation of this kind and if this bill were permanent legislation, I would vote against it.

Mr. BUCK. But the gentleman does think that it might be 2 years or 3 years before the State can solve the problem?

Mr. DONDERO. I do not think it ought to run that long. I think the State will have to provide some way to meet this problem sooner or later and the quicker the better. But for one more year I think the Federal Government should assist in solving this problem, and I hope this bill passes.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NORRELL:

On page 1, line 9, after the word "to" add "(a)."

On page 2, after the word "facilities", strike out the period and add the following: "and (b) local school agencies requiring assistance that may be subject to a loss of tax revenues because of the acquisition or ownership of land by the United States."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to state, briefly, my problem.

During the war there was a large air base located about 8 miles out in the country from Stuttgart, Ark. The War Department purchased two sections of land in Prairie County, located in a very small, one-room, rural-school district. During the war those pupils went to school in Stuttgart in Arkansas County, Ark. The base has been closed. Last year it was vacant. We made no complaint about educating the children from this reservation. This year the Federal Government is using this reservation as a housing project. One hundred and forty-four students are living out there on a Federal reservation.

First of all, let me make this clear: The attorney general of Arkansas has held that these pupils living on this Federal reservation cannot be enumerated for school purposes. Will you get that, please? There is no way to enumerate them for school purposes in Arkansas, because they are living on a Federal reservation. There are no taxes that come from those students or their parents.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Military reservations have funds to take care of their own reservations. They know the situation, do they not?

Mr. NORRELL. That is not the question involved here. If the gentleman will bear with me, he will see that. There is no enumeration possible of the students living on this Federal reservation. They are not working for the Government. The people living there are living all over Prairie and Arkansas Counties. They have these children. The children cannot go to school now in the district in which they live, because they are living on a Federal reservation. And, because the school of the district in which the reservation is located out there is not sufficient to accommodate these 144 students. The only way they can get any aid is through the Federal Government.

With that explanation, may I say this: I would like the gentlemen of the committee to understand this: My amendment is not offering any new language to the present law. The bill before you is a duplication of the present law on this subject. I refer to Public Law No. 452 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. The bill is, word for word, a duplication of the present law, except it has omitted one sentence that is in the present law. That is the sentence that I embody in my amendment.

To be short, and in conclusion, I would like for you to understand that if my amendment is adopted you are not adding one period or one comma or one word to the present law. Our action will mean that we will reenact the present law for another year. That is all my amendment does. It makes no change whatsoever. I have conferred with the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] and other members of the committee and it is perfectly agreeable to them, as I understand it. I hope, since no change would be made in the present law if my amendment is adopted, that you can see fit to adopt the amendment, because there is no money embodied in the amendment and because they have operated this year under the law, and I am asking that they simply operate next year under the present law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] has expired.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Arkansas.

Mr. TRIMBLE. As I understand the purpose of the gentleman's amendment it is to aid small school districts in his State and elsewhere to receive funds from the Government denied by the State because of inability of the districts to get enumeration funds.

Mr. NORRELL. That is correct. If my amendment is adopted these children can go from the one-room schoolhouse in Prairie County to the Stuttgart public schools, and we will pay the difference.

Mr. TRIMBLE. In other words, it will enable the Government to pay to the district in which the reservation is located in the neighborhood of $1,200, which is denied the district by reason of the ruling of the Attorney General.

Mr. NORRELL. That is correct. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto, and on the bill, close in 10 minutes.

Mr. MACKINNON. I object.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I modify my request to make it 15 minutes.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MACKINNON. How many amendments are there on the desk?

The CHAIRMAN. There is one more amendment on the desk.

The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that all debate on the bill close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike to rise in opposition to the amendment, but I think the House is entitled to know just what insertion of this language now does.

The language reported by the committee in this bill limits this assistance to

schools that qualified for it during the year ending June 30, 1947. The language proposed by the gentleman from Arkansas adds "and local school agencies requiring assistance that may be subject to a loss of tax revenue because of the acquisition or ownership of lands by the United States."

It is possible that that might throw open to assistance all the school districts where the Government had acquired lands for national parks or national forests or many other purposes. That was proposed in the original bills but there was considerable opposition.

So the committee in reporting the bill sought to limit aid to those schools which qualified in the past year. This language I am afraid broadens the bill very materially.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. NORRELL. Is not that the present law?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This sentence may be in the present law, but I think the present law refers to the Lanham Act which adds other requirements with regard to the incidence of the war in relation to the plight of any school. The bill before us is not a direct amendment to either the Lanham Act or the act of a year ago. I am afraid just to add this sentence here would make the act much broader than what was intended by the committee limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I agree wholeheartedly with the argument made by my good friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], particularly when he states that this is a program we should wind up as hurriedly as we can, but that it must be continued for another year. However, it is an aftermath of the war and is a condition that confronts us in many of the districts in the United States where we have a serious problem which is not a local problem, but purely a Federal one.

The bill provides Federal assistance for a pressing problem that has arisen out of the war and its aftermath. During the war period, thousands of war workers and their familes migrated into war areas, greatly increasing school attendance and imposing severe financial burdens on local school systems. In addition, the school enrollment in many areas was greatly increased by children of civilian workers and military and naval personnel residing on military and naval reservations and other Federal installations. During the war the Federal Government recognized its responsibilities to these communities and granted assistance for the maintenance and operation of the schools in these areas. Such assistance has been made available under titles II and III of the Lanham Act. Without such assistance many of these schools would have been unable to provide school services for the increased population caused by this war impact. Under the express provisions of the act, Federal agencies and officers are prohibited from interfering with or controlling the administration or operation of any school for which Federal aid is provided. This statutory prohibition is being observed by the Bureau of Community Facilities of the Federal Works Agency, the Federal agency responsible for the administration of this program.

Under existing law, this program of Federal assistance to schools will terminate on June 30, 1947. Many of these school systems, however, still are confronted with the same burdens and the same problems which made Federal assistance necessary in the first place. The end of hostilities has not yet brought about normal school conditions in many places. The war-engendered displacement and inmigration of school children into war areas still presents a problem to many school authorities. In many of these areas the schools are still burdened with war-connected pupils. Their enrollments remain at or near the high wartime levels. From the testimony presented it is evident that this situation will continue in a large number of areas during the coming school year. The enrollment in the 181 schools receiving Federal assistance during the present school year was 115,000 pupils more than enrollment in the same schools during the last prewar normal year. This is an increase of more than 46 percent. These school enrollments continue at high levels in a number of places because air bases, Army camps, forts, ordnance depots, war plants, hospital centers, naval bases, and other war installations are still active. The children of the military and civilian personnel that are stationed at these posts to man these various installations are being provided school services by the local school authorities.

Defense housing continues to be occupied at capacity levels and indications are that this situation will continue next year. The problem is intensified by the shortage of housing and the increased need for veterans' housing. This situation further contributes to the continued high school enrollments in these areas.

It is believed that an impact of this magnitude, and its effect on the school economy, creates a financial problem completely out of balance with any reasonable adjustment that can be made in the tax structure or local revenues. Testimony presented to the committee indicates that unless this Federal aid is continued a number of these schools, affecting a large number of children, will not be able to operate more than 4 to 6 months. In view of the fact that school authorities cannot anticipate more than a 4 to 6 months' school term financed from their own funds, it is impossible with the present teacher shortage to induce qualified teaching personnel to accept positions in these school systems.

In my district we had one housing project, among many others, which was the largest in the United States. Over 30,000 war workers came into this one housing project which was built in a sparsely inhabited neighborhood in my congressional district. Many of those houses are still there. Many of the workers are still there. A great many veterans are occupying these houses. Some of them have children of school age. These children, who are residents within these districts, are really foreign so far as our local districts are concerned. There were brought in there by reason of the war and the activities of the Federal Government and they are still there. For instance, there were brought into my district 25,000 colored people. Before the war we had about 1,800. A large portion of those colored citizens are still there. Some of them came from New York. They came from almost every State in the Union. We have a mild, agreeable climate. They like our citizens; they enjoy the beautiful landscape and pleasant surroundings, and they want to stay with us. They will not return to their former homes. They are there and these school districts have absolutely no way to finance their schools to take care of this heavy increase in school attendance. If you want to turn those youngsters out so that they will not receive any schooling, all good and well, but if you want them to receive a minimum of education, it is the problem of the Federal Government and Lanham Act funds must be continued for another year at least. Some school districts in my State cannot provide adequate schooling without these funds.

Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of this bill. I hope we will not become confused because there may be some question about the financing of the bill and for that reason vote it down. If we are unable to get finances before this Congress adjourns we will be in position to get them at the earliest possible moment later through supplemental appropriations or a deficiency act.

I hope everyone who is in favor of educating the children of this country and not saddling this temporary burden of the United States Government on local communities will vote favorably on this bill, H. R. 3682.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this bill and all amendments thereto close in 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACKINNON: Page 2, line 8, after the period, insert "The additional Federal contributions herein authorized shall be paid from the rental income received by the Federal Works Agency from all such projects."

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is rather simple. I think it will get around the difficulty that might arise with respect to this legislation. This amendment simply provides that this amount of money shall be paid from the rental income. Now, gentlemen, that is exactly the same way that payments in lieu of taxes are made to these very same local agencies by the very same Administrators. I submit the

amendment is sound and should be adopted.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Does the gentleman mean that the Federal Works Agency shall pay this or the Federal Housing Authority, since they have the organization on the job to do it?

Mr. MACKINNON. I think the Federal Works Administrator is the proper agency.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the gentleman's language should refer to the Administrator of the Federal Housing Authority.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I wonder if the gentleman would consider amending that so as to make it "Federal Housing Authority," instead of "Federal Works Agency"?

Mr. MACKINNON. I will accept that amendment if the gentlemen who are primarily concerned with this feel it would be an improvement. I am merely trying to be helpful.

Mr. GWINN of New York. In that case I would like to join in supporting the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota may be modified as suggested.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACKINNON: On page 2, line 8, after the period, insert "The additional Federal contributions herein authorized shall be paid from the rental income received by the Federal Housing Authority from all such projects."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I may say to the gentleman that the objective that he seeks, as I understand, by his amendment, is to overcome the possibility that an appropriation could not be made available to implement this legislaiton before the House adjourns, and he seeks to have this money made available by this amendment to the Federal Works Agency, to be paid by the Federal Works Agency that collects the rental on these projects, to make the necessary contributions.

Mr. MACKINNON. That is right. I merely offer this amendment as a suggestion to obviate that possible difficulty.

Mr. KEEFE. I hope the amendment carries, because that is a step in the right direction of implementing the purposes of this bill and assuring that it be implemented.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. With the permission of the gentleman who now has the floor, I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin if it is an entirely practical manner of administration to handle it that way. If so, then I, too, am in accord with it.

Mr. KEEFE. Of course, I am not an expert on the administration of the Federal Housing Authority. I cannot answer that question. But it would seem to me it would be perfectly reasonable to assume that if the same agency is able to make contributions to those local communities in lieu of taxes, they would be able to do this.

Mr. COLMER. Yes, but they have to have special authority of law to do this.

Mr. MACKINNON. This will give them the authority of law.

Mr. KEEFE. This is the authority of law. We are giving it now.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. If the gentleman will permit, may I ask the gentleman from Wisconsin this question: Would you not have the very impractical situation there of the Federal Works Agency making certain allocations of funds that belcng to the Housing Agency, and the Federal Works Agency telling the Housing Agency to give them so much of their money? They could say "no." So it would be a perfectly innocuous thing to do. It just would not work. You gentlemen would take the hides off them if they could manipulate money around in that way.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment simply because we have not had time to consider the implications of the amendment. If it is practical to do that, fine, but I am afraid we are rushing into something here at the last minute with only 2 or 3 minutes to consider it, and we do not know what we are doing. I do not know whether it is practical or not. It seems to me that we may run into considerable administrative difficulty. We do know that the Federal Works Agency is in a position to administer this act, because I just talked with them a moment ago about it, but if we adopt this amendment we may run into all kinds of difficulties of administration.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota, who has labored so faithfully for this legislation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The purpose of this amendment is so meritorious that I am hopeful that if there is some little technicality in the language it can be worked out when the bill goes to the other body. It seems to me we are in a much better position if this money can be taken out of the rent money in assuring these schools that they will have the money.

Mr. COLMER. Let me say to my friend, who has the same objective as I, let us not adopt this amendment now, let us try to work it out. Then by the time it gets to the other body, if it is a good thing, let them put it in.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. In either event, it is coming out of the taxpayers' pocket. It is just as broad as it is long.

Mr. COLMER. As the gentleman from Ohio well points out, in either event it all comes from the same source, so why complicate it?

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported, as modified.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendment, as modified.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MACKINNON) there were—ayes 27, noes 85.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LEONARD W. HALL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3682) to extend the period for providing assistance for certain war-incurred school enrollments, pursuant to House Resolution 279, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. If no member of the minority wishes to offer a motion to recommit, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion offered by Mr. GWINN of New York; Mr. GWINN moves to recommit H. R. 3682 to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD.

READING, PA.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 218, providing for the representation of the Government and people of the United States in the observance of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Reading, Pa., and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas 200 years ago, in 1748, the city of Reading, the county seat of Berks County of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, was founded by Thomas and Richard Penn, sons of William Penn; and

Whereas it was decided jointly with Berks County, Pa., to fittingly mark the occasion by an appropriate bicentennial celebration from spring until fall 1948; and

Whereas the first defenders of the Colonies from beyond New England to reinforce General Washington's troops in Cambridge, Mass., at the outbreak of the Revolutionary War were an armed company from Reading and Berks County; and

Whereas during the period of the Revolution, Reading was a depot of military supplies, manufacturing cannon and munitions for the Continental Army, and was the site of the camp wherein were detained the Hessian prisoners captured at the Battle of Trenton; and

Whereas the first armed troops to enter the city of Washington in answer to the call of President Lincoln in 1861 for 75,000 volunteers were from the city of Reading, Pa., thus again earning and perpetuating for their city the proud title of "First Defenders"; and

Whereas Reading and Berks County through the two centuries of their existence have in addition furnished many outstanding leaders of our Nation and of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; and

Whereas Reading and Berks County have prominently contributed to the industrial life of the United States from the establishment of the first forges and iron foundries in the early eighteenth century to the present time, and today form a great industrial center, among the Nation's leaders in many types of goods and wares; and

Whereas Berks County, of which Reading is the county seat, ranks fourth in Pennsylvania and thirty-eighth in the United States in agricultural production value; and

Whereas it is an important cosmopolitan center of the United States wherein the population represents a fusion and assimilation of the strains and heritage of almost all the nations of Europe in the best tradition of American life and spirit; and

Whereas it is recognized that, while the contribution of the city of Reading and county of Berks to the material and physical welfare of the Nation has been large, the greatest contribution to the forwarding of the Nation has been their considered and collective judgment, their thoughtful patriotism so that in every crisis in national affairs they have thought their way through to a solution which has reflected the Nation's thinking and which has enabled them in good conscience to make rich contribution of lives and fortunes in every national emergency of war or peace: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Government and people of the United States unite with the city of Reading, Pa., in a fitting and appropriate observance of the two-hundredth anniversary of its founding.

SEC. 2. There is hereby established a commission to be known as the United States-Reading Bicentennial Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") to be composed of nine Commissioners, as follows: One person to be appointed by the President of the United States as his representative, the President pro tempore of the Senate and two Members of the Senate to be appointed by said President pro tempore, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and four Members of the House to be appointed by said Speaker.

SEC. 3. The Commission, on behalf of the United States, shall cooperate with the representatives of the city of Reading in proper and appropriate activities commemorating such anniversary.

SEC. 4. The members of the Commission shall serve without compensation and shall select a chairman from among their number.

SEC. 5. Any vacancies occurring in the membership of the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which original appointments to such Commission are made.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 2455 OF THE REVISED STATUTES

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1363) to amend section 2455 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to increase the size of isolated or disconnected tracts or parcels of the public domain which may be sold, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2455 of the Revised Statutes (43 U. S. C., sec. 1171), as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the words "seven hundred and sixty" and inserting in their place the words "one thousand five hundred and twenty". The said section is further amended by striking out the words "one hundred and sixty" in the second proviso and inserting in their place the words "seven hundred and sixty."

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I have consulted with the distinguished majority leader the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and the minority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], and both are agreeable to the present consideration of the bill.

It is identical to House bill H. R. 3971 which was reported out unanimously by the Committee on Public Lands. The Department of the Interior reported the bill favorably.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 3871) was laid on the table.

ACCEPTANCE OF DECORATIONS BY MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4308) to amend section 1 of the act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662), as amended, relating to the acceptance of decorations, orders, medals, and emblems by officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations, neutral nations, or other American Republics.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of July 20, 1942, as amended (title 10, U. S. C., sec. 1423a), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States and former officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States holding any office of profit or trust under the United States be, and they are hereby, authorized, during the present war and for a year thereafter, to accept from the governments of cobelligerent nations, neutral nations, or the other American Republics such decorations, orders, medals, and emblems as may be tendered them, and which are conferred by such government upon members of their own military forces, hereby expressly granting the consent of Congress required for this purpose by clause 8 of section 9, article I, of the Constitution: *Provided*, That any such officer or enlisted man or any such former officer or former enlisted man holding any office of profit or trust under the United States is hereby authorized to wear any decoration, order, medal, or emblem accepted pursuant to authority contained in this act, or heretofore accepted by such persons from the government of a cobelligerent nation, neutral nation, or of an American Republic."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMITTING OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN TO REPRESENT CERTAIN ORGANIZATIONS BEFORE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3546) to amend section 200 of Public Law 244, Seventy-fourth Congress, June 29, 1935, to permit recognition of officers and enlisted men retired from the military and naval forces of the United States as representatives of certain exservice organizations in the presentation of claims to the Veterans' Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MITCHELL]?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what does this bill provide?

Mr. MITCHELL. This bill has been discussed with the leadership on both sides of the House and has been accepted by both sides.

Mr. SABATH. What does it aim to do?

Mr. MITCHELL. The bill provides that officers and enlisted men in the military service, who are retired, who are members of certain recognized veterans organizations, may present the claims of veterans to the Veterans' Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 200 of Public Law 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved June 29, 1936, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The presentation or prosecution of a claim under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration by an officer or enlisted man retired from the military or naval forces of the United States as a recognized representative of an organization specified in or approved under this section shall not be deemed a violation of the provision of Eighteenth United States Code, sections 198, 203; Fifth United States Code, section 99, or any other law."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out all of line 6 and the remainder of the bill, and insert:

"Retired officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, while not on active duty, shall not by reason of their status as such be subject to the provisions of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code (18 U. S. C. 198 and 203) and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99) in the presentation of claims under statutes administered by the Veterans' Administration as accredited representatives of an organization specified in or recognized under this section."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 200 of Public Law 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, June 29, 1936, to permit recognition of officers and enlisted men retired from the military and naval forces of the United States as representatives of certain organizations in the presentation of claims to the Veterans' Administration."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJUDICATION OF CERTAIN CLAIMS OF PERSONS OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 305 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3999) to authorize the Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims resulting from evacuation of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military orders. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of H. R. 3999, under an open rule, with 1 hour general debate.

The bill authorizes the Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims resulting from the west coast evacuation of persons of Japanese ancestry, under military orders.

As I understand the measure, it simply permits the Attorney General of the United States to adjudicate the claims of those of Japanese ancestry who were hurriedly moved out of their homes, at the outbreak of the war, and to settle such claims up to $2,500.

It is a very meritorious measure, and I do not believe it is necessary to take any further time in explaining the rule or the bill.

Mr. SABATH. The rule provides for the consideration of H. R. 3999, which I understand was unanimously reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. The bill authorizes the Attorney General to adjust the claims of persons of Japanese ancestry who were evacuated from their homes in the Western States during the early part of the war under military orders.

In view that the Attorney General must determine the fair and equitable losses sustained, must substantiate the claims, and the time limitation of 18 months in which applications must be filed, I feel that this is legislation in the right direction. Further, justice requires that we adjudicate the losses of those citizens and others of Japanese origin who proved loyal during the war and who, through no action or fault of their own, were removed from their homes, which resulted in financial loss or damage to them. They should be compensated for such losses, and, with the administration of the act in the hands of the Attorney General, I am satisfied that their claims will be justly considered and the interests of the United States will be properly safeguarded. Consequently, I shall not take up any more time of the House.

I have no requests for time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this resolution was unanimously reported by the Rules Committee and the bill was unanimously reported by the Judiciary Committee. I therefore move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3999) to authorize the Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims resulting from evacuation of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military orders.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3999, with Mr. VORYS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from New York for 30 minutes.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE], chairman of the subcommittee which reported this bill. He is fully prepared to tell us about it.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this bill is rather a simple one. I believe I can give you the main outline of it in a very few minutes.

You will recall that shortly after Pearl Harbor an Executive order was issued requiring the evacuation of persons of Japanese descent from certain areas of the mainland, also in Hawaii. There is no disposition on the part of the committee or anyone so far as I know to question the good faith of the people who made that order. It appeared they were acting then in a patriotic spirit and exercising their best judgment on the evidence as it appeared at that time. Fortunately, their fears were groundless; there was no sabotage. On the contrary, the people involved had a higher percentage of enlistments in the armed forces than the Nation-wide average. Nevertheless, considerable damage was done to these people in their being forcibly removed from their homes and businesses, some to camps and others on farms.

This bill was recommended by President Truman and recommended by the Department of the Interior. It passed the Senate in a different form in the last Congress. It was also reported favorably last year by the House Judiciary Committee, but late in the session, and did not reach the floor of the House.

Subcommittee No. 2 had hearings on the bill this year and reported it to the full committee, and the full committee has now reported it with amendments.

The original bill provided for the setting up of a commission in the Department of the Interior. We have changed that provision in order to avoid the setting up of another commission or board and have simply turned the matter over to the Attorney General, giving him authority to settle these claims. We were moved to do that because of our belief that the Attorney General's office was equipped with the personnel familiar with this sort of thing and we believed it would be done better and with less expense than by setting up some commission.

The committee also substantially rewrote the bill. We appreciated the fact that war brings a loss to many people.

A young man, for example, who enlists or is drafted, who is running a small business and has to turn the key in the door, goes away; when he comes back he finds he has lost several years out of his life, a loss for which no compensation can ever be made.

So we have done the best we could in writing this bill to allow compensation only for those elements of damage which can be traced directly to the evacuation order. I regret we are not able to give you the exact details as to what the cost will be. The highest figure we had, incidentally, was $10,000,000. Personally, I believe the rewriting of the bill will result in a much less amount. That is the substance of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I shall be glad to yield to anyone who may have any questions in regard to this proposed legislation.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I am very much in favor of this measure although the number of Japanese who were evacuated from the Territory of Hawaii were limited. I think it is eminently just and fair that this method should be devised to do those people justice. The committee is to be congratulated on the consideration it has given to this measure and the manner in which it has reported the bill.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. I rise simply to compliment the distinguished Chairman of the Subcommittee and the Subcommittee for giving the House the opportunity to pass this bill which is grounded in honor and in justice. I feel that you have rendered a good service in submitting this bill to us because it gives us a chance to show the world for the second time that the House of Representatives of the United States believes in making our Government a government not only of law but of honor and justice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman four additional minutes.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I may say that the subcommittee was unanimous and had the benefit of the advice and support of the full committee and, as has been stated here, the committee was unanimous in reporting out the bill.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. I, too, want to compliment the committee. In my own district and in the State of Oregon there were a large number of these citizens of Japanese origin who were just literally uprooted, taken away from their homes, their businesses, their farms, and transported to camps elsewhere out of the State. They suffered very material damage, and, as the gentleman said, they were indeed loyal in most cases, particularly loyal to this country, and many of them were in the armed forces.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. The facts show they made a splendid record.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleagues in complimenting the committee on presenting this bill to us. I have received a great many letters on the subject. I have many of these people around Columbia University in my district; therefore I am very much interested, I think it is a splendid thing and is elemental justice.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to pay tribute to the 23,000 Nisei soldiers who served in our armed forces. Of the 110,000 Americans of Japanese ancestry who were taken to relocation camps, a larger percentage enlisted in our armed forces than was the percentage of any other group in the United States. One of the outstanding units in the recent World War was Combat Team 442, composed of some of the finest fighting men that wore our uniform.

In considering this legislation great care was taken so there might be no imposition on the Treasury of the United States. The subcommittee believes that every safeguard has been written into the law.

As the distinguished gentleman from Iowa has stated, the original provision contemplated the creation of a new agency in the Department of the Interior.

We felt that because in the Justice Department there were units for handling alien property claims, and claims in the Court of Claims, and in the Land Division, that there was adequate machinery that could be implemented to the extent that it could take up this new work without any great difficulty. Under the language of this bill the Justice Department has authority to settle claims up to $2,500. It has the authority to adjudicate claims in larger amounts, but where the amount is in excess of $2,500 it is necessary to submit that claim to the appropriate committee, as are judgments that are recovered in the Court of Claims. This bill in a small way will make whole those people who were the innocent victims of an order that probably should never have been issued, and I trust that there will not be a vote against it. It is indeed significant that there was not a case of espionage or sabotage brought against persons of Japanese ancestry. They should certainly be compensated because of the losses they suffered as a direct result of the evacuation. This would be simple justice. The kind of justice everyone in our country is entitled to receive.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN].

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Chairman, the matter has been very fully and entirely adequately covered by the two distinguished gentlemen who have preceded me, and I am not going to trespass upon the time of the House to the extent of the time allotted me except to emphasize two points which perhaps have not been stressed.

The first is that in this bill we are attempting to redress a wrong which has been suffered by these persons of Japanese ancestry by reason of an action of our Government which was entirely unique in all our history. Never before had there been a forced evacuation of this sort.

Secondly, at this particular time, when there are those seeking every effort to attack American ideologies and American principles, it seems to me that if we pass this bill we are putting ourselves in very good position to resist those attacks, because this will show to the world that when our Government by voluntary action of its own affecting a special racial group brings about a situation where these individuals suffer loss of their property, even though the act of the Government is caused by military necessity, we are ready, willing, and anxious to go forward with remedial legislation and attempt to redress those wrongs and do the right thing in the interests of simple justice.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. GOFF].

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, this act is made necessary, as has been explained, by the action of not only the War Department but this Congress, in authorizing the evacuation of those of Japanese descent from the Western Defense Command on the Pacific coast. The reason I say that Congress had a part in it is that the method by which the order was enforced was a statute passed by this Congress which provided that it is a misdemeanor to disobey any order issued by a military commander in a defense area.

Originally the President issued an Executive order authorizing the War Department or the appropriate military commander to evacuate from critical defense areas persons who were considered potentially dangerous to our national security. Congress shortly thereafter enacted the legislation to which I have referred which had the effect of ratifying the Executive order.

While I am in favor of the bill, I rise to speak solely in case there is any criticism, actual or implied, against the military commander who issued the order, who, in this case was General DeWitt, an able and efficient officer, now retired. The Supreme Court of the United States sustained the legality of the evacuation of these Japanese, because it considered there was reasonable ground for the issuance of the order, under the circumstances that were presented, after the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I may say to the gentleman that no witness appeared before the subcommittee who had any criticism whatever. Speaking for myself, I certainly would have it very distinctly understood that the reporting out

of this bill involved no criticism whatever of the people who enforced this law.

Mr. GOFF. I am happy to have this statement from the gentleman from Iowa.

The reason no examination into the individual loyalty of those who were evacuated was possible was the shortage of time. There were over 100,000 of these people. The attack on Pearl Harbor had recently been made, and the military commander rightly concluded that we should not be taken by surprise again.

I have had only the briefest of time to examine it, but it seems to me this is an excellent bill. It provides a general procedure for the relief of a group who suffered special damage through military necessity. It specifically provides that no damages will be recoverable for anything except property damage. It does not authorize any fancy claims for punitive damage, humiliation, mental pain, or suffering. It places a time limit for the filing of claims. I shall support the bill, because if you do not adopt this bill, in every subsequent session of Congress you will have a long series of private bills introduced for the purpose of giving relief to some of these people who suffered as a result of the evacuation. This bill is an orderly way of doing justice to these people, most of whom were fine, loyal American citizens. I hope you will give it your support.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General shall have jurisdiction to adjudicate any claim by a person of Japanese ancestry against the United States arising on or after December 7, 1941, when such claim is not compensated for by insurance or otherwise and is substantiated in such manner as the Attorney General may prescribe, for damage to or loss of real or personal property (including without limitation damage to or loss of personal property bailed to or in the custody of the Government or any agent thereof), that is a reasonable and natural consequence of the evacuation or exclusion of such person by the appropriate military commander from a military area in Arizona, California, Oregon, or Washington; or from the Territory of Alaska, or the Territory of Hawaii, under authority of Executive Order Numbered 9066, dated February 19, 1942 (3 CFR, Cum. Supp., 1092), section 67 of the act of April 30, 1900 (48 U. S. C. 532), or Executive Order Numbered 9489, dated October 18, 1944 (3 CFR, 1944 Supp., 45). As used herein "evacuation" shall include voluntary departure from a military area prior to but in anticipation of an order of exclusion therefrom. Existence or intervention of other causes affecting the damage or loss, including action or nonaction by the claimant or his representatives, shall be considered by the Attorney General in determining the amount of relief that will be fair and equitable according to the facts as they appear in each case.

LIMITATIONS; CLAIMS NOT TO BE CONSIDERED

SEC. 2. (a) The Attorney General shall receive claims for a period of 18 months from the date of enactment of this act. All claims not presented within that time shall be forever barred.

(b) The Attorney General shall not consider any claim—

(1) by or on behalf of any person who after December 7, 1941, was voluntarily or involuntarily deported from the United States to Japan or who is otherwise resident in a foreign country;

(2) for damage or loss arising out of action taken by any Federal agency pursuant to sections 4067, 4068, 4069, and 4070 (relating to alien enemies) of the Revised Statutes, as amended (50 U. S. C. 21-24), or pursuant to the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended (50 U. S. C. App., and Supp. 1-31, 616);

(3) for damage or loss to any property, or interest therein, vested in the United States pursuant to said Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; and

(4) for damage or loss on account of death or personal injury, personal inconvenience, physical hardship, or mental suffering.

HEARINGS; EVIDENCE; RECORDS

SEC. 3. (a) The Attorney General shall give reasonable notice to the interested parties and an opportunity for them to be heard and to present evidence before making a final determination upon any claim.

(b) Any relevant evidence having probative value shall be considered by the Attorney General in his inquiries. For the purpose of any hearing or investigation authorized under this act, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to examination of documentary evidence, attendance of witnesses, and production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 26, 1914, as amended (15 U. S. C. 49, 50), are hereby made applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Attorney General. Any person appointed to examine witnesses may be authorized by the Attorney General to issue subpenas, to procure attendance of witnesses or production of documents, and to appoint an officer to serve the same. Subpenas may be served personally, by registered mail, by telegraph, or by leaving a copy thereof at the residence or principal place of business of the person required to be served. A verified return by the individual so serving the same, setting forth the manner of service, shall be proof of service, as shall be the return receipt or telegraph receipt when service is by registered mail or telegraph, respectively. On request the United States marshals or their deputies shall serve such process in their respective districts.

(c) A written record shall be kept of all hearings and proceedings under this act and shall be open to public inspection.

ADJUDICATIONS; PAYMENT OF AWARDS; EFFECT OF ADJUDICATIONS

SEC. 4. (a) The Attorney General shall dispose of all claims filed under this act by award or order of dismissal, as the case may be, upon written findings of fact and reasons for the decision. A copy of each such adjudication shall be mailed to the claimant or his attorney.

(b) The Attorney General may make payment of any award not exceeding $2,500 in amount out of such funds as may be made available for this purpose by Congress.

(c) On the first day of each regular session of Congress the Attorney General shall transmit to Congress a full and complete statement of all adjudications rendered under this act during the previous year, stating the name of each claimant, the amount claimed, the amount awarded, the amount paid, and a brief synopsis of the facts in the case. All awards not paid under subsection (b) hereof shall be paid in like manner as are final judgments of the Court of Claims.

(d) The payment of an award shall be final and conclusive for all purposes, notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary, and shall be a full discharge of the United States and all of its officers, agents, servants, and employees with respect to all claims arising out of the same subject matter. An order of dismissal against a claimant, unless set aside by the Attorney General, shall thereafter bar any further claim against the United States or any officer, agent, servant, or employee thereof arising out of the same subject matter.

ATTORNEYS' FEES

SEC. 5. The Attorney General, in rendering an award in favor of any claimant, may as a part of the award determine and allow reasonable attorneys' fees, which shall not exceed 10 percent of the amount allowed, to be paid out of, but not in addition to, the amount of such award.

Any attorney who charges, demands, receives, or collects for services rendered in connection with such claim any amount in excess of that allowed under this section, if recovery be had, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall upon conviction thereof be subject to a fine of not more than $2,000, or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 6. For the purposes of this act the Attorney General may—

(a) appoint a clerk and such attorneys, examiners, interpreters, appraisers, and other employees as may be necessary;

(b) call upon any Federal department or agency for any information or records necessary;

(c) secure the cooperation of State and local agencies, governmental or otherwise, and reimburse such agencies for services rendered;

(d) utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as may from time to time be needed and available;

(e) assist needy claimants in the preparation and filing of claims;

(f) make such investigations as may be necessary;

(g) make expenditures for witness fees and mileage and for other administrative expenses;

(h) prescribe such rules and regulations, perform such acts not inconsistent with law, and delegate such authority as he may deem proper in carrying out the provisions of this act.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this act such sums as Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. VORYS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3999) to authorize the Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims resulting from evacuation of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military orders, pursuant to House Resolution 305, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at

the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

NAVY POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL AT MONTEREY, CALIF.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 318 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1341) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], and I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 318 makes in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 1341, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif.

This is an open rule providing for 1 hour general debate.

H. R. 1341 has been reported by the Committee on Armed Services. It has been amended rather strenuously and sharply, I might say, so as to reduce the original authorized appropriation from $28,750,000 to $2,500,000. This is just enough money to permit the Navy to take over a structure on the Monterey Peninsula, which it has been using, under a lease, for officer training.

I have personally seen this installation. I know something of it. If the Navy is to continue to pay rental under the lease until it expires, and then put the property back in condition to turn over to the owners, it will cost the Government more money than it would to go ahead with this legislation and purchase the property outright.

Therefore, it is to the benefit of the Treasury of the United States, as well as to the benefit of the Navy, to have this property under Federal ownership.

There can be no question in the minds of anyone, I believe, as to the necessity for having a permanent postgraduate school for Navy officers on the Pacific coast. Certainly, we will always have a large proportion of our Navy in the Pacific. Certainly, it is necessary in these days of modern warfare, and especialy in these times when there has been so much scientific development in the different methods of warfare, for our officers of the Navy, America's first line of defense, to be trained and schooled in the use of the very latest naval equipment as it is developed. Our Navy must be kept modern, our officers trained and schooled up to the minute, if America is to remain secure. That is exactly the purpose behind the establishment of this school, and that is the reason why it is needed so badly.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. SNYDER. To what extent will this postgraduate school duplicate the present service schools which we have now over the country?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It will not in any way duplicate the service schools we now have. Instead, it will lighten the load and will reduce the cost that the Government is incurring through its attempt to train these particular officers in private scholastic institutions. It will actually mean a saving to the Government.

Mr. SNYDER. I do not have reference to the Naval Academy, but we do have service schools, postgraduate schools, schools which both officers in the Army and Navy, who have been in the service a number of years, attend. They go there and get what we now term a "postgraduate course" in their particular branch.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The answer to that question is this: We have about 500 officers now attending the various universities of the country, receiving what we call specialized instructions. We have 500 line officers on training at Newport, R. I. We have 500 in engineering at the Naval Academy Postgraduate School. This is in addition to all that training.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And I might also add to what the gentleman from Massachusetts has said, this school will obviate the necessity of bringing naval officers from the Pacific clear across the United States and back again, in order to attend some of the schools on the east coast, which are already overcrowded and which cannot be used on a permanent basis for postgraduate training.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

NAVAL SCHOOL AT MONTEREY

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, during my many years of service, I have never heard a gentleman make a stronger plea for favorable consideration of a rule and a bill than the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] has made on this rule. He pointed out the need for this splendid hotel and site at Monterey, Calif. I happen to know the locality and I know of the hotel that the Navy is so much interested in obtaining for use as a postgraduate school. It is a wonderful spot and I know the Navy gentlemen are viewing it with a great deal of expectation. The splendid Delmonico Hotel and its premises enjoys a world-wide reputation and it is second to none of the other splendid spots in California. I will say that much, recalling my visit there some years ago. However, the Navy has acquired and owns thousands and thousands of acres of land in California suitable for this postgraduate school. They have expended, as I understand, close to $150,000,000 for some of these lands, which could be utilized for this school.

I am informed by a former Member of this House, a Member of the other body who has made a thorough investigation, and I know the gentleman from Georgia knows that Member of the other body who informed me there is no need, no possible need, for acquiring this hotel and the adjacent land.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a bit of information that I think the gentleman should have before he concludes his remarks?

Mr. SABATH. I am always desirous of obtaining valuable information.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am very happy to inform the gentleman and the House that the body at the other end of the Capitol has passed this measure unanimously this afternoon after a short debate.

APPROACH IRRESISTIBLE

Mr. SABATH. It is very likely that the former Member could not have been present to give the Senate certain information it should have had before acting on the bill. Perhaps the gentleman was detained somewhere else and was not able to be there.

But who am I to criticize the action of the other body? I am not going to do it. We all know, however, of the courtesy that prevails in the other body and how easy it is over there to vote money to please some Member. Oh, my colleague from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has been over there; of course, I realize that, and I realize that his manner of approach and presentation to the gentlemen over there was as irresistible as it was to us in the Committee on Rules. I fear nevertheless that this bill is not genuinely necessary.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Oh, California has enough. I cannot yield now; and, besides, it is not in the gentleman's district because this is not in the mountainous section.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Will not the gentleman yield for just one question?

Mr. SABATH. For one question? Yes; I yield.

Mr. ELLIOTT. This school will be established not very far from where the gentleman's fine 3,000-acre farm used to be in Stockton, Calif., not very far from there.

A HEAVENLY SPOT IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. SABATH. Well, about 120 or 130 miles. I am familiar with that beautiful spot. I used to go there when the heat was unbearable. I used to spend some of the summer months, after we had adjourned, in the San Joaquin and Sacramento Valleys. Whenever I could leave on Friday night or Saturday to cool off and enjoy life I would drive down there; and really, it is a heavenly place, and I do not blame the Navy officers for wanting it for themselves and their families. I do not envy them anything they are entitled to for the splendid services they rendered to the country during the last war. They are entitled to some pleasure, but "some" I say. I do not want them to spend all their time down there.

Although this is a wonderful spot, I am under the impression that the Middle West is entitled to some consideration. We have in the Middle West a beautiful lake, Lake Michigan. On that lake we have a splendid naval institution. I know it could be utilized, and we would not need to spend these $3,200,000 to start with. The gentleman from Ohio said we were going to save money by buying the California site. I want him to know that it has been estimated in some quarters that before we get through with the necessary construction and improvements it may reach a cost amounting to $25,000,000 to $28,000,000. To the Members on the other side of the aisle that, of course, is small change. They have become accustomed now to appropriating and spending money right and left, and no doubt their eyesight is dim when it comes to seeing the number of digits that follow a dollar sign. But God help the country if they continue much longer.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I realize that we are approaching the end of the session and that the gentleman from Illinois is so worn out from his efforts in opposing all that the Republicans have endeavored to do to reduce public spending that he has evidently been unable to find the time or the energy to read this measure.

If he had read this measure he would see that the appropriation is lessened. If he had listened to the testimony in the Rules Committee he would have known that this has been approved by the Armed Services Committee and by the Navy, that there would be no other funds appropriated for this particular item. I am sure that the gentleman has not visited this particular spot in the last 50 years at least, because he has been so zealous in his attention to his duties as a member of the Rules Committee. I am wondering when it was that the gentleman inspected this particular site.

Mr. SABATH. Well, I have not been there for inspection. I have been there for pleasure for a couple of days at a time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. How long ago, may I ask the gentleman?

Mr. SABATH. It was at my own expense and it did not cost the Government anything. The last visit I made to that beautiful spot was about 16 years ago.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Let me interrupt again for a moment to say to the gentleman that no wonder this building was sold at such a low price. If the gentleman went there for pleasure that long ago I know that the building is quite antiquated.

IMPROVED BY NAVY

Mr. SABATH. But the Navy has been in control for several years and it has spent quite a large sum of money to remodel it and improve it. I hope it is all that these gentlemen hope for, but they are not ready to give positive assurance that it will not cost any more money. I heard these promises that it would not cost any more. This small amount of a few million dollars does not mean much to you, I realize that, but I know that the Government will save money by acquiring it instead of holding on to it at the present high rent that the Navy is paying.

Mr BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The closing days of any Congress brings very many peculiar situations and I am rather surprised to see the gentleman from Illinois take the floor and criticize the Navy Department which is headed and controlled by his own administration. Now, I have faith in Mr. Forrestal as Secretary of the Navy. Mr. Forrestal has assured me personally that it would be much to the advantage of the Government financially to take over this property, that these funds will not be expended as the gentleman has said, but, instead, that this is in the interest of the welfare of the country. I am sorry that the gentleman finds himself in disagreement with his own Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. SABATH. I again thank the gentleman for that information. Of course, I understand that the Secretary of the Navy, yielding to the demands and the recommendations of various officers of the Navy, is obliged frequently to recommend things which he does not actually approve of. But having the interest of these splendid officers at heart he wants them to have as fine a place as possible. Let me say, though, if the Secretary of the Navy were acquainted with the wonderful opportunity that presents itself at the Great Lakes Naval Training Station on Lake Michigan, close to the best city in the United States, Chicago, he would have considered Great Lakes and it would not be necessary to expend these millions of dollars. We have the land there, we have a wonderful lake there, and it could be utilized splendidly and to the same extent as this great hotel will be in Monterey, Calif.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois it should show in the RECORD that since the gentleman from Illinois has found his way up into northern Wisconsin it has not been necessary for him to go way out to California and find 3,000 acres in order to get cooled off because he can get cooled off up in northern Wisconsin in a much better area; he can enjoy good fishing and fully appreciate the wonderful climate of northern Wisconsin.

Mr. SABATH. I fully appreciate the wonderful climate in Wisconsin, and there being so much heat put under me, I need something like that from time to time. I need some place to cool off.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield with pleasure to the gentleman from Georgia [Judge COX], a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. COX. With all of its shaded lanes, its beautiful hills and dales, its marvelous swimming pool, its magnificent golf courses, and with all of its other finery, it is just a little bit of dreamland of which there cannot be the slightest doubt. But I am inclined to believe the gentleman agrees with me that the sponsors of this measure made out an excellent case that these conditions exist there; that Monterey is one of the most beautiful spots in the world of which we can conceive, which stimulates the ambition of the Navy to acquire it, yet in spite of that fact it was made to appear that it was good business to acquire ownership; that it will take care of the need that results from this expansion program of the Navy Department to give postgraduate training or extra training to our people in the Navy, and I know the gentleman does not oppose the granting of the rule nor the adoption of the bill.

Mr. SABATH. How can I? How can I when so many of my friends are so greatly interested to see that we should provide the finest spot that can be found, even in that great State of California? I did not finish when I called attention to the availability of the Great Lakes Naval Training Station situated on Lake Michigan. What I want to bring home is this: The vast majority of these men in the Navy today, the most enlistments, come from the Middle West, but unfortunately the Middle West is always forgotten. We being broad-minded and liberal always yield to the appeals and recommendations of the gentlemen from California or from Texas or from the South or from the East, but in return the Members representing the other sections of our country do not reciprocate when we from the Midwest advocate something for our section. I regret that the Navy gentlemen, as well as others, are not familiar with the advantages that we have in Chicago, with our beautiful parks and boulevards, which would be available and would be enjoyed by them, and to the many adjacent beauty spots comparable to any in the United States.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, private enterprise of Chicago has provided for the

service of the Middle West and of the country your famous stockyards which are worth more than all of these governmental favors shown to other parts of the country.

Mr. SABATH. Yes, we are, but there are a great many other outstanding industries that supply the Nation with many of its needs and wants.

I cannot help but yield to the acting minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the frank answer of my friend from Illinois probably applies to most of us in connection with this bill. However, referring to the observation made by the brains of the Republican Party in the House, my friend from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], that the gentleman was spending most or all of his time resisting the cuts in appropriations made by our Republican friends, I think the RECORD will show that the gentleman from Illinois has certainly spent time and fought vigorously against the false economy of our Republican friends as evidenced by the sharp cuts in appropriations for the West and the Northwest, the sharp cuts in appropriations for agriculture in violation of implied agreements, and all the cuts along the line, so that the distinguished gentleman from Illinois has devoted his time this session to fighting false economy and not real reductions.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I fully appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts. However, I did not wish to bring in politics and you know I am not accustomed to it, but I repeat, how can I, from time to time, help criticizing Republican actions that are not to the best interests of our country as I view them.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, there are no further requests for time on either side, as I understand. I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1361) entitled "An act to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit loans, capital grants, or annual contributions for low-rent-housing and slum-clearance projects where construction costs exceed present cost limitations upon condition that local housing agencies pay the difference between cost limitations and the actual construction costs," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. CAIN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, and Mr. SPARKMAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

LOW-RENT-HOUSING AND SLUM-CLEARANCE PROJECTS

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1361) to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit loans, capital grants, or annual contributions for low-rent-housing and slum-clearance projects where construction costs exceed present cost limitations upon condition that local housing agencies pay the difference between cost limitations and the actual construction costs, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WOLCOTT, GAMBLE, KUNKEL, TALLE, SPENCE, BROWN of Georgia, and PATMAN.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following resignation from committee:

JULY 23, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on House Administration, effective this date.

With good wishes, I am,
Cordially yours,

TOM PICKETT,
Member of Congress, Seventh District of Texas.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

NAVY POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL AT MONTEREY, CALIF.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1341) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1341, with Mr. CHENOWETH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how the time is to be divided?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, general debate is to continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before the committee this afternoon is to provide additional facilities which are urgently needed for the postgraduate training of naval officers. In considering the security of our Nation and the need for proper training of our military officers, this is one of the most urgent bills before the Congress. The bill H. R. 1341 has been considered by the Committee on Armed Services over a period of many weeks. We have very carefully studied and examined every facility owned both by the Army and Navy in order to determine whether those facilities can be adapted readily to the needs of the so-called postgraduate training for our naval officers.

Mr. Chairman, we have come to the same conclusion that three special committees of the Congress have reached that the facilities at Monterey, Calif., which have been under lease by the Navy for several years during the war for the training of our pre-flight officers, adequately meets the needs of the Navy in this particular respect. This bill is truly an economy measure. It not only meets our requirements by providing facilities for the proper training of our naval officers, but over a period of 7 years as a result of the savings made in the transportation of officers and their dependents and household effects and providing quarters for 200 married men, we will save over $4,000,000. The entire cost of this project, when it is fully commissioned, will be in the neighborhood of $2,500,000. That would make a savings in the period of 7 years of about $1,500,000.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FORAND. I fully understand the position in which the gentleman finds himself today, but I am rather disturbed that this might be an entering wedge in the transfer of activities now at the Newport Training Station and that this will be a move similar to that which occurred when the work of the torpedo station at Newport was siphoned away. The gentleman will recall at the time the plant at Forest Park, Ill., was built for the purpose of manufacturing torpedoes we were given the assurance that this was just supplemental and would not take over the activities at Newport.

I understand this addition will be at a cost of $2,500,000 instead of the $28,000,000 requested by the Navy originally. Can the gentleman give me the assurance that this is only going to be a $2,500,000 project and that next year or the year after the Congress will not be authorizing the Navy to spend the entire $28,000,000 originally requested and close down the training station at Newport?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman's inquiry is a very pertinent inquiry, coming as he does from an area in which one of the most active training stations of the country is located and with which I am thoroughly familiar, Newport, R. I. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Post and Stations of the House Committee on Armed Services, I may say that matter has been given very thorough consideration by the committee. I cannot visualize the establishment of a brand-new, up-to-date, large postgraduate school at any other place in this country as long as we have the facilities presently available that will meet the requirements of this Nation in the emergency period that lies ahead.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

It is only because of that viewpoint that instead of adopting the program of a brand-new school that we should establish a school that would meet the emergency required by the Navy until we can find out what the international situation will be 5 or 10 years hence. For that reason, I am firmly of the opinion that we ought to maintain the postgraduate school at Newport to train 500 men now there, 500 men at Annapolis, where we are training men in engineering and other scientific subjects, and also to carry on the training at the various universities in the field of supplies, public works, and specialized subjects of that nature, another 500 men, making a total in those three activities of 1,500 officers. It is imperative that we add 500 more officers to that list in order that we may take care of the backlog of 10,000 Reserve officers who have limited training in which we might call line activities over and above the experience they have had in the Navy. It is to take care of them particularly, as well as the graduates of the Naval Academy and the NROTC, in order to meet these emergency requirements that we are reporting this bill calling for the expenditure not of $28,000,000 requested originally for a new, modern institution, but a bill which will acquire the property which we are now leasing, at an estimated cost of about $2,149,000. The difference between that and $2,500,000 in the bill is for fully commissioning the Monterey property in order to meet the requirements I spoke about.

We ought not to extend this plant until it can be shown there is absolute necessity for the establishment of a brand new postgraduate school anywhere else in the country.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. FORAND. I think the argument advanced a few moments ago that we were saving money by not transporting officers from the Pacific coast to the East coast, or vice versa, is a sound one. I have no objection to a school being established in California to take care of that group that would have to be transferred, but I do want to be assured that in so doing it will not mean that Newport will eventually be eliminated.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. As I said a moment ago, we have a fleet today that is many, many times stronger, larger, and more powerful than it was in the prewar days. We have a Navy today of approximately 400,000, whereas before the war it was only about 150,000 men. But as we enter the field of atomic energy, electronics, guided missiles, jet propulsion, and all of the latest developments we have made in the field of research, we must find the means by which we can train these officers from the fleet, and all the graduates of our various schools, in the latest advancement which we are making in the field of modern warfare. To save money for the Government of the United States we think it is the part of wisdom to establish this school on the west coast and to meet our requirements in other respects, to save transportation of the officers and their families from the Pacific all across the country to Newport or Annapolis, and all the way back, to save the transportation of their household goods. And, in these quarters, these facilities that we are here recommending be purchased today there will be provided quarters for 200 families with a considerable savings in quarters allowance to the Government. Over a period of 7 years the savings will amount to approximately $4,000,000, or in other words, in 7 years a net saving of a million and a half over what it will cost to acquire the property. From the standpoint therefore of meeting the emergency need of training the naval officers and from the standpoint of economy we believe this to be a very sound project for the Government to adopt.

This bill, as amended by the Committee on Armed Services, authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to acquire six parcels of land, consisting of 606 acres, at Monterey, Calif., and to establish there a naval postgraduate school. The Navy now holds an option for the purchase of this land and the buildings thereon, at a price of $2,149,800. The existing improvements consist of a large modern hotel building and adjacent cottages. The property has been under lease by the Navy for several years, during which time it has been used successively as a preflight training school and later for the technical training of certain enlisted ratings. The facilities now available there will be adequate, with minor alterations, to provide all the requirements necessary for the immediate establishment of a general line school with a capacity of between 500 and 600 student officers. The bill provides that the total cost of the project, including the acquisition of the property and fully commissioning the school shall not exceed $2,500,000. The difference between the total cost and the purchase price, as I said before, represents the cost of commissioning the activity, the cost of necessary alterations and the cost of architectural and engineering services.

In order to meet its obligations based upon commitments to those Reserve officers who have transferred to the Regular Navy, the Navy must provide these officers the necessary opportunities for professional training which will enable them to compete on an equal basis with graduates of the Naval Academy. The general line course, consisting of a comprehensive review of general professional subjects, such as gunnery, seamanship, administration and command, is designed to satisfy this need. It is planned, accordingly, to give all junior line officers this training. The importance of giving this training to all former Reserve officers has been amply demonstrated by the experience gained with a pilot group of Reserves who received general line training at Annapolis in 1945. It was found that these officers were deficient in professional knowledge and education, particularly in mathematics. Moreover, while they were found to be highly proficient in the particular department or work in which they had been engaged during their wartime service, they lacked the broad general knowledge required of a line officer.

Existing facilities for naval postgraduate training are not adequate to meet the needs outlined above. Neither are they capable of expansion to take care of an additional enrollment. The postgraduate school at Annapolis, which included general line training as well as advanced technical and engineering courses prior to the war, is now devoted exclusively to the latter type of instruction. All general line training is now given at the general line school in Newport, R. I. The capacity of each of the above schools is between 500 and 600 students. In addition, about 500 officers are receiving advanced training at civilian universities, making an over-all total of about 1,500 to 1,700 students in the postgraduate program.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Is there no opposition to this program?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I do not know. The committee unanimously approved this bill.

I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, this bill really only implements the present laws providing for the commissioning of a large number of ROTC graduates in the line of the Navy in that it provides needed facilities for the completion of their education as line officers.

Present legislation recognizes the fairness, as well as the need, of providing means whereby these graduates of ROTC's shall have an opportunity to be integrated into the naval service on an equality with graduates of the United States Naval Academy, but existing facilities are inadequate for the purpose.

In this bill we provide for the establishment of a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif., a location ideally adapted in climate, location, and in accessibility by ships of the fleet. There is little question but that the proposed school should go to the Pacific coast as a means of saving considerable money in transportation costs due to the normally heavy concentration of naval vessels on that coast. There is no question regarding the adequacy of the site proposed, of the present hotel structure thereon, or of the ultimate benefits—both financial and professional—which will accrue to the Navy through the passage of this enabling legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this proposed United States Naval Postgraduate School at Monterey, Calif., will be authorized without a dissenting vote.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to extend the debate on this subject and I am not speaking for the purpose of opposing the bill. I think it is a very worthy extension of the postgraduate training of naval officers for the Navy, and I think the appropriation authorized in the bill for the purchase of the property is very reasonable. The reason I am saying anything about the matter at all is that this bill does not

add to the undergraduate training of officer personnel for the Navy. There is a desperate need at present for an undergraduate school on the Pacific coast in addition to the one at Annapolis. I know the custom and tradition and the opposition to extending the undergraduate school beyond Annapolis, but we all know that Annapolis is limited insofar as expansion is concerned, and that something will have to be done to provide additional naval training facilities soon.

There is not a better place in the United States for training undergraduate naval officers than on the Pacific coast, and I mean particularly in southern California, because of the year-around fine climate and the facilities for extensive training on land, sea, underseas, and in the air. I have introduced bills on two occasions to accomplish that purpose and I trust that the Committee on the Armed Services when it comes to the consideration of these bills will give them serious consideration in the interest of providing additional officer personnel for the naval forces which is limited insofar as the facilities at Annapolis are concerned, eventually we will have to have another undergraduate naval officers' school and it should be on the Pacific coast.

I hope the pending bill will pass because I believe it is very necessary, but I am also taking this time to call to the attention of the House the fact that we do need additional facilities. I hope the time will come when we will have them.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY. Has the gentleman thought of the large expansion of the regular civilian universities on the west coast due to the ROTC which provides a way for young men in the Western States to get their commissions in the line of the Navy?

Mr. McDONOUGH. Yes; I am familiar with it but I do not think that is adequate to indoctrinate the naval officers; it cannot take the place of a naval academy.

Mr. BRADLEY. One of the purposes of this school is to indoctrinate those young men after they have been a year or so at sea and to make them into well-rounded and competent naval officers. It will permit young men from all parts of the Western States who have been commissioned in the Navy through ROTC, at our colleges, rather than through the Naval Academy, to get onto a professional equality with Academy graduates. That is the reason I am so much in favor of it.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, if the war taught us anything it taught us the need of scientific training and special training for our Army and our Navy. The bill that we have before us follows this line of thought.

In the committee I approached this bill with an open mind. In fact, at first I felt rather hesitant about the need for additional training and the request of the Navy for additional facilities for this purpose, but as the Navy unfolded its case at the hearings I became convinced that there is a need for a postgraduate school in the Navy Department. After the officers leave the Naval Academy at Annapolis there comes a time in the life of every officer, and to a large extent in the lives of the enlisted men also in the Navy, when additional training and additional schooling is necessary if we are to maintain our Navy on the high standard that we expect to be needed in the future. These officers should be sent to postgraduate schools, perhaps several years after they have left their studies in the Academy. They should be sent there at a time when they have obtained practical experience in the operations of the Navy and when that practical experience will be of great help to them in their further schooling. It was with that idea in mind that the Navy asked the committee for this bill to authorize the construction and operation of a school at Monterey, Calif.

After the bill was considered and before the final vote, as my distinguished friend from Massachusetts will recall, I asked the committee to pause and again canvass the possibility of using some completed sites presently owned by the Government in this country that might be suitable for that purpose. At that time we called in Navy officers and we went over the whole program again. We consulted other Members of Congress. We found after mature consideration, in addition to the consideration that had been given before, that no other suggested site was entirely satisfactory, and that this bill should be approved by the Armed Service Committee and presented to the House for consideration.

I think it is important that the bill be passed. The Navy feels that its program of education is going to be retarded unless we give it this authority. As to where the school may be located, the request of the Navy should be given high consideration in our councils here today. From the testimony we had in the committee it is apparent the Navy is convinced that it is the place it needs. The amount that we allow in the bill is, of course, a great reduction from the $28,000,000 originally placed in the bill. The amount is reduced to $2,500,000 which the Navy thinks will be adequate and ample for the purpose, for the time being at least.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, this bill ought to be passed.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 1341, as amended by the Committee on Armed Services, authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to acquire six parcels of land consisting of approximately 606 acres at Monterey, Calif., and to establish there a naval postgraduate school. The land and buildings referred to in this bill are available to the Navy Department at an option price of $2,149,900. The option will expire on July 31, 1947. It is known that a 30-day extension may be acquired but the present owners have definitely stated that a longer-term extension of the option will not be acceptable. The amended bill provides for alterations to existing buildings to provide school facilities, quarters, and collateral facilities and equipment, including the acquisition of the necessary land and buildings thereon at a cost not to exceed $2,500,000. The amount authorized will permit the acquisition of the property and make necessary alterations to accommodate a general line school for approximately 500 student officers on or about January 1, 1948.

The acquisition of the land and facilities thereon provided in this bill will provide additional capacity urgently needed for the postgraduate training of naval officers. To meet its obligations based upon commitments to Reserve officers who have transferred to the Regular Navy, the Navy must provide these officers the necessary opportunities for professional instruction and training which will enable them to compete on an equal basis with graduates of the Naval Academy. It has been determined that former Reserve officers now in the Regular Navy actually need the additional instruction in professional subjects such as gunnery, seamanship, naval engineering, administration, and command, and the general line course is designed to fit this need.

At the present time there is a backlog of approximately 10,000 Reserve transferees who should take this course. In addition, all junior line officers will take this course. This includes Naval Academy graduates as well as graduates of the 52 Naval Reserve units throughout the country. It is estimated that an over-all capacity of 1,220 for this purpose should be provided at the earliest possible moment. At the present time, the only facilities available are those at Newport which has a capacity for approximately 600 student officers. It is expected that the Monterey site in its present form will provide capacity for at least 500 additional officers.

Existing facilities for Naval Postgraduate School are not adequate to meet the present and future needs. Neither are they capable of expansion to provide for additional enrollment. The postgraduate school at Annapolis, which included general line instruction as well as advanced technical and engineering courses prior to the war, is now devoted almost exclusively to the latter type of instruction. The situation at Annapolis was observed and commented upon by the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy for 1947 in their report dated April 24, 1947, as follows:

> The Board is of the opinion that the facilities of the Naval Postgraduate School are inadequate to meet the needs of the Navy for technically educated officers. The increased number of officers and men, and the increased amount and complicity of technical equipment now in use in the Navy, has necessitated doubling the number of student officers being educated at the present time in that school. There is insufficient laboratory space and equipment and much of the equipment on hand is out of date. The Board, therefore, recommends that immediate steps be taken to coordinate the activities and facilities of the Naval Postgraduate School so that it can be developed to serve its objectives.

The Monterey site has been determined by the Navy Department to be the most ideally suited location for a permanent postgraduate school. It fulfills all

the requisites stated as essential by the Navy Department. Three different subcommittees of the House and Senate have reached a similar finding. A subcommittee appointed by the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, Seventy-ninth Congress, visited the proposed site at Monterey, Calif., in May 1946, and in their Report No. 283 recommended unanimously "that the Naval Postgraduate School be established at Monterey, Calif., in accordance with the request of the Navy Department." A subcommittee appointed by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, Seventy-ninth Congress, visited and inspected possible locations for the Naval Postgraduate School on the west coast of the continent during September 1946. This subcommittee visited eight different general areas from San Diego to Puget Sound and inspected available sites in each locality. The subcommittee in its report of April 3, 1947, to the Senate Armed Services Committee recommended:

(a) that the Naval Postgraduate School be established at Monterey, Calif., in accordance with the request of the Navy Department, (b) that the Navy Department be authorized and directed to exercise the option it holds from the Del Monte Property Co. and consummate purchase of the property mentioned in the body of this report, (c) that the Navy Department be further directed to enter negotiations with the city of Monterey to acquire for control of the operation and maintenance of the Monterey Municipal Airport with compatible arrangements for its continued use by commercial airlines, (d) that the Navy Department accept the offer of Mr. Morse of the Del Monte Property Co. to deed Del Monte golf course in fee simple to the Government, (e) in case Del Monte should not become available for any reason it is the recommendation of the committee that the other sites investigated by the committee be reassigned and reevaluated.

A subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee held hearings on this bill commencing March 3, 1947, and made an exhaustive study of all requirements and possible locations for the proposed permanent Naval Postgraduate School. This subcommittee considered in detail all properties occupied by the Armed Services at the present time including surplus property and property in active use. It considered locations on the east and Gulf coasts as well as on the west coast. On April 23, 1947, the subcommittee acted on the proposed bill as amended and the chairman declared that the subcommittee approved the amended bill. Subsequently the full committee of House Armed Services Committee received the report of the subcommittee and unanimously recommended that the bill be reported favorably to the House of Representatives.

In connection with the consideration of this property, and the comparison with other possible sites on the west coast, it should be recognized that this one was not considered as an important strategic point at which important airfields or other essential operational activities were established during the war. It was leased by the Navy Department for training purposes. This observation is made to emphasize the fact that the site selected should not be one which had been used for operational purposes during the war. It should be one which would not subject the postgraduate school to possible displacement during a future emergency. This is essential because the postgraduate school is of a permanent character and its uninterrupted continuance during times of emergency would become increasing important.

In view of these facts and the careful and extended consideration which has been given this matter by the Congress, I strongly urge the passage of the bill as recommended by the Armed Services Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to provide by contract or otherwise for the construction of a naval postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif., including the necessary school facilities, quarters, and collateral facilities and equipment, including the acquisition of the necessary land, at a cost not to exceed $28,750,000: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into without regard to the provisions of 3709 Revised Statutes.

SEC. 2. The provisions of section 4 of the act approved April 25, 1939 (53 Stat. 591), as amended, shall be applicable to all public works and public utilities authorized by this act: *Provided*, That the fixed fee to be paid the contractor as a result of any contract entered into under the authority contained herein shall not exceed 6 percent of the estimated cost of the contract, exclusive of the fee, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to effectuate the purpose of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "and directed to provide by contract or otherwise for the construction of" and insert "to acquire six hundred and six and five hundred and ninety-two one-thousandths acres of land upon which the United States of America now has an option with buildings thereon at Monterey, Calif., for the establishment of."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "at Monterey, Calif."

Page 1, line 10, after the word "necessary", insert "construction and alterations to provide."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "$28,750,000" and insert "$2,500,000."

Page 2, line 6, strike out section 2.

Page 2, line 14, strike out section 3.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will correct the spelling of the word "necessary" on page 2, line 2, of the reported bill.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. CHENOWETH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1341) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif., pursuant to House Resolution 318, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMITTING THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY AND THE SECRETARY OF WAR TO SUPPLY UTILITIES AND RELATED SERVICES TO WELFARE ACTIVITIES

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 3055, An act to permit the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War to supply utilities and related services to welfare activities, and persons whose businesses or residences are in the immediate vicinity of naval or military activities and require utilities or related services not otherwise obtainable locally, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, after line 21, insert:

"SEC. 5. The authority granted in sections 1, 2, and 3 of this act shall terminate at midnight on December 31, 1952."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MINERAL LEASING ACT FOR ACQUIRED LANDS

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3022) to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, gas, and sulfur on lands acquired by the United States. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I have consulted with the majority leader [Mr. HALLECK] and with the minority leader [Mr. RAYBURN], and they are both agreeable to the consideration of the bill at this time. The bill was reported favorably by the Committee on Public Lands and has a favorable report from the Department of the Interior. A similar though not identical bill has been passed by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands."

SEC. 2. As used in this act "United States" includes Alaska. "Acquired lands" or "lands acquired by the United States" include all lands heretofore or hereafter acquired by the United States to which the "mineral leasing laws" have not been extended, including such lands acquired under the provisions of the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961, 16 U. S. C., sec. 552). "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior. "Mineral leasing laws" shall mean the act of October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741, 48 U. S. C., sec 432); the act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437, U. S. C., sec. 181); the act of April 17, 1926 (44 Stat. 301, 30 U. S. C., sec. 271); the act of February 7, 1927 (44 Stat 1057, 30 U. S. C., sec. 281), and all acts heretofore or hereafter enacted which are amendatory of or supplementary to any of the foregoing acts.

SEC. 3. Except where lands have been acquired by the United States for the development of the mineral deposits, all deposits of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, sodium, potassium, and sulfur which are owned or may hereafter be acquired by the United States and which are within the lands acquired by the United States, exclusive of such deposits in such acquired lands as are situated within incorporated cities, towns, and villages, national parks or monuments, or set apart for military or naval purposes, may be disposed of by the Secretary under the provisions of the mineral-leasing laws, subject to the provisions hereof. The provisions of the act of April 17, 1926 (44 Stat. 301), as heretofore or hereafter amended, shall apply to deposits of sulfur covered by this act wherever situated. No mineral deposit covered by this section shall be leased except with the consent of the head of the executive department, independent establishment, or instrumentality having jurisdiction over the lands containing such deposit, or holding a mortgage or deed of trust secured by such lands which is unsatisfied of record, and subject to such conditions as that official may prescribe to insure the adequate utilization of the lands for the primary purposes for which they have been acquired or are being administered: *Provided further*, That minerals in lands set apart for Indian use, including lands the jurisdiction of which has been transferred to the Department of the Interior by Executive order for Indian use, shall be subject to the act entitled "An act to regulate the leasing of certain Indian lands for mining purposes," approved May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347; 25 U. S. C., secs. 396a, 396f).

SEC. 4. Nothing herein contained shall be deemed or construed to (a) amend, modify, or change any existing law authorizing or requiring the sale of acquired lands, or (b) empower any commission, bureau, or agency of the Government to make a reservation of the minerals in the sale of any acquired land: *Provided*, That any such sale or conveyance of lands shall be made by the agency having jurisdiction thereof, subject to any lease theretofore made, covering the mineral deposits underlying such lands.

SEC. 5. Where the United States does not own all of the mineral deposits under any lands sought to be leased and which are affected by this act, the Secretary is authorized to lease the interest of the United States in any such mineral deposits when, in the judgment of the Secretary, the public interest will be best served thereby; subject, however, to the provisions of section 3 hereof. Where the United States does not own any interest or owns less than a full interest in the minerals that may be produced from any lands sought to be leased, and which are or will be affected by this act and where, under the provisions of its acquisition, the United States is to acquire all or any part of such mineral deposits in the future, the Secretary may lease any interest of the United States then owned or to be acquired in the future in the same manner as provided in the preceding sentence.

SEC. 6. All receipts derived from leases issued under the authority of this act shall be paid into the same funds or accounts in the Treasury and shall be distributed in the same manner as prescribed for other receipts from the lands affected by the lease, the intention of this provision being that this act shall not affect the distribution of receipts pursuant to legislation applicable to such lands: *Provided, however*, That receipts from leases or permits for minerals in lands set apart for Indian use, including lands the jurisdiction of which has been transferred to the Department of the Interior by Executive order for Indian use, shall be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of the act of May 17, 1926 (44 Stat. 560, 25 U. S. C., sec. 155).

SEC. 7. Upon request by the Secretary, the heads of all executive departments, independent establishments, or instrumentalities having jurisdiction over any of the lands referred to in section 2 of this act shall furnish to the Secretary the legal description of all of such lands, shall furnish to him all pertinent abstracts, title papers, and other documents in the possession of such agencies concerning the status of the title of the United States to the mineral deposits that may be found in such lands.

Abstracts, title papers, and other documents furnished to the Secretary under this section shall be recorded promptly in the Bureau of Land Management in such form as the Secretary shall deem adequate for their preservation and use in the administration of this act, whereupon the originals shall be returned promptly to the agency from which they were received. Duly authenticated copies of any such abstracts, title papers, or other documents may, however, be furnished to the Secretary, in lieu of the originals, in the discretion of the agency concerned.

SEC. 8. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to affect the rights of the State or other local authorities to exercise any right which they may have with respect to properties covered by leases issued under this act, including the right to levy and collect taxes upon improvements, output of mines, or other rights, property, or assets of any lessee of the United States.

SEC. 9. Nothing in this act shall affect any rights acquired by any lessee of lands subject to this act under the law as it existed prior to the effective date of this act, and such rights shall be governed by the law in effect at the time of its acquisition; but any person qualified to hold a lease who on March 1, 1947, had pending an application for lease of any lands, not situated within the known geologic structure of a producing oil or gas field, shall have a preference right over others to a lease of such lands under the provisions hereof. Any person holding a lease on lands subject hereto, which lease was issued prior to the effective date of this act, shall be entitled to exchange such lease for a new lease issued under the provisions of this act, at any time prior to the expiration of such existing lease.

SEC. 10. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as are necessary and appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act, which rules and regulations shall be the same as those prescribed under the mineral leasing laws to the extent that they are applicable.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 12, after "acts.", insert "'Lease' includes 'prospecting permit' unless the context otherwise requires."

Page 2, line 16, after "deposits", insert "by foreclosure or otherwise for resale, or reported as surplus pursuant to the provisions of the Surplus Property Act of October 3, 1944 (50 U. S. C., sec. 1611 and the following)."

Page 2, line 25, strike out "disposed of by the Secretary under the provisions of the mineral leasing laws, subject to the provisions hereof" and insert "leased by the Secretary under the same conditions as contained in the leasing provisions of the mineral leasing laws, subject to the provisions hereof."

Page 3, line 17, after "administered", strike out the remainder of line 17 and all down to and including line 23.

Page 5, line 9, after "shall be", strike out "disposed of in accordance with the provisions of the act of May 17, 1926 (44 Stat. 560, 25 U. S. C., sec. 155)" and insert "deposited in a special fund in the Treasury until final disposition thereof by the Congress."

Page 5, line 17, strike out "shall furnish to him" and insert "and."

Page 6, line 18, strike out "its" and insert "their."

Page 6, strike out lines 19 to 23 ending with the word "hereof" and insert "who, on the date of this act, had pending an application for an oil and gas lease for any lands which on the date the application was filed was not situated within the known geologic structure of a producing oil or gas field, shall have a preference right over others to a lease of such lands without competitive bidding."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOBBS: On page 3, line 17, after the word "administered", insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That nothing in this act is intended, or shall be construed, to apply to or in any manner affect any mineral rights, exploration permits, leases or conveyances or minerals that are or may be in any tidelands; or submerged lands; or in lands underlying the 3-mile zone or belt involved in the case of the United States of America against the State of California now pending on application for rehearing in the Supreme Court of the United States; or in lands underlying such 3-mile zone or belt, or the continental shelf, adjacent or littoral to any part of the land within the jurisdiction of the United States of America."

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the committee accepts the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOBBS: On page 4, line 7, strike out the period and insert a colon in lieu thereof and the following: "*Provided further*, That nothing in this act is intended, or shall be construed to affect in any manner any provision of the act of June 30, 1938 (32 Stat. 1252), amending the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 813)."

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the committee accepts the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARRETT:

On page 2, line 22, strike out the comma after the words "United States" and insert in lieu thereof "(".

On page 2, line 23, immediately following the word "are", insert "(a)."

On page 2, line 24, strike out "or" at the end of the sentence and insert in lieu thereof "(b)."

On page 2, line 25, immediately following the word "purposes", insert the following: "or (c) tidelands or submerged lands)."

On page 6, line 24, immediately following the word "lands", insert the following: "subject of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SCHICK GENERAL HOSPITAL AT CLINTON, IOWA

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 271 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 54) to provide for the use of Schick General Hospital at Clinton, Iowa, for the Veterans' Administration. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the concurrent resolution and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the concurrent resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and now yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 271 makes in order consideration under an open rule with an hour of general debate, House Concurrent Resolution No. 54. This concurrent resolution is to provide that the Veterans' Administration shall use the existing facilities owned by the United States Government known as Schick General Hospital at Clinton, Iowa, one of the finest and most modern hospitals in all America.

I think the enactment of this resolution will probably result in a considerable saving to the Government. I hope the resolution will be adopted.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the resolution providing for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 54. I only want to say that what is being provided in this bill should have been done with a great many other hospitals that the War Department has built and which they do not need at present. I do not know why these hospitals should not be utilized to the purposes for which they are greatly needed in caring for our disabled and sick veterans who served our country so well and who now require hospitalization.

I hope the passage of this bill will be an incentive and an encouragement to the War Department to turn over to the Veterans' Administration these hospitals which are not being operated but which could be utilized to good advantage. The only excuse the Veterans' Administration gives from time to time is that the hospitals are far removed from available medical centers. I think that the personnel shortage could easily be remedied, and physicians and nurses could be found ready and willing to serve in these hospitals to take care of these deserving veterans.

I hope the Veterans' Administration will take notice of our action and will follow soon in utilizing abandoned Army and Navy hospitals in many other localities where available, without the necessity of spending millions of dollars for the construction of new hospitals which will take from 2 to 3 years to erect and equip.

Our deserving veterans are entitled to hospitalization and, while I am aware of the lack of hospital facilities in many sections of the country, the situation will be greatly relieved if the abandoned Army and Navy hospitals are utilized wherever possible.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman have any other requests for time?

Mr. SABATH. No. I wish to expedite matters.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 54.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 54, with Mr. JOHNSON of California in the chair.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the resolution was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts is recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Mississippi will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, there should be absolutely no objection to this resolution. The able and distinguished gentleman from New York, General KEARNEY, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Hospitals, has unanimously reported this resolution, and it was unanimously reported by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I believe that it will be the judgment of the Congress that Schick General Hospital, Clinton, Iowa, be occupied and used by the Veterans' Administration for the care of veterans. It is to be used for the care of veterans, particularly convalescent or domiciliary cases.

This will fill a very great need for veterans all over the country, Mr. Chairman. It will in no way affect the construction of another hospital in Iowa.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TWYMAN].

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am wholeheartedly in favor of the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 54. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE] for his persistence in keeping before the Members of the House the need for utilization by the Veterans' Administration of the Schick General Hospital at Clinton, Iowa. He has done a magnificent job. I know that his action results from his desire to see that the veterans of the Central West are provided with proper hospital care without further delay. We as Members of Congress have a responsibility to discharge. We have accorded certain privileges to veterans and we should provide hospital facilities, particularly when those facilities are available and standing idle.

I appeared before the subcommittee, before the full committee, and before the Rules Committee to advocate bringing out this resolution. The veterans' hospitals in Chicago are overcrowded and there is a long waiting list. Estimates have been made as to how many people are waiting. Such estimates are meaningless because a large number of veterans entitled to hospitalization have given up and do not apply, because they know that the facilities are not available. By utilizing the Schick General Hospital at Clinton, Iowa, the congestion at Chicago and other points would be greatly relieved, as Clinton is only about 120 miles from Chicago. It will serve a large area in the Central West.

In the hearings, it was stated that the Schick General Hospital does not comply with the specifications of the Veterans' Administration, and yet a number of other Army hospitals whose specifications are identical with those at Schick have been accepted by the Veterans' Administration. With regard to specifications, as you may know, I have been identified with the construction industry for many years. When this point was brought up, I wondered if I was making a mistake and therefore conferred with a leading Chicago architect who has done a great deal of work for the Veterans' Administration. He told me that the Veterans' Administration's specifications are arbitrary and peculiar and that, in his judgment, the most modern private hospital in the city of Chicago would not conform to the Veterans' Administration specifications. In these times, when building materials are in short supply and building mechanics in great demand, the Veterans' Administration insists upon building new buildings to their own specifications instead of utilizing Army hospitals already built, which are comparatively new, having been built within the past 5 or 6 years. Under this procedure, these new hospital buildings would be sold for a song. They contend that veterans' hospitals should be built near important medical centers, and yet they are proposing to build hospitals in isolated locations. As I have said, Clinton is only about 120 miles from Chicago, one of the most important medical centers in the world. With air travel, getting the specialists in any branch of the medical profession to Clinton would be simply a matter of hours.

There are a number of fine Army hospitals standing empty now, and boarded

up. During the emergency which exists, these hospitals should be used, at least until new hospitals can be provided. I certainly hope the House of Representatives will act favorably on House Concurrent Resolution 54 and put itself on record with the Veterans' Administration as favoring the reopening of the Schick General Hospital in Clinton, Iowa.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TWYMAN. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. Can the gentleman tell us the cost per bed of building new hospitals as per Veterans' Administration specifications?

Mr. TWYMAN. I am not prepared to do so, but I can get those figures for the gentleman. Those figures are very high, as the gentleman must know.

Mr. BUCK. I wanted to get a comparison from the gentleman between the cost per bed in veterans' hospitals and the cost per bed in these modern hospitals such as the one in Chicago about which the gentleman is speaking.

Mr. TWYMAN. I have those figures and will furnish the gentleman with them. I think they will be very interesting.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER].

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to oppose this resolution. However, one of the few things I know a little about is hospitals. It has been my good fortune to visit a great many of the veterans' hospitals throughout the northeastern section of the United States and I know that it takes more than sticks and stones to make a hospital.

It is true this is a fine, large plant up there in Clinton, Iowa. It has a swimming pool, a recreation field, and a lot of other things; but that does not make a hospital. You cannot just reach out somewhere and staff a building with doctors and nurses, technicians, and all the other necessary requirements. The Veterans' Administration is planning to construct a new hospital in Iowa City just a few miles away from this hospital. The present Shick Hospital is of temporary construction. It is only semifireproof. General Bradley and General Hawley have been opposed to this. Here we have General Bradley heading the Veterans' Administration and I feel that he is doing a fine job. If we are going to come in here and try to legislate piecemeal and try to tell the Veterans' Administration where they can build this hospital and that hospital there is never going to be an end to it. I say we should back up General Bradley who has the responsibility of following through.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUBER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is it not true that under present circumstances it will take from 3 to 5 years to complete this hospital at Iowa City, 8 miles away from Clinton?

Mr. HUBER. It may.

Mr. MITCHELL. A subcommittee made a very thorough inspection tour out there and took into consideration the availability of practicing physicians and nurses in that immediate area. It simply recommended that this Schick Hospital be used and utilized until such time as the new hospital recommended by the Veterans' Committee has been completed. When there is no longer any need for it, then it will be turned over to the State of Iowa to be used as the State may see fit to use it.

Mr. HUBER. The present policy of the Veterans' Administration is to build these hospitals close to medical centers where they can have expert medical attention for these veterans. The evidence in the hearings, as the gentleman and I know as members of the committee, is that there are available beds within a reasonable distance. If you are going to reach out up here in Iowa and start converting this hospital you will have difficulty finding technicians and everything else that is needed to staff a hospital.

Mr. MITCHELL. If the gentleman will refer to page 13 of the report of the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CROW] he will see there a report from Dr. John E. Norman covering the situation with reference to the availability of doctors and nurses.

Mr. HUBER. I am entirely familiar with the report of the chairman of the subcommittee the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CROW] and I commend that committee for its excellent job. But the fact remains that I feel there is no necessity for going out here and taking over a hospital of temporary Army type construction that is obsolete, in view of the fact that we have a building program. For instance, close to my district we have the Crile General Hospital. The only reason it was taken over was because it was already equipped and was close and convenient to the medical center in Cleveland. That hospital is to be abandoned. They are to build a new hospital in the downtown section of Cleveland to be nearer these medical specialists.

Mr. MITCHELL. What, then, does the gentleman propose to do in respect to the 3,000 veterans in that immediate area who are not now able to get into hospitals?

Mr. HUBER. The testimony I have read and furnished by the VA is that hospital beds are available in areas adjacent to that section. There are empty beds in Hines Hospital. It is not feasible to convert this hospital into a veterans' hospital. It is spread out over so many acres that it is not practicable. General Hawley has testified it will add millions to the cost to convert such hospitals. Then there is one thing you cannot get away from and that is it is semifireproof and I do not want to see any veteran housed in that type of hospital.

Mr. MITCHELL. The building is thoroughly sprinklered; it is of concrete-block construction, faced with brick, and the only part of the building that is not fireproof is the roof.

Mr. HUBER. It is not in the best interests of our veterans to house them in temporary hospitals that are not fireproof; and I trust this resolution will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, the veterans' organizations have made a very complete survey in Illinois and state that the veterans' load there would be much larger except for this and that they are discouraged in trying to secure hospitalization. In many cases they give up. I know that is also true all over the United States. This hospital for domiciliary cases could take care of veterans of that type in a very large area until permanent construction is started and completed.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CROW], chairman of the subcommittee that made the survey of the Schick Hospital. I will say, Mr. Chairman, that the subcommittee made an exhaustive inspection of conditions in that area and submitted to the House full committee a splendid and convincing report.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, I had the pleasure of being the chairman of the investigating committee that went out to Clinton, Iowa, to look over the Schick General Hospital. This is a $12,000,000 institution. The buildings were completed on March 1, 1943. The Army occupied it until February 1946. The building does not show any wear of any kind. The walls are in excellent condition; no weather cracks or no deterioration of any kind.

In reference to this resolution, let me explain this: We do not provide that the Veterans' Administration must occupy this hospital as a veterans' hospital. The resolution merely recommends that they occupy and use it as a veterans' hospital if they are able to staff it. We know that by the action of the Budget Committee the Veterans' Administration was reduced in personnel, and there was a question raised on that. I might say that after our report was completed I received letters from the Governor of Iowa, Governor Blue, and from several other individuals in Iowa that we met while there, and they are all very well satisfied with the action that the committee took.

I believe that the House should pass this resolution at this time and at least recommend that the Veterans' Administration use this installation.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROW. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. What about the statement that there are sufficient beds in this area to house the veterans?

Mr. CROW. I do not believe that statement is correct from the information we received in Clinton, Iowa, and also in Iowa City. I do not have definite or authentic figures. We were told that there were 3,200 veterans awaiting hospitalization in the Iowa area.

Mr. CARROLL. I remember this bill was on the Consent Calendar and the Veterans' Administration was objecting to it. What was the reason for their objection when there is such a great shortage of beds?

Mr. CROW. The main reason that the Veterans' Administration is objecting to this resolution is that they want their hospitals near medical centers. The new policy of building veterans' hospitals is to build them in an area where there is a medical center located. In other words, Iowa City is the home of the University of Iowa.

Mr. CARROLL. Of course, it would take 2 or 3 years for the construction of a new hospital.

Mr. CROW. That is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. Since there is such a bed shortage, I wonder what they had to say about that area furnishing sufficient beds for veterans.

Mr. CROW. Well, they never admitted that there was a bed shortage, I will say that about the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. CARROLL. What would be the cost of transforming the Schick Hospital to a domiciliary institution?

Mr. CROW. We have estimates from the Veterans' Administration that it would cost in the neighborhood of $500,000; that is, if they would use the complete hospital. This hospital is laid out so that they can use one part of it or use any parts of it. As originally built, it was a 1,500-bed hospital. If they want to use 200 beds, they can, and the heating plant is so arranged that they can shut off everything else and only occupy that part of the hospital that they desire. For that reason we recommend that it be used, because it is unoccupied and nothing being done with it. We have plans now to build a $12,000,000 hospital at Iowa City, but that will not take care of the veterans at the present time.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the gentleman yield while I ask the gentlewoman from Massachusetts a question?

Mr. CROW. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. What does the testimony before the committee show about the deficiency of beds in that area for veterans?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will answer the gentleman that I think the chairman of the Subcommittee on Hospitals who heard the entire testimony could answer it more completely than I can. This will take in veterans of a large area and, as the gentleman knows, there are thousands of veterans now awaiting hospitalization. This will fill a great need.

Mr. CARROLL. It is not clear to me, however, why the Veterans' Administration would be resisting this program when there is such a great need for beds. That is what I do not understand.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will say to the gentleman that the Veterans' Administration is anxious to build near universities so that they can use the hospitals as training centers as, for instance, the projected hospital at Iowa City.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that hospital at Iowa City will not be completed for 2 or 3 years. We have a situation in Boston where there is a desperate need for beds. The construction of the hospital has been recommended but not a stone has been moved, not a spade of earth has been turned. That is the situation all over the country. I may say to the gentleman that this is not mandatory, it is simply the judgment of the House that this be done. I think everyone wants the veterans to have beds.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROW. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HUBER. The Governor of Iowa has recommended that this hospital be used. I presume the situation in Iowa is like that in any State, there is a shortage of institutions for the care of the feeble-minded, the insane, and others. I wonder why the State of Iowa did not take steps to take over this great facility that lies idle.

Mr. CROW. This installation was offered to the State of Iowa by the War Assets Administration, but they placed such rigid rules and regulations on the method of their taking it over that the State legislature refused to accept it. Therefore, it is still idle.

May I call your attention to the fact that this installation has excellent facilities for all types of recreation. Because of that, our committee recommended that the Veterans' Administration use this hospital as a convalescent hospital for long-term patients. They have a swimming pool there that would be a credit to any city. I believe it cost in the neighborhood of $180,000. It was opened 2 months before the hospital closed, so the Army personnel who were in the hospital had only a little over a month's use of the swimming pool. For that reason, we recommended that the hospital be used for that purpose, that all long-term patients be sent to this hospital for convalescence.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico [Mrs. LUSK].

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Chairman, I favor this resolution because I feel that in the face of the urgent need we have to take care of literally hundreds of veterans who need hospitalization we cannot afford to wait for new hospital construction. In addition, I think we should consider the cost of building new construction when we have facilities available all over the United States. I hope this will be a precedent for Congress to follow in using the facilities we already have, rather than wait for the planning of a long-range program of beautiful construction and beautiful facilities that will delay the consideration and treatment the veterans need immediately. I appreciate the interest of General Bradley and General Hawley in this work, but I feel that perhaps there is a tendency on the part of the VA in planning a long-range program to overlook the need our men have for immediate treatment. The members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs have every day literally hundreds of calls for hospitalization. If we are to pursue the policy of building entirely new hospitals before these men are treated, I think we will have cause to regret it very seriously. I urge that you support the resolution.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY], the chairman of the subcommittee that made such an exhaustive study of the situation in this area and throughout the entire country.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, this committee conducted a long and exhaustive study on this subject. We had brought in to us a petition signed by over 100,000 individuals in this area, the petition being over 3 miles long.

Regardless of the attitude of the Veterans' Administration and the testimony brought forth by its officers during the hearings, it has been conclusively shown that there are approximately 3,200 veterans in that entire area that need hospitalization.

This resolution is not one which would prevent the Veterans' Administration from eventually building their hospital in Iowa City. An amendment will be offered to that effect before the Committee rises.

Within this area, in a radius of 75 miles of Clinton there are included 8 counties in the State of Iowa, 2 counties in the State of Wisconsin, and 13 counties in the State of Illinois. With the huge veteran population in this area of our country and the desperate need for hospitalization of veterans it is necessary and imperative that the Schick General Hospital be immediately opened and put into operation.

There is complete unity in the request for the reopening of this hospital by every veterans organization and auxiliaries and every individual veteran with the fullest support and encouragement of every civic group and united for the one purpose—the reopening of the hospital.

The complete cost to reopen, I have been advised, will be in the neighborhood of $500,000. The construction of the hospital is good, stable, and better than the average, and in its present condition will adequately serve its purpose for many years. I urge the membership of the House to support this resolution which is so greatly needed in order to hospitalize the veterans in this particular area of our country.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I was on the subcommittee that made this investigation and I came to the conclusion that this resolution should be adopted. Therefore, I voted to report it out of the subcommittee and also out of the full committee.

I yield to the lady from New Mexico [Mrs. LUSK].

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to point out that, after all, it is the treatment that is accorded to the veterans in the hospitals and not the facilities themselves which really get the results. If we pay more attention to the nursing service and the medical service, I think we will achieve the important results that we are all working toward.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I cannot see the wisdom of tearing down these institutions that can be used for this purpose and then going to an enormous

expense to build new ones. Therefore, I took the position in the subcommittee and also in the full committee that this resolution should be adopted and that this institution should be used to the best possible advantage.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the resolution is adopted.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas hospital facilities used by the Veterans' Administration at the present time are inadequate to meet the needs of veterans; and

Whereas there are available for use existing facilities owned by the United States Government and known as Schick General Hospital, Clinton, Iowa; and

Whereas these hospital facilities are suitable for use as a modern hospital and are well located for hospitalizing veterans; and

Whereas State legislatures of certain States have during the current year adopted resolutions recommending that the Veterans' Administration utilize these hospital facilities: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the judgment of the Congress of the United States that Schick General Hospital, Clinton, Iowa, which is adapted for use in whole or in sections for the care of veterans, particularly convalescent or domiciliary cases, be equipped, occupied, and so used by the Veterans' Administration for the care of veterans.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: On page 2, following line 5, insert another paragraph as follows:

"That it is the judgment of the Congress of the United States also that the use of Schick General Hospital for the care of veterans, particularly convalescent and domiciliary cases, should not interfere with or displace the proposed construction of a permanent veterans' hospital at Iowa City in order to make use of the services of the staff of the University of Iowa Medical School."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Concurrent Resolution 54, pursuant to House Resolution 271, he reported the concurrent resolution back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I am most grateful for the action just taken by the House on my resolution pertaining to Schick Hospital in Clinton, Iowa. Believe me, the wholehearted support given to this legislation is deeply appreciated. I say that as spokesman for the more than 150,000 veterans and members of their immediate families who through individual letters have petitioned the Congress. I say that, too, as spokesman for the hundreds of thousands of other persons who have shown keen interest in this hospital and are doing their best to protect the interests of our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my warm appreciation to the delegation—Messrs. CROW, of Pennsylvania, chairman; MITCHELL, of Indiana; and TEAGUE, of Texas—that made an on-the-spot inspection of Schick Hospital at the direction of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs; to the gentleman from New York, General KEARNEY, chairman of the Subcommittee on Hospitals of the Veterans Committee; to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, chairman of the full Veterans' Committee; and indeed to every member of her committee. I further want to express my appreciation to the Committee on Rules, of which my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable LEO E. ALLEN, is chairman, for prompt and favorable action.

A grateful Nation wants to bind up the wounds of those who have borne the burdens of battle. The action just taken by the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States is forceful expression of the firm intent on the part of the people's representatives that our veterans shall get the care they so richly deserve.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the resolution immediately following the passage of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may revise and extend their remarks at this point on the resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EMERGENCY RENT ACT

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 3131, an act to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended; and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3131) to extend for the period of one year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title and agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed on the amendment of the Senate numbered 2.

GREGORY MCMAHON,
JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.,
OREN HARRIS,
T. G. ABERNETHY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

C. D. BUCK,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
J. HOWARD MCGRATH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3131) to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: This is a technical amendment to correct a clerical error. The House recedes.

Amendment to the title: This is a technical amendment to correct a clerical error. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 2: The committee of conference have not agreed on amendment No. 2, which proposes to amend section 5 of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, by adding at the end of such section a new subsection providing that the relinquishment of any housing accommodations, other than those in hotels and apartment hotels, by the original tenant, lessee, or occupant thereof, shall not affect any subtenant of such tenant, occupant, or lessee, and no action or proceeding to recover possession of such housing accommodations shall be maintainable by any landlord against such subtenant, so long as such subtenant continues to pay the rent to which the landlord may be entitled under the provisions of such act.

GREGORY MCMAHON,
JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.,
OREN HARRIS,
T. G. ABERNETHY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 2: After line 8, insert: "SEC. 2. Section 5 of such act, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., sec. 45–1605), is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(d) The relinquishment of any housing accommodations, other than those in hotels and apartment hotels, by the original tenant, lessee, or occupant thereof shall not affect any subtenant of such tenant, occupant, or lessee, and no action or proceeding to recover possession of such housing accommodations shall be maintainable by any landlord against such subtenant, so long as such

subtenant continues to pay the rent to which the landlord may be entitled under the provisions of this act.'"

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF JOHN A. SUTTER

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of (H. Res. 325), authorizing the Clerk of the House to transmit to the California State Library photostatic copies of certain papers in support of the bill, H. R. 3818 Forty-fourth Congress, for the relief of John A. Sutter, a noted California character.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized to transmit to the California State Library at Sacramento, Calif., photostatic copies of the memorial and attendant papers in the files of the House relating to the bill H. R. 3818 of the Forty-fourth Congress entitled "An act for the relief of John A. Sutter," the cost of such photostatic copies to be paid by the California State Library."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. ARNOLD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes tomorrow following the business of the day and other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today following the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE RUSSIAN ESPIONAGE SYSTEM

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the principal characteristic of the Russian intelligence system is not, as it is in the west, a systematic functioning of agencies which laboriously collect material and then fit the results into an intelligence pattern, but it is the clever and brilliant exploitation of the talents, qualities, and capabilities of individuals who, placed skillfully in the jobs best suited to them, produce the most brilliant results.

We must recognize from the very beginning that the Russian espionage service has a much larger supply of men of this type than the countries of the west, because the Russian as an individual has, by his very nature, the requisites for such difficult work. The Russian has two qualities in which he is enormously superior to the civilized nations of western Europe—imagination and sympathy for persons and for situations.

In order to counter the work of Russian agents and to be secretly on guard against the Russian espionage service, the most important thing by far is to take these two qualities into account continually and never to swerve from this conviction, even if circumstances seem to warrant. This implies that a person charged with such tasks must, to say the least, be a match for these typically Russian characteristics and stand in a certain inner relationship toward them. I believe this to be possible only when the person concerned has grown up among these people and knows their every shade of expression and their every gesture, and knows how to interpret them correctly.

As a matter of fact, the purely technical recognition of the system as it manifests itself externally at any given time—and is moreover subject to change—and combating such a system with technical means is doomed to failure for the individual member of this machine is not merely a marionette but is charged with the task of solving his particular problem by his own ingenuity.

The most disastrous mistake which can be made in attempting to counter Russian espionage is the assumption that the Russian agent is dependent on the system and its directives. The Russian agent is always tied to his objectives but is free in his choice of methods of gaining his ends. We must all recognize that the Communist ideology simplifies tremendously the work of the Russian espionage agencies by acquiring, without difficulty, collaborators, and nuclei of activity in all countries.

The development of the Russian Information Service from the Czarist OKHRANA, which was taken over in part by the Communists to CHEKA, OGPU, NKVD, and finally MVD, is well known and needs no further comment here. The entire machinery of the Russian Intelligence Service is subordinate to the MVD and divided mainly into two parts:

(a) The Agency of the Interior.

(b) The Agency of the Exterior.

The Agency of the Exterior, which is again divided into many agencies—Information, Political, Military, Espionage, Counter-Espionage, Sabotage, Geographical, and so forth—which collaborate among themselves only so far as is necessary, is not only in charge of the work of agents but also has the disposal of its own troops, special units, border police, and directs also partisan activities. The basic structure of the organization differs in no marked respect from that of other countries. It is only the method and the procedure, and these are the most important, that must be evaluated separately.

It is important to know that the espionage groups attached to military units—corps and armies—are given their missions by these units but have a free hand in carrying out their missions. They might be called agents for the unit. This system of freedom of execution cannot be emphasized enough.

It has already been pointed out that the communistic ideology greatly aids, abets, and simplifies the Russian espionage service. Since communism has its adherents in every country, the Russian intelligence service needs to utilize only very few Russian agents and can rely for the rest on the political followers of communism in foreign countries who obligingly accomplish every task, often without knowing for what purposes they are being used. Russian agents themselves are a choice group who have been schooled politically and technically and who as residents in a foreign country constitute the center of espionage activity in their district.

The agents and their assistants usually pose before the native population as advocates of communism, increase party membership, and incorporate unwitting new members into espionage activity. They spread a net of collaborators over their particular district with the complete confidence of their superiors in Russia after first having thoroughly outlined the work to be done in their district; but their collaborators on the other hand, which they have recruited from the native population as new members or as old members of the Communist Party, are so definitely steered by them that they never acquire knowledge concerning the purposes for which they are actually being used.

If they are told anything at all, it is only to the barest minimum necessary for the accomplishment of their assignments. Consequently, if they are ever interrogated, they are, indeed, able to give very little information.

The residents stay aloof from public life, are known only to a few collaborators or only to those who, as contact men, enjoy special consideration. These contact men furnish all connection between the leading agents and the subordinate collaborators. They organize the communication service, relay orders, and stimulate recruiting. One of their very important duties is to continue the most careful surveillance of the persons in their charge.

A very important requisite in the Russian Espionage Service is camouflage, which is handled with the greatest diligence and in which the Russians have met with simply phenomenal success. The majority of errors made in combating spy organizations of any nation are due to the failure to give this problem due consideration. In order to conceal themselves and their activities, the residents are ready to apply any means whatsoever.

Camouflaging begins with infiltration into the new country. It will be remembered that in every country there have occured periods in which suddenly a

number of agents in the service of Russia have been arrested. These agents were, for the most part, not outstanding personalities with outstanding assignments. Almost always this has been a maneuver cleverly directed to conceal or cover the appearance and activity of the most important spies. This type of camouflaging is particularly suited to border crossing and/or infiltrations, and today under present border conditions throughout the world these tactics find wide application.

The exact technique of concealment is the following: A number of persons having counterfeit papers, which, however, are not entirely correct and not difficult to examine, are sent across the border, and they are given unimportant but clearly defined assignments. These people are especially intended to fall into the hands of the security agencies of foreign countries, and this is exactly what happens, as a result of their lack of experience; and they are so used that the real agent in the meantime can take the steps necessary to accomplishment of his mission.

The persons who are thus made use of are, of course, not informed about their real purpose and thus ruthlessly sacrificed. As a matter of fact, it frequently happens that the security agencies are often given information about these people by the contact men themselves. These residents in foreign countries have a fixed number of such persons at their disposal, always send them out as decoys and sacrifice them for the sake of concealment of their assignments and their own safety. This is based on the assumption that Russian activity in a foreign country is well known to the intelligence agencies of that country and therefore utilizes persons who are of no importance and can give no essential information, who, however, keep these intelligence agencies busy, sidetrack them, and, in addition, provide them with the illusion of success. Of course there are also clever cases in which the individuals involved—this being a category of select and specially trained persons who are also confidence men—have the express mission to let themselves be apprehended, in order then to set the intelligence organizations on the wrong track, according to a carefully delineated plan.

This category of men, and very frequently of women—who play a major part in Russian espionage—are the most dangerous and inscrutable, because they play the dual role of appearing as traitors to their own cause, and apparently let themselves be reformed, only to regain freedom and to resume activity in some new capacity. This struggle with phonies of this type is tremendously difficult, for the Russians, by using such tricks, have been able to give rise to such an amount of mistakes on the part of the counter intelligence, causing them to vacillate constantly between the important and the unimportant, that many an intelligence bureau seems confronted with a chaos of contradictions.

In the case of border security it is necessary to know all the shadings of the psychology of the Russians and understand these subtleties in order to be able to classify the personalities at work there; and even if these cases involve non-Russians, it is important to know immediately what this particular person means to the Russian intelligence, and what category of work he is being used for. This understanding and correctness of analysis is feasible only from one case to the next; as soon as an attempt is made to develop a rigid system or to adhere to norms, the result is bound to be hopelessly unsuccessful. For each case is different, original, and made so with the greatest ingenuity. In this camouflaging process the Russians often go so far as to expose and denounce their agents publicly in newspapers, for tactical reasons, in order to relieve them of the suspicion of being in Russian employ and to taint them if possible with the suspicion of being traitors in the service of foreign governments.

The legend is a requisite of the espionage organizations of all nations, but in the Russian espionage it assumes a special meaning, which is closely bound to the gift of fantasy which the Russians possess. The Russian agent who is picked for an important assignment goes through a training course in which he is not only prepared for the fulfillment of his task in the field of politics, warfare, and espionage, but in which his entire nature is exactly observed and checked.

On the basis of these observations and of the opinion advanced by the various specialists, the legend for the man or woman in question is concocted. This is accomplished by allowing the person in question a free hand for thinking up and submitting such a story. But going on the premise that a person does not know himself, this story is psychologically corrected by specialists.

Thus the legend is made to fit the agent, not he to fit the legend, so that he acquires the inner certainty of being able to move freely in accordance with the dictates of his nature. As much care is taken to preserve the external circumstances of his life, such as age, vocation, appearance, and so forth, as to preserve intelligence, education, and inclinations and all those factors which a man cannot conceal successfully, if at all; with the result that a well-rounded view of the person is taken which fits him and makes it easy for him to play his role without faltering.

Agents who have to change assignments and places of activity frequently, as well as others, are given several legends or the same ones with variations; but in this respect great caution is exercised by examining the person very diligently, for it is obvious that the chances for discovery due to self-contradiction are very great.

For trained Russian agents picked for important missions, this legend is practiced before such men are allowed to go to work. These practices are regarded as highly important and are not conducted superficially, and persons who fail in these tests are regarded as unfit for the real task. Furthermore, proper equipment and correct clothing are issued in keeping with the legend.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Appropriations Committee may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement of the independent offices appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate by Mr. Burke, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 148) entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the temporary continuation of regulation of consumer credit," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia, and Mr. MAYBANK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

TEMPORARY CONTINUATION OF REGULATION OF CONSUMER CREDIT

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate Joint Resolution 148, to authorize the temporary continuation of regulation of consumer credit, with House amendments thereto, insist upon the House amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WOLCOTT, GAMBLE, KUNKEL, TALLE, SPENCE, BROWN of Georgia, and PATMAN.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE FUR SITUATION

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the commercial-fur farmer finds himself in a deplorable financial position today. The chairman of the Agricultural Committee recognized this situation and appointed a special fact-finding fur committee. This condition is a result of certain definite legislative and administrative actions. First of all, the Secretary of Commerce in June 1946 sent a delegation to Russia which was a second "Mission to Moscow." This

delegation was supposed to increase commerce with the United States. You will note in the following report that $241,000,000 worth of furs were imported into the United States in 1946, including 67.5 millions from Russia. The total agriculture imports in 1946 was $2,300,000,000. The fur imports were over 10 percent of the total agriculture imports. The fur farmer surely furnished 241 millions of the much discussed dollar exchange. Second, we saw fur included in the excise tax list and designated a luxury.

If $99,000,000 was collected in 1946 from the excise tax on furs just why should not this industry be given equal consideration with other groups of American farmers? Why take the toll off the fur farmer when the other types of agriculture are protected by embargoes? Why take this 99 millions collected through the fur industry and spend it on special privilege crops?

After listening to all the hearings I cannot refrain from concluding that the fur farmer is deserving of legislative protection afforded other farm groups. The fur farmers have made constructive legislative proposals. One bill has been introduced that will require truth in labeling for furs comparable to the truth in fabric legislation. This has been introduced by the Honorable JOSEPH O'HARA, of Minnesota. Other legislative proposals are under consideration and not a one of these proposals is asking the Congress for any special privilege legislation. Not a one of the proposals is asking for any legislative protection not afforded other agricultural groups, and nowhere nearly as much legislative protection now enjoyed by certain crops.

The report on fur hearings is as follows:

THE FUR SITUATION

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin, from the subcommittee on fur, submitted the following preliminary report:

THE CURRENT FUR SITUATION

This committee was appointed by the Honorable CLIFFORD R. HOPE, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, to ascertain facts regarding the fur industry in all its phases and in connection with all its problems which might rightly receive the consideration of the Congress. Phases given study included fur raising (wild breeding and fur farming, the latter also including Angora rabbits raised for wool) and trapping and the operations of fur buyers, brokers, dressers, dyers, manufacturers and other processors, dealers, handlers, and agencies concerned in fur raising, processing, and sales.

Hearings were held, with representatives of the various groups engaged in the industry and of the State, Commerce, and Agriculture Departments, the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, and the Tariff Commission giving testimony, on April 17 and 18 and May 19, 20, and 21, 1947.

The hearings disclosed that the problems of the several groups in the industry were varied, and some of them had grown out of the war. Others of these problems appeared to be due to the activities of agencies of our Government and of the peculiar methods by which other governments operated in the handling of their own fur situations. Testimony disclosed that—

The fur-farming industry

(1) The fur-farming industry was, and is, in a serious economic position. The breeders contended that this distress was due to (*a*) above-the-average imports, which some described as "flooding" of the market by foreign furs; (*b*) the establishment of the excise tax and the confusion resulting from the indecision as to its continuation; (*c*) a lack of credit facilities that are used by other agricultural producers of the United States; and (*d*) an unwise commercial approach when, in June 1946, the Commerce Department sent a delegation to Russia to encourage shipments to the United States. (Official records showed, however, that of $241,000,000 worth of fur imports in 1946, $67,500,000 were from Russia.)

(2) The fur farmers and trappers asked for more protection on imports in some form, since only silver- and black-fox furs enjoy tariff protection (37½ percent ad valorem) at this time. Since fur garments are assessed duties up to 50 percent ad valorem, up to 40 percent ad valorem on imported dressed and dyed pelts, up to 37½ percent on dressed furs if not dyed, and none whatsoever on the raw pelts, except silver and black fox, the fur breeder felt his labor was entitled to equal legislative consideration. The trapper was also placed on record as seeking such protection.

(3) The fur farmers suggested the advisability of "truth in fur labeling" legislation, comparable to the "truth in fabric" legislation passed by the Seventy-sixth Congress in regard to wool.

(4) The fur farmers suggested a program whereby a "tanner tax" might be placed on domestically produced furs to be utilized in research in behalf of the fur industry.

(5) The fur farmers proposed that consideration be given their industry in regard to research problems comparable to the research being carried on in respect to other agricultural fields and, as stated above, wished to make a direct contribution through the proposed tanner's tax imposed on themselves.

(6) The fur farmers disapproved of the importation of furs from a foreign country that is subsidizing its own producers. Their contention was, and the evidence appeared factual, that Canada is at the present time subsidizing its producers. The farmers also felt that they should not be placed in direct competition with a government which is operating in the fur business, as is the case with Russia and with other totalitarian countries, as long as other elements of American labor receive protection.

(7) The fur farmers contended that the excise tax of 20 percent was placed on furs on the theory that they were a luxury, yet only about 3 percent of the imports paid any import duty, indicating that they were not classed as luxury items when imported. They also contended that most fur coats and similar garments are not luxuries, but necessities, in a large part of the United States and, because of their considerably longer life than cloth garments, often constitute an economy for the consumer.

(8) The rabbit-wool industry has been developing rapidly in the United States and its product finding more and new uses. Because of its peculiar qualities and uses, Angora rabbit growers contend that their product should not be classified so as to have the same duty as sheep wool. Spokesmen for the Angora rabbit breeders, finding and developing new uses for their product to offer possibilities of an expanded market, contend they should be accorded a greater share of the American market. They likewise complain that their product is not recognized in classifications set up by the Department of Agriculture, being disregarded or forgotten following the transfer of supervision of fur animals from the Department of the Interior to Agriculture. They also complain there are no Federal standards to include provisions for the handling of Angora rabbit wool under the Federal Warehousing Act.

Imports of furs in 1946 and the early part of 1947 came in at a notably high rate, both in numbers and in value, a fact shown in tables presented at the end of this report. The fur raisers contended this dumping of foreign furs had bankrupted many fur farmers and, if continued, threatens to destroy their operation entirely. They indicated their belief that continued unrestricted imports would eventually have an adverse effect on the remainder of the American fur industry by eliminating the American source and placing the industry at the mercy of foreign governmental regulations or unpredictable factors of foreign supply.

The position of the fur trade

Representatives of the various phases of the fur trade were generally in accord in their position, testimony disclosed. The trade witnesses' testimony indicated:

(1) New York City has become the fur center of the world through the labor and import conditions which have existed, and there was fear that a disturbing of these conditions would allow other nations to destroy that leadership and reduce the employment of a large segment of well-paid labor.

(2) Part of the troubles of certain elements of the fur-farming industry was due to the whims of Dame Fashion which decreed style changes and lessened the demand for certain types of fur.

(3) Some did not feel that any legislation was needed for truth in fur labeling, believing that the Federal Trade Commission has sufficient regulatory powers. Others could see no harm in suggested truth in fur labeling legislation.

(4) The fur trade was in complete unanimity, favoring a status quo insofar as import duties are concerned. Opposing the fur farmer's desires for a reappraisal of the duties imposed, the trade felt that the present set-up, wherein the manufactured garment enjoyed a 50-percent ad valorem duty, the dressed and dyed pelts up to 40 percent ad valorem, and the dressed pelts up to 37½ percent, with the raw pelts bearing no duty, except in the case of silver and black fox (37½ percent), should be maintained. Entry of processed furs would decrease employment of processing labor, they maintained, as would duties against all raw furs.

(5) The fur trade cited the necessity of well-qualified workmen, noting high pay scales, in connection with the manufacturing of garments and the processing of furs for them, and the large number of people employed in the industry. Some indicated their feeling that it was more important to continue this phase of the entire fur industry on a full-scale basis than to give too much consideration to the smaller number concerned in fur raising.

(6) Opposition to the placing of import duties on raw furs, other than silver and black fox, was also noted by the fur brokers and manufacturers on the ground that the industry could use all of the $100,000,000 output of American fur farmers and that the additional foreign fur imports were necessary for the other phases of the fur industry to survive and continue to employ a large segment of high-paid labor.

(7) Figures citing average costs of fur garments, considering longer wear, as compared to other types of material, stressed the contention that fur garments were not luxuries demanding an excise tax but, rather, utilitarian items and economies.

(8) One trade witness gave a figure of 40 percent as the percentage of furs exported after manufacture. United States Tariff Commission data, however, gave fur exports for 1946 as $5,669,347 in value for fur-wearing apparel; $18,000,000 worth of undressed furs; $1,300,000 of dressed or dyed furs, or a total of $25,000,000 fur exports. This $25,000,000 in exports is evidently about 10 percent of the imports, since $241,000,000 worth of fur pelts as pelts were imported in 1946.

General observations

(1) Fur farming is becoming a farm enterprise of considerable magnitude, and its problems deserve legislative consideration to compare with that given other agricultural groups of the United States.

(2) As wild fur animals decrease in number, increase in demand for farm furs can be expected.

(3) Fur farmers make use of waste products in their operations. Alaska, with its fish-cannery waste and other fish resources, provides a food for fur farms and may thus be important both as a source of feed for some farms in the United States proper and as the site of additional farms.

(4) The fur industry is more than a billion-dollar industry, although the domestic fur farmer has not been receiving a very large percentage of what the consumer pays for the products manufactured from his pelts.

(5) Fur farming is a further diversification of agriculture and, as a diversion system of farming, should be an addition to a well-rounded program for American agriculture.

(6) Rabbit wool is entitled to the legislative consideration given the products of other groups and should not be classed with sheep wool for various purposes.

(7) The serious financial troubles of the fur ranchers and farmers, as disclosed in testimony, later hearing discussions indicated could be partially solved by better methods of financing in some of their operations. These methods might include possible use of the Central Bank for Cooperatives in some phases and use of other existing agricultural credit set-ups for individuals or fur-farm units in others. In this respect the individual fur farmer was cited as feeling he is entitled to the same credit sources available to other branches of agricultural endeavor, particularly since the regulation of fur farming has been transferred to the supervision of the Department of Agriculture.

(8) Pelts of sheep in various classes (mouton, et cetera) may be imported free, but wool clipped and imported separately would demand duty.

(9) Confusion results when an excise tax is assessed against mouton as a fur, although the product is a sheep pelt with the wool attached.

Tables on furs and fur products

The following table shows the number and dollar value of fur imports from 1920 to 1947:

TABLE 1.—*Furs, dressed or dressed and dyed, and undressed,[1] United States imports for consumption, 1920–46*

[In thousands]

Year	Quantity (pelts)	Value
1920	132,330	$87,471
1921	80,194	38,319
1922	148,153	64,909
1923	127,255	82,216
1924	146,621	82,846
1925	166,932	105,253
1926	165,304	109,423
1927	164,240	120,916
1928	135,721	115,021
1929	134,732	118,563
1930	119,638	64,804
1931	122,061	52,781
1932	93,343	27,239
1933	138,007	35,608
1934	121,180	39,091
1935	197,342	49,871
1936	167,273	77,048
1937	149,551	80,637
1938	94,829	43,128
1939	141,028	52,678
1940	169,716	75,876
1941	160,011	106,172
1942	93,213	70,557
1943	119,599	94,128
1944	138,812	127,561
1945 [2]	141,390	146,328
1946 [2]	192,134	241,274

[1] Includes only whole pelts.
[2] Preliminary.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

The following table shows the exports of fur wearing apparel from 1922 to 1947:

TABLE 2.—*Fur wearing apparel:[1] United States exports of domestic merchandise, 1922–46 and January–March 1947*

Year	Quantity (number)	Value
1922	(2)	$169,617
1923	(2)	160,797
1924	(2)	187,217
1925	(2)	207,698
1926	2,421	111,260
1927	2,776	152,631
1928	5,200	184,445
1929	7,425	297,956
1930	8,686	223,432
1931	5,335	133,071
1932	1,857	34,792
1933	1,531	34,029
1934	1,849	37,366
1935	1,871	41,811
1936	7,557	110,839
1937	5,308	129,256
1938	4,035	108,490
1939	3,709	127,914
1940	7,328	161,547
1941	9,555	235,740
1942	14,494	446,083
1943	17,341	946,408
1944	19,532	1,617,400
1945 [3]	25,056	3,086,640
1946 [3]	48,023	5,669,347
1947 (January-March) [3]	6,811	1,002,498

[1] Not separately classified prior to 1922, included with dressed and manufactures of furs and fur skins.
[2] Not available.
[3] Preliminary.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

In addition to the above, there were exported, in 1946, $18,009,313 in undressed furs and $1,345,567 in dressed or dyed furs, making a total of $25,024,227, as compared to the $241,274,000 of fur imports in 1946.

The following table shows the numbers and values of pelts imported from 1920 to 1946:

TABLE 3.—*Furs (except silver or black fox), undressed: United States imports, by principal sources, 1920, 1921, 1923, and 1925–46*

[In thousands of dollars]

Year	Belgium	France	Germany	Rumania	Soviet Union	United Kingdom	Canada	Argentina	India	China	Japan	Iran	Turkey	Afghanistan	Australia	New Zealand	Union of South Africa [1]	All other countries	Total
1920	3,232	3,398	3,086	-------	4,765	16,811	13,097	2,100	952	10,567	5,307	160	1,668	-------	12,196	2,314	14	4,761	84,428
1921	665	1,359	2,072	6	345	9,137	9,880	2,951	1,069	3,869	1,247	32	209	-------	2,073	682	14	1,164	36,774
1923	2,606	2,973	9,646	18	821	17,779	11,394	2,010	337	14,359	1,755	139	683	8	4,981	919	659	8,552	79,639
1925	4,026	4,368	6,607	49	5,776	19,966	11,914	3,453	290	15,450	2,594	142	822	-------	10,657	2,100	595	12,484	101,593
1926	5,474	4,478	8,881	209	4,446	21,852	11,927	3,588	271	15,101	2,874	114	530	13	11,829	2,118	1,034	12,511	107,250
1927	6,013	6,438	12,952	175	2,429	20,720	14,515	5,020	181	22,002	4,610	168	707	-------	10,972	1,073	1,185	13,570	123,630
1928	6,591	6,984	15,996	169	3,159	17,504	13,368	4,423	310	17,052	3,550	375	1,054	-------	5,758	540	1,257	10,693	108,783
1929	6,807	6,158	18,598	120	4,963	16,409	10,928	3,855	181	15,593	4,217	44	835	-------	7,137	677	1,546	9,981	108,049
1930	2,719	3,241	10,075	37	3,700	13,688	6,573	1,874	173	6,967	1,965	71	319	-------	2,282	313	524	3,124	57,045
1931	938	2,706	7,656	118	735	13,383	5,369	1,920	427	7,048	1,447	42	249	-------	2,198	314	847	2,553	47,950
1932	323	1,301	3,047	19	931	7,396	2,730	997	171	3,950	1,413	7	218	-------	764	129	74	1,667	25,137
1933	753	2,023	3,550	98	1,481	9,559	3,310	1,083	381	4,129	1,306	19	143	-------	2,645	635	542	1,675	33,332
1934	855	2,654	1,786	51	2,129	8,606	4,283	1,237	344	7,632	1,855	34	235	-------	3,215	676	234	2,339	38,165
1935	1,225	3,220	1,593	562	3,188	12,347	5,086	1,955	809	5,421	1,845	56	119	19	5,636	1,615	482	3,069	48,247
1936	3,058	4,973	907	1,869	6,432	22,490	6,887	2,287	798	7,260	2,581	303	204	-------	7,382	2,804	836	3,652	74,723
1937	2,923	5,206	203	2,847	11,597	15,933	5,767	2,370	1,830	9,716	3,137	416	464	1,373	6,914	1,873	1,209	4,764	78,542
1938	1,314	1,447	103	1,597	12,139	2,367	4,945	1,286	1,008	3,476	933	395	222	3,793	1,800	988	1,599	2,623	42,035
1939	808	2,797	274	1,099	12,327	2,136	6,433	1,055	570	4,379	1,272	497	241	6,667	2,360	748	2,813	3,193	49,759
1940	422	2,473	7	658	12,942	2,784	10,694	2,154	1,019	6,287	1,130	2,015	470	12,864	5,315	1,429	7,760	3,239	73,662
1941	16	(2)	-------	35	21,620	4,090	12,872	5,458	1,440	6,144	1,305	2,132	315	16,933	13,954	2,702	11,261	3,780	104,057
1942	-------	-------	-------	-------	15,321	3,822	14,726	3,704	1,671	107	-------	1,810	288	7,758	8,669	1,934	6,767	2,380	68,957
1943	-------	-------	-------	-------	17,917	3,756	20,583	6,672	817	14	-------	1,165	218	9,334	12,853	3,085	9,322	4,750	90,466
1944	-------	-------	-------	-------	32,090	4,516	21,703	5,605	3,517	1	(2)	2,010	548	19,776	13,104	3,624	11,019	6,676	124,189
1945 [3]	39	1,151	-------	-------	26,325	3,798	21,569	8,296	3,154	35	-------	3,811	1,093	31,723	14,689	2,992	16,686	8,113	143,474
1946 [3]	1,152	4,182	4	1	67,495	4,925	18,361	11,029	8,034	14,083	825	6,628	2,019	34,104	22,886	3,168	19,664	20,002	238,563

[1] Before 1928 may include some imports from British South Africa.
[2] Less than 500.
[3] Preliminary.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce, April 1947.
NOTE.—Imports for 1920–33 and 1945–46 are general imports; those for 1934–44 are imports for consumption. Imports of silver- or black-fox furs are shown in table XIV.

R. F. M.

In addition to the importations listed in table 3, there were 53,000 silver- and black-fox pelts imported, valued at $2,500,000, making a total import of over $241,000,000 in fur pelts in 1946.

The following two tables from the United States Tariff Commission show the duty status of dressed, undressed, and manufactured furs:

TABLE 4.—*Furs and manufactures thereof*

Tariff paragraph	Kind	Tariff status	Trade agreement
1681	Furs and fur skins, not specially provided for, undressed:		
	Mink, beaver, and muskrat	Duty-free status bound	Canada, January 1936. Canada, January 1939.
	Wolf	do	Canada, January 1936. Canada, January 1939. Iran, June 1944.
	Kid and goat	do	United Kingdom, January 1939. Iran, June 1944.
	Skunk	do	Canada, January 1939.
	Prairie wolf, lynx, and fisher	do	United Kingdom, January 1939. Canada, January 1939.
	Moleskins	do	Netherlands, February 1936.
	Ermine, fitch, moneky, pony, sable, and squirrel	do	United Kingdom, January 1939.
	Guanaquito, nutria, wildcat, ocelot, and seal	do	Argentina, November 1941.
	Otter	do	Canada, January 1939. Argentina, November 1941. Peru, July 1942.
	Lamb and sheep:		
	Caracul and Persian lamb	do	United Kingdom, January 1939. Iran, June 1944.
	Other	do	United Kingdom, January 1939. Argentina, November 1941. Iran, June 1944.
	Fox (other than silver or black fox)	do	United Kingdom, January 1939. Argentina, November 1941. Iran, June 1944.
	Hare	do	Turkey, May 1939. Argentina, November 1941.
	Jackal and badger	do	Iran, June 1944.
	Marten	do	United Kingdom, January 1939. Turkey, May 1939. Iran, June 1944.
1519 (a)	Dressed furs and dressed fur skins (except silver or black fox): If not dyed:		
	Lamb and sheep	15 percent ad valorem [1]	United Kingdom, January 1939.
		12½ percent ad valorem	Argentina, November 1941. Iceland, November 1943.
	Caracul and Persian lamb	15 percent ad valorem	United Kingdom, January 1939.
	Goat and kid, and hare	12½ percent ad valorem	Argentina, November 1941.
	Other (except coney, rabbit, dog, and fur seal skins)	15 percent ad valorem	United Kingdom, January 1939.
	If dyed: All, except coney, rabbit, hare, dog, goat, kid, and fur seal skins.	20 percent ad valorem	Do.
1519 (a)	Plates, mats, linings, strips, and crosses of dressed goat or kid skins, if not dyed.	12½ percent ad valorem	Argentina, November 1941.
1519 (b)	Plates, mats, linings, strips, and crosses of hare, lamb, and sheep furs (except caracul and Persian lamb), if not dyed.	17½ percent ad valorem	Do.
1519 (c)	Silver- or black-fox furs or skins, dressed or undressed, not specially provided for.	37½ percent ad valorem	Canada, January 1939.

[1] Superseded.

TABLE 5.—*Furs and manufactures thereof*

Tariff paragraph	Item	Tariff history		
		Act of 1922	Act of 1930	1947 rate
		Percent ad valorem	*Percent ad valorem*	*Percent ad valorem*
	Undressed furs:			
1519 (c)	Silver or black fox	50	50	37½
1681	All other kinds	[1]	[1]	[1]
	Dressed furs:			
	If not dyed:			
1519 (c)	Silver or black fox	50	50	37½
1519 (a)	Coney and rabbit, dog, and seal	25	25	25
	Goat and kid, hare, and lamb and sheep (except caracul and Persian lamb)	25	25	12½
	All other kinds	25	25	15
	If dyed:			
1519 (c)	Silver or black fox	50	50	37½
1519 (a)	Goat and kid, hare, coney and rabbit, dog and seal	25	30	30
	All other kinds	25	30	20
1519 (a)	Plates, mats, linings, etc., of dog, goat, or kid skins:			
	Dressed, not dyed:			
	Of dogskins	10	25	25
	Of goat or kid skins	10	25	12½
	Dressed and dyed	10	30	30
1519 (b)	Plates, mats, linings, etc., of fur (except silver or black fox and dog, goat, or kid):			
	Dressed, not dyed:			
	Of hare, lamb, and sheep furs (except caracul and Persian lamb)	40	35	17½
	Other	40	35	35
	Dressed and dyed	40	40	40
	Manufactures of furs (except plates, mats, linings, etc.) further advanced than dressing, prepared for use as material:			
	If not dyed	40	35	35
	If dyed	40	40	40
1519 (d)	Wearing apparel of fur:			
	Of hides or skins of cattle of the bovine species, not specifically provided for	15	15	15
	Of dog, goat, or kid skins, not specifically provided for	15	35	35
1519 (e)	Of other furs	50	50	50
1519 (e)	Articles or fur, except wearing apparel	50	50	50

[1] Free.

GROWING IMPORTANCE DEMANDS ATTENTION

The subcommittee feels that a rather comprehensive picture of the fur industry has been obtained in these hearings, which are printed in parts 1 and 2 of the Fur Situation (hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Fur of the Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, 80th Cong., 1st sess.). Every effort was made to give every branch of the industry full hearing to obtain all facts incident to the industry and its problems. Therein it was indicated that the fur industry, in which this Nation has become the outstanding international leader, may properly deserve more consideration from the Congress and other divisions of Government than it has been given in the past.

This report is hereby submitted to the Honorable CLIFFORD R. HOPE, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives.

REID F. MURRAY,
Chairman,
EDWIN ARTHUR HALL,
PAUL B. DAGUE,
NORRIS COTTON,
W. K. GRANGER,
JNO. L. MCMILLAN,
THOS. G. ABERNETHY,
E. L. BARTLETT.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD the report of this fur-investigating subcommittee that will give the people of this country the facts in connection with the fur industry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think that probably they imported the furs to pay for the 175,000 tons of steel that we shipped out of the country to Russia in the past year, steel that we so badly needed for pipe, for drilling of oil wells, for pipe lines, and so forth.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think it poor Government policy to send out any delegation to ask anybody to send anything in here that we do not need. They will send enough in without sending out any delegations for that purpose.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to my colleague from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION. I wish to take this opportunity to express my own personal appreciation for the fine investigation made by our friend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY], especially on agricultural matters. No Member of the House has been more helpful along that line than he has. I wonder what is going to become of the sheep and the wool industry. We voted sometime ago for a bill to give relief to the wool growers of this country, but that bill was vetoed by the President. Now, I have received many letters from my constituents and from all parts of Kentucky urging me, before Congress adjourns, to try to help do something to protect the sheep and wool industry. Now, what is the prospect for relief to the wool growers and the sheep raisers in this country at this time?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will say to my colleague from Kentucky that I appreciate his asking me that question, but I am sure that he realizes that that is something that is not in my hands, and that the leadership on the floor will have to answer that question.

I will say, however, that this wool industry is just one more example of what has been going on under the present administration. They have deceived the League of Women Voters from one end of the country to the other, talking about reciprocity and good-neighbor policy, and they have erected more trade barricades than were ever erected in the history of our country. Now they are going the wreck the sheep industry. Sheep numbers have been reduced by over one-third the past 4 years. Then people ask why they find no lamb or mutton at the market place. In the last 3, 4, 5, and 6 years, from 25 to 35 percent of the total customs receipts have come from wool. Then they take that money and they use it under what is known as section 32 funds. When we had the agricultural bill up here I paid my respects for a couple of minutes to the misuse of these section 32 funds. I cannot understand it. Talk about a loose fiscal policy. It is not only a loose fiscal policy, but it is a loony one, too. When you take 30 percent of the customs receipts on commodities like livestock and wool and then turn around and use that money for oversubsidizing soil-depleting crops, it does not make sense. And I call attention to the fact that in these section 32 funds that they secure by taking 30 percent of the customs receipts, they even go so far as to subsidize insulating material made out of cotton. One company, if you please, has had over $1,000,000 in subsidies for making insulating material for houses. There is no use having a soil-conservation program when you do this to the livestock industry and then use the funds to oversubsidize soil-depleting crops, and I kind of hope that these general agricultural hearings that are going to be held all over the country will get some semblance of common sense and common justice and equity between the various groups of our farmers and between all groups of our society.

Mr. ROBSION. I thank the gentleman for his very illuminating and informative statement. I knew when I asked the question that we could draw from the gentleman some information and facts worth while on this important subject.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman, and I presume sometime before we adjourn Saturday night that the wool bill will again be brought to the floor. I just take that for granted.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

HUNGARY AND EASTERN EUROPE

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the refusal of the Soviet satellites to attend the Paris Conference has again turned the spotlight on eastern Europe. We realize as perhaps never before, that Europe has been split in two parts, that large areas and tens of millions of people are being cut off from what we like to call the "one world." Thus they are being prevented even from accepting assistance, and that is rather unusual in these pathetic years.

This is however not a new development, it is just the most striking consequence of an evolution which has been in progress since VE-day at least, if not since Tehran and Yalta.

It does not mean a new experience for the peoples involved as the same thing happened to them not so long ago, when Nazism was bent on establishing a European hegemony. After Munich, the world accepted the idea that, after all, Germany had some special interests in Lebensraum. The only surprising thing about it today, for us as well as for the peoples concerned is, that the same mistakes could have been repeated within such a short time, and that so little should have been done to prevent this repetition.

Eastern Europe is an integral and vital part of the old world. The decline of the Turkish and later of the Austro-Hungarian empires made it a bone of contention between the new great powers, Germany and Russia. All of us may remember what we have read in our textbooks on the Oriental question, which in the nineteenth century has so often shattered the peace.

This great area, stretching from the Baltic to the Adriatic and Black Seas, is rich in manpower, in natural resources, but due to reasons of history and economics, it has never been properly developed. Inhabited by a host of small but able nations, it has never succeeded thus far in establishing a well-balanced unified political order, based on freedom and cooperation. It was a sort of hunting ground for expansionist powers and ideologies, for a ruthless game of power politics.

From an economic and strategic point of view, it is of paramount importance. Left alone, peaceful and satisfied, it could become the most important political and economic asset in European recovery. Tightly integrated in the economic and political system of a single great power, it is a base for further expansion and eventual conquest by force of arms.

Two World Wars were generated in this area. World War II was preceded by what we would call now a partition of Europe into spheres of influence. Seeking a balance of power, British statesmanship hoped to achieve that balance in 1938 by splitting Europe, by assigning to the Germans their legitimate share, that Lebensraum they had been claiming, the territories and peoples of Austria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria. But partition did not achieve stability. On the contrary, it was an inducement for further expan-

sion. Yielding Austria to the Nazis did not save Czechoslovakia. Yielding on Czechoslovakia did not save Poland. And thus World War II roared into a holocaust.

And what has happened since? Shall I recall Teheran, Yalta, or the great design? Shall I recall how in the armistice agreements we assured predominance in these countries to the Russian members of the Allied Control Commission? Shall I recall our advice to the eastern European nations that they should have governments friendly to Russia? The long and strenuous negotiations for the peace treaties, when we yielded on almost all the points and cheered ourselves with the thought that we had reached the best possible settlements under given circumstances? How many vain protests did we launch against rigged elections, oppressive practices, and Soviet interference, always followed up by recognition of the puppet governments and the accomplished facts resulting from the very conditions against which we raised our voice?

Instead of telling the whole story, I will limit myself to recalling the happenings of the last few months. On March 12, 1947, the President of the United States made a memorable speech which was considered by many people as opening a new chapter in the foreign policy of the United States. After years of appeasement it sounded like an encouragement for all those who have been oppressed or threatened by oppression. Although limited in its concrete application to Greece and Turkey, it contained a promise that, "Wherever we find free peoples having difficulties in the maintenance of free institutions and difficulty against aggressive movements that seek to impose upon them totalitarian regimes, we do not necessarily react in the same way each time but we propose to react." Those were brave words which our people applauded and all too soon forgot.

But the words of the President had a heartening effect on the peoples of eastern Europe. They were encouraged because they saw in them an official refutation of their worst fears, namely, that the United States of America was an at least tacit partner to an agreed partition of Europe, and that the famous Trieste-Stettin line was drawn with the consent of the most powerful nation in the world. And they saw in this declaration even more: a promise of at least continued concern and of at least some kind of positive action.

Did we live up to these expectations? Did we act in accordance with our words? Hungarians, Bulgarians, Rumanians have since been victims of continued totalitarian aggression. They resisted as well as they could. And what did we do about it?

Let us first take the case of Hungary. The duly elected Prime Minister, leader of the majority party was ousted from his office by Soviet interference and by Communist pressure. The President of the United States termed the event an outrage and declared, that we would not stand by idly. Senator VANDENBERG, while recommending that ratification of the Peace Treaty with that country spoke of a treacherous conquest. Finally the Department of State sent a protest to Russia and stated that the then recent events were the most flagrant interference in Hungarian affairs. The protest was sharply rejected by Russia, and we heard nothing further of the action that may seem appropriate which the Department's note indicated was to be the basis for their case of refusal to recognize the Communist coup.

On the contrary, we ratified the Peace Treaties with Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, as an important contribution to the reestablishment of the sovereignty of these countries. We did so in the hope that the Soviets would do the same. The Soviets, however, did not act upon the peace treaties, because they prefer unsettled conditions to settled ones. Thus our ratification of these abject treaties was just a vain gesture, which would even appear as an implicit endorsement of what is going on in eastern Europe.

We did even more. The Department of State granted formal recognition to the new Soviet puppet Hungarian Government, because it wanted to be represented in Hungary. The maintaining of our listening post on the Danube is however in no way dependent on formal recognition. The United States is to be represented in Hungary anyhow, as the Department must be fully aware because under the Armistice agreement, the United States is a member of the Allied Control Commission, and under the Peace Treaty, the head of the American mission is the member of the commission interpreting the dispositions and supervising the execution of the Treaty.

We offered asylum to Prime Minister Nagy, but I have not seen in the press that he has been received by any responsible officer of the American Government. He is certainly happy to enjoy freedom from fear as a refugee in our country. But after all our Government has said about the case of his country, can this be considered appropriate action? Do the official statements not commit us to something more than we have done thus far? The Soviet Government has every reason to believe that our words of tender concern for their victims mean nothing at all, and that after once blowing our horn they can proceed to devour their victims at their leisure.

In Bulgaria, Mr. Nikolai Petkov, the courageous leader of the Agrarian Party, reduced to a minority by abject and oppressive electoral practices, was arrested on June 7. The charges against him sound familiar to everybody who knows the foul play going on in Red-dominated eastern Europe. He was charged with conspiracy against the Government of the Comintern agents. Mr. Petkov declared bluntly, that his arrest was nothing but a prolongation of what has already happened in Hungary. A few days later 23 members of the Bulgarian opposition party were deprived of their seats in the national assembly.

The acting political representative of the United States inquired the reasons which led to the arrest of Mr. Petkov and was answered by the head of the Bulgarian Government, that the leader of the opposition would be tried by the sovereign country of Bulgaria, and not in London or Washington. We issued a statement on that incident. We assured the world, that Mr. Petkov's leadership of the Bulgarian opposition has evoked deep sympathies in the United States. We referred to Yalta, to the armistice agreement, and to article 2 of the peace treaty. We declared that the present regime in Bulgaria will be on trial in the minds of all freedom-loving peoples outside Bulgaria. And nothing has happened outside since—nothing whatever.

The drive to crush democracy, even when it was reduced to opposition, was continued in Rumania as well. Hundreds of the opposition party and nonparty members were arrested, and our Department of State, keeping its own political record straight, dutifully protested. It recognized that the arrests "represent a deliberate effort at the suppression or terroristic intimidation of democratic elements of the Rumanian population who oppose the present regime." The Communist-dominated Rumanian Government was, however, not in the least impressed by our protests. In the last days, the great old man of Rumania, Dr. Juliu Maniu, leader of the National Peasant Party was arrested with his Vice President and several other top members of his party. I should like to add that even the Nazi regime in its day did not dare to persecute Dr. Maniu, who has been the most respected statesman of his country.

Perhaps it should be pointed out that Mr. Nagy, Mr. Petkov, Dr. Maniu are peasant leaders, representing the majority of their peoples. Actually, the peasants are the backbone of all eastern Europe. Fiercely individualist and hard working, they are the strongest, even though not the exclusive foundation of a truly democratic system in those countries. Their aims are simple. They want individual property rights, and they want to be masters in their homes and not pushed around by government or its police, and they want to have a voice in politics. The police state under which they have to live now is but a complete negation of these basic aims. It is therefore significant that the Red Fascist governments in eastern Europe want to crush them as their most dangerous potential opponents. And it shows as well that the period of democratic face saving has come to an end; the face has been smashed by the Red Fascists.

Everyone who observed the happenings in that part of the world is aware of the fateful part national rivalries have played in preventing those peoples from the realization of their common interests, which are overwhelming indeed in comparison to the interests that divide them. I feel, therefore, that the common initiative which four distinguished exiled agrarian leaders of eastern Europe took on the 4th of July 1947 deserves our appreciation and sympathetic backing. Mr. Nagy for Hungary, Mr. Dimitroff for Bulgaria, Mr. Macek for Croatia, and Mr. Gavrilovic for Yugoslavia proclaimed on that day the

formation of an International Democratic Peasant Union. Rumanian, Polish, Czech, and Slovak agrarian leaders endorsed their manifesto announcing the common aims of eastern European peasants.

It happened for the first time in the history of these countries that the leaders of the majorities agreed on a common program of cooperation and democracy. I warmly commend this courageous step and earnestly hope that our Government will grant to these distinguished representatives of truly democratic forces not only asylum but all the consideration and assistance that their just cause deserves.

Before concluding, I should like to make one more observation. After Munich we got accustomed to call the small countries which were let down by the Western Powers satellites. First there was some sorrow and understanding in the accent on that word, later we blamed and despised them. Now again we call them satellites, but instead of Hitler, the Politbureau is their overlord. Today we are full of regret that they may not attend the Paris Conference because they are satellites. Tomorrow we may blame them again for the same reason. But let us never forget our share of the responsibility for their becoming satellites again.

I am afraid that the people of eastern Europe must think that we are not interested in their fate. Although we vigorously voice our concern, we do not act accordingly. There are signs of increasing antitotalitarian resistance everywhere, but we definitely discourage them by talking big and doing little on their behalf.

If passivity is to be the policy of the United States, is a new form of appeasement, then let us say so. Let us tell them that we accept the Red split of Europe. If that is not the case, and I think that it must not be the case, then we have to let them know that we mean what we say, and that we say only what we mean. Then lack of imagination or of diplomatic know-how must not prevent us from the implementation of our policy. If we want to keep their hopes and their resistance alive, we must at least keep their case alive. If we fail, then the world is doomed to another and a more horrible holocaust. Who are the Chamberlains in our State Department?

OUR FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, the inherent fallacy of our foreign economic policy is daily becoming more apparent. In my opinion by the time the next session of Congress is convened, we will find ourselves forced to throw it overboard.

Arithmetic will not permit the United States to engage in a so-called free trade policy. The recent legislation in regard to wool is just one of many similar items. Under our American system which is based on equal treatment for all groups in our economy we cannot afford to sacrifice first our wool industry and then follow up with the sacrifice of our petroleum and mineral production, and so forth.

It is sometimes much easier to point out a fallacy by using a simple example affecting almost every section of the United States. I would like to point out what has happened in the case of fats and oils, the end result of much of our agricultural economy.

Because of the continuance of wartime controls and the lack of proper tariff protection, we have today the greatest dislocation in the price of fats and oils of any period in our history. In fact it is so severe that it represents a serious threat to our future economic welfare.

For example, in 1910 the retail price of lard was 15.8 cents per pound as compared to 22 cents at the present time. Corn was selling for 50 cents as compared to $2 per bushel at the current market level. It ought to be self-evident that the farmer is not going to feed hogs if this situation is to continue.

The packing industry is absorbing much of the loss on lard through a higher price on choice cuts such as pork chops and hams. It is one of the principal reasons for the high meat prices.

The normal ratio of the price of pork chops and lard is approximately 2 to 1. In other words, lard should sell for one half the price of pork chops. During 1945 lard was retailing at 18.8 cents and pork chops at 37.1 cents. At the present time pork chops are 80 cents per pound and lard is 22 cents.

This dislocation in prices can be traced to the planning of the international food board and the men in charge of controls over exports and imports.

On one hand the Government refuses to permit allocations for the export of lard and on the other hand they permit an almost free flow of imports of vegetable oils which are now available at 11 cents per pound. They are sacrificing our own producers of fats and oils to gain a few cheap dollars for the nations which are exploiting the cheap labor of the Far East.

To some of you the matter may seem unimportant but a study of the situation will convince you otherwise. We use annually about 10,000,000,000 pounds of fats and oils of all kinds. The effect of our foreign economic policy at the present time is causing a loss of at least 10 cents per pound on our own domestic fats and oils. This means a loss to the American farmer—North, South, East and West, of approximately $1,000,000,000. With the seven times turn of farm income into national income it means that we are sustaining a loss of $7,000,000,000 of national income because of our present foreign economic policies.

On one hand fats and oils are being kept from reaching other nations as exports and on the other hand we are buying fats and oils which they badly need.

It was a similar situation of cheap fats and oils from the Orient that started our farm prices downward in 1925. The low price for fats and oils finally forced a drop in the price of livestock and grains. A similar result will follow if present policies are continued.

To my friends in the South I would like to point out that the imports of the cheap vegetable oils is also affecting the price of cottonseed oil and peanut oil. In fact if we are not careful we will soon be forced to support the price of peanut oil and peanuts.

The wool problem which has as yet not been acted upon by the House after the President's veto of proper tariff protection, is similar to that of fats and oils. We cannot maintain a price for the American farmer on a free trade basis and the sooner the South, the Midwest and the West wake up to that fact the better it will be for all of us.

In promoting our present foreign economic policy we are deluding ourselves and the nations which are friendly to the United States. We cannot carry on with the present policy without forcing ourselves into national bankruptcy. Our first foundation for our own prosperity is to protect our domestic producers in their right to produce at the American level.

What right have we to expect to sell $1,600 automobiles to the coolie labor which is producing the fats and oils at a wage of 20 cents per day in competition with our farmer?

A similar example is that of rubber. The price has dropped to 14 cents per pound and the international investors who own the plantations are rapidly convincing our State Department that we ought to discontinue the production of synthetic rubber so that they can continue to exploit the cheap labor of the Far East.

If we really wish to reciprocally trade we should pay them a proper price for the rubber we need, but we should not permit our own rubber industry to be sacrificed for the benefit of a few international capitalists.

Of course the lure of a cheap product has often caused us to sacrifice our own producer. The rubber from the Far East at 14 cents per pound is in reality high priced if properly analyzed. For example, if we pay American labor producing rubber $1 per hour they can buy 4 pounds of rubber at 25 cents per pound with each hour of work. On the other hand, the worker in the rubber plantation receiving 50 cents per day cannot buy 4 pounds of rubber with a full day's work even though it sells for 14 cents per pound.

One of the fundamental rules of economics is that the producer is also the consumer and if we are going to trade for fats and oils, rubber, and so forth, produced by cheap labor than we will eventually find ourselves with a cheap market and unemployment at home.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

FEDERAL AID FOR EDUCATION SHOULD BE ENACTED AT AN EARLY DATE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, those of us interested in Federal aid for education were delighted a few weeks ago when the Subcommittee on Education of the Labor and Education Committee favorably reported H. R. 2593, the bill filed by its chairman the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman EDWARD O.

McCOWEN. In view of the fact that many schools, particularly in rural areas, will be without teachers this fall, we hoped very earnestly that the bill would be favorably approved by the whole committee and passed through the Congress at this session. Apparently, however, the measure has been sidetracked and action on it will have to await until Congress reconvenes. In view of the urgency, let us hope that Federal aid for education may be considered in the event a special session is called, or in any event early in the next session of Congress. At least the Subcommittee on Education deserves high commendation for the splendid hearings and consideration it gave to this important matter.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman for calling this very important legislation to the attention of the House. Perhaps it is too late to get action on it this session, but I am sure the gentleman will agree that there is no more important legislation facing the Congress today than the question of Federal aid for education.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I certainly appreciate the observations of the gentleman. I know of his very earnest work in support of this legislation.

Education is important to every boy and girl in this country because it is the only means that they have for relating themselves to the extremely complex social and economic life that has developed out of a war-torn world. It is extremely important to the States and local communities because it is the major means that will enable the maximum development of their human and material resources. It is of utmost importance to the Nation in the maintenance of national security and the building of domestic prosperity. It is vital to the world because only through a well-enlightened people do we have any possibility of creating an enduring peace.

Complete equality of opportunity was the idealistic dream of our founding fathers. It has never materialized fully because we have never provided equality in the educational opportunity offered to all of our youth. Failure to take some positive and effective action on Federal aid to public education at this time would seem to be a tragic disregard and neglect of our primary resource—the youth of America. In many of America's less wealthy States children get one-third to one-half as many weeks of schooling as more fortunate children in wealthier States. The range of educational opportunity offered in this country is now as great as 60 to 1. Actually there are no less than 2,000,000 children in this country who live in areas sufficiently wealthy to spend 60 times the amount of money that can be afforded to provide the meager education offered to another 2,000,000 less fortunate children. This means that the social and economic opportunity of youth depends almost wholly upon the part of the country in which he is born. In the rural areas of a poor State his chances for an education that will put him in a position to compete on an equal basis with those born under more fortunate circumstances is almost negligible. To me this is a most deplorable situation, in the world's richest Nation that has for so many years exemplified to the remaining nations of the world the value and the force of public education.

I have always thought that we lead the world in the realization of the power and force of public education, yet last year we spent only 1.5 percent of our total national income on education. During this same year Britain spent 3 percent of its total national income for education, while Russia spent 7.5 percent of its total national income for the development of its educational system. When we realize that Great Britain and Russia both learned of the value of educational expenditures from us we realize that we can no longer neglect to provide adequate support of America's public schools.

Today the United States is playing a leading role in world affairs as an aftermath to victory in war. We have emerged a more vigorous and energetic Nation than any other with a productive capacity that exceeds any the world has ever known. We are rapidly assuming a commanding lead in technological developments, science, and agriculture. Can we say the same about human welfare? Not so long as we continue to spend only 1.5 percent of our national income on the education of our future leaders in science, industry, and arts.

The simplification of communications throughout the world has given rise to a need for the future leaders of American political, economic, and social life to be able to take their place as world leaders as well as our leaders. Are we educating our young to such? Not when we discourage the normal recruitment of teachers by inadequate salaries. If you want teachers to come from the best of our population you will have to raise our standards. Not only is an attractive entering salary important but in order to keep the best teachers in the profession there must be a decent final maximum salary. It is inconceivable that a Nation as great as ours should relinquish its dominant place in world leadership by denying itself the best educational system in the world simply because of inadequate educational finance.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BUCHANAN. What is the recommended sum as far as Federal aid for education is concerned?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Taft bill and my bill anticipate that $300,000,000 be appropriated each year to assure that every child in school should have at least $40 spent on them. The McCowen bill, giving assistance to all of the States, would require a somewhat larger amount.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Just what does the gentleman think the chances are of getting that sum out of this Congress?

Mr. KEFAUVER. This is, of course, an economy Congress, and there is no chance in this session, but let us hope it may be different in the next session. I may say this is not a gift. It is an investment in the youth of America which will yield high returns. I hope it will have support from both sides of the aisle. The gentleman, I know, has been greatly interested in this legislation.

I could use the time allotted to me wholly in citing to you existing conditions in American education that present what has been popularly termed "the crisis in education." Experts have presented statistics and other data to such an extent that it is unnecessary for me to go into detail in describing those conditions. The major cause of this crisis is a teacher shortage which has developed at a time when the demands upon the schools are such that a greatly increased teaching force is needed. This teacher shortage has been brought about by the influence of a number of factors. Unquestionably the first and most important of these factors is the low wage that has been paid teachers for a number of years. Many of our teachers are employed at salaries below that of school janitors, scrub women, garbage collectors, and bartenders. The average annual salary of teachers in my State in 1944–45 amounted to approximately $1,300 and for the Nation as a whole only $1,846. This is a condition that will no longer be tolerated by many teachers. It tends to undermine and destroy the efforts to stabilize teaching as a profession. I know the results of this appalling low salary condition because of the stream of personal correspondence and visits from school representatives that I have almost every day.

During the war the Federal Government reached into all corners of the country and into all walks of life for manpower to serve its wartime needs. In this emergency the teaching profession magnificently filled its quota. We found classroom teachers in every branch of the armed services on every battle front and serving the country in its every wartime need. But this in itself produced a terrific impact upon the schools, because many of these teachers learned that the advantages, financial and otherwise, in other fields of employment offered greater opportunity, and those whose love for teaching was not sufficiently strong to overcome the self-sacrifice necessary to go back to underpaid and overworked situations have left the profession for good. This situation has been termed the greatest vocational migration of history. Another highly significant factor comes from the pressure of extra population. In the 5 years following America's entry into World War II 13,000,000 babies were born. Some population experts had predicted only 4,000,000. This increase in population began to be felt in the schools last year as increased enrollments were reported from almost every State. Further increases were reported this year and as this bulge in child population moves upward the demands on the schools for increased numbers of teachers produces conditions that can result only in the disastrous disintegration of our American public schools unless steps are taken at once to alleviate them.

This disaster must not be permitted to happen. The economic strength and security of our Nation, the individual welfare of every citizen, depends more and more upon the educational ability of its citizenry. A significant study made by the education committee of the United States Chamber of Commerce points out that the level of educational attainment of the adult population is a determining factor in the level of income of the country itself. It has been estimated that if the average level of the adult population of 11 of the Southern States having lowest educational status could be increased by only 1 year, which would mean an average of 8½ years of schooling, the increased productivity thereby in these 11 States would raise the total income of the Nation by approximately $4,000,000,000.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS. Is there any way the gentleman knows of whereby each child in the United States, regardless of his location, may have an opportunity that is the same as or at least similar to that of children in other places, without Federal aid?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I can say to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma that I know of no other system, and unless some assistance to education is given through Federal aid, I know that in some States we are always going to have areas where children will not have equality of opportunity. I think in the United States they are entitled to that. I appreciate the contribution of the gentleman to this discussion.

Due to the mobility of our population, and especially of our youth, illiteracy is not merely a local liability, but a national one as well. The declining birth rate in all our major cities and the increasing birth rate in rural areas means that as population pressures are brought to bear upon the youth of low economic areas, the migratory trend is toward the city. This is one of the reasons why the removal of inequalities of educational opportunity is a major responsibility of the Nation and consequently the Federal Government.

During the operation of the selective service system nearly one-half of the rejections were for educational or health defects. Thus, at a time when our Nation had its greatest need for healthy and intelligent manpower, it is estimated that the equivalent of no less than 20 combat divisions were unable to serve the Nation because of illiteracy and educational disqualification.

There is no doubt of the keen Nationwide interest in the teacher shortage and the critical problems of the public schools. Many editorials have appeared in newspapers over the Nation. Frequent articles have been presented in national periodicals. Even the news reels and the radio have presented to the people what is happening to their schools. It is unfortunate that this partial breakdown of the school system was ever forced to public attention through a series of teacher strikes. To me it is disgraceful that this great country should permit our public school situation to become so desperate that teachers should have to resort to such extreme measures.

I am convinced that only through Federal aid to supplement State and local effort can the future soundness of our public education be assured. The least we can do is to give the benefits set up in the Taft bill or in H. R. 2188, which I am sponsoring, to the educational system of the Nation. These bills would establish a minimum program which would enable the underprivileged areas of the Nation to assure a minimum expenditure of $40 per year for each school child. At the same time these bills give every protection to the rights of the States and local communities in the supervision of their schools.

America's deep faith in her free public school system as a sound foundation for our democracy is being put to a severe test at this time. The welfare of the children of the Nation and of the future of our country demands early passage of an education bill.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances in the RECORD and include newspaper articles in each.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances in the RECORD and include some articles.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3123. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3587. An act to provide for the establishment of a temporary Congressional Aviation Policy Board; and

H. R. 4106. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenue of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 254. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Glenna J. Howrey;

S. 323. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to allow credits to and relieve certain disbursing and certifying officers of the War and Navy Departments in the settlement of certain accounts;

S. 512. An act to extend provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to the Virgin Islands;

S. 616. An act to authorize the creation of a game refuge in the Francis Marion National Forest in the State of South Carolina;

S. 1180. An act to authorize the issuance of a special series of commemorative stamps in honor of Gold Star Mothers;

S. 1185. An act to provide for the disposal of materials on the public lands of the United States;

S. 1220. An act to transfer jurisdiction of certain lands comprising a portion of Acadia National Park, Maine, from the Department of the Interior to the Department of the Navy, and for other purposes;

S. 1348. An act to provide for the addition of certain revested Oregon & California Railroad grant lands to the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project, in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes;

S. 1497. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of cottonseed and cottonseed products, and for other purposes," approved August 7, 1916;

S. 1515. An act to make surplus property available for the alleviation of damage caused by flood or other catastrophe; and

S. 1519. An act to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 24, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

951. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the more economical operation of the general supply fund of the Bureau of Federal Supply, Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments (previously referred to the Committee on the Judiciary).

962. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his request for consideration of legislation which will provide sufficient funds for the presentation to Eire of a statue of Commodore John Barry (H. Doc. No. 412); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

963. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to vest the Commissioners of the District of Columbia with the control and jurisdiction of the District of Columbia Armory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

964. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report showing the special assistants employed during the period from January 1 to June 30, 1947, under the appropriation "Compensation of special attorneys, etc., Department of Justice"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

965. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the furnishing of an official residence to the representative of the United States at the seat of the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

966. A letter from the Assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to increase the fees of jurors and witnesses in the United States courts and before United States commissioners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

967. A letter from the Assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 199 of the Revised Statutes of the United States with respect to counsel in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

968. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, in accordance with the provisions of section 2 (d) of Public Law 46, Seventy-seventh Congress, the information that there were no contracts entered into or modified under authority of Public Law 46 during the period beginning April 1, 1947, and ending June 30, 1947; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

969. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to empower the Secretary of the Interior to grant rights-of-way for various purposes across lands of individual Indians or Indian tribes, communities, bands, or nations; to the Committee on Public Lands.

970. A letter from the Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting the Second Semiannual Report of the United States Atomic Energy Commission; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RIZLEY: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 3988. A bill relating to the sale of Paxon Field, Duval County, Fla.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1038). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 4309. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (GI bill of rights), pertaining to "Loans for the purchase or construction of homes, farms, and business property," so as to provide more adequate and effective farm-loan benefits; without amendment (Rept. No. 1039). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. S. 1350. An act to authorize relief of accountable officers of the Government, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1040). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 218. Joint resolution providing for the representation of the Government and people of the United States in the observance of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Reading, Pa.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1041).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Select Committee on Newsprint and Paper Supply. Interim report filed pursuant to House Resolution 58, Eightieth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1042). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JAVITS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 4186. A bill to prohibit and punish the unauthorized use of the official seal, emblem, and name of the United Nations, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1043). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 4212. A bill to provide increased subsistence allowance to veterans pursuing certain courses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1044). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONKMAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 4330. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to perform certain consular-type functions within the United States and its Territories and possessions; without amendment (Rept. No. 1045). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JUDD: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. S. 907. An act to provide for the orderly transaction of the public business in the event of the death, resignation, or separation from office of regional disbursement officers of the Treasury Department; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1046). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4122. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to proceed with construction at military installations, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1048). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1650. A bill for the relief of Maria Hedwig Feresz; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1047). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 4335. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the centennial anniversary of the movement of Henderson and Seth Luelling to the Oregon country; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 4336. A bill to provide for a service credit for veterans for the purposes of title II of the Social Security Act; to the committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEARHART (by request):

H. R. 4337. A bill to provide tax relief for income earned over a period of years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHENER (by request):

H. R. 4338. A bill to prohibit the transportation of obscene literature in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 4339. A bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, to require all members of the Communist Party to register under such act, to provide that all printed matter distributed by such members shall be clearly labeled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 4340. A bill to provide a civil government for the island of Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 4341. A bill to amend Public Law 168, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, an act to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy to be given to not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics other than the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4342. A bill to amend Public Law 447, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, an act to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Military Academy to be given to not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics other than the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 4343. A bill to amend the act of December 5, 1945, entitled "An act granting travel pay and other allowances to certain soldiers of the war with Spain and the Philippine Insurrection who were discharged in the Philippine Islands"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4344. A bill to increase the allowances paid to certain enlisted men of the armed forces retired prior to July 1, 1942; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 4345. A bill to provide further benefits for certain employees of the United States who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for probational civil-service appointments by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States, and who, due to service-connected disabilities, are unable to perform the duties of the positions in the field service of the Post Office Department for which examinations were taken; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. Res. 324. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to have printed additional copies of hearings held before a special subcommittee relative to the agricultural and economic problems of the Cotton Belt; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa introduced a bill (H. R. 4346) for the relief of Charles Cowden Watson, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 24, 1947

(Legislative day of Wednesday, July 16, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Albert Joseph McCartney, D. D., minister emeritus, Covenant-First Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, who knowest the way that we take, we would commit ourselves again into Thy safe and holy keeping. Help us to remember that the steps of a good man are ordered of the Lord. Renew in us a sense of Thy presiding presence in this Chamber, as Thy servants address themselves to the crowded calendar of another day. If any of us are pressed down with some personal anxiety or private sorrow or distress of soul, encourage us to cast all our cares over upon Thee, Thou great burden bearer, that with freedom of spirit and release of care we may devote our thoughts and our energies to the public concerns.

These mercies we ask, with Thy blessing upon the President and the people of the United States, and Thy children throughout the world, in the name of Jesus. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the

Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 23, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which the concurrence of the Senate was requested:

H. R. 1341. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif.;

H. R. 3022. An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, gas, and sulfur on lands acquired by the United States;

H. R. 3546. An act to amend section 200 of Public Law 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, June 29, 1936, to permit recognition of officers and enlisted men retired from the military and naval forces of the United States as representatives of certain organizations in the presentation of claims to the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 3613. An act to amend sections 1802 (a), 1802 (b), and 3481 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 3682. An act to extend the period for providing assistance for certain war-incurred school enrollments;

H. R. 4308. An act to amend section 1 of the act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662), as amended, relating to the acceptance of decorations, orders, medals, and emblems by officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations, neutral nations, or other American Republics; and

H. J. Res. 218. Joint resolution providing for the representation of the Government and people of the United States in the observance of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Reading, Pa.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution to provide for the use of Schick General Hospital at Clinton, Iowa, for the Veterans' Administration; and

H. Con. Res. 110. Concurrent resolution relative to representation of the Congress at a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Bermuda in December 1947.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 981. An act to amend section 2 of the act of January 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 21), relating to the refund to taxes illegally paid by Indian citizens;

H. R. 2938. An act to amend section 1 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 497; 5 U. S. C., sec. 488), fixing the price of copies of records furnished by the Department of the Interior; and

H. R. 3191. An act to amend Public Law 301, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved February 18, 1946, so as to extend the benefits of the Missing Persons Act, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, to certain members of the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Under the order of the Senate of July 23, 1947,

Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4002) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, reported it on July 23, 1947, with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 710) thereon.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 3546. An act to amend section 200 of Public Law 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, June 29, 1936, to permit recognition of officers and enlisted men retired from the military and naval forces of the United States as representatives of certain organizations in the presentation of claims to the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3613. An act to amend sections 1802 (a), 1802 (b), and 3481 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code; and

H. R. 4308. An act to amend section 1 of the Act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662), as amended, relating to the acceptance of decorations, orders, medals, and emblems by officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations, neutral nations, or other American Republics; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 3682. An act to extend the period for providing assistance for certain war-incurred school enrollments; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. J. Res. 218. Joint resolution providing for the representation of the Government and people of the United States in the observance of the two-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Reading, Pa.; to the Committee on Rules.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR (S. DOC. NO. 97)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Labor, amounting to $25,900, fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 98)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate for the Federal Works Agency, amounting to $5,000,000, fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON STOCK PILING

A letter from the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to section 4 of Public Law 520, Seventy-ninth Congress, a confidential report with respect to stock piling between January 1 and June 30, 1947, and stating "This report is supplementary to our report dated January 23, 1947, which covered activities up to December 31, 1946" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from S. P. Spalding, major general, United States Army, deputy executive chairman (Army), and R. W. Paine, rear admiral, United States Navy, deputy executive chairman (Navy), Army and Navy Munitions Board, advising that copies of a supplement to the confidential report on stock piling, transmitted to the Senate today by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, are available for distribution; to the Committee on Armed Services.

LEGISLATION PASSED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, AND ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Councils of St. Thomas and St. John, and St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

PRICE-MINUS CONTRACTS BETWEEN MARITIME COMMISSION AND FROEMMING BROS., INC.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report concerning the conversion of two price-minus contracts between the United States Maritime Commission and Froemming Bros., Inc., to a selective-price contract (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

CONTRACTS ENTERED INTO OR MODIFIED BY UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, reporting that no contracts were entered into or modified under authority of Public Law 46 during the period beginning April 1, 1947, and ended June 30, 1947; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPEAL OR MODIFICATION OF ORDER OF EVICTION BY NATIONAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the mayor and common council of the city of New Britain, Conn., favoring repeal or modification of the order of eviction recently adopted by the National Housing Authority.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW BRITAIN, CONN., *July 22, 1947.*

Senator BRIEN MCMAHON,
United States Senator.

DEAR SIR: Your attention is called to the following resolution, accepted and adopted by the common council at its meeting held Wednesday evening, July 16, 1947:

"To His Honor, the mayor, and the Common Council of the City of New Britain:

"The undersigned beg leave to recommend the adoption of the following:

"That the Common Council of the City of New Britain appeals to the Congress of the United States to use its good offices and its authority to cause the National Housing Authority to repeal or modify its order of eviction, at least until it can be shown that housing facilities will be available to those who no longer qualify due to their increased earnings.

"FRANK E. ZAPATKA,
"VINCENT M. HAYES,
"ERNEST J. SPEZIALE,
"VINCENT KOTOWSKI,
"MATHEW J. AVITABILE,
"STANLEY SADOWSKY."

Attest:

H. E. SCHEUY,
Town and City Clerk

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 479. A bill relating to the income-tax liability of members of the armed forces dying in the service; with an amendment (Rept. No. 711);

H. R. 3546. A bill to amend section 200 of Public Law 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, June 29, 1936, to permit recognition of officers and enlisted men retired from the military and naval forces of the United States as representatives of certain organizations in the presentation of claims to the Veterans' Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 712);

H. R. 3613. A bill to amend sections 1802 (a), 1802 (b), and 3481 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 713); and

H. R. 4257. A bill to provide an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses; without amendment (Rept. No. 714).

By Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. 1602. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 741); and

H. R. 3862. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to grant and convey to Montgomery County, Pa., a certain parcel of land of the United States in Norristown Borough, Montgomery County, Pa., for the purpose of erecting an additional annex to the present courthouse; without amendment (Rept. No. 715).

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Public Lands:

S. 1696. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 784), so as to extend the jurisdiction of the United States District Court, Territory of Hawaii, over Canton and Enderbury Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 743);

H. R. 3395. A bill to add certain lands to the Modoc National Forest, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 716);

H. R. 3874. A bill to authorize the city of Pierre, S. Dak., to transfer Farm Island to the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept No. 744); and

S. J. Res. 110. Joint resolution to provide for the relocation of the McMillan Fountain; without amendment (Rept. No. 745).

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 452. A bill to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act relating to marketing agreements and orders; without amendment (Rept. No. 717);

H. R. 1826. A bill making it a petty offense to enter any national-forest land while it is closed to the public; without amendment (Rept. No. 718);

H. R. 4110. A bill to amend title I of the act entitled "An act to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work and the more complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges," approved June 29, 1935 (the Bankhead-Jones Act); without amendment (Rept. No. 719); and

H. R. 4124. A bill to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 720).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Civil Service:

S. 1082. A bill to credit certain service performed by employees of the postal service who are transferred from one position to another within the service for purposes of determining eligibility for promotion; with an amendment (Rept. No. 721).

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. R. 2776. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 722).

By Mr. BROOKS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution establishing a joint committee to investigate high prices of consumer goods; with an additional amendment;

S. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution establishing a joint committee to investigate the entire housing field; with additional amendments;

S. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution authorizing attendance of Members of Congress at a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association in the Bahamas beginning December 28, 1947; without amendment;

S. Res. 120. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary, in making investigations under section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to employ temporary assistants and make certain expenditures; with amendments;

S. Res. 147. Resolution authorizing a study of agricultural legislation, and of trends, needs, and problems of agriculture; with additional amendments;

S. Res. 148. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Lands to hold hearings at such times and places it may deem advisable; without amendment;

S. Res. 152. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to make additional expenditures and employ temporary assistants; with an amendment; and

S. Res. 153. Resolution extending the authority and increasing the limit of expenditures of the Special Committee To Study the Problems of American Small Business Enterprises; without amendment.

By Mr. McGRATH, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 1736. A bill for the relief of O. Dean Settles and Mrs. Ruth E. Settles, husband and wife; Mrs. Ruth E. Settles, individually; the estate of Ora H. Hatfield; and Mrs. Kittie B. Hatfield; without amendment (Rept. No. 727).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 641. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Roberta Flake Clayton; without amendment (Rept. No. 723);

S. 1235. A bill for the relief of Merchants Motor Freight; without amendment (Rept. No. 726);

S. 1707. A bill to carry into effect certain parts relating to patents of the treaties of peace with Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania, ratified by the Senate on June 5, 1947, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 728);

H. R. 618. A bill for the relief of Fred O. Donohue; without amendment (Rept. No. 724);

H. R. 642. A bill for the relief of Frank F. Miles; without amendment (Rept. No. 729);

H. R. 1085. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Salamone; without amendment (Rept. No. 730);

H. R. 1316. A bill for the relief of Archer C. Gunter; without amendment (Rept. No. 725);

H. R. 1534. A bill for the relief of Graff, Washbourne & Dunn; without amendment (Rept. No. 738);

H. R. 1648. A bill for the relief of Willie P. Goodwin, J. M. Thorud, and W. H. Stokley; without amendment (Rept. No. 731);

H. R. 1730. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Beulah Hart; without amendment (Rept. No. 739);

H. R. 1791. A bill for the relief of Dr. Theodore A. Geissman; without amendment (Rept. No. 732);

H. R. 1810. A bill to amend the Criminal Code and certain other legislation to permit part-time referees in bankruptcy to act as agents or attorneys for claimants against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 733);

H. R. 2432. A bill for the relief of Harry V. Ball; without amendment (Rept. No. 734); and

H. R. 2534. A bill for the relief of James H. Underwood; without amendment (Rept. No. 735).

H. R. 2811. A bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, former Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 736); and

H. R. 3845. A bill for the relief of George J. Hiner; without amendment (Rept. No. 737).

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. R. 4010. A bill to authorize the Treasury Department and the United States Government Printing Office to furnish, or to procure and furnish, administrative materials, supplies, and equipment to public international organizations on a reimbursable basis; without amendment.

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Civil Service:

H. R. 4127. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 746).

By Mr. REVERCOMB, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. 1529. A bill to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Shawneetown, Ill.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 740); and

H. R. 4111. A bill authorizing the construction of flood-control works on the Little Sioux River and its tributaries in Iowa; without amendment (Rept. No. 742).

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I ask unanimous consent to report an original bill, to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and I submit a report (No. 747) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 1720) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, was received, read twice by its title, and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE UNDER LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I ask unanimous consent to report an original resolution, and request that it be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report and resolution will be received, and the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 156) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund

of the Senate, during the Eightieth Congress, $25,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

S. 1708. A bill for the relief of Demise Simone Boutant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1709. A bill to provide for full and fair hearings before deportation or removal of persons now or hereafter interned under the provisions of the act of July 6, 1798 (1 Stat. 577), as amended, relating to alien enemies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1710. A bill to permit the naturalization of Pete James Andrew; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 1711. A bill for the relief of Anthony Demetrios Pashalis, also known as Antonio Pashalis;

S. 1712. A bill for the relief of Spiros Harry Kefalas; and

S. 1713. A bill for the relief of Charalambos G. Kaminaris, also known as Harry G. Toulatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. CHAVEZ) introduced Senate bill 1714, to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of mothers and children and for services to crippled children, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 1715. A bill for the relief of Archie Hamilton and Delbert Hamilton;

S. 1716. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Iola Veach; and

S. 1717. A bill for the relief of the Estate of William R. Stigall, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MURRAY introduced the following bills which were referred, as indicated, and appear under a separate heading:

S. 1718. A bill to promote the equitable distribution of available newsprint to the end that large, small, and new publishing enterprises shall not be unduly handicapped during this period of newsprint shortage; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1719. A bill establishing an Alaska Industrial Commission to plan for the balanced and integrated development of the industrial, agricultural, commercial, recreational, hydroelectric power, transportation, and communication potentialities of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.)

(Mr. MAGNUSON introduced Senate bill 1721, conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of injuries sustained by G. R. Below, late of Seattle, Wash., which was considered, read the third time, and passed, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BYRD (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia):

S. 1722. A bill to provide for State and local taxation of real estate in Arlington County, Va., owned by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GURNEY (by request):

S. 1723. A bill to amend Public Law 168, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, an act to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy to be given to not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics, other than the United States; and

S. 1724. A bill to amend Public Law 447, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, an act to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Military Academy to be given to not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics, other than the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. MURRAY introduced Senate Joint Resolution 153, to provide for consideration by the United Nations Organization of the international aspects of the woodpulp and newsprint shortages; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appears under a separate heading.)

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH BILL

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of mothers and children and for services to crippled children, and for other services. I request that a statement by me dealing with the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Florida will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1714) to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of mothers and children and for services to crippled children, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. CHAVEZ), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. PEPPER was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR CLAUDE PEPPER, OF FLORIDA, ON MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH BILL

A bill to save the lives of mothers during maternity and to give children the best possible health care from birth and throughout their growing years was introduced today by Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, Democrat, Florida, in behalf of himself and Senators JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, Montana; ROBERT F. WAGNER, Democrat, New York; GLEN H. TAYLOR, Democrat, Idaho; and DENNIS CHAVEZ, Democrat, New Mexico.

This bill is similar to the Maternal and Child Welfare Act of 1945, introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress by Senator PEPPER and nine other Senators. This new measure would give the States and Territories the necessary Federal assistance to bring good health services within reach of great numbers of mothers and children who are in urgent need of them. Senator PEPPER's present bill incorporates a series of amendments recommended by physicians, dentists, and representatives of national organizations at hearings held on the 1945 bill.

Under the provisions of the Pepper bill, the Federal Government's grants to the States for maternal and child-health services would be $20,000,000 for the first year, and $30,000,000 for each of the second and third years. For services for crippled children there would be $15,000,000 for the first year and $20,000,000 for each of the second and third years. Thereafter, the Congress would fix appropriations according to the amounts needed to carry out the purposes of the act.

The planning, direction, and control of all maternal and child-health services, financially aided by the Federal Government, would be completely in the hands of the States and communities. The Federal Government would define standards under which Federal grants would be made to the States, and provide technical counsel, when called upon, on the developments of State and local programs.

"The last Congress," Senator PEPPER said in introducing his bill, "was urged to face its responsibility for the well-being of the mothers and children of the Nation. It met that challenge by merely adding $9,000,000 to the meager social-security grants made annually to the States for child-health services and services for crippled children.

"With the technical knowledge and skills we now have, and the great capacity of our people to produce the national income required to support public services, it is unthinkable that any child should be condemned, as many thousands are now, to grow up in the pain and humiliation of handicaps that could have been corrected or relieved."

Provisions of this bill, Senator PEPPER pointed out, have been carefully planned to fit constructively into a general health program for all the people. "National health insurance is the cornerstone of such a general program," he said. "Enactment of national health insurance is an absolute must. But it is not enough merely to pool the risks and costs of medical care. We must also be sure that the health services and medical care mothers and children need exist. They must be well organized and coordinated and within reach of any family needing them. They must measure up to good standards and be provided by professional workers adequately trained and compensated.

"It takes time to train the necessary doctors, psychiatrists, psychologists, nurses, medical-social workers, and other skilled people required in a well-rounded program. It takes time to staff the clinics, health units, hospitals, and convalescent homes needed in a complete health program. This personnel and these services will exist years hence only if steps are taken now. Every year we turn our backs on the children will be a year of shame later."

Urging prompt action by the Congress on his measure, Senator PEPPER said: "The tragic file of mothers and children who now go without care has passed by the representatives of the American people year after year in the figures reported by the United States Children's Bureau and the national Commission advising that Bureau. I have nothing more to add to that solemn picture. I want to remind the Congress that 'each day debate goes on we lose 8 more mothers and 85 more babies needlessly.'"

NEWSPRINT SHORTAGE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference two bills and a joint resolution. They bear on a sacred American institution to which verbal homage has often been paid in this Chamber—the free press. I am proud to offer the Congress an opportunity to strike several real and telling blows for it.

One of the bills which I am here introducing will immediately help large, small, and new papers whose existence is now imperiled by the newsprint shortage.

The other bill and joint resolution are designed to begin immediate efforts in our own country and throughout the world to solve the long-range shortage of newsprint. This long-range shortage will be a sword hanging over free newspapers in every free country in the world for many years to come.

The studies made by the Small Business Committee of the Senate while I was chairman and the hearings conducted by the present subcommittee under the chairmanship of the junior Senator from Indiana, both established the compelling need for this legislation. The majority members of the present committee have recognized this need in their interim report. I must, in all honesty, say I do not believe the bill which they have introduced (S. 1080) will solve this difficult problem. The reasons are set out in the report of the minority members.

The roots of the present newsprint crisis were laid bare by witness after witness who appeared before the committee. First, there is a world-wide shortage of newsprint because of wartime destruction of forests and productive facilities, and because of increasing demands on the available supply. These demands stem from the diffusion of literacy and learning, and the hunger for information and truth which they produce. A contributing factor is the conversion of newsprint to other more profitable types of paper used in producing books, magazines, wrapping papers, and cartons.

Two further factors intensify the perilous newsprint shortage. One is an international maldistribution of this precious commodity. The other is the maldistribution in our own land. As a matter of honest fact, it is not true that there is a shortage of newsprint in the United States. We are getting more than we have ever had in the past. Our share of the world's supply is actually so large that it is not surprising that there have been expressions of resentment in countries whose papers have been pinched by shortages until they are in desperate straits. The situation is especially dangerous now. At the very moment when demand is spiraling in newly literate nations, world production has been sharply cut.

But we cannot soothe ourselves with the delusion that this is a temporary situation. The United States with a population of 140,000,000 can consume more than 4,000,000 tons of newsprint each year. In troubled India a population of 400,000,000 is served by papers using a total of 30,000 tons. Yet that nation and others like it stands on the threshold of a new era of mass education.

It is no exaggeration to say that the future of the ideology of freedom and democracy everywhere in the world depends on our guaranteeing adequate supplies to those anxious to dedicate themselves to the building of a free, truthful, and responsible world press. These newly literate millions, and the millions liberated from the mental regimentation of Fascist tyranny must have a steady stream of truth and varied opinion. I am sure I do not need to remind the Senate that the doctrine of freedom of press, as well as our other freedoms, are being strongly challenged throughout the world. The very least we can do to prove our determination to see them prevail is to secure a supply of newsprint to free people everywhere.

I have proposed, therefore, that the Congress adopt a joint resolution requesting the President to direct our delegates to the United Nations to act. They should at once propose that a United Nations committee explore all aspects of the present and future world supply of and demands for newsprint.

America can, however, make a direct and immediate contribution of its own to the well-being of free newspapers everywhere. Perhaps the only great untapped forest reserve usable for newsprint production is in the Territory of Alaska. It is, indeed, ironic that this should be so. For 80 years the vast riches of that region, whose people are now asking for statehood, have been exploited and removed from it. Now that we and the rest of the world are in dire need of more newsprint, we must more than ever turn our attention to the industrial development of the Territory. It has been estimated that Alaskan forest resources can provide one-fourth of the annual newsprint requirements of the United States. But a newsprint industry in Alaska cannot be pulled out of a hat. It will not be set up in a secure, constructive fashion if we conceive of it as a problem in contract law between the Departments of Interior and Agriculture, and private business.

A secure newsprint industry in Alaska demands the up-building of the Territory in every way. Power production facilities must be vastly expanded. Transportation must be made economical and efficient. Working conditions and community life must be made attractive enough to appeal to thousands of skilled American workers. If we try to establish a newsprint industry piecemeal we will do irreparable damage to a great national heritage. A new Alaskan newsprint industry must provide the wedge to industrialize the Territory and to move it forward toward a goal of full, efficient utilization of resources.

I have, therefore, proposed the establishment of an Alaskan Industrial Commission with 21 members representing Government agencies and private-citizen groups in the Territory. Within 1 year this Commission is to complete a survey of the economic life of the Territory and of the organization of its government. Its report should contain recommendations to the President, the Congress, and the Territorial legislature to speedily enrich Alaska and the United States. Only such a plan, in which the building of the newsprint industry becomes a focal part of an integrated approach, will be fair to the Territory and to our own future.

But the most urgent need of all is to remedy the ominous maldistribution of the gigantic quantity of newsprint now being consumed in the United States. No one denies that there is such a maldistribution. There are some incredibly cold-blooded, blind commentators who talk of it as temporary or unimportant or inevitable. It is none of those. It results fundamentally from efforts of the publishers of the giant press in America to corral as much newsprint as they can for their own use. They are trying to cash in on a flood of advertising and circulation released by the resumption of consumer-goods production. Some newsprint has been diverted to meet the insatiable needs of the mass magazine. More and more newsprint is tied up in long-range direct contracts between mills and large consumers. There is an apparent trend for publishers to acquire their own mill, and even forest, facilities.

There are more than 25,000 publications which are entitled to use the second-class mailing privilege. Yet 525 metropolitan daily papers which report to the American Newspaper Publishers Association undoubtedly swallowed the bulk of the increase in newsprint supplied, by increasing their tonnage use 27.7 percent in 1946 over 1945. One witness before the Subcommittee on Newsprint testified that 200 dailies use more than 68 percent of the total newsprint consumed. At the other end, 9,000 weeklies, semiweeklies, and triweeklies used 2 percent of the total newsprint. We have heard witness after witness representing middle-sized and small dailies, business papers, community weeklies, veterans' papers, religious papers, fraternal and trade-union papers. Uniformly, they report that they and their colleagues are having an impossible time finding enough newsprint to stay in business, much less to increase their circulation or their advertising to meet rising demand and rising costs.

These thousands upon thousands of publishers representing hundreds of diverse interests and viewpoints represent one of the real justifications for our freedom of the press. These publishers are justifiably angered and resentful at their present predicament. They see their giant metropolitan competitors expanding without limit, taking their readers, taking their advertising. And all the time the small publisher must spend valuable time and money frantically seeking a few odd mill ends and scraps of paper. While he must refuse 2-inch advertisements for lack of space, his metropolitan competitors and neighbors print lush vacation supplements. While he must sacrifice attractiveness and fullness of coverage to print a paper at all, he sees his giant competitors printing advertisements which consist of a few lines of type surrounded by a full page of white space. Small publishers are resentful, and properly so, at the narrow view of the big business trade associations which will consider a newspaper only if it appears every day and represents an investment running into the millions. These weekly and special publications, as well as the small dailies, need our assistance and need it quickly. A free, competitive market in the newsprint industry is a myth whose only function is to decorate the speeches of big business apologists. Those who dominate the industries involved could long ago have solved this problem fairly and easily. But they were too shortsighted, undisciplined and greedy to do so. This is now

a vital matter affecting the public interest very directly. It is up to Congress to act.

I have here proposed the establishment of a Newsprint Emergency Administration in the Department of Commerce. It would be composed of representatives of all of the segments of the industries involved. It would issue certificates of approval to all users of newsprint. These certificates would enable all users to acquire enough newsprint to operate at a minimum economic rate. But in no case could any user consume more than 120 percent of the amount which he used during the third quarter of 1945. New publications would also be issued such certificates provided that their bona fide character were established to the satisfaction of the Newsprint Emergency Administration. The Commodity Credit Corporation would be directed to purchase newsprint at prevailing market prices from domestic or foreign sources. The total amount which it could purchase could not exceed 5 percent of the volume of newsprint consumed in 1946.

This 5 percent would be enough to take care of the thousands upon thousands of new, small and group publications which contribute so vigorously and richly to our stream of information and ideas.

All three of these measures are essential to the maintenance and expansion of the freedom of the press at home and abroad. The shortage and maldistribution of newsprint must be attacked on all three fronts. First we must take the dreadful load of newsprint maldistribution from the backs of our small publishers. Then we must begin the solution of the world-wide distribution and shortage problem through appropriate action by the United Nations. And we must take steps now to strengthen and build Alaska's economy, so that it can support a new newsprint industry. I urge that this legislation be given a high priority and that we act upon it in the Eightieth Congress.

There being no objection, the bills and joint resolution, introduced by Mr. MURRAY, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred, as follows.

S. 1718. A bill to promote the equitable distribution of available newsprint to the end that large, small, and new publishing enterprises shall not be unduly handicapped during this period of newsprint shortage; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1719. A bill establishing an Alaska Industrial Commission to plan for the balanced and integrated development of the industrial, agricultural, commercial, recreational, hydroelectric power, transportation and communication potentialities of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. J. Res. 153. Joint resolution to provide for consideration by the United Nations Organization of the international aspects of the woodpulp and newsprint shortages; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

INVESTIGATION OF DISPLACED-PERSONS PROBLEM

Mr. SMITH submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 30), which was ordered to lie on the table:

Whereas there are reported to be in the western occupied zones of Germany and Austria approximately 1,000,000 displaced persons who were taken from their homes for forced labor by the German armies during the war or have since fled into these areas from persecution and who are reported to be unwilling to return to the eastern European and Baltic areas where they formerly lived, by reason of their fear of persecution on grounds of race, religion, or by reason of their opposition to the political and economic systems now prevailing in those areas; and

Whereas it is against the policy of the United States under such circumstances to forcibly repatriate such persons; their continued support in these occupied areas is a financial burden to the United States and condemns them to a protracted life of uncertainty and hopelessness; and to discontinue their support and leave them in the occupied areas would be to place them in the hands of the people whose victims they were; and

Whereas the only other suggested solution to the problem is to resettle them in friendly countries who are willing and able to receive them: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the United States (the House of Representatives concurring), That a special joint committee of 10 persons, 5 Members of the Senate to be selected by the President pro tempore, and 5 Members of the House of Representatives to be selected by the Speaker, shall be constituted and authorized to inform itself thoroughly as to all aspects of the displaced persons problem with a view to determining the practicability of securing, and aiding in, the resettlement of these displaced persons in friendly countries and whether and to what extent it may be deemed desirable and in the interest of the United States and its foreign policy to admit a reasonable number of such persons as nonquota immigrants to the United States under the present safeguards of the immigration laws of the United States and such other safeguards as may be deemed appropriate or what other measures should be adopted or policies should be pursued.

SEC. 2. The special joint committee shall report its findings and recommendations to the Congress on the date of its reconvening.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of this resolution, the special joint committee is authorized to proceed to Germany and Austria and to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems desirable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent funds of the Senate and House of Representatives upon vouchers approved by the committee or its chairman.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS—AMENDMENT

Mr. TYDINGS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1675) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AVAILABILITY OF SURPLUS ATHLETIC EQUIPMENT FOR YOUTHS — AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1302) to aid the associations, groups, organizations, and institutions encouraging participation of the youth of the country in athletic and sports programs by making surplus athletic equipment available to such associations, groups, organizations, and institutions, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed.

PRINTING OF SECOND SEMIANNUAL REPORT OF UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 96)

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, yesterday the United States Atomic Energy Commission filed its second semiannual report with the Presiding Officer of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

INVESTIGATION OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE IN CONNECTION WITH ALLEGED ELECTION FRAUDS IN MISSOURI

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington continues to be concerned and distressed that Senate Resolution 150, submitted by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], appears to be pigeonholed. My associates across the aisle in my opinion do not serve Attorney General Clark well by opposing the resolution. It is my private opinion that Mr. Clark wants an investigation. I believe he is the victim of political pressures. This is shown not only by his silence as the investigation is being and has been debated, but by his whole demeanor during the Kansas City election scandals, and since they were first revealed. Perhaps the Attorney General may have committed the error of placing personal loyalty above duty, but certainly as an American and as a Texan he will wish history to treat his name and his tenure with the merit they deserve.

FLOOD CONTROL AND RIVER BASIN RESOURCES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD two editorials which ably discuss the subject of flood control and river basin resources development.

In the Chattanooga Times of Friday, July 18, 1947, the editor pointedly raises the question of a Missouri Valley Authority, Eventually, Why Not Now? In this editorial the New York Times endorsement of the MVA bill is repeated and elaborated upon. It is clear to anyone making a careful study and honest appraisal of the history of flood control that the piecemeal approach to river basin development is outmoded. That way of dealing with the problem does not even result in reasonably effective flood control, and fails entirely to prevent disastrous floods, as the long experience on the Missouri-Mississippi amply demonstrates.

Yet, by contrast, witness the accomplishment of only 10 years' effort on the Tennessee River. That rampaging destructive river has been brought under full control. In fact, during the recent, most destructive of floods along the main stream of the Mississippi, no flood waters from the Tennessee were added to the flood crests. On the contrary, that river and its tributaries were tranquilly doing the bidding of man, carrying the freight traffic, generating the power, holding back water for irrigation, and performing all those tasks set by the TVA for the river to do.

Mr. President, the prevention of floods and the development of the great resources of the Missouri Valley and the

upper Mississippi are not local or sectional matters at all. For they affect the well-being of all people in this country who are producers and consumers of our agricultural products and our industrial output. That is why I speak on this subject of a valley authority approach which will provide the means for unified river-basin development. The editorial in this morning's Washington Post, MVA or Not, points up this fact. It suggests that the difference between the piecemeal methods of flood contro' and unified river-basin development is the difference between merely appeasing floods and preventing them. As the Post so pithily remarks, "The Missouri Valley Authority bill recently reintroduced by Senator MURRAY would accomplish such control over one of the most unruly and destructive of our remaining unharnessed streams. For proof of the effectiveness of a similar plan, one need only look at the Tennessee Valley where the TVA has virtually wiped out floods while improving farm conditions. We cannot afford to stall much longer. Whatever the cost of MVA, it would be only a fraction of the cost of having our bread basket laid bare."

Mr. President, I offer these two editorials for inclusion in the RECORD.

There being no objection the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chattanooga Times of July 18, 1947]

EVENTUALLY, WHY NOT NOW?

Mr. Truman's flood-control message was one of his most important, as the central valley which has suffered a $500,000 loss this summer can testify. But Congress is disposed to do nothing about it.

Representative TABER, head of the Appropriations Committee, says: "The next thing you know, they'll be talking about a Missouri Valley Authority."

Well, that is what they are already talking about. A hundred years of failure in flood-control work on the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers shows the need of a new system there. The success in the Tennessee Valley shows the new system will work.

The New York Times had a particularly effective editorial last Saturday strongly urging a Missouri Valley Authority. First, it terms the congressional determination to cut flood-control funds to the limit as "niggardliness." And the Times says: "But the spending of money on rivers for single purposes, such as the control of floods, has been rendered obsolete by the success of the Tennessee Valley Authority."

And the Times adds: "Multiple-purpose river engineering is the modern thing, and since we cannot safely turn over a whole great river valley to a single private enterprise we are compelled to invoke the powers of the Federal Government. This has been done in the Tennessee Valley with all due respect for local autonomy and for private business. There is no reason why it should not be done in the vaster and more complicated arena of the Missouri Valley. This is the purpose of the Murray bill, creating a Missouri Valley Authority, to which President Truman gave his warm endorsement on Thursday."

The Murray bill, which is endorsed by the New York Times and which was introduced by the senior Senator from Montana, is modeled on the TVA Act. It would create a three-man board, as in the case of the TVA, to develop and carry out the MVA. The bill mentions flood control, reclamation, and irrigation, industrial expansion, power, navigation, recreation, and the protection of wildlife in the order named.

The New York Times concludes: "It is hard to see how the river can finally be controlled and used if private power companies and several Government agencies each has a vote—and a veto. The lesson of TVA is that private enterprise does not suffer from abundant power, flood control, and conservation. Indeed, the Tennessee Valley today hums with private enterprise, both big and little. The Missouri Valley may be too big, and in places too arid, to hum. But it can get ahead if it has an MVA to attend to the matter."

That is practical logic. It is true that in the present confused political atmosphere in Washington practical logic is scarcely ever adopted.

The Missouri-Mississippi Valley has had three disastrous floods in 4 years and there may be another next year. But whether there is or not, the memory of the $500,000,000 loss this year, the memory of great crops ruined, will still be fresh, and flood control in a practical manner, which means in the TVA manner, will be an important issue in the Middle West.

Already in the Mississippi Valley many were echoing yesterday the words of a St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorial: "How long will it take America to learn a lesson that all can see in the Tennessee Valley? What are we waiting for?"

[From the Washington Post of July 21, 1947]

MVA OR NOT

The difference between President Truman's flood-check program and genuine control is the difference between merely appeasing floods and preventing them. Though not with the same motives, we agree with congressional critics of Mr. Truman's $250,000,000 plan who term it "scatterfire" and "poorly conceived." For the plan does not go nearly far enough. In calling for the bulk of the money to go into the Army scheme of building large dams alone without parallel measures in the hinterland itself, Mr. Truman's plan gets at the effect rather than the cause of floods. Any idea that such a program is the answer to the flood problem is bound to prove illusory.

President Truman missed a golden opportunity, we think, to come out as strongly as he knew how for the broad framework of a Missouri Valley Authority. The MVA would include not only a system of dams, but, even more important, the vital educational and soil-conservation work on farms and control measures on the smallest tributaries in the hills to check water run-off before floods developed. To be sure, Mr. Truman endorsed MVA earlier and supported it by implication in his flood-control message. But this is a situation in which there is utterly no point in asking for mere palliatives when the basic need will remain unfulfilled.

Disastrous floods and erosion in the Middle West should have mellowed a substantial part of the resistance there to a Missouri Valley Authority. A good look by Congress at the damage should have a similar effect on Capitol Hill. Aside from the suffering caused by inundation of cities and farms, thousands of tons of priceless top soil in Iowa and other States has been washed away forever. This greatest of our national assets is not inexhaustible, though it is irreplaceable. We have coasted too long with the apathetic feeling that because there always has been abundance there always will be. The sad fact is that through run-off we have been losing 500,000 acres of our richest farm land a year.

The present destruction is handwriting on the wall of what will come if control measures are not taken soon on a broad scale. Soil erosion, once begun, carries out its devastation with startling rapidity. Individual soil-conservation and flood-control measures, though helpful, are not enough. What is needed is an integrated program of great magnitude encompassing not only a system of river dams, but also controls over tributaries and conservation practices generally. The Missouri Valley Authority bill recently reintroduced by Senator MURRAY would accomplish such control over one of the most unruly and destructive of our remaining unharnessed streams. For proof of the effectiveness of a similar plan, one need only look at the Tennessee Valley where the TVA has virtually wiped out floods while improving farm conditions. We cannot afford to stall much longer. Whatever the cost of MVA, it would be only a fraction of the cost of having our bread basket laid bare.

THE MARSHALL PLAN—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BARKLEY

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the Marshall plan delivered by him on July 18, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

CASHING OF TERMINAL-LEAVE BONDS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MYERS AND EDITORIAL

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued by him in introducing a bill to raise from 2½ to 6 percent the interest accruing on uncashed terminal-leave bonds of veterans, together with an editorial entitled "Keep the Bonds," from the Pittsburgh Press of July 21, 1947, which appear in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by the Renovo (Pa.) Daily Record, and his reply thereto, together with an article by Sumner Welles, all relating to proposed amendment of the United Nations Charter, which appear in the Appendix.]

FAIR PRICES—AMERICA'S BIG PROBLEM—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him, entitled "Fair Prices—America's Big Problem" and an article published in the Christian Science Monitor of July 22, 1947, on the subject of Labor Monopoly, which appear in the Appendix.]

COMMISSION ON REORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from a syndicated article by Joseph and Stewart Alsop entitled "The 100-to-1 Shot," discussing the so-called Lodge-Brown bill for a commission to reorganize the executive branch of the Government, published under date of July 4, which appears in the Appendix.]

INVESTIGATION OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE IN CONNECTION WITH ALLEGED KANSAS CITY ELECTION FRAUDS

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Last Chance," written by Frank C. Waldrop and published in the Washington Times-Herald of July 23, 1947, and an article from the New York Times of today written by Arthur Krock, on the subject of the inaction of the Department of Justice in connection with the Kansas City vote frauds, which appear in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED CURTAILMENT IN NATURAL GAS IN FORT DODGE, IOWA

[Mr. HICKENLOOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter to him from Edward Breen, manager of the Northwest Broadcasting Co. of Fort Dodge, Iowa, together with extracts from a broadcast from Station KVFD on July 17, 1947,

relating to a proposed curtailment in natural gas in Fort Dodge, Iowa, which appear in the Appendix.]

A SUMMARY OF FLORIDA ARCHEOLOGY

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Summary of Florida Archeology," delivered by John W. Griffin, archeologist of the Florida Park Service, before the Jacksonville Historical Society, on February 12, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY WILSON W. WYATT BEFORE AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Wilson W. Wyatt, national chairman of Americans for Democratic Action, before the American Veterans Committee dinner at Chicago, July 18, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY BURGIN DASSETT TO TENNESSEE CONVENTION OF AMERICAN LEGION

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Burgin Dassett, commissioner of education of Tennessee, before the Tennessee Convention of the American Legion at Memphis, on July 21, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR DEBT TO TVA—EDITORIAL FROM THE DENVER POST

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Debt to TVA," published in the Denver Post, July 11, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

TAX REDUCTION—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement which he had prepared on the subject of tax reduction, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSOLIDATION OF GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement with respect to the pending resolution, providing for a single appropriation bill, together with certain letters from Governors of States regarding such legislation.

There being no objection, the statement and the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD ON CONSOLIDATED APPROPRIATION BILL AS PROVIDED IN SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 6

The Federal Government of the United States, measured by any yardstick, is the biggest thing ever created by man, and by this token its expenditures are unexcelled anywhere on earth.

Prior to World War I the Government's tremendous programs, projects, and expenditures as we know them today were not even in the realm of imagination. In the absence of bigness at that time, the differences between Federal appropriations and expenditures were small and inconsequential. Intelligent, comprehensive, and detailed analysis and consideration of appropriation legislation were matters which required no special facilities.

The first complexities of big government began to manifest themselves during the First World War, and not long after that the present facilities for budget information and planning were established under the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, which also reorganized the system of accounting for Federal expenditures.

Whether the maximum usefulness of the Budget Bureau and the General Accounting Office has been achieved may be questioned by some, but the act did recognize the growing magnitude of Federal fiscal problems and the need for machinery to provide for more orderly and intelligent consideration of appropriations made by Congress and the expenditures made against them.

Perhaps present facilities would have been more adequate under more normal conditions, but when the depression came in the thirties the Federal Government really got into big projects and programs designed for big government spending over periods exceeding any one appropriation year. Then World War II came and appropriations, including those inaugurating projects and programs requiring expenditures over long periods, grew beyond any previous conception.

As the already huge expenditures and appropriations became greater and greater for almost every Federal agency, the budget was becoming more and more mammoth, its presentation was becoming more and more complicated, its analysis was becoming more and more difficult and confusing, and it was becoming more and more nearly impossible for Members of Congress to inform themselves sufficiently on its contents to vote intelligently on appropriation bills.

The Congress as a whole, choked with emergency and policy legislation and other urgent matters, necessarily had to depend upon the appropriation and revenue committees to protect the credit of the country. The action by the committees was not coordinated, and the Appropriations Committees, in order to expedite the handling of the budget, by custom have been breaking it up into 12 separate regular supply bills, each assigned to a different subcommittee. The subcommittees have been conducting their own hearings, and for all intents and purposes they have been assuming responsibility for appropriation recommendations to the respective Houses.

This practice in itself is not particularly a matter to be criticized, but as these bills are taken up separately, over a period of nearly 6 months, it may be truthfully said that the Congress for years has not known how much it was appropriating nor how much, by its own acts, it was allowing to be spent in any one year. Not only has there been a lack of machinery for coordination between the appropriating and taxing committees, but it is doubtful that the Appropriations Committees proceeded to their tasks with any over-all budget total in view. If they did it is not recalled that either House of Congress has been advised of the figures before the effort was made in this direction this year.

The situation was partially recognized by the Reorganization Act of last year. After a year's experience, it appears that the legislative budget provided for in section 138 is one of the few good features of that act. And this has failed because of the lack of the means to develop necessary information on appropriations and expenditures.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 6 would provide means not only for producing the information, but also for a more orderly and intelligent appropriation action.

With or without the Legislative Reorganization Act and its section 138, Senate Concurrent Resolution 6 is extremely desirable and in fact necessary to intelligent appropriation legislation.

NATURE AND PURPOSES

In short Senate Concurrent Resolution 6 is in the nature of an amendment to the joint rule of the Senate and the House of Representatives contained in section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act (Public Law 601, 1946) to accomplish the following purposes:

1. Simplify and clarify Federal appropriation bills.

2. Enable Congress to comply more nearly with the clear requirement of section 138 of Public Law 601.

3. Enable the legislative branch of the Government to extend control over expenditures by means of more appropriate statutory limitations.

This would be accomplished, under the terms of the resolution, through:

1. Consolidation of all general appropriation measures into one general consolidated appropriation bill.

2. Statutory limitations on obligations against appropriations which would have the effect of controlling expenditures and keeping them within the revenue.

3. Show by means of an informative table in the reports of the respective Appropriations Committees and conference committees on appropriation bills an itemized estimate of annual expenditures.

ANALYSIS

1. The resolution amends the joint rule of the Senate and the House of Representatives—relating to the legislative budget—as contained in section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to accomplish its purposes.

2. Provisions of the resolution would be effective with the beginning of the second session of the Eightieth Congress next January.

3. The first principal purpose of the resolution is to provide for the consolidation of all regular appropriations in one general appropriation bill to be known as the Consolidated General Appropriation Act.

(a) Under terms of the resolution, the consolidated general appropriation bill may be divided into separate titles, each corresponding to one of the 12 regular general appropriation bills as heretofore enacted, and it would permit consideration of the consolidated bill by titles, at the subcommittee stage, without interruption of the present subcommittee organization of the respective Appropriations Committees, and subcommittee chairmen could manage the respective titles on the floor.

(b) Nothing in the resolution would preclude necessary deficiency and supplemental appropriation bills in addition to the consolidated bill, but a reduction in the number of such bills probably would result.

(c) In addition to the consolidated bill and supplemental and deficiency bills, the resolution provides also for private act appropriation bills and for appropriation rescission bills.

4. The second principal purpose of the resolution is to fix within the general consolidated appropriation bill—and supplemental and deficiency bills—limitation on funds available for obligation during the ensuing year with respect to appropriations which are available for more than 1 year. (In this connection the technicalities of the resolution have been worked out with the assistance of representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, the General Accounting Office, the Treasury Department, and the Legislative Drafting Counsel.)

(a) Carefully drawn language in the resolution is designed to provide that these limitations are not to be construed to—

Prohibit entry into over-all contracts which would extend beyond the year, providing the contracts do not allow for delivery of property or services during the ensuing fiscal year in excess of the limitation on obligations for the year.

Be applicable to appropriations made specifically for payment of claims certified by the Comptroller General.

Be applicable to appropriations for payment of judgments.

Be applicable to amounts appropriated under private acts of Congress.

Be applicable to appropriations for payment of interest on the public debt.

Be applicable to revolving funds or appropriations thereto.

5. The third principal purpose of the resolution is to provide Congress and the public with accessible information on annual expenditures by the Federal Government.

(a) This is accomplished by the provisions in the resolution requiring the respective Appropriations Committees and conference committees on appropriations bills to include in their reports informative tables itemizing available appropriations and estimating annual expenditures from the appropriation items with totals in each case. A similar table would be required showing Government corporations' checking-account transactions.

Both the limitation provisions and the informative table provisions exclude public debt retirement transactions and trust funds because debt retirement is paid largely out of surplus revenue, and trust funds do not represent Federal funds.

CRITICISM

As the resolution is reported to the Senate, it has been criticized on only three points of any consequence:

1. Length of time required by the Appropriations Committee and the respective Houses in consideration of a consolidated bill.

2. Necessity for the President to veto a bill containing all appropriations in the event he disapproved one or more items.

3. Tendency to increase log rolling.

With respect to the first point:

Both the committee and the sponsors take the position that with proper cooperation between the two Houses and their respective committees, the time requirement should be met. This might very well contemplate joint hearings, prior to passage of the bill in the House of Representatives, for detailed information purposes and justifications.

With respect to the second point:

The committee and the sponsors take the position that the difference in the desirability of the item veto for use in connection with a consolidated bill and for its use in connection with 12 bills is a matter of degree: That in view of controversial viewpoints on the constitutionality of the item veto, the subject should not be introduced in a resolution amending the rules; and also fewer vetoes should be expected since Congress has tightened up the rules prohibiting substantive legislation in appropriation bills.

With respect to the third point:

The committee and the sponsors take the position that log-rolling would be no greater than at present. Now members interested in an appropriation item protest reductions in one bill because reductions are not made in the others. With a consolidated bill, the tendency to log roll should be reduced because the total appropriation may be calculated at one time and seen in view of estimated revenue. This would be true more than ever if there were a legislative ceiling over appropriations and expenditures.

ADVANTAGES

The advantages of the one-appropriation bill are numerous, but a few of them may be summarized as follows:

1. It would bring together in one place at one time the expenditure and appropriation program of the Federal Government so that all items can be considered in their relative importance one to the other. This is impossible under the present system wherein appropriation and spending legislation is considered at 12 different times, in 12 separate and almost unrelated bills which are brought in over a period of up to 6 months.

2. It would give Congress and the country a chance to see the whole spending program of the Federal Government at one time, and it would give the Appropriations Committee a chance to see and study the same thing.

3. It would give the Appropriations Committees and the revenue committees, and the country a chance to see how the spending program compares with the tax program, and this is in the spirit of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

4. It would give a clear indication as to the extent to which the Government is committed to long-range spending projects.

5. It would provide a constant safeguard, even during actual consideration of the bill, against exceeding appropriation and expenditure ceilings.

6. It would extend legislative control over expenditures in the executive branch.

7. It would give a clear, concise, and current presentation not only of appropriations being made and the expenditures available, but also it would provide a running account of the approach to the appropriations and spending ceilings.

The advantages of the one appropriation bill technique are attested in letters from the governors of various States which have been using it.

GENERAL SUMMARY

By custom and tradition, appropriations for the world's greatest budget—that of the United States Government—are enacted in supply bills which are numerous, unrelated, and without legislative coordination in relation to the whole budget. These bills are brought in over a period of months and set up funds which actually may be expended not only in the ensuing year but in subsequent years as well.

In addition to the complexities which develop from this method of considering money bills, efforts to expand appropriation bills in their old form to provide for the tremendous growth and spread of Federal activities have developed a confusion of language and practices which only those who work in the drafting technicalities can understand.

It is no exaggeration to say that Congressmen who have not been privileged to serve on the Appropriations Committees have great difficulty in informing themselves sufficiently on appropriation bills to vote intelligently upon them. There is probably not a Member of Congress who does not wish for a clearer and more concise presentation of essential information. The present technique leaves much to be desired not only for intelligent consideration of the various appropriation items and their relation one to the other, but also for consideration of appropriations as a whole as compared with the revenue situation on the opposite side of the fiscal system.

With these conditions in view, the patrons of the pending resolution introduced a resolution for a single appropriation bill late last session. The measure was not perfected at that time but it served the purpose of stimulating thought on the subject. Meanwhile the legislative reorganization bill became law providing for legislative budget limitations in terms of both appropriations and expenditures. It was this provision which brought sharply into focus the difference between appropriations and expenditures—which is another confusing factor in the consideration of appropriation legislation.

Traditionally, both the President's budget recommendations and appropriation legislation have been in terms of appropriations. Prior to World War I appropriations for a fiscal year and expenditures during the year were virtually identical, but in these days of big Federal programs and projects, there is generally a vast difference between the two. When Congress this year tried to carry out the expenditure-ceiling provision of the Reorganization Act it found that, on the basis of the President's recommendations, estimated expenditures requested for the fiscal year 1948 totaled $37,500,000,000, while appropriations requested for expenditures in the same year totaled only $28,500,000,000. The difference was in money being brought forward for expenditure in 1948 which had been appropriated in prior years. At the same time it was revealed that Congress was being asked this year to appropriate $4,000,000,000 for actual expenditure in some year after 1948.

Under these circumstances, the patrons of the single appropriation resolution of last year revised and extended its objectives and with the assistance of the Government's fiscal experts perfected its provisions.

It is designed to give the Congress and the country better, clearer, more concise, and more intelligent appropriation legislation.

The proposal has been approved by Chairman STYLES BRIDGES, of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and indorsed by the late Director of the Budget, Harold Smith.

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Richmond, July 7, 1947.

Senator H. F. BYRD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I have your letter of July 3. In reply, I will say that the Commonwealth of Virginia has only one appropriation bill. In my opinion all appropriations should be included in one bill. The resolution introduced by yourself and Senator BUTLER, if adopted, will greatly improve governmental fiscal procedure, and promote soundness. In fact, I was amazed to learn from your letter that the national Congress has so many separate appropriation bills.

I very much hope that the resolution referred to in your letter will be promptly adopted.

With kindest regards and all good wishes, I am,

Yours most sincerely,

WM. M. TUCK.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Columbia, July 1, 1947.

The Honorable HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: Your letter of June 27 with a copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 6 attached has been received. I wish to inform you that South Carolina has one appropriation bill, and a deficiency bill which supplements the former. I feel that this procedure is definitely preferable to a number of bills. It facilitates analysis and expedites legislative consideration. It further provides a more convenient common source for information in reference to appropriations. If I can forward you any further information in regard to this matter, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

With kindest regards and best wishes,

Very truly,

J. STROM THURMOND,
Governor.

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Jackson, July 3, 1947.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of June 27, 1947, addressed to the Honorable Fielding L. Wright, Governor of Mississippi, which I am taking the liberty of answering for him due to his absence from the office.

Our appropriation bills are governed by constitution provisions and the Mississippi Constitution of 1890 provides, among other things, as follows:

Section 69. General appropriation bills shall contain only the appropriations to defray the ordinary expenses of the executive,

legislative, and judicial departments of the government; to pay interest on State bonds, and to support the common schools. All other appropriations shall be made by separate bills, each embracing but one subject. Legislation shall not be engrafted on appropriation bills, but the same may prescribe the conditions on which the money may be drawn, and for what purpose paid.

Section 63. No appropriation bill shall be passed by the legislature which does not fix definitely the maximum sum thereby authorized to be drawn from the treasury.

Section 64. No bill passed after the adoption of this constitution to make appropriations of money out of the State treasury shall continue in force more than 2 months after the expiration of the fiscal year ending after the meeting of the legislature at its next regular session; nor shall such bill be passed except by the votes of a majority of all members elected to each house of the legislature.

Section 73. The governor may veto parts of any appropriation bill, and approve parts of the same, and the portions approved shall be law.

I hope that the above sections will answer your inquiry, but if there is any further information you desire, please call on this office for the same.

Sincerely yours,

W. B. FONTAINE,
Executive Assistant.

STATE OF UTAH,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Salt Lake City, July 2, 1947.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of June 27. In reply thereto may I state it is the practice of the State of Utah for the Governor to make an itemized statement to each legislature of the anticipated revenue for the coming biennium. The Governor then recommends to the legislature appropriations for each of the departments and agencies of the State, the sum total of which shall not exceed the total of the estimated income. The legislature, through committees, considers the recommendations of the Governor and passes one appropriation bill covering all departments. The amount appropriated is always well within the total estimated income. As a result of this practice the Utah budget is always balanced.

I commend you most highly on the resolution, a copy of which was enclosed with your letter. I feel confident that, if all appropriations are made in one bill, Congress will be in a better position to balance the Federal budget. I hope that you will be successful in your efforts to procure its passage.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT B. MAW, *Governor.*

STATE OF IDAHO,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Boise, July 2, 1947.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I am in receipt of your letter of June 27, and I found it interesting.

We do not have a single general fund appropriation bill in Idaho, and we probably will continue to operate that way in the future.

However, I believe in Federal practice that this would be a wise move, because it would give a complete picture of finances with requisite detail.

Sincerely yours,

C. A. ROBINS, *Governor.*

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Santa Fe, July 2, 1947.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Reference is made to your letter of June 27 in which you enclose a copy of a concurrent resolution providing for one general appropriation bill for the Federal Government.

In New Mexico we have one appropriation bill to cover the needs of all State departments and institutions and agencies. This bill is passed at each regular session of the legislature and we find that it works very well and are entirely satisfied with this method, as we feel that it serves a good purpose.

Under our laws it is possible, however, to introduce special appropriation bills and this sometime occurs. It is especially true when new legislation is enacted which requires an appropriation to carry out the purposes of the act. By combining appropriations in one measure it enables the legislature to consider the needs of all State departments, agencies, and commissions at one time and to apportion the available money according to needs. This is a very fair method and the results in New Mexico have been very satisfactory.

With best wishes and kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS J. MABRY, *Governor.*

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Madison, July 1, 1947.

The Honorable HARRY F. BYRD,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: While I quite agree with the sentiments expressed in your letter of June 27 in regard to the advisability of having one appropriation bill, I must report that this practice presently is not followed in this State. We do have one general budget bill customarily passed by the legislature, but this is always supplemented by various other appropriation measures.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR RENNEBOHM,
Acting Governor.

STATE OF OHIO,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Columbus, July 2, 1947.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Senator, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: Your letter with Senate Concurrent Resolution 6, relative to provisions for an omnibus appropriation bill, has been received and I am pleased to give you the information requested, as to Ohio, and comment on the resolution.

Previous to 1939 our legislature followed to a large extent the past practice of Congress, in passing numerous appropriation bills in the regular sessions and in the many special sessions called. However, in 1939, the plan was adopted by the chief executive of submitting to the legislature an all inclusive budget so that one general appropriation could be passed. There was only one other appropriation act passed, which provided for the payment of sundry claims against the State. Separate action by the legislature on sundry claims is required by law. This plan was continued through the bienniums 1941–42 and 1943–44.

In 1945 an all-inclusive budget was submitted as usual but because of the large surplus accumulated by the State, the legislature created a postwar reserve fund to make provision for much-needed capital improvements for welfare institutions, universities, etc. This required passage of a third appropriation act, known as the additions and betterments bill. This plan, as of necessity, had to be continued through this biennium, 1947–48, although an all-inclusive executive budget was again submitted to the legislature. Therefore, in the regular session just adjourned, three general appropriation acts were passed, one covering current operating expense, one for sundry claims, and one for capital improvements.

The results of the procedure above outlined have been that no deficits were permitted to occur and that the financial position of the State could be obtained at any date, and could be ascertained for a future date, provided of course, that revenues estimated to be received were not placed at an inflated figure, but determined on a reasonably accurate basis.

Our experience in Ohio previous to 1939, through the passage of numerous appropriation acts, expiring on different dates, made it almost impossible to obtain a true picture of the State's financial position, and as a result deficits occurred with regularity. It is therefore conceivable what difficulties Congress faces, especially the members of the Committee on Finance, under its present procedure. The resolution, in my opinion, has great merit and would be a definite aid to Members of Congress in keeping Federal finances in order.

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. HERBERT,
Governor.

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Charleston, July 3, 1947.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of June 27 relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution 6, introduced by you and Senator BUTLER.

While I have not yet had time to very carefully read this resolution, to my mind it perhaps presents a change which would be indeed very wholesome and proper.

You are right in assuming that this is one of the States which has adopted the practice of one appropriation bill, in fact, we are bound by law relative thereto, and minor appropriations or special appropriations can only be passed by the legislature after the regular appropriation bill is passed.

I have no further observations to make, I believe, at this time, but should anything occur to me, I shall be more than happy to pass it on to you.

With highest regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE W. MEADOWS,
Governor.

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Bismarck, July 1, 1947.

The Honorable HARRY F. BYRD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: In North Dakota, not as a matter of legal requirement, but just as a matter of convenience, we have a single omnibus appropriation bill, which includes all of the appropriations for most of the departments of state that have their offices located here at Bismarck in the State capitol. We have another large appropriation bill that carries the appropriation for all of our eight institutions of higher learning.

The penal and charitable institutions of the State, the highway department, the department of veterans' affairs, the Bank of North Dakota, the State mill and elevator, and a number of other independent functions of the State each have separate appropriation bills.

Our experience has been that very few appropriation bills are approved until after the

last day for introducing bills in the legislature. It is then possible to make a complete tabulation and determine if the expenditures are within the limitations of the estimated income before any material number of appropriations have been approved. This gives time and opportunity to make the necessary and advisable adjustments either in the amount of the appropriation or in the sources of revenue.

Sincerely yours,

FRED G. AANDAHL,
Governor.

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Olympia, July 2, 1947.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HARRY: In reply to your letter of June 27, the State of Washington, generally speaking, has one omnibus appropriation bill and one supplemental appropriation bill. However, in some sessions of the legislature, there are two supplemental appropriation bills and also many acts carrying appropriations.

At the beginning of each session of the legislature, the Governor presents to the legislature an omnibus appropriation bill which covers the requested appropriations for running the existing departments and institutions of the State government. The supplemental appropriation bill is made up from claims, judgments, and any special appropriations that are needed to carry out functions created during the session and, in some cases, capital construction.

With every personal regard, I beg to remain,

Cordially yours,

MON C. WALLGREN,
Governor.

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
Pierre, July 7, 1947.

The Honorable HARRY F. BYRD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: Upon my return after an absence of several days from the office I find your letter of June 27 enclosing copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 6, dealing with the matter of appropriations.

The laws of our State provide and it is the established practice, to include in the general appropriation bill all appropriations of moneys for the regular functions of State government. Those of a special nature and having a specific purpose and not within the regular functions of State government are handled by special bills. The general appropriation bill requires only a majority vote of the members elect of both houses whereas special appropriations require a two-thirds majority vote. Deficiency appropriations are handled by special bills regardless of their purpose.

It seems to me that there would be considerable advantage in following some such general procedure in the National Congress as I can well imagine the confusion that results by having 12 regular appropriation bills which you say is the practice at the present time.

Thanking you for writing me and with best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE T. MICKELSON,
Governor.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
STATE HOUSE,
Phoenix, Ariz., July 8, 1947.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In reply to your letter of June 27, the procedure in Arizona at each regular session of the State legislature is to pass a general appropriation bill for all State departments and institutions.

There are, of course, special appropriation bills introduced for specific purposes.

I think the system provided by the State of making appropriations is satisfactory.

With all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

SIDNEY P. OSBORN,
Governor.

TENNESSEE EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Nashville, July 12, 1947.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of June 27.

The State of Tennessee has one general appropriation bill.

I have read your resolution and find nothing that I would object to. I am confident that your long and distinguished service as a Senator gives you a thorough understanding of the need for such legislation.

Sincerely,

JIM MCCORD.

STATE OF ARKANSAS,
Little Rock, July 11, 1947.

The Honorable HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: Your letter of June 27, addressed to Hon. Ben Laney, Governor of Arkansas, asking for information on how appropriation bills are handled in our State, has been referred to the writer for attention.

The Constitution of the State of Arkansas provides that a separate act be passed for each department appropriation. I feel, however, that it would be much better if we could pass one appropriation bill covering all departments, but, of course, in this State that would be unconstitutional.

We require that each department furnish our office with their budget for the biennium some 6 months in advance of the meeting of the legislature. Our office combines all of these into one book, which is presented to our budget committee, which meets 30 days in advance of our legislature. They study these budgets and call the department heads for explanation of their requests. After the budget committee has acted upon them and made their recommendations, we have printed for each member of the legislature a budget manual, which shows the amount of money appropriated by the previous legislature for the various departments, the amount requested for the next biennium, and the amount allowed by the budget committee. This gives each member of the legislature something that they can check against when bills are introduced.

If there is any further information that I can give you, feel free to call on me.

Very truly yours,

JNO. J. TRUEMPER,
State Comptroller.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
St. Paul, July 14, 1947.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: Thank you for your letter of June 27.

The 1947 legislature in Minnesota passed eight major appropriation bills, and that has been the practice in Minnesota for some years.

The appropriation bills as passed in Minnesota specify as to the period of time in which the funds are available, and balances remaining as of the end of each fiscal year are canceled and are not available to the departments in the following year.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 6, which you are proposing, certainly has merit and would clarify the appropriation picture considerably.

If I can be of any further assistance to you, please write me.

Sincerely yours,

LUTHER W. YOUNGDAHL,
Governor.

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Oklahoma City, July 11, 1947.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Committee on Finance,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Senate Concurrent Resolution 6, enclosed in your letter of June 27, 1947, in my opinion conforms to sound fiscal procedure. Most State governments in revising their fiscal procedure in recent years have adopted the policy of making appropriations in one consolidated general appropriation act which seems to have the following advantages:

1. Enables legislative committees studying the financial requirements of the Government to have the complete financial picture without having to comb through hundreds of special appropriation acts which may have been introduced by groups interested in furthering legislation beneficial to their own interests.

2. Assures that the financial needs of all agencies will be considered by the same legislative committees where proper weight may be applied to each request.

3. Makes it more difficult for pressure groups to get legislation through special committees without being properly considered by the general appropriation committee.

In answer to the last paragraph of your letter, however, you are advised that Oklahoma probably has more special appropriation bills than most any other State, because of the peculiar wording of section 55, article 5 of our constitution and the interpretation placed upon said section by the supreme court of this State.

Section 56 of the Oklahoma Constitution requires the salaries of our State officials and employees to be fixed by act of the legislature in the event that appropriations to pay the salaries of employees are contained in the general appropriation act. This provision was practical in 1907, but as the State has grown and the number of its departments and institutions have increased, it has become impractical for the legislature to fix salaries by law. Therefore, nearly every State department and institution has caused bills to be introduced for their appropriation separate from the general appropriation act. This practice has made it very difficult to exercise budgetary control over appropriations during a session of the legislature.

I am sure that the problem that confronts Oklahoma with respect to multiple appropriation acts, is compounded many times when the Congress is faced with the problem of considering multiple appropriation bills for the United States Government, and I wish to commend you in trying to adopt a more sound fiscal procedure such as is outlined in Concurrent Resolution 6, now before the Eightieth Congress.

Respectfully yours,

ROY J. TURNER,
Governor of Oklahoma.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Harrisburg, July 7, 1947.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senate,
Committee on Finance,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I will try to describe briefly the appropriation system which has evolved in Pennsylvania with the years. We have two main types of appropriations.

One type is known as continuing appropriations and comprises receipts from certain designated sources which are continuously available for certain designated governmental functions. Examples of these are:

1. Motor-license fees and gasoline tax, which are spent only on highways.

2. Charges and assessments against State banks, which are spent only for bank examinations.

3. Game and fish licenses and fines, which are spent only for the game and fish functions.

4. Receipts from operation of the liquor stores, which are spent for operating the stores and for enforcement of the liquor laws, with resulting profit paid into the general fund.

Appropriations of this type may be altered at will by any session of the legislature, but as general practice they stand from one session to another without action other than an occasional minor amendment.

The other type of appropriations we term "specific appropriations." This type is for a stated amount in dollars and for a definite period, and each legislature enacts new appropriations in new amounts for each succeeding period. The State's general fund, which encompasses all of the functions of government, with the exception of those cited above, is handled entirely by specific appropriations.

I am enclosing a volume of our appropriations by the 1945 legislature. These are all of the specific type. The volume contains 91 appropriations, which could well be contained in one act were it not for the constitutional provision (art. 3, sec. 15), as follows:

"The general appropriation bill shall embrace nothing but appropriations for the ordinary expenses of the executive, legislative, and judicial departments of the Commonwealth, interest on the public debt, and for public schools; all other appropriations shall be made by separate bills, each embracing but one subject."

Practically all of the functions of the Government covered by specific appropriations are provided for in our General Appropriation Act, which is No. 87-A, and which you will find on page 63.

Our specific appropriations are all restricted as to time, with the exception of appropriations for construction, and no commitments or other obligations may be incurred after the expiration date. Payments from the appropriations carrying an expiration date may be made after the expiration date on account of obligations incurred prior thereto. Balances of appropriations for construction are lapsed by legislative act 4 or 6 years after passage, when it is presumed the contemplated work has been done.

Our budget system carefully records all appropriations as liabilities against revenues, and it lapses, sometimes by executive act and sometimes by legislative act, the balances of expired appropriations which are no longer needed for the payment of incurred obligations. You will note from this that we do not reappropriate balances nor are appropriations available until completely spent. It is the fact of establishing a time limit on specific appropriations which makes it possible to operate the budget intelligently.

As I read your Concurrent Resolution No. 6, I have some question as to your definition of the word "expended." We define "expended" as "disbursed," and it occurs to me that you may define "expended" as a combination of that which is spent plus that which is obligated, committed, or contracted for. With this point cleared and a definite time limit beyond which no further obligations may be made, you should have in hand the fundamentals which will permit of sound financial planning.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. DUFF.

STATE OF IOWA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Des Moines, June 30, 1947.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Until 1939, the State of Iowa had one appropriation bill. In every session of the legislature, this was the last bill passed by the legislature. The bill finally passed was always a conference bill rather than a bill of the appropriations committee. In 1939 we divided our appropriations bill into making a reasonable classification as to the items to be included in each appropriation bill. As soon as that particular section of the appropriation work was finished, it was presented to the legislature for action. In Iowa this resulted in earlier action upon the appropriation bill, fewer appropriation bills went to conference committees, and the handling of the State financial matters were substantially improved.

I can readily see how the procedure you are now following in Congress would lead to a great deal of confusion, making it practically impossible for many of the Members of Congress to have any fair conception of the tax burden he was voting to impose upon the people. I am sure that, not only the Members of Congress, but the people would appreciate the adoption of a simplified procedure in the adoption of appropriations which would result in a better understanding of the financial picture.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT D. BLUE,
Governor.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Baton Rouge, June 30, 1947.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: Thank you for your letter of June 27, enclosing copy of SCR No. 6.

The constitution of Louisiana provides that the general appropriation bill shall embrace nothing but appropriations for the ordinary expenses of the government, pensions, the public debt and interest thereon, public schools, public roads, public charities, and all State institutions, and such bill shall be so itemized as to show to what account each and every appropriation shall be made. (Sec. 9, art. IV, Constitution of Louisiana.)

Under this provision we have one general appropriation bill.

The same section of the constitution provides that all other appropriations shall be made by separate bills, each embracing but one object. There are several special bills passed at every session of the legislature, but the main appropriations are embraced in the general appropriation bill, a draft of which is submitted to the legislature by the governor, after receiving estimates from the various budget units of the State, holding meetings with them, etc., and the bill after its preparation is submitted to the legislature with the executive budget.

Our appropriations are made for the biennium, with the amount to be expended in each fiscal year provided for, any unexpended balance going back into the general fund of the Treasury.

This is essentially the system which is provided for in SCR 6.

I believe if SCR 6 is adopted, it will result in a considerable improvement over the present method which prevails in Congress for making appropriations.

With best wishes, I am,

Your very truly,

J. H. DAVIS,
Governor of Louisiana.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Raleigh, July 2, 1947.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: Acknowledgment is made of your letter of June 27, and I am in agreement with the resolution which you propose.

In North Carolina the general assembly meets every 2 years; and it is the policy of our State to adopt one appropriation bill. This simplifies the work of the general assembly and enables us to have a definite fiscal policy.

With kind regards, I am,

Cordially yours,

R. GREGG CHERRY.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBERS,
Hartford, July 1, 1947.

The Honorable HARRY F. BYRD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BYRD: In answer to your letter of June 27, I would say that it has been Connecticut's practice for many years to have one budget act passed by the legislature.

This year, solely because of legislative problems resulting from the imposition of a new sales tax, three budgets were presented—one for the highway department, one for special funds, and then the general budget.

In my opinion, the single budget, either for a State legislature or for Congress, gives a much clearer picture than various bills, including supplementary and deficiency budgets.

Cordially,

JAMES L. MCCONAUGHY.

STATE OF DELAWARE,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Dover, July 2, 1947.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: Replying to your letter of June 27, you are advised that the State of Delaware does have one appropriation bill, and I am taking the liberty of mailing you a printed copy of same.

In addition to the appropriation bill passed by the general assembly at each biennial session, we include a bill to provide for extraordinary emergencies, which permits the permanent budget commission to transfer to the individual accounts such moneys as may be required for any extraordinary emergency. This amount, of course, cannot exceed the amount provided by the legislature in the emergency bill. The reason for the emergency bill is that we operate under a one-fund act, and of course must provide for such emergencies as extraordinary relief expenditures, bridge wash-outs, etc.

Hoping that this is the information you desire, and assuring you of my endorsement in your efforts to secure one appropriation bill instead of 12 or more, and also of my sincere admiration of your efforts to reduce expenditures, I am

Sincerely yours,

WALTER W. BACON,
Governor.

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Frankfort, June 30, 1947.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: Governor Willis has directed me to acknowledge receipt and thank you for your letter of June 27.

In this State, a general appropriation bill covering practically all expenditures is enacted at each session of the general assembly; however, other bills are sometimes introduced and passed, which provide specific appropriations for certain purposes. This, however, is not the usual case.

Trusting that this is the information you desire, and thanking you for the copy of your resolution, I am,

Sincerely yours,

FOREST HUME,
Executive Secretary.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
June 30, 1947.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I was pleased to receive your letter of June 27.

I am completely and wholeheartedly in favor of a single appropriation bill. After a hard fight, New Jersey achieved this reform a few years ago.

The procedure in New Jersey is for the Governor to submit to the legislature, on or before a specific date early in February, a budget message with detailed analysis of anticipated income and recommended appropriations. The budget message, together with statistical analysis, is referred to the appropriations committees of the State senate and the house of assembly. The latter meet in joint session, headed by the chairman of the senate committee, and conduct public hearings for whatever period of time may be required. The conclusions of the appropriations committees are incorporated in a single appropriations bill which, if passed by the legislature, is, of course, subject to the approval or disapproval of the Governor in the normal manner. The New Jersey constitution provides: "If any bill presented to the Governor contains several items of appropriations of money, he may object to one or more of such items while approving of the other portions of the bill. In such case he shall append to the bill, at the time of signing it, a statement of the items to which he objects, and the appropriation so objected to shall not take effect. If the legislature be in session he shall transmit to the house in which the bill originated a copy of such statement, and the items objected to shall be separately reconsidered. If on reconsideration, one or more of such items be approved by a majority of the members elected to each house, the same shall be a part of the law, notwithstanding the objections of the Governor" (Sec. 7, art. V, New Jersey Constitution of 1844).

For your information, I am sending you (under separate cover) a copy of my budget message for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, with detailed analysis attached, as illustrative of the procedure followed in New Jersey. I am also sending you a copy of the 1947-48 appropriation bill.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALFRED E. DRISCOLL,
Governor.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, July 1, 1947.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: In the absence of Governor Dewey, I acknowledge your letter of June 27 and the enclosure concerning the proposal for a single appropriation bill for the Federal Government.

In the State of New York the practice is to have a group of closely integrated appropriation bills presented at one time, along with the Governor's recommended budget. For all practical purposes the group of bills constitutes a unity and are usually acted upon at the same time. For your information, I enclose a copy of the group of main appropriation bills as they were introduced at the last session of the State legislature.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES D. BREITEL.

STATE OF ARKANSAS,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Little Rock, June 30, 1947.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I am in receipt of your letter of June 27 advising me of a resolution introduced by yourself and Senator BUTLER relative to appropriation bills.

I am convinced that this is a very wise resolution and that it will eliminate some of the uncertainties heretofore existing.

I am asking Mr. John Truemper, State comptroller, to send you the information regarding the procedure in Arkansas.

Thanking you and with best wishes, I am,

Yours very truly,

BEN LANEY,
Governor.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
Concord, June 30, 1947.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In response to your letter of June 27, I would advise you that in the State of New Hampshire, appropriations for the established administrative agencies of the State government are provided for in a single omnibus appropriation bill.

Occasionally when new functions are initiated, initial appropriations are contained in the statute itself, but thereafter, annual appropriations are usually handled in the budget appropriation measure.

I am not familiar enough with congressional procedure to express an opinion on the resolution which you submitted to me, but I can say, the single appropriation bill works well in New Hampshire from the point of view of legislative technique.

Sincerely,

CHARLES M. DALE,
Governor.

STATE OF INDIANA,
Indianapolis, July 1, 1947.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: This acknowledges receipt of your letter in which you advise me the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration has just reported a resolution, of which you are coauthor, providing for 1 appropriation bill instead of 12 as are now being used.

I think your plan is certainly a good one and it seems to be the sensible way in which to handle this matter. I can readily understand it would be almost impossible to know where Congress stood in regards appropriations with 12 different bills.

In answer to the specific question contained in your letter, please be advised that in Indiana we have only one appropriation bill and we think that is the better way to handle the appropriating and expending of State moneys. It has worked very well here and the entire bill has gone through, item by item, by the entire legislature as a committee as a whole, with proper fiscal officers there to explain and defend each appropriation contained therein.

Hoping this information proves helpful and with kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

RALPH F. GATES,
Governor.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee may sit in session at 3 o'clock today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RENT CONTROL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BUCK. I send to the desk the conference report on House bill 3131, the District of Columbia rent-control bill and ask unanimous consent for its consideration and adoption.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3131) to extend for the period of one year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title and agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed on the amendment of the Senate numbered 2.

C. D. BUCK,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
J. HOWARD MCGRATH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

GREGORY MCMAHON,
JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
OREN HARRIS,
T. G. ABERNETHY,
Mangers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection——

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I had offered an amendment to this bill which was unanimously adopted by the Senate and which in effect provided—it is very short and I shall read it——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair interrupt the Senator to say that the point he is raising can be made as soon as the conference report is adopted.

Mr. OVERTON. I am not opposing the conference report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks the point the Senator is discussing will arise when a supplemental message from the House is laid before the Senate.

Mr. OVERTON. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on Senate amendment numbered 2 to House bill 3131, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
July 23, 1947.

Resolved, That the House insists upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 to the bill (H. R. 3131) to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 2 to House bill 3131.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the amendment to which I have referred and which was adopted by the Senate provides that the relinquishment of the original lessee of his right under the lease shall not affect the subtenant to whom he had leased in accordance with the right possessed by him under his original contract lease.

The purpose of the amendment was to protect the lowly and the humble who would be driven from their homes under a renewal of a lease by the original lessee, and then would have to try to find shelter elsewhere.

On inquiry I discovered that while there are a number of such cases and while some of the landlords have tenants who are under their control and who surrender a lease at their bidding, the instances are not so many as to undertake to prevent the continuance of the Rent Control Act for another 3 months, until Congress convenes and may decide to extend it even further.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall not insist on the amendment which I had offered and which was adopted by the Senate. I thank the conferees on the part of the Senate for their efforts to have the House accede to the Senate amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK].

The motion was agreed to.

CONSIDERATION OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LODGE. Last night, when the Senate recessed, the President pro tempore stated:

> When the Senate convenes tomorrow the legislative calendar will be the unfinished business; in other words, the legislative calendar will be the order of business when the Senate resumes its session tomorrow.

I desire to inquire whether that is still correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct. The Chair will state the parliamentary situation as soon as the routine morning business is concluded. It is the Chair's view that the calendar will be called from the point where the Senate stopped last evening, in the first instance, and that thereafter, by unanimous consent, the Senate may return to a given bill on the calendar, prior to the point at which the call was started today.

Mr. LODGE. In common with a number of other Senators, I am interested in a bill which was objected to, assurance having been given me that it would be passed over without prejudice, and that it could be returned to without waiting for another day to come when we would start again at the very beginning.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is entirely correct. We are not going to start at the beginning. We stopped short of the termination of the calendar call last night because a number of bills had not arrived from the Printing Office.

Mr. LODGE. It will be in order to return to a given bill will it not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be in order.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GURNEY. Is the business of the Senate in such order now that I might conveniently present a conference report on unification of the armed services?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair inquire whether there is any other routine business?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there is certain routine business to be transacted. Let us complete it and then we will start on conference reports.

(At this point additional routine business was transacted, which appears earlier in today's Senate proceedings under appropriate headings.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to make an announcement for the benefit of Members of the Senate. It has been determined that, subject to the approval of the Senate, we shall continue in session not only through the afternoon and early evening, but into a night session, in order to expedite consideration of the "must" legislation that is on the calendar. If it meets the approval of the Senate, the War Department civil functions appropriation bill will be considered after the calendar is called. We estimate the calendar call will take at least an hour. After the civil functions appropriation bill is considered the supplemental appropriation bill will be taken up. There are five or six conference reports which must be acted upon.

I shall ask that Senators keep that situation in mind and remain on the floor, because the time has arrived when we must put forth every effort to act on legislation which must be passed before adjournment of Congress, which, it is contemplated, shall take place Saturday night.

I will not say at this time that there will or will not be an all-night session tonight, because that is something which will be determined as we proceed with the work in hand, but I have told the Members of the Senate that I would let them know in advance the contemplated program, and as we contemplate the program now it will be necessary to have a night session tonight.

I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Myers
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Conor
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hill	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hoey	Overton
Bricker	Holland	Pepper
Brooks	Ives	Reed
Buck	Jenner	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kem	Saltonstall
Cain	Kilgore	Smith
Capehart	Knowland	Sparkman
Capper	Langer	Stewart
Chavez	Lodge	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Cooper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Downey	McFarland	Tydings
Dworshak	McGrath	Umstead
Eastland	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ecton	McMahon	Watkins
Ellender	Magnuson	Wherry
Ferguson	Malone	White
Flanders	Martin	Wiley
Fulbright	Maybank	Williams
George	Millikin	Wilson
Green	Moore	Young
Gurney	Morse	
Hatch	Murray	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The clerk will begin the call of the calendar at the point where the Senate suspended the regular call last evening. The clerk will state the first bill.

REHABILITATION OF ALCOHOLICS, ETC., DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2659) to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance, and provide for the medical and scientific treatment of persons found to be alcoholics by the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments.

The first amendment was on page 3, line 6, after the word "by", to strike out "any court of", and insert "the municipal court for".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 15, after the word "before", to strike out "any of the judges of any court of" and insert "the municipal court for".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 19, after the word "may", to strike out "after a hearing commit the person found to be a chronic alcoholic" and insert "suspend the proceedings in the case and order that a hearing be held, upon sufficient

notice, to determine whether the defendant is a chronic alcoholic. The hearing shall be conducted by the judge without a jury, unless the defendant requests a jury. The defendant shall be entitled to representation at the hearing by an attorney of his own choice, and if the defendant does not select an attorney, the court shall appoint an attorney to represent the defendant. If, after the hearing, the judge, or the jury, as the case may be, determines that the defendant is a chronic alcoholic, the court may order that he be committed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 8, to strike out section 5, as follows:

SEC. 5. Any court in the District of Columbia having original jurisdiction of the offenses of drunkenness and intoxication may, upon its own motion, or at the request of any police officer or any representative of the Board of Public Welfare, issue a warrant for any person who has forfeited collateral upon a third arrest for drunkenness or intoxication within any one year and may then determine whether such person is a chronic alcoholic within the meaning of this act. If the court shall find the person to be a chronic alcoholic he may commit him generally to the clinic for a term not to exceed ninety days.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 19, to strike out section 6, as follows:

SEC. 6. (a) Any resident of the District of Columbia who is a chronic alcoholic within the meaning of this act may voluntarily submit himself for admission and treatment in the clinic. Any such voluntary applicant shall be examined by the director of the clinic under such rules and regulations as the Commissioners may approve. If he is found to be a chronic alcoholic, the Commissioners may in their discretion admit the applicant to the clinic for such period of time as is estimated by the director as necessary to effect a cure. He may be given such treatment, guidance, and help as the director deems appropriate except that he may not be committed to a correctional institution. The Commissioners may require any such chronic alcoholic voluntarily applying to pay the cost of his subsistence, care, and treatment. All such money shall be covered into the credit of the appropriation from which the expenditure was made.

(b) Any resident of the District of Columbia who voluntarily submits himself for admission and treatment in the clinic shall not forfeit or abridge thereby any of his rights as a citizen of the United States, nor shall the fact that he has submitted himself for admission and treatment or that he has been given help or has submitted himself to any study, treatment, or guidance be used against him in any proceeding in any court. The record of any application under this section by any individual for admission and treatment in the clinic and the record of any study of, or treatment, guidance, or help furnished to, any individual admitted in the clinic under this section shall be confidential, and not be divulged except on order of the court. No order may be made under section 8 with respect to any such individual except as provided under the rules and regulation of the Commissioners in effect at the time such individual voluntarily submitted himself for admission and treatment in the clinic.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 5, to change the section number from "7" to "5."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, at the beginning of line 14, to change the section number from "8" to "6", and to strike out:

(a) The director of the clinic may then make a recommendation to the committing judge (1) permitting the chronic alcoholic to remain at liberty conditionally and under supervision, or (2) direct that he be committed to another appropriate agency, hospital, or institution for treatment, or (3) directing that he be confined in a correctional institution, and the court may then determine the conditions under which a chronic alcoholic shall be committed and order such commitment.

And insert:

(a) The director may then recommend to the committing judge that the person committed (1) be permitted to remain at liberty conditionally and under supervision, or (2) be placed in an appropriate agency, hospital, institution in the District of Columbia for treatment as a chronic alcoholic, or (3) be returned to the court from which he was committed for trial upon the original offense charged or for such action as the court may deem proper. The court may thereupon, in its discretion, issue such orders as it deems necessary and proper in the case.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, at the beginning of line 16, to change the section number from "9" to "7."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 21, after the word "hearing", to insert "in the same manner and upon the same conditions as provided in section 4 for the first hearing."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, at the beginning of line 1, to change the section number from "10" to "8."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 7, to change the section number from "11" to "9."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 7, after the word "committed" to insert "to a clinic, agency, hospital, or institution."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 10, after the words "to the", to strike out "municipal court of" and insert "municipal court for."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, after line 13, to insert a new section 10, as follows:

SEC. 10. (a) Any resident of the District of Columbia who is a chronic alcoholic within the meaning of this act may voluntarily submit himself for admission, examination, and treatment in the clinic. If he is found to be a chronic alcoholic, the applicant may be admitted to the clinic or such period of time as is estimated by the director as necessary to effect a cure. He may be given such treatment, guidance, and help as the director deems appropriate except that he may not be committed to a correctional institution. Any such chronic alcoholic voluntarily applying may be required to pay the cost of his subsistence, care, and treatment. All such money shall be covered into the credit of the appropriation from which the expenditure was made. The Commissioners may establish or approve such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

(b) Any resident of the District of Columbia who voluntarily submits himself for admission and treatment in the clinic shall not forfeit or abridge thereby any of his rights as a citizen of the United States, nor shall the fact that he has submitted himself for admission and treatment or that he has been given help or has submitted himself to any study, treatment, or guidance be used against him in any proceeding in any court. The record of any application under this section by any individual for admission and treatment in the clinic and the record of any study of, or treatment, guidance, or help furnished to, any individual admitted in the clinic under this section shall be confidential, and not be divulged except on order of the court. No order may be made under section 6 with respect to any such individual except as provided under the rules and regulations of the Commissioners in effect at the time such individual voluntarily submitted himself for admission and treatment in the clinic.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, at the beginning of line 23, to change the section number from "12" to "11."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 25, after the word "control", to insert "which has proper and adequate treatment facilities and personnel to carry out the purposes of this act".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, at the beginning of line 4, to change the section number from "13" to "12."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 6, after the word "qualified", to strike out "medical man" and insert "physician with such training in psychiatry as they may prescribe,".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page at the beginning of line 11, to change the section number from "14" to "13."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 23, to strike out section 15, as follows:

SEC. 15. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $100,000 for the fiscal year 1948 and thereafter such additional sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 3, to insert a new section 14, as follows:

SEC. 14. The annual fees for licenses for the manufacture or sale of alcoholic beverages, except for retailer's license, class E, imposed by section 11 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, as amended, are hereby increased by 10 percent. The revenue resulting from the increase of such fees imposed by this section is hereby permanently appropriated to carry out the purposes of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, after line 11, to insert a new section 15, as follows:

SEC. 15. The Commissioner shall appoint a committee, to be composed of six outstanding residents of the District of Columbia, to advise and consult with the Commissioners and to assist them in carrying out the provisions of this act. The members of the committee shall serve without compensation and shall serve for a period of 1 year and until their successors are appointed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 2659) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. BUCK, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina conferees on the part of the Senate.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1305) to amend section 24 of the Federal Power Act was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next measure on the calendar.

REGULATION OF UNDERTAKERS AND EMBALMERS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2173) to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended, which has been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on the District of Columbia was on page 2, line 2, after the word "undertaker", to strike out "or embalmer."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 3, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "or their designated agent"; and in line 4, after the word "effect", to strike out "Such license shall entitle the holder thereof to perform the duties of an undertaker or embalmer, or both."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 12, after the word "Commissioners", to strike out "or their designated agent."; on page 3, line 1, after the word "Commissioners", to strike out "or their designated agent"; and in line 2, after the word "proper", to strike out *"Provided, however,* That at the time of the enactment of this act every person registered as an undertaker with the Health Department of the District of Columbia and actually engaged in discharging the duties of an undertaker or embalmer at a fixed place or establishment equipped as a funeral home in the District of Columbia and who desires to continue to discharge such duties shall be entitled to a license therefor without examination upon application therefor and upon furnishing proof satisfactory to the Commissioners or their designated agent that he was so registered and so discharging such duties; that he is not less than 21 years of age; a citizen of the United States, of good moral character, and that he is a graduate of a school or college of embalming whose course of instruction is not less than 9 months of study, comprising not less than 840 hours of study, or that he has had actual experience equivalent thereto; and upon payment of a license fee hereinbefore provided."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 23, after the word "Commissioners", to strike out "or their designated agent."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 4, to insert:

(c) Every person who, at the time of enactment of this paragraph, is registered as an undertaker with the Health Department of the District of Columbia and who was actually engaged at any time during the 5-year period immediately preceding the date of enactment of this paragraph in discharging the duties of an undertaker and who desires to continue to discharge such duties shall be entitled to a license therefor without examination upon application therefor and upon furnishing proof satisfactory to the Commissioners that he was so registered and so discharging such duties; that he is not less than 21 years of age, a citizen of the United States, of good moral character; and that he is a graduate of a school or college of embalming whose course of instruction is not less than 9 months, comprising not less than 840 hours of study, or that he has had actual experience equivalent thereto; and upon payment of the license fee hereinbefore provided.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(d)".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 19, after the numeral to strike out "To" and insert "After notice and open hearing, to"; in line 23, after the word "practice", to strike out "considered"; in line 23, after the word "health", to strike out the comma and the words "welfare, and" and insert "or"; and on page 5, line 7, after the word "conviction", to strike out the comma and the words "or for such other cause as the Commissioners may consider advisable."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 10, after the word "character", to strike out "not more than"; and in line 20, after the word "such", to strike out "appointees shall serve without compensation for their services as such" and insert "appointees, except the Health Officer or person designated by him, shall be entitled to a per diem of $10 for each day they are actually engaged in discharging their duties pursuant to this paragraph."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 2, after the word "States", to strike out "under such terms and conditions as they may deem appropriate", and insert "upon the same terms and conditions as such States and Territories issue licenses without examination to persons licensed by the District of Columbia."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 19, after the word "this", to strike out "Act" and insert "paragraph."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 24, to insert:

(7) To designate as their agent, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this paragraph, the Health Officer of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "(d)" and insert in lieu thereof "(e)"; and in line 11, after the word "or", to strike out the quotation marks after the word "transferable."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 11, to insert:

(f) As used in this paragraph the term "undertaker" includes a funeral director, mortician, embalmer, and any person who performs services with respect to the care and preparation of dead human bodies for burial or cremation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. WHERRY subsequently said: Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. COOPER, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina conferees on the part of the Senate.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 968) to authorize the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia to limit the number of taxicabs licensed and operated in the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

RECORDING OF INSTRUMENTS IN RECORDER OF DEEDS OFFICE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3045) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe the processes and procedures for recording instruments of writing in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 1, after the enacting clause, to strike out "That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized and directed to prescribe, from time to time, the legal fees for the services of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia the manner, processes, and

procedures by which deeds and other instruments of writing shall be recorded, and all deeds and other instruments of writing entitled by law to be recorded in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds which are recorded in the manner so prescribed by the Commissioners are hereby declared to be legally recorded. The said Recorder" and to insert "That the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 11, to strike out:

SEC. 2. All receipts and expenditures of appropriations for the Office of the Recorder shall be preaudited, audited, and disbursed in the same manner as are other receipts and disbursements of the government of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. (a) The duties and functions heretofore vested in and performed by the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia under the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940, as amended, are hereby transferred to and imposed upon the Director of Vehicles and Traffic of the District of Columbia.

(b) That in section 1 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes", approved July 2, 1940, as amended, strike out the words, "Recorder shall mean the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia, including assistants or agents duly designated by the recorder," and in the definition "Lien information" strike out the word "recorder's" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Director's".

(c) In section 3 of said act strike out the word "recorder" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Director".

(d) Section 5 of said act is repealed.

(e) Sections 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 of said act are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. Applications for certificates, in addition to all other matters which may be required by law, shall show under oath whether or not there are any liens against the motor vehicle or trailer or any equipment or accessories affixed thereto and if so, the lien information in the order of its priority, and shall be accompanied by instruments or any other papers necessary to entitle liens to be entered on the certificate. Upon receipt by the Director of an application for a certificate and accompanying documents, if any, or on the application for a duplicate, he shall compare the statements in the application as to liens with his records and the documents and instruments accompanying the application and if such statements are incorrect or incomplete or if any of the liens shown by the application are not entitled to be entered on the certificate in the same order as they appear on the application the Director shall advise the applicant or his representative that the certificate may not be issued and the reasons therefor. If the statements as to liens are full, true, and complete and all liens shown by the application are entitled to be entered on the certificate in the same order as they appear on the application, the Director shall enter on the application the words, 'Statements as to liens in accordance with records' a facsimile of his signature, and the date, shall accept all instruments accompanying the application for recording and shall enter his record number opposite the statement of each lien on the application for certificate. The Director shall retain the instruments for his permanent file. The Director shall thereupon prepare the certificate and when liens are shown on such an application shall enter upon each of two cards, the size of which shall be fixed by the Director, the information entered by the Director of the face of such certificate. If the application for title shows no liens, the Director shall enter on the certificate and on the reverse side of that portion of the application for identification tags known as 'Collector's coupon' the words 'No lien shown by the records' and the date. If the application shows liens, the Director shall enter or endorse aforesaid 'Collector's coupon' with the words 'Lien recorded' and shall enter the lien information on the certificate and on each of the said cards. The aforesaid stamping, endorsing and entering shall be made on the face of the certificate in the space provided therefor. The representative of the Collector of Taxes of the District of Columbia, stationed in the office of the Director, shall collect from the applicant or his representative all fees and charges in connection with the recordation of liens, if any, and in connection with the issuance of the certificate. Upon presentation to the Director of proper evidence that said fees and charges have been paid, the Director shall issue said certificate to the record holder of the first lien shown thereon or his representative; or if there are no liens, then to the owner or his representative.

"SEC. 7. When it is desired to have a lien entered on a certificate theretofore issued, the instrument and the certificate shall be presented to the Director and upon the payment of the necessary fees to the representative of the Collector of Taxes of the District of Columbia in the office of the Director, the Director shall accept the instruments for recording and unless he has cards covering said motor vehicle or trailer he shall prepare cards in the manner set forth in section 6. The Director shall enter the lien information on the certificate in the space hereinbefore mentioned and on each of said cards and shall deliver or mail the certificate to the record holder of the first unsatisfied lien shown thereon or his representative.

"SEC. 8. The rights of the holder of an unsatisfied lien shown on a certificate may be assigned by an assignment in writing, which shall show the name and address of the assignee, the trade name and engine number of the motor vehicle, or the trade name and serial number, if any, of the trailer, and the Director's record number of the instrument, or, if none, a brief description sufficient to identify the lien, shall be signed by the holder of the lien and acknowledged by him in the manner provided by law for deeds of real estate. Upon presentation of an assignment and a certificate and the payment of the prescribed fee to the representative of the Collector of Taxes of the District of Columbia in the office of the Director, the Director shall enter upon the face of the certificate and upon each of the cards hereinbefore described his record number of the lien which is being assigned, or, if no such instrument is on file, a brief description sufficient to identify the lien, the date of the assignment and the words 'Assigned to,' and the name and address of the assignee, and the date. The assignment shall be attached to the instrument if the instrument has been filed with the Director, and, if not, the assignment shall be given a director's record number and filed by the Director and such number shall be entered on the certificate and on each of the cards opposite the entry of the information relative to the assignment. The certificate shall be delivered to the record holder of the first unsatisfied lien shown thereon, or his representative.

"SEC. 9. Whenever it is desired to enter a lien or an assignment upon a certificate and such certificate is not available, upon delivery to the Director of the instrument or assignment the Director shall demand that the person possessing the certificate surrender it for the purpose of entering thereon the lien or the assignment and upon surrender of the certificate the Director shall perform the same acts as in cases where the certificate was presented with the instrument. Any person in possession of a certificate shall, upon demand of the Director, surrender it to the Director within 72 hours for the purpose of entering the lien or assignment thereon. This section shall not be deemed to affect the priority given under section 3 (c) to a lien where the instrument is presented together with the certificate.

"SEC. 10. The record holder of the first unsatisfied lien shown upon the certificate shall be entitled to the possession of the certificate and upon satisfaction of his lien he shall, within 72 hours, place upon the face of the certificate the Director's record number of the lien, or, if no such instrument is on file, a brief description sufficient to identify the lien, and in either case the word 'satisfied,' or its equivalent, and his signature, swear to it before a notary public, and forward or deliver it to the Director who shall release the lien in the manner prescribed in section 11 and the Director shall then deliver or mail the certificate to the holder of the lien next to priority, or, if none, to the owner or to the person designated in writing by the owner. Upon the satisfaction of any lien other than the first unsatisfied lien shown on the certificate, the record holder of the lien so satisfied shall, within 72 hours, make similar entries upon the face of the certificate, and it shall be the duty of the person in possession of the certificate, upon demand, to permit such holder to make said entries, and within 72 hours after said entries have been made the person in possession of such certificate shall forward or deliver said certificate to the Director who shall release the lien in the manner perscribed in section 11 and return the certificate to the record holder of the first unsatisfied lien shown thereon.

"SEC. 11. The Director, upon receipt of a certificate whereon a lien is marked 'Satisfied' as set forth in section 10, shall enter on the face of the certificate and on each of the cards described in section 6, and on the instrument, if any, filed in the Director's office as hereinafter provided, his said record number, or, if no such instrument is on file, a brief description sufficient to identify the lien, and in either case the word 'Released,' a facsimile of his signature and the date. When for any reason a lien holder upon satisfaction of his lien has failed to mark the certificate as herein provided and the lien holder cannot be located, or when the certificate after being so marked has been lost or destroyed and a duplicate certificate issued, the Director upon receipt of evidence satisfactory to him that the lien has been satisfied shall release it upon the certificate or duplicate certificate, the aforesaid cards and instrument, if any, as above set forth.

"SEC. 12. The fee for recording liens or assignments of liens upon a certificate shall not exceed the sum of $1 for each lien or assignment of lien on each motor vehicle or trailer contained in the instrument, which said fee shall include the charge for recording the release of such lien.

"SEC. 13. The Director shall maintain files wherein he shall file one set of the cards hereinbefore described alphabetically under the name of the owner and the other under the trade name and engine number if it covers a motor vehicle or the trade name and serial number if any if it covers a trailer. The Director shall preserve all instruments in a separate file."

(f) The following new section 17 is added to said act:

"SEC. 17. All record numbers heretofore assigned to liens by the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia and which have heretofore been referred to in this act as 'the Recorder's record number' of the instrument or lien shall hereafter be deemed and taken to be 'the Director's record number' of such instrument or lien."

(g) All "instruments" as defined in said act of July 2, 1940, as amended, which have

been filed and kept at the main Office of the Recorder of Deeds together with the files containing the same, and all furniture, equipment, cards, and other supplies heretofore furnished and maintained by the Recorder of Deeds in the office of the Director of Vehicles and Traffic shall be transferred to the Office of the Director and shall be under his jurisdiction and control.

(h) That paragraph (d) of section 3 of title IV of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended, is further amended by inserting after the first word of said paragraph (d) the words "fees charged for the recording, assignment, or release of liens against motor vehicles or trailers, all."

(i) Section 3 shall become effective 6 months after the approval of this act, or upon such earlier date as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may order.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to authorize the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia to purchase machines for the recording of deeds, and for other purposes."

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, with reference to Calendar 725, House bill 3045, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. CAIN, Mr. FLANDERS, and Mr. MCGRATH conferees on the part of the Senate.

UNIFICATION OF THE ARMED SERVICES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GURNEY submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 758) to promote the national security by providing for a National Security Organization, which shall be administered by a Secretary of National Security, and for a Department of the Army, a Department of the Navy, and a Department of the Air Force within the National Security Organization, and for the coordination of the activities of the National Security Organization with other departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"SHORT TITLE

"That this Act may be cited as the "National Security Act of 1947".

"TABLE OF CONTENTS

"SEC. 2. Declaration of policy.

"TITLE I—COORDINATION FOR NATIONAL SECURITY

"SEC. 101. National Security Council.
"SEC. 102. Central Intelligence Agency.
"SEC. 103. National Security Resources Board.

"TITLE II—THE NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

"SEC. 201. National Military Establishment.
"SEC. 202. Secretary of Defense.
"SEC. 203. Military Assistants to the Secretary.
"SEC. 204. Civilian personnel.
"SEC. 205. Department of the Army.
"SEC. 206. Department of the Navy.
"SEC. 207. Department of the Air Force.
"SEC. 208. United States Air Force.
"SEC. 209. Effective date of transfers.
"SEC. 210. War Council.
"SEC. 211. Joint Chiefs of Staff.
"SEC. 212. Joint staff.
"SEC. 213. Munitions Board.
"SEC. 214. Research and Development Board.

"TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

"SEC. 301. Compensation of Secretaries.
"SEC. 302. Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries.
"SEC. 303. Advisory committees and personnel.
"SEC. 304. Status of transferred civilian personnel.
"SEC. 305. Saving provisions.
"SEC. 306. Transfer of funds.
"SEC. 307. Authorization for appropriations.
"SEC. 308. Definitions.
"SEC. 309. Separability.
"SEC. 310. Effective date.
"SEC. 311. Succession to the Presidency.

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 2. In enacting this legislation, it is the intent of Congress to provide a comprehensive program for the future security of the United States; to provide for the establishment of integrated policies and procedures for the departments, agencies, and functions of the Government relating to the national security; to provide three military departments for the operation and administration of the Army, the Navy (including naval aviation and the United States Marine Corps), and the Air Force, with their assigned combat and service components; to provide for their authoritative coordination and unified direction under civilian control but not to merge them; to provide for the effective strategic direction of the armed forces and for their operation under unified control and for their integration into an efficient team of land, naval, and air forces.

"TITLE I—COORDINATION FOR NATIONAL SECURITY

"NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

"SEC. 101. (a) There is hereby established a council to be known as the National Security Council (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Council').

"The President of the United States shall preside over meetings of the Council: *Provided*, That in his absence he may designate a member of the Council to preside in his place.

"The function of the Council shall be to advise the President with respect to the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies relating to the national security so as to enable the military services and the other departments and agencies of the Government to cooperate more effectively in matters involving the national security.

"The Council shall be composed of the President; the Secretary of State; the Secretary of Defense, appointed under section 202; the Secretary of the Army, referred to in section 205; the Secretary of the Navy; the Secretary of the Air Force, appointed under section 207; the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, appointed under section 103; and such of the following named officers as the President may designate from time to time: The Secretaries of the executive departments, the Chairman of the Munitions Board appointed under section 213, and the Chairman of the Research and Development Board appointed under section 214; but no such additional member shall be designated until the advice and consent of the Senate has been given to his appointment to the office the holding of which authorizes his designation as a member of the Council.

"(b) In addition to performing such other functions as the President may direct, for the purpose of more effectively coordinating the policies and functions of the departments and agencies of the Government relating to the national security, it shall, subject to the direction of the President, be the duty of the Council—

"(1) to assess and appraise the objectives, commitments, and risks of the United States in relation to our actual and potential military power, in the interest of national security, for the purpose of making recommendations to the President in connection therewith; and

"(2) to consider policies on matters of common interest to the departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security, and to make recommendations to the President in connection therewith.

"(c) The Council shall have a staff to be headed by a civilian executive secretary who shall be appointed by the President, and who shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 a year. The executive secretary, subject to the direction of the Council, is hereby authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to perform such duties as may be prescribed by the Council in connection with the performance of its functions.

"(d) The Council shall, from time to time, make such recommendations, and such other reports to the President as it deems appropriate or as the President may require.

"CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

"SEC. 102. (a) There is hereby established under the National Security Council a Central Intelligence Agency with a Director of Central Intelligence, who shall be the head thereof. The Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among the commissioned officers of the armed services or from among individuals in civilian life. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $14,000 a year.

"(b) (1) If a commissioned officer of the armed services is appointed as Director then—

"(A) in the performance of his duties as Director, he shall be subject to no supervision, control, restriction, or prohibition (military or otherwise) other than would be operative with respect to him if he were a civilian in no way connected with the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, or the armed services or any component thereof; and

"(B) he shall not possess or exercise any supervision, control, powers, or functions (other than such as he possesses, or is authorized or directed to exercise, as Director) with respect to the armed services or any component thereof, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, or any branch, bureau, unit or division thereof, or with respect to any of the personnel (military or civilian) of any of the foregoing.

"(2) Except as provided in paragraph (1), the appointment to the office of Director of a commissioned officer of the armed services, and his acceptance of and service in such office, shall in no way affect any status, office, rank, or grade he may occupy or hold in the armed services, or any emolument, perquisite,

right, privilege, or benefit incident to or arising out of any such status, office, rank, or grade. Any such commissioned officer shall, while serving in the office of Director, receive the military pay and allowances (active or retired, as the case may be) payable to a commissioned officer of his grade and length of service and shall be paid, from any funds available to defray the expenses of the Agency, annual compensation at a rate equal to the amount by which $14,000 exceeds the amount of his annual military pay and allowances.

"(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Director of Central Intelligence may, in his discretion, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Agency whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States, but such termination shall not affect the right of such officer or employee to seek or accept employment in any other department or agency of the Government if declared eligible for such employment by the United States Civil Service Commission.

"(d) For the purpose of coordinating the intelligence activities of the several Government departments and agencies in the interest of national security, it shall be the duty of the Agency, under the direction of the National Security Council—

"(1) to advise the National Security Council in matters concerning such intelligence activities of the Government departments and agencies as relate to national security;

"(2) to make recommendations to the National Security Council for the coordination of such intelligence activities of the departments and agencies of the Government as relate to the national security;

"(3) to correlate and evaluate intelligence relating to the national security, and provide for the appropriate dissemination of such intelligence within the Government using where appropriate existing agencies and facilities: *Provided*, That the Agency shall have no police, subpena, law-enforcement powers, or internal-security functions: *Provided further*, That the departments and other agencies of the Government shall continue to collect, evaluate, correlate, and disseminate departmental intelligence: *And provided further*, That the Director of Central Intelligence shall be responsible for protecting intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure;

"(4) to perform, for the benefit of the existing intelligence agencies, such additional services of common concern as the National Security Council determines can be more efficiently accomplished centrally;

"(5) to perform such other functions and duties related to intelligence affecting the national security as the National Security Council may from time to time direct.

"(e) To the extent recommended by the National Security Council and approved by the President, such intelligence of the departments and agencies of the Government, except as hereinafter provided, relating to the national security shall be open to the inspection of the Director of Central Intelligence, and such intelligence as relates to the national security and is possessed by such departments and other agencies of the Government, except as hereinafter provided, shall be made available to the Director of Central Intelligence for correlation, evaluation and dissemination: *Provided, however*, That upon the written request of the Director of Central Intelligence, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall make available to the Director of Central Intelligence such information for correlation, evaluation, and dissemination as may be essential to the national security.

"(f) Effective when the Director first appointed under subsection (a) has taken office—

"(1) The National Intelligence Authority (11 Fed. Reg. 1337, 1339, February 5, 1946) shall cease to exist; and

"(2) the personnel, property, and records of the Central Intelligence Group are transferred to the Central Intelligence Agency, and such Group shall cease to exist. Any unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds available or authorized to be made available for such Group shall be available and shall be authorized to be made available in like manner for expenditure by the Agency.

"NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD

"SEC. 103. (a) There is hereby established a National Security Resources Board (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Board') to be composed of the Chairman of the Board and such heads or representatives of the various executive departments and independent agencies as may from time to time be designated by the President to be members of the Board. The Chairman of the Board shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $14,000 a year.

"(b) The Chairman of the Board, subject to the direction of the President, is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to assist the Board in carrying out its functions.

"(c) It shall be the function of the Board to advise the President concerning the coordination of military, industrial, and civilian mobilization, including—

"(1) policies concerning industrial and civilian mobilization in order to assure the most effective mobilization and maximum utilization of the Nation's manpower in the event of war;

"(2) programs for the effective use in time of war of the Nation's natural and industrial resources for military and civilian needs, for the maintenance and stabilization of the civilian economy in time of war, and for the adjustment of such economy to war needs and conditions;

"(3) policies for unifying, in time of war, the activities of Federal agencies and departments engaged in or concerned with production, procurement, distribution, or transportation of military or civilian supplies, materials, and products;

"(4) the relationship between potential supplies of, and potential requirements for, manpower, resources, and productive facilities in time of war;

"(5) policies for establishing adequate reserves of strategic and critical material, and for the conservation of these reserves;

"(6) the strategic relocation of industries, services, government, and economic activities, the continuous operation of which is essential to the Nation's security.

"(d) In performing its functions, the Board shall utilize to the maximum extent the facilities and resources of the departments and agencies of the Government.

"TITLE II—THE NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

"ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

"SEC. 201. (a) There is hereby established the National Military Establishment, and the Secretary of Defense shall be the head thereof.

"(b) The National Military Establishment shall consist of the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force, together with all other agencies created under title II of this Act.

"SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

"SEC. 202. (a) There shall be a Secretary of Defense, who shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That a person who has within ten years been on active duty as a commissioned officer in a Regular component of the armed services shall not be eligible for appointment as Secretary of Defense. The Secretary of Defense shall be the principal assistant to the President in all matters relating to the national security. Under the direction of the President and subject to the provisions of this Act he shall perform the following duties:

"(1) Establish general policies and programs for the National Military Establishment and for all of the departments and agencies therein;

"(2) Exercise general direction, authority, and control over such departments and agencies;

"(3) Take appropriate steps to eliminate unnecessary duplication or overlapping in the fields of procurement, supply, transportation, storage, health, and research;

"(4) Supervise and coordinate the preparation of the budget estimates of the departments and agencies comprising the National Military Establishment; formulate and determine the budget estimates for submittal to the Bureau of the Budget; and supervise the budget programs of such departments and agencies under the applicable appropriation act: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force from presenting to the President or to the Director of the Budget, after first so informing the Secretary of Defense, any report or recommendation relating to his department which he may deem necessary: *And provided further*, That the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force shall be administered as individual executive departments by their respective Secretaries and all powers and duties relating to such departments not specifically conferred upon the Secretary of Defense by this Act shall be retained by each of their respective Secretaries.

"(b) The Secretary of Defense shall submit annual written reports to the President and the Congress covering expenditures, work, and accomplishments of the National Military Establishment, together with such recommendations as he shall deem appropriate.

"(c) The Secretary of Defense shall cause a seal of office to be made for the National Military Establishment, of such design as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

"MILITARY ASSISTANTS TO THE SECRETARY

"SEC. 203. Officers of the armed services may be detailed to duty as assistants and personal aides to the Secretary of Defense, but he shall not establish a military staff.

"CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

"SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary of Defense is authorized to appoint from civilian life not to exceed three special assistants to advise and assist him in the performance of his duties. Each such special assistant shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 a year.

"(b) The Secretary of Defense is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such other civilian personnel as may be necessary for the performance of the functions of the National Military Establishment other than those of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

"DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

"SEC. 205. (a) The Department of War shall hereafter be designated the Department of the Army, and the title of the Secretary of War shall be changed to Secretary of the Army. Changes shall be made in the titles of other officers and activities of the

Department of the Army as the Secretary of the Army may determine.

"(b) All laws, orders, regulations, and other actions relating to the Department of War or to any officer or activity whose title is changed under this section shall, insofar as they are not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, be deemed to relate to the Department of the Army within the National Military Establishment or to such officer or activity designated by his or its new title.

"(c) The term "Department of the Army" as used in this act shall be construed to mean the Department of the Army at the seat of Government and all field headquarters, forces, reserve components, installations, activities, and functions under the control or supervision of the Department of the Army.

"(d) The Secretary of the Army shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Department of the Army, of such design as the President may approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

"(e) In general the United States Army, within the Department of the Army, shall include land combat and service forces and such aviation and water transport as may be organic therein. It shall be organized, trained, and equipped primarily for prompt and sustained combat incident to operations on land. It shall be responsible for the preparation of land forces necessary for the effective prosecution of war except as otherwise assigned and, in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of peacetime components of the Army to meet the needs of war.

"DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

"SEC. 206. (a) The term "Department of the Navy" as used in this act shall be construed to mean the Department of the Navy at the seat of Government; the headquarters, United States Marine Corps; the entire operating forces of the United States Navy, including naval aviation, and of the United States Marine Corps, including the reserve components of such forces; all field activities, headquarters, forces, bases, installations, activities, and functions under the control or supervision of the Department of the Navy; and the United States Coast Guard when operating as a part of the Navy pursuant to law.

"(b) In general the United States Navy, within the Department of the Navy, shall include naval combat and service forces and such aviation as may be organic therein. It shall be organized, trained, and equipped primarily for prompt and sustained combat incident to operations at sea. It shall be responsible for the preparation of naval forces necessary for the effective prosecution of war except as otherwise assigned, and, in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of the peacetime components of the Navy to meet the needs of war.

"All naval aviation shall be integrated with the naval service as part thereof within the Department of the Navy. Naval aviation shall consist of combat and service and training forces, and shall include land-based naval aviation, air transport essential for naval operations, all air weapons and air techniques involved in the operations and activities of the United States Navy, and the entire remainder of the aeronautical organization of the United States Navy, together with the personnel necessary therefor.

"The Navy shall be generally responsible for naval reconnaissance, antisubmarine warfare, and protection of shipping.

"The Navy shall develop aircraft, weapons, tactics, technique, organization and equipment of naval combat and service elements; matters of joint concern as to these functions shall be coordinated between the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy.

"(c) The United States Marine Corps, within the Department of the Navy, shall include land combat and service forces and such aviation as may be organic therein. The Marine Corps shall be organized, trained, and equipped to provide fleet marine forces of combined arms, together with supporting air components, for service with the fleet in the seizure or defense of advanced naval bases and for the conduct of such land operations as may be essential to the prosecution of a naval campaign. It shall be the duty of the Marine Corps to develop, in coordination with the Army and the Air Force, those phases of amphibious operations which pertain to the tactics, technique, and equipment employed by landing forces. In addition, the Marine Corps shall provide detachments and organizations for service on armed vessels of the Navy, shall provide security detachments for the protection of naval property at naval stations and bases, and shall perform such other duties as the President may direct: *Provided*, That such additional duties shall not detract from or interfere with the operations for which the Marine Corps is primarily organized. The Marine Corps shall be responsible, in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of peacetime components of the Marine Corps to meet the needs of war.

"DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

"SEC. 207. (a) Within the National Military Establishment there is hereby established an executive department to be known as the Department of the Air Force, and a Secretary of the Air Force, who shall be the head thereof. The Secretary of the Air Force shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"(b) Section 158 of the Revised Statutes is amended to include the Department of the Air Force and the provisions of so much of title IV of the Revised Statutes as now or hereafter amended as is not inconsistent with this Act, shall be applicable to the Department of the Air Force.

"(c) The term 'Department of the Air Force' as used in this Act shall be construed to mean the Department of the Air Force at the seat of government and all field headquarters, forces, reserve components, installations, activities, and functions under the control or supervision of the Department of the Air Force.

"(d) There shall be in the Department of the Air Force an Under Secretary of the Air Force and two Assistant Secretaries of the Air Force, who shall be appointed from civilian life by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"(e) The several officers of the Department of the Air Force shall perform such functions as the Secretary of the Air Force may prescribe.

"(f) So much of the functions of the Secretary of the Army and of the Department of the Army, including those of any officer of such Department, as are assigned to or under the control of the Commanding General, Army Air Forces, or as are deemed by the Secretary of Defense to be necessary or desirable for the operations of the Department of the Air Force or the United States Air Force, shall be transferred to and vested in the Secretary of the Air Force and the Department of the Air Force: *Provided*, That the National Guard Bureau shall, in addition to the functions and duties performed by it for the Department of the Army, be charged with similar functions and duties for the Department of the Air Force, and shall be the channel of communication between the Department of the Air Force and the several States on all matters pertaining to the Air National Guard: *And provided further*, That, in order to permit an orderly transfer, the Secretary of Defense may, during the transfer period hereinafter prescribed, direct that the Department of the Army shall continue for appropriate periods to exercise any of such functions, insofar as they relate to the Department of the Air Force, or the United States Air Force or their property and personnel. Such of the property, personnel, and records of the Department of the Army used in the exercise of functions transferred under this subsection as the Secretary of Defense shall determine shall be transferred or assigned to the Department of the Air Force.

"(g) The Secretary of the Air Force shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Department of the Air Force, of such device as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

"UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

"SEC. 208. (a) The United States Air Force is hereby established under the Department of the Air Force. The Army Air Forces, the Air Corps, United States Army, and the General Headquarters Air Force (Air Force Combat Command), shall be transferred to the United States Air Force.

(b) There shall be a Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of four years from among the officers of general rank who are assigned to or commissioned in the United States Air Force. Under the direction of the Secretary of the Air Force, the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, shall exercise command over the United States Air Force and shall be charged with the duty of carrying into execution all lawful orders and directions which may be transmitted to him. The functions of the Commanding General, General Headquarters Air Force (Air Force Combat Command), and of the Chief of the Air Corps and of the Commanding General, Army Air Forces, shall be transferred to the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force. When such transfer becomes effective, the offices of the Chief of the Air Corps, United States Army, and Assistants to the Chief of the Air Corps, United States Army, provided for by the Act of June 4, 1920, as amended (41 Stat. 768), and Commanding General, General Headquarters Air Force, provided for by section 5 of the Act of June 16, 1936 (49 Stat. 1525), shall cease to exist. While holding office as Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, the incumbent shall hold a grade and receive allowances equivalent to those prescribed by law for the Chief of Staff, United States Army. The Chief of Staff, United States Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, shall take rank among themselves according to their relative dates of appointment as such, and shall each take rank above all other officers on the active list of the Army, Navy, and Air Force: *Provided*, That nothing in this Act shall have the effect of changing the relative rank of the present Chief of Staff, United States Army, and the present Chief of Naval Operations.

"(c) All commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men, commissioned, holding warrants, or enlisted, in the Air Corps, United States Army, or the Army Air Forces, shall be transferred in branch to the United States Air Force. All other commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men, who are commissioned, hold warrants, or are enlisted, in any component of the Army of the United States, and who are under the authority or command of the Commanding General, Army Air Forces, shall be continued under the authority or command of the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, and under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Air Force. Personnel whose status is affected by this subsection shall retain their existing commissions, warrants, or enlisted status in existing components of the armed forces unless otherwise altered or

terminated in accordance with existing law; and they shall not be deemed to have been appointed to a new or different office or grade, or to have vacated their permanent or temporary appointments in an existing component of the armed forces, solely by virtue of any change in status under this subsection. No such change in status shall alter or prejudice the status of any individual so assigned, so as to deprive him of any right, benefit, or privilege to which he may be entitled under existing law.

"(d) Except as otherwise directed by the Secretary of the Air Force, all property, records, installations, agencies, activities, projects, and civilian personnel under the jurisdiction, control, authority, or command of the Commanding General, Army Air Forces, shall be continued to the same extent under the jurisdiction, control, authority, or command, respectively, of the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, in the Department of the Air Force.

"(e) For a period of two years from the date of enactment of this Act, personnel (both military and civilian), property, records, installations, agencies, activities, and projects may be transferred between the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force by direction of the Secretary of Defense.

"(f) In general the United States Air Force shall include aviation forces both combat and service not otherwise assigned. It shall be organized, trained, and equipped primarily for prompt and sustained offensive and defensive air operations. The Air Force shall be responsible for the preparation of the air forces necessary for the effective prosecution of war except as otherwise assigned and, in acordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of the peactime components of the Air Force to meet the needs of war.

"EFFECTIVE DATE OF TRANSFERS

"SEC. 209. Each transfer, assignment, or change in status under section 207 or section 208 shall take effect upon such date or dates as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

"WAR COUNCIL

"SEC. 210. There shall be within the National Military Establishment a War Council composed of the Secretary of Defense, as Chairman, who shall have power of decision; the Secretary of the Army; the Secretary of the Navy; the Secretary of the Air Force; the Chief of Staff, United States Army; the Chief of Naval Operations; and the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force. The War Council shall advise the Secretary of Defense on matters of broad policy relating to the armed forces, and shall consider and report on such other matters as the Secretary of Defense may direct.

"JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

"SEC. 211. (a) There is hereby established within the National Military Establishment the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which shall consist of the Chief of Staff, United States Army; the Chief of Naval Operations; the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force; and the Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief, if there be one.

"(b) Subject to the authority and direction of the President and the Secretary of Defense, it shall be the duty of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—

"(1) to prepare strategic plans and to provide for the strategic direction of the military forces;

"(2) to prepare joint logistic plans and to assign to the military services logistic responsibilities in accordance with such plans;

"(3) to establish unified commands in strategic areas when such unified commands are in the interest of national security;

"(4) to formulate policies for joint training of the military forces;

"(5) to formulate policies for coordinating the education of members of the military forces;

"(6) to review major material and personnel requirements of the military forces, in accordance with strategic and logistic plans; and

"(7) to provide United States representation on the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

"(c) The Joint Chiefs of Staff shall act as the principal military advisers to the President and the Secretary of Defense shall perform such other duties as the President and the Secretary of Defense may direct or as may be prescribed by law.

"JOINT STAFF

"SEC. 212. There shall be, under the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a Joint Staff to consist of not to exceed one hundred officers and to be composed of approximately equal numbers of officers from each of the three armed services. The Joint Staff, operating under a Director thereof appointed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, shall perform such duties as may be directed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Director shall be an officer junior in grade to all members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

"MUNITIONS BOARD

"SEC. 213. (a) There is hereby established in the National Military Establishment a Munitions Board (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Board").

"(b) The Board shall be composed of a Chairman, who shall be the head thereof, and an Under Secretary or Assistant Secretary from each of the three military departments, to be designated in each case by the Secretaries of their respective departments. The Chairman shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $14,000 a year.

"(c) It shall be the duty of the Board under the direction of the Secretary of Defense and in support of strategic and logistic plans prepared by the Joint Chiefs of Staff—

"(1) to coordinate the appropriate activities within the National Military Establishment with regard to industrial matters, including the procurement, production, and distribution plans of the departments and agencies comprising the Establishment;

"(2) to plan for the military aspects of industrial mobilization;

"(3) to recommend assignment of procurement responsibilities among the several military services and to plan for standardization of specifications and for the greatest practicable allocation of purchase authority of technical equipment and common use items on the basis of single procurement;

"(4) to prepare estimates of potential production, procurement, and personnel for use in evaluation of the logistic feasibility of strategic operations;

"(5) to determine relative priorities of the various segments of the military procurement programs;

"(6) to supervise such subordinate agencies as are or may be created to consider the subjects falling within the scope of the Board's responsibilities;

"(7) to make recommendations to regroup, combine, or dissolve existing interservice agencies operating in the fields of procurement, production, and distribution in such manner as to promote efficiency and economy;

"(8) to maintain liaison with other departments and agencies for the proper correlation of military requirements with the civilian economy, particularly in regard to the procurement or disposition of strategic and critical material and the maintenance of adequate reserves of such material, and to make recommendations as to policies in connection therewith;

"(9) to assemble and review material and personnel requirements presented by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and those presented by the production, procurement, and distribution agencies assigned to meet military needs, and to make recommendations thereon to the Secretary of Defense; and

"(10) to perform such other duties as the Secretary of Defense may direct.

"(d) When the Chairman of the Board first appointed has taken office, the Joint Army and Navy Munitions Board shall cease to exist and all its records and personnel shall be transferred to the Munitions Board.

"(e) The Secretary of Defense shall provide the Board with such personnel and facilities as the Secretary may determine to be required by the Board for the performance of its functions.

"RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD

"SEC. 214. (a) There is hereby established in the National Military Establishment a Research and Development Board (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Board"). The Board shall be composed of a Chairman, who shall be the head thereof, and two representatives from each of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, to be designated by the Secretaries of their respective Departments. The Chairman shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $14,000 a year. The purpose of the Board shall be to advise the Secretary of Defense as to the status of scientific research relative to the national security, and to assist him in assuring adequate provision for research and development on scientific problems relating to the national security.

"(b) It shall be the duty of the Board, under the direction of the Secretary of Defense—

"(1) to prepare a complete and integrated program of research and development for military purposes;

"(2) to advise with regard to trends in scientific research relating to national security and the measures necessary to assure continued and increasing progress;

"(3) to recommend measures of coordination of research and development among the military departments, and allocation among them of responsibilities for specific programs of joint interest;

"(4) to formulate policy for the National Military Establishment in conection with research and development matters involving agencies outside the National Military Establishment;

"(5) to consider the interaction of research and development and strategy, and to advise the Joint Chiefs of Staff in connection therewith; and

"(6) to perform such other duties as the Secretary of Defense may direct.

"(c) When the Chairman of the Board first appointed has taken office, the Joint Research and Development Board shall cease to exist and all its records and personnel shall be transferred to the Research and Development Board.

"(d) The Secretary of Defense shall provide the Board with such personnel and facilities as the Secretary may determine to be required by the Board for the performance of its functions.

"TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

"COMPENSATION OF SECRETARIES

"SEC. 301. (a) The Secretary of Defense shall receive the compensation prescribed by law for heads of executive departments.

"(b) The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force shall each receive the compensation prescribed by law for heads of executive departments.

"UNDER SECRETARIES AND ASSISTANT SECRETARIES

"SEC. 302. The Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force shall each receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 a year and shall perform such duties as the Secretaries of their respective departments may prescribe.

"ADVISORY COMMITTEES AND PERSONNEL

"SEC. 303. (a) The Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, and the Director of Central Intelligence are authorized to appoint such advisory committees and to employ, consistent with other provisions of this Act, such part-time advisory personnel as they may deem necessary in carrying out their respective functions and the functions of agencies under their control. Persons holding other offices or positions under the United States for which they receive compensation while serving as members of such committees shall receive no additional compensation for such service. Other members of such committees and other part-time advisory personnel so employed may serve without compensation or may receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $35 for each day of service, as determined by the appointing authority.

"(b) Service of an individual as a member of any such advisory committee, or in any other part-time capacity for a department or agency hereunder, shall not be considered as service bringing such individual within the provisions of section 109 or 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 18, secs. 198 and 203), or section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, unless the act of such indivdual, which by such section is made unlawful when performed by an individual referred to in such section, is with respect to any particular matter which directly involves a department or agency which such person is advising or in which such department or agency is directly interested.

"STATUS OF TRANSFERRED CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

"SEC. 304. All transfers of civilian personnel under this Act shall be without change in classification or compensation, but the head of any department or agency to which such a transfer is made is authorized to make such changes in the titles and designations and prescribe such changes in the duties of such personnel commensurate with their classification as he may deem necessary and appropriate.

"SAVING PROVISIONS

"SEC. 305. (a) All laws, orders, regulations, and other actions applicable with respect to any function, activity, personnel, property, records, or other thing transferred under this Act, or with respect to any officer, department, or agency, from which such transfer is made, shall, except to the extent rescinded, modified, superseded, terminated, or made inapplicable by or under authority of law, have the same effect as if such transfer had not been made; but, after any such transfer, any such law, order, regulation, or other action which vested functions in or otherwise related to any officer, department, or agency from which such transfer was made shall, insofar as applicable with respect to the function, activity, personnel, property, records or other thing transferred and to the extent not inconsistent with other provisions of this Act, be deemed to have vested such function in or relate to the officer, department, or agency to which the transfer was made.

"(b) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the head of any department or agency or other officer of the United States, in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties, shall abate by reason of the taking effect of any transfer or change in title under the provisions of this Act; and, in the case of any such transfer, such suit, action, or other proceeding may be maintained by or against the successor of such head or other officer under the transfer, but only if the court shall allow the same to be maintained on motion or supplemental petition filed within twelve months after such transfer takes effect, showing a necessity for the survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain settlement of the questions involved.

"(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of the second paragraph of section 5 of title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941, the existing organization of the War Department under the provisions of Executive Order Numbered 9082 of February 28, 1942, as modified by Executive Order Numbered 9722 of May 13, 1946, and the existing organization of the Department of the Navy under the provisions of Executive Order Numbered 9635 of September 29, 1945, including the assignment of functions to organizational units within the War and Navy Departments, may, to the extent determined by the Secretary of Defense, continue in force for two years following the date of enactment of this Act except to the extent modified by the provisions of this Act or under the authority of law.

"TRANSFER OF FUNDS

"SEC. 306. All unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, nonappropriated funds, or other funds available or hereafter made available for use by or on behalf of the Army Air Forces or officers thereof, shall be transferred to the Department of the Air Force for use in connection with the exercise of its functions. Such other unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, nonappropriated funds, or other funds available or hereafter made available for use by the Department of War or the Department of the Army in exercise of functions transferred to the Department of the Air Force under this Act, as the Secretary of Defense shall determine, shall be transferred to the Department of the Air Force for use in connection with the exercise of its functions. Unexpended balances transferred under this section may be used for the purposes for which the appropriations, allocations, or other funds were originally made available, or for new expenditures occasioned by the enactment of this Act. The transfers herein authorized may be made with or without warrant action as may be appropriate from time to time from any appropriation covered by this section to any other such appropriation or to such new accounts established on the books of the Treasury as may be determined to be necessary to carry into effect provisions of this Act.

"AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 307. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 308. (a) As used in this Act, the term "function" includes functions, powers, and duties.

"(b) As used in this Act, the term "budget program" refers to recommendations as to the apportionment, to the allocation and to the review of allotments of appropriated funds.

"SEPARABILITY

"SEC. 309. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"EFFECTIVE DATE

"SEC. 310. (a) The first sentence of section 202 (a) and sections 1, 2, 307, 308, 309, and 310 shall take effect immediately upon the enactment of this Act.

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (a), the provisions of this Act shall take effect on whichever of the following days is the earlier: The day after the day upon which the Secretary of Defense first appointed takes office, or the sixtieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

"SUCCESSION TO THE PRESIDENCY

"SEC. 311. Paragraph (1) of subsection (d) of section 1 of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President in case of the removal, resignation, death, or inability both of the President and Vice President', approved July 18, 1947, is amended by striking out 'Secretary of War' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Secretary of Defense', and by striking out 'Secretary of the Navy.'."

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

CHAN GURNEY,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
WAYNE MORSE,
RAYMOND E. BALDWIN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
HARRY F. BYRD,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
GEORGE H. BENDER,
HENRY J. LATHAM,
JAMES W. WADSWORTH,
CARTER MANASCO,
JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
CHET HOLIFIELD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate I shall give a brief report on the important changes made in the Senate bill, and then I shall be prepared to answer any questions on specific language on which any Senator may desire information.

First, let me say in the bill as it passed the Senate the Secretary was called the Secretary of National Security. We agreed in conference to make the name shorter. We agreed on the name "Secretary of Defense." We left in, of course, the three Secretaries of War, Navy, and Air.

Another change in name only was that as the bill left the Senate it established a National Security Organization. The House felt that the proper name should be "National Military Establishment," so we agreed to that change.

With regard to the functions of the Secretary of Defense provided for in the conference report, they are about the same as those provided in the Senate bill. The conferees reached an agreement as to many items in controversy, not including the two most important ones, in about 5 hours, and left for longer consideration and negotiation the question of whether the Senate provision giving to the President the right to appoint either a civilian or a member of the armed services as Director of the Intelligence Organization should be accepted. Finally, the conferees agreed along the lines of the Senate idea, but we accepted the House language, which provided that should a man be appointed from the armed services, he would retain his Army or Navy standing, retired privileges, and so forth.

The other important item in controversy was as to whether or not we should spell out the functions and missions of the Air Corps, the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps. In a measure we accepted most of the House language. I should say that that is a fair statement.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Can the Senator enumerate what functions have been set forth in the conference bill?

Mr. GURNEY. I can. I shall read them for the Army, the Navy, the Marines, and the Air Corps, in that order. Let me say that we accepted the first general provision, which is in almost identical language for the three services.

Mr. LODGE. Is it not true that the Senate bill did not seek to freeze those functions in the law?

Mr. GURNEY. That was the controversy. The Senate conferees, under instructions from the committee and the Senate, believed that we should leave the Army, Navy, and Air Corps flexible so that they could keep up with all developments of modern times. Nevertheless, I believe the statement can be made that this is still a good bill—not a most excellent bill, but still a good bill; and the Congress can approve it and feel that it has done about 90 percent of the job.

Answering the Senator's specific question, let me read the language which applies to functions and missions, first, under the Army:

In general, the United States Army, within the Department of the Army, shall include land combat and service forces and such aviation and water transport as may be organic therein.

That general provision is repeated almost word for word in the paragraphs relating to the Navy and the Air Corps.

Mr. LODGE. Has the Senator concluded his description of the functions of the Army?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. That provision was not in the Senate bill, was it?

Mr. GURNEY. It was not in the Senate bill.

Mr. LODGE. This is the first I have heard of it. As I listen to it, it gives me the impression that it certainly would not permit the amphibious work which made possible the landings in Normandy. Is not that correct?

Mr. GURNEY. I do not believe that this general language prohibits amphibious landings by the Army in any way whatsoever.

Mr. LODGE. It gives me the impression that the Army shall be restricted entirely to land activities. The Normandy landings, the landings in southern France, the landings at Anzio, at Oran, and Morocco, were all amphibious activities which were conducted wholly by the Army. I do not know what we would have done without them.

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator is entirely correct; but I do not think this language in any way prohibits that.

Mr. LODGE. Let me say, Mr. President, that I think it is the height of folly for the Congress in a statute, to undertake to set forth what the tactics of the next war should be. For us to say that one branch shall do all of the antisubmarine work, another branch some other kind of work, and that the infantry shall have the tanks, creates nothing but trouble. No one in the Army or Navy can foresee the future. Certainly if they cannot, we in the Senate cannot. I can remember very well that in the Defense Act of 1920 we said the infantry would have to develop the tank; and it was a great nuisance to us later, because two types of tanks were developed, a slow tank to go forward with foot troops, and a fast tank which would go around the flank. But because of the language in the statute we had to call the fast tank a combat car in order to get around the law. We used to set forth in the statute how many men there had to be in a company of infantry, in a squadron of cavalry, or in a battery of artillery. That was a very foolish thing to do. We do not do our country a service when we limit freedom of action and shackle the services. We have to move with the times. We must keep this Government mentally mobile and our own armed forces mobile so that they can meet unforeseen emergencies. If we freeze all the tactical concepts of World War II into a law in which we are trying to establish a military organization to cope with a war in the future, I think we are making a great mistake.

Mr. GURNEY. I completely agree with the Senator from Massachusetts. I believe we should not have gone into functions and missions. Nevertheless, after many hours of conference we have come out with this suggestion and a conference report which, I believe, is signed unanimously.

I should like to proceed now with an explanation of the functions. I shall read now the functions and missions for the Department of the Navy. I read again the general paragraph which appears with reference to all three services, the Army, Navy, and Air.

(b) In general the United States Navy, within the Department of the Navy, shall include naval combat and services forces and such aviation as may be organic therein. It shall be authorized, trained, and equipped primarily for prompt and sustained combat incident to operations at sea. It shall be responsible for the preparation of naval forces necessary for the effective prosecution of war except as otherwise assigned, and, in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of the peacetime components of the Navy to meet the needs of war.

Mr. LODGE. Who is to make those decisions?

Mr. GURNEY. May I conclude with all the naval functions, first, and then I shall be glad to yield?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. GURNEY. I read further from the conference report:

All naval aviation shall be integrated with the naval service as part thereof within the Department of the Navy. Naval aviation shall consist of combat and service and training forces, and shall include land-based naval aviation, air transport essential for naval operations, all air weapons and air techniques involved in the operations and activities of the United States Navy, and the entire remainder of the aeronautical organization of the United States Navy, together with the personnel necessary therefor.

The Navy shall be generally responsible for naval reconnaissance, antisubmarine warfare, and protection of shipping.

The Navy shall develop aircraft, weapons, tactics, technique, organization, and equipment of naval combat and service elements; matters of joint concern as to these functions shall be coordinated between the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy.

(c) The United States Marine Corps, within the Department of the Navy, shall include land combat and service forces and such aviation as may be organic therein. The Marine Corps shall be organized, trained, and equipped to provide fleet marine forces of combined arms, together with supporting air components, for service with the fleet in the seizure or defense of advanced naval bases and for the conduct of such land operations as may be essential to the prosecution of a naval campaign. It shall be the duty of the Marine Corps to develop, in coordination with the Army and Air Force, those phases of amphibious operations which pertain to the tactics, technique, and equipment employed by landing forces. In addition, the Marine Corps shall provide detachments and organizations for service on armed vessels of the Navy, shall provide security detachments for the protection of naval property at naval stations and bases, and shall perform such other duties as the President may direct: *Provided*, That such additional duties shall not detract from or interfere with the operations for which the Marine Corps is primarily organized. The Marine Corps shall be responsible, in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of peacetime components of the Marine Corps to meet the needs of war.

That covers all functions and missions provided for the Navy and the Marine Corps; and I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, this is the first time I have heard of these provisions, though I read an account of the conference report in the newspaper. I have listened to what the Senator has said, and I am sure that if I could have something concrete to study I could ask several questions. There are three or four questions which occur to me from hearing what the Senator said. We have to meet this issue quickly, at a moment like this, which I think is the most important issue that we have at this session of the Congress.

The Senator talks about such forces "as may be organic." Who says what may be organic? Who determines that?

Mr. GURNEY. The Secretary of each Department, approved by the President.

Mr. LODGE. That is an assumption, is it not? As I have heard the language, it does not say who determines what is organic.

Mr. GURNEY. That would be a decision reached by the Secretary of each branch of the armed services, approved by the Chief of Staff, and finally approved by the Commander in Chief.

Mr. LODGE. Those words, "as may be organic" and "integrated plans," offer a complete exception, it appears to me.

Mr. GURNEY. The conference report which we are presenting uses the word "organic" in connection with all three services.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator has said that the Navy shall have charge of all naval functions, except as the general integrated plans shall cause it to be different, or something to that effect. In

other words, a statement is made, and then a general exception is placed in another part of the statement.

Mr. GURNEY. No; I would not say that.

Mr. LODGE. That is the way I heard it the first time. I should like to know who makes those plans.

Mr. GURNEY. The plans are presented by the Secretary of each branch, first, upon the military level, approved by the Chief of Staff of each branch, submitted to the Secretaries, and then from the Secretaries to the President.

Mr. LODGE. I know how plans are made. I am asking the Senator whether that is set forth in the conference report, or whether that is an inference that he draws and whether the language "as may be organic" is set forth in the conference report. I think the Senator draws a very fair inference, and an inference which I would draw. But I cannot quite understand why it is necessary to set forth certain things so definitely and leave other things so vague.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I am sorry that I cannot hear the Senator's question. There is too much noise in the Chamber.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not wish to be asking for order all the time, but we shall have before us at this session of Congress no more important bill than this.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order. Those who desire to converse will retire to the cloakrooms.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the whole security and future action of the United States may depend upon what we are doing now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hum of general conversation throughout the Chamber is so great that even the Chair cannot hear.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from time to time congressional employees, including committee employees, are on the floor of the Senate and engage in conversation. It seems to me that if employees enter the Chamber, at least they should not carry on conversations of their own.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair agrees with the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I was asking a question of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. LODGE. I was referring to the provisions of the conference report which by statute assign functions to the different branches of the service, based on our experience in World War II, and compel them to accept these frozen concepts in dealing with wars in the future. I was trying to find out whether the language is sufficiently flexible to enable our military and naval leaders to meet the challenge of another war in spite of the fact that this measure freezes these functions into law.

Mr. GURNEY. My answer to that is definitely "Yes." It is general language. I refer to the statement I previously made, namely, that the same general language applies to the Army, the Navy, and the Air. It is my firm conviction that the language embodied in this measure allows the chiefs of staff not only to formulate plans for the organization of each separate branch, but to lay down and suggest plans of organization and functions and missions with which each branch of the service will have to go along.

Certainly this language is sufficiently broad so that with the concurrence of the Commander in Chief, that method of operation can be maintained.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, either the words which the Senator has read as applying to the Army and the Navy—the Senator has not read the ones relative to the Air Force—mean something or they do not. As I heard them read, they seek, in the first part, to limit the Army to the land and to limit the Navy to the sea; and in the second part——

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, let me go back a little. I believe that flexible operation can be maintained. Let me repeat one organic clause about which the Senator from Massachusetts is talking:

> In general, the United States Navy, within the Department of the Navy, shall include naval combat and service forces and such aviation as may be organic therein.

Again I repeat the words "In general."

Mr. LODGE. Who decides what will be organic?

Mr. GURNEY. The Commander in Chief, who has always, as the Senator knows, written out what the functions of each branch of the service shall be.

In this language, which the Senate committee did not recommend, and which the Senate did not adopt, the House has taken upon itself to set forth the functions and the missions, for the first time in the history of our country, I believe.

Mr. LODGE. This is the first time; is it not?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. LODGE. I think that is a most imprudent and unwise thing to do.

Now let me ask another question: I understood the Senator from South Dakota to say that the Marine Corps was to be charged with developing amphibious warfare, but I did not hear anything about the Army's having anything to do with amphibious warfare. Let me repeat that the Normandy landing, the southern France landing, the landing at Anzio beach, the landing at Oran, in Algiers, and the landings at Morocco all were amphibious operations undertaken by the Army; and I have never heard it stated that they were not in the interest of winning the war.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, let me repeat the language which I have read:

> It shall be the duty of the Marine Corps to develop, in coordination with the Army and the Air Force, those phases of amphibious operation.

They are not left entirely to the Marine Corps. There is no doubt in my mind or in the mind of any of the other conferees that either the Army or the Navy could go ahead and maintain their maneuvers and develop amphibious warfare.

Mr. LODGE. I point out to the Senator that landing an army or an army corps, which is what was done in Normandy, is an entirely different matter from landing a division.

Mr. GURNEY. That is true; but let me say that this language, which gives to the Marine Corps the right to develop amphibious operations, contains, in that specific sentence, these words:

> In coordination with the Army and the Air Force—

Which, in my opinion, and also in the opinion of the other conferees, in even that one sentence gives the Army the right, by specific language, to work on amphibious warfare methods.

Mr. LODGE. In other words, the Senator believes, does he not, that it limits it to small-scale amphibious operations? Does not the language which the Senator has just read constitute a limitation to small-scale amphibious operations?

Mr. GURNEY. No; I should not say that it limits the Marine Corps to small-scale amphibious operations. But I say to the Senator from Massachusetts that there is nothing in this measure that prevents the Army from developing amphibious operations whenever it wishes to do so.

Mr. LODGE. If the Marine Corps is to undertake amphibious operations of the scale of the Normandy landing, then we are confronted with a new proposition.

Mr. GURNEY. They never were limited in size, except as a percentage of the total strength of the Navy, as the Senator from Massachusetts knows. Of course, that percentage was discarded during the war, under the war powers of the President; and the Marine Corps grew in size to approximately half a million personnel or even a little more than that.

Mr. LODGE. But the unique combat contribution the Regular Army makes, as all of us know, grows out of the fact that it understands, as no other branch does, the handling of large units.

It seems to me that this language does not recognize that at all.

Mr. GURNEY. This language does not give to the Marine Corps the exclusive right, in any shape, manner, or form, to develop amphibious warfare.

Mr. LODGE. But it does not give anything to the Army in regard to that subject.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct; it does not say as to that.

Mr. LODGE. Would the Senator from South Dakota be willing to put off this matter for a few hours, so that some of us who are interested in this subject may have time to read the report?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Allow me to say that it seems to me that the observations of the Senator from Massachusetts are somewhat "off the beam." We are trying to lay down the development policies, and they do not involve strategy in time of war. The Chiefs of Staff or the President, the Commander in Chief, in the case of a campaign or any other sort of military or naval operation have authority over both the Navy and the

Army, and would integrate the activities of all of them in a campaign; would they not?

Mr. GURNEY. Let me say to the Senator from Texas that during wartime the President, under his war powers, would proceed to run the Army and the Navy and the Air Force just as he would like to.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. GURNEY. But these functions and missions would apply in peacetime.

Mr. CONNALLY. I grant that. If we do not have them, there will be more overlapping, and each one of the departments will be encroaching on the other. That was one of the arguments which appealed to me as to why we needed a unification bill.

Mr. GURNEY. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Without this bill, we would have the different departments trying to do everything. It seems to me it is necessary to lay down the broad outlines of what the functions and the jurisdiction of each one of the departments are in the development of the work in which they are engaged. But when it comes to actual combat the President of the United States and his Chiefs of Staff, who are acting for him, would absolutely command the whole field, both the Army and the Navy, and would utilize whatever services were available in either branch of the service. Is that not true?

Mr. GURNEY. That is my belief.

Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts specifically, and also to the attention of the Senator from Texas, because he has spoken about overlapping, a clause in the conference report which did not appear in the Senate bill. The whole section sets forth the powers of the Secretary of Defense, and an addition made in conference from the House bill reads as follows:

> Take appropriate steps to eliminate unnecessary duplication or overlapping in the fields of procurement, supply, transportation, storage, health, and research.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, it is perfectly true and the Senator from Texas is correct when he said that one of the objects of this type of legislation is to eliminate overlapping and duplication, but the way to eliminate overlapping and duplication is to have it done within the new Department of National Security in accordance with the changing needs of the moment, and the changing developments of modern science. It is not for us to set ourselves up in 1947 as clairvoyants and soothsayers who have the wisdom to write into the statutes what the tactics of the next war are going to be.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I do not contend that this language is as I would like to see it, but I definitely say that it does not prevent development.

Mr. LODGE. It does not facilitate it at all, and I believe the Senator from South Dakota will agree with me that the reason why these provisions were placed in the bill was not because of a desire to eliminate overlapping and duplication; the reason was that some very sincere but, I believe, highly misguided officials, think that some particular activity in which they have an interest will suffer, and put these provisions in. The people who have that view do not understand the way the Government departments operate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield to the senior Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to say to my colleague the junior Senator from Massachusetts, that the Senate conferees and the Senate committee were unanimously agreed against putting functions and missions into the bill. The House felt that some broad general language should be inserted. I would say most respectfully to my colleague that I do not agree with the chairman of the Armed Services Committee when he says functions and missions are provided for. The missions are specifically left out of the conference report.

Mr. GURNEY. If I may interrupt there, I may say that I said functions and missions because that is the way we have spoken of them generally for a long time. I stand corrected. There are no missions specifically stated. They are all functions.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say that the functions of the Army and the Air Corps and the Navy are very broadly stated.

There were at least five members of the House conferees who would not agree to leaving the Navy and the Marine Corps language in the same paragraph in which the Army and the Air Force provision was carried. So there was a certain amount of wording put around the Navy, particularly the aviation and the Marine Corps, which elaborates to a certain extent the language that is set forth in general as to their general component parts.

I think that when my colleague has an opportunity to read the report he will find that there is not even a function set forth in the bill, with one exception. The language is such that it sets out what the Army and the Navy and the Air Corps shall be comprised of, rather than what they shall do.

There is one exception. It says that the Navy shall have the responsibility of antisubmarine control, air missions for the protection of the shipping lanes, and one other thing which at the moment I do not recall.

Mr. GURNEY. If I may interrupt at that point, it does not specifically state that. It says the Navy shall be generally responsible for naval reconnaissance, antisubmarine warfare, and protection of shipping.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In conclusion, Mr. President, I will say that I do not like this language, not one of the Senate conferees liked it, but it was the best we could get. It in no way determines the missions; they are left entirely to the Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary and the President. It fundamentally does not set forth the functions. It says that the Navy shall be comprised of ships and airplanes, it says the Army shall be comprised of certain land forces, and the Air Force of airplanes in the air, and the marines a combination of all three to help the Navy. The marines are kept within the function of helping the Navy.

I would reply to my colleague, when he brings up the question of amphibious landings, by saying that that, of course, is within the duty of the land forces, and that the plans can be promulgated under the Chief of Staff of the Army.

We agreed to the report because it was the best we could get. It does not go into the functions so that it hurts the future development of the Army, Navy, Air Corps, or marines. The necessity of getting unification this year is far ahead, in value, in comparison with the broad general language that is inserted. The language inserted is a part of the language of the Executive order of the President to be promulgated.

Mr. President, I do not like that, my colleague does not like it, no member of our committee likes it, but the language is so general in character that in my opinion as an individual it does not state a function, it does not state a mission, and cannot hurt ultimatley the development of our armed forces.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, so that I may have the RECORD complete in regard to the functions, I read into the RECORD now the functions of the Air Force. Then I shall be glad to yield the floor.

> In general the United States Air Force shall include aviation forces both combat and service not otherwise assigned. It shall be organized, trained, and equipped primarily for prompt and sustained offensive and defensive air operations. The Air Force shall be responsible for the preparation of the air forces necessary for the effective prosecution of war except as otherwise assigned and, in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of the peacetime components of the Air Force to meet the needs of war.

Those are all the functions of the Air Force.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks my colleague the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has made. They are very helpful. But he has the advantage of me in that he has read the conference bill, which is something no Member of the Senate has been able to do except the Senate Members of the conference committee. I also note that there seems to be some lack of agreement among the conferees as to whether or not the bill does seek to write functions and missions into the law.

There is no one more anxious than I to get unification. The longest speech I have ever made in my life I made on that subject on the floor of the Senate. I have lived with that subject. I have seen the need of unification in practice, and, as I have said, the enactment of a real unification bill is the most important and vital thing we can accomplish for the future safety of the

American people. If we do not enact one, I think we will have failed in our trust.

However, Mr. President, I would much rather not have a bill, I would much rather leave the matter in conference all summer, than have a bill which froze a lot of outworn tactical concepts into the statute, thereby compelling the peacetime training to follow out those antiquated lines, with the result that we would have a misshapen and an immobile and an inflexible security program in the event of a future war.

I do not know whether the conference bill does that or not; I have not had an opportunity to read it. I should like to have a few hours to look at the bill in the form in which it now appears, and I wonder if the Senator from South Dakota would be willing to withhold his motion and make it a little later.

Mr. GURNEY. I shall be glad to do that, Mr. President.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator withholds his motion. The clerk will report the next bill on the calendar.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

The bill (H. R. 4268) making supplemental appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INCOME FROM FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC.

The bill (S. 1648) to authorize the expenditure of income from Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for training of Federal prisoners was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the act of May 27, 1930 (46 Stat. 391; 18 U. S. C. 744 a–h), relating to the training and schooling of prisoners in trades and occupations shall be construed as applying to all inmates of Federal penal and correctional institutions qualified for such training and schooling without regard to their industrial or other assignments. The prison industries fund established by section 4 of the act of June 23, 1934 (48 Stat. 1211; 18 U. S. C. 744–L), may be employed in paying the expense of such training and schooling.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 238) to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930 was announced as next in order.

Mr. IVES. Over.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, may I offer a word of explanation on that? First, may I inquire who objected to its consideration?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I objected to it. I should like to ask for an explanation of it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. May we pass it temporarily and come back to it?

Mr. IVES. That is agreeable to me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be temporarily passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4042) to control the export to foreign countries of gasoline and petroleum products from the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERTON. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I inquire what happened to Calendar 731, House bill 72?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It was missed. It will be called in a minute.

COAST GUARD AVIATION STATIONS

The bill (H. R. 72) to increase the number of authorized aviation stations operated by the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GURNEY. Over.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if the Senator will withhold the objection for a moment, this is a bill that is before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of especial interest to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES]. The Senator from New Jersey submitted the report, and I should like to ask him to make a brief explanation.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, there has been no increase in the number of Coast Guard air stations.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. What bill is now being discussed?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Calendar 731, House bill 72.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. AIKEN. What happened to Calendar 730, House bill 4069? Was it skipped?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Calendar 730, House bill 4069, was not considered, because a copy has not been received from the Printing Office.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. May we return to that bill when the copy is available from the Printing Office?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, the purpose of House bill 72 is to amend the act of August 29, 1916, by authorizing an increase in the number of aviation stations which may be operated by the Coast Guard from 10 to 15. In addition the bill clarifies the scope of the Coast Guard's aviation activities by specifically authorizing their use in the interior of the United States and in its possessions as well as along the coasts.

Great expansion in the use of air-sea search and rescue operations occurred during the war years. Since the war, performance of the air-sea rescue function has been assigned to the Coast Guard, which may require additional aviation stations to carry on this job efficiently. At the present time no specific increase in the number of Coast Guard air stations is contemplated, and any establishment of additional stations would require appropriation acts authorizing the expenditure of funds. The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries believes, however, that authorization for the five additional stations is desirable in order to provide flexibility should the need arise for additional establishments of this kind. Increasing existing limitations on the number of Coast Guard aviation stations may well result in added efficiency in the performance of the Coast Guard's duty of saving life and property at sea.

I shall not take up more of the time of the Senate, but I feel very strongly, now that the assignment has been made to the Coast Guard, and in view of the fact that there has been no increase in the number of Coast Guard air stations authorized since 1916, that authorization should be provided for five additional stations. Particularly is this so when we consider that the Coast Guard have demonstrated their efficiency in saving life and property on the high seas and have not left all rescue work to ships at sea.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield for a question.

Mr. GURNEY. It is my understanding that the War Department objects to the bill. I am not informed of the reason. I understand the Senator is informed, and I should like to know the nature of the War Department's objections to the bill.

Mr. HAWKES. The War Department's objection to the bill is a minor objection, I should say, since it is based on a desire to have more clearly defined the scope of authority between the Army and the Coast Guard in rescue work. I would say that the authorization which the bill would provide would not preclude the continued survey by the joint committee.

Mr. GURNEY. Did the committee consider the objection of the War Department? Did they feel it had a valid reason for objecting to the passage of the bill?

Mr. HAWKES. I may answer the question of the Senator by saying that the committee heard the War Department. The committee could not understand why the War Department had not asked to be heard during the 3 months time in which the subject was before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House. The committee, after hearing the War Department, reported the bill on the ground that it could do no harm. I am speaking for myself, and for several committee members, I think, who voted for it. The bill does not broaden one iota the present authority of the Coast Guard, except to increase the number of air stations. As it now stands, the law is applicable to the United States. When it was written, the sponsors probably had in mind the continental United States. The bill merely clears up the obscurity.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think it should be made clear in connection with the comment as to why the War Department did not earlier appear, that the War Department in the inception of this proposal was not asked for an opinion, as it seemed to deal simply with the Coast Guard. It was not for a considerable period that the War Department knew about it, and promptly, when they did, they stated

their views to the Director of the Budget. That was as far as they were allowed to go under the existing Legislative Reorganization Act. They could not appear voluntarily, but only by request. They came before our committee by request, after it was brought to the attention of the committee that there was objection from that source. There was a divided opinion within the committee, and various decisions were reached. That, I think, is the situation.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I request that the bill be temporarily passed over, until I have time to read the War Department's objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

EXPORT CONTROLS OF PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

The bill (S. 1653) to control the export to foreign countries of gasoline and petroleum products from the United States was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over!

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I wish those objecting to Calendar No. 732, House bill 4042, and Calendar No. 733, Senate bill 1653, would withhold their objections for a moment. I was trying to get the floor when Calendar 732, House bill 4042, was called. I ask that the objections be withheld for a moment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. CAPEHART. With respect to Calendar 732, House bill 4042, and Calendar 733, Senate bill 1653, may I say they are exactly the same. House bill 4042, which has been passed by the House, and Senate bill 1653, were reported unanimously yesterday by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as was House bill 4042. The bills would do exactly what they purport to do, namely, control the export to foreign countries of gasoline and petroleum products from the United States.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. MOORE. Is there not at present a provision under the Second War Powers Act, authorizing an embargo?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, if there is such a provision, it is not being enforced. I question whether there is such a provision. I do not know about other States, but I do know that in Indiana our people are becoming tired of having the money of the taxpayers sent to the Near East and elsewhere to stop communism, and having oil flow from the western part of the United States to Russia to keep her going. The measure provides that the Government of the United States shall control the export of oil and petroleum products. It does not say they cannot be exported. It simply provides that the Government shall control the export. It further provides that no oil or gasoline shall be exported if in the opinion of the Government it will become necessary to ration our own people in the use of gasoline and fuel oil. I think the measure is a splendid one and should be passed. I hope if we cannot have it passed at the present time favorable action can be taken upon it at a later date. The American people are vitally interested in this particular piece of legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MOORE. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, in view of my objection and the statement just made by the Senator from Indiana I wish to speak briefly on the subject, and state my objections to the bill. First, the subject matter is already covered by Public Law 188 which authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to control the export of petroleum. This bill is based upon the idea that there is a shortage of these products in the United States. Evidence heard by the committee which considered export control during the course of several weeks was to the effect that there was not a shortage in the United States as a whole, but only in certain areas.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. One of the areas the Senator is thinking about is Indiana and the Middle West.

Mr. COOPER. And one is my own State.

Mr. CAPEHART. If there is a shortage in one portion of the United States it is just as important to that section as if there were a shortage in the entire United States.

Mr. COOPER. The chief reason for the introduction of the two bills is the fact that a certain amount of petroleum was shipped to Russia in June. There was much discussion about it. I think what was said was greatly exaggerated. The fact was that 700,000 barrels were shipped, which amounts to one-quarter of the average annual export. The total annual export is equal to one-half a day's production in the United States. I think what the proposed legislation amounts to is an embargo. If we want to place an embargo upon the shipment of oil, that is a political question, not an economic one, and should not be acted upon hastily.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is the Senator in favor of sending American dollars to Greece and Turkey to stop communism, and then sending petroleum products to Russia to help her propagate communism in Turkey and Greece and other parts of the world? I for one am opposed to such action.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator has asked a question which has only one answer, and which is not related to the question. I am saying that it is a part of the world-trade situation. I do not think it should be handled in this rather hasty manner.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I want to put this question to the Senator from Kentucky: He has just stated that some 700,000 barrels of oil were shipped to Russia in June.

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Has that shipment been completed, or is oil still being shipped to Russia?

Mr. COOPER. I cannot answer. The fact is that the yearly exports to Russia have been about 2,800,000 barrels. The 700,000 barrels which were shipped constitute the average quarterly shipment. The yearly total amounts to about one-half a day's production of the United States. I am not saying it should be done. I am saying that it is a political question. If it is a matter of embargo it should be considered seriously and not acted upon on a day's notice.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to say in passing that I heartily adopt the view which has been expressed here that we are absolutely crossing ourselves up when we spend money to stop communism and then ship oil to build up and propagate it.

Mr. COOPER. I have not adopted a position on this matter.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am not saying that the Senator from Kentucky has. I am expressing my own views, in view of what has been said here.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It is true that the Secretary of Commerce has all the powers under the Export Control Act that are given in the proposed legislation. The language of the act is not expressed quite so forcibly. The Secretary does not have to make the same declaration as provided by the proposed legislation. But the Secretary has such powers, and he has the responsibility just as he would have if the bill were passed. I think he has the necessary power. If we fail to pass this bill it is only because, I would say, he already has that power.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is exactly correct. He already has been given the power that is attempted to be given under the proposed legislation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If the Secretary today has the power, it is very apparent he is not using it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. If the Secretary of Commerce has the power, then what objection can there be on the part of any Senator to passing the legislation which is more specific and direct? In one breath we say that the Secretary of Commerce has the power to do that which is provided in the bill, which the able Senator from Kentucky thinks is perfectly proper. In the next breath he is opposed to the adoption of this simple bill which is specific and directs the Secretary of Commerce to do a certain thing, and there will be no question about it if the Secretary of Commerce knows that that is what the Congress wishes done at this time.

Mr. COOPER. I point out that the bill, designed to reach one situation,

would in effect cripple all the ordinary and usual channels of trade with all countries.

MINING OF COAL AND OTHER MINERALS ON LANDS ACQUIRED BY THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on the call of the calendar yesterday Senate bill 1081, Calendar No. 162, was passed. I am told that there is now lying on the desk House bill 3022 which covers the identical subject. House bill 3022 requires a technical amendment. I ask that the Chair lay the House bill before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H. R. 3022) to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, gas, and sulfur on lands acquired by the United States, was read twice by its title.

Mr. BUTLER. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider the House bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3022) to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, gas, and sulfur on lands acquired by the United States.

Mr. BUTLER. The amendment I offer to the House bill is on page 2, line 4, after the numerals "437", to insert "30."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 3022) was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senate bill 1081 will be indefinitely postponed.

SHIPMENTS OF OIL TO RUSSIA

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to discuss briefly the two bills, House bill 4042 and Senate bill 1653, Calendar No. 732 and 733. These bills were introduced by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

It has been constantly bandied back and forth over the country, and has been said on the floor of the Senate, that we are trying to stop communism in the Middle East and yet we are shipping oil to Russia. That statement makes a good political argument, and I can understand why some Senators and some Members of the House are willing to make such a statement. The truth of the matter, however, is that we should get our facts straight as to exactly what is happening with respect to the oil situation in Russia.

Some time ago I made a speech on the floor of the Senate discussing this entire question, and I simply wish to repeat one or two things I said at that time. I said:

In 1945 we shipped 5,000,000 barrels of oil to Russia, including lend-lease shipments. In 1946 our exports of oil to Russia declined to 2,500,000 barrels. By the end of June this year, we exported about 730,000 barrels of oil, which is at the yearly rate of about 1,500,000 barrels. Year by year our exports to Russia are declining in volume. Seven hundred and thirty thousand barrels sounds like a considerable amount of oil, however, to the man in the street, and particularly does it sound like a considerable amount to the farmer who is beginning to be pinched by a lack of fuel oil and gasoline. But let us get one more fact into the record. The 730,000 barrels of oil we exported to Russia in the first 6 months of this year is equivalent to the petroleum we consume in this country in 3½ hours.

In other words, if we were ever compelled to ration petroleum products in this country, by cutting off the export of every drop of oil to the Soviet Union we could postpone that rationing by 3½ hours.

Let us look at another fact. The 730,000 barrels exported to Russia compares with the actual production in the United States during every day in the year of 5,000,000 barrels of oil.

It is not a question of rationing oil because a little of it is going to Russia. If rationing becomes necessary it will be because of lack of adequate transportation in the Midwest, as everyone who knows anything about this problem is aware.

There is no basis for the controversy raging over this question, because we cannot compare the oil which is going to Russia now with the scrap iron which we shipped to Japan previous to Pearl Harbor. The experts tell us that oil, especially aviation gas, cannot be kept longer than a period of 6 months. At that time it is in such a deteriorated state that it affects the working mechanism of an engine in a way which causes the engine not to work.

So whatever the Russians have done with this oil in no way impairs our security or national defense. What they are doing with it, as I understand, is receiving it on the Siberian coast through the Port of Vladivostok, for the purpose of using it there.

Then again the Russians recently made a contract with England to export oil to England from the Russian oil fields through the Black Sea.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator is taking the position that the only country to which we export oil is Russia. The bill covers the export of all oil to all countries.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that but the Senator made an argument about communism.

Mr. CAPEHART. And I shall continue to do so.

Mr. LUCAS. I know the Senator will continue to make that argument. That was the basis of his plea for the passage of the bill, as he stated a moment ago on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am opposed to shipping oil to Russia from the west coast and sending dollars from the east coast to keep them going.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand the Senator's position exactly. The only thing I was trying to do was to make plain a few facts. We have an abundance of rumor and political innuendo on these questions, but we get very few facts.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. In a moment. I have only 5 minutes. The Senator from Indiana can reply in his own time.

What surprises me is that the able Senator from Indiana, who is always talking about the free-enterprise system, favors a bill through which he would have this country regiment and control oil shipments. It is amazing to see the Senator advocate a return to oil control, which goes directly into the teeth of the free-enterprise system.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The argument which the able Senator from Illinois uses is the same argument to which I have listened for 2½ years when we have endeavored to discuss the communistic issue. The same argument is made every time. Those who are opposed to communism and have been opposed to it for years, and have said they were opposed to it, have been trying to do something about it. They have been stopped every time by the same sort of arguments which the able Senator from Illinois is now using.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not yield further. I will answer the Senator on that point.

I am somewhat surprised that the Senator has, by innuendo, charged the Senator from Illinois with being in favor of communism.

Mr. CAPEHART. No; I did not charge the Senator from Illinois with being in favor of communism. I said——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not yield. The Senator ought to know the rules by this time, but I doubt that he does.

The Senator says that those who have been fighting communism in the Senate are opposed every time they seek to continue to fight it. By innuendo he leaves the implication that there are certain Members on this side of the aisle who are supporting communism. That is the innuendo and the implication which the Senator leaves, whether he intends to do so or not. I deny that charge. I challenge the Senator from Indiana to show any occasion upon which the Senator from Illinois ever upheld communism, at any time during his career as a public servant or as a private citizen. No one in the United States is fighting communism any harder than is the Senator from Illinois.

What the Senator from Indiana seeks to do by his bill, and by his argument, is to convey to the American people, as a result of the small shipment of oil we are making to Russia, the idea that we are in favor of communism on the one hand, by shipment of a few million barrels of

oil, while we are trying to stop it on the other hand. There is no rhyme or reason to the argument. There is no logic in it. It is politics, pure and simple.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield the floor, and the Senator can take whatever time he desires.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, let me say in answer to the able Senator from Illinois that he makes the point that there has been only a small amount of oil shipped to Russia. There is nothing to prevent a larger amount from being shipped to Russia. I do not know whether the Senator is correct or not, but I do know one thing, and that is that the Government has been very much concerned, and the oil industry has been very much concerned. Hearings have been held on the subject. It is a matter of common knowledge, and it has been published in every newspaper in America, that there is a shortage of oil and gasoline in America, and particularly a shortage of fuel oil. This winter we may have to allocate oil, particularly fuel oil. It has been stated in every newspaper in America that there is a possibility that we may have to allocate gasoline. But when a bill is introduced which seeks to have the Government control exports to all countries—not only Russia, but all countries—in order that our own people may not suffer, in order that we may not have to go back to the rationing of gasoline and fuel oil, it meets with opposition.

I continue to stand on the remarks which I made in respect to Russia and communism. I am not accusing the Senator from Illinois of being a Communist or of favoring communism.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What bill is under consideration?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. House bill 4042, Calendar 732, which has been passed over.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, may I say in answer——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

UNIFICATION OF THE ARMED SERVICES—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the bill (S. 758) to promote the national security by providing for a National Security Organization, which shall be administered by a Secretary of National Security, and for a Department of the Army, a Department of the Navy, and a Department of the Air Force within the National Security Organization, and for the coordination of the activities of the National Security Organization with other departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY].

A moment ago I raised some questions regarding the conference report on the unification bill, and requested that the vote be postponed. The Senator from South Dakota very courteously agreed to my request.

I have now had an opportunity to glance at the conference report. I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota a question, referring to subsection (4) of section 202 of title II. I ask him whether I am correct when I say it reads as follows in the conference report:

It is provided that the new Secretary shall—

(4) Supervise and coordinate the preparation of the budget estimates of the departments and agencies comprising the National Military Establishment; formulate and determine the budget estimates for submittal to the Bureau of the Budget, and supervise the budget programs of such departments and agencies under the applicable appropriation act.

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator has correctly stated the language, as agreed to in conference.

Mr. LODGE. So the words "formulate and determine the budget estimates" will be in the law.

Mr. GURNEY. They are in the conference report, and when the report is adopted they will be in the law.

Mr. LODGE. It is very reassuring for me to know that, because that is one of the basic and vital parts of the bill.

I have read the so-called assignment of functions to the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Mr. President, if ever in my experience I have read a lot of verbiage, that is it. I do not think it does a great deal of harm. It will be an impediment but it will not be an insurmountable obstacle to efficient operation.

I say to the interests which insisted on the insertion of that language that, in my judgment, in a very few years they will realize that they have cut off their noses to spite their faces. When we try to look into the future and define it in terms of the past, we are condemning ourselves to frustration and inefficiency. The verbiage which is in this bill in the way of defining functions for the Army, Navy and Air Force is clearly a backward glance, and comes from the minds of people who are looking backward, and not from the minds of people who are looking forward. In my judgment those who favored it will very deeply regret it. But inasmuch as it does not absolutely hamstring the operations of the act, I have no objection to the conference report and shall support it because of the utterly vital need for unification.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I think it ought to be made very clear—and I am sure the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] will share this view—that the Senate conferees did not want this language. It is not the language of the Senate conferees; and we quite agree with the statements made by the Senator from Massachusetts. It is a mistake to attempt even in general language, to freeze functions in a bill. However, I think the Senator from South Dakota has made it very clear—and he did a magnificent job, may I say, as chairman of the conferees on this very difficult assignment—I think he has made it very clear that the language is so general that it cannot be said that we have really frozen any of the functions and missions in the bill. I think that by the passage of this bill we shall be able to move forward with a much more efficient military establishment than would be the case if the bill should not pass.

Mr. LODGE. I am very glad to have the Senator's assurance on that point.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask one question of the Senator from South Dakota. I should like to ask him, as chairman of the Senate conferees, whether or not the conference report carefully preserves that feature of the Senate bill under which the Air Force would be independent and be given independent standing

Mr. GURNEY. The conference bill absolutely establishes a third arm of the military forces known as the Department of Air, as a separate and distinct executive department, the same as the Army and the Navy.

Mr. HOLLAND. There was no change in the conference report concerning that particular portion of the Senate bill?

Mr. GURNEY. Without having the conference report before me at the moment, I will say that there may have been corrections of inapt verbiage, but the organizational set-up for the Department of Air is absolutely agreed to in the words of the Senate bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the conference report is agreed to.

POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL AT MONTEREY, CALIF.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate passed Senate bill 229 relative to the Monterey Postgraduate School, and at about the same time the House passed an identical bill, House bill 1341. The Senate bill has been held at the desk, and I ask unanimous consent that the House bill be substituted for the Senate bill and be now considered.

There being no objection, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 1341) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif., which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 229 will be indefinitely postponed.

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar 729, House Joint Resolution 238, to which I objected and requested that it be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (H. J. Res. 238) to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from New York will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 6, after the word "paragraph", it is proposed to insert "and until July 1, 1948."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out, on page 1, line 7, the numerals "15", and to insert "9."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read the third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, ask for a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. GEORGE conferees on the part of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND SECURITY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Would the junior Senator from Oregon be in order to ask unanimous consent to return to Senate bill 140, the bill creating a Department of Health, Education, and Security, which was passed over yesterday? It is erroneously stated in the RECORD that the junior Senator from Oregon objected to the consideration of the bill. I have discussed the matter with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair suggest to the Senator from Oregon that we proceed to call the few remaining bills, at the conclusion of which the Senator will be recognized to renew his request?

Mr. MORSE. Very well.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1350) to amend the act to establish a National Archives of the United States Government and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF FISHING RESOURCES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 859) to provide for the exploration, investigation, development, and maintenance of fishing resources and development of the high-seas fishing industry, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the bill, in its terms and in its purposes, is quite simple. It authorizes an investigation and study with a view to the development and maintenance of our fisheries, particularly in the tropical and subtropical areas of the Pacific Ocean. It also authorizes, as an aid in the study and maintenance work, the transfer of three surface vessels to the Fish and Wildlife Service. That is the purpose and that comprehends the terms of the bill. I may say that we have had many studies regarding our fisheries in various parts of the world. The North Atlantic has been the subject of study, as have also the waters along the Pacific Coast and in the Puget Sound area. The subject has received attention; but here is an area of the ocean which, speaking in relative terms, has been apparently neglected. It seems to me highly important and desirable that we should familiarize ourselves with the potentialities of this vast area of the oceans of the world.

That is the substance of the bill

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 15, after the name "Hawaii", it is proposed to insert: "*Provided further*, That there are authorized to be transferred to the Fish and Wildlife Service not to exceed three surplus vessels suitable for conversion and use in oceanographic and biological research and exploratory fishing, by any disposal agency of the Government without reimbursement or transfer of funds."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

INCREASED RETIRED PAY FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF FORMER LIFE SAVING SERVICE

The bill (H. R. 2054) to amend the act of April 14, 1930, to provide increased retired pay for certain members of the former Life Saving Service, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRANSPORTATION OF CERTAIN MERCHANDISE BETWEEN HYDER, ALASKA, AND CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

The bill (H. R. 1238) to permit vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and all points in the continental United States, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRIORITIES IN TRANSPORTATION

The bill (H. R. 673) to repeal certain provisions authorizing the establishing of priorities in transportation by merchant vessels, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DEFINITION OF FUNCTIONS AND DUTIES OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The bill (H. R. 3541) to define the functions and duties of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1064) relating to the payment of travel expenses of officers and employees of the Post Office Department and postal service, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

The bill (H. R. 3043) to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MAGNUSON (and other Senators). Over.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, let me inquire what Senator made the request that the bill be passed over?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I did.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington, among others.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, let me ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Maine explain the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief explanation. I understand that we are now discussing Calendar No. 740, House bill 3043.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. That bill provides for the transfer of certain lands to the Secretary of the Interior. I think this matter is of peculiar interest to the Senators from Illinois.

There are available in Illinois approximately 43,000 acres of land—lake, marsh, and other land—variously developed, some of it developed for residential purposes. It is desired to transfer that land to the Department of the Interior, in order that it may be developed not only for recreational purposes, but also for conservation purposes.

So far as I know, no opposition has been voiced by any department of the Government. I very much hope that the Senators who objected to the present consideration of the bill will withdraw their objection, and will permit the bill to be considered and passed at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am not especially familiar with the bill. I was not in the committee on the morning when the bill was discussed. Several persons in Illinois who are interested in this matter have said they wish to be heard, but apparently no witnesses were heard by the committee.

In view of that, I said they surely are entitled to a hearing. I have no personal opinion in this matter, one way or the

other. I discussed it with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], who also feels the same way that I do about it, I understand. The only suggestion I made is that the bill be passed over, in order that hearings may be held.

I understand there is no necessity for immediate action on the bill, anyway.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington has information which I do not have. I think there was complete unanimity among all the interested agencies of the Government that the bill is desirable.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, the statement just made by the majority leader is correct, namely, the departments now have no objection, since we have included at the end of the bill a proviso that the land which is transferred from the War Department shall be administered in accordance with restrictions laid down by that department.

I understand that the Department of the Interior has also been assured by the Wildlife Service and the Secretary who will supervise this land that the qualifications it has imposed will be observed. The bill merely provides that the land shall be placed under one control.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have just consulted with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and I find that his information is the same as mine. So I think a hearing should be held on this matter. Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being heard, the bill is passed over.

MISSION POINT LIGHTHOUSE RESERVATION

The bill (H. R. 3619) relating to the sale of the Mission Point Lighthouse Reservation, Grand Traverse County, Mich., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1714) to exclude certain internes, student nurses, and other student employees of hospitals of the Federal Government from the Classification Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of that bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The chairman of the Civil Service Committee is not present at this time.

Mr. TAFT. I ask that the bill be passed over temporarily.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill goes over temporarily.

The bill (S. 1064) relating to the payment of travel expenses of officers and employees of the Post Office Department and postal service was announced as next in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of that bill? If one cannot be had at this time, the bill should be passed over temporarily, in the same way that the preceding bill was passed over temporarily.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be temporarily passed over.

ADDITIONAL POSITIONS IN PROFESSIONAL AND SCIENTIFIC SERVICE IN WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS

The bill (H. R. 4084) to authorize the creation of additional positions in the professional and scientific service in the War and Navy Departments was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REDUCTION OF INTEREST RATE ON POSTAL-SAVINGS DEPOSITS

The bill (S. 1015) to amend section 7 of the act of June 25, 1910, as amended, to reduce the interest rate on postal-savings deposits to 1 percent per annum was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let us have an explanation of that bill.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, this bill comes to us at the suggestion of the Secretary of the Treasury. It provides for the reduction of the interest rate on postal savings from 2 percent to 1 percent, the reason being that when the Postal Savings System first went into effect in 1910 the rate was 2 percent, and that rate has not been reduced since then. Obviously the rate which was fair then is excessive now.

Under this bill the savings to the Government would amount to $25,000,000 annually.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I was unable to hear all that the Senator said. What is the interest rate at the present time?

Mr. BUCK. It is 2 percent at this time. This bill provides that the rate will be reduced to 1 percent.

It is also to be noted that the 1-percent rate is higher than the rate obtained on series E bonds for the first 3, 4, or 5 years.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, apparently this bill would reduce from 2 percent to 1 percent the interest rate which postal-savings depositors obtain.

Mr. BUCK. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What sort of hearing was held upon this bill?

Mr. BUCK. As I recall, a representative of the Treasury Department came before the committee. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] looked into the matter.

I should add that the Post Office Department is not in favor of the bill. The Treasury Department is very much in favor of it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I also object.

Mr. TAFT. I object because the report is not included in the calendar file.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being heard, the bill is passed over.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in that connection, although the bill has been passed over, nevertheless I wish to call attention to a remark which was made by the Senator from Delaware which obviously is incorrect, namely, that the proposed 1-percent rate will be higher than the rate earned by series E war bonds. Mr. President, those bonds draw 2.9 percent, if held to maturity. So it could not be accurate to say that a rate of 1 percent is higher than the rate the series E bonds draw.

Even the series F bonds draw 2½ percent, and the series G bonds draw approximately 2½ percent. So I am sure the Senator is misinformed when he states that a rate of 1 percent is higher than the rate paid on series E war bonds.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, if series E bonds are disposed of during the first 3½ or 4 years during which they are held the interest rate paid is less than 1 percent.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, during the first year no interest at all is paid.

Mr. BUCK. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. But if they are held to maturity they draw 2.9 percent interest.

Mr. BUCK. When I made the statement I mentioned 3 or 4 or 5 years.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

The bill (H. R. 1602) to stimulate exploration, development, and production from domestic mines by private enterprise, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. KEM. Let the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], I submit an amendment to be printed and to be available for consideration in connection with this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, that seems to complete the calendar, with the exception of——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is one other measure on the calendar. Will the Senator from Texas permit it to be considered at this time?

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to state that I have a matter upon which I wish to have action taken.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will state the remaining bill on the calendar.

The bill (H. R. 4002) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Obviously, that bill cannot be considered during the call of the calendar, so it will be passed over.

That completes the legislative calendar.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling

clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 2800. An act to amend section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3738. An act to amend Public Law 88, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved June 23, 1945.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3818) to amend the Federal Insurance Contributions Act with respect to rates of tax on employers and employees, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3839) making appropriations for the executive office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 7, 18, and 31 to the bill, and concurred therein; and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21, 25, and 28 to the bill and concurred therein severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 364. An act to expedite the disposition of Government surplus airports, airport facilities, and equipment and to assure their disposition in such manner as will best encourage and foster the development of civilian aviation and preserve for national defense purposes a strong, efficient, and properly maintained Nation-wide system of public airports, and for other purposes;

S. 682. An act to regulate the interstate transportation of black bass and other game fish, and for other purposes;

S. 753. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to defer the collection of certain irrigation construction charges against lands under the Flathead Indian irrigation project; and

S. 1262. An act to provide a central authority for standardizing geographic names for the purpose of eliminating duplication in standardizing such names among the Federal departments, and for other purposes.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GURNEY. Yesterday, because of the necessity of my leaving the floor, I asked that if any armed services bills came up during the call of the calendar, they be temporarily laid aside or passed over. Would not they come up now, automatically?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair expects the Senate to return to the bills which yesterday were passed over temporarily. At the moment, the Senator from Texas has a prior request.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, House bill 2776 is not on the printed calendar, but I have unanimous consent to place it on the calendar. It is a minor bill, simply to extend the time for the building of a bridge.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not like to object, but I am compelled to object to the consideration at this time of any bills that are not regularly on the calendar. The calendar will be called again before we adjourn.

I feel that if we permit one Senator to have the Senate consider a bill which is not on the calendar, we shall not be able to avoid infinite confusion.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the bill is on the calendar. It is not on the printed calendar, but I obtained unanimous consent to have it placed on the calendar.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, that would bring the bill up tomorrow, but not today, as I understand the situation.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, it is a little, simple bill that does not cost a nickel.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the trouble. [Laughter.]

TERMINATION OF CERTAIN TAX PROVISIONS

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, we agreed a while ago to recur to Calendar 730, H. R. 4069, whenever printed copies of the bill became available. I understand the printed copies have been delivered to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4069) to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II.

Mr. McCARTHY. Over.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, if I may I should like to make an explanation. This is a bill involving half a dozen war-power measures over which there has been no controversy except as to points regarding which we are prepared to accept amendments. I think we would do a very gross disservice if we were not to take this bill off the calendar at the present time. The President's proclamation of the termination of hostilities naturally threw into confusion many matters which had temporary status. The Committee on the Judiciary made a thorough study of the whole situation. Certain matters were referred to the House Ways and Means Committee and to the Senate Finance Committee. This bill, an omnibus bill, was prepared in the House to give time certainty to the matters involved.

I am quite sure there is no controversy, except as to certain matters, as I have said, on which I believe we are prepared to accept amendments.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am particularly interested in section 7, which takes away from certain military personnel some tax exemptions which they have heretofore enjoyed. The effect of that section would be to reduce the compensation of all service personnel to a very sizable extent. For example, the salary of a second lieutenant would be reduced in the amount of about $257 a year. The compensation of enlisted men would be very substantially reduced. My thought, offhand, is that this is not the time or place to reduce the compensation of the service personnel. If the Senator were inclined to accept an amendment to change the date in subsection A to January 1, 1949, and likewise in subsection B, I should certainly have no objection.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the Senate Finance Committee decided to change the date in subsection B to January 1, 1949. That is for the benefit of the enlisted men. We extended the time to January 1, 1949, for the benefit of the enlisted men because we were told by the military authorities that they had made certain advertising representations in connection with enlistment campaigns which might be embarrassed if we did not give a further extension. Therefore we provided for that extension by a Senate committee amendments.

Subsection A refers to officers. It was felt in the Senate Finance Committee that this being a purely wartime exemption, we might terminate it in the case of officers, as to whom, so far as we know, no representations have been made, and who do fairly well in comparison with enlisted men.

Let me add also that if we were to extend subsection A 1 year it would lessen our revenues. The total loss, including both officers and enlisted men, would amount to $200,000,000, a large part attributable to officers.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is the Senator aware of the fact that on June 29, 1945, the salaries of the officer personnel were increased, that for example the salary of a second lieutenant was increased by $360 per annum? It was thought to be necessary at that time because the officer procurement program was lagging. If we pass this bill as it is now proposed, we will take away from a second lieutenant, for example, $257 of the $360 increase we gave him a year ago. It was felt at that time, as I have said, that it was necessary to give him that increase because the officer procurement program was lagging.

I have had a great deal of contact with men in the service this morning and yesterday, and they are all very much disturbed by the proposal. They feel it would very substantially affect the procurement program.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I repeat to the Senator that both these privileges were wartime privileges, and normally and logically ended with the end of hostilities. We are carrying the officers forward to the first of the year, and we are giving an additional year to the enlisted men, or will by a Senate committee amendment. The House ended them both as of the first of 1948. I repeat, to extend the officers' privilege for another year would cost our revenues considerably.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I do not want to prolong the discussion,

but so that the Senator will understand my position clearly, I desire to say that I feel that unquestionably if we adopt subsection A as it is now written it will affect the procurement program. I do not think this is the time to reduce the salaries of the service personnel, and for that reason I am forced to object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator withhold his objection for just a moment? Unfortunately, we are in this position that this bill, which covers so many matters, cannot be involved in dispute, and cannot be allowed to be defeated. I therefore will reluctantly accept the Senator's amendment. Let me suggest that he get in touch with the technician, because the amendment reaches into other provisions of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that we may have the precise amendment approved later.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin can offer his amendment, which the Senator from Colorado will subsequently accept?

Mr. McCARTHY. I can state the amendment now. I move to amend subsection A, in line 18, substituting January 1, 1949, for January 1, 1948.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that the date appears on line 17 on page 4 of the bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is in line 18 of the bill before me. I understand the Senator himself is proposing an amendment to subsection B, to substitute January 1, 1949, for January 1, 1948.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is a committee amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest that the Senator offer the amendment to bring it into agreement with some of the other provisions of the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I do not find a copy of the bill in my calendar.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The bill is available at the desk.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I inquire of the Senator from Colorado whether the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin was acted on.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Not yet.

Mr. GEORGE. I make the suggestion to the distinguished Senator from Colorado that, inasmuch as we have already changed the date for the enlisted men, he might accept the amendment and take it to conference, and see if we could secure agreement with the House. The War Department have now some 100,000 Reserve officers, and I think there is rather substantial ground to believe or fear that they will lose many of those Reserve officers unless they can have this tax advantage for one additional year.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the distinguished Senator. I have agreed to accept the amendment.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let us get the RECORD straight before the Chair recognizes any other Senator.

The Senator from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 17, it is proposed to strike out "1948" and insert "1949."

On page 6, line 18, before the period insert a comma and the words "except that the amendment striking out paragraph (1) of section 1621 (a) shall be applicable with respect to wages paid on or after January 1, 1949."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the amendment of course is not printed. Will the clerk be good enough to read it again, slowly, so that I may understand it?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the amendment again, slowly, for the benefit of the Senator from Wyoming.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 17, it is proposed to strike out "1948" and insert "1949."

On page 6, line 18, before the period insert a comma and the following: "except that the amendment striking out paragraph (1) of section 1621 (a) shall be applicable with respect to wages paid on or after January 1, 1949".

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the effect of the amendment?

Mr. McCARTHY. It merely provides that the tax exemptions which the officer personnel and the enlisted men have previously enjoyed shall be extended to January 1, 1949, instead of January 1, 1948, as proposed in House bill 4969. It gives them an extra year in which to complete the procurement program.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin?

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There are several committee amendments, which the clerk will state.

The first amendment of the Committee on Finance was on page 4, line 3, after the word "on", to strike out "the fifteenth day after the date of the enactment of this act" and insert "March 31, 1948."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 7, page 5, line 4, to strike out "1948" and insert "1949."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 8, on page 5, line 14, after the words "prior to", to strike out "August 1, 1947" and insert "January 1, 1948", and on line 17, after the words "prior to", to strike out "August 1, 1950" and insert "January 1, 1951."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 15, page 9, line 9, after the word "TALC", to insert "(INCLUDING PYROPHYLLITE)", and on line 11, after the word "ASPHALT", to insert a comma and the word "TRONA."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to know whether the clerk read the word "trona" on page 9, line 20?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There are two more committee amendments, the Chair is now advised. The clerk will state the other amendments.

The next amendment was on page 9, line 18, after the word "talc", to insert "(including pyrophyllite)"; on line 20, after the word "mines", to insert a comma and the words "trona"; on page 10, line 9, after the word "talc", to insert "(including pyrophyllite)"; and on line 11, after the word "asphalt", to insert a comma and the word "trona."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to insert on page 10, after line 21, a new section, as follows:

SEC. 16. Charitable contributions by corporations.

Section 23 (q) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to charitable and other contributions by corporations) is hereby amended by striking out "the date of the cessation of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1948."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does that complete the committee amendments?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Was the amendment on page 9, line 18, which reads "including pyrophyllite", agreed to?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that all committee amendments have been agreed to.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I desire to present a perfecting amendment to the pending bill, which I have already discussed with the chairman of the Finance Committee .

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California offers an amendment, which the clerk will state.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to amend section 15, on page 10, line 4, by adding at the end of paragraph (b) thereof the following: "In the case of potash and thenardite, whether extracted from a mine or from a brine or other deposit, there shall be included in gross and net income from the property the income from other minerals or mineral salts extracted therefrom."

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, this is merely a perfecting amendment. This particular amendment in the act was passed upon by the Finance Committee in 1943 and was adopted by the Senate. It amends a provision which allows a 15-percent depletion allowance in the case of potash mining, and allows a depletion also to cover other chemicals in the same brine from which the potash has been extracted. I believe it is satisfactory to the chairman of the Committee on Finance, and I am also advised that it is satisfactory to the representatives of the House.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that we have had a new bill printed, I ask that the amendment be inserted on page 10, line 2, instead of on page 10, line 4, as the amendment originally read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The correction will be made. The question is agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the

Finance Committee whether, under this bill, "metal mining" includes aluminum or bauxite? On page 9, in the case of metal mines, what does "metal mines" mean?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should not want to go into a comprehensive definition of a metal mine. I do not know whether an aluminum deposit, which I understand is a clay deposit——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Bauxite.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would be considered as a metal. I am inclined to believe it might fall in the category of some sort of clay, but I am unable at the moment to give it a scientific definition.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Would the Senator have any objection to adding "bauxite"?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should have no alternative but to accept it and take it to conference.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I move——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In order to be sure to clarify the bill, I propose an amendment, adding "bauxite", on page 9, line 17, after the first comma.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Colorado to Section 7 of the bill, on page 4, and to ask him what the effect of that section will be.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Section 7, on line 4?

Mr. McMAHON. On page 4, additional allowance for military and naval personnel.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The effect of the section as amended would be that the officer personnel of the military establishments or a commissioned warrant officer would have a $1,500 exemption until January 1, 1949, and, under (b), enlisted men, three grades lower than commissioned warrant officer, would have a complete exemption as to their service pay until the same date.

Mr. McMAHON. Does that mean then that after that date, the officer personnel and enlisted men, on the respective dates, will become taxed the same as the rest?

Mr. MILLIKIN. They will be taxed then the same as everyone else, so far as that exemption is concerned.

Mr. McMAHON. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that only a few days ago we increased the pay of doctors in the Army $100 a month. Has the Senator taken into consideration the fact that this provision would about take away that increase?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes; and I also have taken into consideration that the amendment which has been added affecting officers will decrease the revenue of the Treasury by millions of dollars.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, has subsection (a) of section 7 beginning in line 16 been amended so as to change the date?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Subsection (a) of section 7 has been amended. I will read it in part:

In the case of compensation received prior to January 1, 1949.

Mr. PEPPER. That change of date has already been inserted.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the effect of that amendment is to continue these exemptions for an additional calendar year?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, line 11, after the word "asphalt", it is proposed to insert "phosphate rock"; and on page 9, line 20, after the word "clay", it is proposed to insert "phosphate rock."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 4069) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. GEORGE conferees on the part of the Senate.

INCORPORATION OF THE FRANCO-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate return to Calendar 696, Senate bill 1356, providing for the incorporation of the Franco-American War Veterans.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that the bill was passed over yesterday without prejudice.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, is that one of the three bills the Senator is sponsoring?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I shall not object to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts, but I wish to observe that it seems to me to be bad practice, and one that may cause a great deal of trouble in the future, for Congress to enact legislation giving a Federal charter to American veterans' organizations of all kinds, however worthy they may be. I recall that following World War I it took a long time to secure a congressional charter for the American Legion. It seems to me the American Legion is an organization of sufficient breadth and comprehensive inclusion of everybody who was a veteran, to satisfy all those who wish to associate themselves with organizations of ex-servicemen.

There are three bills in question: one to incorporate a Franco-American Legion, one to incorporate a Jewish-American Legion, and one to incorporate a Catholic-American Legion. It is conceivable that we might in the future be confronted with these subsidiary organizations of servicemen for some particular purpose or some local purpose, I do not know exactly what, but it seems to me that we ought to be cautious in regard to the incorporation of organizations, however worthy they may be, which carry a hyphenated implication.

I am strong for the American Legion. I am strong for the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and for the Disabled Veterans—organizations which include Americans without regard to their origin. I think Congress ought to take stock of what it is liable to get into by the wholesale incorporation of subsidiary organizations, based upon some racial origin, instead of plain American participation in veterans' organizations of all sorts.

As I stated, I shall not object to these bills, but I call the attention of the Senate to what we are liable to find in the future if we start on a wholesale program of incorporating with a Federal charter, which may or may not be used sometimes for purposes that we may not contemplate or understand, every subsidary organization that desires a Federal charter.

With these remarks about the general trend, without any particular reference to these three organizations, I will say that I hope we will not embark upon a general program of incorporating by means of a Federal charter every organization that, in the future, may seek to secure a Federal charter.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I may say to the Senator from Kentucky that on this very morning in the Committee on the Judiciary the entire matter was gone into again, and the very expressions which the able Senator now makes were made in the Committee on the Judiciary. Let me further say that for at least 2 years and more some of the proposed charters have been pending before the Committee on the Judiciary, during the time the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] was chairman of the subcommittee working on the problem. The senior Senator from West Virginia worked out a formula which to my mind was very commendable. It was approved by the Committee on the Judiciary during the Seventy-ninth Congress. I am not certain now whether or not that formula was approved by the Senator from Kentucky. It did not become a law.

Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that what he says has more cogency than he realizes. Many applications for Federal charters are being made. The applications come with splendid recommendations and splendid backing. But it seems to me, as it has for the past 2 years prior to the present session of Congress, that it is a matter of serious concern as to what organiza-

tions shall be granted Federal sanctions; not because we do not admire the various organizations, but rather because after we grant the Federal sanction by way of a charter, that charter is used as a Federal stamp of approval upon everything the organizations do, and the Congress of the United States knows nothing as to what they are doing, because there is no check whatever on them.

I voted in the committee to report the bill known as the AMVETS bill, but I say to the Senate now, and to the House as well, that it is one of the most serious things we can deal with, because behind this bill is an avalanche of other bills coming on, bills with equal sanction and equal force behind them.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nevada for his contribution to this subject.

These men did not fight as Franco-Americans. They fought as American soldiers. They did not fight as Jewish-Americans. They fought as American soldiers. I do not have to stand here and explain my attitude toward the Jewish people. I believe that the friendship which I entertain for the Jewish people has been manifested on many occasions. I am a friend of the Jewish people, not only in the United States, but all over the world. I have in my modest way tried to help to relieve their situation. They fought as American soldiers. If we incorporate a Catholic-American Legion, why not incorporate a Methodist-American Legion, a Baptist-American Legion, an Episcopalian-American Legion, a Presbyterian-American Legion, or a Holy Rollers-American Legion? I mention that not in ridicule; but if we ought to incorporate a legion made up of one religious denomination, why not incorporate the members of any religious denomination whose members say that they fought, not as Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Catholics, Episcopalians, Mormons, or any other religious denominations? Why is it not sufficient to have an American Legion made up of American soldiers? Is not that sufficient for any patriotic purpose for which Congress ought to create a charter in behalf of any organization of this sort?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CORDON. Are we on the Consent Calendar?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CORDON. I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator please withhold his objection until I have an opportunity to use the 5 minutes to which I believe I am entitled?

Mr. CORDON. Certainly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the Senator from Massachusetts proceeding? He has exhausted his rights under the rules.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts have 5 minutes additional.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I appreciate the attitude of the Senator from Nebraska.

I agree with the Senator from Kentucky that it would be a great mistake to enter into this kind of procedure on a wholesale basis. I do not believe that we confront that question today, because I understand from the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH] who joined me in introducing the bill that it is contemplated to establish a regular procedure whereby these questions will not come before Congress next year. So I do not believe that we are confronting here today a wholesale proposition. We confront the question of giving a charter to a few organizations.

Mr. President, there was nothing hyphenated about the service of these people during the war. They went into the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps; and wherever there was a battle in this war, whether in Europe or in the Pacific, on land, or sea, or in the air, I presume that there was taking part in that battle and shedding his blood, an American of French descent. If these people desire to associate themselves on the basis of the fact that they are of French descent, and on the basis of the fact that they all fought together for the United States of America, that is not a hyphenated attitude.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is there any more reason for incorporating a Franco-American Legion, than any other legion based upon national origin? The name "Franco-American" does not carry any implication of hyphenated service, but it is a hyphenated name. Is there any more reason for incorporating a Franco-American Legion than for incorporating an Anglo-American Legion, an Italo-American Legion, a Belgo-American Legion, a Chino-American Legion, or any other similar legion? There is no question that their service was not hyphenated; but if we are to do what is requested, if we are to be confronted with the desire to separate veterans into groups based upon national origin, and establish a separate corporation for each national group, it seems to me that we shall be opening Pandora's box in the matter of Federal incorporations.

Mr. LODGE. Let me respond to that point, because I think it is very fundamental.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. First let me respond to the Senator from Kentucky, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

It is not my understanding that we are engaged in America in constructing an absolutely monolithic society. Perhaps I am mistaken. I think we have a right to organize as we please, and to speak different languages if we wish to do so. I never could see that it was a detriment to a man that he spoke French, German, or Italian. It seems to me that all adds to the richness and power of American life. What we do want is a common belief in the American ideal. These men have proved that they have that. If they want to join together on the basis of a common cultural association, I cannot see that anything but good can come from it.

I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, does the Senator know whether or not it is true that many States of the Union have made grants-in-aid to veterans' organizations, and have limited such grants-in-aid to veterans' organizations which have been federally chartered? Is it not the purpose of many of these applicants for a Federal charter now to avail themselves of the grants-in-aid and quarters which may be provided by several States of the Union?

Mr. LODGE. I do not think that enters into this question. I do not understand that to be the case.

Mr. BRICKER. It is the case in several of the States that I know of.

Mr. LODGE. Insofar as the Franco-American veterans are concerned, I am confident that that question would not arise.

Mr. President, that is about all I wish to say. These veterans fought, bled, and died for America. They have been in North America for 300 years. They have kept their philosophy of life, their language, and their faith. They are patriotic Americans. Among them are holders of the Navy Cross, the Distinguished Service Cross, and other honors. If they want to associate on the basis of a common culture, it seems to me an entirely American thing to do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over, under objection.

RESEARCH RELATING TO DENTAL DISEASES AND CONDITIONS

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 449, Senate bill 176, a bill to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to dental diseases and conditions. I have just been advised by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], who objected yesterday to the consideration of the bill, that after talking with members of the American Dental Association he is prepared to withdraw his objection. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to revert to Calendar No. 449, Senate bill 176, which the clerk will state by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 176) to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to dental diseases and conditions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me for a moment on another matter which will not take more than a minute?

Mr. SMITH. I have another bill which I should like to bring up. I should like to retain the floor, if I may.

Mr. McCARRAN. If the Senator yields to me he will not lose the floor.

Mr. President, yesterday Calendar No. 531, House bill 2109, was called, and I objected to its consideration. After having studied the matter, I am now content that the bill should be passed, and I withdraw my objection. The senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] is in charge of the bill as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the request of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. Is there objection?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey as to the amount of money necessary to implement the legislation. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations I wish to say to Members of the Senate that we are forever confronted with new and additional needs for money, and I believe the Senate should know in advance what it is doing to the Federal purse when it passes additional legislation.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the question is entirely relevant, and I am glad to answer it.

The bill was passed last year after extended hearings. It provides a $2,000,000 fund to build a research laboratory in connection with the Bethesda Hospital, and $730,000 a year for dental research. I made the same announcement previously when the bill was before the Senate for consideration, and we had the same figures before us a year ago. The bill was passed a year ago and sent to the House, but the House adjourned before it could be acted upon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show that I objected when the calendar was called the first of the week to the consideration of Senate bill 176. Since then I have had telephone calls from all over the country inquiring why I object to it. I objected on behalf of another Senator. I had no personal objection to the passage of this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have no disposition and no intention to interpose an objection to the consideration of the bill. However, I desire it to be known that I personally oppose the legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 176) to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to dental diseases and conditions, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of conducting researches, investigations, experiments, and studies relating to the cause, diagnosis, and treatment of dental diseases and conditions; assisting and fostering similar research activities by other agencies, public and private; and promoting the coordination of all such researches and activities and the useful application of their results, with a view to the development and prompt widespread use of the most effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of dental diseases and conditions, there is hereby established in the National Institute of Health of the United States Public Health Service a division which shall be known as the National Institute of Dental Research (hereinafter referred to as the "Institute").

SEC. 2. The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service (hereinafter referred to as the "Surgeon General") is authorized and directed for the purposes of this act and subject to its provisions, through the Institute and in cooperation with the National Advisory Dental Research Council hereinafter established—

(a) to conduct, assist, and foster researches, investigations, experiments, and studies relating to the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of dental diseases and conditions;

(b) to promote the coordination of researches conducted by the Institute and similar researches conducted by other agencies, organizations, and individuals;

(c) to provide fellowships in the Institute, from funds appropriated or donated for such purpose;

(d) to secure for the Institute consultation services and advice of persons who are experts in the field of dental diseases and conditions from the United States and abroad; and

(e) to cooperate with State health agencies in the prevention and control of dental diseases and conditions.

SEC. 3. There is hereby created the National Advisory Dental Research Council (herein referred to as the "Council"), to consist of six members to be appointed without regard to the civil-service laws by the Surgeon General with the approval of the Federal Security Administrator, and of the Surgeon General, ex officio, who shall be chairman of the Council. The six appointed members shall be selected from leading dental, medical, or scientific authorities who are outstanding in the study, diagnosis, or treatment of dental diseases and conditions in the United States, and at least four of these members shall be dentists. Each appointed member shall hold office for a term of 3 years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (2) the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the Surgeon General at the time of appointment, two at the end of the first year, two at the end of the second year, and two at the end of the third year after the date of the first meeting of the Council. No appointed member shall be eligible to serve continuously for more than 3 years but shall be eligible for reappointment if he has not served as a member of the Council at any time within 12 months immediately preceding his reappointment. Each appointed member shall receive compensation at the rate of $25 per day during the time spent in attending meetings of the Council and for the time devoted to official business of the Council under this act, and actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses while away from his place of residence upon official business under this act.

SEC. 4. The Council is authorized—

(a) to review research projects or programs submitted to or initiated by it relating to the study of the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis and treatment of dental diseases and conditions, and certify approval to the Surgeon General, for prosecution under section 2 (a) hereof of any such projects which it believes show promise of making valuable contributions to human knowledge with respect to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis and treatment of dental diseases and conditions;

(b) to collect information as to studies which are being carried on in the United States or any other country as to the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of dental diseases and conditions, by correspondence or by personal investigation of such studies, and with the approval of the Surgeon General make available such information through the appropriate publications for the benefit of health agencies and organizations (public or private), physicians, dentists, or any other scientists, and for the information of the general public;

(c) to review applications from any university, hospital, laboratory, or other institution, whether public or private, or from individuals, for grants-in-aid for research projects relating to dental diseases and conditions, and certify to the Surgeon General its approval of grants-in-aid in the cases of such projects which show promise of making valuable contributions to human knowledge with respect to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of dental diseases and conditions;

(d) to recommend to the Surgeon General for acceptance conditional gifts pursuant to section 6; and

(e) to make recommendations to the Surgeon General with respect to carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 5. In carrying out the provisions of section 2 all appropriate provisions of section 301 of the Public Health Service Act shall be applicable to the authority of the Surgeon General.

SEC. 6. The Federal Security Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator") is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States gifts made unconditionally by will or otherwise for study, investigation, or research into the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of dental diseases and conditions, or for the acquisition of grounds or for the erection, equipment, and maintenance of premises, buildings, and equipment for the Institute. Conditional gifts may be accepted by the Administrator if recommended by the Surgeon General and the Council. Any such gifts, if in money, shall be held in trusts and shall be invested by the Administrator in securities of the United States, and the principal or income thereof shall be expended by the Surgeon General, with the approval of the Administrator, for the purposes prescribed by this act, subject to the same examination and audit as provided for appropriations made for the Public Health Service by Congress. Donations of $50,000 or over in aid of research under this act shall be acknowledged permanently by the establishment within the Institute of suitable memorials to the donors.

SEC. 7. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sum not to exceed $2,000,000 for the erection and equipment of a suitable and adequate building and facilities for the use of the Institute in carrying out the provisions of this act. The Administrator is authorized to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, donation, or otherwise, a suitable and adequate site or sites in or near the District of Columbia for such buildings and facilities, and to erect thereon, furnish, and equip such buildings and facilities when funds are made available. No permanent building shall be erected with funds authorized to be appropriated under this section until after the end of the war.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $730,000 for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act (except subsection (a) hereof). Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection may be expended in the District of Columbia for personal services, stenographic recording and translating services, by contract if deemed necessary, with-

out regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; traveling expenses (including the expenses of attendance at meetings when specifically authorized by the Surgeon General); rental, supplies, and equipment, purchase and exchange of medical and dental books, books of reference, directories, periodicals, newspapers, and press clippings; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; printing and binding (in addition to that otherwise provided by law); and for all other necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 8. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appointed in the Public Health Service, in accordance with applicable law, such commissioned officers as may be necessary to aid in carrying out the provisions of this act.

(b) This act shall not be construed as limiting (1) the functions or authority of the Surgeon General or the Public Health Service under any other act or of any other officer or agency of the United States relating to the study of the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of dental diseases and conditions; or (2) the expenditure of money therefor.

(c) The Surgeon General with the approval of the Administrator is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

(d) The Surgeon General shall include in his annual report for transmission to Congress a full report of the administration of this act, including a detailed statement of receipts and disbursements.

(e) This act shall take effect 30 days after the date of its enactment.

(f) The term "dental diseases and conditions" shall mean diseases and conditions affecting teeth and their supporting structures and other related diseases of the mouth.

(g) This act may be cited as the "National Institute of Dental Research Act."

INTERCHANGES OF PERSONS, KNOWLEDGE, AND SKILLS BETWEEN AMERICA AND OTHER NATIONS

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to order No. 602, House bill 3342, to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of the interchanges of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Jersey to return to House bill 3342?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I desire to study this bill at some length, as do various other Senators. I told the Senator from New Jersey that I would object to all features of the bill except the establishing of a commission to investigate the matter. It seems to me that we should investigate it before we act. Unless the Senator from New Jersey is willing to strike out all of the bill except the provision that the subject be investigated, I shall have to object.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I am not willing to strike out all of the bill except the provision for investigation. I should like to have it remain on the calendar. But I will suggest to the Senator from Ohio that I have prepared a concurrent resolution which I should like to ask unanimous consent to have considered. It contains the same language as that in title X to which the Senator from Ohio has referred. I should like to have the concurrent resolution agreed to so that the investigation can be made this summer, leaving the bill itself on the calendar.

I ask unanimous consent that it be agreed to without being referred. It has already been passed on by the Foreign Relations Committee because it was part of the bill in question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey asks unanimous consent that the pending business be set aside for the consideration of a resolution which he wishes to present. Is there objection?

Mr. EASTLAND. I object.

Mr. TAFT. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, with reference to the matter to which the Senator from New Jersey has just referred and to which objection has been made—

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is not in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico is proceeding by sufferance, and if he will wait until the next bill is reported, the Chair will be glad to recognize him.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not care to proceed by sufferance. I shall take my seat now, and at an appropriate time, in my own right, I hope to address the Senate somewhat at length on this measure.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I find that I was talking about one bill and thinking about another. I want what I said a moment ago to be applied and attached to what is known as the Cain bill, which I thought was then before the Senate. I had no objection to the previous bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, would it be in order to ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 249, Senate bill 140?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator would be in order.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that I am unable to pursue my request for consideration of the resolution to which I referred?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SMITH. A Senator seated to my left thought we were discussing another matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There were at least a dozen objections raised in the Chamber.

Subsequently, Mr. SMITH (for himself and Mr. HATCH), by unanimous consent, submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29), which was ordered to lie on the table:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Government Information Programs (hereinafter referred to as the joint committee), which shall be composed of five Members of the Senate (three from the majority party and two from the minority party) appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate and five Members of the House of Representatives (three from the majority party and two from the minority party) appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. The joint committee shall—

(1) make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the nature, manner of performance, and effect of all activities carried out by the State Department or any other agency of the Government (including private companies engaged in international broadcasts or other information activities) for the purpose of acquainting the peoples of foreign countries with the United States, its people and their activities, and the policies and objectives of its Government, including, without limitation—

(A) the policies and methods employed, and their objectives;

(B) the qualifications of all persons engaged in any such activities;

(C) whether the costs of such activities are justified;

(D) whether such activities are a proper function of government or should be carried out by privately owned organizations, with or without subsidies; and

(2) report to the Senate and the House of Representatives at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 1, 1948, the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1947, any amendment thereto or other necessary legislation as it may dee n desirable.

SEC. 3. (a) The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times (within the United States or abroad) during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

(b) The joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties.

(c) The expenses of the joint committee shall not exceed $50,000. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of disbursements so made.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Chair please state to the Members of the Senate what happened to Calendar No. 531, House bill 2109, as to which colloquy was exchanged?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Calendar No. 531, House bill 2109, was not submitted to the Senate. The Senator from New Jersey made a statement while there was another unanimous-consent request pending.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND SECURITY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 249, Senate bill 140.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If we return to the consideration of the bill, as suggested and as moved by the Senator from Oregon, will the Senate still be proceeding under unanimous consent?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, is the state of the record such that we might revert to Calendar No. 531, House bill 2109?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will have to say to the Senator that there is a prior unanimous-consent request pending, which has been submitted by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The Chair will be glad to recognize the Senator from Nevada as soon as that request is acted upon.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to revert to Calendar No. 249, Senate bill 140?

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over!

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think it is a very fine bill and I wholeheartedly support it. I hope that in due course of time it will be supported by the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, when the calendar was being called yesterday I interposed an objection to Calendar No. 531, House bill 2109. I have since made a careful study of the bill and desire now to withdraw my objection to the consideration of that bill. If I am in order, I ask unanimous consent that we revert to that bill.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2109) to amend section 1003 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended.

Mr. LUCAS. May we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. I think the Senator in charge of the bill, the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], can best explain the bill.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I am very glad to make a brief explanation of the bill. Under the present law, if there is through service established between an air carrier and a ground carrier there must be joint rates covering the service. It is felt by rate authorities and transportation agencies of one sort and another that joint rates are not essential to sound through service. As a matter of fact, most rates are not joint rates, but are combinations of local and proportional rates. The law as it now stands requires joint rates.

Mr. LUCAS. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INSTITUTIONAL ON-FARM VETERAN TRAINING

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, when the calendar was called yesterday, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] objected to Calendar No. 610, House bill 2181, relating to institutional on-farm training for veterans. I have since had some conversation with the Senator from Ohio, and while I infer that he does not favor the bill, he recognizes the right to have the bill brought up for consideration. Under the unanimous-consent rule I realize that, and hope the bill may now be considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 2181?

Mr. BALL. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, is it in order at this time to move to consider the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; it is not in order now to make a motion for the consideration of a bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Then, Mr. President, at the earliest opportunity I shall make such a motion, because I expect to have a vote taken on this measure.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator misunderstood me. What I agreed to was that this bill might be brought up as soon as we got through with the calendar. We mean to bring it up, along with the general on-the-job training bill. I am opposed to both of them, but my statement was that we would move to bring it up just as soon as we get through with the calendar.

I wish to speak for at least 10 minutes on it, and probably longer. It is contrary to the program of the President. The Veterans' Administrator has disapproved it and the President has disapproved it, and I think at least it should not be passed during the call of the Consent Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill goes over at the moment.

TIVOLI BREWING CO.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate revert to Calendar No. 651, Senate bill 551, to which the Senator from Illinois objected yesterday. I have conferred with him. I do not see him on the floor at this time, but I understand that he has no further objection. The bill is entitled "For the relief of the Tivoli Brewing Co."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to object to this bill for the simple reason that, as I remember, last year when I was on the Claims Committee, we had before that committee a great many bills somewhat similar to this one. If I correctly remember, all the departments warned us against passing a bill of this kind, providing for the payment of back taxes on whisky. We were told that if we did that we would have to pay out several hundred thousand dollars. For that reason, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

INCORPORATION OF CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS AND JEWISH WAR VETERANS

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we revert at this time to two bills, Calendar No. 702, Senate bill 1557, to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, and Calendar No. 704, Senate bill 1375, to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is necessary to take one request at a time.

First, the Senator from Connecticut has requested unanimous consent to revert to Calendar No. 702, Senate bill 1557, which will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1557) to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut for the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I find myself in agreement with the statements made by the minority leader [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], statements which I would have made in my own right. I believe that further consideration should be given before the passage by the Congress of a measure for the incorporation of that type of organization, which is not general, which does not have as its purpose the universal right, by virtue of military service, to membership in the organization. I think we should thoroughly investigate before we enact legislation of this type.

Therefore, I am compelled to object and ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, may I make a brief statement in connection with the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BALDWIN. This bill calls for the incorporation of the Catholic war veterans, and the other bill calls for the incorporation of the Jewish war veterans. It seems to the junior Senator from Connecticut that it is entirely natural and entirely an American thing for American citizens who had the common experience of sharing the perils and dangers of war, and who also are joined together in the common bond of a religious denomination or a religious faith, to wish to organize and join a separate organization.

It has been my experience as a veteran and as a member of the American Legion and as a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars that many of these men also belong to those veterans' organizations. Each of these two veterans' organizations which is seeking authority to incorporate has a program, in which it is tremendously interested—and it is willing to raise funds to carry forward its program—to teach sound Americanism and to combat communism.

So it seems to me, in light of the fact that the Congress has many times before

enacted legislation permitting the incorporation of organizations of this kind, that these two groups should be given that privilege.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The two bills will go over upon objection.

REGULATION OF LIFE INSURANCE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to Calendar No. 376, House bill 1633, a bill to which I made objection yesterday during the call of the calendar. I have examined the bill and the report; and I withdraw my objection, and ask that the bill be considered at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1633) to amend section 16 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RESTORATION OF CITIZENSHIP TO AMERICANS WHO SERVED IN FOREIGN ARMED FORCES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to revert to Calendar No. 515, House bill 84, a measure to amend the Nationality Act of 1940.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 84) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia again objects.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this is not the bill to which the Senator previously objected——

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. A while ago a point of order was made against me, after objection had been made to the consideration of another bill. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation in that regard?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has submitted the question whether there is objection to the request for present consideration of House bill 84, Calendar No. 515.

Mr. HATCH. Objection was made.

Mr. WILEY. I ask that the Senator withhold his objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Except as the Senator from Georgia withholds objection, the point of order is well taken.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have no objection to having the Senator make a statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia withholds objection.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the purpose of section 1 of this bill is to make certain that the benefits of section 317 of the Nationality Act do not run in favor of former citizens of the United States who lost their status as citizens because of service in the armed forces of an enemy country. At the present time, the statute would run in their favor.

The purpose of section 2 of the bill is to guarantee that former American citizens who lost their citizenship because of service in Allied armies may reacquire the status which they had prior to that loss of citizenship. In other words, if a native-born United States citizen lost his citizenship by reason of being in the service of the Canadian Army, he could reacquire it, whereas a person who lost his United States citizenship because of service in the armed forces of an enemy country would not be permitted to reacquire it, under this statute.

Mr. President, I wish to refer to page 3 of the report, at which it is shown that the Attorney General has said that the change appears desirable, because a citizen of the United States who lost his citizenship because he fought against this country should not be permitted to regain his United States citizenship under the favorable terms provided in that section of the statute.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to observe, first of all, that after a Senator has twice interposed objection to a bill during the call of the calendar, it is quite unusual for another Senator to undertake to bring up the bill without giving to the Senator who objected some notification that that course would be pursued.

This bill was called several days ago, and at that time I interposed objection. It was called yesterday, during the call of the calendar, and at that time again I interposed objection.

If I had not been on the floor of the Senate at this time when the Senator from Wisconsin made this request, no doubt the bill would have been passed, in spite of the objection I had made, and without the slightest notice to me, even though I had made objection.

So, Mr. President, I shall object to the bill.

There have been a great many changes since the Attorney General made his recommendation. In view of the situation in the world today, I do not propose to support a measure which would give to a Yugoslav citizenship rights which are denied to an Italian or an Austrian. There has been a great deal of change in the world situation.

We all know what the changes in the situation abroad have been. I would much prefer today to trust an Italian who had been drafted into the Italian Army to fight against us—and this bill would deny him any opportunity to regain his citizenship—than I would to trust some fifth columnist brought in from Yugoslavia to take over American citizenship again and begin to undermine the institutions of our Government.

I object, and I hope that some of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, and all of those who believe in fair play on both sides of the aisle, will give me an opportunity to interpose objection if this bill shall be recurred to again.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will go over.

PROCUREMENT OF SUPPLIES AND SERVICES BY WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask to revert to a bill temporarily passed over yesterday, No. 597 on the calendar, H. R. 1366.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1366) to facilitate procurement of supplies and services by the War and Navy Departments and for other purposes.

Mr. AIKEN. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will go over

Mr. GURNEY. Will the Senator from Vermont withhold his objection until I can make a brief explanation?

Mr. AIKEN. Certainly.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, this bill is undoubtedly the most important bill on the calendar with which the Armed Services Committee dealt, with the possible exception of Calendar No. 627, Senate bill 1116. The bill passed the House. I understand the subcommittee of the House committee has agreed to accept the limiting amendments the Senate Armed Services Committee recommends to the Senate, and it is very necessary for the Army that the bill be enacted.

If the Senator from Vermont is going to continue to object, of course, even though we should explain further, we might as well abandon the bill without any further explanation, but I shall be glad to answer any questions.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I see no urgency for the bill. I certainly want to take more than 5 minutes on it. It does give to the Army and the Navy powers which they now enjoy under the First War Powers Act, which they will continue to enjoy for 6 months after the cessation of hostilities.

Mr. GURNEY. I abandon the request, and I ask unanimous consent that we proceed to consider Senate bill 1116.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to complete my statement?

Mr. GURNEY. Certainly.

Mr. AIKEN. I have no objection to the enactment of the proposed legislation, but it applies only to the Army and the Navy, and when the need for it arises, all the other agencies of Government will be left high and dry. I would rather it would come up when there was plenty of time to discuss it. I have no objection to the part that is included in the bill, but it does not go far enough. Furthermore, I do not see the urgency for it, because the Army and the Navy have broader powers already than those granted them under H. R. 1366, and they will have those powers until 6 months after the cessation of hostilities as officially declared.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota withdraws his request.

LIMITATION ON CONSTRUCTION OF ARMY FAMILY QUARTERS

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider Senate bill 1116, to provide a limitation on the construction of family quarters for the Army, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1116) to provide a limitation on the construction of family quarters for the Army, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, on page 3, after line 15, to insert:

SEC. 3. Family quarters for personnel of the Navy heretofore, herein, or hereafter authorized shall not be of greater net floor area per unit than the following:

For flag officers, 2,100 square feet.

For captains, 1,670 square feet.

For commanders and lieutenant commanders, 1,400 square feet.

For warrant officers, commissioned warrant officers, and commissioned officers through the rank of lieutenant, 1,250 square feet.

For enlisted personnel and noncommissioned officers, 1,080 square feet.

For the purposes of this act, net floor area is defined as all floor space inside the exterior walls, excluding basement (or service space in lieu of basement), attic, garage, and porches.

The above area allowances shall superside the limitations contained in the act of July 8, 1946 (Public Law 492, 79th Cong.), and may be increased by not to exceed 10 percent for all quarters outside continental United States and by not to exceed 10 percent for quarters of commanding officers of stations or installations over and above that to which his rank would entitle him. Quarters for civilians shall be limited to conform to the allowances for officers or men of comparable status according to responsibility, rating, and pay, as determined by the Secretary of Navy to be appropriate.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasuray of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums of money as may be necessary for the purposes of this act but not to exceed $67,300,000 for public works in continental United States, including $3,000,000 for the correction of deficiencies in existing or approved facilities, for emergency projects authorized by the Secretary of the Navy, and repairs incident to casualties thereto and $60,500,000 for public works outside continental United States, including $3,000,000 for the correction of deficiencies in existing or approved facilities, for emergency projects authorized by the Secretary of the Navy, and repairs incident to casualties thereto for the fiscal year 1948. Any such appropriation shall be available, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for expenses incident to construction, including administration, overhead, planning, and surveys, and shall be available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from South Dakota, who is in charge of the bill, whether it means that there is no limit at all to what can be spent for a house for an Army officer.

Mr. GURNEY. Absolutely there is. The limitation is on the size of the house. The bill merely removes the limitation so as to take care of the increased building costs.

Mr. LANGER. The size of the house is limited?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes; it is limited in size by cubic feet.

Mr. TAFT. What the bill does is to take all limitations off the financial amount that may be spent on a house.

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TAFT. And it imposes a limitation only by size.

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TAFT. But within the size fixed, all the money desired can be spent in the construction of a house.

Mr. GURNEY. The budget puts some limitations on that, and the construction program of the Army or Navy has to receive the approval of the budget.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as I read the bill, and as I heard it discussed in the committee, it limits the cost of a house for one above the rank of captain to $14,500, and to those of and below the rank of captain to $12,500.

Mr. TAFT. Money, or feet?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Money.

Mr. TAFT. As I read the bill, there was no limitation on the amount.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I read from page 3 of the bill:

Provided further, That hereafter no part of this appropriation or any appropriation hereafter made shall be expended for the construction of quarters for officers of the Army in the United States or its possessions, the total cost of which, including heating and plumbing apparatus, wiring and fixtures, shall exceed in the case of an officer above the rank of captain, $14,500, and of an officer of and below the rank of captain, $12,500.

That would appear to me to be a dollar limitation on the cost. Is that the understanding of the Senator from South Dakota, or not?

Mr. GURNEY. The money limitation there is far exceeded by the limitations in cubic feet of space allowed for each house. The Senator will notice in section 2——

Mr. CORDON. I think I can answer my own question.

Mr. GURNEY. In the first line of section 2 that is repealed.

Mr. CORDON. It is modified, and is not applicable in this case, so it specifically takes out the limitation.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, would the bill cover the Navy also?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand, the Navy contemplates the construction of 115 family units near the Pacific coast, at an average cost of $43,000 a unit. Is this bill intended to remove the limitations because of that building project?

Mr. GURNEY. The answer is no, and I would say there is no building in prospect for the Navy or Army or Air Corps that has a unit cost of $43,000. It just could not be, under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. One building project was called to the attention of my committee. I do think it was located in a difficult environment; I believe in the desert. It is claimed that the cost will be very high.

Mr. GURNEY. I do not know of the particular project about which the Senator is talking, but the limitation here is an individual-unit limitation. There may be more than one unit in one building in the project to which the Senator alludes.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not objecting to the Senator's bill, but I was asking if it was introduced for the purpose of covering this high-priced project.

Mr. GURNEY. No.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to have the sponsor of the bill suggest to the Senate whether the enactment of the proposal will require further appropriations out of the United States Treasury, and if so, how much? I should like to keep that question and that information before the Senate from now on.

Mr. GURNEY. I am not advised as to any total construction asked for by the Army and Navy above what presently appears in the Navy and the Army appropriation bills. They do find that in building family units at air bases and Army posts and Navy bases, at Norfolk, and elsewhere, they cannot, under the existing limitation of $3,000 a unit, adequately house their men. A house simply cannot be built for such a low price. This bill is to remove the $3,000 limitation and insert a limitation involving square feet of floor space. I am sincere in saying that this is one of the bills which we should have passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no money from current or future appropriations for the Army shall be expended for the construction of family quarters for personnel of the Army of greater net floor area in square feet per unit than the following:

For enlisted men, 1,080.

For warrant officers, flight officers, and commissioned officers of and below the rank of captain, 1,250.

For majors and lieutenant colonels, 1,400.

For colonels, 1,670.

For general officers, 2,100.

For the purposes of this act, net floor area is defined as the space inside the exterior walls, excluding basement (or service space in lieu of basement), attic, garage, and porches: *Provided*, That these areas may be increased not to exceed 10 percent at activities outside the continental United States, and not to exceed 10 percent for quarters of commanding officers of stations, bases, or installations based on the normal rank of such officers: *Provided further*, That quarters for civilians shall be limited to conform to the allowances for officers or men of comparable status according to responsibility, rating, and pay as determined by the Secretary of War to be appropriate.

SEC. 2. The following parts of acts are hereby repealed, and shall not be applicable to contracts or expenditures under the appropriations "Engineer Service, Army," contained in the Military Appropriation Acts, 1946 and 1947: That part of section 1 of the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 721), which reads as follows: "*Provided*, That hereafter no money appropriated for military posts shall be expended for the construction of quarters for officers of the Army, or for barracks and quarters for the artillery the total

cost of which, including heating and plumbing apparatus, wiring and fixtures, shall exceed, in the case of quarters of a general officer, the sum of $15,000, of a colonel or an officer above the rank of captain, $12,000, and of an officer of and below the rank of captain, $9,000," as modified by section 1 of the act of February 25, 1927 (44 Stat. 1235), which reads as follows: "*And provided further*, That hereafter no part of this appropriation or any appropriation hereafter made shall be expended for the construction of quarters for officers of the Army in the United States or its possessions, the total cost of which, including heating and plumbing apparatus, wiring and fixtures, shall exceed in the case of an officer above the rank of captain, $14,500, and of an officer of and below the rank of captain, $12,500."

SEC. 3. Family quarters for personnel of the Navy heretofore, herein, or hereafter authorized shall not be of greater net floor area per unit than the following:

For flag officers, 2,100 square feet.

For captains, 1,670 square feet.

For commanders and lieutenant commanders, 1,400 square feet.

For warrant officers, commissioned warrant officers, and commissioned officers through the rank of lieutenant, 1,250 square feet.

For enlisted personnel and noncommissioned officers, 1,080 square feet.

For the purposes of this act, net floor area is defined as all floor space inside the exterior walls, excluding basement (or service space in lieu of basement), attic, garage, and porches.

The above area allowances shall supersede the limitations contained in the act of July 8, 1946 (Public Law 492, 79th Cong.), and may be increased by not to exceed 10 percent for all quarters outside continental United States and by not to exceed 10 percentum for quarters of commanding officers of stations or installations over and above that to which his rank would entitle him. Quarters for civilians shall be limited to conform to the allowances for officers or men of comparable status according to responsibility, rating, and pay, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy to be appropriate.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums of money as may be necessary for the purposes of this act but not to exceed $67,300,000 for public works in continental United States, including $3,000,000 for the correction of deficiencies in existing or approved facilities, for emergency projects authorized by the Secretary of the Navy, and repairs incident to casualties thereto and $60,500,000 for public works outside continental United States, including $3,000,000 for the correction of deficiencies in existing or approved facilities, for emergency projects authorized by the Secretary of the Navy, and repairs incident to casualties thereto for the fiscal year 1948. Any such appropriation shall be available, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for expenses incident to construction, including administration, overhead, planning, and surveys, and shall be available until expended.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide a limitation on the construction of family quarters for the Army and Navy, and for other purposes."

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair inquire whether this assault is upon the bill, which the Chair is trying at the moment to state is passed, or does it apply to the next order of business?

PROMOTION AND ELIMINATION OF OFFICERS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I next ask unanimous consent to call up Calendar 637, House bill 3830.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to revert to Calendar 637, House bill 3830, which the clerk will state by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill to provide for the promotion and elimination of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I understand this is the act that applies to the promotion and elimination of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. DWORSHAK. It is a bill with some 131 pages?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. DWORSHAK. It is proposed to dispose of it here in the space of a minute or two? I object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will go over.

G. R. BELOW

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on yesterday, during the call of the calendar, there was passed in my absence a bill introduced by me, namely, S. 795, Calendar No. 618, for the relief of G. R. Below, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment reducing the amount payable to him to $1,000. The Judiciary Committee had authorized me, subsequent to the reporting of the bill, to submit an amendment which would allow Mr. Below to institute a suit in the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington.

The bill, as I am informed, has been transmitted to the House of Representatives, and rather than enter a motion to reconsider the vote on the passage of the bill and move that the House be requested to return the bill to the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a new bill containing the language which the Judiciary Committee authorized me to offer as an amendment to the original bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, why does not the Senator from Washington move to reconsider the passage of S. 795?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The bill has gone to the House, and I think the matter could be expedited by the passage of a new bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1721) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of injuries sustained by G. R. Below, of Seattle, Wash., was read twice by its title, considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim for compensation against the United States arising out of injuries sustained by G. R. Below, late of Seattle, Wash., who was injured on May 16, 1942, while engaged in the pursuit of his occupation as a fisherman, by a bullet fired during target practice at the naval section base, Port Angeles, Wash.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations, suit upon any such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, suit on such claim may be instituted and maintained by the widow of the said G. R. Below, and in the determination of such claim the United States shall be held liable for damages to the said G. R. Below, and for any wrongful acts or omissions committed by any of its officers or employees, to the same extent as if the United States were a private person and to the same extent as if such suit had been instituted and maintained by the said G. R. Below prior to his death, except that any judgment rendered therein shall be payable to such widow. Except as otherwise provided in this section, proceedings for the determination of such claim, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the cases over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph "twentieth" of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

DREDGE "AJAX"

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, am I in order to ask this question? On the calendar, there is a motion by the Senator from Louisiana to reconsider a vote which the Senate took on Monday on the passage of H. R. 4229, relating to the dredge *Ajax*. Is it in order to ask that that be brought up at this time?

Mr. LUCAS. What is the calendar number?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is House bill 4229. The motion is on the calendar. It is a motion to reconsider.

Mr. LUCAS. What is the calendar number?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, what is the calendar number?

Mr. MAGNUSON. There is no calendar number. It is a motion to reconsider appearing on page 17 of the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington is dealing, as the Chair understands, with a motion which was entered by the Senator from Louisiana for reconsideration.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And which is pending.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is pending, but it cannot be taken up under the existing order, except by unanimous consent. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio objects.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. May I ask the Senator from Ohio when these motions to reconsider can be disposed of?

Mr. WHERRY. When the unanimous consent calendar is concluded.

Mr. TAFT. May I say to the Senator that I do not know. It seems to me, Mr. President, that we have a unanimous consent request. We obtained the right to call the calendar. I do not think we ought to do anything beyond calling the calendar. There are many other matters pressing for attention.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This is on the calendar.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think that matters not on the calendar should be brought up.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This is on the calendar. It is a pending motion. All we want to do is to call it up and dispose of it. The Senator from Louisiana and I are in agreement on it, and we want it called up, and to be disposed of.

Mr. TAFT. As a matter of fact, it is not on the calendar.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois submits a parliamentary inquiry. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Are these motions to reconsider, found on page 17, considered a part of the calendar?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Then, if the Senator from Ohio is correct that we are to conclude the calendar, this motion will automatically come up when we get through?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No. Let the Chair state the situation, as the Chair understands it. The Senate is operating now under a unanimous-consent order, and nothing can be done except by unanimous consent. The bill to which the Senator from Louisiana attached his motion to reconsider was passed by unanimous consent. The motion to reconsider, however, cannot be taken up until after the unanimous-consent procedure is entirely finished, and after the pending motion in respect to the Kem resolution is out of the way, so that the Senate is open again to consider motions to take up legislative matters.

Mr. LUCAS. Do I understand the Kem resolution has priority over motions to reconsider?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It does. It is a pending motion, which has been temporarily set aside by unanimous consent.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. What is the status, then, of the bill (H. R. 4229) which passed the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The status of the bill is that it is in suspended animation, held up by the motion of the Senator from Louisiana. Nothing can be done about it until the Senator from Washington or the Senator from Louisiana can call it up in regular legislative session.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Washington and the Senator from Louisiana are trying to do that. It is only on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Of course, the Senator from Louisiana can withdraw his motion if he wishes; but otherwise there is nothing the Chair can do to give any solace to the Senator from Washington.

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

Mr. McGRATH. Mr.. President, I now ask unanimous consent to revert to Calendar 598, Senate Resolution 144, authorizing an investigation of law enforcement and police administration in the District of Columbia. I understand the Senator who objected yesterday will not further object.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina objects.

SPECIAL COINAGE BILLS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, yesterday I entered several motions to reconsider, and discussed a number of the bills. I discussed the matter with a member of the committee. It is his thought and mine that if we let all these bills go, they will disclose how ridiculous it is to have so many of these that will better enable the President to veto all of them. So I have concluded that I wish to withdraw a motion to reconsider on Senate bill 1614, Senate bill 1304, Senate bill 1042, Senate bill 722, Senate bill 342, and Senate Joint Resolution 48.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas withdraws his motions to reconsider.

AMENDMENT OF THE RFC ACT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to revert to Calendar 644, Senate bill 1543.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1543) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I objected to this bill yesterday. I have consulted further with the Senator from Alabama and looked up the figures. There is, of course, a particular difficulty that exists in small towns where the banking facilities are limited, but so far as I can discover, $100,000,000 would more than cover the necessary sum, during the next 6 months, until the Senate returns. I think the RFC ought to be under pressure to create and find financial institutions to whom they can transfer the mortgages. If the Senator is willing to accept an amendment reducing the amount from $350,000,000 to $100,000,000, I shall be glad to withdraw my objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do think this is a matter of very grave concern to many of the areas of the United States. While we are not certain that the $100,000,000 will be sufficient, I certainly think it would be much better to have the authority, with that limited amount, than not to have the authority at all. Therefore, so far as I am concerned, I am willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. TAFT. I may say that the RFC in all the period of the last 2 years has put out only about $90,000,000, so I feel confident the $100,000,000 will cover the next 6 months.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1543) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment, after the enacting clause, to strike out:

That section 4 (a) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended by Senate Joint Resolution 135, approved June 30, 1947, is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subdivision as follows:

"(5) To provide for original mortgagees a market for home loans guaranteed or insured under the provisions of title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, by the purchase, administration, and disposition of such loans directly, or through national banks, acting as agents or as trustees, in an aggregate amount not to exceed $500,000,000 held by the Corporation at any one time."

SEC. 2. Section 4 (c) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended by Senate Joint Resolution 135, approved June 30, 1947, is further amended by striking out "$2,000,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,500,000,000."

And insert:

That section 4 (a) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended by Public Law 132, Eightieth Congress, approved June 30, 1947, is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(5) Subject to such terms and conditions and in such manner as it may determine, to provide for original mortgagees a market for home loans guaranteed or insured under the provisions of title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, by the purchase, administration, and disposition of such loans directly, or through national banks, acting as agents or as trustees, provided—

"(A) any such loan shall not have exceeded $10,000 in original principal amount, shall not be dated prior to July 1, 1947, and shall not be delivered for purchase except during the initial 6 months from the date of such loan;

"(B) any such loan shall not be in default as of the date it is delivered for purchase;

"(C) the purchase price shall not exceed the unpaid principal balance of the loan, plus unpaid accrued interest;

"(D) an original mortgagee shall not deliver to the Corporation for purchase a loan having an unpaid principal balance which when added to the aggregate unpaid balance of loans (computed as of the dates of purchase) theretofore purchased under this section 4 (a) (5) exceeds 50 percent of the original principal amount of all such loans made by such mortgagee dated after June 30, 1947;

"(E) the aggregate unpaid principal balance of such loans purchased and commitments made pursuant to this section 4 (a) (5) shall not exceed $350,000,000 outstanding at any one time."

So as to make the bill read:

That section 4 (a) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended by Public Law 132, Eightieth Congress, approved June 30, 1947, is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(5) Subject to such terms and conditions and in such manner as it may determine, to

provide for original mortgagees a market for home loans guaranteed or insured under the provisions of title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, by the purchase, administration, and disposition of such loans directly, or through national banks, acting as agents or as trustees, provided—

"(A) any such loan shall not have exceeded $10,000 in original principal amount, shall not be dated prior to July 1, 1947, and shall not be delivered for purchase except during the initial 6 months from the date of such loan;

"(B) any such loan shall not be in default as of the date it is delivered for purchase;

"(C) the purchase price shall not exceed the unpaid principal balance of the loan, plus unpaid accrued interest;

"(D) an original mortgagee shall not deliver to the Corporation for purchase a loan having an unpaid principal balance which when added to the aggregate unpaid balance of loans (computed as of the dates of purchase) theretofore purchased under this section 4 (a) (5) exceeds 50 percent of the original principal amount of all such loans made by such mortgagee dated after June 30, 1947;

"(E) the aggregate unpaid principal balance of such loans purchased and commitments made pursuant to this section 4 (a) (5) shall not exceed $350,000,000 outstanding at any one time."

SEC. 2. Section 4 (c) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended by Public Law 132, Eightieth Congress, approved June 30, 1947, is further amended by striking out "$2,000,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,350,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I now offer an amendment on page 3, line 14, to strike out the figure "$350,000,000" and insert "$100,000,000"; and in line 20 to strike out the figure "$2,350,000,000" and insert "$2,100,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GEORGE. The inquiry is whether we have escaped from the Consent Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. We have not yet escaped.

Mr. GEORGE. Then I demand the regular order on every item from now on, so that we can finally get out from under the calendar, and I can make a motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not understand what the Senator has in mind. It would be the Chair's view that the regular order is the unanimous Consent Calendar at the moment.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; but I perceive, Mr. President, that discussions continue for more than 5 minutes on almost every bill called on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has been endeavoring to hold Senators to 5 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE. I shall object then to special requests as they come up.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LANDS IN ILLINOIS TO THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to revert to House bill 3043, Calendar No. 740. When the bill was called on the calendar the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] objected. I understand he does not now object, so I ask for immediate consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3043) to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN INTERNS, STUDENT NURSES, AND OTHERS FROM CLASSIFICATION ACT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to revert to House bill 1714, Calendar No. 742. I was absent from the Senate when the bill was reached on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, when the bill was reached on the calendar I asked for an explanation. The Senator from North Dakota was not present. There was no direct objection to the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the bill deals with certain interns, student nurses, and other student employees of hospitals of the Federal Government. There are at present a number of these student employees engaged in study and training in hospitals, clinics, and laboratories operated by the Federal Government or the District of Columbia. The bill would exclude such individuals from the Classification Act and other laws relating to compensation and benefits of Federal employees.

Mr. President, I wish to say that at the request of the Civil Service Commission the bill was introduced and was unanimously reported from the Committee on Civil Service. It was stated by the Civil Service Commission that they preferred not to have those who were to take such positions to come under civil-service examination; that the examination in the last analysis meant nothing. Therefore they asked that the civil-service examination do not apply for this particular class of individuals.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Can the Senator advise the Senate as to whether the proposed legislation would require the appropriation of money from the Treasury, and if so, how much?

Mr. LANGER. It would require no appropriation of money.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1714) to exclude certain interns, student nurses, and other student-employees of hospitals of the Federal Government from the Classification Act and other laws relating to compensation and benefits of Federal employees, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

APPLICATION FOR SELECTION TO THE STATES FOR HIGHWAY PURPOSES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 1305, Calendar No. 721. When the bill was reached on the calendar objection was made by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], to whom I have spoken, and he has withdrawn his objection.

I may say that the bill relates only to giving the States notice so that they can file applications for rights-of-way for highways. I have received letter from the State engineer of Colorado, from the State of California, from the State of Nevada Department of Highways, from the State of Washington Department of Highways, from the New Mexico State Highway Department, and from the Wyoming Highway Department, all asking that the legislation be passed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] asked me to object to the bill. He is not present at the moment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Arkansas that I have spoken to the Senator from Illinois, who made objection on behalf of the Senator from Wyoming, and the Senator from Illinois himself called my attention to the objection. Thereupon I consulted with the Senator from Wyoming, who withdrew his objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1305) to amend section 24 of the Federal Power Act so as to provide that the States may apply for reservation of portions of power sites released for entry, location, or selection to the States for highway purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 24 of the Federal Power Act, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first proviso thereof a colon and the following new proviso: "*Provided further*, That before any lands applied for, or heretofore or hereafter reserved, or classified as power sites, are declared open to location, entry, or selection by the Secretary of the Interior, notice of intention to make such declaration shall be given to the Governor of the State within which such lands are located, and such State shall have 90 days from the date of such notice within which to file, under any statute or regulation applicable thereto, an application for the reservation to the State, or any political subdivision thereof, of any lands required as a right-of-way for a public highway or as a source of materials for the construction and maintenance of such highways, and a copy of such application shall be filed with the Federal Power Commission; and any location, entry, or selection of such lands, or subsequent patent thereof, shall be subject to any rights granted the State pursuant to such application."

INCORPORATION OF THE FEDERAL CITY CHARTER COMMISSION

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate revert to Senate bill 354, Calendar No. 102, a bill to incorporate the Federal City Charter Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I object.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection until I may make an explanation?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; I withhold the objection.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, all that is embraced within the bill is the right of the people, consisting of more than 1,000,000 souls, of the District of Columbia, to set up a commission to prepare a charter which must be submitted to the Congress, in order that they, the people of the District of Columbia, might have a voice in their own municipal government. If there is any Senator who thinks that there is a community in all America that should be deprived of the right of having a voice in its own particular government, then let him object to the bill, but if an American principle is contained in any measure we pass, certainly it is in this bill.

All that is incorporated in the bill is the right of the people of the District of Columbia to try, if you please, to formulate a government for home rule. Not that they have a vote in the Nation; not that they have a place in the Nation as regards the election of a President or a Vice President or a Senator, but rather that they may have a voice in their own home rule. That is all that is involved in the bill. Then they must, after drafting the proposed charter, submit the charter to the Congress for approval.

Today the Committee on the District of Columbia is asking for some $25,000, if I am correct in the figure, with which to investigate a part of the District of Columbia government, namely, the Police Department, whereas, as a matter of fact, if the people of the District of Columbia had a chance to express their own voice in the selection of their chief of police and their city organization, perhaps that would be entirely unnecessary. If it is right to appropriate out of the funds of the Senate $25,000 with which to investigate the Police Department of the District of Columbia, then is it not right that the people of the District of Columbia should have a chance to voice their own expressions in the selection of their own governors who would select the chief of police, so that then the people of the District of Columbia themselves could hold the chief of police responsible to the people of the District of Columbia?

That is all that is involved in this bill. There is no charter involved. There is no national vote involved. There is no national position involved. It involves only the opportunity for the people of an American community to have American rights.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. McCARRAN subsequently said: Mr. President, it is indeed surprising when an American Congress will deprive an American community, living at the Capital of the Nation, where the Congress must assemble, of the right to express itself in the selection of its own local government.

On every hand we are asked to do everything to prevent communism in this country and to prevent subversive action. I cannot permit this moment to pass without saying that by mere personal objection on the floor of the Senate we are depriving 1,000,000 souls in the Nation's Capital of the right to express themselves in the selection of their own municipal governors.

If there ever was a government in all America that required immediate investigation, immediate revision, immediate thought and consideration, it is the Government of the District of Columbia. Who is better entitled to investigate that government, to consider it, and to establish a new government, if necessary, than the people who pay a high percentage of taxes to maintain the government? Yet by one objection we deny the right of those who are living here merely to study a method by which they might set up their own charter and their own civil government. It is incomprehensible. To my mind it is without the scope of the American spirit, and without the scope of American ideals.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] has objected to consideration of the bill. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a question of this importance requires longer consideration. This bill involves the question of government in the District of Columbia, which we have met and dealt with in its many phases.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator wait until the next bill is before the Senate, so that we may proceed in order?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thought I was discussing the bill which was before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill has been passed over at the Senator's request.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Am I in error in believing that any Senator has a right to discuss this question for a period of 5 minutes?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Just so soon as something is before the Senate. The Senate is in precisely the same situation in which it was when the point of order was made against the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] sometime ago. When the next bill is before the Senate, the Chair will be very glad to recognize the Senator from West Virginia, unless the Senator from West Virginia withdraws his objection temporarily.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I did withhold my objection, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Very well. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, this bill is one phase of the matter of government in the District of Columbia. I feel that it is of such importance that it ought not to be passed summarily and quickly upon the call of the calendar. It should be given more consideration. Therefore I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. What is the status of the RECORD? Did the Senator from West Virginia insist on his objection, or was it withheld?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia renewed his objection at the end of his statement.

COAST GUARD AVIATION STATIONS

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 731, House bill 72.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 731, House bill 72, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 72) to increase the number of authorized aviation stations operated by the Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, earlier in the day when Calendar No. 731, House bill 72, was reached, objection was made by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] on the ground that he felt that there was a letter in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce from the Army opposing the bill. I have since learned that there is no such letter. I have taken the question up with the Senator from South Dakota, and he has authorized me to state that he withdraws his objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 72) to increase the number of authorized aviation stations operated by the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAYMENT OF TRAVEL EXPENSES OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar 743, Senate bill 1064.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to return to Calendar 743, Senate bill 1064, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1064) relating to the payment of travel expenses of officers and employees of the Post Office Department and postal service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator what expense is involved?

Mr. BALDWIN. The bill would entail no expenditure. Under the present practice and the present law, if a postal employee expends any money for traveling expenses on business of the Government, the account must first be preaudited by the General Accounting Office. The bill would simply give authority to postmasters and disbursing officers to authorize traveling expenses. The accounts would all be carefully and properly audited thereafter. The difficulty under the present law is that when a man spends his own money he must often wait several weeks, and perhaps months, before he is reimbursed. The bill would merely correct that situation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, does this bill involve expenditure for clerks and employees of the Post Office Department attending conventions?

Mr. BALDWIN. The bill would not involve any additional expenditure. As a matter of fact, it might result in saving some money, because it would eliminate some paper work. It merely eliminates the preaudit of the traveling-expense accounts, and gives the Postmaster General authority to prescribe, by rules and regulations, the method for effectuating the payment of traveling expenses of postal employees engaged in business of the Government.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, authorize the payment of travel expenses of officers and employees of the Post Office Department and postal service, and advances of necessary sums to defray such travel expenses, without regard to section 3674 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 632), and section 4055 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (39 U. S. C. 787), by designated postmasters and other disbursing officers prior to certification by the General Accounting Office, by warrants or checks not registered and countersigned in the General Accounting Office.

CONTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS BY THE NAVY

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 660, Senate bill 1675.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 660, Senate bill 1675, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1675) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works and for other purposes.

Mr. GEORGE. I object. This is a Senate bill; and I have a bill of which I am in charge which passed the House. If I cannot get consideration for it I shall certainly not consent to consideration for any other Senate bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to revert to Calendar 661, Senate bill 1676, to authorize the Secretary of War to proceed with construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Mr. GEORGE. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. GURNEY. I ask unanimous consent to revert to Calendar No. 697, House bill 1544, to provide appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the armed forces who lost their lives in World War II.

Mr. GEORGE. I object.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, is the call of the calendar completed?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will have been completed when we have considered one more request, which the senior Senator from Michigan now makes. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] objected to Calendar No. 715, House Joint Resolution 232, when it was called yesterday. This is a joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission and authorizing an appropriation therefor. The commission is simply a consultative commission between Australia, New Zealand, and the United States, with respect to mutual relationships among the islands.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if I objected, I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will add that the expenditure of the United States in this participation will not exceed $20,000.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I shall have to object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia objects.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, is the call of the calendar completed?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair so understands.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the Senator from North Dakota endeavoring to call up a bill for consideration?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an explanation of House bill 710 which was passed yesterday. Since that time complaints have been received, and I should like an explanation from the Senator from the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota asks unanimous consent that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] explain a bill which is not before the Senate.

Mr. KEM. I object.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. REED submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3839) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 4, 8, 24, 29, 30, 36, and 38.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 13, 14, 26, 32, 33, and 37, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT REPORTS

"Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of Government Reports, including personal services in the District of Columbia; newspapers and periodicals (not exceeding $500); teletype news service (not exceeding $900); printing and binding; not to exceed $1,000 for deposit in general fund of the Treasury for cost of penalty mail as required by the Act of June 28, 1944; not to exceed $500 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600); health service program as authorized by the Act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 658); and the payment of claims pursuant to part 2 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (Public Law 601); $230,000: *Provided*, That no person paid from this appropriation shall receive a salary in excess of $7,500 per annum: *Provided further*, That amounts expended under the authority of Public Law 161, Eightieth Congress, shall be deducted from the appropriation herein made for the fiscal year 1948."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "of which amount there shall be available to the Commission for cancer research work such sums (not exceeding $5,000,000) as the Commission believes can be efficiently used without duplicating the cancer research work of other public and private agencies"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$122,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,612,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert $2,900,120"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 5 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the figure "$3,850,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$3,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$9,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagrement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the salary of any employee of grade 5 or above in the professional service or of grade 11 or above in the clerical,

administrative, and fiscal service who was originally appointed in the National Archives to a war-service appointment, except a presently employed veteran of either World War or a member of the active or inactive reserve of the armed forces"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ", and not exceeding $15,000,000 for reconditioning"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$208,206,774"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$208,206,774"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,320,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$898,040,780"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,964,457,080"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 2, 7, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 25, 28, and 31.

CLYDE M. REED,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
GUY CORDON,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
CHAS. R. ROBERTSON,
F. R. COUDERT, Jr.,
JOE HENDRICKS,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
ALBERT THOMAS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I want to take a few minutes in which to explain the general purport of the conference report on the independent offices appropriation bill, 1948. I shall be happy to answer any questions that any Member of the Senate might wish to ask me.

The Senate had allowed the War Assets Administration an increase of approximately $25,000,000 above the House figure. The Senate receded from that increase with the understanding that it write into the conference report authority for the War Assets Administration to use 60 percent of the smaller appropriation in the first half of this fiscal year.

An appropriation for the Office of Government Reports was omitted by the House. The Senate allowed them $400,000. The conference provided $230,000.

The Atomic Energy Commission asked for $250,000,000 cash appropriation and $250,000,000 contract authorizations. The House allowed $250,000,000 contract authorizations, but kept the cash appropriation down to $175,000,000. The Senate raised that amount to the amount requested, $250,000,000. We wrote into the conference report this language because we did not underrate the importance of their work and the effect upon the world situation of the Atomic Energy Commission's appropriations, and we appropriated $175,000,000 in cash as proposed by the House. In the report it is stated:

The conference committee has every desire to provide for the Atomic Energy Commission all funds necessary to carry its mission to complete fulfillment. At the time of the House hearings plans of the Commission were not complete and the amount requested rested more or less upon conjecture. The House allowed $175,000,000 for cash expenditures instead of the $250,000,000 requested, and the House committee in its report stated that, when the Congress reconvenes in January 1948, additional funds would be allowed if necessary. The House deemed the sum of $175,000,000 ample for cash requirements for the first half of the fiscal year 1948. The conferees have accepted this view in its action. Whatever may be shown to be necessary for the remainder of the fiscal year 1948 will be allowed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I wanted to ask the Senator a question on a particular point——

Mr. REED. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. First let me say, Mr. President, that the matter of appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission is a matter of very vital consideration and concern to the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and should be a matter of vital and deep concern to every Member of the Senate and every Member of the House of Representatives under their responsibility for national defense.

The appropriations requested by the Atomic Energy Commission for the ensuing fiscal year represent not only the estimates of the Manhattan District before the Commission came into being, but also represent the coincidental estimates of the Atomic Energy Commission at the present time. Two hundred and fifty million dollars was asked for contract allocations; $250,000,000 was asked for cash expenditures for the fiscal year. For some reason, which I was not previously able to understand, the House committee saw fit to slash $75,000,000 from that cash appropriation. I objected to it seriously. Together with other members of the committee I made representations to the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Senate replaced the $75,000,000 in the appropriation bill and took it to conference. Now, however, the House view has prevailed, and the $75,000,000 remains out of the bill.

However, I have had conversation with the House members of the Conference Committee. I will say that the Senate members of the Conference Committee stood fast on the Senate position for every reasonable period of time. I am now convinced that the House members of the Conference Committee not only have no intention of curtailing the proper and desirable actions of the Atomic Energy Commission, but they have now declared affirmatively that they intend to support every possible need of the Atomic Energy Commission; or, to use their own language—

The Conference Committee has every desire to provide for the Atomic Energy Commission all funds necessary to carry its mission to complete fulfillment.

Mr. President, on behalf of the conference committee, I insert that statement in good faith, as I know it is made in good faith by the conference committee.

I am also mindful of their statement that they have allocated the sum of $175,000,000 in cash, which is deemed to be ample for the requirements of the first half of the fiscal year 1948. They also said:

Whatever may be shown to be necessary for the remainder of the fiscal year 1948 will be allowed.

Mr. President, I say that I am not only greatly comforted, but I am encouraged by the attitude, as expressed in the conference report, of unlimited support of the advancement of atomic energy in this country within all reasonable and sound and proper limits.

Upon that basis, I congratulate the conferees for finally arriving at that very clear statement of their great willingness to support and advance atomic energy development, and I say that the clouds of doubt that I once had that they might attempt to curtail or cut down our preeminence in the field of atomic energy, have disappeared and have been dissipated, and I feel that the Congress can depend upon the committee as to any future showing that may be made.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As a member of the committee, I wish to say that I desire to associate myself with the distinguished Senator from Iowa, the chairman of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee. As he has stated in commenting on the conference report, nothing will be done that in any way will curtail this very vital organization, the Atomic Energy Commission, in carrying out its functions of such vital concern to the national security.

So I am willing to go along with the conference report.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from California and the

Senator from Iowa that if the assurance contained in the conference report is not adequate, it is the fault of the Senate conferees, because they were told to write their own ticket on that assurance.

Mr. President, the Senate voted an increase of $400,000 for the appropriations for the Federal Communications Commission. In the conference report, that is reduced by one-half; it is cut back to an increase of $200,000 above the amount appropriated by the House.

The appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission was increased $200,000 by the action of the Senate; and in the conference report that increase is reduced by one-half, so that a $100,000 increase is left.

The Interstate Commerce Commission was voted an increase in appropriations of about $400,000 by the Senate; and in the conference report that is cut back to about one-half of the increase the Senate voted.

In the Senate, the appropriation for the Securities and Exchange Commission was increased by $300,00. Under the conference report, all that increase has to go out.

The Senate also arranged for an appropriation of $900,000 for the purpose of bringing back to Washington the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Immigration Division of the Department of Justice, both of which now are in Philadelphia. Together, they pay approximately $500,000 a year rent for quarters in Philadelphia, and about $300,000 more is paid for quarters for other agencies in other places.

The Public Buildings Administration testified that, beginning in September, they would have room, owned by the Government or through Government corporations, sufficient to take care of all these agencies. In this bill we provide for the appropriation of the money necessary to bring them back. We shall save about as much rent, during the first year, as the expense of moving them back will be.

We had quite a struggle over the appropriation for the Maritime Commission. We finally took the House policy with respect to the sale of ships.

In respect to the Veterans' Administration, the Senate had increased the House figure $27,000,000; and on the floor, an amendment increasing the amount for personnel by some $14,000,000 was written into the bill. That provided for an increase of approximately $41,000,000. The conference report carries about $20,000,000 more than the amount voted by the House for that item.

Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas will be happy to answer any questions that any Members of the Senate have as to the details of the conference report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a while ago I rose to address the Chair for the purpose of commending the Senator from New Jersey for his activities and his sincere endeavors in trying to secure the consideration of a bill of vast importance to the United States. That was my purpose when I rose. I had nothing else in mind, and nothing else to say.

For some reason, the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I objected merely because I was most anxious to have the Senate complete action on the Consent Calendar, so that we could go on to other business, and could thus make the parliamentary situation somewhat less complicated.

I apologize to the Senator for cutting off what he had to say. Now he has full opportunity, in unlimited time; and I shall be delighted to hear what he has to say.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am not yielding now. I have the floor in my own right.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, do not I have the floor?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas cannot hold the floor beyond the completion of his own statement.

Mr. REED. I have not yielded the floor. I yielded for a question.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to have no controversy about who has the floor. Some time, in due time, I hope the Senator from New Mexico may claim the floor and be recognized in his own right.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will even conspire with the Senator to that end. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kansas.

Now the Senator from New Mexico is entitled to the floor.

Mr. REED. I ask the Senator to let me finish in regard to action on the conference report, and then I shall take my seat.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas says he wishes to finish. I thought he had concluded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair assumes that the Senator from Kansas is anxious to have a vote taken on the conference report.

Will the Senator from New Mexico await a vote on the report?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have no desire to delay the business of the Senate in any way whatever.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will not be able to recognize the Senator from New Mexico immediately after the vote on the conference report is taken. The Chair wishes to caution the Senator from New Mexico in that respect.

PROMOTION OF FOREIGN RELATIONS BY INTERCHANGE OF INFORMATION, ETC.

Mr. HATCH. Then, Mr. President, I must exercise my privilege of saying a few words in my own time. In doing so, I hope it is understood that I am not being arbitrary, and I am not going to take an undue length of time, but I wanted the Senate to understand and to know exactly what is taking place.

There is on the Calendar Order of Business No. 602, House bill 3342. I wish Senators would refer to that calendar number and read the title. It is a measure to enable the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign policy.

Mr. President, I submit that is exactly what House bill 3342 does; it does enable the Government of the United States to more effectively carry on its foreign policy. If any Senator has any doubt of the truth of what I have just said, let him read the testimony of the Secretary of State, Mr. George Marshall, as he appeared before the committee of the House of Representatives. Let him read the testimony of the Chief of Staff, General Eisenhower, and of further witnesses who appeared before either the House committee or the Senate committee. In looking through the hearings in both Houses it will be found, Mr. President, that every witness who appeared was in favor of the bill. Not one single witness appeared, not one voice was raised, in opposition to the bill, in the hearings before either the House committee or the Senate committee. It is a bill more effectively to carry on the policies of the United States when, in the condition in which this world now is, the policies of this Government need to be carried on with more force and vigor than ever before in our history.

Mr. President, this bill is on the calendar, not by unanimous report from our committee, as I started to say, because there was one dissenting vote. The bill is now blocked after it had been considered by our committee, after great leaders of this body and of the Nation who had first opposed the bill had examined into its purposes, and with an eloquence seldom heard in a committee room, explained how vitally necessary it was that the bill pass and pass at this session. I refer to no other than our Presiding Officer, the President pro tempore of the Senate, as well as the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who spoke with an eloquence seldom heard.

Yet, Mr. President, the haste of the Congress is so great, its desire for adjournment is so strong, its anxiety to leave its duties and return home is so keen, that we are told that because the bill cannot pass on the call of the Consent Calendar, it cannot be considered.

The Senate of the United States has not time to consider a bill affecting the foreign policy of the United States. It cannot take an hour or two, or three or four, or 2 or 3 days, if necessary, to debate a bill of this importance. I am not asking that the bill be passed; I would give to every Senator the right to make up his mind; but I am asking that Senators have the opportunity to express themselves.

Today, when the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], as fine and as able a man as there is in this body, a man who has spent hours in the consideration of the bill, in close study and arduous labor, as I know, asked that it be considered—and that is all he did ask, that the Senate consider it—objection was heard, and because one objection is heard, one mild, weak voice in the United States Senate stifles the voice of America all over the

world. I am not speaking idly, Mr. President, in calling on Senators to consider what they do. And that is not all.

As a last effort, one with which I did not agree, still trying to do something, not giving up, as is the nature of the Senator from New Jersey, he offered a concurrent resolution, a resolution which would merely have set up a joint committee of the Congress to consider this question, to study it, to ascertain where there is truth, to find out whether there is falsehood, to learn what should or should not be done under the program; and that resolution was objected to, and the Senate does nothing.

Mr. President, I hope this condition will not prevail throughout the rest of this week. I hope that the voice of America may be asserted in this Chamber, that Senators may hear the voice of their own country, and that they may heed that voice, for our country is being assailed by other voices in every part of the world. Our country is being slandered, her purposes are being misconstrued, and more than misconstrued, they are being deliberately misrepresented. The people of many countries in the world are crying for information about America, and the Senate of the United States refuses to consider a bill which would give basic authority for this program.

Mr. President, it is a bill which was first hotly contested in the House of Representatives, but not before the committee. When it came to final debate in the House, after the Members of the other House had considered their duties and had taken the bill up for debate, and after it had been debated and considered more vigorously than any measure in the House with which I am familiar—after that had been done, the House of Representatives passed the bill by a vote of 3 to 1.

I say, all honor and credit to the House of Representatives, all honor and credit to them for taking up the measure and facing the issue, and credit and honor to them for doing what they believed was the right thing to be done.

Mr. President, my only plea now is that Senators may reconsider their position, that there yet may be time to consider the bill, and whether we remain in session another week, if necessary, is not too important. It is far more important that the authority necessary be granted than it is for us to adjourn and go home.

Sometime, Mr. President, before this week is over, if I can obtain recognition from the Chair, I shall make a motion that the Senate proceed to consider the bill. It will not be my purpose then to argue and debate the measure at length, but I do think that, representing, as I know I do, a large majority of the sentiment of this country, I have the right to make such a motion, and to ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the motion in order that Senators may express themselves on it.

Mr. President, I again express the hope—and that is what I am urging now, and is my reason for taking the floor—that while there is yet time the decision be reconsidered, and that whoever is responsible for the decision being reached will reconsider and let the measure come before the Senate, at least for a vote.

Mr. President, with this request, and with this expression of my hope that the action I have suggested be taken, I shall not longer detain the Senator from Kansas, and I wish him luck in his endeavors.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3839) making appropriations for the executive office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report submitted by the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Kansas what the conferees did with the Senate amendment, which would provide some funds, much less than the Maritime Commission desires, for the reconversion of certain vessels now held by the Commission.

Mr. REED. The Senate receded from its amendment and accepted the original language of the House, so far as the sale and the handling, reconversion, and reconditioning of vessels is concerned.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So that we are now in this position, that the vessels cannot be reconditioned for sale?

Mr. REED. There is $99,000,000 in the bill for new construction and reconditioning, if I remember the language correctly. We returned to the House language as to the sale of vessels. We ran into this difficulty: The Ship Sales Act of 1946 fixed a basis for the sale of the ships, and all our friends, or most of them at least, claimed, and we conceded, that if we undertook in this limited time in the appropriation bill to change the 1946 basis, we might confront a great deal of trouble. That is the worst headache, I may say to the Senator from Wyoming, that the Senator from Kansas encountered in handling the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But the Senator from Kansas will agree that there was a budget estimate for the purpose? The Senator agrees to that, does he not?

Mr. REED. Let me refer to the bill. We allowed $15,000,000 for reconditioning.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What was the budget estimate for that?

Mr. REED. I think it was $50,000,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The position then in which we find ourselves is that additional funds allowed by the Senate for reconditioning the vessels, which was an amount far below the budget estimate, has been disallowed?

Mr. REED. The figure carried in the bill for reconditioning, as it went through the Senate, was $4,500,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, of course; we have a little more.

Mr. REED. Now, we have $15,000,000 for that purpose, but that is below the figure of the budget; that is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is far below the figure of the budget?

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But the effect is this: Having ended the war with the greatest merchant fleet that ever existed upon the globe, now, because of the failure to appropriate for the reconditioning of the vessels in any adequate manner, we are endangering the position which the United States attained during the war, are we not?

Mr. REED. I want to say to the Senator from Wyoming that the weight of opinion expressed in the committee was that the 300 vessels now in the hands of the Maritime Commission can be sold to the best advantage "as is," letting the purchaser make such reconditioning and reconversion as he desires to make. There was a conflict of opinion within the shipping industry.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But the expert testimony which we had, and upon which the Senate acted, was that there would be a greater return to the United States by this additional investment for reconditioning?

Mr. REED. We included a requirement of competitive bidding in the Senate bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. REED. There was a difference of opinion about that. The Maritime Commission itself thought the Government would get more money if there were competitive bidding. I should say, however, that the weight of opinion was against that, and that the floor placed in the Ship Sales Act of 1946, it was claimed at least with equal vigor, would produce——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My inquiry is not at all directed to the competitive-bid aspect of the problem, but to the failure of the conferees to report the sum required to recondition the vessels, upon the theory that a better return would be had by the United States. In other words, the logic upon which the Senate acted in increasing its appropriation was that it would be a sound investment for the United States and would increase the return to the Treasury. That position has been abandoned by the Senate conferees?

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wanted the RECORD to make that clear.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 3839, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
July 24, 1947.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 7, 18, and 31 to the bill (H. R. 3839) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate num-

bered 2 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: "$35 (unless a higher rate, not exceeding $50, shall be approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget)."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: "$35 (unless a higher rate, not exceeding $50, shall be approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget)."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert: "$35 (unless a higher rate, not exceeding $50, shall be approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget)."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: "$35 (unless a higher rate, not exceeding $50, shall be approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget)."

That the House recede from its disagreement of the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: "$35 (unless a higher rate, not exceeding $50, shall be approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget)."

That the House recede from its disagreement of the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of said amendment, after "funds", insert "not exceding $11,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: "$35 (unless a higher rate, not exceeding $50, shall be approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget)."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$75,000."

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

PUBLIC WORKS—OPINION OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, a few days ago when the Senate was considering the Interior Department appropriation bill there was a colloquy between the Senator from Nebraska and myself with reference to certain matters. On the following day there were further discussions, and in that connection the Comptroller General's opinion was referred to. I referred to it as being under date of May 27, 1947, whereas I should have stated that it was under date of May 20, 1947. I now ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the RECORD a copy of the Comptroller General's opinion given to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

There being no objection, the opinion of the Comptroller General was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, May 20, 1947.

Hon. STYLES BRIDGES,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have your letter of April 29, 1947, as follows:

"This inquiry is being made for my own personal information and for the information of those Senators who have raised the questions included.

"The budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, carries an estimate for the Federal Works Agency which deals with 'public works not incidental to the normal work of other executive establishments and administers Federal grants or loans to State and local governments or to other agencies for the planning and construction of public work.' The items of appropriation covered are the Office of the Administrator, Public Buildings Administration, Public Roads Administration, and Bureau of Community Facilities.

"Subsection (c) of section 139 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.), provides:

" 'No general appropriation bill or amendment thereto shall be received or considered in either House if it contains a provision reappropriating unexpended balances of appropriations; except that this provision shall not apply to appropriations in continuation of appropriations for public works on which work has commenced.'

"The Southwestern Power Administration, one of the agencies under the supervision of the Department of the Interior, was originally created by the Secretary pursuant to Executive order of the President, as an aid to the war effort, for the purpose of operating certain flood control dams in Oklahoma and Arkansas. By section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, the Secretary was authorized to sell and distribute incidental hydroelectric power that might be generated at these dams. The Southwestern Power Administration is performing these functions

"The general appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, carried an appropriation of $7,500,000 for this agency. I am advised that expenditures for construction for the first half of the fiscal year 1947 amounted to $156,602; that forecast of expenditures for the second half of the fiscal year total $3,799,991. Of this amount $1,352,415 was earmarked specifically for the purchase of a transmission line and facilities from the Ark-La Electric Cooperative which will not be used, thus leaving a net expenditure for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, of $2,447,576.

"I am, therefore, asking that you please advise me if the unexpended balance of this appropriation must be covered back into the Treasury, or must the appropriation be treated as a continuing appropriation for 'public works on which work has commenced'?

"Also, please advise me if the letting of a contract constitutes the commencement of work within the meaning of the statute. Of course, if the activities of the Southwestern Power Administration do not constitute public works, then my second question has no bearing on the matter.

"Assuming that the projects covered by the estimated expenditures for the last half of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, have actually been commenced by Southwestern Power Administration and are under construction but not completed by June 30, then please advise me if the appropriation sufficient to cover these projects may be carried over into the fiscal year 1948, for the purpose of discharging the obligation of the administration as to these projects."

The appropriation of $7,500,000 made to the Southwestern Power Administration, referred to in your letter, is contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1947, approved July 1, 1946, 60 Stat. 384, and provides as follows:

"Construction: For construction and acquisition (not to exceed $1,352,415 for purchase of the Ark-La line from Markham Ferry, Okla., to Nimrod, Ark.) of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, and administrative expenses connected therewith; purchase (not to exceed ten in the fiscal year 1947), hire, maintenance, repair, and operation of passenger automobiles; and printing and binding; $7,500,000."

The foregoing is an annual appropriation and as such is available for obligation and expenditure during the fiscal year 1947 and for expenditure only in the fiscal years 1948 and 1949 in payment of obligations properly incurred during the fiscal year 1947. Under the provisions of sections 712 and 713 of Title 31, United States Code, the unexpended balance remaining in the appropriation on June 30, 1949, in the absence of other provision of law, would be for carrying to the surplus fund of the Treasury. (See 21 Comp. Gen. 46; 23 id. 689.)

As to contracts properly entered into in the fiscal year 1947, the appropriation chargeable therewith remains available for payments thereunder during the two succeeding fiscal years (23 Comp. Gen. 370).

Section 139 (c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, quoted in your letter, was designed to prohibit the reappropriation of unobligated balances of appropriations except for continuing public works already commenced. In view of the citation of said section and the phraseology of the questions propounded in your letter it appears that you may be concerned with the effect of the construction appropriation provision for the Southwestern Power Administration contained in the Interior Department appropriation bill, 1948. Said provision as now contained in H. R. 3123, Eightieth Congress, reads as follows:

"Construction: For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, and administrative expenses connected therewith; including purchase of 10, and hire of passenger motor vehicles; for temporary services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600), but at rates not exceeding $50 per diem for individuals; and printing and binding; $1,246,000, which amount, together with the unexpended balance of the appropriation for this purpose contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1947, is hereby continued available until expended."

It has been held that when the term "unexpended balances" is used in an act reappropriating funds for some other purpose or for some subsequent fiscal year, the term is to be construed as meaning the unobligated balances (22 Comp. Gen. 59). However, section 139 (c) forbids the reappropriation of unobligated balances of prior appropriations unless such funds are for use in continuation of public works on which work has commenced.

Public works are defined in Funk & Wagnalls new standard dictionary as permanent works or improvements made for public use or benefit, as roads, canals, or harbors, especially such as are made by or at the expense of the local or central government. (See 15 Comp. Gen. 719; 19 id. 467 and cases cited therein. Also see 35 Words and Phrases, Permanent Edition 433.) Hence it would appear that the construction of transmissions, lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities authorized in the fiscal year 1947

appropriation would constitute the construction of public works within the meaning of section 139 (c), supra. However, section 139 (c) also contemplates that the public works already be commenced. Accordingly, if the public works for the construction of which the appropriation was made to the Southwestern Power Administration for the fiscal year 1947 have been commenced, the unobligated balance of that appropriation would be merged with the 1948 fiscal-year appropriation and remain available until expended, if the provision contained in the Interior Department appropriation bill, 1948, be enacted into law in its present form.

With respect to your question as to whether the letting of a contract constitutes the commencement of work within the meaning of section 139 (c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, an examination of the legislative history of said section reveals no discussion of the phrase public works on which work has commenced. However, it seems clear that what the Congress contemplated was the actual commencement of work in the usual and ordinary sense of the term. The entering into of a contract, while creating an obligation against the appropriation involved, is only the preliminary step in the accomplishment of a public work. But, the contract once executed may be breached or cancelled by mutual consent long before any actual work is performed pursuant thereto.

In the case of *Kendall* v. *Bunnell* (205 P. 78), involving the act of March 28, 1908 (35 Stat. 52), which gave a preference right to bona fide settlers who had reclaimed or commenced the work of reclaiming unsurveyed desert land prior to survey thereof, it was held that the placing of posts at the corners of an intended desert land entry, with notices thereon stating an intention to reclaim, was not the commencement of the work of reclamation within the act involved. Thus, even though there was an actual physical entry and posting of the land such action was held insufficient to satisfy the statutory requirement to commence the work of reclaiming the land. In the case of the entering into of a contract for the prosecution of a public work—where in many instances the execution thereof is accomplished far from the scene of intended operations—the disparity between the contract action and the commencement of work is more evident. Accordingly, it is my view that the entering into of a contract for the construction of a public work does not constitute the commencement of the work within the meaning of section 139 (c), supra.

I trust that the foregoing will serve the purpose of your inquiry.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3022) to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, gas, and sulfur on lands acquired by the United States.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4347) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 3243) for the relief of Roman Toporow, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

ADDITIONAL HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4347) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 54) to provide for the use of Schick General Hospital at Clinton, Iowa, for the Veterans' Administration, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar 748, House bill 4002, the War Department civil functions appropriation bill for 1948.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4002) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Myers
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Conor
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hill	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hoey	Overton
Bricker	Holland	Pepper
Brooks	Ives	Reed
Buck	Jenner	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kem	Saltonstall
Cain	Kilgore	Smith
Capehart	Knowland	Sparkman
Capper	Langer	Stewart
Chavez	Lodge	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Cooper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Downey	McFarland	Tydings
Dworshak	McGrath	Umstead
Eastland	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ecton	McMahon	Watkins
Ellender	Magnuson	Wherry
Ferguson	Malone	White
Flanders	Martin	Wiley
Fulbright	Maybank	Williams
George	Millikin	Wilson
Green	Moore	Young
Gurney	Morse	
Hatch	Murray	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Ninety-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

SOCIAL SECURITY TAX RATES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I present a conference report on House bill 3818 with reference to Social Security tax rates, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3818) to amend the Federal Insurance Contributions Act with respect to rates of tax on employers and employees, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, and 5, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, and omit the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, and on page 2 of the House engrossed bill, line 1 and line 13 strike out "to 1956, both inclusive", and insert "and 1951"; and on page 2, lines 4 and 16 strike out "1956" and insert "1951"; and the Senate agree to the same.

E. D. MILLIKIN,
ROBERT TAFT,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

DANIEL A. REED,
ROBERT W. KEAN,
NOAH MASON,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
WILBUR D. MILLS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the original House bill froze the rates for 1948–49 at 1 percent; increased the rates for 1950–56 to 1½ percent, and after December 31, 1956 to 2 percent.

The Senate amended by freezing the rates for 1948–49 at 1 percent, and after December 31, 1949 at 3 percent.

The conferees agreed upon 1 percent for 1948–49, 1½ percent for 1950–51, and 2 percent thereafter.

There are some other changes.

I hope the report will be agreed to, and ask for its approval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4002) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order will be made.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask that the first committee amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Civil functions of the War De-

partment—Quartermaster Corps—Cemeterial expenses," on page 3, line 6, after the word "cemeteries", to strike out "$4,093,369" and insert "$4,914,924."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, this is the bill known as the War Department civil functions appropriation bill. It deals with the civil functions administered by the War Department—Army engineers.

The amount of the bill as passed by the House was $339,186,869.

The amount of increase recommended by the Senate committee is $200,740,580, making the total of the bill as now reported to the Senate by the committee, $539,927,449.

The amount of the regular and supplemental estimates for 1948 is $619,727,100.

The amount of appropriations for the fiscal year 1947 was lower than the amount recommended in the pending bill. In 1947 the amount was $333,142,250.

So the bill presently being considered by the Senate is $79,799,651 below the regular budget figure, plus the supplemental budget which was recently submitted.

The bill also exceeds the appropriation for 1947 by $206,785,199.

The amendment under consideration covers cemeterial expenses, as outlined on page 2 of the report, mostly for establishing cemeteries in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Alaska. It also provides for some construction in existing cemeteries in the United States, but most of the $626,000 is to be spent outside the United States. A request was made for $1,500,000, but the committee allowed only $626,000, and asked that certain high-priced items be deferred for further consideration.

I ask that the amendment on page 3, line 6, be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the next amendment appears on page 3, in line 13, and I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 13, after the word "village," it is proposed to insert the following additional proviso: *"Provided further*, That upon completion of repairs to the approach road to the Natchez, Miss., National Cemetery, provided for in this act, the Secretary of War is authorized to convey title thereto to the State of Mississippi or any county, municipality, or proper agency thereof in accordance with the provisions of section 1 of the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1942 (55 Stat. 191)."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the language is necessary so that the Quartermaster Corps can have an approach road built, and when it is built future upkeep will be taken care of by the State of Mississippi.

I ask for the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the next amendment appears on page 7, line 23. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. Under the heading "Corps of Engineers—Rivers and Harbors," on page 7, line 23, it is proposed, after the word "law", to strike out "$94,659,700" and insert "$125,268,700."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, we now come to the large items of the bill. I will say that first the rivers and harbors item was considered after we had come to an agreement on the total amount the committee would recommend for flood control. On page 10 of the report Senators will find that the flood-control item in the House amounted to $121,269,800. The amount recommended in the Senate bill is $258,829,825, or an increase by the Senate committee of $137,560,025. The rivers and harbors item recommended by the Senate committee is a $26,859,000 increase over the House figure. For rivers and harbors work also the committee recommends advance planning in a total amount of two and a half million dollars, and another $2,000,000 for preliminary examinations.

Mr. President, I ask for the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, before the amendment is adopted I should like to say very briefly that in the full Committee on Appropriations, when this matter was considered, I voted to support an amendment whereby the total amount for rivers and harbors, for the Mississippi Valley, and for flood control generally be set at $210,000,000 instead of approximately $325,000,000 as the committee voted.

If I read the figures correctly, the Senate committee has increased the House figures for rivers and harbors by $30,000,000; flood control by $142,560,000; and the item for the Mississippi River and its tributaries by $26,000,000; or a total of $199,919,000. The total amount recommended in the House bill was $339,000,000, and the total amount recommended in the Senate version was $539,000,000.

Like everyone else, I am in favor of flood control. I believe that we must maintain and improve our rivers and harbors. But, Mr. President, I believe that the Appropriations Committee has increased these items over the House items to too great an extent in this year when we are cutting down on so many things that are essential to our Government. We have voted to separate employees from their jobs because we believe that the Government should get along with less. We have voted to eliminate improvements and new construction which the Army and Navy believed was necessary for national defense. We have cut down on many items. At the very tail end of the session, to increase a House bill from $339,000,000 to $539,000,000, and to ask our Army engineers to draft overnight, or over a couple of nights, plans or suggestions as to where the money can be spent throughout the country, seems to me to be going too fast and too far too quickly, in a year when we are asking our Government to cut down in so many other respects.

I shall not offer an amendment to reduce the amount which the Senate bill carries, but I certainly hope that in the conference the figure will be made very much nearer the House figure than the Senate figure, even after we have this greater knowledge of flood relief that is necessary this year.

We want flood-control projects to go ahead in an orderly way, but we do not want to appropriate, at the very end of the session, a very substantial amount of money without knowing, as the result of careful planning, just how it is to be spent or where it is to be spent. So I hope that when the Senate conferees go into the conference they will not be too insistent on the amount of increase recommended by the committee. If any Senator today makes a motion that some of these items under rivers and harbors or flood control be reduced, I shall certainly join in that effort.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me finish one more sentence.

I make these few statements at this time because, to the best of my ability in the Appropriations Committee, I have joined in carrying through unanimously that committee's previous reports, whether the appropriations were for the benefit of the eastern part of the country, the central, western, or southern part of the country.

I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. I ask the Senator to pardon me if I show some ignorance of American history; but I desire to know whether the able Senator from Massachusetts occupied the executive chair in his State immediately following the tremendous flood in New England a number of years ago?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Massachusetts respectfully answers that question by saying that those floods occurred just prior to his becoming Governor of Massachusetts. The Senator will say most respectfully to the Senator from Louisiana that any Federal assistance given to Massachusetts or New England we gladly received. We also used our own funds. I certainly trust that the Congress would do the same thing again. I, for one, certainly hope to help any other parts of the country so afflicted. What I object to is cutting down all through the year and then appropriating these tremendously increased amounts without really any careful planning, and without knowing just where the money is to be spent.

Mr. OVERTON. There was no objection, however, on the part of New England or any of the officials of the New England States when the Congress of the United States appropriated huge sums in order to fortify the New England States against flood damage.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say to the Senator from Louisiana that I do not believe that nearly as huge sums were involved as are now being considered.

I hope to help the Mississippi Valley and help the Senator's State. I shall certainly be glad to vote for any amount for his State which will be helpful toward flood control, if the program is carried on in an orderly, careful way over a period of years.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator; but I do not understand that there was any opposition in the committee or anywhere else to the appropriation for the Mississippi River and its tributaries, which embraces the lower Mississippi River from Cairo, Ill., to the Gulf.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am sure that the Senator from Louisiana agrees with me that it is difficult to vote to reduce appropriations so that people lose their jobs, and certain construction for our armed forces which may be necessary or helpful is eliminated, and then to vote large amounts at the very end of the session.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I cannot quite agree with the Senator. I do not understand why he implies that in this appropriation bill, in connection with the amount of expenditure being appropriated for, we are not proceeding in an orderly way.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that if I heard correctly in the full Committee on Appropriations, the Army Corps of Engineers worked all of two nights to draw up the figures on which we are voting today. It was not done carefully or with forethought.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is it not true, with respect to the Army engineers working for 2 nights, that the figures which were arrived at represent a reduction from what the Army engineers recommended, what they said they needed and could wisely expend this year? Does not the total amount of the appropriation in this bill come far below what the Army engineers said they were ready and prepared to spend wisely and effectively if the Congress should make the funds available?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The amount in the bill, as it stands today, is $79,799,000 under the estimate; but as I listened to the brief discussion, apparently when the time came to increase the amount by $200,000,000, the Army engineers had to work all of a couple of nights in order to produce the figures.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has deplored the fact that we are apparently increasing the appropriation for flood control, in view of the fact that we have reduced other appropriations and thrown Federal employees out of work.

I sympathize with any Federal employee who is thrown out of his position because of a reduction in the department in which he works. However, many of those employees came here under temporary conditions due to the war. They were, of course, bound to have notice in advance that the time would come when the Government would not need their services. Does the Senator believe that that situation, unfortunate as it may be to any individual who is separated from the service of the Government, is to be compared with the tremendous loss of property and life due to great floods, in many cases sweeping away the savings of a lifetime? Are the two situations to be compared, in the Senator's opinion?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No.

Mr. BARKLEY. I recall the recent floods in the Middle West and in the section known as the Corn Belt. The damage has been estimated to be as much as $900,000,000. I recall the flood in the Ohio Valley in 1937. The damage to property in that flood was more than $500,000,000. Many homes were washed away, many thousands of people lost their business, the savings of a lifetime were washed down the river, and many persons lost their lives.

I cannot compare the importance of that situation in the ultimate, sound economy of our country with the loss of Federal jobs because appropriations have not been made. I hope there will be ample jobs for all. Many persons came here under temporary appointment. They were bound to know they would be separated from the service sooner or later.

It is a permanent condition with which we are faced; and the amount of money involved in the construction of flood-control projects to preserve some of the most prosperous and lovely valleys in America from recurring floods is a permanent matter that will result, in the years to come, in a sounder economy for our country and for greater happiness in these valleys, whether they are in New England, the Pacific Coast, or the Middle West. I was glad to support flood control for the Connecticut Valley a few years ago and for all of New England—anywhere in which disastrous floods take place. I think it is a national obligation which we cannot escape. I appreciate the fact that while the Senator criticizes that item he is not going to move to reduce it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I want to leave the impression with the Senator from Kentucky that I agree with the great body of what he says. What I am being critical of at this time is that this should suddenly be done after we have been going along——

Mr. BARKLEY. If I may interrupt the Senator, here is the thing which I think we should not lose sight of. Most of these flood-control projects were suspended completely during the war. I have in mind a number which had been begun and upon which great progress had been made, but they were completely suspended for 4 or 5 years. We are merely resuming, in a way, the program which was started in 1937. The fact that appropriations are increased at this time is only evidence of the fact that we are endeavoring to take up the slack which was created during the 4 or 5 or 6 years when no flood-control work at all was done.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I want to make this further observation. I want to associate myself with everything which the able minority leader has said. My recollection of the testimony before the Appropriations Committee by the Army engineers was that they could wisely spend $900,000,000 for rivers and harbors and flood control if the money were made available. I mean, within the next fiscal year. This appropriation comes far below that amount. It is approximately half of what they say they are prepared to spend.

I want to point out also with regard to eliminating expense in connection with the pay roll, the purpose of the appropriations and the purpose of this program is not primarily to give someone a job on the Federal pay roll. Its purpose is to preserve property, human lives, and the resources of the Nation. After all, Mr. President, it is an investment in the development of greater wealth, greater opportunities for the people of this country. I also point out, as has the able Senator from Kentucky, that this program is long past due. We remember that last year the President froze the funds which were made available by the Congress to do this work. Certainly the work is at least 1 year behind schedule for the reason that during the war we suspended the program and deferred many projects which had been authorized and started. As has been said by the Senator from Kentucky, we are now undertaking to take up the slack and to eliminate and eradicate those dangers which are constant and which frequently result in heavy loss and damage.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Something has been suggested as to the willingness and even the eagerness of New England to accept huge sums of money for the purpose of building dams for flood-control purposes. I should like to correct any impression which may have been gained by such references. New England has never come to the Congress asking for huge sums of money for that purpose. We have never attempted to get our hands into the Federal Treasury for that purpose. The reason why the dams were built in New England was because in the 1930's several million persons in this country were unemployed, and representatives of the administration came to New England and asked the States if they would cooperate in finding places where the unemployed could build dams so as to put men to work. Those dams were built for the express purpose of putting several thousand men on the Federal pay roll in New England. I do not say that the dams have not done any good, but New England did not request them. President Roosevelt and his official family requested us to let unemployed men build those dams.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May I ask the Senator from Vermont if I am not correct in stating that in the first very heavy flood in Vermont, in approximately 1928, when Governor Weeks was in office, Ver-

mont took care of her own problems without any Federal assistance?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. Vermont refused to come to Congress and ask for money to take care of her loss. Governor Weeks said Vermont would take care of her own. But that was about the last example of any such attitude that has been seen in this country.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield the floor.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Public Works, I ask unanimous consent that the committee may meet today while the Senate is in session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, which has been stated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Flood control," on page 9, line 4, after the word "control", to strike out "$132,041,800" and insert "$274,601,825."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to mention a matter. In the itemization of the projects in California there are two dams, in connection with Isabella Reservoir and Pine Flat Reservoir. The report indicates that $2,000,000 is to be spent on Isabella Reservoir and $3,000,000 on the Pine Flat Reservoir. There was some difficulty experienced a year ago because of a conflict of jurisdiction between the Reclamation Service and the Corps of Engineers. We reported in the Interior Department appropriation bill $1,000,000 for the Pine Flat Reservoir, and it came over from the House providing for $1,000,000. Our final suggestion was that the Corps of Engineers would build the dams and the work would be supervised by the Reclamation Service. I assume that is the same arrangement that is made in this instance?

Mr. GURNEY. That is my understanding. Having been in California with the representatives from California who requested it, I am sure that nothing came before the committee that would indicate that that plan is to be changed in any way.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is to be worked out by mutual agreement between the two Departments?

Mr. GURNEY. That is the way I understand it.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, have we disposed of the flood-control amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a few questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. GURNEY. I shall be glad to answer any questions.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I recall that about a year ago the President issued an order impounding funds which had been appropriated by Congress for flood-control work. As I recall, the funds were in excess of $90,000,000 or $95,000,000. The funds were frozen because the President pointed out that it would be unwise to divert labor and the use of critical materials in public works of that nature which could temporarily be deferred. In the bill the committee is recommending that $274,601,000 be expended for flood control during the coming year. That is about three times as much as the President thought, a year ago could be justifiably spent for this particular program.

Mr. President, how does the committee justify that 200-percent increase in funds to be expended for flood control?

Mr. GURNEY. Undoubtedly the committee members justified it in any way they wanted in their own individual minds; but I expect that the whole committee came to their decision on account of the heavy flood damage in at least the Mississippi Valley system of rivers during the last few months.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is it not true that a large amount of these funds has been allocated for projects located outside the Mississippi Valley?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. DWORSHAK. How is that justified?

Mr. GURNEY. The committee's instruction was that the project should as nearly as possible take care of the high-priority, high-flood-protection projects necessary all over the United States.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I thank the chairman of the committee.

Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Members of this body to the appropriations which have been made for general flood control, annually, since 1938.

In 1938, $49,000,000 was appropriated for flood control generally.

In 1939, $58,000,000.

In 1940, $133,000,000.

In 1941, $70,055,000.

In 1942, $98,780,000.

In 1943, $128,961,700.

In 1944, $4,385,100.

In 1945, $25,191,100.

In 1946, $108,831,000.

In the past fiscal year, 1947, $144,065,000 was made available.

So, with the exception of the past year, we can readily see that much smaller amounts have been appropriated under the heading of flood control. Yet, for the coming year it is proposed to spend approximately twice as much as was appropriated and spent for this program during 1947.

Mr. President, I am one of those, possibly in the minority at the moment, who believe that as we view the alarming and critical conditions which obtain throughout the world, we must recognize that we need a strong national economy if we are to maintain the defense of this country and the security of our Government. In the light of the President's action of a year ago freezing the funds for flood control and reclamation and other public-works programs, I wonder how we can justify at this time going completely out on a program that will make available many millions of dollars for the construction of public works projects. There is little to justify the diversion of funds for such programs, under the conditions which obtain today in the United States and throughout the world.

A few weeks ago the Interior Department appropriations subcommittee reported to the Senate legislation recommending drastic reductions in the appropriations for various public-works projects in the Western States; and at that time, with few exceptions, the Members of this body representing those Western States were willing to cooperate in effecting retrenchment and economy, not because they did not want these various projects to be constructed or the work to be expedited, but, rather, because if we need economy in this Nation, then we recognize that all the programs, and particularly the public-works projects, must be curtailed.

So, Mr. President, even though I realize the complete futility of offering any opposition—and I do not propose to offer any amendments at this time—I am in disagreement with the members of my Appropriations Committee who bring to the floor of this body, in the closing days of this session, appropriation bills which not only are in conflict with every principle of economy, but, in addition, are in complete disregard of the advice and exhortations of the Chief Executive less than a year ago, when he pointed out that we could not justify spending these millions of dollars on public-works projects at a time when there is an acute shortage of housing and when we are attempting to effect an orderly transition from a wartime to a peacetime status in respect to our national economy.

Mr. President, I make these few remarks in order that my constituents will know that I am not in sympathy with a fiscal program which weakens our national defense and which expands the construction of public works at an inopportune time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 9, in line 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 12, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "$24,000,000" and insert "$50,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 23, after the numerals "638–651", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "United States Soldiers' Home", on page 11, line 14, after the word "fund", to strike out "$2,114,100" and insert "$2,410,100, of which $296,000 shall be immediately and continuously available until expended for the preparation of plans and specifications for the renovation and enlargement of the United States Soldiers' Home."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General Provisions", on page 18, line 4, after the word "Government", to insert "(7) that no alien employed on the Canal Zone, who may secure United States civil-service status, shall be paid a salary or wages, wholly or in part, from moneys appropriated by this act."

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, as a member of the committee which reported this bill, I regret that I must raise the point of order that this language is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, it was the feeling of the committee that this is a limitation on the expenditure of funds, and is not legislation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to submit that if it is legislation, it is included in a legislative provision in the bill, and therefore would not be subject to a point of order. All the provisions of the bill partake of a legislative character.

Mr. President, a great deal of legislation is included in all the general provisions of the bill. Therefore, it is subject to amendment, with other legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will rule that the point of order is not well taken, and that the amendment is not legislation, but is a restriction.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I then wish to say a few words about the amendment itself, on its merits.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. GREEN. I have no interest in this matter personally. My State has none. I take my present position because I believe that the good name of the United States is involved, because if the legislation is adopted, then no Panamanian can be employed in the Canal Zone on the same terms with a citizen of this country.

When the treaty with Panama was negotiated it was expressly agreed that the Panamanians would be employed on terms of equality with citizens of this country. I know of the argument for the amendment, that there is opposition on the part of certain citizens because they can discriminate, and do not want certain kinds of aliens to be employed, on the theory that it might endanger the safety of this country, that there might be Communists, that there might be undesirable aliens. But that has nothing to do with the matter, as I see it. The United States has entered into a treaty with Panama, and the question is whether we are going to disregard the treaty we have made with another sovereign government simply because it is to our interest to do so.

It is not a question whether the treaty was wise or unwise, it is not a question whether the proposed legislation is wise or unwise; the question is whether we are to live up to our international agreements or not.

Mr. President, this action will be watched by other countries. It will be taken as a precedent. It will be used as an argument why they should not enter into treaties with the United States of America, because the United States of America, like some other countries which have done the same, will have acted in violation of their treaty when they thought it was to their interest to do so, without denouncing the treaty. If a treaty prevents us from doing what we want, we can denounce it and negotiate a new treaty. But the way to act is not to proceed by putting what amounts to legislation on an appropriation bill.

I now justify my statement as to what occurred in connection with the negotiation of the treaty with Panama, and limit myself to reading the result of the negotiation in the form of a letter from Hon. Cordell Hull, then Secretary of State of the United States, dated March 2, 1936, an official letter addressed by him to the Honorable Ricardo J. Alfaro and the Honorable Marcisco Caray, members of the Panamanian Treaty Commission. The letter reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE.
Washington, D. C., March 2, 1939.

SIRS: With reference to the representations made by you during the negotiation of the treaty signed today regarding Panamanian citizens employed by the Panama Canal or the Panama Railroad Co., I have the honor to state that the Government of the United States of America, in recognition of the special relationship between the United States of America and the Republic of Panama with respect to the Panama Canal and the Panama Railroad Co., maintains and will maintain as its public policy the principle of equality of opportunity and treatment set down in the order of December 28, 1908, of the Secretary of War, and in the Executive orders of February 2, 1914, and February 20, 1920, and will favor the maintenance, enforcement, or enactment of such provisions consistent with the works and their effective protection and sanitation as will assure to Panamanian citizens employed by the Canal or the railroad equality of treatment with employees who are citizens of the United States of America.

Accept, sirs, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

CORDELL HULL.

Mr. President, my point is that while Panamanians are aliens, if they were other aliens than Panamanians I would not be rising to make my point. My point is that our treaty obligation is to treat Panamanians employed by the Canal Zone or railroad in just the same way as employees who are citizens of the United States of America are treated. It seems to me perfectly plain that the language proposed in the amendment violates that provision of the treaty.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, as to this particular amendment on page 18, dealing with employees of the Panama Canal Zone, our subcommittee, of course, did not have as much time as we would have liked to consider the matter. Nevertheless, we did spend 3 or 4 hours on it, and the committee was convinced that the language proposed should be reinstated, and that we should give the legislative committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives a chance to inspect and study and get reports from the Panama Canal Zone, and in the meantime hold the civil-service workers in Panama in about their present status. Therefore the committee recommends the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee, on page 18, line 4. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" appear to have it.

Mr. GREEN. I ask for a rising vote.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, that completes all the committee amendments in the bill. I now have a number of amendments to offer on behalf of the committee which are in the nature of legislation on an appropriation bill. All of them were filed with the Senate 2 days ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the first amendment offered on behalf of the committee.

Mr. GURNEY. I ask first to bring up the amendment lettered "E."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 8, in the paragraph "Flood control, general," after the sum of money, it is proposed to insert ", of which, in view of the threat to human life, $200,000, shall be made available for the preparation of detailed plans for the Dyberry and Prompton Reservoirs in the Lackawaxen River Basin, Pa., recommended for construction in the report of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, in House Document No. 113, of the Eightieth Congress, and the preparation of such plans is hereby authorized."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, this does not increase the total in the bill at all, and I ask for the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I now offer an amendment affecting the Missouri River in Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, line 7, after the word "law", it is proposed to insert "*Provided further*, That funds appropriated herein may be used for necessary bank protection on the Missouri River in the vicinity of Aten, Nebr."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, this would not increase the total in the report of the bill, and it has the unanimous consent of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I now send forward another amendment, relating to the Garrison Reservoir in North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed on page 9, after line 22, to insert the following:

Garrison (N. Dak.) Reservoir: For acquisition of the lands and rights therein within the taking line of Garrison Reservoir which lands lie within the area now established as the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, N. Dak., including all elements of value above or below the surface thereof and including all improvements, severance damages and reestablishment and relocation costs the sum of $5,105,625, which said sum is included in the total allocated under this act for the said Garrison Reservoir and which shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Three Affiliated Tribes of Fort Berthold Reservation, to be

subject to withdrawal and disbursement as herein provided. This amount is made available subject to the following conditions subsequent and in the event the said conditions are not complied with then this amount shall lapse and be thereby null and void. Said conditions subsequent are:

That a contract between the United States and the said Three Affiliated Tribes shall be negotiated and approved by a majority of the adult members of said tribes and enacted into law by the Congress, providing for the conveyance of said lands and interests and the use and distribution of said fund and that disbursements from said fund shall be made forthwith in accordance with said approved contract and act of Congress.

That said contract shall be submitted to the Congress on or before the 1st day of June 1948: *Provided, however*, That, notwithstanding said contract or the provisions of this act, the said Three Affiliated Tribes may bring suit in the Court of Claims as provided in section 24 of the act of August 13, 1946, on account of additional damages, if any, alleged to have been sustained by said tribes by reason of the taking of the said lands and rights in the said Fort Berthold Indian Reservation on account of any treaty obligation of the Government, any intangible cost of reestablishment or relocation or any other basis of claim cognizable under said act of August 13, 1946, and for which the said tribes are not compensated by the said $5,105,625.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I regret to talk about the amendment, but I confess it was difficult for me to understand the reading of the amendment. The clerk read it rather fast. I wish the Senator would briefly explain to me why all these Indians must be considered at this time, and why this amount of money must be provided at this time. I do not quite get the purport of it.

Mr. GURNEY. In the first place, the amount of money provided in the bill is $5,195,000. This is to pay the Indians for the land that will be inundated when the water comes up to the level behind Garrison Dam. It also pays for moving the Indians away from that land to other land, and for resettlement, the buildings, and what not, that are presently under the taking line, when the reservoir is filled. Of course, the provisions in the bill are such that the $5,000,000 goes into the Treasury, so that it will be held in trust until the three tribes of Indians in the Fort Berthold Reservation agree to the settlement.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. If it is impossible to get the Indians to agree, then as I understand it, there will be no money spent?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Who is responsible for pressing for this amendment, if it is not known where the Indians stand on it?

Mr. GURNEY. During the hearings, the Indians appeared before the committee with legal counsel and at that time presented their story. The subcommittee suggested that the Army engineers and the Indians get together, after the hearing which we accorded them, to see if they could not agree on the language that would be satisfactory to both parties. Of course, the Army engineers could not in any way try to get together with the Indians on anything intangible, such as the loss of property rights, moving away from their homes, and things of that sort; so the $5,000,000 is merely an agreement made between the Army engineers and the Indians, through their legal representative, on the tangibles, land, buildings, things that can be seen.

Mr. LUCAS. How many Indians are involved in the transaction?

Mr. GURNEY. Two thousand and seventeen.

Mr. LUCAS. And what is the extent of the land that is expected to be inundated?

Mr. GURNEY. One hundred and fifty-nine thousand acres.

Mr. LUCAS. Did legal representatives for the Indians appear before the committee and ask for the money? I mean, did they request the Appropriations Committee to approve legislation of this kind?

Mr. GURNEY. As I said, the Indians with their legal representatives and the Army engineers have agreed to this amount of money for the tangibles. They are not in agreement on the intangibles, so the amendment gives congressional authorization for the Indians to take that part of the claim to the Court of Claims.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, would the Senator yield to me for a brief statement?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, when the appropriation bill dealing with this matter was before the Senate a year ago, the Senate adopted an amendment which I had proposed in committee, to provide that before the dam itself should be built, the Army engineers should offer to the Indians in compensation for the land which was to be taken, land equal in area and comparable in value to that which was being taken. It provided that the decision as to whether or not the land to be offered was compensatory should be made by the Secretary of the Interior. An amendment was worked out at one of the sessions of the committee between the Chief of Engineers, General Wheeler, and myself. The Army engineers, acting in compliance with that amendment, made a survey of the general area in which the Indians live and in which the dam is to be built, and selected certain lands now belonging to other persons which the Army engineers proposed should be condemned by the Federal Government, and, having been condemned, should be given to the Indians in exchange for the lands that were to be taken away.

The Interior Department felt that the offer was not adequate and did not comply with the provisions of the law; so that when the measure came before the Congress at this session, the problem still remained unsolved. It is a problem, I will say to the Senator from Illinois, because of the fact that these three Indian tribes, known as the three affiliated tribes, who occupy the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, once before had an experience with the Federal Government, in which they lost some 4,000,000 acres of land. The Federal Government took that great area from these same Indians, about 75 years ago, to give some of it to the railroads, in order that railroad transportation might be provided in this area, to set aside some of it for settlement by white settlers, and so forth. The land was taken, but the Indians were not compensated for more than 50 years. Long after the Indians who were deprived of this 4,000,000 acres had suffered that loss, the Congress of the United States gave them authority to sue in the Court of Claims. They recovered a judgment, the payment of which was authorized by Congress. That was their experience about 50 years ago. I point out, I will say to the Senator from Illinois, that most of the land was taken from the Indians by Executive order, issued, I think, during the administration of Benjamin Harrison. I allude to that fact in order to demonstrate that the Executive order was not an invention of recent years.

In any event, however, when the bill came up for consideration this year, the problem remained unsolved. During the hearings to which the Senator from South Dakota has referred, when counsel for the Indians was making his representations to the committee, in the presence of the Army engineers and of a delegation from the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, he said, in answer to a question that was propounded by one of the members of the committee, that the Indians and the Army engineers had never had an opportunity to try to come to an agreement themselves. Thereupon it was suggested by the subcommittee that the Army engineers and the Indians, through their counsel and their three representatives who were then in Washington, should go into conference the next day to see whether or not it would be possible to come to an understanding.

The amendment which was presented by the committee, except for the last proviso, was written by the attorney for the Indians. It was agreeable to the Army engineers and agreeable to the members of the committee. The amendment provided that the sum of approximately $5,165,000 should be set aside to compensate the Indians for certain tangible losses. The Indians said that $5,000,000 would not compensate them, that it would not pay for the loss of treaty rights. Thereupon it was suggested that an additional proviso should be added giving the Indians the right to sue in the Court of Claims for any other damages, if there are such, which they may suffer by reason of the taking of this land. The $5,000,000 figure was reached by the Army engineers by way of the appraisal of the land that was proposed to be substituted for the land to be taken.

I may say that the land which is to be taken, which will be flooded, covers about 159,000 acres. It consists of one-third of the diminished reservation of these Indians. It contains their so-called bottom lands, the lands in which most of them live. The Indians naturally dislike to be deprived of their homes. It may be doubted, and seriously doubted, whether there is any other

solution if the dam is to be built. The Indians proposed at one time to the Army engineers that instead of building the Garrison Dam, three other small dams should be constructed. The judgment of the Army engineers expressed to the committee was that these other dam sites and the structures that could be built there, would not serve the purposes of flood control. It was suggested by the Governor of North Dakota when he came to Washington and appeared before the House committee, that the compensation should be made by way of cash.

The provision contained in the bill is not self-enforcing. The bill provides that before it shall become absolutely effective the Indians at a meeting on their own reservation shall decide whether or not to accept it. If the Indians do not accept it, then the case remains substantially as it is now.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to ask the Senator, who is pushing the project, besides the Indians and the Army engineers?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Indians are not pushing the project, if the Senator refers to the Garrison Dam.

Mr. LUCAS. I am referring to the Garrison Dam which is going to require the taking of the number of acres the Senator referred to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Garrison Dam is being pushed in the first instance by the Army engineers, who tell the committee and tell Congress that that is the site at which the dam can be most effectively constructed, most efficiently to control the flood waters of the river.

Mr. LUCAS What territory does the river affect? Does it run through North Dakota and South Dakota?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It affects the territory down the Missouri and the Mississippi Rivers.

Mr. LUCAS. It is part of the flood-control program.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is. It is a beneficial part of the flood-control program.

Mr. LUCAS. The situation is a very interesting one. I wish to say that I had some experience with the Army engineers previous to the war when they took over for flood-control purposes certain lands which were adjacent to a river. The experience I had with them was an unpleasant one so far as the payment of the actual fair cash value of the land was concerned. Many a farmer protested, and protested in vain. During the war the Army engineers changed their policy, as I understand, entirely. At the beginning of the war, when the Army engineers and other Army officials began taking property in my section of the country for military purposes, immediately there arose some fear in the minds of the landowners, by reason of the previous experience with the Army engineers with respect to fair and equitable treatment. They had some hesitancy in dealing with the Army engineers because they feared they were not going to receive what the land was worth. But during the war they did receive what the land was worth. I certainly hope they do not revert to the policy of taking land that was in effect before the war, so far as flood control is concerned, and the erection of dams and other structures necessary to harness the waters of the West, the South, or any other section of America.

Mr. President, I want to speak out rather boldly. I hope the Army engineers who are going to do this work, behind which the Congress of the United States will stand, do not take a niggardly position with respect to the value of the lands which are owned by the people who are finally going to be obliged to give them up for flood-control purposes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I understand, the $5,000,000 may be insufficient or it may be sufficient, but it is to be used exclusively for the real-estate ventures of the project, and the amount does not embrace aboriginal, incorporeal hereditaments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It embraces other factors of damage besides the actual real estate. It embraces the cost of certain buildings and the like. I shall not use the mixture of aboriginal and Blackstonian metaphors which the Senator from Maryland used, but I shall say it does not involve the violation of treaty rights. If treaty rights have been violated, then under the proviso which has been added to the bill the Indians are given the positive jurisdiction to raise the question in the Court of Claims as provided under the Indian Claims Commission.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one observation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. I hope when the overall figure is written, however, that the aboriginal, incorporeal hereditaments will be duly compensated for so far as the Indians surrendering the land are concerned.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Under the amendment sponsored by the able Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] last year, the Army engineers were given the right to condemn land and secure lieu lands for the Indians; that is correct, is it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. YOUNG. And under the present amendment they would not have that right?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. YOUNG. I personally believe that the amendment sponsored by the Senator from Wyoming was a very fair one and a good one for the Indians, but it did not result in a solution of the problem. In fact, it even raised another problem, that of the white people of North Dakota whose lands would be acquired for the Indians. The cash settlement, I believe, is the only way out, and I believe the Indians themselves will eventually agree that it is the best solution. I hope the treatment of the Indians will be generous.

Mr. LUCAS. I hope so. I simply raised the question, because, as I said before, I had had a somewhat unpleasant experience with the Army engineers respecting the value they had placed in their appraisals on certain lands in my section of the country. I may have more to say on that subject as time goes on.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it should be said that the figure contained in the bill, $5,105,625, was a figure which was reached by the Army engineers and the Indians who were here with their counsel, as adequate compensation for the physical, tangible damage occasioned by the taking of the land.

The additional damage which the Indians claim is governed by the concluding proviso, which gives tribes the authority to bring suit in the Court of Claims "on account of additional damages, if any, alleged to have been sustained by said tribes by reason of the taking of the said lands and rights in the said Fort Berthold Indian Reservation on account of any treaty obligation of the Government, any intangible cost of reestablishment or relocation or any other basis of claim cognizable under said act of August 13, 1946, and for which the said tribes are not compensated by the said $5,105,625."

So the whole question can be reviewed by the Court of Claims on the basis of any failure of compensation in this sum.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I ask the Senator if he does not know that this land was not appraised by North Dakota people.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I did not know that.

Mr. LANGER. Even the abstracts were examined by people from without the State of North Dakota.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was not advised of the procedure taken by the Army engineers in making the appraisal. The committee did not go into that question when we were advised by the representative of the Indians that this figure was satisfactory for the items which were mentioned.

Mr. LANGER. I know from my association with the distinguished Senator on the Indian Affairs Committee last year that the Senator knows that this is the very best land in that locality. It is nearly all bottom land.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The land which is to be taken?

Mr. LANGER. The land which is to be taken.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is my understanding.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator know that the land of some of the farmers whose land was to be taken for this purpose was condemned, and that the farmers insisted upon a jury trial? The jury found that that land, which is not as good as this land, was worth $36 an acre, while the Indians are receiving only $31.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was not aware of that.

Mr. LANGER. I wanted to get that fact in the RECORD. I am sure that my distinguished colleague [Mr. YOUNG] does too.

Even though this amount is accepted by the Indians, they are accepting it with a pistol at their heads. They know that

the Garrison Dam is to be built. They know that their property is to be taken. I serve notice now that even though they accept this amount with a pistol at their heads, some of us in North Dakota are going to insist that they get a sum adequate to compensate them for the value of the property which is taken.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say that it was for the purpose of removing the pistol that the Senator from Wyoming offered the concluding proviso, which authorizes the Indians to take this matter to the Court of Claims.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct. I wish to say further that 2 years ago it was the distinguished Senator from Wyoming who insisted on that proviso being placed in the bill, that the Indians might be properly compensated for the property which was taken. I may add that my colleague the distinguished junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] has spent many hours trying to settle the question in a manner satisfactory both to the Government and to the Indians. We have had conference after conference on it, and have done the very best we could under the circumstances.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have welcomed the sympathetic cooperation of both Senators from North Dakota. In the Committee on Indian Affairs last year the senior Senator from North Dakota, who was a member of the committee, cooperated very diligently in the hearings upon this question. I am very happy to see that there is so much concern to see that the Indians shall be properly treated. It must be remembered, however, that we have carefully written into this amendment the proviso that the settlement must be accepted by the Indians, and that a contract must be signed. If the Indians are not satisfied, if the compensation is not sufficient—although it is $31.91 an acre—or if the amount allocated for any of the other causes of damage is not satisfactory, then it will be for the Indians to say so when the tribe meets to discuss the contract.

We have provided a specific sum which apparently is adequate in the minds of the Indians who were here, for the tangible damages which have been inflicted. Over and above that, we have given the Indians the right and the authority to go into the Court of Claims and assert any additional claims.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire of the able Senator whether or not the evidence discloses what will happen to the Indians once they are removed from the reservation on which they live at the present time?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course they will not be removed from the entire reservation. The 159,000 acres which will be taken constitutes possible one-third of the total reservation.

Mr. LUCAS. Is the remaining part of the reservation productive land?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; it is principally grazing land. The land to be taken is the better land.

Mr. LUCAS. That is what I understood. It seems to me that if we are continually to take the better land for flood-control purposes, sooner or later we shall have to consider the ultimate effect of it. I am for flood control; but when we look at the little picture which has been so vividly portrayed by the Senator from Wyoming, and realize that this group of Indians—2,000 or more—who have been living in this fertile valley all these years and using the valley for farming purposes, are now compelled to move back into the hills, so to speak, and take their chances with grazing or some other form of activity, I submit that it is a serious question as to whether or not the land should be taken.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was pointed out in the hearing that the construction of the reservoir will result in the creation on the reservation, as it were, of a great, new lake which will provide fishing as well as water for livestock. Some advantages are likely to flow from the construction of the reservoir.

Mr. LUCAS. The Indians cannot live solely on fish.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Let me say to the Senator from Illinois that the Indians will not lose all of their good lands. As the Senator from Wyoming has pointed out, they will lose only about a third of their lands. I think it will be possible to acquire other lands and put together good units.

I should like to add further that as a result of the efforts of the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from Wyoming, the Indians have obtained a much better settlement than they otherwise would have. I believe it is one of the outstanding settlements ever received by any Indians.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to have the Senator say that, because I am cognizant of the fact that if it had not been for the amendment written into the bill last year the Indians would probably have found themselves in exactly the same position in which they were 75 years ago, when a large part of their original lands were taken and they had to wait half a century for any compensation.

Mr. YOUNG. In the meantime, no harm has been done by delaying the construction of the dam. They can proceed in any orderly manner.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And there may be no possibility during the next year, under the appropriations provided in this bill, that any substantial part of that dam can be constructed. Certainly the land will not be flooded for at least 5 years.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I regret that I have taken so much time upon this amendment, but it interested me, and I am glad to get the story.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad the Senator has asked the question, because I think it is a very good thing to have in the RECORD.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I want to thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois for the interest he has taken in some of my constituents. They are very fine, brave people, and their sons enlisted in the war and did a good job.

I want to call the attention of the Senator from Wyoming to this fact. I am familiar with every acre of that land. The units consist of two kinds of land. They have land upon which they raise a little crop and where they keep their cattle, and they have upland. They make a little hay on the upland. When we take the good land it detracts from the value of the upland, as the Senator can very well see. So the amount of $31.91 is entirely inadequate, because it lessens the value of the upland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GURNEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have stated another amendment authorized by the committee, in which the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is interested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 6, line 5, after the word "aircraft", to strike out the following: "*Provided further*, That no appropriation under the Corps of Engineers for the fiscal year 1948 shall be available for any expenses incident to operating any power-driven boat or vessel on other than Government business" and to insert in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided further*, That hereafter no appropriation under the Corps of Engineers shall be available for any expenses incident to operating any power-driven boat or vessel on other than Government business, and that the Government business shall be construed to include transportation, lodging, and subsistence on inspection trips of Federal and State officials having a public interest in authorized or proposed improvements for river and harbor and flood control, and any expense incurred therewith shall be chargeable to river and harbor and flood-control appropriations heretofore or hereafter made, and under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Chief of Engineers: *Provided further*, That such expenditures shall be certified by the division engineer as necessary and proper expenditures."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Cordon	Hill
Baldwin	Donnell	Hoey
Ball	Downey	Holland
Barkley	Dworshak	Ives
Brewster	Eastland	Jenner
Bricker	Ecton	Johnson, Colo.
Brooks	Ellender	Johnston, S. C.
Buck	Ferguson	Kem
Bushfield	Flanders	Kilgore
Butler	Fulbright	Knowland
Byrd	George	Langer
Cain	Green	Lodge
Capehart	Gurney	Lucas
Capper	Hatch	McCarran
Chavez	Hawkes	McCarthy
Connally	Hayden	McClellan
Cooper	Hickenlooper	McFarland

McGrath	O'Mahoney	Thomas, Okla.
McKellar	Overton	Thomas, Utah
Magnuson	Pepper	Thye
Malone	Reed	Tydings
Martin	Revercomb	Umstead
Maybank	Robertson, Va.	Vandenberg
Millikin	Russell	Watkins
Moore	Saltonstall	Wherry
Morse	Smith	White
Murray	Sparkman	Wiley
Myers	Stewart	Williams
O'Conor	Taft	Wilson
O'Daniel	Taylor	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY].

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the committee agreed with the suggestions made by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the amendment now pending contains the suggestions of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President——

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a moment? It is necessary that three or four men go to the conference with the House. I have to stay until the bill has passed. I wonder if the Senator would allow us to pass this bill. We are all through with the committee amendments. The men are waiting down in the Appropriations Committee room, and have been waiting for approximately an hour.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am sorry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire to speak in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. McCARRAN. I desire to speak to the Senate, which I have a right to do, whether it be in opposition or in favor of the pending amendment.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I will yield for a question, if I do not lose the floor—if I have unanimous consent that I shall not lose the floor.

Mr. GURNEY. Does the Senator want me to call off the conference and thereby put the bill over another day and perhaps make it impossible for Congress to adjourn this week?

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall be very sorry if Congress does not adjourn this week, because I have reservations and expect to leave here at the end of the week, and I think probably other Senators do. I should not want to be a party to preventing the adjournment.

Mr. GURNEY. This is a conference report on the War Department appropriation bill.

STUDY OF ACTIVITIES OF SEC AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in February 1941, by means of Senate Resolution 35, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Senate authorized and directed the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to make a full and complete study and investigation of the activities of the Securities and Exchange Commission and Post Office Department, to determine whether the activities of these Federal agencies, through their representatives, have (a) crippled, hampered, or rendered ineffective the Federal Municipal Bankruptcy Act, as amended; and (b) unfairly resulted in undermining the credit of the taxing units of the State of Florida.

Pursuant to that resolution, a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, consisting of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], was appointed. That subcommittee held open hearings in Florida and Washington, D. C. Both the attorney and investigator of the subcommittee made investigations, under its supervision; and the chairman assembled a substantial amount of pertinent matter through the use of questionnaires. Despite these efforts, the subcommittee was unable to complete the assignment by the time of the sine die adjournment of the Seventy-ninth Congress. Whereupon, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary of the Eightieth Congress, under authority of the Congressional Reorganization Act, continued the investigation as a committee investigation in the Eightieth Congress. The subcommittee was reorganized. It now consists of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who, by the courtesy of the majority of the Judiciary Committee, was continued as chairman of the subcommittee, and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

The record of 1,068 printed plates, bound in two volumes, constitutes the material assembled by the original subcommittee. The typewritten record contains the proceedings of the subcommittee as now constituted. The wide latitude allowed to all parties in presenting testimony and evidence, as well as the necessity of delving into the general economy of a soverign state in an effort to uncover factual segments germane to the specific questions contained in Senate Resolution 35, Seventy-ninth Congress, will, it is believed, satisfactorily explain why the combined record appears so voluminous.

Mr. President, I hope I may have the attention of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. I hope I may have the attention of the Senate, because, let me say, I do not believe there has been anything more important, before either the Seventy-ninth Congress or the Eightieth Congress than the question that is involved in the resolution which I shall discuss quite at length.

Mr. President, the subcommittee has undertaken the laborious task of separating the "wheat from the chaff"; and, based upon the record, respectfully submits the following:

THE FEDERAL MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY ACT, AS AMENDED

The history of the Municipal Bankruptcy Act, as amended, is within the personal knowledge of several Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, at this point I wish to depart from my manuscript to say that the State of Florida——

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. In a minute, Mr. President; I am not yielding just now.

Mr. FERGUSON. I merely wish to try——

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am not yielding now. I do not wish to be discourteous, but just now I am not yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada declines to yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I was about to say that the State of Florida did not send to Washington the representatives of only one county of the State, but I think every county of the State of Florida sent its representatives to Washington during the early part of my term of office as a Member of this body. From the very beginning of my service in the Committee on the Judiciary, that committee had to do with this matter. The representatives of the State of Florida came before me and before my subcommittee and before the full committee, pleading for the Municipal Bankruptcy Act, because they said the State of Florida and its municipalities were bankrupt, and that unless we did something, they did not know what would happen down there in respect to the financial condition. So we went on.

What I have to relate now is a follow-up of what we did then.

It will be recalled that many public officials of Florida, prominent private individuals, civic bodies, and other representative groups endorsed and actively urged the Congress to enact the original act. In fact, the act, as originally passed was introduced by a Member of Congress from Florida. The subsequent reenactment was vigorously urged by the congressional delegation from Florida; and although delegations from other States displayed an interest in the passage of the measure, it has always been generally understood that the acute municipal debt problems of Florida taxing units presented the primary necessity for congressional assistance. The amendment of 1940, extending the life of the act and enlarging its scope to embrace financially distressed counties, was likewise urged by the Florida delegation in Congress and by substantial Florida interests. Hence, the Municipal Bankruptcy Act, as amended, which now constitutes a permanent part of the Federal bankruptcy laws, is the result to a great extent, of the insistence by, as well as the need of, the taxing units of Florida.

The reasons prompting governing authorities of Florida's political subdivisions, taxpayers, civic groups, and others to request Federal assistance in the form of the Municipal Bankruptcy Act and the amendment thereto, were made clear to the original subcommittee during its study and investigation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am sorry; I cannot yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Without doubt, the catastrophic set-backs and the seemingly hopeless bond defaults of the early 1930's struck at the very heart of the most op-

timistic person's faith in the future, and especially those who required a solvent and prosperous community as an impetus to self-improvement. The overwhelming majority of individuals in all fields of endeavor were in this category.

Prior to the investigation of Florida municipal refundings by representatives of the Securities and Exchange Commission and Post Office Department, the Municipal Bankruptcy Act was frequently resorted to when it became apparent that sufficient creditors to effectuate a voluntary refunding could not be obtained. A refunding program under this Federal act requires the presentation of a plan of composition to a United States district court. Hearings are held and objectors are given every legal opportunity to file objections to the plan and argue the merits thereof.

The success of a refunding proceeding under the Municipal Bankruptcy Act, as amended, largely depends upon the degree of tripartite confidence existing between the investors, the taxing unit, and the refunding agent. The record develops that several of these Federal court proceedings dealing with the refunding of Florida municipal bonds were minutely scrutinized by Federal agents, notwithstanding the fact that the court had rendered a final decision, the interested parties had complied with it, and the time for taking an appeal had expired. During and after their investigation of the court proceedings, personal interviews were held and questionnaires or letters were sent to bondholders suggesting irregularities in the court proceedings. These critical letters and biased personal interviews of the Federal agents became common knowledge to the investing public. Many holders of Florida taxing units' bonds who had voluntarily committed their bonds to refunding proceedings under the bankruptcy law did, upon learning of the Federal agents' activities, decline to participate further. As a result, several distressed Florida taxing units have been deprived of the benefits of the Federal Municipal Bankruptcy Act, as amended, and the act has been, to this extent at least, rendered ineffective.

Let me say, aside from my prepared remarks, that the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary has been visited by a responsible party from a county in Florida in which, by reason of the acts of the agents of the Post Office Department and the agents of the Federal Security Exchange Commission, he and his county have been unable to go forward with refinancing, a most distressing situation.

THE CREDIT OF THE TAXING UNITS OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA

The record relating to "the credit of the taxing units of the State of Florida" begins with the issuance of approximately—and this is startling—$500,000,000, par value, of interest-bearing ad valorem tax bonds and the sale and distribution thereof to the investing public of the Nation between the years 1920 and 1928. Each and every subsequent event affecting "the credit," through 1946, is covered in the record and has been considered by the subcommittee, including but not limited to, the large-scale defaults on principal and interest during the early 1930's, the temporary refunding resorted to by the taxing units between 1932 and 1938, and the permanent refinancing by them between 1938 and 1946.

It became clear—at least clear to the chairman of the subcommittee and to the subcommittee—early in its study and investigation, that two of the principal factors in the field of municipal finance in Florida from about 1929 through 1942 were the "Alfred I. du Pont interests" and "the Crummer interests." I use these terms because they have been known in Florida and before the committee by those names.

Alfred I. du Pont established his residence in Florida in 1926. During the same year he formed the Almour Securities Co., and it was through this company that he began the acquisition of substantial Florida holdings. Alfred I. du Pont died, as a citizen of Florida, in 1935, and since then his vast fortune has continued to acquire diversified holdings in Florida through the trustees of his trust estate. These holdings include: Florida taxing units' bonds, 20 banks, real estate, timberlands, docks, warehouses, 1 railroad, public utilities, office buildings, a paper mill, and so forth, and are held largely by the ownership of controlling shares of several companies. The St. Joe Paper Co. is the principal company in the group. About 76 percent of its stock is owned by the du Pont trust.

Mr. President, nothing in the statement I am making is not supported by the record made by the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I have, during the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses up to date, been chairman.

The Crummer interests, so-called, were, from 1922 to 1942, very active in the field of municipal finance. Their activities were confined to those of a municipal investment dealer. They operated originally as the Brown-Crummer Investment Co. and later, from 1934 through 1942, as R. E. Crummer & Co. When the large-scale defaults in Florida taxing units' bonds became evident, the Crummer interests undertook to suggest means of alleviating the threatened disaster, motivated apparently by a desire to save their reputation with their investor-customers. They proposed State legislation and temporary refunding plans tending to bring emergency relief. Later they joined many others in recommending the adoption of the Federal Municipal Bankruptcy Act and the amendment thereto.

The Crummer interests handled a substantial portion of the refunding proceedings during the temporary refunding period and were generally known as "the refunders." I quote that from the record. The du Pont interests are the interests set up by the trust of Alfred I. du Pont. The du Pont interests opposed the State legislation, temporary refunding, Federal Municipal Bankruptcy Act, and the amendment thereto. They were known as "the antirefunders." I quote that from the record.

A struggle between the forces advocating refunding and the forces opposing it had as its genesis the fight over the passage of the Gas Tax Act and the State Board of Administration Act by the 1929 session of the Florida Legislature.

Mr. President, it may seem out of place that a Senator from the far West should be presenting this matter, but the reason for it will be developed in a very short time. The resolution that gave rise to this entire study was fostered and promoted and introduced by the two Senators from the State of Florida, and the reason why the Senator from Nevada comes into the picture is that, at the time of the introduction of this resolution, he, the senior Senator from Nevada, was chairman of the Judiciary Committee, to which the resolution was referred. In all my public life, I have never met a more lovable character or one who seemed more sincere and honest in his purpose than that great and glorious former Member of this body, who has been called to his last reward, Senator Andrews. His fine personality in the committee over which I had the privilege of being chairman was a dominant factor at all times. I would not be standing here today were it not for his having come to me time and time again, saying to me, "Senator, will you not take the chairmanship of the subcommittee? Please take the chairmanship of the subcommittee." And so I took the chairmanship of the subcommittee and carried on as best I could. I say that, out of high respect for a great spirit, for a glorious personality who was with us, for a great spirit who has passed on, who, if there be a reward for men, will certainly have merited a crown.

The Crummer interests were the leaders of the refunders and the du Pont interests the leaders of the opposition. For over 12 years following the initial clash, it was a case of "an irresistible force meeting an immovable object." These two strong forces brought into play all the political, financial, and personal resources at their command, and it was between these two forces that the agents of the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Post Office Department "took sides."

The refunders—and this is all shown by the record—made substantial progress despite the formidable opposition. The Crummer interests alone refunded approximately $170,000,000, par value, of the bonded debt of some 200 taxing units, which debt was held by nearly 15,000 investors scattered throughout the United States. Other investment dealers, following the Crummer plan, also refunded a substantial volume. When, in 1938, the stronger Florida taxing units began to negotiate with the investing public for credit accommodations on permanent low-interest rates, the struggle between the refunders and the antirefunders increased in intensity. R. E. Crummer & Co. purchased, for cash, as the committee is advised, on competitive bid, a total of about $31,000,000, par value, of bonds from 10 separate taxing units, between July 1940 and May 5, 1941. These purchases, for cash, served notice on the antirefunders that the refunders were

just as formidable competitors on cash purchases as they had been during the period of exchanging bonds under temporary refunding programs. By May 1941 it was apparent to both the refunders and antirefunders that millions of dollars of permanent refundings were soon to be offered to the public. R. E. Crummer & Co. had demonstrated its financial ability in cash transactions by outbidding the "antis" for the $31,000,000 offerings during the preceding 10 months.

Then came the charge of Roger L. Main, of the du Pont interests, and Howard S. Wheeler, a Crummer competitor, to the Post Office Department, alleging mail fraud violations by R. E. Crummer & Co.

Mr. President, we shall have to distinguish between the du Pont interests and their adversaries. My statement is not made for the purpose of distinguishing between the du Pont interests and their adversaries, but rather of bringing the Senate to a realization that the representatives of the bureaus and departments of the Federal Government very frequently apparently fall in line, and let their departments lose sight of their obligation, and as was said, they are willing to depart from the duty they owe to the Government and to the law, apparently, to serve their own interests.

I am sorry to say that, and I am saying it on the left-hand side of the center aisle. I am saying it as a lifelong Democrat. I am saying it as one whose democracy no one dare challenge. But the representatives of the agencies downtown, the departments, if you please, under a Democratic regime, have gone out of line and have forgotten their obligation and their duty. The avalanche of Nation-wide propaganda occasioned by the activities of the Federal agents of the Post Office Department and the Securities and Exchange Commission, once they became active in the field, eventually completely discredited the leader of the refunders in the eyes of the investing public. One would only have to go to the State of Florida and hold hearings, as the subcommittee did, to know that that statement might be underscored 100 times.

The attacks upon the Crummer interests—the attack upon any interest, if you please, engaged in refunding—by the Federal agent, and in this instance by the du Pont interests were, if not coordinated, at least coincidental and complementary. A State investigator was appointed as a result of a Florida House of Representatives resolution — and again I draw the attention of the Senate to the fact that the subcommittee was not acting solely under resolution of the Senate; the subcommittee was acting under the request of a subcommittee of the Legislature of the State of Florida. The subcommittee and the Legislature of the State of Florida had requested, because of the fact that there was Federal law involved, that the Senate of the United States should take action in the matter. So the subcommittee was not acting alone on the mere resolution of the Senate.

A State investigator, appointed as a result of a Florida House of Representatives' resolution, 1941 session, creating an investigatory committee to examine municipal bond refundings, also contributed to the attack on the Crummer interests. It appears that close liaison was established and maintained among the Crummer antagonists. Eventually, the orderly conduct of business by R. E. Crummer & Co. was rendered impossible.

Mr. President, in order that we may understand at the outset what that meant, here was one of the refinancing agencies which had refinanced any number of the communities of the State of Florida, rendered inoperative, by reason of—what? We will see later. I say now preliminarily, it was by reason of the action of an investigator of the Post Office Department, a man by the name of Mansfield, and by the activities of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Therefore, in late 1942 the company—the record shows Brown-Crummer Investment Co., 1920 to 1938, date of dissolution; R. E. Crummer & Co., 1934 through 1942, date became inactive, the Crummer Co., 1943 to date, but prevented from doing business 1943 and 1944 until Supreme Court of Florida ordered permit be issued; none of these companies was controlled by the same stock ownership—announced its intention to discontinue business as of December 31 of that year and the formation of a new company to be known as the Crummer Co. This company was an entirely new set-up, composed of former officers and employees of R. E. Crummer & Co. R. E. Crummer, individually, did not have an interest in the Crummer Co., nor has he ever served that company in an official capacity. The Crummer Co. intended to begin business in January 1943, but was prevented from doing so by the Florida State Securities Commission which refused it a permit, after the president of a du Pont-controlled company protested the issuance thereof.

Again we find the entry into the picture of the du Pont-controlled company. It should be most interesting to both Senators from the State of Florida to listen to this, and I know the Senators from the State of Florida have very intimate knowledge of what I am saying.

It appears that by 1943 the Crummer antagonists were all working toward a criminal indictment of R. E. Crummer & Co. and its principal officers. Cases were being developed with this in view. In February or March 1944 agents of the Securities and Exchange Commission and a post-office inspector conferred with the United States attorney's office in Tampa, Fla., requesting criminal prosecutions of Crummer, et al. Their request was denied. The request was denied by the Federal law agency of the State of Florida.

However, in June of the same year they induced one or more assistant United States attorneys of Kansas, in the absence of the United States attorney, to proceed against the Crummer interests. A grand jury was called, and on August 3, 1944, R. E. Crummer & Co., its principal officers, and several employees, along with the Crummer Co., were indicted. The agents of both the Securities and Exchange Commission and Post Office Department were present and very active during the grand jury proceedings. In fact, the post-office inspector contended that he drafted the original criminal indictment in one of the two criminal cases.

Keep in mind, Mr. President, that the subcommittee was set up for the purpose of investigating the activities of the Post Office Department or its agents, and the activities of the Securities and Exchange Commission and its agents, in their activity in impairing the credit of the municipalities of the State of Florida under the Municipal Bankruptcy Act.

The post-office inspector contended—he not only testified, but he argued—that he, the post-office inspector, drafted the original criminal indictment in one of the two criminal cases. That fact will stand out in history.

The post-office inspector later appeared before the United States attorney—and I invite the attention of the Senate to this fact—in Cincinnati, Ohio, urging a criminal prosecution in Ohio. Of what? Of the du Pont interests? Of any other financing interests? Not at all. Of the Crummer interests. He had set out against the Crummer interests. His whole attitude indicated that he was intent upon putting Crummer and his interests and financing concern out of the State of Florida; and he succeeded in doing it. That is the peculiar part of it.

It is significant to note at this point that three United States attorneys were sought to be enlisted to join in the criminal prosecutions. Each of them declined to prosecute. It was only the assistant United States attorney at Topeka, Kans., who consented to bring the matter before a grand jury; and this happened while the United States attorney was a patient in the Mayo Clinic. That fact should certainly be dwelt upon. The Department of Justice, the Department of the Government which should defend the most lowly citizen, as well as prosecute any criminal, seems at least to have been remiss in this particular instance. The Department of Justice was not represented by its duly appointed United States district attorney at Topeka, Kans. He was ill in the Mayo Clinic; but his assistant went forward with the case.

In late 1945 or early 1946, counsel for the Crummer interests appeared before the United States Attorney General and requested a hearing on the merits of the pending criminal cases. Again the Crummer interests are brought into the picture. This should arouse the concern of the Senate.

I repeat my last sentence. In late 1945 or early 1946 counsel for the Crummer interests appeared before the United States Attorney General and requested a hearing on the merits of the pending criminal cases; that is, the criminal cases then pending in the State of Kansas. Mind you, this prosecution had been peddled in three different States, and none of them would take it, except an assistant district attorney in the State of Kansas. Why is it necessary to peddle something that is criminal outside the State in which the crime is

committed? When the United States district attorney of the State of Florida refused to take cognizance of this case and go forward with it, why was it necessary to go into Ohio? Why was it necessary to go into Kansas? Could they go anywhere and everywhere in order to get an indictment against someone? If that be the case, where is the security of the liberties of American citizens?

All of the witnesses before the subcommittee, whether on one side or the other of this investigation conducted by the representatives of the two Federal agencies involved, agreed that the elimination of the Crummer interests as a factor in the field of Florida municipal financing necessarily impaired the flow of credit which they had developed through the years.

Mr. President, I again depart from my manuscript to say that here was a situation in which a sovereign State had come before the representatives of the Federal Congress and asked them—nay, begged them—to pass legislation so that municipalities might have the benefit of a bankruptcy act. Yet it is admitted that the investigation conducted by the representatives of the two Federal agencies involved, the Post Office Department and the Securities and Exchange Commission agreed that the elimination of the Crummer interests as a factor in the field of Florida municipal financing necessarily impaired the flow of credit which they had developed through the years.

Moreover, Mr. President, it was admitted that by the discrediting of the Crummer organization—and certainly when an indictment is found it does discredit any individual or any organization—the taxing units of Florida were deprived of the services and facilities of the investment dealer which had geared its organization to meet the requirements of those taxing units.

It does not follow, however, that this investment dealer is now or ever has been immune to investigation, or should not be answerable to the properly constituted authorities for its illegal acts, if any.

I hold no brief either for the Crummer interests or the du Pont interests, or any other financing agency. But when a governmental agency attempts to go into matters of illegal conduct, it must never overlook its duty to the public or its responsibility to promote and preserve the public interest. In this regard the representatives of the two Federal agencies were obviously derelict.

Mr. President, I have used the most temperate language I could in that respect. They were not only derelict. To my mind they were vicious in their determination to carry out the desires of one financing agency against another in the State of Florida, and to eliminate from the State of Florida a financing agency which had lent much to Florida during its trying hours and days.

When Florida was coming here begging Congress to pass legislation, then indeed, it must have been looking for financial agencies which would help it out under the Bankruptcy Act.

In this regard the representatives of the two Federal agencies were obviously derelict. Instead of proceeding with caution, as would be expected of an impartial and well-qualified group of investigators dealing with a subject as exclusive as municipal credit, they drove roughshod toward their preconceived goal of criminal indictments with apparently no regard for the effect of their activities upon the credit of Florida. Is it any wonder, then, that the legal representative of one of the municipalities of the State of Florida came to the chairman of the committee and said that it was impossible for him to go forward with refinancing his agency?

The representatives of the Post Office Department and of the Securities and Exchange Commission abused their administrative authority and subpena power. They were openly partisan between the warring factions in a highly competitive field. They tampered with the legal machinery of the civil and criminal courts. They denied the right of due process to citizens. They interfered with the orderly conduct of business in the channels of interstate commerce and trade, and they violated many of the departmental regulations during the course of their investigation.

I want to draw the attention of the Post Office Department and of the Securities and Exchange Commission to the record in the case made by the subcommittee in Florida and the city of Washington. If they do not agree with me that their representatives went beyond the authority extended to them, then, indeed, I am at a loss to construe what authority was conferred upon them.

The question of whether the criminal indictments against the Crummer interests were justified, and many other questions are raised by the record, such as the existence of a monopoly in Florida and the allocation of responsibility under Resolution 35 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. However, to draw attention to the specific question of whether the activities of the Federal agencies involved through their representatives have unfairly resulted in the undermining of the credit of the taxing units of the State of Florida, I quote the language of the resolution offered by the two Senators from the State of Florida:

"There can be but one answer, and that is in the affirmative."

I repeat that statement. However, to draw attention to the specific question of whether the activities of the Federal agencies involved, that is, the Post Office Department and the Securities and Exchange Commission, through their representatives have "unfairly resulted in undermining the credit of the taxing units of the State of Florida," quoting from the resolution, "There can be but one answer, and that is in the affirmative."

In view of the above, it is strongly recommended by the chairman of the subcommittee that henceforth the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Post Office Department—

(a) Prohibit their representative agents from investigating or interfering with judicial proceedings under the Municipal Bankruptcy Act, as amended.

(b) Assure full and complete compliance by their respective agents with the provisions of law relating to the prosecution of alleged illegal acts and practices.

(c) Prevent their respective agents, during the course of an investigation, from taking sides in favor of one or more individuals against another or others.

(d) Require a careful study and investigation of complaints filed with them, including the personal interests of the complaining parties, before launching a formal investigation; and

(e) Extend to the person, firm, or corporation being investigated in any case opportunity for a full and complete hearing on the subject matter under investigation.

Mr. President, as I have stated, this was a matter of unusual consideration. The Judiciary Committee of the Senate was presented by two Senators from a sovereign State with a resolution calling for an investigation by the Senate. Their action was impelled, as the record will show, by the action of the State of Florida, acting through its legislative body. In other words, the Senate of the State of Florida had requested that a Federal investigation be made by the Senate of the United States. On that request the Senators from Florida had apparently acted. No one, at least not one coming from the far western region and unfamiliar with these conditions, could anticipate what was involved in this matter. I had taken a very active part in the enactment of the Municipal Bankruptcy Act; in fact, I had taken a leading part, because I thought that there were States of the Union and municipalities in the Union where unusual legislation was essential. The statements made to the committee of which I was a member, by representatives of the State of Florida, convinced me that the State of Florida, of all States in the Union, was calling for special legislation by the Federal Government. It is no discredit to the State of Florida. We went through a peculiar time in which the investing public did not look to the future very much; and when a great depression came upon us the State of Florida suffered perhaps more than any other State. So, when this matter came to the Committee on the Judiciary, of which it was my privilege to be the chairman, I was not unfamiliar with past legislation.

I was entirely unfamiliar with conditions which prevailed in the State of Florida; and, indeed, I was entirely unfamiliar with the situation which prevailed there. Whether it now prevails, time will tell. But I say without fear of successful contradiction that the record made by the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee will show the existence in the State of Florida of a monopoly that transcends anything I ever heard of that exists in any other State in the Union—a monopoly that reaches out into the private life of individuals and into the public life of communities. When the existence of such a monopoly is shown, it certainly behooves the Senate Judiciary Committee to go at length into the matter.

Mr. President, I wish to discharge my duties and to be relieved. As chairman of the Judiciary Committee during the

time when I served in that capacity, this onerous duty had fallen upon my shoulders. When the Eightieth Congress was assembled in January last, I brought the matter to the attention of the full Judiciary Committee, and I asked that something be done—that either the committee be authorized to go forward with further investigations, or that the obligations incurred by the committee during the Seventy-ninth Congress be discharged, and that I be relieved of the chairmanship of the subcommittee, and that the matter be closed.

The Judiciary Committee decided to augment the membership of that subcommittee, of which I had been chairman during the previous Congresses. So the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from Oklahome [Mr. MOORE] were added to the subcommittee together with the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who acted as an ex-officio member.

Hearings were held. Then the hearings were closed. I had been honored by my Republican colleagues on the Judiciary Committee by being continued as chairman of the subcommittee; and I do consider it an honor—perhaps an unusual one, but one which I should like to discharge as best I can. It seemed to me, as chairman of the subcommittee, that it was my duty to present to my subcommittee a report by way of a summation of what had gone on, so that the subcommittee could either adopt the report or refuse to adopt the report or do something to close the matter, so that the senior Senator from Nevada might be relieved of the obligation.

Mr. President, after I have taken on a responsibility, never at any point during the course of the performance of that responsibility have I wished to shirk my duty, and I am not going to shirk this one. I do wish to be discharged of my duty; I do wish the subcommittee to wind up its affairs; I do wish to be through with it.

By reason of the volume of business before the Senate, and for other reasons, it appears that my colleagues on the subcommittee have been unable to agree to the report which I presented to them. I have it before me now.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I have with meticulous energy weighed the words in this proposed report; and, with footnotes, I have tied every expression in the report into the record which was made through the months and months of hearings that were conducted and into the records that are indisputable.

What shall I do now? What would any Senator do at the close of this session? I wish to present my proposed report to the Senate. I wish to report progress. I want the Senate to know that my committee has been diligent.

I wish to say in fairness to my colleagues that this report has not been adopted; not one member of the subcommittee, aside from myself, has seen fit to take the position which this proposed report advocates. But it is a complete summation, a complete statement with proposed final decision and proposed recommendations with respect to all that was brought before the subcommittee, acting under and pursuant to Senate Resolution 35 of the Seventy-ninth Congress and Senate Resolution 90 of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. President, I now offer my proposed report on this matter; and I ask unanimous consent that this report, which is to the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee on Senate Resolution 35 of the Seventy-ninth Congress and Senate Resolution 90 of the Eightieth Congress, be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVESTIGATION OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION AND THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT IN FLORIDA

[Report pursuant to S. Res. 25, 79th Cong. and S. Res. 90, 80th Cong.]

Authority for investigation

In February 1945, by means of Senate Resolution 35, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Senate authorized and directed the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to make a full and complete study and investigation of the activities of the Securities and Exchange Commission and Post Office Department, or any representative thereof, with a view of determining whether the activities of these Federal agencies, through their representatives, have (a) crippled, hampered, or rendered ineffective the Federal Municipal Bankruptcy Act, as amended; and (b) unfairly resulted in undermining the credit of the taxing units of the State of Florida.

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 35, a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was appointed, consisting of Senators MCCARRAN (chairman), EASTLAND, and WHERRY. Within the short space of approximately 5 weeks allowed under the resolution, this subcommittee conducted a preliminary investigation, and reported its findings to the full committee which, after due consideration, filed its report with the Senate setting forth the committee's findings and recommending that the investigation be continued until January 1, 1946. Subsequent extensions of the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 35 were made under Senate Resolution 112, Seventy-ninth Congress (until December 31, 1945) and Senate Resolution 194, Seventy-ninth Congress (until the end of the 79th Cong.). Senate Resolution 293, Seventy-ninth Congress provided that "all resolutions heretofore agreed to, authorizing standing or select committees to employ clerical assistance, hold hearings, and conduct investigations during the Seventy-ninth Congress, hereby are continued in full force and effect until January 31, 1947." By action of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, the investigation was continued as a committee investigation in the Eightieth Congress, under authority of the Congressional Reorganization Act, and the subcommittee was reorganized to consist of Senators MCCARRAN (chairman), FERGUSON, MOORE, and EASTLAND.

Procedure and methods

During the early stages of the investigation it became evident that all pertinent documents and information could not be obtained during open hearings if expenditures were to be kept within the limits fixed by the Senate. Therefore, the subcommittee sent out numerous questionnaires (in the nature of interrogatories), letters, etc. Open hearings were held at Jacksonville, Fla., on February 15 and 16, 1946, and at Tampa, Fla., on February 18 and 19, 1946. These hearings were attended by Senator MCCARRAN, chairman, and Senator EASTLAND. Due to the unavailability of Senators EASTLAND and WHERRY, and the illness of Senator MCCARRAN, Senator CARL HATCH, at the request of the chairman, conducted an open hearing in Jacksonville, Fla., on December 27 and 28, 1946. On January 6, 7, 10, 17, and 30, 1947, Senators MCCARRAN and EASTLAND held open hearings in Washington, D. C., the record being closed at the conclusion of the hearing on January 30. Counsel for the committee attended all open hearings.

In furtherance of the investigation, and in addition to the open hearings held and the questionnaires, letters, etc., sent out by the committee, the counsel for the committee made a trip to Florida to interview prospective witnesses and gather information, and the chief investigator of the committee made one trip to Florida and one trip to Philadelphia, Pa., for similar purposes.

Voluntary statements, in letter form, have been received and made a part of the record. Pertinent files in the office of the Attorney General of the United States were brought before the committee and there discussed by two attorneys in the Department of Justice, and the record of the hearings of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Finance Docket No. 13170, on the question of the reorganization of the Florida East Coast Railway Co. was examined by counsel for the committee.

In connection with the various questionnaires sent out by the committee, the Post Office Department and the Florida State Securities Commission appear as the two recalcitrants, having failed to answer the questionnaires addressed to them.

BACKGROUND

Credit of Florida taxing units, 1920 through 1946

The record establishes that—

(1) From about 1920 through 1928, the taxing units of Florida (county, school, and municipal) made their first large borrowings, amounting to approximately $500,000,000 par value, this aggregate debt being evidenced by interest-bearing ad valorem tax bonds issued by the respective borrowing units.

(2) These bonds were sold to approximately 40 municipal investment dealers, upon sealed bids submitted in open competition; and were thereafter sold and distributed to investors throughout the United States, with the largest concentration, both in numbers of holders and dollar volume, in the Midwest.

(3) The largest single purchaser of bonds among the approximately 40 investment dealers participating in such purchases was, in all probability, the Brown-Crummer Investment Co., of Wichita, Kans., which purchased approximately $50,000,000 par value of such bonds during the period 1920 through 1928.

(4) During this period (1920–28) Florida suffered several devastating calamities, including a crash in real-estate values, two hurricanes, an invasion by the Mediterranean fruitfly, a general freeze of all agricultural and citrus crops, and State-wide bank failures.

(5) By 1929 or 1930 it became evident to the then chief executive of the State, and to the governing authorities of the taxing units, that widespread defaults in payments of principal or interest, or both, on bonds were inevitable.

(6) By 1932, tax payments on real estate had declined to such a point that 80 percent, more or less, of all the original bonds, issued between 1920 and 1928, were in default as to principal or interest, or both. The market price, where there was a market, for the defaulted bonds was only a fraction of the par value; many issues were selling for as low as 10 to 15 cents on the dollar flat.

(7) Litigation, running into thousands of suits, involving the legality, enforcement, or

repudiation of the defaulted debt, immediately followed the huge defaults.

(8) Temporary refunding of defaulted bonds began about 1932 and continued on a large scale through 1938.

(9) By 1938, due to economic improvement, both State and national, and the success of the temporary refundings, the stronger taxing units of Florida were seeking credit accommodations on permanent terms with lowered interest rates.

(10) From 1938 through 1946 Florida taxing units engaged in large-scale, permanent refinancing.

Enactment of State legislation to assist taxing units

A few months prior to the convening of the regular session of the Florida Legislature in 1929, an officer of the Brown-Crummer Investment Co. submitted a legislative program to the then Governor of Florida. The proposal embodied what came to be known as the Gas Tax Act and the State Board of Administration Act. (The Gas Tax Act provided that 3 cents of the collected gas tax be used toward the payment of the approximately $160,000,000 par value outstanding bonds of the road and bridge districts of Florida. The State Board of Administration Act created a board consisting of the Governor, the State treasurer, and the State comptroller, to administer the funds.) The Governor endorsed the program. The program found favor with the large commercial interests throughout the State, with the exception of the Alfred I. du Pont interests in Florida; Mr. Edward Ball, active head of these interests, opposed it.

The Gas Tax Act and the State Board of Administration Act passed the Florida Legislature in 1929. Subsequently, the Florida Supreme Court held the Gas Tax Act invalid in part. The 1931 session of the Florida Legislature considered a revised act, designed to meet the objections pointed out by the State Supreme Court. The revised act was passed despite du Pont opposition. Later, it was held constitutional in all respects.

The 1941 Florida Legislature proposed an amendment to the State constitution, providing for the allocation for 50 years of 2 cents of the gas tax toward payment of road and bridge bonds. The proposed amendment was ratified by the electorate at the 1942 general election, and is now section 16 of article IX of the Florida Constitution.

Temporary refinancing

Under the impetus provided by the Gas Tax Act of 1931, governing authorities and creditors of many Florida taxing units were brought together for the purpose of reaching at least a temporary settlement of their mutual problem, namely, the defaulted debt. The record shows that the Brown-Crummer Investment Co. was extremely active in bringing debtors and creditors to a "meeting of minds." During what may be called the refunding period, the Brown-Crummer Investment Co. (from 1932 through 1934) and R. E. Crummer & Co. (from 1934 through 1942) were identified with refunding operations of over 200 Florida taxing units, involving approximately $170,000,000 par value of bonds, owned by approximately 15,000 investors located in various States of the Union.

Bonds issued under the temporary refunding plan usually provided a reduced interest rate for a term of years, allowed the taxing unit to buy its bonds with surplus funds, and contained a callable clause. The plan was designed and used to relieve the tax-paying public and, concomitantly, to provide the investor with a current interest-paying security. This plan came to be known by governing authorities, investment dealers, and the municipal investing public as the Crummer plan. It was adopted, in principle, by other investment dealers engaged in refunding operations.

Numerous public officials (including a former governor, several State senators, and county and city commissioners) and other prominent citizens of Florida, as well as investors scattered throughout the United States, have either testified for the record or submitted written statements to the effect that the Crummer plan proved to be a fair, workable, and equitable solution of the problem presented by the many and widespread defaults. The testimony and statements of these witnesses are strongly fortified by the record of the rapidity with which taxing units returned to solvency and the further fact that all creditors who involved their securities in refunding, under this plan, received new bonds obligating the debtor to pay 100 percent of the principal refunded, and an acceptable rate of interest.

Refunding under the Crummer plan was not, however, an acceptable formula to the du Pont interests. The record shows that the first refunding under the Crummer plan (which was, in fact, the first refunding under any plan) was adopted by the county commissioners of Bay County, Fla., in 1932. The du Pont interests owned Bay County and Panama City (county seat of Bay County) bonds, Bay County real estate, and business enterprises located in Bay County and in Panama City. They attacked the plan of refunding in the courts and before the respective governing authorities, and the ensuing struggle lasted 12 years. Finally, the debt was settled on a permanent basis, with the du Pont interests receiving 100 cents on the dollar principal and the original 6 percent interest on their bonds while other creditors, representing about 90 percent of the total debt, accepted a settlement providing reduced interest rates. Another instance was Sumter County which, according to the record, was in dire need of help. R. E. Crummer & Co. undertook the refunding. About 90 percent, in volume, of the creditors voluntarily agreed to participate in the Crummer plan. But the du Pont interests, holding about $150,000 par value of the $2,000,000 bonded debt, acquired at a cost of less than $50,000, instituted suit against the county. As a result, the county and 90 percent of its creditors were delayed about 5 years in reaching a settlement; and such settlement was not affectuated until the du Pont interests were paid 100 cents on the dollar both principal and interest for securities purchased by them at less than par. The other creditors, more considerate of the taxing unit, accepted new bonds (not cash) carrying reduced interest rates.

Permanent refinancing

Large-scale permanent refinancing by Florida taxing units began about 1938. By that time, general economic conditions had improved, in Florida as elsewhere, and there were numerous valid reasons to justify and encourage permanent refinancing. Money was plentiful and investors were willing to extend credit accommodations at substantially lower interest rates than had ever before prevailed in the history of public financing. Taxing units could avail themselves of this credit since a large volume of the outstanding bonded indebtedness had been refunded under the Crummer plan and was therefore callable at interest-paying dates. Another factor which may have persuaded many taxing units to seek new credit, on a permanent basis, was the fact that practically all the bonds issued during the lean years under temporary refunding carried an increased interest charge after 5 and 10 years from the date of issuance; and many issues carried a coupon representing the difference between the interest rate on the original defaulted bond and the reduced rate of the refunding bond exchanged therefor. The sooner these temporary refunding bonds were called, the greater would be the saving to the taxing unit.

The record discloses that two prominent factors in public finance in Florida, when the refinancing on a permanent basis began, were R. E. Crummer & Co. and the du Pont interests. It should be noted here that by 1933 the du Pont interests had acquired control, by stock ownership, of a chain of banks located in nearly all the prominent Florida cities; also, that their bond dealings in Florida municipals were done largely through and by participation with one or both of two local investment dealers, namely Clyde C. Pierce Corp., of Jacksonville, Fla., and Leedy-Wheeler & Co., of Orlando, Fla.

In consummating the permanent refinancing operations, various types of procedure were designed and adopted. These included the orthodox method of inviting sealed bids by publication and selling to the highest bidder for cash; awarding contracts for future delivery under specified conditions; granting options to accept delivery by a specified date; and purchases under contracts with future delivery dates fixed, provisions for calling outstanding bonds upon redemption dates, forfeitures in case of nonperformance, etc.

Prior to 1941 the du Pont-controlled banks had acquired and held about $4,000,000 par value of bonds of Florida taxing units. These banks as a rule entered into a participation agreement (frequently called joint account) with Clyde C. Pierce Corp. and Leedy-Wheeler & Co. whereby one or more of them would take a portion of the bonds embraced in contracts awarded to Clyde C. Pierce Corp. or Leedy-Wheeler & Co., or both. It is not clear from the record, but a reasonable assumption would be that the du Pont banks were not extremely anxious to acquire Florida municipals prior to 1941, but were, rather, willing to let others take the great financial risks involved in temporary refunding. However, when R. E. Crummer & Co. acquired in open competition for cash an aggregate of $31,000,000 par value of noncallable bonds from 10 different Florida taxing units, between July 1940 and May 5, 1941, subsequent events strongly indicate that the du Pont interests determined it was now or never with them.

Crummer had come to be widely known as a successful investment dealer in Florida municipals; his company was favorably regarded by governing authorities throughout the State, and his recommendations were quite generally followed by a large number of investors in various parts of the country. Crummer's competitors headed by the du Pont interests, faced the choice of either taking their chances of success before the governing authorities (with the yardstick of past experience appearing to favor Crummer) or of devising ways and means for getting Crummer out of the picture. The following related events may be indicative of the choice which was made.

Machinery of the Post Office Department and Securities and Exchange Commission set in motion

Mr. Roger L. Main, treasurer of the du Pont-controlled St. Joe Paper Co., treasurer of the paper company's subsidiaries, director of three banks in the du Pont-controlled Florida national group, and president of one of them, with Mr. Howard S. Wheeler, vice president and one-fourth owner of Leedy-Wheeler & Co., journeyed from Florida to Washington, D. C., to advise the Post Office Department that R. E. Crummer & Co. had violated the mail-fraud statutes. Their interview with Post Office Department officials was held on May 21, 1941, having been arranged by Mr. L. C. Leedy, president and one-fourth owner of Leedy-Wheeler & Co., through the office of a Florida United States Senator. A few days after this conference, and after his return to Florida, Mr. Main,

under date of May 30, 1941, wrote and forwarded a letter to the Post Office Department in support of his oral presentation previously made, and as a verification of the documents left with the Department.

From this point forward Mr. Main and Mr. Wheeler faded into the background. They were the harbingers and the prolocutors; their joint purpose appears to have been accomplished when the wheels of Government were set turning. Mr. Wheeler testified his motives for the action which he took were mixed, including a desire to police the securities business in Florida, for the benefit of his own firm and other securities dealers. Mr. Main said he acted solely as a favor to Mr. Wheeler, which statement cannot be accepted as accurate in view of Mr. Main's business connections with the du Pont interests. Mr. Ed Ball told the committee he was not certain when he first learned of Main's and Wheeler's trip to Washington; but he felt sure that the St. Joe Paper Co. paid Main's expenses in making the trip, and said that at the time Main appeared before the Post Office Department his only gainful employment was with the du Pont interests.

The Post Office Department forwarded the file to the Atlanta, Ga., regional office for action. On June 10, 1941, the regional office notified the general counsel of the Securities and Exchange Commission at Philadelphia that the Post Office Department had decided to institute an investigation of R. E. Crummer & Co. to determine whether this company had violated the mail-fraud statutes. The SEC swung into action by ordering its Atlanta office to conduct an investigation of R. E. Crummer & Co.'s Orlando, Fla., office. The machinery of two Government agencies, thus set in motion, was to turn relentlessly for nearly 4 years. It began before Pearl Harbor, and was still churning on VJ-day.

ACTIVITIES OF SEC AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT AND THEIR REPRESENTATIVES

Interagency cooperation

Cooperation between representatives of the Securities and Exchange Commission and of the Post Office Department, in the carrying out of their inquisition, was extremely close. They also received full and effective cooperation from various representatives of the du Pont interests. The liaison between these agencies and their representatives was complete. Their activities were closely intertwined once they jointly began to move. The Securities and Exchange Commission supplied the lawyer and vested him with subpena power. The Post Office Department supplied the factotum who functioned as the entree to the United States attorneys in at least three States. Both sets of agents apparently depended upon the du Pont interests to furnish information, documents, legal briefs, etc., in working up the cases.

An assumption that the common objective motivating all this cooperative activity was simply an impartial investigation, aimed at unearthing the facts, does not appear to fit the circumstances. On the other hand, an assumption that the common objective was to discredit R. E. Crummer and to eliminate his companies as a factor in the field of municipal finance provides a complete explanation for all that was done. Such an objective was not "in line of duty" for agents of either the Securities and Exchange Commission or of the Post Office Department. The second assumption, therefore, necessarily implies either that the employees of these two powerful agencies of the Government actively and knowingly took sides in a private controversy between two powerful financial interests or that they were unwitting but willing pawns of one of those interests. Either of these inferences is repugnant to the committee; but no other explanation has been found which fully covers the facts as shown by the record.

The Securities and Exchange Commission and its representatives

The committee has no desire to criticize or weaken the effectiveness of the Securities Act of 1933 or the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended. Nor does the committee desire to minimize the abuses which these laws were enacted to correct, nor to lessen the credit that is due the Securities and Exchange Commission for the fine work it has done in reducing such abuses. However, the committee feels compelled to inform the Senate that during its study and investigation it discovered many serious violations and evasions of substantive provisions of the law by representatives of the Securities and Exchange Commission and many instances of improper conduct by them.

Among the derelictions disclosed by the record are:

(1) Failure to grant the company being investigated an orderly hearing in accordance with the accepted notions of due process of law.

(2) Failure to include in the criminal reference report statements, accounts of interviews, etc., favorable to the company being investigated.

(3) Filing with the Department of Justice, as a criminal reference report, a document replete with conclusions, insinuations, and innuendoes.

(4) Appointing an apparently incompetent person as an officer of the Commission with power to issue subpenas and assigning the investigation to him.

(5) Failure to advise the Department of Justice that the United States attorney for the southern district of Florida had declined to prosecute the company being investigated.

(6) Conducting a fraud investigation prior to the entry of the Commission's order of December 4, 1942.

(7) Taking sides in the controversy between the du Pont interests and the company being investigated.

(8) Accepting, as reliable, information and suggestions from individuals antagonistic to the company being investigated, with knowledge of the fervid desire of such individuals to crush such company.

(9) Filing of reports by subordinates, to their superiors, filled with gross inaccuracies, flagrant misstatements, and unfounded conclusions.

(10) Obtaining full, complete, and unrestricted access to the books, records, etc., of the company being investigated by misrepresenting to its officers that the investigation was only routine.

(11) Giving frequent assurances to officers of the company being investigated that they would be given the opportunity to discuss all matters considered irregular or illegal by the Commission, when in fact no such opportunity was given.

(12) Refusing to pursue interviews with customers of the company being investigated as soon as it appeared that such customers were favorable to the company.

(13) Deliberately bypassing large customers (in volume of bonds purchased) of the company being investigated, during the course of the investigation.

(14) Denying requests for interviews made by customers of the company being investigated.

(15) Making of oral statements by agents, in the presence of others, reflecting adversely upon the integrity and business dealings of the company being investigated and some of its officers.

(16) Using the subpena power to harass and intimidate private citizens.

(17) Using John Doe subpenas, sealed in advance, to be filled in by the agent and served on the spot.

(18) Resorting to indelicate and abusive language during interviews with women.

(19) Refusing (by the Chicago regional office) to permit informants to correct their signed statements, and subsequently using such statements as a part of the case, knowing them to be inaccurate.

(20) Conferring with the United States attorneys' offices in Florida and Kansas, urging criminal action against R. E. Crummer and others, without knowledge or approval of the Department of Justice, and before the Commission filed its criminal reference report with the Department.

(21) Discussing (by the Chicago regional office) with the United States attorney's office in Kansas, matters relating to criminal action against R. E. Crummer and others, without knowledge or approval of the Department of Justice and before the Commission filed its criminal reference report with the Department.

(22) Meddling by agents of the Commission in Federal grand jury proceedings held in Kansas.

The minutes of the Securities and Exchange Commission, entered under date of February 3, 1944, established to the satisfaction of the committee that the Commission itself desired to keep the activities of its agents within the rules of ordinary decency and respect of the rights of private citizens. However, as shown above, the mandate of the Commission in this regard was flagrantly violated and ignored by the agents of the Commission working out of the Chicago office.

There is nothing in the record to commend the conduct of SEC respresentatives Hart, Reutell, Butler, and Brown. Hart was the administrator of the Chicago regional office, and as such, the primary responsibility for a fair and impartial investigation rested with him. In this he not only failed but also pursued the same unwarranted, biased, and bigoted course followed by his subordinates. Moreover, there is nothing in the record to have justified the SEC agents' apparent belief that the company being investigated was an undesirable institution or that its officers were disciples of the school of professional manipulators in the field of municipal finance. On the contrary, had the agents possessed the slightest desire to seek the whole truth they would have approached their task under the presumption that the company to be investigated enjoyed creditable rating with a record of satisfactory performance to its customers, and that its officers were responsible citizens. Inquiries of banking institutions, insurance companies, business executives, and any number of others who had occasion to know, would have so informed the agents, as they did this committee. But Mr. Hart and his entourage preferred to rely upon competitors of the company being investigated as a source of information concerning the business and personal integrity of the subjects of the investigation. Apparently, to these Federal agents at least, one' reputation in the community where he resided meant nothing.

The Securities and Exchange Commission was reluctant to cooperate with this committee while the criminal cases against R. E. Crummer and others were pending in a Kansas Federal court. However, upon the dismissal of those cases in June 1946, the Commission responded to all requests by this committee, including a visit of its Chairman to the chairman of the subcommittee shortly before the hearings were closed, at which time the Chairman voluntarily offered the full and complete cooperation of the Commission.

There is no doubt but that to the Commission itself, the Crummer investigation was "just another case"—one of the several hundred cases handled annually. But apparently, to Regional Administrator Hart and the agents assigned to the investigation, it was the case of the century.

The Shockley incident

Marjorie M. Shockley filed with the committee a sworn statement relating her ex-

periences with Administrator Hart and Agents Reutell and Butler. Excerpts from the statement are quoted as follows:

"George Reutell was the dominant individual during the examination and carried on most of the discussions with me.

"* * * Reutell assumed a very antagonistic, insulting, and unreasonable attitude toward me. He charged me with concealing information from and being unwilling to cooperate with him, all of which charges were untrue. This attitude of Reutell toward me continued throughout the entire period of the investigation; and it was impossible for me, as hard as I tried, to please him or satisfy his demands. He would frequently charge or infer that the officials of the Crummer Co. (especially Mr. R. E. Crummer) had been dishonest in their business dealings; had concealed information which the company's customers were entitled to; and had taken advantage of information for their own private financial benefit to the detriment and loss of the company's customers. * * *

"Reutell said that The Crummer Company had charged its customers, holding Citrus County bonds, excessive fees; had withheld information to which they (the customers) were entitled and, as a result, had made illegally fabulous sums of money; that no one could honestly make over $12,000 a year; and then ended his tirade by saying that in time these investment companies would be put out of business, as they should be, and that the Government would be handling the fiscal affairs of taxing units. * * *

"Early one morning I was in the private office of Mr. Moon—an employee of the company. Reutell came in, asked me a question which I answered. Whereupon he said, in effect, with eyes fastened upon and glaring at me, 'When are you going to begin telling me the truth?' * * *

"* * * Reutell made a critical statement to me in reply to which I said, 'Mr. Reutell, for once you are mistaken, for a Federal court has passed on that very question'—and I handed him the decision of the court. He threw the decision on my desk, contempt was written all over his face, he did not so much as read the decision, but retorted with the threat, 'When I get through with Crummer the SEC will be making his laws.

"In July 1944 I was summoned before a Federal grand jury of Kansas, convened at Topeka. * * * After 2 weeks' waiting I was escorted into a room and introduced to a Mr. Hart, whom, it was stated, held the position of director of the Chicago regional office of SEC. Stack upon stack of Crummer Co. records were in the room. The door was closed, and I was left in there with Mr. Hart and Mr. Butler. Mr. Hart began the conversation in a very courteous manner, telling me that he intended to treat me like a members of his family; that he had a very sympathetic understanding of my predicament; and that all he wanted me to do was to sign a paper which he called a waiver. I told him that I did not desire to sign anything; that I had done no wrong; and that I did not believe anyone else associated with the Crummer organization had done any wrong. Mr. Hart told me that I was mistaken and I could best protect myself by signing the paper and then going through these records (pointing to the stack of records) with a Government agent and help the Government tell the true story. Still I declined.

"Mr. Hart then resorted to other tactics to no avail. Finally he frightened and threatened me when he said: 'You know the grand jury is in session and you are going to be indicted, but if you will sign the waiver I feel the Government will give you protection.'

"* * * Mr. Butler objected to a certain type of power of attorney, previously used by the company, and recommended a supplemental power of attorney be prepared and circulated. Having previously won my confidence, I followed Mr. Butler's advice by writing a supplemental power of attorney as recommended by him, and after he approved it I caused the same to be circulated among the company's clientele. Later, in August 1944, I was indicted by a Federal grand jury of Kansas for the issuance of this supplemental power of attorney which, as heretofore stated, was prepared by me under the supervision of the SEC agent, Mr. Butler, and circulated by me in order to comply with his directions."

The above-quoted portions of the Shockley statement, standing alone, would be sufficient to establish the unconscionable methods employed by the agents named, and the limits to which they actually went in their efforts to destroy Crummer and his associates. These agents were not gunning for Marjorie Shockley. She was not named as a defendant in the Commission's criminal reference report. But obviously it was believed that her position in the Crummer Co.'s refunding department was of vital importance to the "cause." When the agents found Miss Shockley to be incorruptible, Agent Butler seemed willing to disgrace himself by becoming the "fixer," and finally when the "top" from Chicago, Mr. Hart, failed with honey, vinegar, and threats, they decided to throw Miss Shockley in the criminal hopper; and they did. Butler apparently felt a little wary about possible repercussions, for he wrote a memorandum concerning talks he had with Miss Shockley just before she was sent to the grand-jury room.

The Shockley episode is an ignominy to American citizens. It is the type of thing which might have been expected to occur during the Dark Ages or, in more recent times, at the hands of a certain class of agents of one of the totalitarian powers; but it is certainly not what the public has a right to expect from the sworn officers and agents of a Government instrumentality in what we like to regard as an enlightened democracy. The trio responsible for this incident should be required to account fully for their respective parts in it, and they should neither be retained nor placed in a position to stage a similar performance on any later occasion.

The Commission's lawyer-investigator

Alexander J. Brown, Jr., was the lawyer appointed an officer of the Securities and Exchange Commission and a special assistant to the United States attorney at Topeka. He roamed at large during the investigation armed with John Doe subpenas, and the record indicates that on occasions he either used them or threatened to do so. He was a mobile judge, jury, and enforcement officer in one package, and was obviously uncivil, and overly pompous upon occasions. He knew what Mr. Ball of the du Pont interests thought of R. E. Crummer; in reporting his interview with Mr. Ball he said Ball several times called Crummer a crook.

When the grand jury met Brown removed the cloak of detective and assumed the role of special prosecutor. He attended the grand jury proceedings that resulted in the indictment of R. E. Crummer and some 10 or 12 others. Mr. William A. Paisley, special assistant to the Attorney General, told the committee, among other things:

"My information is that they (meaning Brown and other agents) went in and bowled the United States attorney over and got an indictment from the grand jury. * * * It (the indictment) was presented by the assistant district attorney. The SEC lawyers were there though. * * * My experience is that they more or less dominate the scene on an occasion of that kind. (Parentheses ours.)"

There is little doubt that an outrageous fraud was prepetrated upon the Federal court and the United States attorney by the SEC agents before and during the session of the Kansas grand jury. That the sacredness of the proceedings was transgressed is shown by Post Office Inspector Mansfield's report written before the actual finding of the indictments. The report named those who would be indicted, and they were subsequently indicted. Significant also is the fact that Mansfield's prediction list contained the names of six or seven more individuals than were recommended for indictment in the Commission's criminal reference report to the Attorney General. Did Brown keep Mansfield informed of developments in the grand-jury room? It is a reasonable assumption. The committee feels that Brown has demonstrated a lack of competence, in temperament and ability, to represent properly a Government agency in any of the various capacities entrusted to him in the Crummer cases.

It would not be amiss for all Federal administrative agencies to advise their personnel that interference with the orderly processes of the courts, or taking sides in private controversies, will not be tolerated. There is no more effective way to undermine the respect for and dignity of government than by permitting agents of the Government to extend its omnipotent power to one individual or group of individuals against another or others. The recorded history dealing with the decline of nations is filled with incidents similar to those reflected in the record before this committee. Governmental agencies cannot be too diligent and cautious in the selection of their representatives; especially in the appointment of subordinates with powers which may be used to infringe the civil liberties of men.

The conduct of Brown in the field, armed with blanket subpenas and using the authority they imply in the minds of our citizens, is a living example of the figure portrayed and the possibilities envisioned by Mr. Justice Murphy when he aptly warned:

"Perhaps we are too far removed from the experiences of the past to appreciate fully the consequences that may result from an irresponsible though well-meaning use of the subpena power. To allow a nonjudicial officer unarmed with judicial process to demand the books and papers of an individual is an open invitation to abuse of that power. It is no answer that the individual may refuse to produce the material demanded. Many persons have yielded solely because of the air of authority with which the demand is made, a demand that cannot be enforced without subsequent judicial aid. Many invasions of private rights thus occur without the restraining hand of the judiciary ever intervening. (*Oklahoma Press Pub. Co.* v. *Walling* (66 S. Ct. 494).)"

SEC says credit not affected; investors say it was

The Securities and Exchange Commission, speaking through its Chairman, represented to the committee as follows:

"I wish to point to certain facts which seem clearly to indicate that our investigation did not adversely affect the credit of such taxing units in Florida. The Citrus County bonds sold at substantially above par during the entire period of the investigation and subsequent court proceedings. Panama City bonds also were sold at above par during that period. * * * It is plain that our investigation had no adverse effect on the credit of Florida taxing units."

It will be noted that Chairman Caffrey restricted his comment on the market price of the securities to "the entire period of the investigation and subsequent court proceedings." The committee, in its study, projected its consideration beyond that limited period. And in so doing, the committee found that the bonds referred to were, for the most part, distributed to investors by R. E. Crummer & Co. These investors, despite the attacks of the two Federal agencies, appear to have been satisfied so long as Crummer remained identified with Florida's public financing. But when they realized that Crummer's forced withdrawal from the

field of municipal finance in the State was inevitable and that they would be deprived of the services and advice of the investment dealer through whom they had advanced credit to the taxing units of Florida, on the most economical terms available, for many years preceding, many of them concluded to either (1) sell their holdings, (2) refrain from additional purchases, (3) refuse to commit their securities in bankruptcy proceedings, or (4) refuse voluntarily to submit to any plan designed to refinance the taxing units whose securities they held.

The fact that bonds were selling at par or better during the period of the activities of representatives of the SEC does not palliate their faults, nor prove the contention of the SEC recited above. There is certainly nothing in the record to indicate that the activities of the SEC and Post Office Department improved the prices for taxing-unit bonds; nor does the committee understand that either Federal agency involved so urged. Logical reasoning suggests that the extensive activities of these Federal agents would affect a temperamental and sensitive commodity such as a bond, one way or the other, and the committee believes they did.

Many favorable conditions existed to encourage an increasing market price. Economic conditions all over the country were at a peak. The Florida constitutional amendment adopted by the Florida Legislature in the spring of 1941 and approved by the electorate in 1942, making all road and bridge bonds a semi-State security, became effective January 1, 1943. Even before that date, the taxing units' securities were sold at around par; and they did not show any sharp "bull" tendency immediately thereafter, as might have been expected. Perhaps it is significant that the period within which the effect of this constitutional amendment might have been expected to be most strongly felt, and the effective removal of Crummer's companies as a competitive factor in connection with the sale of bonds of Florida taxing units in the open market, coincide closely in point of time. One of the questions for the committee's consideration involved not only the prices the bonds brought at the given time, but also the prices the bonds would have brought had not the representatives of the SEC and Post Office Department projected themselves actively into the picture.

Expressions voluntarily submitted to the committee by a number of investors who had been intimately acquainted with the activities in the field of municipal finance in Florida are to be found in the record. The committee quotes from a few of them as follows—

The American United Life Insurance Co. of Indianapolis, Ind. (successful litigant in the often-quoted case of *American Life Insurance Co.* v. *City of Avon Park*):

"The company has always been a substantial creditor of Florida municipalities, having at one time between $5,000,000 and $6,000,000 of Florida municipal bonds in its portfolio, including bonds of counties, cities, school districts, and road districts. * * * this company has been fully satisfied with all its dealings with R. E. Crummer & Co., and it can be categorically stated that R. E. Crummer & Co. have never failed to carry out to the letter any commitment made by it to this company, this including transactions totaling several millions of dollars, both in sales and purchases as well as in refunding operations. * * * There is no question but that curtailment of the activities of one of the principal distributors of Florida municipal bonds, the Crummer Co. did diminish the outlet which Florida municipalities had to get needed credit, and to whatever degree that may be, decreased the gains otherwise possible by lower interest rates. It is unfortunate, indeed, that any governmental bureau can lend itself to a waste of time, money, and effort, only to the detriment of a reputable business concern, and what is more important, to a loss to debtor municipalities in Florida."

Mr. James C. Titus, of Los Angeles, Calif. (a large investor in Florida municipals):

"From what information I have, it would appear that this matter has been carried far beyond a normal SEC investigation. I have wondered if any effort is not being made to force R. E. Crummer out of Florida. In fact, I have been sufficiently impressed that for the past year and a half I have not purchased a single Florida bond—nor do I intend to do so—and, as a matter of fact, I have substantially reduced my holdings in that State."

Mr. H. H. Heimple, an officer of the Fourth National Bank in Wichita, Kans.:

"May I inform you, in closing, that I am no longer willing to extend any credit to the taxing units of Florida; that I have not purchased any bonds of the taxing units of Florida since the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Post Office Department investigation was made known to me; and that I have declined to participate in practically all the refunding or refinancing plans which have been submitted to me since such investigation. * * * I have conferred with several substantial creditors of Florida taxing units since the Securities and Exchange Commission and Post Office Department investigation, and I believe they share my views as above expressed."

Mr. Robert J. Flick, former director of National Dairy Products:

"I cannot relate, for I do not personally know, the minute details concerning the activities of the Federal agents. However, I do know that their activities throughout the Middle West have been very damaging to future credit possibilities of Florida taxing units. I also know that their meddling in refundings when the same were under the jurisdiction of United States courts by virtue of the Federal Municipal Bankruptcy Act, has seriously impaired the effectiveness of the act because of the now apparent lack of confidence and the fear that maybe the SEC and not the courts have the final say. Moreover, these agencies have hurt the credit of Florida's taxing units because they have eliminated, for the most part, the most economical source of credit which flowed into Florida for years through Crummer's organization."

Mr. W. C. Helmers, of Helmers Manufacturing Co., Kansas City, Mo.:

"As respects Florida securities which we now own, we feel that the agitation respecting Florida municipal securities has impaired the value of those securities, that it has impaired the ability of Florida municipal divisions in their ability to borrow, that it has removed an element of competition in the creation of a broad market, both for issued and prospective issued Florida municipal securities, and tended to create a monopoly in the later flotation of Florida municipal securities, all greatly to the detriment of the holders of these securities and to the issuing municipal authorities."

The Guarantee Mutual Life Co. of Omaha, Nebr.:

"In November of 1945 we sold some $2,000,000 Florida municipal bonds which took us out of Florida completely. Our decision to do this was reached after considering the large profits obtainable, coupled with the reduction in the service performance by the R. E. Crummer & Co. Until we are able to find an organization in whom we can have like confidence, the likelihood of our investing further in Florida securities is quite remote, and it is our opinion that other investors are thinking in the same terms.

"We cannot overemphasize our dependence on the R. E. Crummer & Co. and Brown-Crummer Co., and our gratitude to them for a job well done. It meant thousands and thousands of dollars to our policy owners and it meant millions of dollars, plus the saving of reputation, to the citizenry of Florida."

The Post Office Department and its inspectors

The Post Office Department did not respond readily to the committee's numerous requests for information and documents. Although the Department furnished the committee, at its request, with a large number of files, certain files, information, and documents were withheld and access to inspectors' reports was denied, and while the Department carefully avoided an outright refusal to answer the questionnaire addressed to it, its vacillation and obvious delaying were tantamount to a direct refusal. The questionnaire went unanswered. Had the Department responded to the questionnaire of the committee, as was done by the SEC, the record of the committee would be complete. As it stands, certain facts are indeterminable, such as the reasons prompting the Post Office Department, on February 10, 1943, to advise the Securities and Exchange Commission at Philadelphia that the Post Office Department had decided to discontinue its investigation of R. E. Crummer & Co., and 13 days later, on February 23, 1943, to advise the SEC that the Department had determined to continue the investigation. Nevertheless, the record is adequate and no difficulty was encountered in supporting this report by an abundance of footnotes. To throw further light on the activities of the Department's inspector and his confederates, as the withheld documents may have done, was desirable but not indispensable.

The original written complaint of Roger L. Main charging "irregularities in connection with a refunding of some of Lee County, Fla., road and bridge bonds" was transmitted by the Chief Post Office Inspector, Washington, D. C., to the Atlanta, Ga., regional office on about June 10, 1941. During a period of about 14 months thereafter, the complaint was assigned at different times to three separate post-office inspectors as a matter for investigation. According to the record, these inspectors, except perhaps E. O. Jones, took no action on the complaint, nor did the Atlanta regional office urge action by any of them. Why the complaint, which later became the basis of a very broad investigation crossing many State lines, lay dormant for over a year has not been explained to the committee.

On or about August 3, 1942, the Roger L. Main complaint was transmitted to Post Office Inspector E. J. Mansfield, whose immediate predecessor, E. O. Jones, had filed a report on his activities in the case during February 1942. The Jones report was not made available to the committee, but it is safe to assume it was not in harmony with Mansfield's theory of the case, for Mansfield testified that he had to start from scratch.

When Mr. Mansfield took over for the Post Office Department in August 1942, the investigation of Crummer's refunding activities by other agencies was proceeding full blast. Mr. Walter P. Fuller, hailing from Mansfield's home town, had been appointed State investigator under H. R. 46 of the 1941 Florida Legislature some 5 months earlier (March 1942). In July of the same year Fuller had conferred with the Assistant Postmaster General at Washington. The SEC investigators had completed the initial so-called routine investigation of the Crummer office at Orlando, Fla., many months prior to August 1942, and had filed their report under date of January 12, 1942. By December 1942, Mansfield had met Fuller, Reutell, and Butler. Close liaison was established.

On December 16, 1942, Mansfield filed a report with the Chief Post Office Inspector, Washington, D. C. The same month (December 4, 1942) the SEC entered its first order directing a fraud investigation of R. E. Crum-

mer & Co. and others. On January 14, 1943, Edward Ball entered a formal protest with the Florida State Securities Commission to the issuance of a license to the Crummer Co. to do business in Florida. The lines were tightening from all sides, and to such an extent that Crummer was unable to continue the operation of an orderly business.

The Post Office Department, one of the oldest administrative institutions in the Government, was originally established in 1794, and for nearly a century the functions of inspector were performed solely by the Postmaster General. In June 1872, the Congress authorized the Postmaster General to designate his subordinates as "inspectors." From 1872 until 1939, the inspection service took various forms to meet the general changing conditions of the country. In February 1939, the Bureau of Chief Inspector was established. The Bureau contained a fraud section within the Division of Administrative Investigations with jurisdiction over matters involving the alleged use of the mails to promote frauds, etc.

The Post Office Department and Inspector Mansfield of its inspection service undoubtedly relied upon section 2350 of the Postal Laws and Regulations for authority to proceed in the manner indicated by the record. The act is sufficient, and, in fact, may require an investigation of a complaint filed with the Department pointing out violations of a statute entrusted to the Department for administration. But the Congress never intended the act to be used, by agents of the Department, for the personal aggrandizement of one private individual to the detriment of another, or as authority to review or question legal proceedings in Federal court under the Municipal Bankruptcy Act, as amended, as seems, from the record before the committee, to have been done in this case.

Post-office inspectors are authorized by law and regulation to administer oaths but they have no subpena power. A means of using this power is provided by direct appeal to a Federal grand jury. To resort to other sources, as was done by Inspector Mansfield, is in direct conflict with all law and custom. Mansfield solicited and obtained the aid of the subpena power vested in the SEC. The Annual Report of the Postmaster General for the year ending June 30, 1945, sets forth the duties of inspectors. The committee quotes:

"When violations of the postal laws are indicated, inspectors must develop the evidence required by United States attorneys and grand juries for consideration of instituting criminal action. While decision as to prosecution and prosecution itself rests with the Department of Justice, inspectors are required to confer with the United States attorneys, and, whenever necessary, to testify before United States commissioners, grand juries, and in courts."

Mr. Mansfield certainly was aware of the foregoing regulation but, not unlike Caesar, he was ambitious. He had a long record of successful investigations, in the sense that he was credited with securing many convictions. With nearly 30 years of service behind him, he apparently regarded the Crummer cases as his "last round-up" and, as the record affirmatively shows, he assumed the role of either lawyer, prosecutor, accountant, consultant, financial expert, witness, judge, or grand jury whenever the circumstances of the moment seemed to require. The record is full of instances of Mr. Mansfield's "omissions" to do his duty and his "commissions" of abuses under the guise of official duty. The committee reports some of them, as follows:

(1) Failing to investigate the Roger L. Main complaint to determine the personal and business incentives prompting it.

(2) Alining himself, in his official capacity, with the Du Pont interests in their fight against R. E. Crummer, and others, while knowing that such interests were antagonistic to Crummer.

(3) Failing to disclose to his superiors that the investigation basically involved two prominent individuals and their controversy of long standing.

(4) Accepting material from (as the primary source) private individuals who were known by him to be violently opposed to the company and individuals being investigated.

(5) Trading information with State Investigator Walter P. Fuller, and accepting and using information from Fuller without himself checking such information for accuracy, though well knowing Fuller's personal antipathy for R. E. Crummer.

(6) In the case of Fuller and others, accepting as "gospel truth" any information which would serve his purpose and passing such information on to others without checking its accuracy.

(7) Conducting a one-sided investigation by reporting to his superiors and to United States attorneys information that was against the subject of his investigation, while withholding information that was favorable.

(8) Failing to interview R. E. Crummer or any other persons prominent in the Crummer companies to learn their side of the controversy.

(9) Failing to interview prominent investors (in volume) of the Crummer companies.

(10) Failing to interview the successful litigant in the case of *American United Life Insurance Co.* v. *City of Avon Park*, although frequently referring to the case as an example of Crummer's illegal conduct.

(11) Writing letters to private individuals containing false and misleading statements.

(12) Writing letters to other representatives of the Federal Government falsely charging private individuals with either bribery, perjury, manipulations, or prior indictments.

(13) Writing letters to United States attorneys and representatives of the SEC containing erroneous statements, misrepresentations, and improper conclusions for the obvious purpose of influencing the action of the addressees.

(14) Writing letters to the investing public questioning either the validity, the value, or the negotiability of securities issued by Florida taxing units.

(15) Rendering written opinions to bondholders on their legal rights as such.

(16) Advising a bondholder that he had a claim to additional moneys in the face of a record in Municipal Bankruptcy Act proceedings, in Federal court, showing that the bondholder received equal treatment with all others similarly situated.

(17) Interfering with the orderly functioning of governing authorities of political subdivisions in Florida by disseminating false information.

(18) Assuming the role of an appellate court by reviewing the refunding proceedings, in bankruptcy, in the city of Stuart and Okeechobee County cases.

(19) Threatening individuals with the issuance and service of subpenas upon them.

(20) Gaining access to records, books, etc., of private individuals by requesting SEC agents to obtain them for him under the SEC subpena power.

(21) Concentrating his investigation of refunding operations upon those which the Du Pont interests had opposed or were opposing.

(22) Preparing and forwarding to the Post Office Department a report which may have caused the Department to resume the investigation after its decision to discontinue it, well knowing that the entire subject matter involved the vendetta between highly competitive and private interests. (This report was not produced although request for it was made.)

(23) Inducing an assistant United States attorney outside Florida to inaugurate criminal prosecution, after being turned down by the United States attorney for the southern district of Florida.

(24) Furnishing an assistant United States attorney at Topeka, Kans., with a proposed criminal indictment naming R. E. Crummer and others as defendants, involving the refunding operation of Panama City, Fla., and claiming to be the author of the indictment.

(25) Furnishing the United States attorney at Cincinnati, Ohio, with a proposed criminal indictment naming R. E. Crummer and others as defendants, involving the refunding operation of city of Stuart, Fla., and claiming to be the author of the indictment.

(26) Attempting to mislead and deceive the United States attorney at Cincinnati, Ohio, by advising him that most of the "victims" in the city of Stuart refunding were residents of Ohio, though well knowing at the time that nearly all the holders of the Stuart bonds lived in other States.

(27) Representing to the United States attorney at Cincinnati, Ohio, that the operations underlying the proposed Stuart case were similar to those upon which indictments had been found in Kansas, when there was no similarity whatsoever.

(28) Failing to inform the United States attorney at Cincinnati, Ohio, that the United States attorney in Kansas had refused to prosecute the proposed Stuart case.

(29) Attempting to obtain criminal indictments upon facts which previously had been passed upon and adjudicated by the Federal courts in proceedings under the Federal Municipal Bankruptcy Act, as amended.

(30) Obtaining illegally information concerning the deliberations of a Federal grand jury and passing it on to his superior, including the names of individuals whom the grand jury intended to indict, when the grand jury would return the indictments, etc.

(31) Refusing to furnish the Judiciary Committee's Investigator Moore with information requested by him.

(32) Frequently evading the questions of counsel during his testimony before the subcommittee.

Weighed in the light of the entire record before the committee, the instances enumerated above, wherein a representative of the Inspection Service exceeded his investigatory powers, violated current Postal Regulations, and failed to perform his duty impartially, point strongly to the conclusion that Inspector Mansfield had one major objective (which he apparently held in common with his allies in the employ of the SEC with the State investigator, Walter P. Fuller, and with Mr. Edward Ball, the Du Pont interests, their attorneys and bond dealers associated with them): namely, the total destruction (at least as factors in the Florida bond business) of R. E. Crummer individually, his companies and associates. Mr. Mansfield and the other forces activated by this objective moved forward, without interruption, gaining momentum by one success after another. The apparent goal—criminal indictments—seemed a certainty. The first attempt at criminal prosecution failed, when the United States attorney at Tampa, Fla., refused to lend his office or become a party to the scheme. However, this one negative experience neither deterred progress nor dampened enthusiasm. New strategy was devised. The existing cohesion was strengthened. The United States attorney at Topeka, Kans., was agreed upon as the next possibility. The agents gathered in Topeka. The United States attorney was ill. An assistant received the delegation and accepted their representations without question. He was, as one official of the Department of Justice testified before the subcommittee, "bowled over."

Numerous witnesses who are known, or who may fairly be presumed, to have held and acted in furtherance of the "major objective" mentioned above, apparently were so sure of their eventual success, during all of the time the indictments were in the making and after they had been returned and until they were dismissed in June 1946, that they displayed before this committee, while testifying in open hearing, various attitudes of indifference, evasion, arrogance, or disrespect.

It was difficult for the committee to penetrate the armor of "collective security" which these witnesses erected and preserved during their period of unbridled and successful activity. In fact, the true story did not begin to unfold until the hearings in Jacksonville, Fla., on December 27 and 28, 1946. Before these hearings were held the armor of security had burst at the seams, due to the dismissal of the criminal cases, at the request of the Department of Justice, the previous June. Following the dismissal of the criminal cases reams of correspondence between the agents were delivered to the committee by the SEC. Then, and not until then, the brothers-in-arms began to run to cover and the committee believes that had the Post Office Department supplied the committee with all of the reports and other material requested of it, the impenetrable alliance and wall of nondisclosure would have crumbled completely.

But the Post Office Department stood adamant, and agent Mansfield exemplified its policy in the field. To demonstrate how far Mansfield would go to protect his coadjutors, the committee needs merely to point out that although he repeatedly stated, while testifying before the committee to the effect that: "I have no legal training beyond that I have picked up in investigation of postal fraud cases particularly," he nevertheless insisted that certain legal documents, briefs, analyses, criminal indictments, etc., appearing in the record, were the products of his efforts solely. The committee finds this preposterous. Mansfield's absurd explanation of the method employed by him to locate judicial decisions "in point," as well as his unfamiliarity with a workable law library, makes such insistence entirely unreasonable.

The committee inclines to the view that SEC Regional Administrator Hart, and Attorney Alexander J. Brown, Jr., of the SEC Chicago office, knew the source of Florida legal assistance available to them through Mansfield. Certainly they knew it was possible, through Mansfield, to tap a fund of legal resource far beyond anything which might be expected from a postal inspector (and, in fact, far beyond Mansfield's own capabilities) as is clearly shown by the exchange of letters and telegrams between the SEC Chicago office and Mansfield relating to the latter's production of legal briefs on points of law in reply to pleadings, in support of indictments, on admissibility of evidence, etc.

The SEC had a legal staff in the Chicago office, and Hart, the Regional Administrator, Wright, the deputy, and Brown are attorneys. Certainly no dearth of legal talent existed. But the cases under consideration involved the highly specialized field of bond refunding. Attorneys with special training in this field, augmented by practical and local experience in it, and sympathetic with the efforts to secure indictments, were most desirable. There were in Florida two attorneys who filled these specifications in every respect. These attorneys had performed professional services for the Du Pont interests or their associate bond dealers in the past. One of them opposed the Stuart refunding, the other the Panama City refunding. Both attorneys were profound in the law and were very decidedly anti-Crummer. Mansfield testified that both attorneys were available to him for conferences. These facts, unrefuted and irrefutable, might be deemed to justify the logical conclusion that these Florida attorneys were the authors of the legal papers, briefs, indictments, etc., said to be the work of Mansfield. The record contains testimony antagonistic to this conclusion. However the case may be, the most that can be credited to Mansfield with respect to all this legal effluence is the typing, and the committee has serious doubts on that score. Inspector Mansfield would have been more impressive to the committee had he refrained from attempting to establish the impossible. His attempts to mislead this committee and his apparent use of Florida attorneys, allied with the movement to eliminate Crummer from the field of municipal finance in Florida, are not to be commended, and ought not to have been pursued.

RELATED FACTORS

Florida House Resolution 46 (1941)

On May 31, 1941, the Florida House of Representatives adopted House Resolution 46. This resolution established a committee with power to investigate bond-refunding activities. Walter P. Fuller testified that House Resolution 46 was introduced by Representative Wallace Shafer, who later became a member of the investigating committee created by such resolution, and who accompanied Fuller on his initial trip to Washington to interview the Post Office Department with reference to the Crummer investigation.

The committee which House Resolution 46 was designed to create did not function until the Governor, about 10 months after the 1941 legislature had adjourned, made funds available to it from his emergency fund. Walter P. Fuller personally requested and received the assignment of investigator for the committee. The committee, as such, was never really active. Only one public hearing was held by it. Fuller was the only paid employee, and the work of the committee was his work. From March of 1942 until June of 1943, Fuller as investigator was busy investigating refundings in Florida, furnishing Inspector Mansfield with information from his investigations, encouraging litigation against the Crummer companies, and assisting the private competitive interests who brought about the denial of a permit to the Crummer Co. to do business in Florida. According to Fuller's testimony, within approximately 3 months after he began work he contacted Mansfield of the Post Office Department, and from then on it was the avowed purpose of the committee to bring about the criminal prosecution of Mr. Crummer. Fuller testified he knew the effect of such criminal prosecution would be to render it virtually impossible for Mr. Crummer to operate thereafter in Florida.

Liaison was immediately established between Fuller and the du Pont interests through their attorney who, according to letters in the record (the attorney in question has himself denied that he so acted) acted without compensation as legal adviser to the committee and was actively associated with it, reviewing its reports, furnishing information, etc., to the State committee. Many of the matters investigated by Fuller were pending in the Federal courts of Florida under the Municipal Bankruptcy Act at the time; others had already been passed upon by the bankruptcy courts. Liaison with the Du Pont interests was further made possible through the assistance rendered to Fuller by the securities dealers who were at that time being financed in their various bond transactions by the Du Pont chain of banks. Thus was made complete the confederation between certain political interests, certain competitive financial interests, the inspector for the Post Office Department, the agents of the SEC, and Investigator Fuller of the State committee

Numerous instances could be cited of the machinations of the State legislative committee, but only one will be reported, to demonstrate its contribution to the over-all scheme. This is the so-called Pasco County case. Mansfield had been advised by Fuller that Pasco County would furnish one of the most fruitful Crummer situations in Florida. Apparently Fuller had reference to the refunding plan of Pasco County and its four municipalities. The plan was in operation and so far as the record shows all securities holders and taxpayers were satisfied with it. However, upon investigation Fuller apparently decided that a civil suit should be instituted at the expense of a taxpayer seeking to set aside the refunding plan, and thus throw the debt problem into confusion. Fuller's sharp lampooning referred to his scheme as his little play and outlined to the attorney for the SBA of Florida the cast in that play. However, although Fuller thought he had a lawsuit, he did not have a plaintiff, nor did he have counsel; nor did he have anyone to pay counsel fees. He soon set about to rectify these deficiencies and, with the aid of the above-mentioned counsel for the State board of administration and interests antagonistic to the Crummer interests, he soon had the rehearsals completed and production of his play began.

Fuller attempted to induce the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad, a taxpayer in Pasco County, to take on the load. He was referred to Mr. Thomas B. Adams, Jacksonville attorney, who was agreeable to handling the litigation (which Adams later advised counsel for this committee would constitute his final settlement with R. E. Crummer). Fuller discovered a Mr. Donahoo, formerly with Attorney Giles J. Patterson but, at the time of the discovery, office attorney for the Cummer Cypress Co. When Attorney Adams mentioned his fees, according to the testimony of Fuller, the payment of such fees was to be made possible by the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad and the Cummer Cypress Co. These companies did not appear in the litigation.

The testimony of Attorney Adams and Investigator Fuller, as well as written communications in the record, show conclusively that the origin and prosecution of this litigation constitutes champerty and maintenance of the first order; that it was conceived in bad faith, and that it was a part of the plan of action which resulted in the elimination of the Crummer companies from the field of municipal finance in Florida.

Standing by itself, the Pasco County case would be of no interest to this committee. However, the record conclusively shows that it was considered by the Federal agents in their investigation, with full knowledge of the political and financial interests behind its inception and prosecution. In fact, one of the attorneys for the Du Pont interests and Mansfield were studying Fuller's report on Pasco County at identically the same time, and before its submission to the chairman of the State committee. The data which Mansfield obtained from this report was promptly passed on to the SEC. So close was the liaison between Fuller and Mansfield that many of the files of Fuller were found, upon inspection, in the Post Office Department files.

The Pasco County litigation may have served a useful purpose to the alliance seeking indictments of Crummer and others, because Crummer was identified with the refunding plan made the "cause of action," but the credit of the taxing units has been placed in question, which issue was still pending at the time the committee record was closed. It is regrettable to observe that Federal agents in their zeal to make a case would knowingly lend themselves to such a nefarious undertaking.

Fuller's activities became common knowledge in Florida public official circles. His "tie-up" with Federal agents was also gen-

erally known. He was a prodigious worker but his report makes it clear he did not always cling to the truth. Fanciful fabrications apparently were conceived by him and written into the solemn record whenever the exigencies of the moment seemed to require. Obviously he hated Crummer and his associates, and he showed this hate on many occasions. The story, by him, on the purchase of a $100,000 par value block of San Antonio, Fla., bonds with many past-due interest coupons attached for $8,000 flat, when counsel for this committee discovered that the little town had only issued a total of about $57,000 par value of these bonds (and they were accepted by a contractor in payment of labor and materials in the installation of a water system), is a fair example of Fuller's disregard for the truth. What is worse is the fact that he incorporated this fanciful imagination in his committee's report.

Fuller reluctantly admitted his occasional detours from the truth when he acknowledged one libel suit wherein he made a retraction. Of course, Fuller's activities in Florida can be evaluated in Florida. But they became this committee's concern when it was made to appear that Federal agents relied upon him, used his information, and produced him as a witness before the Federal grand jury in Topeka, Kans.

A bit of mystery surrounds the committee record and report prepared by Fuller. At least one copy was signed by the members of his committee, and a few hundred copies were circulated throughout the United States. But there is no copy, as a permanent record, in the archives of either the Florida House of Representatives or the Florida secretary of state. Fuller located what he called an original in a warehouse in St. Petersburg, Fla., and gave it to counsel for this committee. When asked why the report had not been formally filed, he stated that he figured it had been, since he was chief clerk of the Florida House of Representatives during the 1943 session, and that he handed the report from Investigator Fuller to Chief Clerk Fuller.

The record does not show whether the foregoing incident was merely an outgrowth of Fuller's apparent habit of engaging in irregular methods, or whether formal filing of the report in question was deliberately avoided.

Florida State Senate action

The Florida State Senate adopted two resolutions during its regular session of 1943, conferring broad investigatory powers upon the committee established. Shortly after adjournment the State senate committee received many urgent and pressing appeals from outstanding local officials and citizens of certain taxing units urging the State senate committee to investigate the bond refunding situation and condition, and representing that they were being hampered and prevented from carrying out voluntary refunding agreements on account of arbitrary and illegal interference of certain State officials, etc.

The chairman of the State senate committee appointed a subcommittee as a fact-finding body. The subcommittee held hearings. The members of the House committee, under House Resolution 46, and Investigator Fuller were invited to attend the hearings, but none of said persons appeared. The subcommittee found, among other things, that interference of State officials existed, and recommended that it be withdrawn and that the taxing unit be allowed and permitted to conclude its refunding program through such agency as it might in its independent judgment select and choose.

The State senate committee received urgent appeals from Pasco and Okeechobee Counties, as well as other localities, to conduct hearings, representing that they were being blocked in their efforts to carry out refunding programs by interference on the part of State officials. Preliminary investigations were held in Pasco and Okeechobee Counties and the State senate committee found that in addition to interference by State officers, there was interference by Federal officials, to wit: The SEC and postal authority.

In commenting on its investigation of Okeechobee County, the State senate committee had this to say:

"The bond refunds have been completed through Federal bankruptcy proceedings and cleared through the Federal courts, but the agitation and investigations which were being conducted by these Federal agencies caused suspicion to be cast upon said refunding programs and caused the taxpayers and bondholders alike to fear that something wrong had occurred and were thereby undermining the credit of said localities, as well as confidence in the courts. Finding this condition to exist, and said Federal agencies being beyond the jurisdiction of this committee, your committee determined to present these facts to the United States Senate to the end that this grave injustice being perpetrated upon the State of Florida should be brought to an end."

The report of the State senate committee was presented to the State senate at its 1945 session and was unanimously adopted by the State senate on the 25th day of April 1945, and became a permanent record in the archives of the Florida Senate.

What a striking contrast between the methods, procedure, and activities of the two committees. The house committee of 1941 apparently amounted to little more than color of authority for Fuller, who roamed about conducting ex parte hearings and grinding out material for Inspector Mansfield, who in turn relayed it to the SEC.

Fuller was proud of his contribution to the extent of sending it (the report) to investment dealers, individuals, and concerns residing beyond the limits of the State, but not to the point of presenting it, formally, to the 1943 session of the State legislature. Fuller, the investigator, simply handed the document to Fuller, the chief clerk, who without ceremony found a place for it to rest in the home town of Fuller, the individual.

The State senate committee of 1943 performed its duty in the manner to be expected of a group properly upholding the dignity of a State legislative body. It was the recommendation of members of this State senate committee that prompted the two United States Senators from Florida to introduce Senate Resolution 35, Seventy-ninth Congress.

Florida State Securities Commission

Prior to December 1942, R. E. Crummer & Co., announced to the public its contemplated dissolution, and the formation of the Crummer Co. The latter company intended to commence business in Florida on January 1, 1943. It had agreed to take over, assume, and fulfill all outstanding or pending contracts of the former company. In December of 1942 the Crummer Co. filed with the State Securities Commission an application for license to engage in business as an investment dealer, and otherwise qualified as a foreign corporation authorized to do business in the State of Florida. On January 14, 1943, Mr. Ball, as president of the St. Joe Paper Co., filed a written protest with the State securities commission to the issuance of a license to the Crummer Co. (This letter appears at p. 669 of the record.) Thereafter, on February 11, 1943, at an executive session of the commission the license was refused.

* * * * *

The Crummer Co. instituted mandamus proceedings in the Supreme Court of Florida, which finally resulted in a peremptory writ of mandamus requiring the State commission to issue the license. On December 4, 1943, the commission complied with the peremptory writ of mandamus and authorized the Crummer Co. to act as a dealer in governmental securities only, and recited on the face of the license that it was issued in compliance with the order of the Supreme Court, and "not otherwise."

* * * * *

The above-narrated events involve the first open appearance of Mr. Ball in the movement to crush Crummer. In his testimony before this committee Ball identified the protest letter of January 14, 1943, and said he wrote the original, signed it and forwarded it to the State securities commission knowing that favorable action on it would prevent Crummer from doing business in Florida. His personal appearance before the State commission, in protest, was also acknowledged by him. Competitor Clyde C. Pierce likewise admits he appeared before the State securities commission in protest.

This committee's interest in the activities of the members of the State Securities Commission of Florida is confined to their participation with Federal agents in a possible joint effort to serve private individuals at the unfair expense of others, or to obstruct the effectiveness of Federal laws.

* * *

Department of Justice and criminal proceedings

The exact time the agents of the Securities and Exchange Commission, Inspector Mansfield and Investigator Fuller, agreed upon criminal prosecution of Crummer and his associates cannot be determined from the record; but it appears certain they were working toward that common objective during the greater part of 1943. Several refundings of several taxing units were being given the once-over by the agents to discover the most promising among them. The SEC agents liked the looks of Panama City. Fuller developed the Citrus County case and delivered his narrative to Mansfield who in turn sent it to the SEC. Mansfield not only wanted to come up with what he considered a case peculiarly his own: namely, the city of Stuart refunding, but he was eager to make certain that full credit for his service in this regard was assured, in advance. He wrote to Mr. Hart (of the SEC) on April 27, 1944, in part, as follows:

"I desire to have the initiative in the investigation and prosecution of this Stuart case, but with complete and full collaboration at all times of your office and assigned personnel on the same basis that I have endeavored to collaborate on the Citrus and Panama City cases while leaving the initiative and direction to them and with the understanding there is to be an agreement among us before any important step is taken. * * * I desire to have all records of the First National Bank of Chicago * * * all produced upon grand jury subpena and ordered impounded, with the view of full and free access of accountants. * * * It would no doubt expedite our investigation materially if your office could obtain advance access to all these records."

From this letter it is obvious that the agents in the field had agreed on criminal prosecution prior to April 27, 1944; the only question left for discussion, as of that date, was a division of responsibility and "credit" among them. Moreover, it is clear, from the record, that the superiors of these field agents were not informed and had no part in the trafficking of their underlings. This fact exposes a serious and often iniquitous weakness in the administration of administrative law. Would the commission members and the Postmaster General have engaged in such machinations or completely

ignored the United States attorneys and the Department of Justice? The committee does not think so. But that very negative answer prompts the committee to caution all officials in high administrative positions of the necessity to maintain a tight rein on their subordinates.

Notice of the SEC's intention to prosecute R. E. Crummer and others reached the Department of Justice on or about June 26, 1944. The notice purported to be a criminal reference report, signed by a special counsel for the SEC. The filing of the criminal reference report constituted the SEC's overt attempt of compliance with the law requiring it to "transmit such evidence as may be available concerning such acts or practices to the Attorney General" showing possible criminal violations by the subject investigated.

The Securities and Exchange Act clearly intends (and properly so) that the Attorney General "may, in his discretion, institute the necessary criminal proceedings." But in the Crummer cases, the most that can be said for the SEC's consideration of the law or the Attorney General is that the commission was courteous to the point of letting the Attorney General know that a grand jury had, at the instance of SEC agents, been called to convene on July 10, 1944, to consider the Crummer cases. The then head of the fraud unit of the Department of Justice obligingly performed the ministerial duty of sending a telegram to the United States attorney at Topeka, Kans., on July 5, 1944, authorizing a submission to the grand jury, followed by a letter which reached Topeka on the day the grand jury convened.

Prior to any pretense of submission to the Attorney General, the agents of the SEC and Post Office Department had been doing considerable indictment peddling. They had been turned down by a United States attorney in Florida, in February or March 1944. Later, on June 1, 1944, they received encouragement in Topeka, Kans., at which time, undoubtedly, an assistant United States attorney agreed to arrange for a grand jury. On June 16, 1944, Inspector Mansfield forwarded a proposed criminal indictment to the assistant United States attorney at Topeka. On July 8, 1944, an assistant United States attorney advised the Administrative Assistant to the United States Attorney General that a grand jury would convene on July 10, 1944, to consider the Crummer cases. More than a month preceding this, the assistant United States attorney at Topeka, Kans., had notified Hart, of the Chicago office of the SEC, that a grand jury would meet on July 10, 1944, to consider the case of the *United States* v. *R. E. Crummer et al.* On the day the grand jury met in Kansas, A. J. Brown, Jr., otherwise known as Alexander J. Brown, Jr., of the legal staff of the SEC was appointed by the Attorney General as a special assistant to the United States attorney in Kansas.

It was the policy, more or less, of the Attorney General preceding the Honorable Tom C. Clark, to delegate the prerogatives of his office to administrative agencies and officials in cases developed by such agencies. Such a policy lends itself to the temptation of excessive use or abuse, as is shown by the record in this investigation. The appointment of SEC agent Brown as a special assistant to the Kansas United States attorney resulted in intimidation of witnesses and defendants. Brown had roamed at large as an SEC agent, armed with the administrative subpena power, for many months. He had clashed with many individuals who were later compelled to face him, vested with the powers of a prosecuting officer, within the four walls of a grand jury room.

Only by confining the handling of criminal cases exclusively to the governmental agency specifically charged with the responsibility in such matters can there be any definite assurance of the proper administration of justice. It is gratifying to know that the present United States Attorney General declines to "farm out" criminal cases to others.

The grand jury began to hear evidence on the Crummer cases on July 17, 1944, and finally on August 3, 1944, the long-standing objective was achieved. Indictments were returned naming not only those named in the SEC criminal reference report of 6 weeks previous, but also six employees of R. E. Crummer & Co. and the Crummer Co. Just who decided to include these additional defendants is unknown but undoubtedly Mansfield and Brown agreed to it, for under date of July 31, 1944 (3 days prior to the indictments being returned), Mansfield reported to the inspector in charge at Atlanta, Ga., that the grand jury would make its return on August 3, 1944; that the two cases would be Panama City and Citrus County, Fla.; and named the persons and companies who would be indicted. His predictions were accurate. This letter from Mansfield demonstrates the intense and ardent interest of the administrative agents; their indulgence in unpardonable improprieties; and their total disregard for the sanctity and secretiveness of grand-jury proceedings.

Not only does it appear that agents of the Post Office Department and the Securities and Exchange Commission allowed themselves to be used to bring about a given objective, but likewise a Federal court was imposed upon by these agents in the unwarranted use of its criminal process to bring about the same objective. It is not at all surprising, therefore, that under date of June 10, 1946, at the direction of the Department of Justice, a motion was made by the United States attorney of Kansas, pursuant to which both the indictments were dismissed and the Government agents ordered to return all records of the defendants then in their possession. The special assistant to the Attorney General, Mr. Paisley, in commenting upon the criminal reference report prepared by the Securities and Exchange Commission as a basis for the criminal indictments against Crummer and others (beginning at p. 874 of the record) had this, among other things, to say:

"I have carried the thing home (meaning the SEC report) at night and studied it at length to find out what the facts are all about. It is full of conclusions, insinuations and innuendoes. It is difficult to secure the facts." [Parentheses ours.]

Further, in commenting upon the lack of justification for the criminal indictments, Mr. Paisley testified that five members of the Fraud Unit, Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, reviewed the entire record of the criminal proceedings "very thoroughly" and unanimously agreed that "the cases never should have been brought and should not be prosecuted."

The above-quoted testimony clearly establishes the injustices and frauds which may be perpetrated upon courts and citizens by administrative agents when they exceed or abuse the authority delegated to them by Congress. Again we quote, with approval, from a recent dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Murphy in the case of *Oklahoma Press Pub. Co.* v. *Walling*, supra:

"Administrative law has increased greatly in the past few years and seems destined to be augmented even further in the future. But attending this growth should be a new and broader sense of responsibility on the part of administrative agencies and officials. Excessive use or abuse of authority cannot only destroy man's instinct for liberty but will eventually undo the administrative processes themselves. Our history is not without a precedent of a successful revolt against a ruler who "sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people." * * * A people's desire to cooperate with the enforcement of a statute is in direct proportion to the respect for individual rights shown in the enforcement process. Liberty is too priceless to be forfeited through the zeal of an administrative agent."

DOES A MONOPOLY EXIST IN FLORIDA?

The avenues necessarily traveled by the committee in making the complete study and investigation directed by Senate Resolution 35, Seventy-ninth Congress, were found to be crowded with so-called Alfred I. du Pont or Ed Ball companies. Millions of dollars were and are invested by these companies, and in some cases by their principals, in municipal bonds of Florida taxing units, banks, real estate, timberlands, docks, warehouses, railroads, public utilities, hotels, office buildings, paper mills, and other commercial businesses or properties located in Florida. In fact, the very lifeblood of the economic structure of numerous cities and counties in Florida depends upon the Du Pont-Ball interests for nourishment and strength. These companies, through their management, are a most prominent, if not deciding, factor in the production, distribution, and consumption of wealth of nearly all Florida key centers, in the management of their affairs, and in their efforts to satisfy human desires.

Mr. Edward Ball became the harbinger for the late Alfred I. du Pont when he determined to leave Delaware and move to Florida. He is the late Alfred I. du Pont's brother-in-law, his sister Jessie Ball, being Du Pont's wife. As the forerunner, Mr. Ball began, in 1925, the purchase of large quantities of Florida real estate located in strategic areas and especially suited to the future plans, as subsequent events establish.

Alfred I. du Pont, his wife, and Mr. Ball moved to Florida in late 1925 or early 1926, and upon their arrival the vast fortune was put to work in that State. Mr. Ball was actively identified with the establishment and expansion of the Du Pont fortune in Florida, and upon the death of Alfred I. du Pont in April 1935, assumed complete control of all the Du Pont enterprises.

Almours Securities, Inc. (the initial Du Pont Florida company) was incorporated as a Florida corporation in November 1926 by Alfred I. du Pont, his wife, Jessie Ball du Pont, and Edward Ball. Approximately $35,000,000 of stock of E. I. du Pont de Nemours, Inc., was transferred to the company in exchange for the company's authorized capital stock. In addition to the acquisition of vast real-estate holdings, the Du Pont fortune, through Almours Securities, Inc., by December 1932 had invested nearly $3,000,000 in stock of banking institutions located in prominent Florida cities.

An interesting statement revealing the early intentions of the Florida Du Pont interests is found on page 70 of volume 35, United States Board of Tax Appeals Reports in the case of *Almours Securities, Inc., petitioner*, v. *Commissioner of Internal Revenue, respondent*, as follows:

"Petitioner (meaning Almours Securities, Inc.) further contends that it was its plan to build up a surplus of approximately $55,000,000 to carry out its banking program and an additional reserve of approximately $70,000,000 to conduct its real estate developments. [Parentheses ours.]"

The plan of the early 1930's reached fruition, for as heretofore pointed out the Du Pont interests control a score of banks located in nearly every principal city of Florida, with combined resources of about $375,000,000, including about $26,000,000 par value of Florida taxing units' securities.

Dealing in municipal securities in Florida taxing units may have been a mere sideline of the Du Pont millions, when measured in dollars invested, prior to 1941. So long as R. E. Crummer & Co. was able to provide stiff competition, especially during the period of temporary refinancing, the Du Pont interests

apparently were resigned to a policy of open and vigorous opposition of the Crummer plan in the courts, the Florida legislature, and before governing authorities. They always insisted upon free value for their holdings, even though such holdings had been purchased at depreciated prices. All of the time, however, the Du Pont interests kept a watchful eye trained upon the field of municipal finance, but were putting their millions of dollars to graze in greener fields where active Crummer competition did not exist.

Shortly prior to January 1941, the Du Pont interests apparently decided to assume a larger measure of control in the field of municipal finance, as evidenced by the fact that for the 15 preceding years their banks had acquired about $4,000,000 par value of Florida taxing units' bonds, while during the 4 years 1941 through 1944, both inclusive, their banks alone acquired more than $72,000,000 par value of such bonds. Furthermore, such a decision may help to explain why Roger L. Main lodged the initial complaint with the Post Office Department on May 21, 1941, against R. E. Crummer & Co.; and why Mr. Ball lodged the complaint with the State Securities Commission in January 1943 against the issuance of a license to do business to the Crummer Co., and later, in February, personally appeared before the State Securities Commission in opposition to the issuance of such license; and perhaps, also, why Mr. Ball, his lawyer adjuncts and associates so enthusiastically adopted the SEC and Post Office Department agents. If Mr. Ball had determined that the elimination of the Crummer companies from the field of municipal finance in Florida was essential to his plans, that determination explains many facts appearing in the record developed by this committee, which otherwise are hard to rationalize.

The result of driving Crummer and most of his 15,000 customers from the field of municipal finance in Florida has enabled the Du Pont interests, and the two Florida bond houses with whom those interests operate, to regulate to a large degree the issuance of bonds by Florida taxing units, and to restrict the sale thereof. A recent example is the case of $1,500,000 par value of supplementary bonds for the Rickenbacker Causeway, which was bid for by the Florida National Bank & Trust Co. at Miami "acting for the Alfred I. du Pont estate." These bonds carried the remarkably high interest rate of 4¾ percent per annum. They were bid for on October 8, 1946, and were delivered to the Alfred I. du Pont estate through the Florida National Bank & Trust Co. at Miami about November 18, 1946. Significant also is the fact that "the original issue of $4,000,000 was likewise cleared through us (meaning the Florida National Bank & Trust Co. at Miami) during the first week of March 1941." [Parentheses ours.]

To report the apparent existence of a near-monopoly in the field of municipal finance in Florida is to disclose only a part of the discovery made by the committee during its study and investigation. The exclusive control of the Du Pont interests extends to other fields of trade, commerce, and industry as well.

The activities of the Du Pont interests revolve around the Du Pont-controlled group of banks. The extent of any particular company's operations is indeterminable from the record. But close intercorporate relationships exist between the companies, as disclosed by Mr. Ball's testimony, at pages 742 and 743 of the record, in reference to the purchase and subsequent expansion of a telephone company located in west Florida. This company had about 99 miles of lines when the Du Pont interests purchased it. Within a short space of time nearly 13,000 miles of additional lines were added. Funds for the expansion were loaned to the company by another Du Pont-controlled company. Mr. Ball said that the Du Pont banks do not extend credit accommodations to other Du Pont concerns. Of course with their other interests possessing a "fat treasury" it would hardly be necessary. But it must not be understood that these various banks do not do business with each other, for they do. For example, the record shows that the Du Pont-controlled banks engage extensively with each other in trading in municipal securities. Practically all municipal securities of Florida's taxing units owned by the banks of the Florida National Group were purchased, initially, by the Du Pont Jacksonville bank, and according to the schedules submitted by the banks, for the record, were subsequently distributed to the other members of the group at cost regardless of the market value at the time of distribution.

The widespread and strategically located chain or group of banks throughout Florida enables the Du Pont interests to exercise a major influence in the economic life of the State and its citizens. An example is shown by quoting from a lease between the Du Pont Florida National Bank & Trust Co. at Miami and one of its tenants, as follows:

"As a further consideration for the execution of this lease, the lessee herein agrees that it will do all of its banking business in Miami with the lessor bank, the Florida National Bank & Trust Co. at Miami, during the term of this lease or any extension or renewal of the same."

This provision of the lease affords the management of the Du Pont interests confidential access to the financial affairs of its tenants in the bank building which, incidentally, is the largest office building in Florida and regarded by many as the most modern in the South.

The ability of the Du Pont interests to grant or withhold credit sought by established individuals and concerns, or by individuals and concerns who seek to begin new enterprises in Florida, also affords the Du Pont interests the opportunity of determining the extent of commercial growth in the areas served by them. It is not unreasonable to state that in many areas it would be difficult for Florida citizens to buy a home or operate a business without turning to the Du Pont interests; and if their desires are not looked upon with favor by the Du Pont interests, such citizens may well find themselves without a source of credit.

While, as stated above, the Du Pont interests revolve around the group of banks, at the same time, all of their interests, being as they are under the active supervision of one man—Mr. Edward Ball—are closely intermeshed. It seems reasonable to assume that the other interests, such as the St. Joe Paper Co., the land companies, the insurance and finance companies, the railroad and utility companies, are used to increase the power, influence, and business of the banks, and that the banks are used to promote and extend the Du Pont industrial and real-estate operations and other commercial objectives, present and future.

At present the St. Joe Paper Co., a key Du Pont company, which owns extensive pine and hardwood forests, a pulp mill, a railroad, and many subsidiary companies, is seeking to obtain control of the Florida East Coast Railway Co., one of Florida's three major railway systems. At an estimated cost of some $4,000,000, the St. Joe Paper Co. purchased approximately $25,000,000 par value of bonds of the railway company. This company is now in reorganization in the Federal court. It has about 15 percent of the entire trackage in the State of Florida and serves about 46 percent of the population of the State. Its operating revenue in 1940, according to the records of the hearings of the Interstate Commerce Commission on the question of the reorganization of the railway company, was over $10,000,000, or about 25 percent of the total for the State. Its passenger revenue in that year was about 45 percent of the State total, and its freight revenue about 15 percent. Moreover, it operates the only tracks on the east coast of Florida between Jacksonville and West Palm Beach.

Thus the record establishes that the Du Pont fortune has obtained such vast power in the State of Florida, through its diversification of interests in the most favored parts of the State, that it can with some measure of success determine who shall enter business or who shall be permitted to remain in business in a large part of the State.

The successful ouster of the Crummer companies from the field of municipal finance in Florida, to which ousted the activities of the SEC and Post Office Department representatives contributed, is a glaring object lesson to all those who dare to oppose the Du Pont juggernaut, that opposition is a hazardous thing and that acquiescence to the Du Pont wishes in all respects may well be the price of being permitted to begin, or to continue, to do business in Florida. An organized group of banks, numerous companies with extensive and diversified holdings under corporate structures filled with the same individuals occupying prominent positions in many of them (such as Roger L. Main), and all undertakings being headed up by one man (Mr. Edward Ball), vests such a vast concentration of power in the hands of private individuals, and under the supervision of one, that the economic life of the State and the well-being of its people may well be affected more by such power than by the power of the government of the State itself. Further augmentation of this vast accumulation of private power, now in prospect, by control of a central artery of commerce, the Florida East Coast Railway Co., certainly will not lessen the appearance of a private monopoly over the economic life of the State.

The committee views the concentration of economic power in the State of Florida—achieved, in part, with the aid of the activities of Federal agents—as a most unhappy condition which, if not curtailed, ultimately may block the free functioning of the economy of the State.

Within the last few weeks, a legal document bearing the seal of the clerk of the Supreme Court of Florida was brought to the attention of counsel for the committee. The document apparently was filed with the Supreme Court of Florida in the case of *Edward Ball, appellant*, v. *James A. Yates, appellee*, pending in that court on petition for rehearing. Extensive commercial transactions are alleged to have taken place between Edward Ball and two justices of the State supreme court. The nature of these transactions seems to have involved the granting of oil and mineral rights by the St. Joe Paper Co. to one justice, and the advancement of $110,000 by Du Pont-controlled banks to the other justice. These business transactions apparently took place while the case of *Yates* v. *Ball* was either pending before the court or had recently been ruled upon by it, both justices having ruled in favor of Mr. Ball.

The document requests, among other things, that the justices "recuse themselves or, in the alternative, that the court hold that they are disqualified to participate in these proceedings." The committee quotes from the body of the sworn petition, as follows:

"The appellee does not question the legal right of Justice Buford to make oral leases with Mr. Ball, the St. Joe Paper Co., or anyone else. He only questions his right, having done so, to sit in judgment on his case. He does not question the right of Justice Adams to borrow money from Mr. Ball's banks in any amounts and on any terms that he sees fit but, having done so or expecting to do so, he questions his right to sit in judgment on his case."

Although the two justices admitted their dealings, as complained of, the court, in ruling on the petition, declined to hold them disqualified.

This committee is not, of course, interested in Edward Ball's personal litigation in Florida or elsewhere. Nor is the committee concerned with his commercial or social dealings with justices of Florida's court of last resort. The committee, however, is obliged to take into account any and all circumstances which bear upon the activities of an individual who has been so prominently identified with the subject matter of the committee's study and investigation, and the committee believes it has a duty to report fully what its study and investigation have uncovered.

In this connection, the committee has endeavored to portray, in this report, a true picture and conservative estimate of the Du Pont interests' extensive influence and control of the vital elements of the economic life of a sovereign State, and the way in which those interests were served by the activities of agents of the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Post Office Department. Since it would seem, from the very recent facts recited above, that the dominant head of the Du Pont interests has seen fit to extend his influence beyond the recognized fields of finance, business, or politics by becoming a party to large commercial transactions with members of Florida's judicial system, while he was a litigant, the committee is more than ever convinced of the monopolistic designs of the Du Pont interests and the evident necessity of curtailing them.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The record of the committee relating to "the credit of the taxing units of the State of Florida" begins with the large borrowings of the taxing units in the early 1920's, and covers each and every subsequent event of condition affecting "the credit" through 1946. Such an extensive and complete study was deemed necessary in order to evaluate intelligently and accurately "the activities of the Securities and Exchange Commission and Post Office Department, or any representatives thereof" and report sound findings to the Senate, on the two propositions set out in Senate Resolution 35, Seventy-ninth Congress.

The history of the Municipal Bankruptcy Act, as amended, is within the personal knowledge of several Members of the Senate. It will be recalled that many public officials of Florida, prominent private individuals, civic bodies, and other representative groups actively endorsed and urged the Congress to enact the original act. In fact, the act, as originally passed by the Congress, was introduced by a Congressman from Florida. The subsequent reenactment was vigorously urged by the congressional delegation from Florida, and while delegations from other States displayed an interest in the passage of the measure, it has always been generally understood that the acute municipal debt problems of Florida taxing units presented the primary necessity for congressional assistance. The amendment of 1940, extending the life of the act and enlarging its scope to embrace financially distressed counties, was likewise urged by the Florida delegation in Congress and by substantial Florida interests. It is therefore appropriate to note that the Municipal Bankruptcy Act, as amended, which as such now constitutes a permanent part of the Federal bankruptcy laws, is the result, to a great extent, of the insistence by, as well as the need of, the taxing units of Florida.

The reasons prompting governing authorities of Florida's political subdivisions, taxpayers, civic groups, and others to request Federal assistance in the form of the Municipal Bankruptcy Act and the amendment thereto, were made clear to the committee during its study and investigation. Without doubt, the catastrophic set-backs and the seemingly hopeless bond defaults of the early 1930's struck at the very heart of the most optimistic person's faith in the future, and especially those who required a solvent and prosperous community as an impetus to self-improvement. The overwhelming majority of individuals in all fields of endeavor were in this category. The Alfred I. du Pont fortune was one prominent exception. A stagnant market, resulting in greatly depressed prices, naturally would attract a fortune of such magnitude. The early 1930's in Florida provided ready dollars with the opportunity to dictate their own terms.

A bitter struggle between the forces advocating refunding and the forces opposing it had as its genesis the fight over the passage of the Gas Tax Act and State Board of Administration Act by the 1929 session of the Florida Legislature. R. E. Crummer was the leader of the refunders, and Edward Ball, of the du Pont interests, the leader of the opposition. For over 12 years following the initial clash of 1929, it was a case of "an irresistible force meeting an immovable object." These two strong forces brought into play all the political, financial, and personal resources at their command, and it was between these two forces that the agents of the SEC and the Post Office Department "took sides."

The refunders made substantial progress despite the strong opposition. Crummer's company alone refunded for 15,000 investors about $170,000,000 par value of the bonded debt of some 200 taxing units. Other investment dealers, following the Crummer plan, also refunded a substantial volume. When the stronger taxing units began to negotiate with the investing public for credit accommodations on permanent low interest rates, the struggle between the refunders and antirefunders increased in intensity. As already related, R. E. Crummer & Co. had purchased for cash on competitive bid a total of about $31,000,000 par value of bonds from 10 separate taxing units, between July 1940 and May 5, 1941. The antirefunders had been urging cash deals, contending that the refunders' contracts calling for a two-point or better service charge gave them an unfair margin in dealing with the taxing units. The $31,000,000 transactions for cash not only exploded the antirefunders' contention, but served notice that the refunders were able to provide cash credit on terms which the antirefunders were not willing to meet.

The antirefunders knew that millions of dollars of permanent refundings would be offered in the near future. Crummer had demonstrated his resourcefulness in cash transactions by outbidding the antis for the $31,000,000 offerings. Then came the appeal to the Post Office Department. The response by this Federal agency and the SEC provided the antirefunders with the offensive strength to turn the tide. The avalanche of propaganda made possible by the activities of these Federal agents taking sides completely discredited the leader of the refunders. He was forced to withdraw from the field of municipal finance, and spend his time and money to defend his name against the attacks hurled at him by Federal and State agents, through the medium of the civil and criminal courts.

The record is voluminous, but the committee has separated the wheat from the chaff—the good from the bad. Based upon its complete study and investigation as shown by the record, the committee has made a number of specific findings, as follows:

FINDINGS

The committee finds that:

I. The activities of the Securities and Exchange Commission and Post Office Department, through their representatives, have crippled, hampered, and rendered ineffective the Municipal Bankruptcy Act, as amended. (Illustrations from the record are attached hereto as appendix A.)

II. The activities of the Securities and Exchange Commission and Post Office Department, through their representatives, have unfairly resulted in undermining the credit of the taxing units of the State of Florida. (Illustrations from the record are attached hereto as appendix B.)

III. The investigation of the activities and operations of the Brown-Crummer Investment Co., R. E. Crummer & Co., the Crummer Co., their officers, directors, associates, employees, and R. E. Crummer, individually, by the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Post Office Department was ordered, instituted, and prosecuted by such agencies without sufficient probable cause, justification, or reason to believe that such companies and individuals had violated the postal laws and regulations or the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, or the Securities Act of 1933.

IV. Such investigation was originated by the Post Office Department acting upon the complaint of representatives of the most bitter competitive rivals of R. E. Crummer, R. E. Crummer & Co., and the Crummer Co., namely, an officer and director of several Alfred L. du Pont companies and banks, and an officer of a Florida investment house closely associated with the Du Pont interests.

V. During such investigation representatives of the Du Pont interests, and those closely associated with them, guided, influenced, and encouraged the Federal agents in the prosecution thereof, without sufficient cause and in the advancement of their own private business interests; and the Federal agents followed such guidance.

VI. The complaint lodged with the Post Office Department, requesting the investigation, was made without probable cause, justification, or reason to believe that R. E. Crummer & Co. had violated the law, and appears to have been filed for the purpose of maliciously injuring the company named in the complaint and its officers, associates, and employees, and advancing the plan of the Du Pont interests and those closely associated with them to eliminate their strongest competition in the field of muncipal finance in Florida.

VII. The criminal prosecutions, against R. E. Crummer and others, were initiated by agents of the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Post Office Department without sufficient probable cause, justification, or reason to believe that a criminal offense had been committed, for the purpose of justifying their extensive investigation, and advancing the cause of private competitive interests in their joint effort to eliminate the Crummer companies as a competing factor in the field of municipal finance in Florida.

VIII. The investigation by agents of the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Post Office Department was conducted under the guidance, advice, and encouragement of a union of different elements and interests in Florida, resulting in the illegal destruction of the business of R. E. Crummer & Co. and the Crummer Co., prevention of performance of contracts, impairment of public credit, invasion of private contract relations, malicious damage to private individuals, and malicious interference with governing authorities in the performance of their duties.

IX. The result of the unwarranted criminal prosecutions against R. E. Crummer and others, growing out of the activities of representatives of the SEC and the Post Office Department, was not only the destruction of the business of R. E. Crummer & Co. and the Crummer Co., but the furtherance of the Du Pont interests' monopolistic control over the field of municipal finance in Florida.

X. The agents of the Securities and Exchange Commission and Post Office Department conducting the investigation in the field were willing pawns of the Du Pont interests in the advancement of their own private business interests.

XI. The excessive use of administrative authority and the abuse of Federal criminal processes by the Federal agents during the investigation were a sham and a fraud upon

the Federal courts, violative of ordinary standards of decency, and circumvented the prerogatives and duties of the Department of Justice and constitutionally appointed officers charged exclusively with the administration of the Federal criminal laws.

XII. To epitomize: The record is replete with instances of: (1) Excessive use and abuse of administrative authority and subpena power, (2) irregular and illegal actions, (3) interdepartmental collusion, (4) obstinate refusal to disclose facts during open hearings, (5) refusal to furnish documents in defiance of the committee, (6) partisan attitude and conduct of Federal agents, (7) perpetration of frauds upon Federal courts, (8) misrepresentations and nondisclosures to the Attorney General, (9) intentional and secret connivance and working in consort with private persons against their competitor, (10) interference with the right of persons and concerns to continue in a lawful business, (11) tampering with proceedings of a Federal grand jury, (12) intimidating and molesting witnesses under grand jury subpena, (13) questionable procedures and practices by private businesses operating in interstate commerce, and (14) unbridled expansion of economic power in the hands of one individual.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the many irregular, unauthorized, and often iniquitous acts, administrative abuses, legal violations, and questionable economic practices apparent in the record, the committee recommends as follows:

I. That the Congress consider a revision of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, in order to clarify the Commission's jurisdiction and responsibility over municipal securities and the persons, firms, and corporations doing business in such securities.

II. That the United States Attorney General investigate:

(a) The activities of the agents of the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Post Office Department, the United States attorneys and their assistants, in relation to any and all criminal proceedings against R. E. Crummer, et al., heretofore had in the States of Florida, Ohio, and Kansas, as a result of the Securities and Exchange Commission's and Post Office Department's examination of the business affairs of R. E. Crummer & Co., et al., with a view to determine, inter alia:

1. The acts of fraud, misrepresentation or nondisclosure committed by the Federal agents in their presentation to the respective United States attorneys, or their assistants.

2. Why the United States attorney's office in Topeka, Kans., failed to notify the United States Attorney General of the series of conferences, correspondence, etc., with agents of the SEC and Post Office Department during June 1944, and prior thereto.

3. Whether perjury was committed by witnesses before the grand jury.

4. Whether witnesses under grand jury subpena were intimidated or molested by SEC agents.

5. The full and complete details of the matter related in the committee's report under the heading: "The Shockley Incident."

6. Whether inducements were offered by SEC agents to witnesses under grand jury subpena for their signatures to immunity waivers.

7. Whether information concerning proceedings of the grand jury, nature of witnesses' testimony before it, names of individuals against whom indictments were voted, etc., was transmitted by Government representatives having access to same to other Government agents while the grand jury was in session, and the nature and extent of any other interdepartmental collusion.

(b) The extent of monopoly and monopolistic practices in the field of municipal finance, industry, commerce, trade, and agriculture in the State of Florida, and whether appropriate action should be taken to prevent the further extension of any monopolies found to exist.

(c) Concentration of economic power in the State of Florida, with a view to determining:

1. How such power has been and is being used.

2. Whether the existence of such power, under present conditions, involves a violation of the antitrust laws.

3. The desirability, in the light of findings under (1) and (2) above, of instituting appropriate action to eliminate such power.

III. The Comptroller of the Currency and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System investigate:

(a) The banks of the Florida national group to ascertain whether any officer, director, or employee of any of these banks, members of the Federal Reserve System, is in violation of section 32 of the Federal Reserve Act which prohibits any partner or employee of a partnership "primarily engaged in the issue, flotation, underwriting, public sale, or distribution, at wholesale or retail, or through syndicate participation, of stocks, bonds, or other similar securities" from serving as an officer, employee, or director of a member bank.

(b) The municipal bond transactions between or by any of the several banks of the Florida national group with a view to determining—

1. Whether the prices paid by the purchasing bank to the seller bank were at the market price at the time of purchase.

2. Whether any of the banks have participated as a silent partner in a syndicate, or otherwise, in bond refunding proceedings contracts.

3. Whether two or more of the banks have participated respectively as partners in syndicates or joint accounts which opposed each other in bidding for bonds or proceedings contracts.

4. Whether the presidents and directors of the several banks actually have performed the duties imposed on them by law, or are mere "figureheads."

IV. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue investigate:

(a) The municipal bond transactions between the several banks of the Florida national group with a view to determining:

1. Whether the banks' method and plan of purchase and distribution of municipal bonds, as indicated by the tabulations and schedules contained in the record, present a case within the provisions of section 45 of the Internal Revenue Code or any other sections of said code.

2. Whether the plan, (1) above, upon execution, constituted a shifting of income, profits or losses, from one or more controlled corporations to others, to the detriment or benefit of stockholders.

3. Whether the plan, (1) above, upon execution, resulted in unaccounted-for profits.

4. Whether the plan, (1) above, was evidenced by a written agreement duly executed by the several corporate participants, under proper authority, or was merely a device put into operation, from time to time, at the instance and direction of the dominant head of the Du Pont interests.

5. Whether the benefits accruing to the bank as a participant in a syndicate or joint account for the purchase of municipal bonds were "earmarked" for the recipient banks before the purchase from the taxing unit and in the ratable proportion according to the bonds actually received by them, respectively, or later upon actual delivery of the bonds to the several banks.

6. How, when, and by whom the fractional distribution, to the several recipient banks, of the bonds purchased was determined and the purchase price fixed.

7. The arrangements which resulted in the Florida National Bank at Belle Glade acquiring municipal bonds, at cost, from other members of the Florida National group which had been purchased, by the other members, prior to the organization of the Belle Glade bank.

8. The extent of the Florida Du Pont interests represented by stock or otherwise in each of the banks of the Florida National group engaging in intercorporate municipal bond transactions.

V. The Securities and Exchange Commission and Post Office Department take such action as may be necessary and appropriate to—

(a) Prohibit their respective agents from investigating or interfering with judicial proceedings under the Municipal Bankruptcy Act, as amended.

(b) Assure full and complete compliance by their respective agents with the provisions of law relating to the prosecution of alleged illegal acts and practices.

(c) Prevent their respective agents, during the course of an investigation, from taking sides in favor of one or more individuals against another or others.

(d) Require a careful study and investigation of complaints filed with them, including the personal interests of the complaining parties, before launching a formal investigation.

(e) Extend to the person, firm, or corporation being investigated in any case opportunity for a full and complete hearing on the subject matter under investigation.

APPENDIX A

With respect to the committee's finding on the first of the two propositions set out in Senate Resolution 35, Seventy-ninth Congress; namely, that the activities of the Securities and Exchange Commission and Post Office Department, through their representatives, have crippled, hampered, and rendered ineffective the Municipal Bankruptcy Act, as amended, the following are illustrative.

(a) The agents of the afore-mentioned agencies examined in detail refunding operations of Florida taxing units which had been approved in toto by a Federal court under authority of the Municipal Bankruptcy Act, as amended, and interrogated, orally or by writing, numerous holders of bonds issued in compliance with the court's approved plan of composition. These inquiries caused certain holders of bonds issued under the plan to question either (1) the finality of the final decree of the Federal court, (2) the settlement received under the decree, (3) the value of the bonds issued under authority of the decree, or (4) the negotiability of the securities.

(b) The agents of the afore-mentioned agencies frequently obtained the names and places of residence of the holders of bonds involved in legal proceedings under the Municipal Bankruptcy Act, as amended, from the list filed in such proceedings showing the consenting and nonconsenting holders. Questionnaires or letters would then be sent to many of these holders of both classes of creditors and oral interviews held with others.

These facts became generally known by the holders of securities of Florida taxing units, and as a result at least three taxing units of Florida have been denied the assistance of the Municipal Bankruptcy Act, as amended, because the holders of the securities, in sufficient volume, have refused to commit their holdings to a bankruptcy proceeding, assigning as their reasons the activities of the agents of the SEC and Post Office Department in reviewing bankruptcy proceedings of other Florida taxing units.

(c) Inspector Mansfield, of the Post Office Department, after corresponding with a city

of Stuart, Fla., bondholder for about 6 months, wrote him on March 14, 1944, as follows:

"Since you appear to have received only the $90 interest which was represented by coupons, it would appear that you still have a claim for the accrued interest," even though the bondholder had been paid everything due him under the terms of the Federal court's decree in proceedings under the Municipal Bankruptcy Act, as amended.

(d) The principal investment dealer used by the taxing units and creditors as the medium to work out an equitable plan of composition for presentation to the Federal court by assembling necessary data, locating the holders of the outstanding bonds, obtaining the required consents, etc., was forced to discontinue such services, due at least in part to the activities of the Federal agents.

(e) The following insidious misinformation, to wit:

"Were you fully informed concerning Florida county bonds, including provisions by the State of Florida to supply money out of gasoline taxes for payment of principal and interest of such county bonds?"

was included in a questionnaire, prepared and mailed by inspector Mansfield to holders of Okeechobee County, Fla., defaulted bonds which created the impression that sufficient funds were available to the county to meet its defaulted bonds in full, and that the county could not, therefore, qualify under the Municipal Bankruptcy Act, as amended. An obvious purpose to be accomplished by the questionnaire was to cajole the holders of the defaulted bonds to withdraw their consents of approval to the existing plan of composition. The end result, whether or not intended, was to assist the attorney for the Du Pont interests in his efforts to defeat the municipal bankruptcy proceedings.

(f) Inspector Mansfield's solicitation of antiadministration forces in Okeechobee County, Fla., and SEC agents' solicitation of proadministration forces in Panama City, Fla., both forces being openly and notoriously opposed to the refunding agent, amounted to an unwarranted interference and partisan interest in matters which were the proper subject for determination by judicial decree under the Municipal Bankruptcy Act, as amended.

(g) The success of a refunding proceeding under the Municipal Bankruptcy Act, as amended, largely depends upon the degree of tripartite confidence existing between the investors, the taxing unit, and the refunding agent. The critical letters, written and biased oral interviews held by the Federal agents were of common knowledge, and therefore encouraged the opposition to the refunding plan; confused the cooperative investors; increased the expense of the undertaking; undermined the confidence; complicated the technical proceedings; and reflected adversely on the jurisdiction of the Federal courts.

(h) Several specific instances are to be found in the record whereby the activities of the Federal agents have impaired the effectiveness of the Federal Municipal Bankruptcy Act, as amended. A most recent experience is related in a communication from Mr. Henry C. Tillman, attorney for the town of Largo, Fla., to the SEC and the Postmaster General under date of January 16, 1947. Excerpts therefrom are quoted, as follows:

"My firm was retained in the fall of 1946 by the town of Largo, Fla., for the specific purpose of attempting to work out a settlement of the defaulted debt problem in which the taxpayers and the bondholders have been involved for many years. * * *

"I found that Largo, a town of approximately 1,000 people, owed in principal, past-due coupons, and past-due interest, about $2,400,000 and with an assessed valuation on a 100-percent basis of $1,200,000, the only possible solution for that town was the Municipal Bankruptcy Act, and my first step was to try and interest the bondholders in reaching a settlement of default, under the provisions of the Federal municipal bankruptcy law.

"My efforts so far, with most of the bondholders, have been met with a point-blank refusal to discuss a settlement.

"It is my understanding that their attitude is largely influenced by reason of the fact that during the past several years many adjustments which were undertaken and accomplished under authority of this act and which were approved by the Federal district court have been the subject of investigation, criticism, and other embarrassment as a result of the activities of the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Post Office Department. * * *

"The problem in which the Largo taxpayers are today involved is, for practical purposes, almost identical with the problem which the taxpayers of the city of Stuart, Fla., were involved for many years. * * *

"I understand the investigators of your Commission and the Post Office Department have been quite active over a long period of time in an apparent effort to disrupt the very satisfactory relations which were established by the city of Stuart and its bondholders when this refunding program began to operate with the approval of the Federal courts.

"These activities of the Federal Departments above-mentioned, are responsible for blocking me in the efforts which I am making to settle the troubles of this little Florida community of 1,000 souls, and I am finding it difficult to even get a discussion of my problem with some of the bondholders. * * *

"If the activities of your agents * * * being used to make the holders of those securities (referring to city of Stuart refunding bonds) believe that the terms of that settlement * * * must be the subject of full review and snooping of Federal agents of other departments, I can see that the holders of the town of Largo bonds and of any other similar situated defaulting taxing unit could not logically expect the holders of its defaulted indebtedness to participate in any debt-adjustment program and thereafter be subject to the same experiences which were apparently forced upon the city of Stuart and the holders of its refunding bonds.

"And, if these practices are to be continued, the city officials of the town of Largo will have to be advised by me that the settlement in court may not be the end of the matter, which advice I would be very much opposed to giving unless I found it necessary in justice to my client."

(i) Mr. Tom Conely, at the time chairman of the Florida State Democratic Executive Committee, and attorney for the Board of County Commissioners of Okeechobee County, was asked by Mr. Moore, investigator for this committee:

"Is it your impression that the investigation of these two agencies has in any way hampered the effectiveness of the Bankruptcy Act?"

To which Mr. Conely replied:

"I think so. I think that the manner in which they have made their investigation has tended to cause some of the bondholders to think that a fraud has been perpetuated."

Then Mr. Moore asked:

"Even through the court proceedings and decree of bankruptcy?"

Mr. Conely:

"Yes, sir."

(j) Mr. R. E. Crummer, principal target of the SEC and Post Office Department, submitted a sworn statement to the committee from which portions are quoted as follows:

"The extent of my Florida activities covering a period of 25 years consists of the purchase by competitive bid, of approximately $50,000,000 par value of taxing units' bonds in the twenties and the distribution of same to approximately 5,000 investors; assisting in formulating legislation (State and Federal) to aid in the solution of the problems presented by the defaults, beginning in the late twenties, including the Gas Tax Acts, State Board of Administration Act, and, the Federal Municipal Bankruptcy Act, as amended; financing necessary economic and financial surveys; financing constructive litigation; defending obstructive litigation; designing a general refunding plan which was, in principle, adopted and has been used by more than 200 taxing units in refinancing approximately $170,000,000 par value of bonded indebtedness held by approximately 15,000 investors.

"As a direct result of the activities of the agents of the SEC and Post Office Department, my associates and I have been, for all practical purposes, excluded from the field of public finance in Florida.

"Since our exclusion, the du Pont interests and their satellites have acquired approximately 75 percent of the public bond offerings for which they submitted bids—before, they secured less than 25 percent.

"The Du Pont interests are not in sympathy with the Federal Municipal Bankruptcy Act, as amended, as demonstrated by their opposition to its enactment and their attack upon the act, as amended, in the Supreme Court of the United States. Hence, so long as they remain the dominant factor in public financing in Florida, the act, as amended, will be impotent.

"Letters from a post-office inspector and oral statements by him and SEC agents to holders of Florida taxing units' bonds caused many investors to decide against involving their holdings in proceedings under the Federal Municipal Bankruptcy Act, as amended. * * * In June 1942 the city of Wauchula, Fla., attempted to settle its 10-year default by entering into a contract with R. E. Crummer & Co. In due time the contract was fulfilled, and the plan of composition approved by the Federal Municipal Bankruptcy Act, notwithstanding the fact that the pernicious interference by the SEC agents and a post-office inspector in league with State agents made it vastly more difficult to complete the undertaking. The suspicions aroused and doubt cast upon the operation by these agents were undoubtedly a contributing factor to the unsatisfactory performance by the city under the contract. On November 20, 1946, the city of Wauchula authorized the refunding of all the indebtedness now outstanding under the June 1942 contract. Holders of a substantial amount of the original bonds (approximately $500,000 par value) * * * are not now interested in any new or different credit accommodations which the city of Wauchula may be seeking through any source. * * * As a consequence of this decision * * * the city of Wauchula will be precluded from obtaining the benefits contemplated by the November 20, 1946, contract, which may mean the imposition of approximately $1,000,000 additional debt service tax liability against the taxpayers, which threat of this potential increased liability is wholly chargeable to the activities of and interference with the refunding transactions in which the city of Wauchula has engaged in the past by SEC and Post Office Department agents.

"In October of 1946 Avon Park entered into a contract to refund all of its outstanding bonded indebtedness. * * * holders of a substantial amount of the bonds to be refunded have indicated that they will not run any chances by committing their holdings to the proposed refunding. They base their decision upon past events which can be briefly stated as follows: In 1930 their original bonds defaulted. In 1937 the city authorized R. E. Crummer & Co. to refund about $1,235,000 par value of the original debt. The Federal Municipal Bankruptcy Act was invoked. Mr.

Edward Ball's personal attorney, acting for an insurance company which opposed the proposed terms of settlement, contested the plan. The contest ran the gamut of the courts, finally reaching the Supreme Court of the United States. The highest Court reversed all the inferior courts. The plan failed. Litigation followed by several bondholders to enforce their claims. By 1942 an increased tax burden of more than $250,000 had accrued. Again the city appealed to R. E. Crummer & Co. for help, as shown by the city's resolution of April 22, 1942. R. E. Crummer & Co. accepted the undertaking by, in effect, reinstating the 1937 contract, but was compelled to add the more than $250,000 accrued liability, which amount would have been saved had the 1937 contract prevailed. The 1942 contract succeeded mainly because the litigant of the 1937 undertaking, an Indiana insurance company, joined in the 1942 undertaking. Despite the equitable success of the 1942 program, all the agents (State and Federal) jumped with all fours on the Avon Park refunding. The decision of the Supreme Court which caused the failure of the 1937 plan then became a household word with the SEC agents and the Post Office inspector, notwithstanding the generally recognized success of the subsequent refunding plan of 1942. The activities, charges, criticism, etc., of these agents relating to the refunding operations in which the city of Avon Park and its creditors have heretofore engaged, have caused a substantial amount (in volume) of Avon Park creditors to conclude that they will not participate in the extension of any new or different credit accommodations to this city, even though it may be that the improved financial status of Avon Park and present money market would ordinarily afford Avon Park more favorable terms, except for the fact that its credit opportunities have been impaired by governmental interference, and the city will inevitably be denied the benefits contemplated by the October 1946 contract."

APPENDIX B

With respect to the committee's finding on the second of the two propositions set out in Senate Resolution 35, Seventy-ninth Congress, namely, that the activities of the Securities and Exchange Commission and Post Office Department, through their representatives, have unfairly resulted in undermining the credit of the taxing units of the State of Florida. The record shows that the Crummer Co., successor to the customers' accounts, contracts, commercial facilities, business locations, etc., of R. E. Crummer & Co., was prevented from carrying on the extensive operations of its predecessors, by reason of the independent activities of the agents of the afore-mentioned agencies and in conjunction with the efforts of local competitors, personal antagonists, State officials, and their appointees. Elimination of the Crummer Co. from the field of municipal finance in Florida—

(a) Stopped the flow of credit to Florida taxing units from the source which, on the basis of actual performance, had been the most economical, dependable, and cooperative source of credit available to them continuously since the initial borrowings in the 1920's.

(b) Has enabled the Du Pont interests, through such mediums as they select, to exercise a substantial measure of control over the credit requirements of Florida taxing units.

(c) Has enabled the Du Pont interests to control more effectively other fields of endeavor where they are intimately serving key centers of Florida commerce, agriculture, and industry.

(d) Has deprived the taxing units of Florida (and the investing public of America) of the services of an investment dealer apparently particularly well equipped with the facilities to handle all phases of public credit problems, including those peculiar to Florida tax units.

(e) Has deprived the tax units of Florida of the benefits which had existed through the years by the knowledge among investment dealers generally that a Crummer bid represented the vast and widely scattered buying power of thousands of individuals, financial institutions, and insurance companies.

(f) Eliminated the most formidable competition available to the taxing units of Florida.

(g) Has stifled and excluded formidable competition, resulting in a general interfering with the normal course of dealing and trade in municipal securities of Florida taxing units under conditions of free enterprise.

The prices received by taxing units of Florida for their bond offerings subsequent to 1942, although higher than in previous years, were below the average of the prices received by taxing units of other borrowing States and municipal taxing units, as shown by reference to a survey of early 1946 stating the average annual interest yield on municipals to be under 1.50 percent, whereas tabulations furnished by the Jacksonville Du Pont bank shows purchases by it of Florida municipals during 1945 and 1946 at prices yielding on the average substantially above that figure. The result of this comparative analysis is strong support for the statement contained in R. E. Crummer's communication to the committee, reading:

"The credit of the taxing units of Florida has suffered to such proportions, as a result of the activities of these Federal agencies, that a conservative estimate of the dollar damage already sustained would be at least $15,000,000."

The Florida national group of banks in Florida benefited by the forced withdrawal of the Crummer Co. as shown by the fact that during the 10-year period prior to 1942 they acquired only about $4,000,000 par value of Florida taxing units' bonds, while during the following 4-year period beginning with 1942 they acquired about $22,000,000 par value. These facts establish the strong and efficacious competition of the Crummer companies and convey some indication of a possible ulterior motive prompting the Roger L. Main complaint to the Post Office Department, as well as the continuing assistance to the agents of the SEC and Post Office Department by the Du Pont interests and their associates.

APPENDIX C

CHRONOLOGY

(This chronology does not attempt to embrace all activities of the Securities and Exchange Commission, Post Office Department, their respective agents, and others.)

1920 through 1928: The taxing units of Florida made their initial borrowings amounting to approximately $500,000,000 and evidenced the debt by the issuance of interest-bearing ad valorem tax bonds. Some 40 municipal investment dealers purchased the bonds and distributed them to the investing public of America. Largest single purchaser, in volume, was the Brown-Crummer Investment Co., of Wichita, Kans.

1925 or 1926: Alfred I. du Pont and Edward Ball, his brother-in-law, moved to Florida and soon thereafter began the acquisition of real estate, businesses, banks, etc.

1926: The market in Florida real estate collapsed, taxes became delinquent, private businesses were failing, etc.

1927: First large-scale bank failures in Florida. Devastating tropical storm. Mediterranean fruitfly damage.

1929: Second series of bank failures. Florida Legislature enacted Gas Tax Act to provide funds to support $160,000,000 par value of road and bridge bonds, and State Board of Administration Act. R. E. Crummer supported legislation; Du Pont interests opposed it.

1930: Ad valorem tax collections had declined to serious level. Bonds were defaulting in principal or interest, or both. Gas Tax Act of 1929 held unconstitutional, in part, by Supreme Court of Florida.

1931: Florida Legislature enacted Gas Tax Act to meet objections of the Supreme Court of Florida to the 1929 act. Ad valorem tax collections continued to decline.

1932: Approximately 80 percent of taxing units' original bonds aggregating $500,000,000 were in default as to principal or interest, or both. Bonds were selling for as low as 10 to 15 cents on the dollar flat. Thousands of lawsuits involving the defaulted debt were filed. The Du Pont interests had acquired large diversified holdings in Florida.

1932 through 1938: Temporary refunding began in 1932 and was resorted to by nearly all Florida taxing units thereafter, at some period, through 1938. R. E. Crummer was the leading factor in temporary refunding. Edward Ball, of the Du Pont interests, was the leading opponent. The Du Pont interests had extended their investments until by 1938 they were identified in practically all key centers of Florida commerce, agriculture, and industry.

1939: Economic conditions had improved. Strong Florida taxing units were seeking credit accommodations on permanent terms with lowered interest rates.

July 1940 to May 5, 1941: Ten taxing units offered $31,000,000 par value of bonds to the public on sealed bids. R. E. Crummer & Co. was the successful bidder for all of them.

May 5, 1941: Sarasota County, Fla., awarded to R. E. Crummer & Co. approximately $4,500,000 of its road and bridge bonds upon competitive bid, and against the heated competition of Leedy, Wheeler & Co. and Clyde C. Pierce Corp., who were being financed by the du Pont interests.

May 13, 1941: Section 16 of article IX of the Constitution of Florida was proposed by both houses of the legislature then in session, which had the effect of making all road and bridge bonds in the State semi-State obligations by a 50-year irrevocable constitutional pledge of 2 cents of the gasoline tax.

May 21, 1941: Roger L. Main, an officer of the du Pont companies, and Howard Wheeler of Leedy, Wheeler & Co., bond dealers, made a complaint to the Post Office Department in Washington, D. C., charging R. E. Crummer & Co. with a violation of the mail fraud statutes, with reference to the Lee County call that had been made for January 1, 1941, on certain of its road and bridge bonds.

May 30, 1941: Letter was written by Roger L. Main constituting letter of transmittal of exhibits left with the Post Office Department at the time of the visit he and Howard Wheeler made on May 21, 1941.

May 31, 1941: The Florida House of Representatives adopted a resolution (H. R. 46) purporting to create an investigating committee to investigate Florida bond refundings. (This is the committee which could not operate for want of an appropriation, and which in March of 1942 was revived by funds made available from the Governor's emergency fund.)

June 10, 1941: The post-office inspector at Atlanta, Ga., notified the general counsel of the Securities and Exchange Commission that the Post Office Department was instituting an investigation of R. E. Crummer & Co. to ascertain whether the company had violated the mail-fraud statutes.

September 30, 1941: The State board of administration refused to transmit $138,000 to the paying-agent bank, thus jeopardizing and impairing the contract of May 5, 1941, between Sarasota County and R. E. Crummer & Co. The money was necessary to meet a call pursuant to the terms of such contract of the road and bridge bonds scheduled for

October 1, 1941. (The record indicates that a subsequent suit in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida by R. E. Crummer & Co. against Sarasota County resulted in a judgment for and payment in full of this obligation, the company having been forced to advance that amount of money in order to protect its contract and make the call effective.)

September or October 1941: Two investigators from the Securities and Exchange Commission, Atlanta regional office, began the initial examination of R. E. Crummer & Co.'s records in the company's Orlando, Fla., office, under the guise of a routine investigation of matters within the purview of the company's broker-dealer permit.

January 6, 1942: Report of investigation of the Orlando office of R. E. Crummer & Co., conducted by M. J. McLaughlin and R. J. Wagner, was filed. This was transmitted to the Washington headquarters of the Commission and thence to its Chicago regional office, with instructions to continue the investigation there.

February 7, 1942: Post Office Inspector E. O. Jones who had been handling the investigation under the initial complaint submitted a report. (This report was not made available to the committee by the Post Office Department.)

March 23, 1942: Walter P. Fuller, a severe critic of R. E. Crummer & Co., solicited and was given the job of investigator for the revived H. R. 46 "State Committee" and directed his initial investigation to the Sarasota County matter involving the May 5, 1941, contract that had been repudiated by the State board of administration.

July 20, 1942: The State committee's investigator, Walter P. Fuller, accompanied by Wallace Shafer (a cosponsor of Florida House Resolution 46), conferred with an Assistant Postmaster General at Washington concerning the investigation being made by the Post Office Department. By this time, according to Fuller, the State committee's purpose had been enlarged, its aim was "to have the Post Office Department investigate the Crummer Co.'s activities" with a view to prosecution, and thereafter its purposes were "primarily concerned with the Crummer Co."

August 3, 1942: Post Office Inspector E. O. Jones was relieved by E. J. Mansfield, and shortly thereafter Walter P. Fuller established contact with Mansfield and began working in close cooperation with him.

September 3, 1942: Representatives of the Securities and Exchange Commission, Chicago regional office, Messrs. George W. Reutell, F. Joseph Butler, and J. Edwin Corbett, submitted their report of the examination of the Chicago office of R. E. Crummer & Co.

November 16, 1942: Securities and Exchange Commission Agents Reutell and Butler conferred with Post Office Inspector Mansfield in Jacksonville, Fla.

November to December 1942: Public copyrighted announcement published by R. E. Crummer & Co. announcing its dissolution as of December 31, 1942, and the formation of the Crummer Co. to conduct a general municipal bond business.

December 4, 1942: The Securities and Exchange Commission entered its first order directing that an investigation be made of the activities of R. E. Crummer & Co. and others, to ascertain possible violations of sections 15 (c) and 17 (a) of the SEC acts. Messrs. Abe Hoffman, Thomas B. Hart, and William Green were appointed examiners.

December 16, 1942: Post Office Inspector Mansfield submitted a report to the Chief Post Office Inspector. (The Post Office Department has refused to make this report available to the committee.)

December 1942: The Crummer Co. made application to the Florida State Securities Commission for an annual license to do business as a securities dealer commencing January 1, 1943.

January 14, 1943: The St. Joe Paper Co. (of which company Roger L. Main is treasurer), by Edward Ball, president, transmitted a letter to the Florida Securities Commission opposing the issuance of the license to the Crummer Co. and requesting an opportunity to appear before the Commission personally should it be inclined to further consider such application.

February 10, 1943: Mr. Aldrich, Assistant Postmaster General, advised the Director of the Trading and Exchange Division of the SEC at Philadelphia that the Post Office Department had decided to discontinue its investigation of R. E. Crummer & Co.

February 11, 1943: A special meeting of the Florida State Securities Commission was called and held, with neither the knowledge of the Crummer Co. nor an opportunity afforded it to be heard, in connection with the Crummer Co.'s application. At that time objections to the granting of the registration were received from Messrs. Edward Ball, Archie Clement, Walter P. Fuller, Clyde C. Pierce, and Thomas B. Adams. The commission then went into executive session and heard Messrs. Edward Ball, Clay Lewis, Walter P. Fuller, and Clyde C. Pierce present their objections to the granting of the license.

February 26, 1943: Mr. Aldrich, Assistant Postmaster General, informed the Securities and Exchange Commission that on the basis of a report from Post Office Inspector E. J. Mansfield, the Department had determined to continue the investigation. (The Post Office Department has declined to make this report available to the committee.)

March 24, 1943: The Florida State Securities Commission declined to issue a license for the year 1943 to the Crummer Co., there having as yet been afforded no opportunity to the Crummer Co. to be heard.

April 7, 1943: The Securities and Exchange Commission amended its initial order directing the investigation, by designating Alexander J. Brown, Jr., an attorney for the Chicago regional office, as an officer of the Commission. This action appears to have been intended to vest Brown with the power to issue subpenas.

April 12-13, 1943: Joint conference in Washington between representatives of the Post Office Department and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

May 1943: The State Senate of Florida passed Senate Resolutions 2 and 8 of the 1943 session, pursuant to which a committee was appointed and an investigation made which caused members of the committee to call upon the United States Senate because of the State senate committee's inability to cope with the situation created by the activities of Federal agencies.

June and July 1943: Mansfield joined SECA agents Brown and Reutell in the Midwest, interviewing numerous bondholders.

August 1943: By this time, and probably prior thereto, letter from Mansfield to Hart shows not only that the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Post Office Department had jointly determined to obtain indictments, but likewise they had determined the strategy to be best to have several indictments in various States.

December 1943: Peremptory writ of mandamus was issued by Florida State Supreme Court directing the Florida State Securities Commission to forthwith issue to the Crummer Co. a license which had been denied by the commission since January 1, 1943. Such writ was complied with on December 4, 1943, by the granting of a license expiring December 31, 1943.

January 5, 1944: The Florida State Securities Commission, without a hearing, refused to issue a renewal license (required annually to do business), as requested by the Crummer Co. for the calendar year 1944.

January 1944: The Florida State Supreme Court issued its enforcement order directing and requiring the Florida State Securities Commission to issue the renewal license for the year 1944 to the Crummer Co.

February or March 1944: Mansfield conferred with the office of United States Attorney Herbert Phillips of the Southern District of Florida at Tampa, in which district was located the main business office of the Crummer companies, recommending indictments. The United States attorney refused to prosecute the cases upon the ground that the matters had all been reviewed by the Federal courts in Florida pursuant to the Federal Municipal Bankruptcy Act.

June 1, 1944: Messrs. Mansfield, Brown, and Hart had a conference in the office of the United States attorney in Topeka, Kans., where they conferred with an assistant in the absence of the United States attorney, who was ill.

June 6, 1944: Letter from Assistant United States Attorney Luther to Hart advising that Judge Helvering had called a grand jury for Topeka to convene on July 10, 1944, at which time the case of *The United States* v. *R. E. Crummer et al.* should be presented.

June 16, 1944: Mansfield transmitted to Topeka, Kans., from Jacksonville, Fla., the draft of a proposed indictment against Crummer and others, involving the refunding of Panama City. The transmittal letter was directed to Assistant United States Attorney Luther and was received by the United States attorney's office on June 19, 1944.

June 26, 1944: Criminal reference report was filed by the Securities and Exchange Commission with the Department of Justice, signed by Robert S. Rubin, special counsel for the SEC, recommending prosecution of R. E. Crummer and others.

July 5, 1944: Telegram was sent from the Department of Justice to the United States attorney in Kansas, authorizing the cases to be submitted to a grand jury, if the United States attorney agreed, and advising that a letter would follow.

July 7, 1944: Letter referred to in the telegram of July 5, 1944, was written. (It was received by the United States attorney's office in Kansas on July 10, 1944.)

July 8, 1944: Letter from Harlow B. King, assistant United States attorney at Topeka, Kans., to the Administrative Assistant to the Attorney General, advising that a grand jury had been called to convene July 10, 1944. (George H. West, the United States attorney for the district of Kansas, was absent during all of the months of June, July, and August, 1944, due to illness.)

July 10, 1944: A. J. Brown, Jr., of the SEC legal staff, Chicago office, was appointed by the Attorney General as assistant to the United States attorney at Topeka, Kans. On this same date the special grand jury was convened by a judge of the circuit court of appeals, in the absence of the resident district judge.

July 17, 1944, to August 3, 1944: The special grand jury heard the matters presented and on August 3, 1944, returned two indictments against R. E. Crummer and some 10 or 12 others, involving Panama City, Fla., and Citrus County, Fla., refundings.

January 1945: The Stuart City matter was presented to United States Attorney West, of Kansas, who had returned, and he declined to prosecute the Stuart case.

January 18, 1945: Senators PEPPER and ANDREWS, of Florida, introduced Senate Resolution 35, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, reported out without amendment February 19, 1945, and agreed to February 26, 1945.

March 8, 1945: Mansfield forwarded a proposed indictment, a list of defendants and witnesses, and a report to the United States attorney at Cincinnati, Ohio, urging its presentation to the grand jury for the purpose of indicting R. E. Crummer and others.

Copies of all these papers were forwarded to the Chicago regional office of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

March 10, 1945: Mansfield conferred with the assistant United States attorney at Cincinnati, Ohio, to present the Stuart case and attempt to obtain prosecution thereof. Representatives of the Securities and Exchange Commission attended the conference.

April 25, 1945: The State Senate of Florida unanimously adopted the report of its committee, appointed by authority of Senate Resolutions 2 and 8 of its 1943 session, which committee report found interference by the Securities and Exchange Commission and postal authorities, and recited the action of the United States Senate under Senate Resolution 35 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, and this subcommittee's initial report thereunder (S. Rept. 159, 79th Cong., 1st sess.).

November 6, 1945: United States attorney at Cincinnati advised the Chief Post Office Inspector at Washington, respecting the Stuart case, as follows: "We went into this matter very carefully and after full consideration of same, prosecution is declined."

June 10, 1946: The United States attorney, Topeka, Kans., at the direction of the Department of Justice, moved to dismiss both the August 3, 1944, indictments against R. E. Crummer, et al. The motion was granted, the cases dismissed, and the Government agents ordered to return all records of the defendants then in their possession.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4002) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have a vote on the pending amendment?

Mr. McCARRAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Overton
Brooks	Holland	Pepper
Buck	Ives	Reed
Bushfield	Jenner	Revercomb
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Kem	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kilgore	Smith
Capper	Knowland	Sparkman
Chavez	Langer	Stewart
Connally	Lodge	Taft
Cooper	Lucas	Taylor
Cordon	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McClellan	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Tydings
Eastland	McGrath	Umstead
Ecton	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	White
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota to the pending bill.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, line 7, before the period, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That the existing rivers and harbors project for Fire Island Inlet, N. Y., as authorized by the act approved August 26, 1937, is hereby modified in accordance with the report of the division engineer dated May 16, 1947, subject to final approval by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and the Chief of Engineers."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, and violates rule 16 of the Senate rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order made by the Senator from Louisiana is a good point of order against the amendment.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, regarding the point of order made by the Senator from Louisiana, I point out to the Senate that day before yesterday I sent to the desk notice that I intended to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule 16 under the provisions of rule 40.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have only to say in behalf of the distinguished chairman of the committee that, so far as he personally is concerned, he has no objection to the amendment.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I should like to press the motion to suspend the rule.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator give a brief explanation of what the amendment is?

Mr. IVES. I shall be very glad to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I should not be urging this amendment on the floor of the Senate if the matter were not urgent. No one recognizes the need for rules and the need for following rules in a legislative body better than I. However, in this particular instance, due to the fault of no one connected with either House of the Congress, we are faced with an amendment which is intended to cure an emergent condition. If not cured this condition will cause serious consequences on Long Island.

Fire Island Inlet, with which I assume the Members of the Senate are not at all acquainted, connects the Atlantic Ocean with the Great South Bay, an intercoastal waterway directly south of Long Island. This inlet is the only means by which ingress can be made from the ocean to Great South Bay. As a result, the southern shore of Long Island is dependent to a vast extent upon the use of this inlet for shipping purposes, particularly in respect to fuel oil and oil products. The ordinary means of transportation, namely, railroads and motor vehicles, are not sufficient to handle the amount of traffic of this nature which must be had if the southern part of Long Island is to have the amount of fuel and other products necessary for its proper maintenance. Over the last number of years, because of the currents, because of storms and hurricanes which had occurred in that particular section of the country, the inlet has been gradually closed. Only a few years ago the Army built a $1,000,000 breakwater at the end of the inlet. That today is threatened, unless the project sought for in the amendment is actually put into execution. The amendment provides, on the basis of the report of the Army Engineers, the necessary amount of dredging to keep the inlet open, as it must be kept open. No appropriation is here involved. The State of New York itself has appropriated funds to take care of the cost of the dredging. Perhaps some day the State may be repaid; but I assure the Senate that in taking the action I am taking here today, I am doing so with a full realization that the State of New York may never be repaid for the $309,000 involved in the dredging project. It is so vitally necessary that we as a State are perfectly willing to go ahead with the undertaking and pay for it, if granted the authorization, with the strong possibility that we may never be repaid, in order to protect our own people on Long Island. That is why I am offering the amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield——

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is making a very impressive statement. I am wondering whether or not this same speech was made before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. IVES. It was not; because I did not have the information which I now have in my possession. The report was very late in arriving here. As a matter of fact, it was my understanding that it did not arrive in time for adequate consideration by the House.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator made a statement a moment ago, as I recall, that the inlet has been filling up gradually for a number of years. Apparently everybody knew about it, and I am wondering why something was not done about it sooner.

Mr. IVES. The State of New York itself over the last few years has been appropriating moneys, insofar as may be necessary to take care of the situation, when the State itself could possibly do so. But the condition now has reached a pass where the State itself can go no further without Federal authorization. That is what is requested in this instance.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am in sympathy with what the Senator is attempting to do. However, I am wondering, if it is opened up with an amendment of this kind, how far we may have to go in the consideration of other amendments presented on behalf of different sections of the country. It may be they will present situations before the Senate which are just as serious as is the condition of which the Senator from New York speaks.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I know of no other proposed amendments to the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Amendments could be offered, however.

Mr. TAFT. Oh, amendments could be offered in the future, too.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Illinois is not going to propose any amendments to the bill, but certainly the amount of money that has been granted by the civil-functions committee, so far as Illinois is concerned, is not in line with what was recommended by the Army engineers, though I am not going to make any objections to it.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I should like to indicate to the Senator that it is extremely unlikely an emergency of this character will arise, certainly at this session of the Congress. It would be very unlikely that it would arise frequently. We have here a situation that calls for action. If this is not done during the early fall, the south shore of Long Island, by next winter, may be in a serious situation. That is the emergency with which we are confronted.

Mr. LUCAS. What I cannot understand is that those who were in charge of this emergency proposition realized that it is an emergency in the last moments of the closing days of the Congress. Perhaps I am wrong, but I gained the impression from the remarks of the able Senator that it was something that had been gradually coming on, month after month, year after year; yet here all of a sudden it becomes a great emergency. If I am wrong about that, I shall of course stand corrected.

Mr. IVES. On the face of it, as the Senator states it, it would appear as the Senator pictures it; but actually it is a condition on which the Army engineers have been working for a considerable period of time. It is only very recently, in last May or June, that their report was issued. Consequently, without the report, it was impossible to get information to the Congress in time to afford a basis for proper consideration. It was fully realized that this condition was becoming more serious all the time, but only at this very moment has it actually come to the critical point where something must be done.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the motion was made before the Appropriations Committee to authorize the chairman of that committee to present the amendment on the floor. That motion was voted down by a very heavy vote; I do not recall exactly how many were for the amendment, and how many were against it. The ground of the opposition—and I made the motion—is one that is based on law. The Appropriations Committee has no authority whatever to act upon the authorization of any project for flood control and river and harbor improvement. We might just as well have a report, if that could be done, from the Committee on Banking and Currency or the Committee on Finance. The Appropriations Committee has one function to perform—to recommend appropriations for a project which has already been authorized.

The process of authorizing a project is one that is long established, established by law, and established by the Congress of the United States. When either a Senator or a Member of the House desires a project to be initiated, he first gets Congress to authorize a preliminary examination and survey. That is done. The survey is made by the district engineer. The district engineer conducts public hearings, and those who are for the project or against the project may appear. A record is made of all they have to say, both for and against the project. Then the district engineer makes his report to the division engineer, and the division engineer enters into a thorough scrutiny of the project. When the division engineer has finished, he makes his report, with such modifications as he desires and with such recommendations as he desires, to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors sets the project down for hearing. Those who are in favor of the project may appear, and those who are opposed to it may appear. The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors again conducts a thorough hearing and makes a thorough examination. They make their recommendation to the Chief of Army Engineers. The Chief of Army Engineers acts upon it. All this is provided for by law. He makes the recommendation, but before he can do that, under the law recently enacted, he must submit his report to the Governor of the State affected, or the Governors of the different States affected, and obtain their views upon the subject. If it affects the Department of the Interior, he must obtain the views of the Secretary of the Interior. When all that is done, the project which is recommended as a result of those different steps in the process, does not go before the Appropriations Committee to be authorized. It goes before the Committees on Public Works of the House and of the Senate, under the Legislative Reorganization Act. Prior to that act, it went before a committee of the House, known as the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and before another committee, known as the Flood Control Committee. In the Senate, it then went before the Commerce Committee.

The Committee on Public Works holds a hearing. It gives notice to all who favor the project to appear before the committee and all who oppose the project to appear before the committee. Hearings are held. The Corps of Engineers appear and make an explanation of the project and present their recommendations. The committee, after considering the testimony of the witnesses and the reports that have been made, either recommend the project or reject the project. That is the process authorized by law. When the committee makes a recommendation of a project it is brought in the shape of a bill before the Senate or the House, and the Senate or the House acts upon it. That procedure is the result of long experience. We have found that if we do not pursue such a course meticulously we are going to be authorizing projects which never ought to be authorized. Such projects have been authorized in the past. There is no doubt about that. I remember when I first came to the Senate, that a Rivers and Harbors bill was reported, and any Senator who wanted a project acted upon submitted an amendment providing for it and it was incorporated by the committee. The result was such a bill that when the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] got up on the floor and opposed it and showed how ridiculous some of the projects were, the Senate voted the bill down and we had no Rivers and Harbors bill that year.

Mr. President, the project in question may be an emergent one. I do not know anything about it. But it would be setting a precedent from which it would be difficult for the Senate to escape if we should take the action now proposed. If we were to follow such a precedent all I would have to do would be to say "I have a meritorious project in Louisiana"—and heavens knows I have many of them—and say, "I wish to offer an amendment to the bill to authorize my project to be proceeded with," to do so without any hearing having been held before the proper committee, at which those who favor the project may appear and those who oppose it may appear, and then get the Senate to authorize the project and the House to concur in it.

That is not the proper way to legislate in rivers and harbors matters and in flood-control matters. There is only one way to legislate properly, that is to go through the proper channels of engineering, the proper channels of committees authorized by the Congress. There is only one committee in the Senate which has any functions to discharge in reference to flood control or rivers and harbors projects, and that is the Committee on Public Works. The Reorganization Act specifically directs that all projects connected with rivers and harbors and flood-control works should be brought before the Committee on Public Works and be examined by it, and report made by that committee to the Senate. If we depart from that rule, if we let the Finance Committee or any other committee make a report on a rivers and harbors project, or, if a bill should be pending and a Senator should offer an amendment to it to authorize a rivers and harbors or flood control project which, as in the present case, has not even gone through the process of hearings, has never been acted upon by the Committee on Public Works, has not been acted upon by the Chief of Engineers, has not been submitted to the State of New York—if we proceed and disregard the law and authorize such a project, I do not care how emergent it may be, we will establish a precedent which will rise up to harass us in the future.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I understand, it is proposed that we should now proceed to legislate on a project, and give approval to it afterward by the Corps of Engineers, or from the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, or from the Chief of Engineers. As I understand the procedure which is usually followed, approval is first received of a project

from the proper officials, and then the recommendation is acted upon by the proper committee, which reports the proposed authorization favorably. Is that not correct?

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator's statement is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is now proposed to turn that order of procedure around. If such a course should be followed, there could not be much integrity in such legislation. If we take such a course in the present instance, we must take a similar course in other instances. If a Senator has a project with respect to which he desires to place an amendment in a bill, subject to the approval of the Corps of Engineers, the regular and established procedure would be reversed, if the pending amendment should be adopted and such a precedent established and hereafter followed.

Congress, Mr. President, should have the final authority in such matters, not the Corps of Engineers, nor any other agency. Only Congress should have the final say in the matter. Here it is proposed that we reverse the whole legislative procedure. It is proposed that the Senate shall act on an amendment, and grant final approval of the project to the Corps of Engineers. Is that not a correct statement of what is now proposed, I ask the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct. If we should agree to the amendment we would be acting without any advice from the Chief of Engineers, from the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors; we would be acting on a bill which has never been considered by the Committee on Public Works. It is proposed to place the amendment on an appropriation bill, but not even a dime of appropriation is asked for. It is not an amendment providing for an appropriation at all.

Mr. McCLELLAN. But the pending bill is an appropriation bill, and it deals with projects which have been authorized, and which have passed through the proper channels. If the proposed amendment is adopted we shall simply be reversing the whole process, and Congress will be delegating power to some board, or to the Chief of Engineers, to do the legislating with respect to flood control for the Government. It will result in delegating to such agency the final decision, and the Congress surrendering final decision.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is correct.

The Senator from Ohio a few years ago, at two different sessions of Congress, pressed for favorable action on some project in his State, without the measure having gone through the proper engineering process and being considered by a committee. He desired the Senate of the United States to approve such a measure without it having gone through the proper channels. I had to object to it. I hated to object to it. I do not like to object to any project that may be meritorious, but I want its merits established in the proper way and be properly considered by the engineers and by the proper committees.

The Senator's amendment was not agreed to. I think the Senator from Ohio perfectly understood the situation after he had time to reflect upon it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. My own opinion was that the flood out of Lake Erie was just like a flood out of the Mississippi River, and that there was exactly the same authority for such a project as there was for flood-control works on the Mississippi. I entirely disagreed with the Senator. At that time, however, I was unable to obtain the approval of the Senate.

Mr. OVERTON. But the heavy floods are on the Mississippi. We dare not undertake a project on the Mississippi unless it has gone through the regular processes. The trouble with the amendment which the Senator from Ohio offered was that it had not gone through the regular engineering processes nor the regular legislative committee processes.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I should like to point out one or two things in connection with what the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has had to say. In the first place, the procedure which the Senator has spoken of, has been followed insofar as it has been possible to follow up to the present time. The report of the division engineer was submitted May 16, and the matter is now subject to final approval by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and the Chief of Engineers. The amendment makes the whole project contingent upon such approval. Naturally it would be a bit difficult to hold a hearing on something in respect to which there has been no final approval. However, as I indicated in my previous remarks, the information was not in my possession in time for final approval. That is why the contingent provision was incorporated in the amendment. Furthermore, I want to point out that the State of New York is ready to advance the necessary money to pay for this project. All we ask is the authorization.

Mr. OVERTON. Before the Senator proceeds to the State of New York. The Senator says all he wants is approval by the Chief of Engineers. But what about the function of the Committee on Public Works? Would the Senator deny that committee the authority which the law imposes upon it to examine into the merits of the proposal?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I prefaced my remarks by stating that no one has a higher respect for, or a greater realization of, the proper procedures and functions of committees in a legislative body, than does the junior Senator from New York. I know the value of committees. I know the necessity for committees, and I know the necessity for following committee procedure. No one will ever have to convince me of that. But at the same time I recognize that now and then there are emergency situations in which it is necessary to bypass the regular procedure of committees. This is not being done with the idea of deliberately bypassing the Committee on Public Works. That is not the thought. This is a situation in which it was impossible to present the project to the Committee on Public Works for a hearing and approval.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Can we bypass the Committee on Public Works and comply with the Reorganization Act?

Mr. IVES. I think by the suspension of the rule, as I have indicated, it can be done.

Mr. OVERTON. There is a project in Louisiana which would connect New Orleans with the Gulf of Mexico by a channel known as the Tidewater Canal. That project has gone to the division engineer, and it has been before the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. Does the Senator think for a moment that I would rise on the floor of the Senate and ask the Senate to approve the project, which has not been considered by the committee?

Mr. IVES. There are a couple of questions which I should like to ask the Senator in that connection. In the first place, is it an emergency project?

Mr. OVERTON. It is emergent in this sense, that the harbor of New Orleans is daily growing more and more important, and is handling more and more tonnage.

Mr. IVES. Is the health of the people in New Orleans to be affected by delaying the project?

Mr. OVERTON. No.

Mr. IVES. The health of the people of Long Island is at stake in the situation that has arisen in New York. It is a question of having sufficient fuel in the winter.

Mr. OVERTON. No; it is not a question of health.

Mr. IVES. It is, in this connection.

Mr. OVERTON. However, the Louisiana project would greatly increase the prosperity of the city of New Orleans.

Mr. IVES. The next question I should like to ask the able Senator is this: Is the State of Louisiana contemplating paying for the project?

Mr. OVERTON. No.

Mr. IVES. We are. We recognize the emergency to be so great that we have already appropriated money to pay for the project; and if we never get back a cent from the Federal Government it will be all right with us.

Mr. OVERTON. Why does not the State of New York then proceed to construct the project?

Mr. IVES. Because we need this authorization in order to go ahead.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not see why any authorization should be necessary.

Mr. IVES. I am informed that it is necessary before the project can be undertaken. Otherwise we would go ahead.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I have made the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rule, on July 22 the Senator from New York served notice that he would make the motion to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of offering an amendment to House bill 4002, the pending bill. The motion of the Senator from New York to suspend the rule is in order, under the rules of the Senate.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Is the motion now pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the pending motion.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is the motion debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is debatable.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is a two-thirds vote required to suspend the rule for this purpose?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the precedents of the Senate, a two-thirds vote is required.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in view of that fact I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hoey	O'Daniel
Brewster	Holland	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Ives	Overton
Brooks	Jenner	Pepper
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Cain	Kem	Russell
Capehart	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capper	Knowland	Stewart
Connally	Langer	Taft
Cooper	Lodge	Taylor
Cordon	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McCarran	Thye
Downey	McClellan	Umstead
Dworshak	McFarland	Vandenberg
Eastland	McKellar	Watkins
Ecton	Magnuson	Wherry
Ferguson	Malone	White
Flanders	Martin	Wiley
Fulbright	Maybank	Williams
George	Millikin	Young
Green	Moore	
Gurney	Morse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Seventy-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] that paragraph 4 of rule XVI be suspended for the purpose of his offering an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. OVERTON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are unavoidably detained. These Senators, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are detained on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent on public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, would vote "yea," if present.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—42

Aiken	Ecton	Moore
Baldwin	Ferguson	Morse
Ball	Flanders	Murray
Brewster	Gurney	Reed
Bricker	Hawkes	Revercomb
Brooks	Ives	Taft
Butler	Jenner	Thye
Cain	Kem	Vandenberg
Capehart	Knowland	Watkins
Capper	Langer	Wherry
Cooper	Lodge	White
Cordon	Malone	Wiley
Donnell	Martin	Williams
Dworshak	Millikin	Young

NAYS—34

Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	O'Daniel
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Kilgore	Overton
Downey	Lucas	Pepper
Eastland	McCarran	Russell
Fulbright	McClellan	Sparkman
George	McFarland	Stewart
Green	McKellar	Taylor
Hatch	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	Maybank	Umstead
Hoey	Myers	
Holland	O'Conor	

NOT VOTING—19

Bridges	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	McGrath	Tobey
Bushfield	McMahon	Tydings
Chavez	Robertson, Va.	Wagner
Ellender	Robertson, Wyo.	Wilson
Hickenlooper	Saltonstall	
Hill	Smith	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Two-thirds of the Senators not having voted in favor of the motion to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI, the motion is lost.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, does that complete all the amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still open to amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on the question of final passage, I wish to ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is necessarily absent, I wish to read the following statement:

I am aware that it is unusual for the chairman of the Appropriations Committee to vote against the passage by the Senate of a bill reported by his committee. But I wish to have it understood that in my judgment the appropriations recommended in the War Department civil function bill are far in excess of what they should be. I cannot in good conscience support the bill.

The excessive appropriations recommended are completely inconsistent with sound Government economy, the announced sound economy program of the Republican Party, and are not in the best interests of the country as a whole.

It is unfortunate that this War Department civil functions bill came to us so late from the House of Representatives, and even more unfortunate that the President chose such a tardy date in this session of the Congress to make his unprecedented request for additional funds included in this bill. I think a thorough examination of the bill will be revealing not only to the Senate but to the country in the amounts appropriated, the total costs of the projects included in the bill, and their locations.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to join the able senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, in the statement he has made, which has just been read. I should like to adopt it as my own, as to the reasons why I cannot vote for this bill.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I find that this bill carries appropriations of $539,927,449. As the bill was passed by the House, it provided for appropriations of $339,186,869.

After the bill was passed by the House, it came to the Senate. On July 17, 1947, the President sent to Congress a communication recommending that the Congress appropriate, for flood control in the Mississippi River Basin, $250,000,000. Of that amount, $237,000,000 is included in this particular appropriation bill.

After the bill was referred to the committee, the committee saw fit to include in the bill not only appropriations for flood control in the Mississippi Valley or Mississippi River Basin, but appropriations for flood control elsewhere in the United States.

Mr. President, I find that I cannot join in such a proceeding. I also find that the committee, of which I am a member, saw fit to include in this bill river and harbor appropriations as well as flood-control appropriations. Mr President, I believe in flood control. I believe we should control the rivers of this country. But I believe that if we had appropriated for specific items, for particular dams, in the Mississippi Valley or Mississippi River Basin, and if we had allowed them to be erected in the speediest possible time, we would have been doing the proper thing, instead of making a "pork barrel" measure out of the bill.

Mr. President, this bill does not line up with my ideas of economy in Government. I think we should economize. But the way this bill now stands before the Senate for a vote, we cannot economize; and this bill is not in accordance with the principles of the Republican Party.

Therefore, as has been indicated by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I cannot vote for this bill; and I hope it does not pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. MORSE and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN answered in the affirmative when his name was called.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I was addressing the Chair before the roll call began.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I withdraw my vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have a great deal of sympathy with the letter which has been read by the Senator from Ohio——

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. OVERTON. The roll call has been begun, and the first Senator whose name was called has voted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas was addressing the Chair at the time when the call of the roll began.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. That means that the bill is open to debate by any Senator who wishes to address himself to it; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have a great deal of sympathy with the views expressed in the letter from the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, which has been read by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. In the committee, there was a discussion of the limit which should be placed upon these items, particularly those for flood control. There was no discussion in the committee, so far as I know, of the increase in the item for rivers and harbors. I voted for the lower appropriation in the committee.

If we had more time, Mr. President, I certainly would hope that the bill would receive further attention in the Senate. We are within a few days of the end of the session. Undoubtedly there are situations which must be met. So I am going to vote for the bill, but reluctantly, and in full agreement with those who claim that there are many wasteful items of appropriation in the bill. There is not time for further attention by a Senate committee except in conference with the House where, I hope, the amount carried in the bill will be reduced.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and the statement read by the able Senator from Ohio as coming from the chairman of that great and powerful committee indicates that the bill is not in accord with the program of the Republican Party. The Committee on Appropriations is dominated by the majority party. If it had not been for the vote of the majority party the bill could not have come out of the Committee on Appropriations as it has. Therefore, no one should be blamed for the fact that the bill is now before the Senate but the Republican Party.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on final passage of the bill.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, is a motion to recommit in order at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the Senator from Idaho is in order.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I offer a motion to recommit H. R. 4002 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to cut $100,000,000 from the appropriations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the junior Senator from Idaho to recommit to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to reduce the bill by $100,000,000.

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. LUCAS. Is the motion debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to recommit is debatable.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire of the able Senator on just what theory he is making his motion with respect to a reduction of $100,000,000?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I made some remarks during the debate on the bill this afternoon indicating that the committee had provided $200,740,580 in excess of the amount contained in the bill as it passed the House, and I referred to the fact that the flood-control item was approximately double the amount available during the fiscal year 1947, and from three to five times as much as has been appropriated during each of the previous 10 years for that particular item.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. How did the Senator arrive at the $100,000,000? Is that just a figure drawn out of the air?

Mr. DWORSHAK. No; I presume the Committee on Appropriations would use its discretion and good judgment in determining on which items the $100,000,000 cut could be made.

Mr. LUCAS. The instruction is specific, that if the bill shall be recommitted, it is to be reduced by $100,000,000 when reported back.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Less than the appropriation of $539,927,449 carried in the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will the Senator again read into the RECORD the figures of appropriation for the last 5 or 6 years preceding this? The Senator read them earlier in the afternoon.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I did.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will the Senator read them again?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I have the figures broken down for rivers and harbors and for the flood control general items. Does the Senator want the figure on the flood-control items?

Mr. McCLELLAN. On the flood-control items.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The records in the office of the Committee on Appropriations indicate that the following appropriations have been made for flood control:

1938	$49,000,000
1939	58,000,000
1940	133,000,000
1941	70,055,000
1942	98,780,000
1943	128,961,700
1944	4,385,100
1945	25,191,100
1946	108,831,000
1947	144,065,000

The amount in the pending bill for this item is $274,601,825.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Two hundred and seventy-four million dollars is proposed in the pending bill?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I did not hear the Senator's question.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Two hundred and seventy-four million dollars is proposed in the pending bill for flood control. Is that correct?

Mr. DWORSHAK. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will the Senator acknowledge that the period for which he has been reading the appropriations for flood control was a war period, when we had to dispense with the construction of a number of approved and important projects in order to concentrate on prosecution of the war?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that 1938 was not a war year, and only $49,000,000 was appropriated.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that in 1938 the amount of the appropriation to handle the construction of some projects that were authorized before and appropriated for before, would he double that appropriation if it were being made today.

Mr. DWORSHAK. That is a very legitimate reason——

Mr. McCLELLAN. The longer projects are deferred, the more expensive they will be to the Government. Notwithstanding the loss that has occurred from year to year from floods, flood control is something that needs to be provided for, not on the basis of politics, but on the basis of the best interests of the Nation. It can be deferred, but the price will be double when the Government finally does the work and the job has to be done. Is the Republican Party ready to stand in the way of progress? Is it ready to say that this Nation is not now in position, in this reconstruction period, to move out and do the job of reconstruction and the job of conservation that has to be done? Does the Senator want the Republican Party to take that position? Well, let them take it before the Nation, if they want to——

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I decline to yield further.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the Senator does not want to hear any more, then I assure him I shall talk further on my own time.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I am not seeking to represent my party in the motion I am making. I want that perfectly understood. I made it as an individual Member of this body, and in doing it I am fully cognizant of the fact that the public-works projects involved cost approximately double what they did a few years ago, and that, in my mind, is a legitimate reason why we should move cautiously in the wasteful expenditure of the public money.

Mr. President, I recall very vividly that it was less than a year ago when the Chief Executive froze all the funds in excess of $95,000,000 for the past fiscal year to be expended on flood-control items. Yet the pending bill provides for expenditures approximating three times the money which the President less than a year ago thought would be justified as an expenditure for the item of flood control.

Mr. President, I have no desire to attempt to debate whether my views coincide with those of the majority of the members of my party. I am in complete accord, however, with the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations in contending that we are in a position in which we are obligated, if not compelled, to use discretion and judgment in the expenditure of public money for the construction of public works.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator realizes that flood control in general was not assumed as a national responsibility until the year 1936, does he not?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I did not hear the question.

Mr. OVERTON. I say, the Senator realizes that the Federal Government did not take over flood control generally throughout the United States until the year 1936?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I quoted figures only back to 1936.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct. Then, during the years 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1946 there was $100 a year token appropriation. The appropriation made for flood control in general during the war years was $100 a year. Is not that a fact?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I quoted figures back to 1938 only, showing what the exact amount of the appropriations made for flood control by the Congress had been.

Mr. OVERTON. The appropriations were $100 a year. I remember it vividly, during the war years. They were token appropriations. The Senator must be thinking about expenditures, or perhaps he has reclamation mixed up in it; I do not know. But, speaking of reclamation, does the Senator know how much has been spent by the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation, in Idaho?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. Has the Senator those figures?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes, I have, Mr. President. I have stated here, during the afternoon, that when the Interior appropriation bill for 1948 was before this body, I was in accord with the economy which was provided for in that bill, on the basis that the reductions had been made for the Labor Department, for the Agricultural Department, for the Interior Department, and in all of the 12 regulation appropriation bills, and on that basis I can see no reason why we should economize in every activity of the Federal Government; but on the other hand, in the matter of flood control, that we should double the appropriation in 1948 over 1947.

I am in agreement with the Senator from Louisiana that flood control is a very essential and important activity of the Federal Government. I am not in opposition to the program at this time, but I merely want to point out that if we are economizing in other activities of the Government, then surely there is little justification now to say that there should be no economy in the Federal flood-control program during 1948. I think that is a logical and a consistent position to take.

Mr. OVERTON. I was speaking not only of 1948 appropriations, in reference to the Bureau of Reclamation's work in Idaho, but also in years gone by, in preceding years. Has the Senator a summary of how much money has been spent?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes. It is a very few millions of dollars, because during the war the reclamation program was curtailed very effectively, just as was flood control.

Mr. OVERTON. Yes; that was inevitable.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. May I call attention to the fact that every economist of the country, I think everyone who has ever spoken on the question of public works, has said we should hold public works to a minimum when we have a general business activity in the United States. We should plan them and use them liberally whenever there is a falling off, in the way of a depression; and yet today at the very height of the greatest business activity we have ever had, we are imposing on top of that a tremendous Federal public-works program. Not enough men are available today to do the work. We have not enough steel to take care of the civilian population. We have not enough of many other materials, and yet we are defying every principle that any economist has ever proposed, by enlarging to the greatest extent we have ever enlarged it, the public-works program in these several fields.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am fully aware of the fact that conditions in this country from an economic standpoint have not materially changed since August 6, 1946, when the President of the United States impounded the funds in excess of $95,000,000, to be expended for flood control. I believe that the President had some justification for that action then, and I think, consequently, that the Congress must now recognize that there has been very little change in the employment situation. The critical status of materials, the housing shortage, and other economic factors today indicate that the change has not been so great during the last 11 months that we can completely reverse the policy which was sponsored by the Chief Executive 11 months ago.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator from Idaho have the figures on the amount included in the President's $37,500,000,000 budget which was sent to Congress, in January.

Mr. DWORSHAK. For the item of flood-control budget estimate? No; I do not have that figure. As I recall, there was about $150,000,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. One hundred and fifty million dollars?

Mr. DWORSHAK. One hundred and fifty million dollars in the original budget submitted to the House just a few months ago.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not a fact that the amount suggested in the memorandum of recommendations by the President to the Congress on July 17, 1947, was that $250,000,000 would be in excess of and increase the budget of $37,500,000,000 to the amount of $250,000,000?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes; that is very obvious.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think we might recall, in regard to the remarks of the Senator from Ohio, about the state of business, that it was only about 10 days ago, in the argument on the tax bill, that I made the point particularly in a discussion with the Senator from Colorado, that I thought the great business activity that has just been mentioned, and so on, was not a proper time in which to reduce taxes, but if I understood the argument, then, the able Senator from Ohio indicated he thought we were on the verge perhaps of a recession in business, and I thought we ought to reduce the taxes in order to give a stimulus to business to greater activity and greater profits so there would be increased capital, and so on. Now, it seems the Senator from Ohio thinks business is so booming that these programs cannot be undertaken. I would think that is rather an inconsistent position.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, that was not my argument. It was that during the next fiscal year, according to any intelligent estimate of receipts and expenses, there would be a surplus of some $6,000,000,000; that under those circumstances, we should retire about $2,500,000,000 of debt. Out of the other funds, we would have a cash surplus of about $8,000,000,000. That would be a dangerous deflationary factor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If that is deflationary, we should speed this program along in order to help promote it.

Mr. TAFT. Apparently the Senator thinks that it is not the time to reduce taxes, but that it is the time to spend the money. I prefer to make a reduction in taxes and let the people spend the money.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The argument at the time we were considering a reduction of taxes was not that we were going to spend it on the Mississippi River and on the Missouri River; we were going to waste it on someone abroad. That was the argument made against continuing the taxes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I think I heard the name of the junior Senator from Colorado mentioned. I do not know which of the three theories the Senator has outlined he is attributing to me, but the principal one which he has attributed to me——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I made the point in the course of a little colloquy here one morning, when, as I recall, the Senator did me the honor of coming over to this side and listening. There were not many others. I made the point that, so long as business is as highly active and profitable as it is today, we should not reduce taxes. There is no better time to get taxes. If I understood the Senator from Ohio, there was nothing certain about this business, and it was very likely no one could tell but that we would have a recession by the end of the year, and that we should not count on this continued level of prosperity. In connection with that, there was a further argument which I think the Senator made, that we need a greater incentive for production, we need a greater incentive to attract risk capital into business, in order to build new business. If the Senator himself did not make that argument, I am sure it was made on behalf of the proponents of the bill. Yet now the evidence seems to be—at least, the Senator from Ohio says it is—that we are at the greatest peak of activity, and there would not seem to be any reason for a recession.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator from Arkansas has given a résumé of all the arguments which have been made for tax reduction, and I do not care to reargue the whole subject. I merely wanted to know which particular argument he attributed to me, so I might make clear of record whether I did make it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator, as chairman of the committee, made all the arguments. Others made arguments, but the Senator apparently concurred. I think they are all wrong.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I say that I do not wish to reargue the tax bill. I wish to say also that I did say that, whether or not we predict recession, when we have the money to make it, and also to make debt reduction, we should have tax reduction.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I realize fully that a few weeks ago we had disastrous, devastating floods in the upper Mississippi Valley, and in view of the fact I certainly would approve a proposal to provide additional funds, in excess of the budget, for that particular area of our country to relieve a distress that resulted from those floods. But an examination of the report submitted by the committee will indicate that a large proportion of the funds included for flood control is being allocated to areas far removed from the upper Mississippi River Valley, and therefore we must conclude there is little, if any, relationship in offering legislation to provide funds for flood control in the various sections of the country. There has been no change in those areas. I am fully in accord with the flood-control program, and believe it should be carried on in a systematic manner. But surely at this time, outside of the upper Mississippi and Missouri River Valleys, there is no reason, so far as I can see, for this extreme increase in the original budget which was submitted to Congress only a short time ago.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I have yielded the floor.

Mr. MYERS. I was about to ask the Senator from Idaho if he would be just as charitable to my State as he is to the Mississippi Valley. When I testified before the Senate committee, a Member of the House from Pennsylvania also testified, and he presented at that hearing numerous newspaper articles, numerous photographs, which visibly demonstrated just what was happening in Pennsylvania—not 3 years or 5 years or 10 years ago, but what had happened in Pennsylvania this year as a result of floods. I was going to ask the Senator from Idaho if he intended in his motion to recommit this bill that Pennsylvania's flood-control projects be curtailed because he seemed to indicate that he would dispense charity to the Mississippi Valley because of the floods that had recently occurred there. We had similar floods in Pennsylvania, I will say to the Senator from Idaho.

I do not consider this flood-control program, as was intimated by the Senator from Ohio, a WPA project. I consider this program to be vital and absolutely essential now. These projects are not now and never were recommended for the purpose of providing employment. It is a program to save lives and property in Pennsylvania and in many other States of the Union. So I think it is absolutely necessary that we proceed with adequate flood control immediately, so that we can build the dams and dikes and flood walls to prevent the floods of 1948 and 1949 and 1950.

I know the people of Pittsburgh and Punxsutawney and of Williamsport and St. Marys and Sunbury, those along the Clarion River, yes, and those from many other sections of Pennsylvania who suffered from the floods, in which lives have been lost and property damaged, would not like this kind of an economy program, Mr. President. I remember that during the debate on the legislative budget I put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a telegram from the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh recommending that the budget be reduced $6,000,000,000. Then I produced another telegram received from the same Chamber of Commerce the following day in which it recommended that the budget estimate be increased by $2,000,000 for the Conemaugh flood-control dam in Pittsburgh.

Those same men appeared before the House committee and recommended that it increase the budget estimates for this flood-control project in western Pennsylvania. I joined in that recommendation. The Senate subcommittee and the Senate full committee accepted the House figures and increased the budget estimate for this project by the sum of $2,000,000. I know that the people in western Pennsylvania do not like and do not want the kind of economy which is being attempted here in the Senate today—this penny-pinching, when the lives of Pennsylvanians are at stake.

And I know too that those in other sections of Pennsylvania where floods were on the rampage just this year don't like this false economy which guarantees devastation instead of security.

I hope, Mr. President, that we will not look upon the flood-control program as a glorified employment project, but that we look upon it as a program which will bring security and happiness to vast areas of the country, which will save the lives of many of my fellow Pennsylvanians. I predicted in the debate on the legislative budget that an attempt would be made to economize at the expense of the health and safety and security of the people. My prediction has come true.

So I sincerely hope the motion to recommit will not prevail.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from Idaho declined to yield further a few moments ago when I was discussing his motion. I am happy to know, however, that he acknowledges that he does not speak for the Republican Party. I hope when the vote is taken on his motion to recommit that his assurance that he does not speak for the Republican Party will be confirmed. I do not regard this appropriation bill, Mr. President, as a partisan issue. Certainly there are rivers, streams, and harbors in almost every State of the Union, irrespective of whether that State is Republican or Democratic. I know that in every valley of the Nation where devastating floods have occurred, the people of those valleys, irrespective of their party allegiance, irrespective, Mr. President, of what party is in power, look to the Congress to make the appropriations now in order to assure the carrying out of a constructive program which will ultimately provide the flood protection and the flood control that is needed, and more, Mr. President, that will provide for the development of our rivers, the water resources of the Nation, so that they may be utilized for the benefit of mankind.

Mr. President, the figures quoted by the Senator from Idaho clearly indicate that during the war the Nation was buckling down and making sacrifices and dispensing with those things that could be dispensed with in order to have our strength and might and resources mobilized and concentrated in the mighty war effort. The war is now over. We

have come to the period of reconstruction. Is the Republican Party, is the Democratic Party, is the Congress now willing to delay these much needed improvements, to delay and retard and hinder this program, simply because we are unwilling to make an appropriation, by reason of the fact that some economist says that this is not a period of depression, but that this is an era of prosperity, and therefore we will take the risk, ignore the danger, to our valleys, and not give the protection now, but if perchance another recession or depression occurs, then we will be willing to make some provision to give jobs? This program is not a temporary job program.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to the able minority leader from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] stated that economists had suggested that we hold back these appropriations until there was a scarcity of work, so that we might give employment to the people. I do not know who the economists are to whom the Senator from Ohio referred, but I wonder if those economists have devised any plan by which they can hold back the floods until there is unemployment?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The floods do not know anything about a budget. Providence never heard of a budget. The rains descend, the floods come, and the torment, damage, and devastation follow. If the Republican Party is not willing to go along with this program, it must assume the responsibility and be held accountable for the risk of damage which may ensue. I call upon them, in the name of America, in the interest of the people of the valleys of this Nation, not to hinder this program, but to advance it. The floods have come in the past. We have had them this year. Do the Republicans want them to recur? This is not a program that can be completed this year. It is a 10- or 20-year program. We must start some time. We ought to start now and carry through the program, and not hesitate and be timid about it. If we can reduce taxes by $4,000,000,000 and not cause inflation, we can spend half a billion dollars to preserve the resources of the Nation and protect property and human lives from damage and destruction. Make up your minds. You are either for constructive progress or against it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I certainly am opposed to cutting this appropriation or recommiting the bill. I know that in our State of Idaho we have had damaging floods. Although our section of the country is comparatively new, these disasters have begun to overtake us. Every year I receive pleas from three sections of the State of Idaho—from the Boise-Roberts section in the eastern part of the State, from along the Boise River, in the southwestern part of the State, and from the northern part of the State, in Boundary County. They have serious and recurring floods. As has been pointed out, the floods do not wait for unemployment to come along so that we can use unemployed persons to stem the floods or build the dikes or whatever else must be done.

The appropriations for some of our big dams have been cut. It would have been the more sensible thing to put the money into Palisades Dam to stop the floods before they get down to the lower country; however, dams generate power, and, therefore, the electric power companies bitterly oppose such undertakings. Of course, levees and dikes do not generate power, so it is much easier to get appropriations for these things. So, Mr. President, inasmuch as there is money in this bill to build flood-control works to protect the lives and property of the citizens of Idaho, I want to see this bill go through so that the work can be done. I cannot turn a deaf ear to the pleas of my neighbors. I do not believe in this theory of economy at any price.

It is not a question merely of preventing floods. If the water came and ran over the land and then receded, and that was all there was to it, that would be one thing. But when the water comes it takes away the topsoil in some of the finest sections of our great agricultural State, and it cannot be replaced now or ever at any price. I am sure that my colleague must be aware of the plight of our citizens.

I have put in a great deal of time and effort acquainting my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee with the dire need and the urgency and the necessity of making these funds available, now that relief is just within our grasp.

I plead with the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] not to press his motion, and to let the bill go through so that we may stem the floods which are doing such great damage to our State.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I shall be compelled to vote against the motion to recommit, on the practical ground that it is utterly impossible, within the time the Senate has to reconsider the question, to reallocate the funds so that there may be a logical distribution for construction at the points where the need exists.

The allocation of funds was not made by the Appropriations Committee or the Civil Functions Subcommittee. The allocation was made by the Army engineers, under direction of the subcommittee; and the sole direction was that the money be placed where, in the judgment of the body which has the only complete knowledge of this subject, the money should go.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. In a moment.

The allocation represented a distribution of funds based upon an examination, in the first instance, of the area involved, a determination of damage, a determination of the need for control, a determination of how that need could be met, and an estimate of the cost. The final allocation was the judgment of the greatest construction group in the world, and those who know most about the problem. It is utterly impossible, within the time we have, to reallocate these funds and do the equity that should be done—not to areas, not to States, not on the basis of political pressure—but equity to those who are in danger of losing their property or lives because of unrestrained floods.

I now yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I believe that the letter from the able chairman of the Appropriations Committee which has been read into the RECORD should have perhaps a little more attention. The Senator says:

> I am aware that it is unusual for the chairman of the Appropriations Committee to vote against the passage by the Senate of a bill reported by his committee, but I wish to have it understood that in my judgment the appropriations recommended in the War Department civil functions bill are far in excess of what they should be. I cannot in good conscience support the bill.

Whether or not these recommendations are followed is a matter for the Congress of the United States to determine. In other words, the sole responsibility rests with the Congress.

The chairman of the committee further says:

> The excessive appropriations recommended are completely inconsistent with sound Government economy, the announced sound economy program of the Republican Party, and are not in the best interests of the country as a whole.

It is a matter for the Republican Party in this Congress to determine whether or not the Senator is correct.

The chairman further states:

> It is unfortunate that this War Department civil functions bill came to us so late from the House of Representatives, and even more unfortunate that the President chose such a tardy date in this session of the Congress to make his unprecedented request for addition funds included in this bill.

We cannot place any responsibility on the President of the United States. The President of the United States is not responsible for the floods which occurred in the Mississippi, Illinois, and Sangamon Valleys recently, causing all the devastation, injury, and damage which have been done to the lands, the people, and the property. The responsibility for meeting the recent emergency rests in the Senate of the United States and in the House of Representatives.

As I see it, the responsibility rests entirely on the Republican Party to decide whether or not to go through with the recommendation, because they have the votes and the power. No letter of this kind, and no speech, can shift that responsibility.

It is interesting to note, Mr. President, that in the civil functions appropriation bill the House recommended nothing for New Hampshire, but I noticed that when the bill came before the Senate Appropriations Committee the amount recommended by the Senate committee for a project at West Peterboro, N. H., was $500,000, and that amount was sustained by the full committee.

In other words, New Hampshire came in for its share in connection with the flood-control program. It did not get anything in the House, but it got something in the Senate when the appropri-

ation was increased. That goes for Idaho as well, Mr. President.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, merely defending the good faith of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who is unable to do it for himself, let me say that the vote in the committee was for $210,000,000 against $300,000,000. We voted to cut out $90,000,000, which, if the vote had succeeded, would have eliminated the New Hampshire program. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has no particular interest in the New Hampshire project; he is interested in the over-all figure which might be included in the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BARKLEY. I desire to ask a question of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not understand the Senator from Ohio, in reading the letter from the chairman of the Appropriations Committee thereby adopts the views expressed in that letter. Is the Senator from Ohio opposed to the bill?

Mr. TAFT. I propose to vote to recommit the bill with instructions. If that motion fails, I shall vote for the bill, hoping that the House will accomplish the same purpose.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me make my observation, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia declines to yield at this time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the arguments which have been advanced back and forth in the Senate. The argument of economy appeals strongly to me, but at the same time, economy must be guided by wisdom. There has been discussed here the subject of the great damage which has been wrought by floods. The idea has been advanced that the public works should be deferred until there is a depression and lack of employment. But there is an argument which appeals very much to me and which has not yet been presented, so far as I know, and that is that these projects must justify themselves. They must all justify the outlay. In other words, the damage must be shown to be so great as to justify the expenditure. So it seems to me that whenever we can justify a project of this kind we can, within the bounds of reason, although it may seem to interfere with the economy we desire, go forward with the program.

With reference to reserving public works for a time of need, when there is unemployment, let me say to the Senate that we already have a program involving more than $900,000,000, with plans drawn and approved, ready to proceed. So I must say, with all respect to my friend from Idaho—and I do respect him very much—that when these projects have justified themselves, when the damage is shown to be greater than the cost involved, then I say that in fairness and justice to the people who suffer in trying to preserve the soil of the country, in the production of the crops so necessary for the welfare and sustenance of our people, we should go forward with the program.

With respect to the statement of the Senator from Illinois concerning the chairman of the committee—and I disagree with the view of the chairman of the committee on this point—I must say, in fairness, and in defense of his position, that he was not present, and the fact that some allotments for construction in the State of New Hampshire were received were not upon his request.

Those projects which were approved were recommended, Mr. President, by the Army engineers, not by any member of the committee, not by the Senators themselves. The chairman of the subcommittee instructed the Army engineers, regardless of State boundaries, to bring in a plan within an over-all limit. So no one is chargeable. The chairman of the committee certainly is not, because he was not even present.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. What is the duty of the Congress of the United States in matters of this kind? The Senator seems to be attempting to shift all the responsibility to the Army engineers.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am shifting no responsibility. I am saying that the committee was advised as to where the projects were needed. Certainly the Army engineers, with their information, could well advise us. The Senator from West Virginia is not shifting any responsibility. He will take full responsibility for his position.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Ohio indicated, by remarks he made, that he was defending the good name of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], indicating that something which I said in my speech reflected upon his good name. I certainly intended no reflection upon the able chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who is my very close personal friend. I was attempting to show that the letter needed a little certification.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, it seems to me that though this appropriation may appear to be rather great, I should point out again that each project involved is one which we have been told is needed and each one justifies the expenditure. That fact has been impressed upon the committee.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

For some years I have vigorously and earnestly urged that a different program be followed and a different policy be adopted in the allocation of flood-control projects, river and harbor projects, and the appropriation of the money necessary to complete them. It has always been my theory that the cost of the projects was increased by the policy which had been followed of distributing the money available for them between so many projects in so many different States and districts, and that they did take on the aspect of a pork-barrel procedure.

Three or four nights ago we discussed that subject in the subcommittee, of which I am a member, and I urged upon the subcommittee, as I have done before, the fact that we ought to follow a different policy. We are all very busy, particularly the members of the Appropriations Committee. I was so busy that I missed one evening session. The next morning I went to the subcommittee with a resolution which I had written out and which I offered to the committee. The resolution reads as follows:

> The committee is of the opinion that the present policy governing the allocation, appropriation, and use of funds made available for construction work is wasteful, tends to increase the cost from 20 to 50 percent, and delays effective flood control. The result of scattering money appropriated over a large number of projects of varying importance, completing few if any of such projects, leaves the territory affected without substantial relief from floods.
>
> The committee believes that the projects for which authorization is made should be classified by the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget as to their relative importance and urgency, from the viewpoint of flood control.
>
> The committee believes that the important projects directly affecting flood control should be designated, and appropriations limited to such projects, with a view of completing them in the shortest practicable time, and reducing the cost of the over-all program.
>
> The committee believes that such a policy would greatly reduce the final cost, and bring effective flood control to many areas years sooner than the present policy will do.

I offered that resolution in the morning. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] who was chairman of the subcommittee said to me, "That is precisely what we have instructed the Army engineers to do. We returned the whole program to the Army engineers with instructions to do precisely what you want and what you have stated in the resolution. So it is not necessary for the committee to adopt the resolution."

I offer that to the Senator from Illinois, not as trying to escape any responsibility nor as placing any responsibility upon the Army engineers. It is the way that I have believed for years that the work should be done. I have urged it in committee and in every place in which I had an opportunity; and this is the first time within my Senate experience that that kind of a policy is being followed. I think it is a commendable policy.

Let me say to the Senator from Illinois that, under that, the regrouping of the projects submitted for approval as those to which the money was to be applied, was made by the engineers, under this policy.

The committee voted on the question whether the over-all budget should be $210,000,000 or $300,000,000. I voted for a budget of $210,000,000. The subcommittee adopted the $30,000,000 budget. It was on the basis of the enlarged budget of $300,000,000 that the Army engineers made their choice of locations where the projects would be located and completed.

Let me say further—and I do not wish to detain the Senate—that I have a great deal of sympathy with the views expressed in the statement of the Senator

from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and I have a great deal of sympathy with what the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has said. I share to a considerable extent the views of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK]. But, Mr. President, we are within almost a few hours of adjournment. Something should be done about a flood-control program. There are conditions which must be remedied.

I think this bill carries appropriations for too much money. If the Senator from Idaho had not included in his motion the instruction to the committee to reduce the total appropriations under the bill by $100,000,000, I would have been tempted to vote to recommit the bill. But I think the part of the motion proposing a reduction by $100,000,000 constitutes too rigid a rule to lay down to the committee.

Mr. President, I shall vote in favor of passage of the bill. I hope that in conference the total appropriations carried in the bill may be reduced. I think they fairly and reasonably can be reduced; and I come from the section of the country that most recently has suffered from the floods that have occurred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] to recommit the bill to the Appropriations Committee, with instructions to reduce the amount of appropriations contained in it by $100,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate, but I wish to make a brief observation regarding this bill and the motion to recommit.

Mr. President, the projects covered by this bill have been authorized. Under the Flood Control Act of 1936, which was a compact, in a sense, between the Government of the United States and the people who from time immemorial had suffered from these recurring floods, about which they can do nothing, either individually or as communities, we passed the flood-control bill, by which we set out to implement the promises which had been made to the American people. Indeed, I think in the preamble of that legislation, if not in the platforms of both political parties, flood control was accepted as a national obligation. In that legislation we set out to coordinate the efforts of the Federal Government with those of the communities. In other words, the communities provide a part of the expense. I think as a rule they provide the rights-of-way for flood walls, although frequently it is a considerable burden upon them to do so.

We started out to try to relieve the valleys of this country from recurring floods which wipe out billions upon billions of dollars' worth of property and many human lives. We started out modestly, not only to build flood walls and other devices, but to build reservoirs to hold back the waters during the flood seasons, in order that later on the waters might be fed out into the rivers for navigation or irrigation or for such other purposes as they might be used. Eleven years ago, by our flood-control program, we promised the American people that gradually and systematically we would try to relieve our country of these devastating floods.

The fact that the President sent here, the other day, a message recommending the appropriation of $250,000,000 for the floods which we have immediately before us, which had occurred in the Middle West—and they were unusual floods, by the way—has no bearing upon the provisions of this bill. This bill contains appropriations for projects which were authorized years ago, all of which have been recommended by the Army engineers, upon whom we rely for expert information.

Mr. President, this program started out modestly. It had to be suspended altogether during the war; and in the entire Ohio Valley, which is one of the worst valleys for floods in the American continent, no work of any substantial amount was done during the war. We still had our floods. Property was washed away. People still had to move out of the lowlands and out of the low portions of the cities, even in the largest cities in the Ohio Valley, in order to save their lives and their property.

Now we have come to a point where the committee undoubtedly felt that we were justified in resuming the consummation of our contract with the American people, and resuming it on a little larger scale than that on which we undertook to proceed at the very beginning of the program in 1936 and 1937.

Mr. President, I am more familiar with the Ohio Valley than I am with any other portion of the United States, except the Mississippi Valley. I have lived in those valleys all my life.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. On that point, let me say that this program must necessarily be one of increasing costs, because as the years go by and as successive Congresses convene in session more and more projects are authorized.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. As the Senator from Kentucky has pointed out, we started in 1936, and then we assumed flood control as a national problem. Gradually we authorized various projects, after they had been studied and investigated by the Army engineers; and, year after year, more and more projects have been authorized. After they have been authorized, in order to provide for our welfare we must appropriate more and more money for them.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for that contribution. Of course, what he has said will be true up to a certain point, until we have completed the flood-wall projects and other projects. When they have been completed, the appropriations will gradually decrease and begin to disappear, except for appropriations for the maintenance of the projects.

Mr. President, this measure is not a pork-barrel bill. When the floods occurred nearly a decade ago, the American people and almost every organization in the United States and almost every newspaper in the country said, "This is a national obligation." In response to that feeling the Congress passed the Flood Control Act.

The mere fact that Members of the Senate go before the Appropriations Committee to urge appropriations is no indication that the projects to which they refer are not worthy or that the bill partakes of the characteristics of pork-barrel legislation. I went before the committee to recommend appropriations for projects on the Ohio River and other rivers tributary to it. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] went before the committee on behalf of his own home city of Cincinnati, and he was able to secure for it the appropriation of items for nearly a million dollars. I am in favor of that, because I think Cincinnati needs such protection, although there was no estimate in the budget for such projects for Cincinnati. However, I am glad to say that the Senator from Ohio was influential enough to secure the appropriation of $1,000,000 for those purposes, without a budget.

Mr. President, what is done in Cincinnati should be duplicated over in Kentucky, because the higher the walls they build in Cincinnati, the more water is thrown over into Kentucky. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. REED. Can Kentucky use all that water for its purposes?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, Senators will be surprised at the amount of water Kentucky can use. In Kentucky, a liquid is made that is used all over the United States; and if it were not for the amount of that liquid that is consumed elsewhere in the United States, every distiller in Kentucky would have to close down. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I am for the bill. I think it is a fair bill, and I think the committee which has considered it has given it discriminating consideration. I congratulate the subcommittee and the full committee, including the Senator from Kansas, who is a valuable and very able and industrious member of the committee——

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. For the wise foresight they have exhibited in bringing out a bill which has been screened and sifted until it has gotten down to the meritorious projects which can be wisely put forward by the expenditure made by the bill. I hope the motion of the Senator from Idaho will not prevail, and that the bill will pass.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Chavez	Fulbright
Baldwin	Connally	George
Ball	Cooper	Green
Barkley	Cordon	Gurney
Brewster	Donnell	Hatch
Bricker	Downey	Hayden
Brooks	Dworshak	Hickenlooper
Butler	Eastland	Hill
Byrd	Ecton	Hoey
Cain	Ellender	Holland
Capehart	Ferguson	Ives
Capper	Flanders	Jenner

Johnson, Colo.	Millikin	Sparkman
Johnston, S. C.	Moore	Stewart
Kem	Morse	Taft
Kilgore	Murray	Taylor
Knowland	Myers	Thomas, Utah
Langer	O'Conor	Thye
Lodge	O'Daniel	Umstead
Lucas	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
McCarran	Overton	Watkins
McClellan	Pepper	Wherry
McFarland	Reed	White
McKellar	Revercomb	Wiley
Magnuson	Robertson, Va.	Williams
Malone	Russell	Young
Martin	Saltonstall	
Maybank	Smith	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] to recommit the bill with instructions.

Mr. LANGER and others asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REED. I have a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I am informed that he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. The Senator from New Hampshire, if present and voting, would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], who are necessarily absent, would vote "nay" if present.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], who is absent on public business, would vote "nay" if present.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who is necessarily absent, is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 67, as follows:

YEAS—15

Ball	Ferguson	Saltonstall
Bricker	Flanders	Smith
Byrd	Lodge	Taft
Cain	Martin	Wiley
Dworshak	Moore	Williams

NAYS—67

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Myers
Baldwin	Hill	O'Conor
Barkley	Hoey	O'Daniel
Brewster	Holland	O'Mahoney
Brooks	Ives	Overton
Butler	Jenner	Pepper
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Capper	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Chavez	Kem	Robertson, Va.
Connally	Kilgore	Russell
Cooper	Knowland	Sparkman
Cordon	Langer	Stewart
Donnell	Lucas	Taylor
Downey	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	McClellan	Thye
Ecton	McFarland	Umstead
Ellender	McKellar	Vandenberg
Fulbright	Magnuson	Watkins
George	Malone	Wherry
Green	Maybank	White
Gurney	Millikin	Young
Hatch	Morse	
Hayden	Murray	

NOT VOTING—13

Bridges	McGrath	Tydings
Buck	McMahon	Wagner
Bushfield	Robertson, Wyo.	Wilson
Hawkes	Thomas, Okla.	
McCarthy	Tobey	

So Mr. DWORSHAK's motion was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is, Shall the bill pass? The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REED. I have a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I am informed that he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. The Senator from New Hampshire, if present and voting, would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maryland, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], who is necessarily absent, would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], who is absent on public business, would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who is necessarily absent, is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 78, nays 5, as follows:

YEAS—78

Aiken	Hayden	Murray
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Myers
Barkley	Hill	O'Conor
Brewster	Hoey	O'Daniel
Bricker	Holland	O'Mahoney
Brooks	Ives	Overton
Butler	Jenner	Pepper
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Capehart	Kem	Robertson, Va.
Capper	Kilgore	Russell
Chavez	Knowland	Saltonstall
Connally	Langer	Smith
Cooper	Lucas	Sparkman
Cordon	McCarran	Stewart
Donnell	McClellan	Taft
Downey	McFarland	Taylor
Eastland	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Ecton	McKellar	Thye
Ellender	Magnuson	Umstead
Flanders	Malone	Vandenberg
Fulbright	Martin	Watkins
George	Maybank	Wherry
Green	Millikin	White
Gurney	Moore	Wiley
Hatch	Morse	Young

NAYS—5

Ball	Ferguson	Williams
Dworshak	Lodge	

NOT VOTING—12

Bridges	McCarthy	Tobey
Buck	McMahon	Tydings
Bushfield	Robertson, Wyo.	Wagner
Hawkes	Thomas, Okla.	Wilson

So the bill (H. R. 4002) was passed.

Mr. GURNEY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. OVERTON, and Mr. RUSSELL conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and concurred therein; and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59 to the bill, and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3756) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 21 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its

disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 to the bill, and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 358. An act for the relief of Julian M. Thomas;

S. 483. An act to relocate the boundaries and reduce the area of the Gila Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes;

S. 526. An act to promote the progress of science; to advance national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes;

S. 706. An act for the relief of William D. McCormick; and

S. 1368. An act to amend section 2455 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to increase the size of isolated or disconnected tracts or parcels of the public domain which may be sold, and for other purposes.

ADDITIONAL REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following additional reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WATKINS, from the Committee on Public Lands:

S. 1133. A bill providing for the per capita payment of certain moneys appropriated in settlement of certain claims of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in North Dakota; with an amendment (Rept. No. 748);

S. 1698. A bill to define the exterior boundary of the Unitah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 749);

H. R. 2793. A bill authorizing an appropriation for the construction, extension, and improvement of a State tuberculosis sanatorium at Galen, Mont., to provide facilities for the treatment of tuberculous Indians in Montana; without amendment (Rept. No. 755);

H. R. 3064. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to the surviving members of the Laguna Band of Mission Indians of California; without amendment (Rept. No 750);

H. R. 3325. A bill to enable Osage Indians who served in World War II to obtain loans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 751); and

H. R. 3696. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Daniel Broken Leg; without amendment (Rept. No. 752).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Public Lands:

H. R. 3834. A bill to authorize a project for the rehabilitation of certain works of the Fort Sumner irrigation district in New Mexico, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 753).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Civil Service:

S. 1564. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the centennial anniversary of the movement of Henderson and Seth Luelling to the Oregon country; with an amendment (Rept. No. 754).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that he had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

On July 23, 1947:

S. 254. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Glenna J. Howrey;

S. 323. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to allow credits to and relieve certain disbursing and certifying officers of the War and Navy Departments in the settlement of certain accounts;

S. 616. An act to authorize the creation of a game refuge in the Francis Marion National Forest in the State of South Carolina;

S. 1180. An act to authorize the issuance of a special series of commemorative stamps in honor of Gold Star Mothers;

S. 1185. An act to provide for the disposal of materials on the public lands of the United States;

S. 1220. An act to transfer jurisdiction of certain lands comprising a portion of Acadia National Park, Maine, from the Department of the Interior to the Department of the Navy, and for other purposes;

S. 1348. An act to provide for the addition of certain revested Oregon & California Railroad grant lands to the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes;

S. 1515. An act to make surplus property available for the alleviation of damage caused by flood or other catastrophe; and

S. 1519. An act to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

On July 24, 1947:

S. 364. An act to expedite the disposition of Government surplus airports, airport facilities, and equipment, and to assure their disposition in such manner as will best encourage and foster the development of civilian aviation and preserve for national defense purposes a strong, efficient, and properly maintained Nation-wide system of public airports, and for other purposes;

S. 512. An act to extend provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to the Virgin Islands;

S. 682. An act to regulate the interstate transportation of black bass and other game fish, and for other purposes;

S. 753. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to defer the collection of certain irrigation construction charges against lands under the Flathead Indian irrigation project;

S. 1262. An act to provide a central authority for standardizing geographic names for the purpose of eliminating duplication in standardizing such names among the Federal departments, and for other purposes; and

S. 1497. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of cottonseed and cottonseed products, and for other purposes," approved August 7, 1916.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Public Lands:

James Boyd, of Colorado, to be Director of the Bureau of Mines, vice Royd R. Sayers.

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Honorable Philip L. Rice, of Hawaii, to be judge of the fifth circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii; and

Charles M. Eldridge, of Rhode Island, to be United States marshal for the district of Rhode Island, vice Neale D. Murphy, resigned.

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Rudolf E. Schoenfeld, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Rumania;

John A. Bovey, Jr., of Minnesota, and sundry other persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States; and

Charles F. Baldwin, of Maryland, and sundry other persons, for appointment as Foreign Service officers and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1948

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4269, Calendar No. 727, the bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes. The bill contains all the appropriations for foreign relations and other important matters, amounting to $1,600,000,000, and is the last appropriation bill, except the one containing very minor items which we may consider on Saturday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I object, and I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 610, House bill 2181, relating to institutional on-farm training for veterans.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia objects.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, Mr. President, I object.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator from Georgia desire to speak?

Mr. GEORGE. I do.

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2181 relating to institutional on-farm training for veterans. I will say very frankly——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair say to the Senator that another motion to take up is not in order so long as the unfinished business is a motion to take up. The unfinished business is the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to proceed to the consideration of the so-called Kem resolution.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, then I move to lay aside the unfinished business and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2181.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised, first, that the two subject matters cannot be joined in the same motion. Secondly, that the first part of the motion to postpone cannot be made. The only motion that can be made is to lay on the table, or to postpone to a day or an hour certain.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I move to postpone the unfinished business until January 3, 1948. I say very frankly now to the majority party that I propose then to move to take up House bill 2181. Consideration of it should not

occupy much time. Moreover, I am then perfectly willing to proceed, by unanimous consent, to the consideration of the last appropriation bill. It is not in order at this time, but I am willing to proceed to the consideration of that bill. The bill was actually reported on the calendar day of yesterday, but that happens to be the same legislative day as today.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. What is the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Georgia to postpone until January 3, 1948, the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to proceed to the consideration of the so-called Kem resolution.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, is that motion debatable?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is debatable, and is in order, both.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield the floor?

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be glad to yield the floor in a moment, Mr. President. I have no desire to debate the motion further than to state what it is, and what I have in mind. I state very frankly to the majority party that all I wish to do is to have the bill I have mentioned made the unfinished business, and that can be accomplished only by laying aside the unfinished business, or postponing it until January 3, 1948.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. BALL. Could not that also be accomplished by disposing of the unfinished business, which Senators on the other side of the aisle apparently are determined not even to permit the Senate to vote upon?

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator's question is so irrelevant that I shall not answer it. I am not impeding the progress of the unfinished business, and I would be perfectly willing to vote on it, so far as I am concerned. But I am not in control of the Senate, and I do not undertake to control the Senate.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that my motion to postpone the unfinished business until January 3, 1948, is made with one purpose in view, and that is then to move to take up House bill 2181. I state that I would be entirely willing then to lay aside House bill 2181 temporarily so the Senate could proceed with the consideration of the appropriation bill. But since I have been unable to make any progress whatever, I wish now to explain to the Senate and to the country what this particular bill is, and then I shall yield the floor, and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] may take the floor.

Mr. President, I have not spoken on the merits of the bill, but the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and others who have objected to the bill, have undertaken to say just what it was. For that reason I want to make clear precisely what it is. The bill would continue the present existing practice of the Veterans' Administration. It would give to the farm-boy veterans of the United States the right to have institutional training on the job, just as the village boy and the city boy have the right to such training.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be glad to yield in a moment, if the Senator from Massachusetts will permit me to proceed.

Mr. President, there is only one issue involved in this bill. If a farm veteran wishes to go to an educational institution, of course he has all the rights under the GI bill of rights. If he wishes to go to an agricultural school, he has the rights under the GI bill. If he is an employee, that is, if he is hired for a wage, under the existing law, he has a perfect right to take training on the job. The only issue in the bill is: Are the farm veterans who own or control the land which they themselves work entitled, under a standard set up in the bill, to have the benefit of the GI bill of rights? That is all there is in the bill.

I should like to make the situation perfectly clear. Last summer—I believe it was in August—the Veterans' Administrator decided, guided very largely by the gentlemen who function under him, that the farm boys of the country who fought in the armies of this Nation were entitled to only part-time benefits under the GI bill of rights, so he proceeded to issue an order under which the farm veterans would get about one-fourth as much as the boy who was studying how to become an automobile mechanic in the village or in the city, or the veteran who was undertaking to study how to be an assistant manager or vice president of a financial institution in one of the great commercial centers. He decided to cut the boy on the farm down to the status of a part-time beneficiary under the GI Act, as we call it, and stated that he would be entitled to receive tuition of only about $16 a month, and subsistence of about $20 a month. Perhaps I have the figures reversed.

At any rate, I took the matter up with General Bradley. I have great respect for General Bradley. I am reminded that what the Veterans' Administration proposes to pay these veterans would not pay for the equipment they require, and which they have already bought.

I took the question up with General Bradley, for whom I have great respect; and after I had talked with him on three successive days General Bradley finally said to me, "Let me have time to think this through." Later General Bradley advised me that he would revoke his order and let the farm boys who had gone into the war have the same treatment with respect to on-the-job training or institutional on-the-job training on the farm that he permitted other veterans to have when they were studying in the drygoods store, the bank, or the factory.

However, General Bradley said to me, "I think this educational program, so far as the farm veterans are concerned, should be placed upon a part-time basis, as I construe the law and as I think Congress intended. However, I will revoke the order. I will wait until the next session of the Congress has the opportunity to express its views."

Mr. President, that is all there is to it. The farm veteran can go to the vocational school or the agricultural college and get every benefit given under the GI Act. He can hire himself to some other man and become a trainee in agriculture and receive all the benefits that any other trainee can get. But if he arranges to get his own land and wishes to cultivate it, then General Bradley, at least, asserts the right to say that he can place him on a part-time training basis, which would, of course, greatly reduce his benefits.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask the Senator two questions.

First let me express to the Senator from Georgia my very deep appreciation for his discussion of the bill. It happens to be one of the veterans' bills upon which I have been trying for a great many days to get action.

Mr. GEORGE. I realize that.

Mr. MORSE. This one happens to be in the position of having already passed the House, so it is not in as serious a position as some measures for which I have been fighting, which have not yet passed the House.

The first question I should like to ask the Senator, by way of reemphasis of a point which he has already made, is this: Is it not true, in the opinion of the Senator from Georgia, that if we do not pass this bill, after the adjournment of the Congress in all probability General Bradley will reinstate the order which he revoked last summer?

Mr. GEORGE. I think there is no doubt about it. In fact, I understood General Bradley's statement to me to mean exactly that—that he would reinstate it unless Congress gave him a different directive.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say to the Senator from Georgia that, as chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill, that is also my understanding, because General Bradley feels that unless we take action in this session of Congress he should go back to his original interpretation of the law.

Mr. GEORGE. I am sure that is correct.

Mr. MORSE. The second and last question which I wish to ask the Senator from Georgia is this: The real purpose of the Senator from Georgia and the junior Senator from Oregon in regard to this bill is to give equality of treatment to farm-boy veterans, along with city-boy veterans, so far as the on-the-job training program is concerned. Is not that true?

Mr. GEORGE. That is exactly true. Let me add this: The most expensive provision of the Servicemen's Adjusted Compensation Act, or the GI Act, as we call it, is, of course, the regular educational program pursued by the veteran in the college or university.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. The second most expensive program is the on-the-job training. The least expensive program is

this particular program of the farm veteran who takes his actual and practical course in connection with his scholastic studies, on his own land.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts, as I promised I would.

Mr. LODGE. I wish to observe that when the Senator from Georgia says that the bill would benefit every farm boy in America, he is making a statement which I think is contrary to fact, because as the bill now stands it would not benefit the farm boy either in Massachusetts or Illinois. In fact, the passage of the bill as it now stands would seriously cripple, if not destroy, the whole on-the-farm training program which has been undertaken in those two States.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I did not make the statement attributed to me by the Senator from Massachusetts. The Senator misunderstood me. Whether the requirements in Massachusetts or Illinois come up to the minimum standard fixed in the bill, I do not know; and I am not disposed to quarrel about that issue. If they do not come up to the reasonable minimum standards fixed in the bill, if some reasonable proposal were made to take care of a State like Massachusetts or Illinois, which might not be able to meet those standards, I myself would have no objection to it. So I hope the Senator from Massachusetts will not misunderstand me. I did not say that the bill would benefit every farm boy, but I say it is the opportunity through which the farm veteran has the chance to get some training.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely want to say, in connection with the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts, that so far as the Southeast is concerned, the standards are set more or less by the States. The Senator from Georgia well remembers that in my State 10,000 persons were threatened with being turned off last August. Every one of them gave up his right to go to college and his rights under the GI law to a college education, by signing for on-the-job farm training.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. In lieu of their college education and benefits they signed up for on-the-job training in the rural areas. So they have much more to lose if the bill does not pass than the simple statement of General Bradley would indicate. He made the statement to the Senator from Georgia, to the Senator from Oregon, and certainly to me, in no uncertain terms, that unless the bill was enacted he would not continue the program after this coming August.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does this apply only to the farm boy who works his own farm?

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no. There is no issue with respect to any of the farm veterans except the ones in control of the land themselves.

Mr. CAPEHART. Of what does the training consist?

Mr. GEORGE. The minimum standard laid down in the bill and which is the present practice in the States, is this: Institutional on-farm training includes any course of instruction approved by the appropriate agency of the State or the Administrator—that is, the Veterans' Administrator—which, when taken, is considered a full-time course when it combines, first, organized group instruction in agricultural and related subjects of at least 200 hours a year and of at least 8 hours each month, and, second, supervised work experience on a farm or other agricultural establishment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further at that point?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CAPEHART. What is the compensation for the 200 hours?

Mr. GEORGE. They would be subject to the same compensation that the on-the job trainee is subject to. They would get whatever the Administrator allowed them to have to the limit fixed in the present law, which is $65 for a single person.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is there any information which might be placed in the RECORD at this point regarding the question as to what they are taught, or what the veteran teaches himself?

Mr. GEORGE. If the Senator will permit me, I have tried to lay down the first standard for the veteran. The bill provides that if the veteran pursues part of his course on a farm under his own control—

(a) He shall receive not less than 100 hours of individual instruction per year, not less than 50 hours of which shall be on such farm (with at least two visits by the instructor to such farm each month). Such individual instruction shall be given by the instructor responsible for the veteran's institutional instruction and shall include instruction and home-study assignments in the preparation of budgets, inventories, and statements showing the production, use on the farm, and sale of crops, livestock, and livestock products;

(b) He shall be assured of control of such farm (whether by ownership, lease, management agreement, or other tenure arrangement) until the completion of his course.

The farm must be of such size and character as will occupy the full time of the veteran and permit instruction in all aspects of the management of a farm, assuring him a satisfactory income under normal conditions, if he continues operating the farm at the conclusion of his course.

I will say to the Senator that from my own personal knowledge the trainees who have been given benefits under the GI Act in my State have been those farm veterans who lived near or at least were accessible to a high-grade agricultural vocational school or an agricultural college. The boys were required to go each week to the school and put in so many hours of work, and they were also required, and are required, to put in so many hours of full-time work under instruction on the farm itself. A farmer requires a good deal of machinery, as the Senator from Indiana knows. The farm veteran must have certain machinery in order to maintain himself and to carry on his farm operations.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, this question occurs to me: Is this on-the-job training under which so much is paid to a single man and a larger sum to a married man?

Mr. GEORGE. Exactly.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If a man is working on his own farm does he have to make a certain amount before he gets extra pay for on-the-job training?

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, yes. If his income during the year totals the annual ceiling fixed—that is, the monthly ceiling multiplied by the months in which he draws his compensation allowed by the Administrator—he is treated just as the boy who works in the factory. He is paid so much an hour or so much a week and receives his subsistence allowance, subject always to the ceiling which is placed on him.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is the ceiling fixed for the farm boy the same as that fixed for the town boy?

Mr. GEORGE. Exactly. It should be the same and is the same.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. There seems to be a misapprehension that the farm boy works under supervision only 2 hours a week. As a matter of fact, does he not work under supervision all the time? The 2 hours a week represents the time that a supervising instructor spends with him, who lays out his work for him, and then comes around to see that the boy has followed his instructions?

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. The farm boy works under supervision all the time. It is the supervisor and the instructor who work 2 hours a week.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is quite correct. The supervisor actually supervises and checks his work.

Mr. AIKEN. So he is really working under supervision all the time; is he?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; all the time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to make a comment?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am sure that when the Senator from Georgia made his original motion, he did not intend to get into a discussion of the merits of the bill. However, we are more or less in a discussion of its merits at this time.

I wonder whether the Senator will permit me to read three or four short paragraphs from the report on the bill, which I think will clear up some of the questions of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be happy to have the Senator from Oregon do so.

Mr. MORSE. The purpose of the bill is stated on page 1 of the report, as follows:

The purpose of this bill is to enact into law standards controlling institutional on-farm training and to insure treatment of courses complying with such standards as full-time institutional courses.

The bill if enacted would amend the existing law by inserting "(including institutional on-farm training)" in those portions of the law which directs the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs—

(a) to secure from the appropriate agencies of each State a list of educational institutions approved for furnishing training;

(b) to pay tuition to institutions offering such training;

(c) to pay subsistence allowance to persons enrolled in such courses.

Mr. President, there are three types of training which we should have clearly in mind. They are stated in the next paragraph of the committee report. Two of the three come under the heading "Group instruction," as follows:

The standard provided in this bill will define "institutional on-farm training" to include any course of instruction approved by the appropriate agency of the State or by the Administrator, which when taken as a full-time course combines—

(a) Organized group instruction in agricultural and related subjects of at least 200 hours per year (and of at least 8 hours per month) at an educational institution, with

(b) Supervised work experience on a farm or other agricultural establishment.

The third type of instruction is individual instruction, and under that heading the report contains the following statement:

INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTION

If a veteran performs part of his course on a farm under his own control—

(a) he shall receive at least 100 hours of individual instruction per year, 50 hours of which must be on such farm;

(b) he shall be assured of control of such farm until completion of his course;

(c) the farm must be of such size and character as will—

(1) occupy the full time of the veteran;

(2) permit instruction in all aspects of the management of a farm;

(3) assure him a satisfactory income under normal conditions if he intends to continue operating the farm at the conclusion of his course.

In the case of a veteran who receives this training while an employee on another's farm, the report states:

If the veteran is to perform part of his course as the employee of another, he must receive at least 50 hours of individual instruction per year on the farm, which must be of the size and character as to occupy (with the group instruction part of the course) the full time of the veteran and as to permit instruction in all aspects of the management of a farm of the type for which the veteran is being trained. Further, the employer must agree to instruct the veteran in accordance with a training schedule developed by the instructor in cooperation with the employer.

Mr. President, with that statement in the RECORD, I think we should have a rather clear idea of the type of supervision and training and instruction that is contemplated under this bill. I agree with the Senator from Georgia that the above-mentioned type of instruction certainly is comparable to the type of instruction that a veteran receives, for example, when he is training to learn how to manage a filling station in a village. He receives subsistence of $65 a month if he is single, or $90 if he is married. A veteran on a dairy farm who is learning how to run the milking machines or is learning all about the scientific feeding of dairy cattle and all the other complex procedures that go with modern dairy farming, certainly is entitled to the same amount of subsistence that is allowed to a veteran who is learning to operate a filling station.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon. Certainly the veteran who is taking part in an on-the-farm training course should not have his compensation reduced to a point where he cannot "make a go" of his training.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, let me inquire what the objection to the bill is?

Mr. GEORGE. General Bradley, I think I should say in all fairness, believed that he had the right to put into effect a part-time training course and to reduce the amount of subsistence to approximately one-fourth of what the trainee otherwise would have received. However, after the General considered the matter very carefully, he decided that he might be wrong about it, and he said he would be glad to revoke that order and would be happy to await action by the Congress up until the end of this session, to see what policy would be declared.

It is true that the Bureau of the Budget said that the bill was not in accordance with the President's program. Of course, Mr. President, that statement by the Bureau of the Budget is due entirely to a misapprehension. With all respect to the Bureau of the Budget, that statement by it simply does not accord with the facts.

In the first place, the program is in the budget. It is in the approved President's budget exactly and precisely as this measure calls for it. It already is carried as a budgetary item.

In the second place, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget erroneously assumes that if the farm veterans who own or control their own land are denied the privileges of the GI bill of rights, approximately three-quarters of the present sum expended for the training of those veterans will be saved. However, that is not so at all. If the Director of the Bureau of the Budget knew anything about it, he would know very well that if the farm boy merely becomes an employee, he can get under the GI bill of rights, all that this bill would give to him. If he goes to an educational institution, he can get all that this bill gives him.

The only point at all is that if the farm veteran has secured some land which he himself desires to work, under his own control, and if he has complied with the minimum standards that are fixed, and if he has obtained the approval of the appropriate State agency or the Veterans' Administration, he will claim the same benefits that the veteran who goes into business or commerce or industry or manufacturing or what-not may claim under the GI bill of rights.

Let me say this, and then I shall be glad to yield: There are many counties in this country where the farm veteran must leave his home and his community and get a job or learn a trade somewhere other than on the farm where he was born and reared. Is that fair? Is that right? Why should we hesitate to say what is a proper policy, regardless of whether the Veterans' Administration or the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, my good friend Jimmy Webb, thinks to the contrary?

Mr. President, your committee has not thought that such discrimination is fair or proper. This bill passed the House of Representatives on the consent calendar. One objection there would have stopped it. This bill came to the Senate, and was referred to the appropriate Senate committee, and was subsequently reported by it. The bill is on the calendar. If it is not passed, of course General Bradley not only will feel that he is justified, but will feel that he should place these farm veterans on a mere part-time participation basis, under the benefits of the Adjusted Servicemen's Act. That is what I have had in mind when I have said that back of my motion to postpone the consideration of the pending business is my purpose to move to have this bill taken up; but in that connection I make the frank statement that I should be entirely willing to have the bill set aside, and to let the Senate proceed with the consideration of the appropriation bill which already has been reported, and which can, barring a mere technicality, at least, be taken up at this time.

Mr. FERGUSON obtained the floor.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Michigan intends to discuss the Kem resolution, which the Senator from Georgia is trying to postpone until next January?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of making a brief statement on the bill in reply to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I inquire whether it would be in order to amend the motion made by the Senator from Georgia to postpone consideration of the Kem resolution until tomorrow noon, because the situation is that we are in a very difficult condition, it seems to me, from the standpoint of getting votes on the bill that we really want to consider, because some of us want to vote on the Kem resolution, too, but we do think that we should be able to exercise some comity toward each other and enter into a gentleman's agreement so that we can vote on both measures within a reasonable time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Getting back to the parliamentary inquiry——

Mr. MORSE. That explains it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The answer is that the motion of the Senator from Georgia is subject to amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, providing the Senator from Michigan will not lose the floor, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia is insisting that the bill which he offers shall go ahead, in the first place, of an appropriation bill which

I asked unanimous consent to have considered. He is insisting that it go ahead of the sugar bill, which is a vitally important measure, and which is practically noncontroversial. He is insisting that it go ahead of two or three other bills which are noncontroversial. His bill is one of the most controversial bills that could be imagined. All one has to do is to read the report of General Bradley, the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, on pages 9 and 10. It is a complete answer to anything the committee said. I voted against the bill in the committee. His statement explains the reasons why General Bradley is absolutely opposed to the bill.

The suggestion is made that he said it was all right. Of course it is all right if Congress passes it, but the argument he makes on pages 9 and 10 cannot be answered, in my opinion.

My objection to the bill is based on the general objection to the whole on-the-job training program. This bill deals only with the farm end of it, it is true, yet as framed today it would put every single veteran farmer on the relief roll, so to speak, of the Federal Government. He would draw $65 if single, or $90 if married, for a period of 3 or 4 years, as the case might be.

The report points out that when the on-the-farm training was initiated the Veterans' Administration classified the training as part-time institutional training because the veteran while on the farm is not under direct instruction or direct supervision except for short periods of approximately 4 hours at intervals of 2 weeks, when the instructor calls at the farm to check up on what the student has done.

In the case of men who own their own farms, the bill prescribes only 100 hours. A man who owns a single farm, with an instructor coming 2 hours a week to give some lessons, and called upon the next week for 2 hours by some instructor to teach him how to farm, obtains the full subsistence allowance of $65 or $90. Therefore when the Administrator refers to this particular plan, he refers to twice as much instruction as is provided in the pending bill. He says:

> In contrast to that situation in institutional on-farm training, the veteran training on the job in an employer's establishment is commonly under instruction or supervision by the employer-trainer during each workday.

I am just as much opposed to the so-called on-the-job program in industry and all kinds of occupations as I am to this particular bill, because it moves entirely away from the theory of instruction, and in effect would give to every veteran the particular allowance prescribed for a period of 3 or 4 years, as the case might be.

The argument in substance is that because we said we would pay for the instruction of people who go to college for 2 or 3 years, who necessarily cannot work while they are there, we shall give the same amount to every veteran in the United States. This is what the Veterans' Administrator says:

> Immediately following the issuance of the directive—

His directive was that, in effect, since this training covered only about one-fourth of the veteran's time, he got only one-fourth of the allowance for living expenses during the period while he was being instructed. The Administrator said:

> Immediately following the issuance of the directive referred to above, opposition was voiced by persons interested in the program. In line with these objections and with suggestions from some Members of Congress, the directive was rescinded, in this regard, on September 25, 1946, until such time as the particular question might be considered by Congress.

The Senator from Georgia was one of those who insisted that it be rescinded.

> Under the rescinded directive, which the Veterans' Administration believed to be a sound administrative measure, such courses—

The course of 100 hours a year, 2 hours a week, of instruction—

> such courses would be considered as part-time courses and subsistence allowances and tuition would be paid accordingly.
>
> At the present rate of payment—

That is, when he went back to the full-subsistence allowance in tuition—

> it is estimated that the cost of this program for the fiscal year 1948, for each 100,000 veterans in institutional on-farm training, is approximately $117,200,000.

We just increased it 15 percent, so that it is approximately $135,000,000.

> If the course had been considered as a part-time course, as determined by the rescinded directive of August 27, 1946, the cost of this training, including tuition and subsistence allowance per 100,000 veterans, would have been $48,345,000.

So at the present rate the bill costs the country annually approximately $60,000,000.

This is significant:

> The number of veterans participating in this program has been steadily increasing. On September 30, 1946, there were 54,223 trainees in institutional on-farm training; on January 31, 1947, there were 98,035; on March 31, 1947, it is estimated that there were 130,789.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The Veterans' Administration is informed that approximately 1,650,000 men entered the armed forces from farms. Based on Army surveys it is estimated that from 900,000 to 1,000,000 men intended to be farm operators or to seek farm employment, from 8 to 10 percent of this number indicated a desire for farm employment only. It is believed that 500,000 have a reasonable certainty of having a farm to operate.

In other words, the cost of this program, if these 500,000 who have farms to operate take advantage of it—and they are invited to do so—will be five times $135,000,000, or some $750,000,000 a year for on-farm training alone.

The Administrator continued:

> I further pointed out that education and training have not been offered to the veteran simply as rewards but as tools that will enable him to achieve economic and vocational self-sufficiency. I said that in fairness to those other veterans whose circumstances do not permit or require the use of training benefits, and in fairness to all the American people who must pay for their cost it is our responsibility to safeguard the integrity of the program and make certain that it shall not be diverted from its sound economic objectives and become a windfall.

In other words, what the Administrator says is that, if you please, there is not a single farm boy on any farm of the United States, who is a veteran, who will not be able to draw the $65 or the $90—now the $75 or $105, under the bill passed the other day. There is not a single veteran on the farm who will not be able to draw such amounts. That not only applies to the farm. The objection is just as great with respect to all the other industries of the country. There is not going to be a single one of the 15,000,000 veterans, if we proceed with this kind of on-the-job-training program, who is not going to draw this money.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for just the matter of correction of a figure?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. The subsistence allowance of $65 and $90 is not at all changed by the legislation passed the other day.

Mr. TAFT. I apologize to the Senator. I remember there was a change made for those who were in the schools, but the Senator's bill did not make a change for those in on-the-job training. I take back the statement I made. So the figure of 500,000 who own their own farms will result in approximately five times $135,000,000, or about $675,000,000 or so, instead of $750,000,000. If the whole one and a half million who are probably on the farm take advantage of the program, and there is no reason why they should not, it will cost approximately more than $2,000,000,000 for farm training alone.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Ohio how familiar he is with the ordinary farm?

Mr. TAFT. Well, I live in the midst of farms, and I have something I call a farm myself which is not very successful.

Mr. GEORGE. Has the Senator ever worked on a farm?

Mr. TAFT. I have not worked on a farm; no. I do not quite see what that question has to do with the question I am discussing, I will say to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. It has a good deal to do with it.

Mr. TAFT. No; it does not have anything to do with the question under discussion. The Senator is trying to make a point which has no relation to the question. The man who works on the farm is in exactly the same situation as the man who works in a factory.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. If the Senator will bear with me, I should like to say to him that he certainly does not mean that these 1,650,000 men who answered to the call of the country, or who were drafted and who fought in the ranks, just like all the other veterans of the country, are going to take advantage of this training?

Mr. TAFT. No; but they are going to take advantage of the subsistence allowance.

Mr. GEORGE. How can they unless they take the 200 hours of training a year?

Mr. TAFT. What do 2 hours a week amount to? Anyone can take 2 hours a week of training.

Mr. GEORGE. No, not under an instructor, or someone else who comes out to supervise and check on them.

Mr. TAFT. People are going around the country establishing schools and having them recognized by the States. It is a racket. There will not be a town in the United States which will not have one of these agricultural schools, and the State government will necessarily approve them. How can they help approving them? When they approve them it is going to be perfectly simple for any farm boy to say, "I will take 2 hours instruction in town Saturday afternoon, and I will be glad to see an instructor on the farm for 2 hours the next week to tell me something about how to farm."

Mr. GEORGE. I may say to the Senator in all frankness that it is no more of a racket than the training of young men in the great cities to be assistant managers and assistant vice presidents of commercial and industrial enterprises.

Mr. TAFT. I fully agree with the Senator, and what I propose to do is to vote to recommit the bill; I propose to move to recommit the next bill also, which relates to on-the-job training in the cities, until a full study can be made of the on-the-job proposal, until we can develop a program which really carries out the purposes of the GI bill of rights, which really gives individuals opportunity to receive instruction, and is not based on the theory of giving 15,000,000 veterans of the war $65 or $90 a month to live on during the next 3 years.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I very respectfully beg to correct the distinguished Senator from Ohio. These boys cannot organize unless they can find a competent instructor. They cannot claim subsistence unless they have complied with the minimum standards of the law. I live in a farm community and there is a mere handful of the veterans in my community compared to the total who have claimed any benefit under the GI bill of rights. Some of them have gone to college and cost the Government a great deal more—but not men on the farm-training program. The Senator may be correct in saying that there are abuses in the part-time training program and the on-the-job training program. But there is not any bill pending in the Senate which affects that question. The only question here is whether the subsistence should be increased or should remain as it is.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Do I understand correctly that a veteran farmer or a farmer who was a veteran and owned, let us say, a 40-acre farm, or a 100-acre farm, or a 150-acre farm can, by taking 2 hours' training a week, or the equivalent of 100 hours a year, draw, if single, $65 a month for 3 or 4 years, or if married, $90 a month for 3 or 4 years, and still live on his own farm, operate his own farm, and take the profits from the farm?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is correct. I read from the bill:

1. If the veteran performs part of his course on a farm under his own control—

(a) He shall receive not less than 100 hours of individual instruction per year, not less than 50 hours of which shall be on such farm (with at least two visits by the instructor to such farm each month).

Well, 100 hours a year is 2 hours a week. So that what happens is that one week the instructor goes to the farm for 2 hours and the next week the farmer goes to town and takes 2 hours' instruction. There are some additional requirements which I shall be glad to read.

Such individual instruction shall be given by the instructor responsible for the veteran's institutional instruction, and shall include instruction—

Of various kinds.

(b) He [the veteran] shall be assured of control of such farm * * * until the conclusion of his course.

(c) Such farm shall be of a size and character which (1) together with the group instruction part of the course will occupy the full time of the veteran—

Well, I think farm work will occupy the full time of a veteran.

(2) will permit instructions in all aspects of the management of a farm of the type for which the veteran is being trained, and (3) if the veteran intends to continue operating such farm at the close of his course, will assure him a satisfactory income under normal conditions.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Perhaps I should be familiar with this, but I am not. Is there available, and could it be read into the RECORD, an example of what is taught to a veteran on a farm on the basis of 2 hours a week? Let us consider a farm of 160 acres, a grain farm, on which the owner raises wheat, corn, soy beans, and clover. What do the instructors teach that farmer who owns his own farm?

Mr. TAFT. I cannot claim to be an expert on that question.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I should much prefer to finish my statement.

Mr. GEORGE. If the Senator will yield I will say that the course must be approved by the appropriate State agency which is in charge of the farming operations, or the Administrator, and any time the Administrator or the State agency decides that the trainee should be dismissed, his course may be ended abruptly and he may be dismissed. I also wish to say to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] that the farm training is subject to exactly the same ceiling on the individual's total earnings as the young man who receives from an employer $150 a month. He could receive only $50 under existing law if he is married. And the same is true with respect to the farmer.

Mr. TAFT. May I suggest the farmer who clears $2,100 a year in cash—and that is what the ceiling means—is a fairly prosperous farmer, if he has just started in on a small farm. I do not think the ceiling has much effect on the farm training.

Mr. President, I should like to finish what General Bradley said:

What I said in that report is equally applicable here and it is the position of the Veterans' Administration that to treat courses of instruction involving no more than 6 hours per week as full-time courses would be merely to provide a windfall for those who participate in such programs. I believe that the Congress should also consider in this regard that if this program is determined by statute to be a full-time program calling for the payment of subsistence allowances and tuition, that it will set a precedent whereby State boards of education in the various States could develop similar courses for veterans who operate their own stores or shops, designating such courses as full-time institutional courses. If the proposed legislation is enacted, the Veterans' Administration will be subjected to great pressure to consider such courses as requiring the payment of full subsistence allowance to veteran participants and full tuition to educational institutions offering such courses.

The Veterans' Administrator seems to feel that if the State sets up a course, the veteran must adopt it, if it is anywhere within reason, as a course of instruction, even though it only be for 6 hours a week, and give it the same effect as a full college course. As the Senator has said the Veterans' Administration has been advised by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that enactment of the proposed legislation would not be in accord with the program of the President.

Mr. President, this is the controversial bill for which the Senator from Georgia proposes to set aside an appropriation bill necessary for our entire foreign policy. He proposes to set aside a sugar bill dealing with the entire sugar policy of the entire sugar industry, during the next 5 years, on which there is no substantial difference of opinion—on which he proposes to set aside other bills. It seems to me the Senator from Georgia ought to go along as the others have gone along with the program we have presented.

This bill will be brought up in due time, but it seems to me the Senator should have agreed to the unanimous-consent request for the consideration of the appropriation bill. Since he has not done so, the order of business before the Senate is the Kem resolution, and so far as I am concerned, we will keep that resolution before the Senate the remainder of the night. We will stay here all night, until we can get a vote on a very simple motion to take up a proposal which has been before the Senate, and which there is absolutely no reason to oppose.

The Senators on the other side have been filibustering against the Kem resolution. They have used every device they could to prevent a vote even on the motion to take up that resolution—a resolution involving an important question of public policy, a resolution which affects the Attorney General of the United States and really questions his integrity in the performance of the duties of his office. It seems to me the Attorney General himself ought to be willing to have the resolution adopted.

So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, in view of the attitude of the Senator from Georgia I am in favor of keeping before the Senate until we dispose of it, unfinished business of the Senate, which has been the unfinished business for the last 10 days.

Mr. GEORGE. If my good friend from Ohio would not be so excitable——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan has the floor. Does the Senator yield? If so, to whom?

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator from Ohio is not charging me with having filibustered, is he?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I decline to yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan declines to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the first thing I would like to do is to send to the desk a report from the Judiciary Committee in the matter of the nomination of the Solicitor General. Permission has been given to file it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, what is the request of the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. FERGUSON. It is to file the report on the nomination of the Solicitor General.

Mr. McCARRAN. I object, there being no report from the Judiciary Committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator objects.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, it is a minority report. As I said, permission was given to the Senator from Wisconsin, as chairman of the committee, when he filed——

Mr. McCARRAN. There is no report from the Judiciary Commitee, and if it is presented as a report from the Judiciary Committee, either major or minor, I object.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan has the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. At the time the nomination was reported on July 21, 1947, by the Senator from Wisconsin, and placed on the calendar, it was done with the understanding that no action would be taken until Thursday July 24, 1947, in order that a minority report might be submitted by the junior Senator from Michigan; and he is now asking to file that report.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may we have the report read?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. FERGUSON. I decline to yield at this time.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask that the report be read before it is placed before the Senate, because the Senate ought to know what it is.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question which the Chair will have to determine is whether or not the order that the Senator from Michigan just read was an order of the Senate. The Chair inquires what it is that the Senator from Michigan just read?

Mr. FERGUSON. I passed it to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senate gave unanimous consent to the filing of a minority report, obviously it can be filed. The clerk will read the order.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

JANUARY 31, 1947.

Ordered, That the following nomination be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary: Philip B. Perlman, of Maryland, to be Solicitor General of the United States, vice J. Howard McGrath, resigned.

Reported by Mr. WILEY, with recommendation that the nomination be confirmed. It is reported to the calendar with the understanding that no action is to be taken until Thursday, July 24, 1947, in order that a minority report may be submitted by the junior Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That sounds to the Chair as though it was an agreement made in the committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is an agreement made in the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It does not sound to the Chair like an order of the Senate; in which event unanimous consent would be required to file the minority report.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I withdraw the request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator withdraws his request.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I decline to yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield.

INVESTIGATION OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE IN CONNECTION WITH ALLEGED ELECTION FRAUDS IN MISSOURI

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, what I am about to say does not involve the motion by the Senator from Georgia to take up the bill which he discussed. I am glad that the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Ohio have debated the issue there presented. It is understood that I want to speak upon a matter that has been before the Senate from the 17th day of July 1947. It is the motion of the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 150, to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from further consideration of Senate Resolution 116.

So, Mr. President, the question really before the Senate is whether we shall adopt Senate Resolution 150, which is a resolution to discharge the Judiciary Committee from further consideration of Senate Resolution 116.

As one of the members of that committee I rise now to speak upon that resolution, because the Senator from Michigan believes that the resolution should be adopted and that the Senate Judiciary Committee should be discharged at this time.

The motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] would allow the Senate as a whole to decide whether or not Senate Resolution 116 should be agreed to. The Senate Committee on the Judiciary has pigeonholed Senate Resolution 116.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have been asked to yield for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum. I will yield only upon condition that I do not lose the floor, and that I may proceed upon the completion of the quorum call.

Mr. HATCH. With that understanding, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. FERGUSON. And with the further understanding that I shall not be charged with having made two speeches upon the same subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As the Chair understands, the Senator from Michigan yields for a quorum call with the understanding that the call does not change his parliamentary status as it now exists.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield upon that basis.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Moore
Baldwin	Hatch	Morse
Ball	Hawkes	Murray
Barkley	Hayden	Myers
Brewster	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Bricker	Hill	O'Daniel
Brooks	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Buck	Holland	Overton
Bushfield	Ives	Pepper
Butler	Jenner	Reed
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Capehart	Kem	Russell
Capper	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Chavez	Knowland	Smith
Connally	Langer	Sparkman
Cooper	Lodge	Stewart
Cordon	Lucas	Taft
Donnell	McCarran	Taylor
Downey	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	McClellan	Thye
Eastland	McFarland	Umstead
Ecton	McGrath	Vandenberg
Ellender	McKellar	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wherry
Flanders	Malone	White
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
George	Maybank	Williams
Green	Millikin	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the motion of the Senator from Nebraska would allow the Senate as a whole to decide whether or not Senate Resolution 116 should be adopted. The Senate Judiciary Committee has pigeonholed Senate Resolution 116.

Senate Resolution 116 would direct the Senate Judiciary Committee, or a subcommittee thereof, to make a full and complete study and investigation concerning the failure of the Attorney General of the United States and the Department of Justice to act with respect to alleged irregularities in the Democratic primary election held in the Fifth Congressional District of Missouri on August 6, 1946, with a view to ascertaining whether the Attorney General and the other officers of the Department of Justice have properly performed their duties with respect to the investigation and prosecution of any violation of law which may have occurred in connection with that primary election. The committee would have to report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the result of the study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it might deem advisable.

Mr. President, there is no doubt that the Senate is fully within its rights in or-

dering an investigation of the Department of Justice. The investigation would be made for a number of purposes: First, to determine whether or not the laws governing these various subjects are the kind of laws which should be on the statute books, or whether there should be amendments or additions to such laws; second, whether the Department of Justice is properly operated under the law; and third, whether the law applicable to that Department is the correct law. There is no question that the Senate committee would have the right to make the investigation and report back to the Senate so that the Senate might act properly in this particular case.

Mr. President, boiled down, the so-called Kem resolution, a part of which I have read, involves the question, Shall there be a thorough investigation of the Department of Justice; that is, of the Attorney General, who is the head of the Department of Justice, and of the Department itself, for alleged dereliction of duty? This is not a resolution to investigate the vote fraud itself. It is concerned with the conduct of the Department of Justice in connection with the vote fraud.

It is clear that it is the duty of the Attorney General to see that the Federal laws are faithfully enforced. The Constitution of the United States requires the President of the United States, as the Chief Executive of the Nation, to see that the laws are properly enforced. Under him, it is the duty of the Attorney General, who is the chief law-enforcing officer of the United States, to see that the laws are faithfully enforced. The Attorney General has complete facilities to investigate Federal crime, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation has a competent director in the person of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover. I say again that it is wholly within the province of the United States Senate to investigate. If the Attorney General of the United States, who represents the executive branch, does not have the necessary facilities properly to investigate criminal activities in the United States, then the Congress and the people of the United States should know it.

The Committee on the Judiciary opened the door, took a look, and hurriedly closed the door, thus preventing the subcommitte from making a full and fair investigation of the question before it. The Senate Judiciary Committee has authority to make a full and fair investigation in this case under section 134 of the Reorganization Act. But when the Senator from Michigan attempted by motion to have such an investigation made, the committee disagreed, declined to order it, and pigeonholed the resolution. So it is up to every Senator to determine whether or not the Senate of the United States shall be allowed to investigate within its authority.

Mr. President, the vote against both these propositions, and against the resolution itself, was 7 to 6. Senators who voted against reporting the resolution, and against the investigation, were the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. Senators voting to report the resolution, and in favor of further investigation, were the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

Grave charges have been made against the Department of Justice. Are they true? Only a complete investigation will disclose the facts. Is the public entitled to know the facts? Is it the public's business to know how public officials are managing and carrying out the duties entrusted to them? Should the light of publicity be thrown upon the activities of the Attorney General in this case? These are questions which the United States Senate is called upon to decide.

Mr. President, the good name of an official, the Attorney General of the United States, is challenged. It is essential that the public have faith in our Department of Justice. It is our law-enforcing agency, and must, like Caesar's wife, be above suspicion. It is imperative that the people of our Nation have confidence in the officials selected to guard their interests and enforce their laws. All must stand equally before the law, and there must be no political exceptions. When there is a reasonable doubt in the mind of the public as to whether a Cabinet officer has been derelict in his duty to enforce the law, it is only fair to that Cabinet officer, to the person involved, and to the public generally that a complete and thorough investigation be made, and that the findings be published; for such dereliction of duty strikes at the very heart of our free election system.

Can the Department be above suspicion if the minority in Congress, the Democratic Party, prevents the facts from being disclosed and the truth from seeing the light of day?

Mr. President, if the Senate votes for the motion of the Senator from Georgia nothing will be done on this resolution—not even a vote can be taken—until January of next year. Why? That is the question before the United States Senate. Why is it proposed that a vote be taken next January, instead of at the present time? Why has the Senate been prevented since the 17th day of July from voting on this matter? These are the questions the people want answered. They want to know the answers to these questions. Why cannot we get a vote on this matter?

As I said before, Mr. President, can it be above suspicion if the minority in the Congress prevent this vote and prevent the facts from being disclosed and prevent the truth from seeing the light of day? Does Mr. Clark, the Attorney General, want this investigation stopped? I ask you, Mr. President, does the President of the United States want this investigation stopped? Does the Democratic Party, the minority in this Senate, want this investigation stopped? If they do, why do they want to stop it? Why do they want to delay it until next January? Every day that a disclosure of the facts is postponed, it will be more difficult for the Senate to obtain the facts. Everyone knows that. It is obvious that if there is delay after delay, the eventual result will be that there will be no facts for the people of this Nation to have.

Mr. President, do those people want this investigation stopped? I say to you that it is not fair to the Attorney General, Mr. Tom Clark, and neither is it fair to the public, to have these facts concealed for even a short time.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Michigan hesitates to discuss what he found as chairman of the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, because ordinarily a report should be made only upon the basis of a full and complete investigation, and ordinarily it is not fair to report on the basis of only a partial investigation. But in this particular case we are forced to report, as a subcommittee, to the Judiciary Committee, without a full and complete investigation, because the order was that we were to make only a preliminary study upon the basis of the resolution, and thereafter to report.

Therefore, I feel that it becomes the duty of the junior Senator from Michigan to make this report to the Senate and to the people, in order that we may know what that preliminary study showed and whether there was a prima facie case that we should proceed further, or whether there was reasonable doubt as to whether we should proceed further into the matter. The Senator from Michigan did so, believing that the subcommittee was only authorized to consider this measure and to make a preliminary study of the subject matter. That was done. The chairman of the subcommittee believed that the subcommittee was of the opinion that the resolution should be reported to the Senate, but when the vote was taken he found that he was in the minority, and the investigation was stymied.

So the Senator from Michigan feels that he must discuss before the Senate what the record shows and what he found in this preliminary study.

Mr. President, on January 6, 1947, the Attorney General's office wrote to the Director of the FBI as follows:

> Accordingly, we are closing our files and informing you that no further investigation is desired.

Mr. President, hear me. On the 6th day of January 1947 the office of the Attorney General of the United States told the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation:

> Accordingly, we are closing our files and informing you that no further investigation is desired.

Mr. President, we know that at that time the Federal Bureau of Investigation had no authority to make the investigation, and the Director of that Bureau was not permitted to make an investigation except in the particular way and to the

particular extent that he was allowed to do so by the Attorney General. So that statement by the office of the Attorney General was an absolute road block, it was an absolute stop, so that the Director of the FBI could not proceed further with the investigation.

So the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], knowing that the investigation was stopped and that nothing was being done, submitted Senate Resolution 116, on May 20, 1947.

On May 21 it was referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee, and on May 26 it was referred to the subcommittee, for the purpose of having it make a preliminary study of it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I decline to yield at this time.

Mr. President, on May 21, a hearing of the subcommittee was set for May 28, 1947.

On May 28, during the hearing held by the subcommittee, the subcommittee and the Attorney General, who was present, were notified that the ballots, which were important evidence in this particular case, had been stolen from the court house in Kansas City, Mo., on May 27 or on the morning of May 28—in other words, either on the night before or on the morning of the hearing held by the subcommittee. Of course, notice had been given that the hearing was set for the 28th.

On the same day, May 28, the Attorney General, after he heard that the ballots were stolen, announced that the FBI would investigate the theft of the ballots in question. In other words, Mr. President, after the ballots were stolen, after the horse was gone, the Attorney General was willing to lock the door. Mr. President, the Attorney General says it is not a Federal crime to steal State ballots. Nevertheless, he was willing to have the FBI investigate that theft of State ballots, because the Judiciary Committee was investigating the entire matter. But he declined—and he says so in the testimony—to investigate the other matters, the things that were Federal crimes, because in his opinion they were not Federal crimes. So, Mr. President, we find that on the morning of the 28th of May, in the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, the Attorney General announced that the FBI would investigate the theft of the ballots in question.

On May 30 the Attorney General announced that he has ordered a full investigation of the vote-fraud case. Mr. President, I ask why did the Attorney General close the case on the 6th day of January, and, after the Senate Judiciary Committee's subcommittee brought him before it, why did he then order an investigation?

The Senate of the United States is entitled to know, Mr. President. That is what we want to vote on, so that all Senators, as Senators of the United States, and the people in general may find out why the Attorney General closed the case on the 6th day of January, and why, if on the 6th day of January he was of the opinion that there was nothing to warrant an investigation, he would open the matter for an investigation after much of the evidence was gone and after the hearing was started.

Mr. President, the next date in this connection, is July 8, mark you, even though the Attorney General had declared the case closed on January 6. Notwithstanding the closing of the case on January 6, it was opened again, as I have said, on May 30. At that time nothing had happened so far as the record shows, except that the evidence had disappeared.

A Federal grand jury was impaneled in Kansas City, Mo., by Judge Ridge, the district judge, at 10 a. m., on July 8, 1947.

On July 11, 1947, five persons were indicted for Federal crime relating to the preliminary election of August 6, 1946. Mark you, Mr. President, back in August and September of 1946, and on up to January 6, 1947, there was no evidence at all, according to the Attorney General, not even a scintilla of evidence, to cause a continuation of the investigation. But once this Senate of the United States started to look into this matter, and after a grand jury was called on the 8th day of July 1947, five people were indicted on the 11th day of July 1947, for Federal crimes in connection with the election vote fraud in Kansas City.

On July 12, 1947, these five persons were arraigned in the Federal court in Kansas City, Mo., for this Federal crime.

Mr. President, what does that mean? It means that there is prima facie evidence that on January 6, 1947, there was sufficient evidence available to indict for Federal crimes in relation to the voting on August 6, 1946, in the Kansas City election, the day the Attorney General's Office closed the investigation.

If the Attorney General had not restricted and limited the FBI investigation there is no reason to believe that they would not have found the same evidence back in September, when it was fresher, back on January 6, 1947, which they did find in June or July 1947.

What happened other than the investigation by the Senate of the United States? As the record shows, the FBI was not authorized to interview anyone except the reporters of the Kansas City Star and the four commissioners of the election.

Mr. President, if we were not dealing with skilled lawyers, men skilled in the practice of criminal law in the United States, if we were not dealing with skilled investigators, the best in the world, under the direction of Mr. Hoover, we could then say that these men did not recognize evidence, that they did not understand how to investigate, that they did not know whom to interview. But I ask, why was this limited to those who would have no personal knowledge? Why did they not go down to the people who made affidavits and statements, who had been kept from voting, who had been intimidated?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I refuse to yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator asked why——

Mr. FERGUSON. I decline to yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Why did they not interview the people who would know about the conspiracy which was the Federal crime? Right in the files, right in the Attorney General's files, were documents, were statements by people who knew about the crime, and I am going to offer the Senate a little proof tonight.

But the Senate should go further. It is not fair to Mr. Clark, it is not fair to the Senate, it is not fair to the administration, and I say it is not fair to the minority, on the other side of the aisle, to stop where we are now and not proceed to have a complete investigation and look into the matter. No; we cannot open the crack of the door and look in; we must enter, look at the evidence, and return a just verdict for the people of the United States. They must know all the facts—not part of the facts.

What did Mr. Hoover, an expert, have in his file? What did Mr. Clark, an expert, have in his file? Why do I say Mr. Clark was an expert? He was the head of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice before he became the Attorney General of the United States. If he had not been, if he had never had any experience in the practice of criminal law, then he might have overlooked what I am going to read to the Senate.

Mr. President, here I have an affidavit he had in his file:

Kansas City, Mo., September 7, 1946.

Mark you, Mr. President, the FBI did not get this from Estella Carter; no. The Kansas City Star reporter got it. Why should the United States of America, which spends millions of dollars every year looking into criminal activities of people, rely upon the Kansas City Star reporters to determine all the facts in a criminal case? Why would they even take the evidence that was obtained by a reporter from the paper, and not even use it in the case to determine whether or not there was a crime?

Mr. President, I shall read the affidavit later. As I have said, if the Attorney General had not restricted and limited the FBI investigation, they would have found the same evidence in September 1946 to January 6, 1947, which they found in June or July of 1947.

As the record now shows, the FBI was not authorized to interview one Estella Carter, and did not interview her, nor were they permitted to interview persons with original knowledge or original evidence.

There was in the file of the Attorney General, and of the FBI, when he closed the investigation, this statement by Estella Carter, and many other persons had given statements who would have knowledge and who had original knowledge to prove this Federal crime.

Mr. President, I am sorry there are so few on the minority side, because I think it would be well worth while that they know what is in this particular affidavit and what happened later. Estella Carter said in this statement:

My name is Estella Carter. I live at 805 East Eighth, Kansas City, Mo. I am making this statement voluntarily and I want the true facts known.

Mark you, this is a statement obtained by the Kansas City Star, given to the FBI, because the FBI was allowed to interview only the newspaper reporters, not the witnesses. The statement proceeds:

On August 6, 1946, at about 6:45 p. m., I went to the polling place located in a radio shop in the 700 block on East Eighth Street. I went there to cast my vote at the primary election. I was met at the door by a man whom I would describe as about 5 feet 11 inches or 6 feet, having a large frame, and wearing glasses, white, about 180 pounds. I told him my name and that I wanted to vote. This man I judged to be a precinct worker. He was holding the poll book. He said, "I voted you." I said, "How could you? Nobody could vote for me as no one knew how I wanted to vote." I said, "I haven't been here before today," and he said, "Nellie Riente told me you weren't coming to vote." Nellie Riente is my apartment manager and she worked at the precinct on the primary election day. I told him I hadn't discussed this with Nellie. He said, "Wait a minute," and he went out and talked to some people in a car. Then he came back and asked me if I knew "Lovey." I told him I didn't. Later as we walked up the street this man pushed at me some folded bills. He handed these folded bills to me. I didn't take the money. As he handed me, or attempted to hand me, the money he said, "Here take this and buy yourself some beer." This all occurred as we were walking east on Eighth Street. This man then walked up the street and talked to Miss Riente and told her I had been voted. I repeated to him and Miss Riente that he had told me "I voted you." He said, "Well we'll take care of you." I told him I had missed my vote and expressed to him that I felt he had kept me from voting.

As a consequence I was not allowed to cast my vote in the primary.

These statements on this and the preceding page are true.

ESTELLA R. CARTER,
805 East Eighth Street, fourth floor, front.

Witnesses: John P. Swift, 909 East Forty-seventh Street; Dwight M. Smith, Jr., 916 Walnut.

Mr. President, the same Estella Carter testified before Ira McLaughlin, an attorney of Kansas City, Mo., just recently, after the indictments, and I read the report of that evidence from the Kansas City Star. At the present time the United States Government must rely upon the news files of a newspaper rather than the files of the Attorney General because we do not have permission at the present time to look into this matter and ascertain the true facts for the Senate.

And here is what they report:

Her ballot was cast without her knowledge and illegally in the primary election last August by Morris (Snag) Klein, machine captain of the tenth precinct in the first ward. Mrs. Estella R. Carter, 805 East Eighth Street, testified late yesterday.

She appeared to give a deposition for Ira McLaughlin, attorney for Klein, who was indicted by the county grand jury on a charge of hindering a voter from exercising the right to vote.

Mrs. Carter is a Negro employee in the Jackson County office, 1907 Grand Avenue, of the Missouri Department of Health and Welfare. Her testimony reflected surprise and resentment at what happened when she appeared to vote at the precinct poll, 709 East Eighth Street, about a half hour before the 7 o'clock closing time.

As she approached the polls, a man with a list of voters' names accosted her. She had not seen him before, but learned he was Morris Klein, the precinct captain for the Democratic machine. He asked her name. She told him. "I voted you," she quoted Klein as saying. "How could you?" Mrs. Carter testified she replied.

She tried to step toward the door into the polls, but Klein talked rapidly to her and said "that Mrs. Nellie Riente told me you would not be coming to the polls, so I voted you."

Mrs. Nellie Riente was manager of the apartment building where she lived, Mrs. Carter explained.

"I protested I had a right to cast my own vote," she said. "I said no one had the authority to vote for me, and that I was being deprived of a right and a privilege."

Klein said something about everybody being Democrats around there, so it did not make any difference, Mrs. Carter related.

"I told him I never had cast a Republican vote, but that certainly if I wanted to I would," she said.

"Then he said, 'wait a minute,' and crossed the street to talk to some people in a car. He came back and asked if I knew Lovie. 'Who is Lovie?' I said. And Klein pointed to a colored man across the street. I didn't know him." There was more talk and delay, and the polls closed before she could get away from Klein, Mrs. Carter continued. She said Klein asked her to go back to her apartment and bring Mrs. Riente to the polls vicinity.

"I refused to do this," Mrs. Carter testified, "and s nce the polls had closed, I started walking back to my home. Klein walked along, and on the way he offered me money, and suggested I take it and go buy some beer. I refused to."

"How much was it?" asked Mr. McLaughlin.

"It was currency," the witness replied, "more than one bill, I do not know how many or how much."

At her apartment building, Klein asked her to go with him into Mrs. Riente's apartment to discuss the matter, Mrs. Carter related. She went with him and heard Klein tell Mrs. Riente what had happened, and say something about "making it all right."

"What did Mrs. Riente say?" asked McLaughlin.

"She told Klein: 'I didn't have Mrs. Carter's card,'" Mrs. Carter replied. It was presumed she referred to a precinct polling card used by party workers.

The witness said she telephoned the board of elections commissioners and reported what had happened. She also told fellow workers about it on the job next day, and talked later to the Star's investigators, the county grand jury, and the FBI agents.

That, Mr. President, was after the start of the investigation begun by the FBI in May of this year. Now, Mr. President, there are facts which, if obtained by an expert after proper interviews, could have been used to determine that there was a conspiracy to prevent people from voting in a Federal election. It will be recalled that this was the election in which Mr. Slaughter was running for renomination as a Member of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. It was a Federal election. He was not the only candidate on the Democratic ticket. There was another candidate, Mr. Axtell, and there was another, Mr. Walsh. So there were three candidates. There were a number of candidates on the Republican ticket. Here was a woman who was invited to vote. Her vote had been cast illegally. She had been deprived of her vote. There was complete evidence of conspiracy to deprive this citizen of her right to vote.

Yes, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] the other day asked several times, "Are we interested in democratic institutions here in America?" Are we sufficiently interested in them to see that the sanctity of the ballot is maintained? I say that nothing can strike at the heart of America more than to deny the right of a person to cast a ballot freely and of his own will at a Federal election. Nothing can be more sacred to the people. Shall our laws be applied to see that those who commit conspiracy or crimes to keep citizens of America from voting are punished? Should there be a complete investigation? Or should there be only a restricted investigation, interviewing, or taking into consideration not what the persons who were prevented from voting knew, but what a newspaperman, or the four top officials of the election commission knew? These are serious matters.

What happened after the grand jury convened, after the Senate began its preliminary investigation. Here is what happened—and I am reading further from the Kansas City Star. Two of the persons named by Estella Carter have been indicted—two of them have been indicted—for Federal crimes? No; there were no Federal crimes on January 6, 1947. The case was closed. Why? I quote again from the Kansas City Star, about the two persons who were indicted:

Named in the secret indictment reported Friday afternoon by the special grand jury charged by Judge Albert A. Ridge were:

Morris (Snag) Klein, 321 Ward Parkway, Democratic precinct captain.

Harry Burke, 927 Locust Street, Jackson County deputy sheriff and Democratic precinct worker.

William D. Wilson, 808 East Ninth Street, Republican judge of election.

Here I want to interpolate that the law should be applied to a crooked Republican; in fact, the sentence should be harsher, because he should know better than to commit a crime. We are not asking here that the rule not be applied to Republicans the same as Democrats. We want to know why the rule was not applied at all. The Congress is entitled to know why no action was taken.

The next person indicted was John Mellham, 2607 Lexington Avenue, Democrat, judge of election.

Frank L. (Lovie) Holmes, Negro ex-convict, 2204 Charlotte Street, Democratic precinct worker and an employee in the city street cleaning department.

Mark you, Mr. President, I am reading from the Kansas City Star.

All the defendants were active in the tenth precinct of the first ward at the August 6, 1946, primary election which is being investigated by the special grand jury. They are charged in the indictment with violating the civil rights statute by falsely voting the name of persons who did not appear at the polls. The indictment was made public when all the defendants had made bond.

Exactly what is set forth in the Estelle Carter affidavit.

The grand jury charged the five men "permitted and caused to be permitted the votes of unqualified and fictitious persons to be cast, counted, and recorded for said precinct tenth and ward first."

The indictment also charged that they "made and caused to be made a false, fraudulent, and fictitious certification as to the total number of votes received by candidates."

The single indictment naming the five covered seven typewritten pages. Judge Ridge instructed that the indictment be kept secret until all the defendants had been apprehended.

Mr. President, we should not judge the case on these facts alone. We as Members of Congress should be interested in obtaining all the facts. That is what the motion before us would have done. That is the matter we have been trying to secure a vote on since July 17, 1947. All the facts must be brought to light in order that Congress may determine if our present laws are adequate to preserve our free institutions, to preserve the right of the ballot.

Mr. President, even though it is late, I feel that I am duty bound, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, to report some of the facts in the case in order that the record may be clear.

The primary election in Missouri was held on August 6, 1946, at which time candidates were to be nominated by each political party for various State offices, as well as for United States Senator and Representatives in Congress. In the Fifth Missouri Congressional District, constituting part of Jackson County, Mo., which in turn includes most of the city of Kansas City, Mo., there were three candidates for the Democratic nomination for Representative in Congress: Roger Slaughter (the incumbent), Enos Axtell, and Jerome Walsh. Axtell was shown on the face of the returns to have received the Democratic nomination for Representative in Congress from that district.

In the Fourth Missouri Congressional District, which includes the remainder of Jackson County and the remainder of the city of Kansas City, Mo., there were two Democratic candidates, and C. Jasper Bell was shown on the face of the returns to have received the Democratic nomination for Representative in Congress from that district.

I merely cite that to show that both these districts where the alleged fraud in voting occurred and where the alleged conspiracy occurred to violate the Federal law there were several candidates, so there was a contest, a real contest in the primary.

On August 12, 1946, the Kansas City office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation received an anonymous telephone call, "alleging that there were flagrant vote frauds in the primary election at Kansas City." This information was transmitted to FBI headquarters in Washington, D. C., and by FBI Director Hoover to Assistant Attorney General Theron C. Caudle on August 14, 1946 (p. 49). The FBI was advised by Caudle, on September 5, 1946, that no investigation was warranted by reason of said anonymous telephone call.

Let us take for granted that they did not want to follow up an anonymous telephone call; we now find that Ludwick Graves, chairman of the Kansas City Board of Election Commissioners, called Sam Wear, United States district attorney for the Western District of Missouri, and asked him if he would be willing to confer with the board, because "there was some suspicion there might be some election fraud." The following day, Wear did talk to the board of election commissioners, and then he, Wear, conferred by telephone with the Department of Justice—not knowing exactly with whom it was, probably Caudle—concerning the request of the board of election commissioners for aid of the Government in connection with rumored irregularities in the recent primary election in Kansas City, Mo. Pursuant to the information received by telephone, on September 18, 1946, Wear wrote a letter to the members of the election board, in which he stated:

> If you or any other reputable men could furnish any substantial evidence indicating any fraud, that the Department of Justice would immediately turn the matter over to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and have a complete—

I repeat—

> have a complete and full investigation made * * * from the assurance of the Department of Justice, I am confident that an immediate full investigation will be made.

Later they had the evidence from a competent, responsible person, yes, an employee of the city of Kansas City, Mo., but they did nothing about it.

A copy of the entire letter is identified as exhibit 1 in the files, and I will place it in the RECORD.

On October 7, 1946—mark you—the city council of Kansas City, Mo., adopted a resolution requesting the Attorney General of the United States, the United States district attorney, and the prosecuting attorney of Jackson County, Mo.—

> To proceed immediately and promptly with an investigation of all violations of election laws at the primary, August 6, 1946, to the end that all persons guilty of violating either the Federal or State laws, or both, be prosecuted in appropriate courts.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a quorum call?

Mr. FERGUSON. Not at this time.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator declines to yield. I am sorry.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Attorney General out there told the election commissioners if any responsible person made a complaint, that they would make a full and complete investigation. The common council, an elected body in Kansas City, Mo., made the complaint and asked that an investigation be made. Why was no full and complete investigation made? The Senate is entitled to know the answer from what we might find in the files and in the minds of the men who conducted these examinations, and in the Justice Department.

A copy of this resolution was sent to Attorney General Clark at Washington, D. C., and to United States District Attorney Wear at Kansas City, Mo. The Kansas City Star, a public-spirited newspaper, whose duty it was not to get evidence to indict, or to see that the laws were enforced, but merely as a public-spirited newspaper trying to see that American institutions, including the right of voting, might be kept sacred to the people in Kansas and other places in this great country of ours, became convinced that there were election irregularities in the primary election. It assigned two of its reporters to supervise a private investigation, and employed 32 former ex-service men to make an examination of the poll books and to interrogate election officials and voters. One thousand three hundred and twenty-seven persons were interrogated, and many news reports, articles, and editorials appeared in the Kansas City Star reporting the information concerning election frauds disclosed by the investigation.

Why was this public-spirited newspaper spending its own money to do this job for the people of the United States, and at the same time contributing in taxes to support the Department of Justice to do the job which is required to be done, to see that the law is enforced?

Jerome Walsh, one of the defeated candidates for nomination for Representative in Congress, registered a complaint. Was he a responsible person? He was on the Democratic ticket. He registered a complaint with the House of Representatives Special Committee on Campaign Expenditures. Two investigators of the House were sent to Kansas City. The evidence obtained by them and by the Kansas City Star was turned over to the Attorney General, together with a report. Here was an agency of Congress trying to get the Attorney General to look into this matter. By the way, it was controlled by the Democratc Party, the party in power, the party which was trying to purge Representative Slaughter.

This is what the report said, in part:

> The investigators obtained a sufficient quantity of evidence concerning improper methods of counting, coercion, and fraudulent procedures to justify the committee's referring the entire report to the Attorney General.

In other words, the congressional committee, in the preliminary investigation it made at that time, found sufficient evidence to refer the entire report to the Attorney General. The members of that committee were Mr. J. PERCY PRIEST, of Tennessee, a Democrat; Mr. JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, a Democrat; Mr. OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas, a Democrat; Mr. CARL T. CURTIS, of Nebraska, a Republican; and Mr. FRANK FELLOWS, of Maine, a Republican.

When the committee's report was delivered to the Attorney General it consisted of several envelopes containing detailed data of voting irregularities in different precincts in Kansas City. One of these envelopes, marked "Exhibit 5" on the outside, contained a memorandum attached thereto, stapled to the outside of the envelope. One did not have to look inside and look through all the papers to find it. It was a white sheet of paper stapled on the outside of a manila envelope, so that anyone who wanted to read it could see it. What did it say? It was on the letterhead of the Campaign Expenditures Committee of

the House of Representatives, so there was no doubt that it was placed there by an official body. This is what it said:

This file contains evidence of five serious offenses:
1. Impersonation of voters.
2. Illegal ballots cast.
3. Ballots counted by unauthorized person, the machine precinct captain.
4. A conspiracy to induce voters to take false oaths of assistance.
5. Many violations of the Missouri election laws.

On the face of it was the statement by this election commission that there was a conspiracy to induce voters to take false oaths of assistance. What more could anyone ask who was looking for evidence to continue an investigation, at least until it was completed, or at least until a full investigation had been made?

The second envelope, which was marked on the outside "Exhibit 6" contained the following memorandum attached thereto:

Campaign Expenditures Committee, House of Representatives. Fifth precinct, second ward.

That was the letterhead, so there can be no doubt as to whose writing it was. This is what the memorandum contains:

This file contains good evidence that the Democratic precinct workers and election officials conspired to vote the names of individuals who were not expected to vote that day. It also contains proof that votes were paid for.

Did the FBI have authority to find out who furnished the money for those voters? No. Mr. Hoover testified that he had no such authority. He could not interview any person who had first-hand knowledge. Here we have, right out in the open, a white paper stapled upon a manila envelope, with the statement:

This file contains good evidence that the Democratic precinct workers and election officials conspired to vote the names of individuals who were not expected to vote that day.

This is in the Carter case, from which I read an affidavit. Continuing:

It also contains proof that votes were paid for.

Was this a Republican committee? No; this was a Democratic committee of the House of Representatives which gave this evidence to the Attorney General, and he failed to use it. The Senate should inquire why he failed to use it. That is one of the things that we are here tonight considering, even at this late hour.

Attention will be directed to items 3 and 4 of exhibit 5. Item 4 refers specifically to a "conspiracy," and item 3 refers to the counts of ballots by unauthorized persons, including a machine precinct captain. This could have happened only as the result of an agreement or conspiracy. No other conclusion could be drawn by men skilled in the practice of criminal law, or men who have the skill to look into such matters, such as members of the FBI. But the FBI was muzzled. It was stymied. It was prohibited from giving the evidence until after the Senate committee met on May 28. Then it was given the sign to go ahead and in a few days it obtained grand-jury indictments with respect to the very things which had happened in the previous August.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I decline to yield.

During the course of the investigation by the Kansas City Star, various articles published in that newspaper were sent to the Office of Attorney General Clark by the United States district attorney in Kansas City. Mr. Caudle advised the FBI on October 2, 1946, that "If investigation was desired, the Bureau would be so informed."

It will be noticed that Caudle told the FBI on October 2, 1946, that if an investigation was desired, the Bureau would be so informed. In other words, the FBI did not have a free hand, as the people of the United States thought it had. I suppose there are not a hundred people in the United States who ever knew that the FBI could not investigate a crime until it received a go-ahead signal and on the consent of the Attorney General of the United States. But here it is. Caudle advised the FBI on October 2, 1946, that if an investigation was desired, the Bureau would be so informed

That will be found in the record on page 49. This directs attention to the fact that the FBI was not to make an investigation in the case until instructions were received from the Attorney General.

On October 11, 1946, the Attorney General, by memorandum, instructed the FBI to conduct a preliminary investigation of the allegations of the complaint in this case. The pertinent facts of the memorandum are as follows:

A study of the material at hand indicates possible violation of sections 51 and 52, title 18, United States Code.

Even there they said it indicated a possible violation of those sections of the United States Code.

It is accordingly requested that a preliminary investigation be undertaken along the lines indicated below.

Notice that it is preliminary. I shall come to this evidence later in the letter which was written to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]. They did not use the words which they used in the instructions—"preliminary investigation." We should investigate and ascertain why they did not use the same words.

Reports of the investigators indicate that persons, first, are officially listed as having voted while claiming they did not vote; or, second, are officially listed as not having voted while claiming they did vote; or, third, appeared at the polling place and found that their names had already been voted.

That is the Carter case.

These latter irregularities indicate a violation of section 51, for if the charges can be substantiated they would have amounted to a conspiracy to deny to qualified voters their federally secured right to vote for a candidate for Federal office, to have that vote counted as cast, and to have all legitimate ballots honestly and accurately counted free of dilution or falsification and fictitious ballots.

It is said it would amount to a conspiracy to deny a qualified voter a federally secured right. Why did they not use the evidence? Why did they not permit the FBI to look into this question? Why did they have to get only affidavits.

I think we can show the situation simply by a preliminary examination that we have made. It is not a complete investigation, and therefore it should be complete before we pass judgment in this case. I shall place a copy of this memorandum in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

It is observed from reading the entire memorandum that this authorization limited the witnesses to be interviewed to persons designated in the memorandum. Those designated included no person suspected or accused of crime, included no person having first-hand knowledge of possible violations, but included those who obviously had only hearsay knowledge. It is observed that the persons to be interviewed are of only two classes: First, members of the board of election commissioners, and, second, employees of the Kansas City Star. All other witnesses are excluded.

On October 17, 1946, the FBI started its investigation and concluded it on October 24, 1946, which fact is designated on the flyleaf of the FBI report. They completed their preliminary investigation and closed the matter in exactly the same time that we have been trying to get a vote on this resolution—from the 17th to the 24th. Imagine looking into a case in that way. All they did was to collect affidavits and the different facts which the newspapers had collected, interview the four men in the election commission, and close the case.

The significant fact will here be noted that it was not until this latter date, October 24, 1946, that District Attorney Wear actually received official information of the preliminary investigation. It will be noted that the investigation was being conducted along with Wear, and he did not even know about it officially until the twenty-fourth, which was the day on which it was closed. Wear actually received the official information on October 24 in the form of a copy of a memorandum dated October 11, 1946, from the Attorney General to the FBI. Only seven men were assigned to the investigation. A total of six persons, those specifically named in the memorandum from the Attorney General, were interrogated, and the FBI made an examination of the evidence of election irregularities obtained by the investigators of the Kansas City Star. A report consisting of 355 pages was prepared. Although the FBI might have, under the instructions received from the Attorney General, interviewed the 32 former service men employed by the Kansas City Star, the two Kansas City Star reporters were interviewed, and these two men made available all material which had been obtained by the 32 former service men as a result of their interviews with voters in Kansas City, Mo. That is from page 4 of the FBI report.

On October 23, 1946, FBI Agent in Charge Brantley, in Kansas City, Mo.,

talked by telephone to J. M. Mumford, assistant to D. M. Ladd, who is Assistant Director of the FBI, concerning the FBI preliminary report. Following that conversation Mumford prepared a memorandum to Ladd, which in part, I shall read. Mr. President, I hope Senators will pay particular attention to what was in this memorandum. It is very significant. Was this a political case? Was Mr. Hoover's office trying to protect the FBI? Did they know there was something wrong? Did they know they had a limitation that was interfering with them? Yes, Mr. President, they did; and I shall read it to the Senate. Here is what Mr. Mumford, assistant to Ladd, said:

Mr. Brantley—

Who is the FBI agent in charge in Kansas City, Mo.—

was also instructed that the copy he sends to the United States Attorney Wear—

That is, the copy of the report—

should have a cover letter specifically and carefully pointing out that its contents do not constitute the results of an investigation but, pursuant to the specific instructions of the Attorney General, are merely a summary of the data developed by the Kansas City Star and the election board and turned over to the Bureau for the consideration of the Attorney General and the United States attorney.

Mr. President, there we see the statement that it is a summary, not an investigation at all—only a summary of the data.

What else does he say? Here it is, Mr. President:

This procedure is being followed—

In other words, they are putting this fly letter on that report—

in an effort to prevent the possibility of our reports being cited as the result of investigation proving that further investigation or prosecution is not justified.

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, here was Brantley, the special agent in charge, instructed by the FBI in Washington to put this on the fly leaf, so that—what? I read, Mr. President:

To prevent the possibility of our reports being cited as the result of investigation proving that further investigation or prosecution is not justified.

Did the FBI think they were going to use this report to whitewash?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I decline to yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Senator has asked a question. Why cannot we answer it?

Mr. FERGUSON. I decline to yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thought the Senator would not yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, do I use these words advisedly? Did the FBI expect that this report would be used as a whitewash?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I decline to yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Senator yield for an answer to his question?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I decline to yield.

They wrote on the flyleaf:

This procedure is being followed in an effort to prevent the possibility of our reports being cited as the result of investigation proving that further investigation or prosecution is not justified.

That appears in the record at pages 199 and 200.

Mr. President, we found all this on the basis of a preliminary study. Certainly the Senate should investigate this matter fully and should follow it up and should ascertain why Ladd said this and why Brantley put it on the flyleaf so it could not be used to whitewash.

When this memorandum came to the attention of FBI Director Hoover—you see, Mr. President, this was called specifically to Mr. Hoover's attention—portions of it had been underscored in red, so that he could not fail to see it. Mr. Hoover personally took his pen and drew a line from this language down to the bottom of the memorandum, and wrote on it the following:

Were we so restricted by the Department's orders?

He testified that he did that because—

I sensed the necessity of meticulously following whatever the Department had instructed.

That appears at page 62 of the record.

Mr. Hoover, to my mind the greatest investigator in the world, sensed this whitewash, and he was not going to have it put on his doorstep. So he took his own pen and put a line from that language down to the bottom of the memorandum, and wrote with his own pen, in his own handwriting, this language:

I sensed the necessity of meticulously following whatever the Department had instructed.

Mr. President, he did so.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is it necessary or imperative, under the rule, that we cannot reply now to misstatements of fact as they are being stated by the Senator from Michigan?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not consider that the Senator is raising a parliamentary inquiry. The Senator from Nevada is familiar with the rule. The Senator who has the floor controls the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Then I ask the Senator to yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. FERGUSON. I decline to yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan declines to yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I expected that.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, Mr. Hoover was satisfied that the FBI was so restricted.

On October 24, 1946, FBI Agent Brantley, in Kansas City, Mo., transmitted a copy of the FBI report to United States District Attorney Wear, with a covering letter which, except for the caption and closing, read as follows:

I am transmitting herewith a copy of the report of Special Agent H. C. Boswell in the above case, dated October 24, 1946.

I desire to advise that this report does not reflect the results of an investigation by special agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and it should in nowise be considered as such. It does, however, contain information furnished us by members of the Kansas City Election Board, and information developed by investigators for the Kansas City Star. The limitations indicated herein are imposed in the instructions received by the Bureau from the Department respecting this case (p. 56).

A copy of the FBI report was sent by FBI Agent Brantley to the FBI headquarters in Washington, which report was in turn transmitted to the Attorney General with a memorandum dated October 25, 1946, which called the attention of the Attorney General to the fact that interviews were had by the FBI with only the six persons named in the memorandum dated October 11, 1946, and that representatives of the Kansas City Star "advised that their investigation and canvass did not cover congressional and senatorial candidates to determine alleged fraud and election irregularities" except in a recent test check in one ward. The memorandum concluded as follows:

You will note that only the specific investigation requested in your memorandum has been conducted, and I shall appreciate your advising me as soon as possible whether any further investigation is desired.

That is in the record, pages 58 and 185.

Mr. President, this is Mr. Hoover, of the FBI, talking to the Attorney General:

You will note that only the specific investigation requested in your memorandum has been conducted, and I shall appreciate your advising me as soon as possible whether any further investigation is desired.

Mr. Hoover knew what had happened to him. He had instructions and he was obeying them to the letter. He wanted to make sure. With his own pen he drew a line down the memorandum so it would be returned to him, so that he could not be mistaken.

Do the people think that fair investigations are being made in that way, or do they think Mr. Hoover's hands are tied—Mr. Hoover, the investigator, the expert, and, as I said before, the greatest expert in investigation in the world? They should find out all the facts, and I am suggesting the only way to find them.

Thank God that here in America we have an institution, the Congress of the United States, with the power to investigate, the power to turn the white light upon wrong doing and malfeasance and misfeasance of those in public office. This is a great institution. We should not turn it down. It should never be said that Congress will prevent itself from looking into the facts in a case as serious as this.

How can a man deny the Congress the right to investigate, the right to bring out only the facts, no matter what they are, that the people of America who pay

the taxes and support this great Government may know what is going on?

Mr. President, this is a serious matter, this is an important matter. No matter how important any other measure may be, I say that it cannot be more important than the maintaining of the fundamental rights of the people to cast their ballots without fear or without favor and that there must not be conspiracies in violation of the Federal law to keep men being voted for to be sent to the Congress under an honest election.

What could be more sacred, what could be more important? Yes, we stand here as we reach midnight because we believe that these are fundamental rights. Our boys went across the sea, they fought for rights, they fought for just such fundamental rights as these. They stayed up all night. They were in the mud of the trenches or on the boat deck facing the fire of the enemy, and I say tonight as we stand in the Senate we face the evils of people in America, and it is up to us to vote that we may set this thing right, that we may see what has gone on.

Nothing is more important than the business now before the Senate, to get a vote upon this right to look into a matter which involves the people's business. I say this is the people's business. It is not a private concern. It is the people's business, and why can they not look into it through their elected representatives?

This memorandum from FBI Director Hoover to the Attorney General points out and conveys the same message as in the cover letter from Brantley to Wear, and it clearly advised the Attorney General that the FBI had completed its investigation according to instructions and would not proceed further unless it received further instructions. The Attorney General has supervision of the FBI and, if he had been of the opinion that any additional persons should have been interviewed by the FBI, he could and should have so directed. However, the Attorney General considered the investigation to be thorough (p. 126). This unquestionably shows that both the FBI and the Attorney General placed the same interpretation on the memorandum and both concluded that it had been fully complied with.

Shortly after the receipt by District Attorney Wear of the FBI report, he prepared, in conjunction with one of his assistants, a 23-page "synopsis" entitled "Review of Report of Federal Bureau of Investigation, dated October 24, 1946—Alleged Election Irregularities." This "review" or "synopsis" is not complete and is inaccurate. For example, in the FBI report, on page 68, relating to alleged election irregularities in precinct 10 of ward 1, appears a copy of a statement of Estella R. Carter.

In the "review" or "synopsis" where the evidence pertaining to this precinct and ward is summarized, there is no mention of a statement of Estella R. Carter or of the contents of her statement.

I have a photostat of the original statement of Estella Carter. This copy clearly shows what indicted two or five of these people. But when Mr. Sam Wear made up his synopsis or memorandum he did not put that one thing in, and there are some others he did not accurately set out. Should the Congress know why? Is it not material to the enforcement of law in the United States to know why, when he made this memorandum up, to give to the judges, to take to three judges? Never in the history of any of these judges had he brought other evidence to them and asked them whether or not there were sufficient facts.

Oh, he had a political case. He left out this affidavit. I would not stand here on the floor of the Senate and make such a statement if the synopsis and the evidence did not show it. He left it out. Then he used the opinion of the judges, and I say that such a thing should not be done to one, two and three judges of the United States of America, going and getting their opinion, which they did not have to give to him, but which they did give him, upon evidence that was not complete, the very evidence which, when looked into, was cause for an indictment. Is that the way to treat three district judges of the United States, putting them in the light of giving false advice? Those three able judges came here to the Senate committee and testified that they did not get all the facts, according to that memorandum, when they were shown this particular affidavit.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield just for a moment?

Mr. FERGUSON. Later I will yield.

Mr. HAWKES. Very well.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, these are serious matters. That is why we should look into them.

The contents of this statement were material. Commenting on it, Federal District Judge Albert L. Reeves stated that he perceived in it "a concert of action which would be in the nature of a conspiracy" (p. 411), and that he was inclined to think that there was enough in that statement to submit to a grand jury, to ask for an indictment (p. 413). District Judge Albert A. Ridge stated that while the statement "in and of itself" was not sufficient to submit to a grand jury to ask for an indictment.

One of the first things that was told to us by Mr. Clark, at the very first of the testimony, was that he had the opinion of three judges that there was not enough evidence to proceed further with the investigation, or with any prosecution or the calling of a grand jury, and when we get the judges here what do we find? We find that they did not have all the evidence.

The district judge, Albert L. Reeves' statement in and of itself was not sufficient to submit to a grand jury, to ask for indictment. I quote from his statement:

> There is a pattern revealed here of suspicion.

He further stated, referring to this statement:

> There was suspicion that might require some other investigation.

That will be found on page 435.

District Judge J. C. Collet indicated that he thought the statement would call for further investigation. That is the statement that was not even shown to him by Wear, the district attorney.

It appears that there was consistently omitted from the synopsis any reference to language used in the statements obtained by the Kansas City Star that would give rise to the probability of a conspiracy to miscount ballots, to deny a person the right to vote, or to permit or cause persons to vote who were not entitled to vote, and that numerous statements were inaccurately or incorrectly summarized by District Attorney Wear.

Attached thereto and identified as "Exhibit 3," which I will put in the record, are three statements taken from the report of the FBI, from which the synopsis was made, and following each statement is the summary appearing in the synopsis prepared by Wear, referring to that particular statement.

The FBI report contained a flyleaf on which is was stated:

> Representatives of Kansas City Star state their investigation and canvass did not cover congressional and senatorial candidates to determine alleged fraud and election irregularities except in a recent test check in precinct 5, ward 2, where Kansas City Star investigators reported 14 affidavits from persons stating they voted——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I decline to yield at the present time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan declines to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Would the Senator be willing to yield when he concludes his statement, for an observation?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I certainly will.

Mr. MAYBANK. Whenever the Senator is ready.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I shall be glad to yield later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is so ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Continuing, I quote:

> Kansas City investigators reported 14 affidavits from persons stating they voted for Roger Slaughter for Representative in Congress as contrasted with official count furnished in file of Kansas City State of six.

The pages that I am giving are the official stenographic pages in the notes taken by the stenographers in the hearing before the Senate subcommittee.

> The same information was called to the attention of the Attorney General by FBI Director Hoover in his memorandum dated October 25, 1946 (p. 124). Attorney General Clark testified that he added the underlining shown above. In the preface of the synopsis of the FBI report it is stated that the two reporters of the Kansas City Star "stated to the agents—five—that they made no canvass or investigation to develop information concerning fraud or irregularities which may have occurred in the United States congressional race"—and it is also stated that:
>
> "It will be observed that the information as to each precinct is incomplete, general in most instances and inconclusive as far as furnishing any certain basis for the prosecution of anyone under the provisions of section 51, title 18, United States Code."

Mr. President, in spite of this, District Attorney Wear submitted a copy of the synopsis to each of the three Federal

judges in Kansas City, Mo., the Honorable Albert L. Reeves, Hon. J. C. Collet, and Albert A. Ridge, for an opinion whether there was evidence shown in the synopsis to justify the judges in calling the Federal grand jury into session. I desire to emphasize that. They were never asked whether or not there should be a complete or a further investigation. They were only asked to determine from that synopsis. Oh, yes; they could have looked at the affidavits; but they were given a synopsis of them, and they had a right to rely upon that. It was not complete as to whether or not there was sufficient ground for calling a grand jury into session.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I will not yield at the present time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. May I ask a parliamentary question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will ask the question.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is it to be understood that, notwithstanding a very certain misstatement of fact, the Senator refuses to yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada expect the Chair to rule on that?

Mr. McCARRAN. I thought the Senator from Michigan might answer the question.

Mr. FERGUSON. I will answer that a little later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That will be developed later.

Mr. FERGUSON. For the sake of continuity, I am declining to yield at the present time.

For an opinion whether there was evidence shown in the synopsis sufficient to justify the judges in calling the Federal grand jury into session, not about a further investigation, not about whether or or not there was sufficient grounds for calling a Federal grand jury into session. By the way, the judges do not have power to prevent the district attorney from giving evidence to the grand jury. If Mr. Wear wanted to, he could have taken this evidence direct to the grand jury, because there was one in session at that time. But here we had a political case. Here we had on the flyleaf of the report, so that it could not be used, that it was not a complete investigation, and they used it, and obtained from the three judges—oh, yes—to the public—what could have been more important? Mr. Clark immediately said, "Why, we have the opinion of three judges," but when we heard from the judges—oh, we should go completely into this matter. Judge Reeves, a member of the Federal bench in excess of 24 years, stated that he could not recall ever having been before asked by a district attorney whether certain evidence should be submitted to a grand jury. Each judge was told that a copy of the FBI report was available to him, but none read it or looked at it, because they relied on the accuracy of the synopsis, and also because they did not believe that it was the proper function of a Federal judge to pass on the sufficiency of the evidence at that stage. That is true. Judges do not pass upon the sufficiency of the evidence at that stage, before it is submitted to a grand jury. Can Senators imagine having a practice where the evidence will be taken to the court that is to try the cases later, and where it will be said to the court, "Is there sufficient evidence to submit it to the grand jury?" No; that is not the way. The evidence is submitted to the grand jury, and then if sufficient evidence cannot be presented at the trial, on the examination at the trial, the judge will kick the case out, as we say. The judges were unanimous in their opinion that the evidence shown in the synopsis did not warrant the calling of a grand jury into session at that time. However, all three judges testified that they either thought or assumed that the investigation would continue, that they did not know of any limitation upon the duty or authority of the FBI to make an investigation.

These three judges, Mr. President, were not told that the FBI investigation was limited; that they were only to interview as witnesses the members of the Kansas City Star investigating staff and the four members of the election board. They had every right to believe, as the citizens believed, that when the FBI made an investigation it was complete and thorough, that it was done by the greatest organization of its kind in the world. But they did not know that it was limited and specifically limited, so that they would not interview people having original evidence, or knowing the facts in the case.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). The Senator will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McCARRAN. I want the Presiding Officer to state to the Senate if the Senate is required to sit by without comment and listen to absolutely unwarranted statements of fact. Is that the rule of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield. The Chair would observe that the question of an unwarranted statement of fact is one to be determined in this debate.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is that the ruling of the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. McCARRAN. Then I appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. FERGUSON. I decline to yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. There is pending an appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. There is pending an appeal from the ruling of the Chair. The question is, Shall the ruling of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. MAYBANK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. FERGUSON. I decline to yield for a quorum call.

Mr. McCARRAN. The question is on the appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, with respect to the parliamentary inquiry, it seems to me the point of order raised by the Senator from Nevada is so trivial and is so perfectly obviously an attempt to delay the proceedings of the Senate, that it is not a point of order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I resent the statement of the Senator from Ohio. I raised a point of order.

Mr. TAFT. There is no point of order raised.

Mr. McCARRAN. I resent the statement of the leader of the majority that my question is trivial when it is based on a parliamentary situation; when the Chair has ruled, and I have appealed from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. FERGUSON. I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. The question is on the ruling of the Chair. The question is, Shall the ruling of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate? And I ask the Chair now to put the question.

Mr. MAYBANK. Put the question.

Mr. McCARRAN. Shall the ruling of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the Senator from Michigan has the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. The judges were unanimous in their opinion——

Mr. McCARRAN. I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. FERGUSON. That the evidence——

Mr. McCARRAN. A parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FERGUSON. I decline to yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. I refuse to yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. What was the ruling of the Chair on my parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The ruling of the Chair is that the Senator from Michigan will proceed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

Mr. McCARRAN. That was not the question to be decided by the Chair. The question was, Should we be compelled to listen to utter misstatements of fact?

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The ruling of the Chair is appealed from.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan declines to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Does the Senator from Michigan have to yield for a parliamentary inquiry? Is not a parliamentary inquiry paramount?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not unless the Senator from Michigan is willing to yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have a privileged matter, and I am standing on my privilege here, and I am going to stand here. This is a privileged matter. I have made a parliamentary inquiry. I want a ruling from the Chair.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, a point of order. The Senate is not in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a ruling has been made by the Chair, and I appeal from the ruling of the Chair. I appeal now, Mr. President. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. FERGUSON. I decline to yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would hold that the Senator from Michigan does not have to yield for a parliamentary inquiry or a point of order.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the judges were unanimous in their opinion that the evidence shown——

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a question of personal privilege.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The only way in which the Senator from Michigan can be taken off the floor is by a violation of rule XIX.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, may we have order in the Chamber?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would observe that we have pretty good order, except in just trying to keep things concentrated a little bit. Just one minute.

Mr. McCARRAN. To whom is that addressed—"just one minute"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would apologize to the Senate and say that it is addressed to the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. To the Senate. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is looking up the rule. The Chair would read for the benefit of the Senate paragraph 2 of rule XIX, as follows:

> No Senator in debate shall, directly or indirectly, by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

Unless the Senator on the floor violates that provision he cannot be taken from the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. A point of order, Mr. President.

Mr. FERGUSON. I decline to yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. A point of order, Mr. President.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, may I propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. McCARRAN. A point of order, Mr. President. The Senator from Nevada——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the request?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senater from Nevada made a parliamentary inquiry on which the Chair ruled, and I appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has stated that the Senator from Michigan shall proceed.

Mr. McCARRAN. The question is, Shall the ruling of the Chair prevail?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An appeal on a parliamentary inquiry is not in order under all the rules of the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. And the Presiding Officer is not going to permit an appeal from the decision of the Chair? Is that the ruling?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not on a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McCARRAN. All right. A point of order, Mr. President.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, may I call the Chair's attention——

Mr. McCARRAN. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. McCARRAN. A point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. The judges were unanimous in their opinion——

Mr. McCARRAN. A point of order, Mr. President.

Mr. FERGUSON. That the evidence shown in the synopsis did not warrant——

Mr. McCARRAN. A point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan declines to yield for a point of order.

Mr. McCARRAN. A point of order, Mr. President.

Mr. FERGUSON. Calling the grand jury into session at that time. However, all three judges——

Mr. McCARRAN. A point of order.

Mr. FERGUSON. Testified that they either thought or assumed that the investigation would continue; that they did not know of any limitation——

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator decline to yield for a point of order?

Mr. FERGUSON. Upon the duty or authority of the FBI to make a full investigation.

Mr. McCARRAN. A point of order, Mr. President.

Mr. FERGUSON. And that they were not asked and offered no opinion——

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to read a rule of the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. That additional investigation should not be made. Mr. President, Judge Reeves stated that in his opinion——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Michigan will kindly desist for a moment the Chair will observe that the Senator from Michigan does not have to yield to a point of order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, just a moment. I read now rule XX of the Rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. I read:

> A question of order——

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I decline to yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I read:

> A question of order may be raised at any stage of the proceedings, except when the Senate is dividing, and, unless submitted to the Senate, shall be decided by the Presiding Officer without debate.

Now, Mr. President, I raise the point of order under rule XX. I ask the Presiding Officer to rule.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. McCARRAN. The Chair has ruled, and I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Now I raise the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the Senator from Michigan shall proceed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Judge Reeves stated that in his opinion——

Mr. McCARRAN. Is that the rule of the Senate of the United States?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is that the rule under which we are proceeding? It cannot go on.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. FERGUSON. I decline to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan declines to yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. A point of order has been made. Does the Presiding Officer refuse to rule on that point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no point of order on which to rule.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have raised a point of order under rule XX.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has ordered the Senator from Michigan to proceed.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have raised the point of order under rule XX, and I ask the Presiding Officer to rule on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the Senator from Michigan has the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no decision on a point of order.

Mr. McCARRAN. I want the Presiding Officer to rule. He has ruled, and I am appealing from the decision of the Chair. Is not the decision of the Chair debatable? Will the Chair answer that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair declines to entertain the appeal.

Mr. McCARRAN. Then I appeal from that decision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair still declines to entertain the appeal.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is not that decision debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That decision is not debatable.

Mr. McCARRAN. Then we are ruled off the floor of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Until the Senator from Michigan gets ready to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I decline to yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is not that a funny one?

Mr. FERGUSON. Judge Reeves stated that in his opinion the statements obtained by the Kansas City Star that he heard read at the hearing would be evidence of a conspiracy to defraud voters, and that he thought the experts in the Department of Justice would have followed "such leads" if they were properly exercising their duties. Judge Collet stated that—

> This review indicated fraud and someone ought to investigate it further.

The judges never anticipated that their opinion—that there was insufficient

evidence shown in the synopsis to warrant calling a grand jury at that time—could be used as a reason for not continuing the investigation by the FBI. The three judges all testified that they were never asked concerning the advisability of impounding the ballot boxes. Since the close of the hearings before this subcommittee, District Attorney Wear "requested the Federal court to impound primary ballots and election data pending the report of the FBI and possible grand jury action."

Mr. President, it has been stated upon this floor that if they had impounded the ballot boxes back in August, September, October, November, and December, they might have been interfering with the local grand jury of the city or the county of Jackson. Mr. President, there was no county grand jury at that time looking into fraud in these election cases. Not until a Republican prosecuting attorney was obtained was there a local grand jury called to look into the State crimes.

In spite of this, District Attorney Wear wrote, on December 19, 1946, to the assistant to the Attorney General, Douglas W. McGregor, in part as follows:

> I have had a long conference with our three district judges and have gone over the matter with them fully. They are unanimous in their opinion that there is not enough evidence to warrant them calling a grand jury to investigate the alleged frauds.
>
> I am submitting this to you so that you can have the benefit of how our three judges feel about the matter and the conclusion they have reached.

The Attorney General informed the subcommittee that the reason he did not look into the conspiracy angle further last fall was—

> Because the United States attorney and three Federal judges, and the Department, including the section head, and the Assistant Attorney General, the head of the Division, and the office of the assistant to the Attorney General, unanimously told me that there was not any evidence sufficient for a grand jury, for impounding the ballots, or for having further investigation.

Mr. President, I have sought in vain to find any evidence that anyone or all of these three judges ever said to Mr. Wear, or to anyone, that there was anything said about impounding the ballots, or that anyone "told me that there was not any evidence sufficient for a grand jury, for impounding the ballots, or for having further investigation." That will be found on page 172 of the record.

The Attorney General and FBI Director Hoover both testify that the FBI had authority to make a full investigation in any case on its own initiative except in four classes of cases—and I want to call these to the attention of the people and to the attention of the Senate tonight.

What were the four classes of cases named? Civil-rights cases—any civil-rights cases; antitrust cases; war labor dispute cases; and election cases.

District Attorney Wear added a fifth, or what is known as the criminal-flight case. In these classes of cases the FBI takes no action until directed by the Attorney General, and then takes only the specific action directed. It was testified that in election-fraud cases it is now the usual procedure for the Attorney General to order the FBI to make what is termed a preliminary investigation in which only the complainants are interrogated. The purpose of the preliminary investigation was stated to be to determine if there were reasons disclosed justifying the making of a full investigation, in which case every facility of the FBI would be made available to determine if there had been a violation of Federal law. It is noted that at the time of the election-fraud investigation by the FBI following the 1936 election in Kansas City, Mo., there were no restrictions by rule of the Attorney General limiting the authority of the FBI to make only the investigation specifically directed and authorized by him. In that case the FBI conducted a full and complete investigation immedately following the election and, as a result thereof, more than 250 persons were convicted in the Federal courts of illegal conduct in connection with that election. Thereafter, in 1941, the Attorney General imposed the restrictions now in force on the FBI in making investigations in this class of cases. In the instant case, acting on the instructions of the Attorney General, the FBI made only a preliminary investigation. The facts disclosed by this preliminary investigation clearly indicate to this subcommittee that there was evidence of numerous violations of Federal law. The three Federal district judges each testified that statements in the FBI report contained indications of conspiracy and that additional investigation appeared to be warranted.

District Attorney Wear thought, and so advised the Attorney General, that there were a few things that "I thought might be investigated a little further."

In other words, the district attorney stated that there were a few things that he thought might be investigated a little further, and that there were probably a couple of affidavits that would probably bear further investigation. That is stated on page 508.

But not one of the witnesses who made these affidavits or statements was ever interviewed during this investigation. Even in view of Wear's recommendations, Attorney General Clark stated to the subcommittee:

> If anything showed up that the district attorney thought should be investigated, they would investigate further.

That is on page 31.

On January 6, 1947, as I said before, the investigation, on the order of the Attorney General, was stopped.

Instead of using the preliminary investigation for its stated purpose, an inaccurate and incomplete synopsis of it was made and presented to the three district judges for the purpose of determining whether there was sufficient evidence disclosed in such synopsis to justify the calling of the grand jury at that time.

As I said before, the report of the FBI was submitted, but the synopsis was taken by the judges. The material evidence available to the Attorney General established beyond any reasonable doubt abundant evidence of every element of a Federal crime, in the opinion of the Senator from Michigan. Attention is directed to the fact that the evidence of conspiracy and the material obtained by the Kansas City Star and made available to the Attorney General was there by accident, because an invesigation was not directed along this line. The facts should have caused the Attorney General to have desired some investigation of this phase. No investigation as to the existence of a conspiracy was made by the FBI and none was ordered or permitted by the Attorney General. The subcommittee cannot justify, in my humble judgment, the failure of the Attorney General to cause such an investigation to be made. The subcommittee cannot justify (a) the failure of the Attorney General to cause such investigation to be made; or (b) the use of the report of the preliminary investigation.

The Attorney General testified that it was the customary procedure to order a preliminary investigation and for the Attorney General to name the persons to be interviewed and to list the information to be obtained when complaints were received concerning election frauds. That will be found on page 7.

I want to call the attention of the Members of the Senate to what happened when the Democratic committeeman in Wyandotte County, Kans., called some irregularities to the attention of the Attorney General. The common council of Kansas City, Mo., and the election commission called it to his attention in Kansas City, Mo. I have told some of the things that happened. Let me tell the Senate what happened when, in Wyandotte County, Kans., the Democratic committeeman called to his attention some irregularities so far as the Republicans were concerned. Here is what happened.

Wyandotte County, Kans., borders Jackson County, Mo., and contains the city of Kansas City, Kans., which is considered a part of the metropolitan area of Kansas City, Mo. But Mr. Slaughter was not running in that district. On November 23, 1946, the United States district attorney at Topeka, Kans., received a letter from Carl V. Rice, of Kansas City, Kans., in which it was claimed that frauds had been discovered in the recent general election in Wyandotte County, Kans.; that a county candidate—not a Federal official—had admitted that election records had been changed, and that in some precincts the total votes counted exceeded the number of voters. This was in Kansas City, Kans. The letter stated that an investigation pertaining only to county officials was being conducted by the State's attorney for Wyandotte County. A request was made that the Department of Justice immediately investigate the election to determine if there had been violation of Federal laws. There were no restrictions at all in Kansas City, Kans., but where Mr. Slaughter was running we could not obtain any evidence that there was a full and complete investigation. The evidence so far presented on the preliminary studies showed that it was restricted. But it was to be a complete investigation across the river.

By telegraph a copy of the Rice letter was sent to the Attorney General on November 25, 1946, by the United States district attorney, with a request that he

be directed how to proceed in the matter. It is now pointed out by the committee that in the Wyandotte County case there had been no investigation made such as was made by the Kansas City Star, and the complaint came from only one individual, so far as the record shows. The Attorney General sent a telegram to the United States district attorney on November 27, 1946, as follows:

Lineation November 25, Department is today requesting FBI to investigate Wyandotte County election frauds under your direction to determine possible violations of 18 United States Code 51. Copy of authorizing memorandum follows.

There is no restriction in that one and no specification that certain witnesses only were to be interviewed or investigated. But that was across the river.

The FBI was furnished a copy of the telegram from the district attorney, and the above reply, and were instructed to make an investigation limited only as shown in the following instructions:

Investigation of the charges set out above is desired to determine whether the vote for Federal candidates was nullified or diluted as a result of tampering, altering of ballots, and stuffing of ballot boxes in violation of section 51, title 18, United States Code.

It is requested that you conduct your investigation under the direction of the United States attorney.

In other words, to conduct the investigation—not a limited investigation—but an investigation under the direction of the United States attorney.

In this Wyandotte County case the Attorney General did not instruct the FBI what witnesses only were to be interrogated. The FBI was told to make an "investigation of the charges," and the discretion as to what persons should be interrogated was left to the highly trained and expert agents of the FBI.

On December 3, 1946, FBI Director Hoover advised the Kansas City office of the FBI, in part, as follows:

In accordance with the Department's request, you are instructed to conduct an immediate and thorough investigation and to submit a report.

Again, we note no limited investigation.

The Attorney General closed the investigation on January 6, 1946, by memorandum to the FBI which sets out at length the conclusions of the Attorney General's Office, and I ask that it be inserted at this place in the RECORD. I shall ask to have included in the RECORD later the entire memorandum which I shall offer.

There being no objection, the portion of the memorandum referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

No evidence was uncovered to indicate a conspiracy to violate section 51, title 18, United States Code, nor is there evidence to indicate that the election judges, or anyone else knowingly violated the Federal law. * * * No evidence is offered that anyone conspired to miscount or falsify ballots in violation of section 51, title 18, United States Code, despite the admittedly improper method of counting the ballots employed in many of the polling places.

The investigation in this case was thorough, and we concluded that there was no certain basis for the prosecution of anyone under section 51, title 18, United States Code, for election fraud conspiracy. This conclusion is further supported by the detailed memorandum of the United States Attorney Wear, based on the FBI report above-mentioned, and submitted with his letter of November 1, 1946, to assistant to the Attorney General McGregor.

In a supplementary letter of December 19, 1946, Mr. Wear stated that he has gone over this matter with the three judges of the western district of Missouri in a lengthy conference, and they are unanimous in this opinion that there is not enough evidence to warrant their calling a grand jury to investigate the alleged frauds.

Accordingly, we are closing our file, and informing you that no further investigation is desired.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I decline to yield at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, Attorney General Clark delivered to this committee his official file in this matter. In it, labeled "office memoranda," are 28 typewritten sheets of paper, each containing a summary of the evidence pertaining to election irregularities in a specific precinct. Near the bottom of almost all of these sheets are the following words: "Possible Federal violations—." Following this phrase appears a number or the word "None." The total of the "possible Federal violations" noted in the file is 173.

Attention is directed to the fact that in the memorandum from the Attorney General to the FBI directing a preliminary investigation it is stated that reports—

indicate that persons first, are officially listed as having voted while claiming that they did not vote; or, second, are officially listed as not having voted while claiming they did vote; or three, appeared at the polling places and found that their names had already been voted. These latter irregulatities indicate a violation of section 51.

In the above-referred-to file of the Attorney General the summaries indicate that there were 159 persons who were listed on the election records as having voted but the evidence indicates that they did not vote; that there were 10 persons who claimed they did vote, but the election records failed to so show; and that 14 persons were not permitted to vote when they went to the polls because their names had been voted.

On page 57 of the report of the FBI it is noted that in precinct 10 of ward 1 the investigators for the Kansas City Star interviewed 121 voters of the total of 295 shown to have voted by the poll book or the 237 shown to have voted by the voting list. In the files of the Attorney General the result of the recount of ballots in this precinct by the State grand jury discloses that Axtell had been given six votes too many, Slaughter four votes too few, and Walsh three votes too few. If all the voters had been interviewed, and the same ratio of illegal votes were found, the total would have been approximately 56. There was an error of 13 in the counting, and if the same ratio were carried through, there would be a total error of 69 in the precinct. The error in this one precinct apparently is approximately 26 percent.

Numerous statements were furnished to the Attorney General by the Kansas City Star, which indicated that the election officials and others counted the ballots by stacking them into three piles of what was supposed to consist of "straight machine" ballots, "mixed" ballots, and Republican ballots.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the distinguished and able Senator from Michigan yield for one little question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I decline to yield at the present time. I shall yield a little later.

Mr. LUCAS. I regret that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan declines to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Attorney General testified that "the agreement to count the votes that way would not be" a violation of Federal law, but "if it included a miscount of votes it would be." In the file of the Attorney General there appears the report of the result of the recount of the ballots in seven precincts by the State grand jury as follows:

	Official count	Grand jury count	Difference
Roger Slaughter	53	118	65
Jerome Walsh	59	185	126
Enos Axtell	1,651	1,456	195

It is particularly noted that in the memorandum of the Attorney General closing the files in this matter and directing no further investigation by the FBI, it is stated that the "investigation in this case was thorough." This obviously is an inaccurate statement. FBI Director Hoover stated that the investigation was "thorough insofar as the instructions received from the Criminal Division were concerned" but the instructions of the Attorney General prevented it from being a thorough investigation of the alleged violations of Federal law. Mention is made frequently in this memorandum that there is "no evidence to indicate conspiracy."

It is appropriate to point out that there is evidence in the file to indicate that the investigators for the Kansas City Star made no effort to discover evidence of a conspiracy, and that the FBI investigators, within the limits of their authority, could interrogate no person, in order to obtain the original evidence of acts of conspiracy, who was present in the polling booths on election day or who likely would have reason to know of a conspiracy.

On April 29, 1947, Turner L. Smith, Chief, Civil Rights Section, sent an interoffice memorandum to Assistant Attorney General Caudle, concerning an editorial that appeared in the Kansas City Star. Smith wrote:

If it can be established, as charged in the editorial, that certain election officials conspired to permit false votes to be cast, or conspired to make false returns, this, of

course, becomes a Federal offense where a congressional candidate is involved.

If this can be established as a fact and responsible persons identified, we have a Federal case.

The trouble about answering this editorial is, to date we don't have enough facts to go on.

In other words, Mr. President, there was evidence in the files that indicated they should have made a further investigation, because Smith said:

The trouble about answering this editorial is, to date we don't have enough facts to go on—

Because they had not interviewed the witnesses.

It appears that no attempt was made by the Attorney General to obtain the original evidence of the truth of many allegations that conspiracy in violation of Federal law existed, and that as late as April 29, 1947, the Chief of the Civil Rights Section admitted that there were not sufficient facts available upon which an opinion could be based.

Nevertheless as early as January 1947, it was stated by the same Department that sufficient facts were at hand for them to come to the conclusion that no evidence of conspiracy existed. This is set forth in the following section.

Mr. President, there is one thing that I wish to call to the attention of the Senate at this point. Great stress was laid on the fact that Mr. Hoover, after he testified before the committee on June 18, wrote a letter to the junior Senator from Michigan. Later I shall ask to have the letter printed in the RECORD, but at this time I shall read just a part of it, because it was referred to on the floor of the Senate, and it seems to have been regarded as very important. We find that the Attorney General has a rule that election fraud cases cannot be investigated by the FBI.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I decline to yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. FERGUSON. I decline to yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield for a point of order?

Mr. FERGUSON. I decline to yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I appeal from the decision of the Chair that the Senator can decline to yield for a point of order.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I decline to yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair ruled that except as the Senator yielded for a point of order, it could not be made. Therefore, there is no possibility of an appeal, under the circumstances.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I appeal from the decision of the Chair in that respect.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan has refused to yield, and the Chair holds that an appeal is impossible on a ruling that has not been made.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, as I said before—and this is a very appropriate time for an interruption, and I appreciate it—I call attention to the fact that in this letter of Mr. Hoover it is thought so important to say who made the order.

Mr. President, if one man in the United States made it, it would look as if it was a genuine order, based upon reasonable grounds. Who was that man? It was Maurice Milligan, of Kansas City, who prosecuted the Pendergast machine back in 1936.

This is what Mr. Hoover said in his letter to the junior Senator from Michigan:

The fact that we were ordered to make a preliminary inquiry in this case was not unusual. In the summer of 1941 Mr. Maurice Milligan, who you will recall prosecuted the original Kansas City vote-fraud case in 1936, as a special assistant to former Attorney General Robert H. Jackson, instituted the policy that unless advised to the contrary in election-fraud cases, preliminary inquiry was to be made only upon departmental instructions, after which the facts were to be submitted to departmental attorneys who would study the facts for decision as to further action. This same policy is followed in other classes of cases.

Mr. President, it appeared that there must be some reason for calling the attention of the junior Senator from Michigan to the fact that Mr. Milligan put into effect this rule, this limiting rule, that the FBI could not investigate unless they were ordered, and then only as they were allowed to. So I thought the best thing to do was to make an inquiry from Mr. Ladd. Mr. Ladd could not find this order, and stated that it must have been a verbal order.

The next witness to go to was naturally Mr. Milligan and the junior Senator from Michigan called Mr. Milligan and sent him a telegram. All I have is what Mr. Milligan stated. There is something wrong about these dates and that is why I am putting this in, because we should have a further investigation. The junior Senator from Michigan is convinced that Mr. Hoover would not have sent this letter unless someone gave him some evidence, and this is what Mr. Milligan said:

KANSAS CITY, MO., *July 18, 1947.*

Senator HOMER E. FERGUSON:

Replying to your telegram. I was appointed special assistant by Attorney General Jackson October 15, 1940, to direct special investigation into complaints received by Justice Department as to election fraud violations of Hatch Act, and Corrupt Practices Act, and other violations relative to contributions and expenditures concerning the 1940 general election. Investigation was concluded February 25, 1941. I have no recollection of instituting the policy that preliminary inquiry was to be made in election fraud cases only upon departmental instruction, nor do I recall the existence of such an order.

MAURICE M. MILLIGAN.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. FERGUSON. I decline to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator yield for an observation? It has nothing to do with what the Senator is talking about.

Mr. FERGUSON. I will yield a little later.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. On February 10, 1947, Attorney General Clark wrote a second letter to Senator KEM, a portion of which is as follows:

As I previously advised you, the Federal Bureau of Investigation at my instance conducted a full investigation into the charges of fraud in this primary. A careful and thorough review of the results of this investigation has been made and no evidence of a Federal violation was established.

It is noted that the Attorney General stated that, at his instance, the FBI had made a "full investigation" of the alleged vote frauds in Kansas City, Mo., when in truth and in fact, at his specific direction, the investigation made was something less than full, and he had specifically directed that a full investigation not be made.

In the opinion of the chairman of the junior Senator from Michigan, the replies of the Attorney General were phrased in such language as are likely to mislead a Senator of the United States. In answer to an official inquiry, the Attorney General assured Senator KEM, of Missouri, that the investigation was "lengthy and detailed." It was not. The Attorney General also wrote Senator KEM that the "Federal Bureau of Investigation, at my instance, conducted a full investigation into the charges of fraud in this primary."

No such full investigation was conducted.

Subsequent to the time that the Attorney General closed his files in this case and informed the FBI that no further investigation was desired, a State grand jury returned 81 indictments against 71 individuals. On May 27, 1947, the State grand jury made its final report, a portion of which is as follows.

I ask leave to insert the report in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In our investigation it was revealed that in some precincts ballots were deliberately miscounted and false returns made of the election results to the election commissioners. We also discovered wrongful, illegal, and wholesale marking of ballots, vote buying and bribery, and illegal participation of party workers who were not polling officials in the counting of votes, gross negligence, carelessness and indifference on the part of judges and clerks in the performance of their duties.

* * * * *

The grand jury subpenaed the ballots, tally sheets, poll books, and other records from the election commissioners and recounted the ballots in certain precincts. Miscounts of shocking proportions were revealed. A significant fact is that where a sizable miscount of votes was found the count invariably was in favor of one factional slate of Democratic candidates. In not one instance in which a consequential miscount was found was the miscount in favor of a candidate other than the candidates upon that particular factional slate.

The grand jury recommends further investigation including a complete recount of all ballots in the race for the Democratic nomination for Representative in Congress for the Fifth District of Missouri, by the proper authorities. It is our belief that Roger C. Slaughter, in this race was deprived of the nomination by a fraudulent miscount of votes and by other types of fraud.

* * * * *

Our investigation revealed that in certain precincts the names of some registered voters were voted by impersonators and in some instances payments were made to the impersonators. This type of fraud can only be perpetrated by collusion and conspiracy.

* * * * *

Our investigation and indictments further reveal that improper and unauthorized persons were wrongfully permitted by the precinct officials to handle ballots and count votes, and otherwise participate in the preparation of the official returns as certified to the election commissioners. In certain precincts watchers and challengers, usually precinct captains, unlawfully and wrongfully took charge of the ballots after the polls closed and after the ballot boxes were opened through collusion with, or intimidation of, polling officials. In all precincts where this was permitted there was a wide discrepancy between the official returns as certified by the polling officials and the true count as determined by the grand jury.

* * * * *

In our investigation of vote frauds we have confined our efforts, of necessity, largely to a recount of the ballots. The grand jury strongly stresses the fact that in an investigation of vote frauds and irregularities the great majority of the fraud can only be substantiated and proved by a thorough, scientific examination of the ballots and records by competent scientific methods by trained men. There were definite indications of conspiracy and irregularities requiring such expert services bearing on the identity of handwriting, pencil marks, finger prints, etc. It is a matter of general knowledge that the Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice, has such expert examiners and facilities to carry on such an investigation. We strongly urge that the United States Department of Justice and the FBI enter this investigation.

Mr. FERGUSON. On the night of May 27, 1947, less than 24 hours after the report of the State grand jury, from which the above quotations were taken, was made public, and less than 24 hours before the beginning of the hearings before this subcommittee, the vault door to the room in the Jackson County courthouse in Kansas City, Mo., where the ballots were stored, was blown open with explosives and all or substantially all the ballots which could be used as evidence in the prosecution of persons indicted by the State grand jury were stolen. These stolen ballots have not been recovered. On May 28, 1947, the Attorney General ordered the FBI to investigate the theft of the ballots, and on May 30 the Attorney General ordered the FBI to make a full investigation of the alleged election frauds occurring at the primary election held August 6, 1946, in the Fifth Congressional District in Missouri. Newspaper reports indicate that the FBI investigation has twice since May 30 been enlarged to include other areas in Missouri. FBI Director Hoover stated to this subcommittee that—

There is no question, now that the ballots, or some of them, at least, have been stolen, that our investigation will be seriously handicapped; and it will probably require much longer time to conclude and will not be as complete as it would have been if we could have had the examination of the ballots for our investigation.

Mr. President, these ballots have not been recovered, but five people have been indicted for Federal crimes out there since the calling of the grand jury.

I recommended then, and I certainly recommend today, that Senate Resolution 116 be reported favorably to the Senate without amendment, and, second, that a full and complete investigation by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary be authorized, and that we should have a favorable vote.

At this time I wish to insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks Exhibits 1, 2, 3 and 4, which I now hand to the Clerk.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, does the Senator ask for unanimous consent?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. He did, as I the Chair understands. Is there objection?

Mr. McCARRAN. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada objects.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. FERGUSON. I will yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will the Senator yield that I may make the point of order that a quorum is not present?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I decline to yield for the present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield under a unanimous-consent agreement that no parliamentary situation will be created by which he will be disturbed, and that he will continue to have the floor?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator declines to yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, it is now 10 minutes after 1 o'clock, but I have been prohibited from putting this report into the RECORD. I think this is so material that I shall read it into the RECORD if it is impossible to get it into the RECORD in any other way.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield that I may make a motion that the page boys may be allowed to go home?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, at this time I move that the pending motion before the Senate be laid on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan moves——

Mr. McCLELLAN. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state the parliamentary situation. The Senator from Michigan moves that the motion made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] be laid on the table.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Millikin
Baldwin	Gurney	Moore
Ball	Hatch	Morse
Brewster	Hawkes	Myers
Bricker	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brooks	Hill	Pepper
Buck	Holland	Revercomb
Bushfield	Ives	Saltonstall
Butler	Jenner	Smith
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Capehart	Kem	Stewart
Capper	Kilgore	Taft
Chavez	Knowland	Taylor
Connally	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Cooper	Lodge	Thye
Cordon	McCarran	Umstead
Donnell	McCarthy	Vandenberg
Downey	McClellan	Watkins
Dworshak	McFarland	Wherry
Ecton	McGrath	White
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wiley
Flanders	Malone	Williams
Fulbright	Martin	Young
George	Maybank	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask for a recapitulation of the quorum call.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is entitled to a recapitulation. The clerk will recapitulate.

The legislative clerk read the names of Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. BALL, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BUCK——

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a point of order. I ask that Senators answer to their names.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is not entitled to make any such request, in the opinion of the Chair. That is not a recapitulation.

Mr. McCARRAN. I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Parliamentarian says he never heard of anything like that before in the history of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order. The Senator from Nevada is not in his seat, and is not in position to address the Chair.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the question is, Shall the ruling of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will announce what the question is.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thought the Chair would.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair rules in a fashion from which the Senator from Nevada appeals. There is no precedent on the subject. In the opinion of the Chair, the Senator is entitled to his appeal. The question is, Shall the ruling of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move——

Mr. McCARRAN. A parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. TAFT. I move to lay the appeal on the table.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is that motion debatable?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio moves to lay the appeal on the table.

Mr. McCARRAN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is the decision of the Chair debatable?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is not debatable. A motion to lay the appeal upon the table has been made.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. McCARRAN. A point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, as I understand—first of all, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. We are in the midst of a quorum call at the moment, and the result has not yet been announced. That is involved in the question of order that the Senator has raised.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under rule V——

Mr. STEWART. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Just a moment. Under rule V, when a quorum call has been made the Presiding Officer is directed to announce the result, "and these proceedings shall be without debate."

The question is on the appeal which the Senator from Nevada has taken from the decision of the Chair, followed by the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to lay the appeal on the table. It must be settled without debate. The question is, Shall the opinion of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. STEWART. A parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a point of order. Is not the question on the motion to lay the point of order on the table?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair corrects himself. The question is, Shall the point of order be laid on the table? [Putting the question.]

Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. STEWART, and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays have been requested. Evidently there is a sufficient number, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask for a recapitulation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is entitled to a recapitulation of the vote. The result must first be announced, and then the Senator is entitled to his recapitulation. The clerk will announce the result. The clerk will make the first regular recapitulation anyway, under the regular practice.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is not recorded.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I vote "nay."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator wish to vote?

Mr. MAYBANK. No. I ask how I am recorded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have not voted. Have I the right at this time to explain why I will not vote on this motion?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has no right to interrupt the roll call with an explanation. Does the Senator wish to vote?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not wish to vote unless I can explain my vote.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the calling of the roll.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will recapitulate the vote.

The legislative clerk recapitulated the vote.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the previously mentioned Senators would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family. If present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. The Senator from Kansas, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent on public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—46

Aiken	Ecton	Moore
Baldwin	Ferguson	Morse
Ball	Flanders	Revercomb
Brewster	Gurney	Saltonstall
Bricker	Hawkes	Smith
Brooks	Hickenlooper	Taft
Buck	Ives	Thye
Bushfield	Jenner	Vandenberg
Butler	Kem	Watkins
Cain	Knowland	Wherry
Capehart	Langer	White
Capper	Lodge	Wiley
Cooper	McCarthy	Williams
Cordon	Malone	Young
Donnell	Martin	
Dworshak	Millikin	

NAYS—25

Chavez	George	Holland
Connally	Green	Johnston, S. C.
Downey	Hatch	Kilgore
Fulbright	Hill	McCarran
McClellan	Myers	Taylor
McFarland	O'Daniel	Thomas, Utah
McGrath	Pepper	Umstead
Magnuson	Sparkman	
Maybank	Stewart	

NOT VOTING—24

Barkley	Lucas	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	McKellar	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	McMahon	Russell
Eastland	Murray	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	O'Conor	Tobey
Hayden	O'Mahoney	Tydings
Hoey	Overton	Wagner
Johnson, Colo.	Reed	Wilson

So Mr. TAFT's motion to lay on the table Mr. MCCARRAN's point of order was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] to postpone the Wherry motion to January 3, 1948.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. McCARRAN. What is the motion? May I ask the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair just stated the parliamentary situation. The pending question is the motion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. Those in favor will answer "yea" as the roll is called.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. What is the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has answered the Senator twice.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have not been here for two answers; only one.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator requires two at least. This will be the second.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well. I thank the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will first respond to the Senator from Nevada. The Senator from Illinois can wait.

Mr. LUCAS. I regret that I disturbed the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to lay upon the table the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. The Senator from New Hampshire, if present and voting, would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. The Senator from Wyoming, if present and voting, would vote "yea," and the Senator from Ten-

nessee, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. The Senator from Iowa, if present and voting, would vote "yea," and the Senator from Mississippi, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family. If present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. The Senator from Kansas, if present and voting, would vote "yea," and the Senator from New York, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent on public business.

On this vote the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay" and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay" and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON]. If present and voting the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay" and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. If present the Senator from New York would vote "nay" and the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "nay."

The clerk will continue the calling of the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I am serious about this.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Were the yeas and nays ordered?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that they were.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not recall that they were ordered on this particular vote. Perhaps so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will continue the calling of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the calling of the roll.

Mr. BRICKER. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], which in my judgment covers this vote. So instead of voting "yea," let the RECORD show that if the junior Senator from Virginia were present he would vote "nay," and if I were at liberty to vote I would vote "yea."

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, when the vote is announced I desire to be recognized.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will announce the vote.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask for a recapitulation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That can be done after the announcement is made.

The vote resulted—yeas 45, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—45

Aiken	Ecton	Millikin
Baldwin	Ferguson	Moore
Ball	Flanders	Morse
Brewster	Gurney	Revercomb
Brooks	Hawkes	Saltonstall
Buck	Hickenlooper	Smith
Bushfield	Ives	Taft
Butler	Jenner	Thye
Cain	Kem	Vandenberg
Capehart	Knowland	Watkins
Capper	Langer	Wherry
Cooper	Lodge	White
Cordon	McCarthy	Wiley
Donnell	Malone	Williams
Dworshak	Martin	Young

NAYS—30

Barkley	Holland	Myers
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor
Connally	Kilgore	O'Daniel
Downey	Lucas	Pepper
Ellender	McCarran	Russell
Fulbright	McClellan	Sparkman
George	McFarland	Stewart
Green	McGrath	Taylor
Hatch	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Hill	Maybank	Umstead

NOT VOTING—20

Bricker	McKellar	Robertson, Wyo.
Bridges	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Murray	Tobey
Eastland	O'Mahoney	Tydings
Hayden	Overton	Wagner
Hoey	Reed	Wilson
Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] asks for a recapitulation, which the clerk will give him.

The legislative clerk recapitulated the vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The total remains as originally announced.

The motion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is agreed to.

The question now before the Senate——

Mr. MCCARRAN and Mr. MAYBANK addressed the Chair.

The Chair wishes to state the parliamentary situation when Senators will then be recognized.

The question is on the motion of the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] to proceed with the consideration of Senate Resolution 150 to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 116.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is recognized.

Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. MCCLELLAN, and Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nevada yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MCCARRAN. If I do not yield the floor or lose my position on the floor in any respect, I will yield for a question from my colleague the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. Is that understood?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair cannot give the Senator that assurance.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, without in any way interfering with the occupancy of the floor by the Senator from Nevada, to make a brief statement with reference to the ruling of the Chair a moment ago on the appeal of the Senator from Nevada, upon which question I did not vote, and also to comment upon the ruling of the Chair previously this evening with respect to the right of a Senator to interrupt another Senator while he has the floor.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The Chair was about to ask if the Senator from Nevada would yield for that purpose.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

Mr. MCCARRAN. I cannot yield, apparently, without losing the floor.

Mr. President, greatness is achieved by the actions of men——

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nevada yield for that purpose?

Mr. MCCARRAN. I decline to yield.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MCCARRAN. I cannot yield. The precedent has been set this evening.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct. The precedent has been set, and it follows many precedents of the Senate which the Chair has been since exploring.

Mr. MCCARRAN. May I repeat, that greatness is achieved by the actions of men. Jealousy is a peculiar thing in the human mind and the human heart. It is a strange thing that men should lend themselves to jealousy. The senior Senator from Michigan has achieved a great place in a great nation's history. The name of the senior Senator from Michigan will go down in the history of the nations of the world, and no degree of jealousy can ever transcend that fine place which he has achieved. It is unfortunate that others would climb to his

place. It is unfortunate that we cannot all occupy that fine position in the world. But apparently we cannot have it, because the senior Senator from Michigan has gained a place in world history to which I doubt any of us can ever aspire.

Mr. President, an unusual thing is asked of the Senate tonight, a most unusual thing. It is proposed that a major committee of the Senate be divested of its jurisdiction after it has carried out everything which it was called upon to do.

Mr. President, Senate Resolution 116 is couched in such language that he who runs may read. It was submitted by this body to the Senate Judiciary Committee, and the chairman of that committee selected his own subcommittee. No one suggested to him any Senator to be appointed to membership on the subcommittee. The subcommittee went forward with its work with some zeal——

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall yield in just a moment.

Mr. President, as I said, the subcommittee went forward with its work with as much zeal as I think I have seen manifested by any subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, of which I have been a member for 14 years.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I am now looking at the clock. It is now 10 minutes to 2 a. m. The Senator from Nevada has not had an opportunity to discuss this case until just now. Does he think it is quite fair to force him to make his discussion at 10 minutes of 2?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, if I may answer that question, let me say that I have experienced so much unfairness tonight that a little more will do me no harm.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator has not answered my question.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am sorry if I have not. But do not let anyone think for a moment that I am tiring, because I am not. Senators may smirk and they may smile, but I will answer the Senator from Michigan before the sun rises in the morning.

Mr. President, I wish to have the Senate listen to Senate Resolution 116, and I ask Senators in all their judicial temperament to judge kindly the proceedings thereafter.

Mr. President, with your permission, I read the resolution. This is Senate Resolution 116:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation concerning the failure of the Attorney General of the United States and the Department of Justice to act with respect to alleged irregularities in the Democratic primary election held in the Fifth Congressional District for Missouri on August 6, 1946, with a view to ascertaining whether the Attorney General and the officers of the Department of Justice have properly performed their duties with respect to the investigation and prosecution of any violations of law which may have occurred in connection with said primary election. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

Mr. President, let me repeat part of the resolution which I have read:

Any violations of law which may have occurred in connection with said primary election.

Mr. President, what law? The law of Missouri? That is all that the Senator from Michigan wants us to do. Yet we have no more right to investigate the enforcement of the laws of Missouri than we have to regulate or investigate the laws of any other State of the Union.

Mr. President, I come back to the thought of how it is that men grow jealous of each other. It is too bad, indeed, that there should be jealousy that the senior Senator from Michigan should have gained such fine place. It would have been well, indeed, if others of us could have gained the same place. The only way we have to gain that place is by finding the mote in someone else's eye. The only way we have to gain a place comparable with that of the senior Senator from Michigan is that we might pull ourselves up by crushing other men down. May God forbid that any man should seek to climb to the attainment of another man who, by his mentality and splendor, is recognized around the world. If others want to gain something in his shadow, it will be in the shadow of the senior Senator from Michigan. It will never be in the light that he has shed in his fine achievements at home and abroad; and I doubt very much if any of us can ever gain that place. I wish we could.

Mr. President, the law is the law. I am going to deal with it, and I hope I may have the attention of the Senate.

In the period immediately following the Civil War Congress saw fit to enact very comprehensive laws touching almost every conceivable wrongful act which might take place at the polling place. For example, it was made a Federal crime—

For anyone to obstruct another in the exercise of the right to vote, by means of bribery to influence a vote, to knowingly impersonate another in the act of voting, voting in the wrong precinct or ward, for anyone to interfere with the duty of an election officer, to improperly register to vote; and this act, known as the Enforcement Act of 1870, went so far as to provide for Federal supervisors at the polling place.

After about 20 years' experience with these laws which amounted to virtually complete Federal supervision over elections within the respective States, Congress repealed the Enforcement Act and by this means practically withdrew from the business of regulating elections through the means of criminal statutes. The repealing act removed from the statute books each of the examples set out above, and such acts no longer were Federal violations with the following exceptions. The repeal of these laws took place in 1894.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question or for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall yield as I go along; I shall be glad to yield for any inquiry, so long as it is understood that I do not lose the floor thereby.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, my point is this: It is now 2 o'clock in the morning——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not wish to be discourteous to the Senator from New Mexico; but I do not wish to have the Senator from Nevada jeopardize his position on the floor, so I must object.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I object; now——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada has not lost the floor yet as the result of anything that has happened.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I was about to propound a parliamentary inquiry, with the permission of the Senator from Nevada. My inquiry is this: To be very frank about it, I do not want to stay here all night. Has any business been transacted since the last quorum call?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The President pro tempore will consult the Journal Clerk.

Mr. HATCH. Has there?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair replies that there has.

Mr. HATCH. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nevada yield for that purpose?

Mr. McCARRAN. If I shall lose the floor by yielding for that purpose, I will not yield at all.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The only parliamentary effect will be to terminate the Senator's first speech on the subject; and after the quorum call, the Senator will start his second speech.

Mr. McCARRAN. No; I will not do that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to state the situation for the benefit of the Senator.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the President pro tempore, the present presiding officer, who has always been very fair and frank in his statements relative to the rules of the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, if I lose the floor by permitting the inquiry to be made, I shall not yield, if I am asked to yield for that purpose.

Mr. HATCH. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. McCARRAN. If I lose the floor, or if there is any interference with my position on the floor, I cannot yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Of course, the Senator will have to take the responsibility of yielding.

Mr. McCARRAN. If that is the case——

Mr. HATCH. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. McCARRAN. That may interfere with my position on the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair the Senator can yield for a parliamentary inquiry without losing his position on the floor.

Mr. HATCH. If I recall the rules of the Senate, they provide that when any Senator observes the absence of a quorum he may suggest the absence of a quorum, and I have observed the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator yields for that purpose——

Mr. McCARRAN. No, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair rules that a quorum cannot be called in the time of another Senator without the consent of the Senator, and the reason is obvious, because under the rule which confines a Senator to two speeches in one legislative day a quorum call ends the first speech, and the Senator therefore is at least partially taken off his feet without his consent. The Chair rules that a quorum cannot be called without the consent of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

Mr. McCARRAN. I am not going to yield if it takes me off the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall abide by the ruling of the Chair in that respect all the way through my discussion of this matter.

Mr. HATCH. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nevada yield for that purpose?

Mr. McCARRAN. If it does not take me off the floor, yes, but not otherwise.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is for the Senator from Nevada to decide.

Mr. McCARRAN. I take it that the question is questionably decided by the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No. The Chair repeats that a Senator can yield for a parliamentary inquiry without taking him off the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very, well; if that is the case, I yield for that purpose.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Chair add, so long as we are trying to get the matter straightened out for a pleasant evening session——

Mr. LUCAS. The Chair means a pleasant morning session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If anyone objects, the Senator can yield only for a question, but without objection the Senator can yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McCARRAN. Providing I do not lose the floor.

Mr. HATCH. I certainly do not want to take the Senator off the floor, and I merely wanted to make an inquiry——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada has the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have the floor, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will proceed or yield, one or the other.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to say that I think the Presiding Officer was absolutely correct in his ruling. I have no question about it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am not yielding.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada——

Mr. McCARRAN. The rulings tonight have been so peculiar that I am not yielding.

At the time the Congress repealed the Enforcement Act of 1870 outlawing such acts as above indicated—it left on the statute books two statutes which are commonly known as civil rights statutes—sections 51 and 52 of title 18. Neither of these statutes directly mention in any way election crimes but merely guarantee to all citizens the right to freely exercise any Federal right guaranteed by the Constitution and laws of the United States.

By a process of judicial interpretation of these two statutes, the right to vote for a Federal candidate became read into these statutes as one of the Federal rights they secured. A number of U. S. Supreme Court decisions have dealt with these two statutes relating to election frauds beginning with the case of *U. S.* v. *Cruikshank* (92 U. S. 542), about 1880, and *Ex parte Yarbrough* (101 U. S. 651 in 1884), and ending with United States against Saylor in 1944. Based on these decisions the following Federal rights with respect to elections have been read into these statutes and constitute today the sole jurisdiction of the Federal Government over election frauds.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I take it that I may yield for a question, because it has been a common custom on the floor of the Senate to yield for a question without losing the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator may yield for a question.

Mr. McCARRAN. But I have seen so many rulings tonight that were contrary to rules that have been made during my 14 years in the Senate that I do not know where I am.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks the Senator is mistaken, but that is not for argument at the moment. The Senator may yield, certainly, for a question at any time.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

Mr. LUCAS. The question I wish to propound to the able Senator is simply this: The Senator is now quoting from Supreme Court decisions upon election matters, which are of course vital and fundamental to all prominent and capable attorneys, but does the Senator think for one moment that the committee which is requested to investigate the situation which is before the Senate would in any wise follow the laws laid down by the Supreme Court of this country?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wish to answer that in the Record. This matter was submitted to a subcommittee of which the able and eminent junior Senator from Michigan—not the senior Senator, but the junior Senator from Michigan—was chairman. The whole matter was in the hands of that subcommittee headed by that able and distinguished gentleman. He had a right to go as far as he liked, and he called all the witnesses he wanted. No one else on the committee, so far as I know, ever had a voice in calling witnesses. I was a member of the subcommittee, not by my choice, but wholly by designation of the Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and being a member of the subcommittee I attended as much as I could. We were not consulted as to the witnesses who would be called. They were called at the designation of the chairman. The last word of the chairman was that "The committee is now in recess, or adjournment, at the call of the Chair."

I hope the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] will not leave the Senate Chamber, because we are discussing his resolution, and indeed it would be apropos of the whole situation if he might remain and listen to a discussion of his resolution.

Of course, if he wishes to leave he has a perfect right to do so, but I think it would be well for the Senator from Missouri to remain here. Perhaps he might interrogate me as we go along, and I should be glad to be interrogated.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question, under the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator believe that the Senator from Missouri, who submitted this resolution, is really interested in what the Senator is discussing, so far as the law is concerned, and so far as the facts are concerned?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I would not be so discourteous as to say that the Senator from Missouri was not interested in the law, because I think the Senator from Missouri is a lawyer, and, if he is, naturally he would be interested in the law. Therefore, being interested in the law, he should be interested in the law which applies to the question involved in his particular resolution. He has now, as I see, left the Chamber, notwithstanding the fact that I am trying to discuss the very thing that is within his own resolution. Therefore, Mr. President, I must conclude he is not interested in my discussion of the law, although there has been no discussion of the law, so far as I know anything about it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Illinois for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. Again, the occupant of the chair has changed. Therefore, I ask, what is the ruling of the Chair as to my yielding for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The ruling of the Chair is, the Senator from Nevada may yield for a question without losing the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Chair. I yield to the Senator from Illinois for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the able Senator agree with me upon this question? I have been a Member of Congress for

about 14 years, and I have been on a great many committees. Does the Senator agree with me that insofar as the power of one of the committees is concerned, regardless of what is in the resolution, the chairmar of a committee, if he wants to go to any ends, can do anything and everything under that resolution, or under the charge that is given him by the Senate, without any consequences whatever?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, that is a general question, and it calls for a general answer. A startling thing occurred here tonight, apropos of the Senator's question, when the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] lent himself, apparently—at least I saw him carry the paper up to the clerk's desk, on which, as I understood it—I think I am correct—the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] was about to address himself, which had nothing to do whatever with the question before the Senate.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. Just a moment. It was rather peculiar, because, had the Senator from Michigan addressed himself to the matter that was sent to the desk, that was carried by the Senator from Maine—which in itself was unusual, because as I recall, it is usual for the page boys to carry those things to the desk—if the Senator from Michigan had addressed himself to that, he could not be charged with two speeches on the subject before the Senate. It was rather ingenuous, to be frank.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am yielding only for a question. I cannot yield for anything more, under the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator from Nevada know what was the question to which the Senator from Michigan was addressing himself at the time?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; my recollection is that he was going to address himself to the Kem resolution; but the Senator from Maine carried to the desk a matter that was not pertinent to the Kem resolution at all.

Mr. BREWSTER. Was the Senator from Nevada unconscious——

Mr. McCARRAN. Am I yielding to a question again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to a question from the Senator from Maine?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Was the Senator from Nevada unconscious of the fact that if the Senator——

Mr. McCARRAN. I am never unconscious. I hope I shall never be unconscious.

Mr. BREWSTER. That the Senator from Michigan was addressing himself to a unanimous consent request that the report of his minority views regarding the Perlman case should be presented and be printed; to which the Senator from Nevada objected? Does that recall the matter to the recollection of the Senator?

Mr. McCARRAN. Oh, yes; I have a very vivid recollection of it, because if the Senator from Michigan had proceeded to address himself to the matter which the Senator from Maine carried to the desk and which he now has in his hand he could not be charged with two speeches on the subject before the Senate. I am very cognizant of that. I do not blame the Senator from Maine for smiling when I suggest it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, does the Senator yield further for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield further for a question by the Senator from Maine?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield further for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is the Senator from Nevada, in his intimations as to the propriety of this activity of the Senator from Maine, conscious of what the document contained that I carried to the desk? I shall read it, in order to pose my question:

NOMINATION REFERENCE AND REPORT

(In executive session, Senate of the United States)

JANUARY 31, 1947.

Ordered, That the following nomination be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary: Philip B. Perlman, of Maryland, to be Solicitor General of the United States, vice J. Howard McGrath, resigned.

July 21, 1947:

All reported by Mr. WILEY, with a recommendation that the nomination be confirmed.

On the edge is written:

Reported by Mr. WILEY, July 21, 1947.

Beneath:

Reported to the calendar with the understanding that no action is to be taken until Thursday, July 24, 1947, in order that a minority report may be submitted by the junior Senator from Michigan.

Is the Senator from Nevada aware that that was the official record of the report of the nomination which was filed with the Senate clerk and was brought to the desk of the Senator from Maine, when he requested the printed copy of the report of the minority views by the printer at which time the Senator from Maine was informed there was no printed report of the views, and the document was left on the desk of the Senator from Maine? It seemed the responsibility of the Senator from Maine to return that to the desk of the Senate where it belonged; where I now return it. I trust that will clarify the matter.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am holding the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. And I shall retain the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will protect the rights of the Senator from Nevada. He may yield for a question without losing his rights on the floor. He yields for any other purpose at his own risk.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct. I hope the Chair will mark whether or not the substance is in the form of a question. I am going to try to protect myself, and I want the Chair to protect me, likewise.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would merely like to say at this point, so the record may be kept straight as we go along, that if at any time the distinguished Senator from Nevada, who has yielded to someone for a question, feels that a Senator is not phrasing a question but is making a statement, which might jeopardize the Senator's position, he has a right at that point to stop it and to regain the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct. That is exactly what I anticipate.

Now, as to the matter presented to me by the Senator from Maine, I certainly exonerate the Senator from Maine. I think he was just doing a kindly act for someone else, to be very frank with the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator yield further to a question?

Mr. BREWSTER. May I express to the Senator from Nevada my profound appreciation of his generous expression.

Mr. McCARRAN. I know the Senator from Maine. I have worked with him many months here, with a very cordial atmosphere surrounding us, and I always appreciated his fine intellect, his quick wit, and his alertness to a situation; which I distinguished tonight very abruptly when the Senator used the paper that he has now returned to the desk. It is all right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from New Mexico for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. For a question only.

Mr. HATCH. I was just looking at the other side of the aisle. As the Senator from Nevada observed, there are only two Republicans present here.

Mr. LUCAS. And one of them is asleep. [Laughter.]

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I do not wonder at that at all, but I am not concerned over it. When the author of the resolution we are now discussing does not have sufficient consideration to sit in the Senate and listen to a free and frank discussion of the whole situation, it is not to be marveled at that there should be so small an attendance on the other side of the Chamber. The Senator left the Chamber after I drew his attention to the discussion I was about to indulge in, so I have nothing more to say on that point. I shall proceed, because I think the Senate of the United States and the country should know what the debate is all about.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

Mr. McCARRAN. May I proceed?

Mr. HATCH. No. I want to ask the Senator a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from New Mexico for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask the Senator please to indulge me a little while, because the matter I wish now to present to the Senate is very important.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada declines to yield at this time.

Mr. McCARRAN. The individual and personal right of all qualified voters to cast their ballot for a candidate for Federal office, the right to have the vote counted as cast, and the integrity of the ballot preserved once it has been cast. Section 51 requires that a conspiracy be established before prosecution can be undertaken. Under section 52, a conspiracy does not have to be shown but the Government must show that the act interfering with the vote was committed by some official "under color of law."

Bribery of voters is not now a Federal offense unless committed in a general election. I draw the attention of the Senate to the fact that the matter now before the Senate pertained to a primary election, and not to a general election. Bribery is a Federal crime at a general election under the Corrupt Practices Act.

The Federal Government, under the various Supreme Court decisions, had no jurisdiction whatever in primaries nominating Federal candidates until the time of the decision of United States against Classic in 1941, a case coming out of a Louisiana primary. This is a long decision, the effect of which is to give Federal jurisdiction in primaries where the result in the primary is tantamount to election. I draw the attention of the Senate to that—is tantamount to election or where under State law the primary is an integral part of the electoral procedure. There is, therefore, no question but what the Federal Government has jurisdiction over primaries in States having systems similar to Louisiana, such as South Carolina, Georgia, and Mississippi. The question of whether the Federal Government has jurisdiction over primaries in such a State as Missouri where the nomination in neither party primary is equivalent to election has not been passed upon by the Supreme Court.

I want to dwell on that for a moment.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from New Mexico about to address a question to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. HATCH. No, I do not wish to address anything to the Senator from Nevada. I have observed the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from New Mexico for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. HATCH. No, Mr. President, I do not ask the Senator to yield. I have observed the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am not going to yield for that purpose, for if I do I may lose the floor, even though it be at 2:25 in the morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has the floor. The Senator from Nevada has stated he does not yield.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield for the purpose of the Senator from New Mexico making a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. McCARRAN. What is the ruling of the Chair on the point with respect to whether or not the Senator from Nevada loses the floor if he yields for such a purpose?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to advise the Senator from Nevada that under the universal precedents, the only purpose for which he can yield without danger of losing the floor is for a question. If the Senator yields for any other purpose he does so at his own risk and is subject to some Senator making the point that he has spoken twice on the same subject on the same legislative day.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield only for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the purpose, as the Chair stated when he first took over from his predecessor, of protecting the rights of the Senator from Nevada, the Chair wanted to advise him fully as to what the ruling of the Chair would be under the circumstances discussed.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield only for a question, and for nothing else.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has the floor. Does the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I cannot yield under the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has the floor. The Senator from New Mexico will take his seat.

Mr. McCARRAN. The following two cases will illustrate the difficulty encountered by the Government in undertaking to make out a case of election frauds through the means of a civil-rights statute.

Mr. President, I may say that I should like very much to have the Senate enlightened on this subject as to the law, but of course if the law means nothing in the Senate, if there is no law to be observed, if the majority, which has now left the Chamber, is not interested in the law, I am wondering why all this debate is going on. I hope the Senate of the United States may have sufficient dignity at least to listen to a consideration of the law of the country on the subject before the Senate of the United States. If this body does not have that dignity, then I can only express my regret.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nevada yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. For a question only.

Mr. BREWSTER. Did I understand that the Senator from Nevada draws a distinction between the States where a primary election is equivalent to an election and States where it is not?

Mr. McCARRAN. I draw it in the same language as did the Supreme Court, that where a primary election is tantamount to a final election, then the rule prevails. That was the rule in the Louisiana case. It is the only rule that has been applied by the court of last resort.

Mr. BREWSTER. May I inquire if there have been no other Supreme Court decisions regarding the right of the Federal Government to regulate primaries?

Mr. McCARRAN. Oh, yes. But as regards a primary election, when the primary election is tantamount to a final election, as for instance in the southern States, where custom shows that the primary election is tantamount to a final election, then of course the rule of the Supreme Court, as laid down in the Louisiana case, prevails, but not otherwise. It is my contention that the question has not been decided. As regards whether or not the rule of the primary being tantamount to election in the State of Missouri, I do not believe that could be questioned, from the record as it is displayed on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Maine for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. For a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. Was the language of the Supreme Court such as to exclude that, or simply to rule upon the case that was then before the Court?

Mr. McCARRAN. It ruled on the case that was then before the Court, and said that where the primary election was tantamount to a final election, then the Federal Government became involved; not otherwise.

In a recent and most important civil-rights decision, the United States Supreme Court held in the case of United States against Screws—1945 case—that in order to maintain a prosecution for a civil-rights violation under these two statutes the Government must show to the jury's satisfaction, and it must be so charged by the court, that the purpose of the act in question was for the specific purpose of interfering with the civil right in question. In other words, if the wrongful act which would deprive one of a civil right, such as the right to vote, was merely the incidental result of some other purpose or objective in mind, then no civil right had been violated. The purpose of this decision, as stated by the majority of the Court, was to preserve the traditional balance between the Federal and State sovereigns and served notice upon the Federal Government that it could only proceed in civil-rights cases where it could establish clearly and specifically that the sole purpose of the wrongful act was to deny or take away or deprive someone of some specific Federal right.

Mr. President, much might be said on that subject, but in order to cover the question from a legal standpoint, may I have unanimous consent to send to the desk, to be inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, a discussion of the law bearing upon the subject as the law has been established by the courts of this country?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXTENT OF FEDERAL JURISDICTION OVER ELECTION FRAUDS

In the period immediately following the Civil War Congress saw fit to enact very

comprehensive laws touching almost every conceivable wrongful act which might take place at the polling place. For examples, it was made a Federal crime to:

For anyone to obstruct another in the exercise of the right to vote, by means of bribery to influence a vote, to knowingly impersonate another in the act of voting, voting in the wrong precinct or ward, for anyone to interfere with the duty of an election officer, to improperly register to vote; and this Act, known as the Enforcement Act of 1870, went so far as to provide for Federal supervisors at the polling place.

After about 20 years' experience with these laws which amounted to virtually complete Federal supervision over elections within the respective States—Congress *repealed* the Enforcement Act and by this means practically withdrew from the business of regulating elections through the means of criminal statutes. The repealing act removed from the statute books each of the examples set out above and such acts no longer were Federal violations with the following exceptions. (The repeal of these laws took place in 1894.) At the time the Congress repealed the Enforcement Act of 1870 outlawing such acts as above indicated—it left on the statute books two statutes which are commonly known as Civil Rights Statutes (Sections 51 and 52 of Title 18). Neither of these statutes directly mention in any way election crimes but merely guarantee to all citizens the right to freely exercise any Federal right guaranteed by the Constitution and laws of the United States.

By a process of judicial interpretation of these two statutes, the right to vote for a Federal candidate became read into these statutes as one of the Federal rights they secured. A number of United States Supreme Court decisions have dealt with these two statutes relating to election frauds beginning with the case of *U. S.* v. *Cruikshank* (92 U. S. 542), about 1880, and *Ex parte Yarbrough* 101 U. S. 651 in 1884), and ending with United States against Saylor in 1944. Based on these decisions the following Federal rights with respect to elections have been read into these statutes and constitute today the sole jurisdiction of the Federal Government over election frauds. They are:

The individual and personal right of all qualified voters to cast their ballot for a candidate for Federal office, the right to have the vote counted as cast, and the integrity of the ballot preserved once it has been cast. Section 51 requires that a conspiracy be established before prosecution can be undertaken. Under Section 52, a conspiracy does not have to be shown but the Government must show that the act interfering with the vote was committed by some official "under color of law."

Bribery of voters is not now a Federal offense unless committed in a general election. (The civil rights statutes, under United States against Bathgate, do not embrace bribery.) Bribery is a Federal crime at a general election under the Corrupt Practices Act.

The Federal Government, under the various Supreme Court decisions, had no jurisdiction whatever in primaries nominating Federal candidates until the time of the decision of United States against Classic in 1941, a case coming out of a Louisiana Primary. This is a long decision, the effect of which is to give Federal jurisdiction in primaries where the result in the primary is tantamount to election or where under State law the primary is an integral part of the electoral procedure. There is, therefore, no question but what the Federal Government has jurisdiction over primaries in States having systems similar to Louisiana, such as South Carolina, Georgia, and Mississippi. The question of whether the Federal Government has jurisdiction over primaries in such a State as Missouri where the nomination in neither party primary is equivalent to election has not been passed upon by the Supreme Court.

The following two cases will illustrate the difficulty encountered by the Government in undertaking to make out a case of election frauds through the means of a civil rights statute.

United States against Bathgate: There the Court stated, in addition to holding that bribery was not a Federal offense under the civil rights statutes, that the Federal Government was not in the business of guaranteeing fair and honest elections but was confined to prosecuting in only those instances where there was a definite intent, desire, and purpose to interfere with the personal and individual right of a voter to cast his ballot and have it counted. Common miscellaneous frauds as to which the general public might have an interest were ruled to be clearly without the scope of these civil rights statutes.

Then in a recent and most important civil rights decision, the United States Supreme Court held in the case of United States against Screws, 1945 case, that in order to maintain a prosecution for a civil rights violation under these two statutes the Government must show to the jury's satisfaction, and it must be so charged by the court, that the purpose of the act in question was for the specific purpose of interfering with the civil right in question. In other words, if the wrongful act which would deprive one of a civil right, such as the right to vote, was merely the incidental result of some other purpose or objective in mind, then no civil right had been violated. The purpose of this decision, as stated by the majority court, was to preserve the traditional balance between the Federal and State sovereigns and served notice upon the Federal Government that it could only proceed in civil rights cases where it could establish clearly and specifically that the sole purpose of the wrongful act was to deny or take away or deprive someone of some specific Federal right.

Then the case of *Steedle* v. *U. S.* (85 F. (2d) 867), a 1936 case. The gist of this case is that certain State and Federal candidates were on the same ballot. A conspiracy was entered into to change and otherwise miscount the votes. It developed that the object of the conspiracy was to defeat one of the candidates in the State race. One of the results of the conspiracy was to also change and miscount the votes for a Federal candidate. There the Federal Court held that the Government had no jurisdiction and set aside the conviction on the basis that the Government did not establish that the object of the conspiracy was to interfere with the right to vote and the count thereof touching a Federal candidate.

Thus, no matter how many State laws are violated in a primary and no matter how grievous the effect of the conspiracy is upon any Federal candidate—the Department, in determining upon a Federal investigation or Federal prosecution, has to ask itself these questions: Does the fraud in question affect the Federal candidate? Were the wrongful acts intended to affect the Federal candidate or were they aimed at State or local candidates? Was any qualified voter intentionally deprived of his right to vote for the Federal candidate? Was his vote intentionally miscounted or the ballot boxes intentionally padded? The difficulties are numerous in reaching a decision on these questions. In most every election there is some charge of irregularity. Oftentimes, the irregularities in question are completely without Federal jurisdiction or else, if they did affect the Federal candidate, there would be no satisfactory evidence that the irregularities were the result of intentional misconduct aimed at the ballot as distinguished from careless and negligent conduct in receiving and counting the votes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the jurisdiction of the Federal Government over election irregularities committed in connection with primary elections for candidates for Federal office has been limited since 1894 when the Federal election statutes were repealed. Since that time it has been the duty primarily of the several States to deal with such problems, and Missouri, among others, has statutes covering the primary election irregularities indicated by this evidence. The State authorities are currently conducting prosecutions under State law upon these irregularities.

The Federal Statutes do not provide for Federal enforcement with respect to irregularities in elections in the following situations:

(a) They do not make it a Federal crime to bribe a voter or for a voter to receive a bribe in a primary election. *United States* v. *Bathgate* (246 U. S. 220).

(b) They do not cover a private individual who, without conspiring with others, votes in the name of another person, living or dead, or otherwise votes falsely, stuffs a ballot box or otherwise commits or aids the commission of election irregularities. *United States* v. *Mosley*, supra; *United States* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 299); *United States* v. *Saylor* (322 U. S. 385).

In dealing with the numerous election irregularities complaints which have been received by it in the past, the Department of Justice, since 1940, has consistently and properly followed a policy of conducting preliminary investigations to ascertain whether enough evidence of violation of Federal statutes appears to warrant full investigation. The Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, after receiving orders from the Attorney General that this matter be investigated, followed the regular policy in such matters. The evidence clearly establishes that the initial instructions of the Criminal Division for investigation were entirely proper and called for a preliminary investigation, typical of instructions given to the Federal Bureau of Investigation by the Department of Justice in prior election irregularity cases.

In conducting this investigation, agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation interviewed members of the election commission and the chief investigators of the Kansas City Star, from whom was procured approximately 1,400 affidavits and statements, based upon 8,000 interviews which had been conducted by some 30 to 40 investigators of the Kansas City Star. In addition to the 355-page report by the Federal Bureau of Investigation dated October 24, 1946, covering the above, the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice had the benefit of the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures for the House of Representatives, 1946, which had conducted an independent investigation. Thus, it is clear that the investigation in this case went far beyond the usual preliminary investigation conducted in this type of case.

The three United States district judges at Kansas City were furnished by United States Attorney Wear with a com-

prehensive report of the results of the preliminary investigation and were advised that the Federal Bureau of Investigation Report was available to them and asked whether a grand jury investigation was warranted. After thorough consideration and during December 1946, they each testified, they advised the United States attorney that they were unanimously of the opinion that there was insufficient evidence for presentation to a grand jury. These judges testify to their confidence in the United States attorney at that time and now.

Mr. President, let me depart from the general course of my discussion for a moment. I stated at the opening of this discussion that this was a most unusual procedure. In all the history of the United States Senate there has never been a time when the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, or the chairman of a major committee, took the floor of the Senate to advocate the discharge of his own committee. It is a most unusual thing. It is a thing that is unprecedented. Why it is I am at a loss to know.

The Committee on the Judiciary acted through its duly constituted subcommittee, a subcommittee of the choosing of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, without suggestion. I regret exceedingly tonight as I stand here, at 20 minutes to 3, that I was selected by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary to be a minority member of that subcommittee. I regret that because I am compelled to stand here and relate to the empty desks of the majority, who will not listen, a narrative of the facts in this case. I regret that men who are Members of the United States Senate must go through these things. It is a travesty on the Government of this country.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator does not mean to ignore the presence of the faithful few on the majority side of the aisle who are paying very strict attention to the learned discussion of the Senator from Neveda, does he?

Mr. McCARRAN. The faithful few are always here; but the faithful none are over there—with the exception of the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator mean to imply that there was any larger attendance on the other side when the Senator from Michigan was indulging in his very learned discussion?

Mr. McCARRAN. In the first place, I would not say it was a learned discussion. Secondly, I thought that the minority attended with comparative faithfulness.

Mr. President, let us go back into the history of this matter. The junior Senator from Michigan, the chairman of the subcommittee, conducted the hearings pertaining to the subject. He had carte blanche. He called on witnesses from the State of Missouri to appear. He brought the august district judges here to testify, and they, without at all relenting, came and testified. He called on everyone in the Department of Justice whom he wanted to call. The rest of us had nothing to do with it, so far as I know. I was never asked with regard to calling a witness. The last word I heard from the able Senator from Michigan was that the committee had adjourned subject to the call of the Chair. After that we went into a conference, and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] told the Senator from Michigan that he could not go along with him, because the Senator from Michigan had filed with the Judiciary Committee of the Senate his own report, without even reporting to the subcommittee. He will not deny that. He filed it with the Judiciary Committee before he filed it with the subcommittee. Then the Senator from North Dakota told him he could not go along with him.

I shall not repeat what went on in the subcommittee meeting. Suffice it to say that the Senator from North Dakota apparently is still voting against the view of the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. President, the Judiciary Committee of the Senate has acted. It has not acted in accordance with the desires of the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]. But, Mr. President, committees have acted today. The Committee on Public Lands, if I may use it as an example, has acted today contrary to what I think it should have done. Am I to move to discharge that august committee? I would expect to be turned down. I think it would be outrageous if, when a major committee of the Senate refuses to go along with the views of some Senator who is the author of a bill or resolution before that committee, the author of the bill or resolution should come in and say, "I move to discharge the committee because it did not go along with my views." We should be dealing with the discharge of committees day in and day out. All there is before the Senate is the fact that the Judiciary Committee of the Senate refused to go along with the views of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] was one of those in the minority.

The Committee on the Judiciary consists of 13 members. Seven of those 13 voted not to report the resolution. They said it should go no further. They said more than that: They said, in substance, that it would be frivolous, harassing, unworthy of the Judiciary Committee, and therefore it should go no further. But, according to the views of the junior Senator from Missouri, because the Judiciary Committee took that attitude the committee should be discharged. Mr. President, if that is to be the policy of the Senate from now on, may God help us! If the record made by the Senate tonight on the rulings of the Presiding Officers is to be a precedent for the future, then I think the minority is indeed in a bad way, and that it is time for a change. The rulings made tonight in this matter will not bear the light.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I will yield for a question.

Mr. HATCH. What time is it?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is now 14 minutes of 3. Is that the question the Senator wanted to propound?

Mr. HATCH. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. After thorough review of the files in the entire matter by the United States Attorney, the Civil Rights Section of the Criminal Division, and the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Division, it was concluded by each that no violation of Federal law was disclosed. Accordingly, in conformity with the usual practice in the Department of Justice, the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division, on January 6, 1947, informed the Federal Bureau of Investigation that no further action was warranted, and that therefore no further investigation was desired.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. HATCH. What time is it?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is now 12 minutes of 3.

Mr. HATCH. How many Senators are present? Count them on the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. McCARRAN. I cannot answer that question. Mr. President, I can yield only for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada declines to yield further.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am deadly serious.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has the floor and he declines to yield at this time.

Mr. McCARRAN. In view of the theft in May 1947 of some of the ballots, the Attorney General personally ordered a full investigation of the theft and of the election irregularities, which investigation the Federal Bureau of Investigation is currently conducting. The State authorities had the opportunity to use the expert services of the FBI in connection with these ballots prior to the theft and failed to take advantage of it. It would have been improper for the Federal Government to have taken the ballots from the State officials, in whose custody they were, and who were using them in the State investigation. Moreover, no serious prejudice will result to prosecutive or investigative efforts by reason of the theft.

The Attorney General appointed on June 17, 1947, Richard K. Phelps, a former United States attorney in the western district of Missouri as a special assistant to the Attorney General with full and complete authority to prosecute any Federal law violations arising out of the alleged irregularities in the primary of August 6, 1946, in the Fifth Congressional District, Kansas City, Mo. Mr. Phelps, as a prominent member of the United States attorney's staff, was active in all of the prosecutions of the so-called Pendergast election cases which resulted in the conviction of some 250 persons, including the one against William J. McMahan. He handled all of the

cases on appeal. The Attorney General has requested Mr. Phelps to confer immediately with the Federal judges in the district relative to the summoning of a special grand jury to inquire into the matter. Mr. Phelps is authorized also to engage such assistants as he may require, either inside or outside the Government. He will devote his entire time to the assignment.

It is concluded that throughout this matter the Department of Justice and the Attorney General have acted promptly, in good faith, and in the public interest, and have properly discharged their duties with reference to the subject matter of the afore-mentioned resolution.

Mr. President, I ask leave to insert at this point in the RECORD my statement as to the findings as to the scope of the Federal law relating to election irregularities and policy of the Department of Justice. The statement consists of four pages.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

III. FINDINGS

1. SCOPE OF THE FEDERAL LAW RELATING TO ELECTION IRREGULARITIES AND POLICY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The jurisdiction of the Federal Government over election irregularities committed in connection with primary elections for candidates for Federal office has been limited since 1894, when the Federal election statutes were repealed. Since that time it has been the duty primarily of the several States to deal with such problems, and Missouri, among others, has statutes covering the primary election irregularities indicated by this evidence. The State authorities are currently conducting prosecutions under State law based upon these irregularities.

At the present time it is a Federal criminal offense to conspire to deprive a person of any right secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States (18 U. S. C. 51). It is also a criminal offense for any State or Federal official, acting under color of law, to deprive a person of any right secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States (18 U. S. C. 51). These two provisions, which are known as the civil-rights statutes, have been held by the Supreme Court to be applicable to the right to vote (*United States* v. *Mosley* (238 U. S. 383)).

The Federal statutes, however, do not provide for Federal enforcement with respect to irregularities in elections in the following situations:

(a) They do not make it a Federal crime to bribe a voter or for a voter to receive a bribe in a primary election (*United States* v. *Bathgate* (246 U. S. 220)).

(b) They do not cover a private individual who, without conspiring with others, votes in the name of another person, living or dead, or otherwise votes falsely, stuffs a ballot box or otherwise commits or aids the commission of election irregularities (*United States* v. *Mosley*, supra; *United States* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 299); *United States* v. *Saylor* (322 U. S. 385)).

In dealing with the numerous election irregularities complaints which have been received by it in the past, the Department of Justice, since 1940, has consistently followed a policy of conducting preliminary investigations to ascertain whether enough evidence of violation of Federal statutes appears to warrant full investigation.

The practice in the Department of Justice has been for attorneys of the Civil Rights Section of the Criminal Division of the Department to screen such complaints carefully before requesting the Federal Bureau of Investigation to conduct even a preliminary investigation. After such screening, and before final determination to expend large sums of money and to involve large numbers of highly trained investigative employees in an investigation of this difficult and controversial type, a preliminary investigation would be directed for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not there existed a probability of establishing a violation of Federal law.

It is necessary for the Department of Justice to maintain a consistent national policy with reference to such Civil Rights cases, since (1) Federal jurisdiction is based on very tenuous statutes (secs. 51 and 52 of title 18, U. S. C.); (2) There are ever present difficulties when Federal authority is invoked in the regulation of State and local affairs; (3) There would be unnecessary expenditure of money and time if the preliminary investigation does not indicate the probability of violation of Federal law; and (4) The full investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of all complaints regarding State primary and general elections would place a substantial if not impossible additional burden upon the resources of the Department of Justice.

Mr. Hoover testified that this policy of preliminary investigation and review has been followed in War Labor Disputes Act cases, War Frauds cases, and in Anti-Trust cases, as well as in Civil Rights cases (R. 51). The policy has been of long standing, having been followed in Civil Rights cases since 1940 (R. 52).

The necessity for this practice, which had been established when Mr. Justice Murphy was Attorney General, is clear from the testimony of Attorney General Clark, who pointed out:

"And I would like to say this: Take this year, up to June 1. We had 9,356 complaints like these, elections and cases involving civil rights.

"Last year we had 5,000-some-odd. So it would be impossible if we used all the FBI men, the 3,200 of them, to investigate just these matters, to have a full investigation of every complaint that we got" (R. 118–119).

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I now ask leave to have inserted at this point in the RECORD a statement of my views as to the investigation directed by the Department of Justice. I state in that connection that the statement consists of four typewritten pages.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

2. THE INVESTIGATION DIRECTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

About the middle of September 1946, United States Attorney Sam M. Wear of the Western District of Missouri, Kansas City, conferred with members of the Jackson County election board, at their request, concerning rumored irregularities in the primary election held in August 1946 (R. 483). He communicated with the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division, and was advised, and so informed the board that if "substantial evidence" of the violation "of any Federal statute" were received, a "full investigation" would be made by the Department of Justice (R. 484–486).

Thereafter, United States Attorney Wear, pursuant to request of the election commissioners, met with two investigators for the Kansas City Star, who furnished information of irregularities in some wards and advised they were conducting a continuing investigation. This information Mr. Wear analyzed and forwarded to Washington with newspaper clippings (R. 494). This was done in order to inform the Department of Justice exactly what the Kansas City Star investigation showed (R. 493).

This information was furnished to the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice in September and early October 1946 (R. 524).

The Attorney General was informed of this matter in early October 1946 and directed that it be investigated (R. 77).

On October 11, 1946, a memorandum prepared by the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice was forwarded, in the name of the Attorney General, to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. A copy of this has been furnished to the subcommittee (R. 4, 32).

This memorandum, which was not reviewed by the Attorney General (R. 77), outlined possible violations and requested that a "preliminary investigation be undertaken along the lines indicated below." The memorandum then stated (R. 78, 500):

"It is, therefore, requested that the following persons be interviewed and such information elicited from them as will determine (1) the identity of qualified voters who were deprived of the right to vote for a Federal candidate and (2) the identity of persons with their official position, if any, who stuffed ballot boxes with false or fictitious ballots or failed to count ballots for Federal candidates honestly or accurately; together with all circumstances surrounding the violations: 1. Ludwick Graves, Richard C. Jansen, William Davis, Joseph R. Stewart, members of the board of election commissioners, Jackson County Courthouse, Kansas City, Missouri; 2. Ira B. McCarty, and John P. Swift, reporters for the Kansas City Star who have written articles on the above described matters, and such other of the Star employees as participated in the Star investigation.

"Please give this investigation your special attention and submit reports to me as promptly as possible. Please conduct your investigation in cooperation with the United States attorney at Kansas City, Mo., and furnish him copies of your reports."

On October 16, 1946, a teletype was sent by the Federal Bureau of Investigation to the special agent in charge at Kansas City which read as follows (R. 1):

"ELECTION IRREGULARITIES IN PRIMARY ELECTION AUGUST 6, KANSAS CITY, MO., ELECTION LAWS

"Confirming telephone conversation today, re above cases. Department has advised that investigative report of Kansas City Star indicate irregularity in following four precincts of Fifth Congressional District namely, fourteenth ward, first precinct; nineteenth ward, second precinct; tenth ward, first precinct; and first ward, twenty-fifth precinct.

"Possible violations of sections 51 and 52, title 18 indicated. Department requests preliminary investigation along lines indicated below, advising that while many of irregularities charges amount at most to violations of State law such as assistance by election officials to volunteers in marking ballots without filling out the necessary oaths of assistance, improper selection of election officers and improper methods of tallying and counting ballots, nevertheless reports of Kansas City Star indicate that persons are officially listed as having voted while claiming they did not vote, or officially listed as not having voted while claimed they did vote, or appear at the polling place and found that their names had already been voted.

"These latter irregularities indicate violation of section 51 in that it may be found that there was a conspiracy to deny to qualified voters their federally secured rights to vote for a candidate for a Federal office, to have that vote counted as cast, and to have all legitimate ballots honestly and accurately counted, free from any dilution by false or fictitious ballots.

"Possible violations of section 52 is election officials acting under color of law either

alone or with others perpetrated denials of the rights mentioned above.

"Department requests that following persons be interviewed and such information elicited from them as will determine, first the identity of qualified voters who were deprived of the right to vote for a Federal candidate and, second, the identities of persons with their official position who stuffed ballot boxes with false or fictitious ballots or failed to count ballots for Federal candidates honestly or accurately, together with all circumstances surrounding the violations.

"Persons to be interviewed are: Ludwick Graves, Richard C. Jansen, William Davis, Joseph R. Stewart, members of the board of election commissioners, Jackson County, Courthouse; Ira B. McCarty and John P. Swift; reporters for the Kansas City Star, who have written articles on the above-described matters, and such other of the Star employees as have participated in the Star investigation.

"You are instructed to immediately assign a sufficient number of experienced and thoroughly qualified agents to this investigation to insure completion at earliest possible moment. This case to receive your personal supervision.

"Daily teletypes are to be submitted setting forth progress being made. Expedite submission of report and furnish copy to U. S. A."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a statement on the subject that the preliminary investigation ordered was entirely consistent with usual practice, and was not restricted by the Department of Justice. For the information of the Chair, I state that the statement consists of four pages.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

3. THE PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION ORDERED WAS ENTIRELY CONSISTENT WITH USUAL PRACTICE AND NOT RESTRICTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation testified concerning the directions for investigation, dated October 11, 1946:

"I would not consider that in any way out of line, because that has been the practice in practically all of the preliminary investigations of election frauds. We have received many cases here that outline specifically who to interview and exactly what steps we are to take." (R. 55.)

"This is what we would call a preliminary investigation or inquiry, typical of what we have made in dozens of election-fraud cases." (R. 65.)

It is apparent from the foregoing that the Criminal Division suggested investigation to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, along "the lines indicated" in the memorandum of October 11, requested that interviews be conducted to ascertain what voters rights were impaired, and who impaired them, "together with all circumstances surrounding the violation," and specifically requested that the election commissioners and principal investigators for the Kansas City Star be interviewed "and such other of the Star employees as participated in the Star investigation."

Had the memorandum been followed literally it would have involved the interview of some 40 persons. Mr. Hoover testified, the circumstances were such, however, that the Federal Bureau of Investigation determined that it was only necessary to interview 6. The reason for this, he stated, was the fact that the individuals interviewed, the 4 election commissioners and the chief investigators of the Kansas City Star had in their possession the accumulated evidence of the other persons. This evidence consisted of approximately 1,400 affidavits and statements based upon approximately 8,000 interviews (R. p. 80.)

In compliance with the instructions of the Department and the later teletype of October 16, 1946, the Kansas city office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation assigned seven agents, who worked intensively on the investigation for 12 days (R. 528).

The evidence shows that while this preliminary investigation was in progress, and until October 23, when it was completed, no one suggested that the investigation had been restricted.

On October 23, however, Mr. Mumford, assistant to Mr. Ladd, who in turn is an assistant to Mr. Hoover, at Washington headquarters of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, being advised that the Kansas City investigation was about to be reported by that office to the Department, instructed the special agent in charge at Kansas City to inform the United States attorney there that the contents of the report were not the results of an investigation but, pursuant to specific instructions of the Attorney General, were merely a summary of data developed by the Kansas City Star and election board. This procedure, Mr. Mumford said, was to be followed to prevent the possibility of the FBI report being cited as the result of an investigation proving that further investigation or prosecution would not be justified.

This action by Mr. Mumford was taken without the prior knowledge of either Mr. Hoover or Mr. Ladd and was based upon Mr. Mumford's interpretation of the October 11, 1946, memorandum prepared by the Criminal Division, which Mr. Hoover has characterized as typical and in accord with usual practice in all such cases.

Mr. Mumford wrote a memorandum in this connection to Mr. Ladd on October 23, 1946, which later came to Mr. Hoover's attention. He by written note inquired whether the Federal Bureau of Investigation had been so restricted (R. 23). Mr. Ladd responded by memorandum to the Director, dated October 25, 1946, discussing the Department's October 11 memorandum and stating that specific investigation was therein requested and had been performed (R. 27). This was in error. Only the named individuals had been interviewed and none of the Star investigators, except the two chief investigators, had been interviewed. The reason for this has been previously mentioned but was not set forth in the memorandum to the Director at the time.

It is apparent that the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation did not share the fears of Mr. Mumford as to any possible misrepresentation or misuse of the Federal Bureau of Investigation report and found no facts indicating that the report would be used later as a "whitewash." The record states:

"Senator FERGUSON. Now, there is one thing in there, to which I should like to call your attention. This is from Mumford, now, to his superior, Ladd: 'This procedure is being followed in an effort to prevent the possibility of our reports being cited as a result of investigation proving that further investigation or prosecution is not justified.'

"Did you get any facts to indicate that these men thought that these reports would be used later to whitewash the Attorney General's office?

"Mr. HOOVER. Most certainly not."

The United States attorney at Kansas City was given a letter on October 24, 1946, along with the FBI report of that date covering the preliminary investigation, which letter stated that the report did not reflect an investigation by the FBI and that the limitations indicated were imposed in the instructions received by the Bureau from the Department (R. 56). This letter was never furnished to the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice or to the Attorney General. Nor was Mr. Mumford's memorandum brought to the attention of either the Criminal Division or the Attorney General.

On October 25, 1946, there was forwarded to the Criminal Division the FBI report of October 24, 1946, consisting of some 355 pages, with a cover memorandum stating that only the specific investigation requested had been conducted and requesting advice as to whether any further investigation was desired (R. 58). Thus, the Criminal Division of the Department was not advised that the Federal Bureau of Investigation did not regard the activities covered in the report as an investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation or that those activities were thought to have been restricted. Nor was the Attorney General so advised.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I now ask leave to have printed at this point in the RECORD my statement as to the Federal Bureau of Investigation's report and the evidence submitted. The statement is based on the record, and it consists of two pages.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

4. THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION REPORT AND EVIDENCE SUBMITTED

The October 24 report supplied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation to the United States attorney at Kansas City and to the Department of Justice in Washington set forth the results of interviews with the two Star investigators and the four election board members and covered the information in the possession of the Kansas City Star and the election board. In addition thereto the Department of Justice had also been furnished the files and report of the Special Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures for the House of Representatives, 1946. That committee during a lengthy investigation had interrogated 37 witnesses at Kansas City.

The information submitted to the Department of Justice through the Federal Bureau of Investigation included, in addition to interviews of the two chief investigators of the Kansas City Star and the four election judges of Jackson County, Mo., a detailed analysis of their files. The two chief investigators, who had some 30 to 40 other investigators working for them, submitted to the Federal Bureau of Investigation as the results of some 8,000 interviews approximately 1,400 affidavits which had theretofore been prepared for and signed by voters or nonvoters, and statements of witnesses purportedly having knowledge of certain facts which occurred during the August 6, 1946, primary. These statements or digests of the same were incorporated in the Federal Bureau of Investigation's report to the United States attorney and to the Attorney General.

There is in evidence in this record a sample copy of the instructions which had been given to the investigators of the Kansas City Star to guide them in obtaining evidence (R. 71). These were detailed instructions and directed that special effort be made to obtain evidence from voters for Slaughter or Walsh.

The wide scope of this investigation, as reflected in the FBI report, was pointed out by the Attorney General in his testimony:

"Senator LANGER. The only question I wanted to ask you was this: Did you do as much in this investigation you have had, even with election cases, or did you do less?

"Mr. CLARK. We did more, sir. We had a more thorough investigation here, reflected by this 355-page report that was sent to me, than any preliminary investigation, I will wager, since I have been in the Department of Justice, for 10 years. I can give you the numbers, Senator, of many cases that the

boys took down, where it was asked that the FBI investigate specific matters by interrogating specific persons in elections, and in civil rights" (R. 118).

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I now ask leave that the clerk read the hearings before the Judiciary Committee, commencing with the hearings for Friday, June 6, and continuing throughout the following hearings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has requested unanimous consent that the clerk be permitted to read the hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee commencing with the hearings for Friday, June 6, and continuing throughout the following hearings?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. McCARRAN. Then, Mr. President, I move that the clerk be permitted to read the hearings to which I have referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Rule XI states:

When the reading of a paper is called for, and objected to, it shall be determined by a vote of the Senate, without debate.

Mr. McCARRAN. Then, Mr. President, I move accordingly.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the rule, the Senator from Nevada has a right to make the motion he has made, and the making of the motion does not take him off the floor. I inquire whether the suggestion of the absence of a quorum, following the making of the motion the Senator from Nevada has made, operates to take him off the floor?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I did not yield for that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that under rule XI, which is to this particular point, under the heading "Objections to reading of a paper," which appears on page 15 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is stated that—

When the reading of a paper is called for, and objected to, it shall be determined by a vote of the Senate, without debate.

The question then before the Senate was, Shall the paper be read?

At that point, the absence of a quorum was suggested.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. I did not yield for the purpose of having a quorum call had. Does that take the Senator from Nevada off the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules in this case that the suggestion of the absence of a quorum occurred under the particular rule in question, relative to the reading of a paper. On that basis, the suggestion of the absence of a quorum would not jeopardize the Senator's position on the floor, but is for the purpose of determining the decision of the Senate as to whether the paper shall be read.

The absence of a quorum has been suggested, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Baldwin	Gurney	Moore
Ball	Hatch	Morse
Barkley	Hawkes	Murray
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Myers
Bricker	Hill	O'Daniel
Brooks	Hoey	Pepper
Butler	Holland	Revercomb
Cain	Ives	Russell
Capehart	Jenner	Saltonstall
Capper	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Chavez	Kem	Sparkman
Connally	Kilgore	Taft
Cooper	Knowland	Taylor
Cordon	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	Lucas	Thye
Downey	McCarran	Umstead
Dworshak	McCarthy	Vandenberg
Ecton	McClellan	Watkins
Elender	McGrath	Wherry
Ferguson	Magnuson	White
Flanders	Malone	Wiley
Fulbright	Martin	Williams
George	Maybank	Young
Green	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask for a recapitulation.

Mr. TAFT. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Must a vote not now be taken without debate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question comes under rule XI, relating to the request of the Senator from Nevada that a paper be read by the clerk. Rule XI states:

When the reading of a paper is called for, and objected to—

And objection was made—

it shall be determined by the vote of the Senate, without debate.

The question is, Shall the paper be read?

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. The Senator from New Hampshire, if present and voting, would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maryland, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. The Senator from Kansas, if present and voting, would vote "nay," and the Senator from New York, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. The Senator from Wyoming, if present and voting, would vote "nay," and the Senator from Tennessee, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. The Senator from Iowa, if present and voting, would vote "nay," and the Senator from Mississippi, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are unavoidably detained. If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family. If present and voting, he would vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senators from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS and Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Connecticut is absent on public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. If present and voting the Senator from New York would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

The result was—yeas 30, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—30

Barkley	Hoey	Morse
Chavez	Holland	Murray
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Myers
Downey	Kilgore	O'Daniel
Ellender	Lucas	Pepper
Fulbright	McCarran	Russell
George	McClellan	Sparkman
Green	McGrath	Taylor
Hatch	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Hill	Maybank	Umstead

NAYS—41

Baldwin	Ferguson	Moore
Ball	Flanders	Revercomb
Brewster	Gurney	Saltonstall
Bricker	Hawkes	Smith
Brooks	Hickenlooper	Taft
Butler	Ives	Thye
Cain	Jenner	Vandenberg
Capehart	Kem	Watkins
Capper	Knowland	Wherry
Cooper	Lodge	White
Cordon	McCarthy	Wiley
Donnell	Malone	Williams
Dworshak	Martin	Young
Ecton	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—24

Aiken	Langer	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	McFarland	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	McKellar	Stewart
Bushfield	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	O'Conor	Tobey
Eastland	O'Mahoney	Tydings
Hayden	Overton	Wagner
Johnson, Colo.	Reed	Wilson

The vote was recapitulated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 30 and the nays are 41, and the Senator from Nevada will proceed.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask for a recapitulation of the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will recapitulate the vote.

The vote was again recapitulated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 30 and the nays are 41, and the Senator from Nevada will proceed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, upon receipt of the FBI report of October 24, the United States attorney, Wear, and his assistant, Thomas Telio, separately reviewed the evidence contained therein.

Of course I realize, Mr. President, that the majority will not remain here to listen to the facts, but while a few Senators are present, let me say that the FBI report consisted of some three-hundred-odd pages. Much was made of an alleged fact by the junior Senator from Michigan, which is not in keeping with the record, that a report was furnished by United States Attorney Wear to the three district judges. Intimation has continually been made by the junior Senator from Michigan, which intimation is aside the record, is not borne out by the record, and the Senator does not dare cite the record to sustain his position. He would not even allow us to query him while he had the floor, because the record would not sustain him, and he knew it. He knew as well as I know the fact that the three district judges made a statement to the United States district attorney that they would not call a Federal grand jury because the facts did not warrant the calling of a grand jury.

Oh, the junior Senator from Michigan, not the senior Senator from Michigan, whose great fame has gone the world round, but the junior Senator from Michigan, who would like to excel his great career or equal it some way or another—and I do not blame him at all, because that is most commendable—how the junior Senator from Michigan dwells on the record, how he uses the record. What he would do is significant when we consider the great career he has built up for himself, a great career he has built up on his investigatory ability. May God save the mark.

Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan would not yield because of the fact that the record will not sustain him. The three district judges in that district sent word to the United States Attorney General, through the United States District Attorney, that they would not call a Federal grand jury. Not one thing has occurred since that time save and except the record which is referred to by the Senator from Michigan to change that attitude. The three judges appeared before the committee. Did they change their position? Not at all, not at all. Is the Senate of the United States tonight going to say that it will override the decision of three district judges in the district in which the so-called fraud is alleged to have occurred? Is the Senate of the United States going to say that it will set aside the decision of the law officer of that particular district? Is the Senate of the United States going to set itself up as being something over and above the courts of the country? Is the Senate of the United States going to waste the money of the taxpayers to conduct an investigation when a grand jury, subsequently called by the district judges, is now investigating the whole situation?

I doubt the propriety of the proposed action. I do not know why it should be taken unless it be that someone wants to climb the ladder of fame upon headlines, if you please—headlines. Headlines are going to be the biggest things in the lives of certain individuals, whether it be headline Harry, or headline Johnny, or whatever headline it is. That is the only thing that can exist here as an incentive for somebody.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask that those words be taken down. I think the Senator is transcending the rules of this body.

Mr. McCARRAN. In what respect, please?

Mr. BREWSTER. Reflecting upon the motives and the actions of a Member of the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. What Member, please?

Mr. BREWSTER. The one to whom the Senator so assiduously referred.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have not even referred to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). The Senator will proceed.

Mr. BREWSTER. In order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I know the able Senator from Maine, for whom I have a great deal of respect, would lend himself to this matter and carry a message up to the clerk on which a speech might be made. I realize the fact that something might prick his feelings. I do not mean to do that. I know the Senator from Maine regards my views enough to have respect for them—at least I think so, as I would have for his.

Mr. President, the matter we are dealing with is a factual one. I say factual because a major committee of the United States Senate has voted against the very thing which is sought to be done now. A major committee has said there should be no further proceedings. A major committee has made that decision after a prolonged hearing and investigation. A major committee, by a vote of 7 to 6, voted down Resolution 116. Are we going to say that that major committee shall be set aside, that the deliberations of 13 men amount to naught, notwithstanding the fact that it is one of the major committees of the Senate? I cannot believe that the Senate would take such a position. I doubt very much if the majority of the Senate would do so, even in all their zeal, in all their desire to carry out political views to get at the President of the United States. That is all there is here. It is not an investigation as to fraud, so-called, in Missouri.

The State of Missouri can deal with the matter. The State of Missouri has dealt with it. The Federal Government can deal with it. The Federal Government has dealt with it. It is not a question of what Tom Clark has done. He is only the front for what is desired, and that is to build up a political something so as to tear down the great prestige of a great President. It is the only thing on God's green earth that can be found in this endeavor. Nothing can be found, when headlines are laid aside, headlines, if you please. The substance of the column will almost dissuade one from believing the headlines. The object, the aim, the purpose, to set up headlines against the President of the United States so that the people of the country may be led astray in the 1948 election is all that is holding the august Senate of the United States at 3:30 in the morning, when as a matter of fact there are bills of great importance in the Senate involving the welfare of the people of the country, and not only the welfare of the people of our own country but involving the welfare of the people of the world. But it is proposed to lay all that aside, to forget it all, for the sake of personal ambition. That is all that is involved—personal ambition, a desire of someone to gain sanction, to be a candidate for the Presidency.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may I have the ruling of the Chair? The occupant of the chair has now changed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). The present occupant of the chair will give the Senator the same ruling as that made by the previous occupant of the chair.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Nevada agree with the junior Senator from Oregon that the Senate of the United States should have proceeded to pass pending veterans' legislation now on the calendar, which will have to be passed by the Senate before it can be acted upon by the House of Representatives if there is to be any action in this

session of Congress, before proceeding to take final action on the Kem resolution?

Mr. McCARRAN. My answer to that is that the legislation referred to by the able Senator from Oregon is all-important. It should be dealt with with mature thought and consideration in the closing hours of this session. It should be passed. It should become a part of the law of the land.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. But at half past 3 in the morning today we are not considering that. We are considering something else.

If the Senator from Indiana wishes to propound a question, I will yield to him if I may yield without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield only for a question.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does not the able Senator think that if there is no more to this investigation than window trimming and headlines, and the ambition of certain persons, as he stated a moment ago, there would be nothing wrong with having the investigation? If there is nothing to investigate, what is wrong with holding the investigation?

Mr. McCARRAN. The investigation has already been held.

Mr. CAPEHART. The investigation under this resolution has not been held.

Mr. McCARRAN. The investigation has already been held, and held without limit, without stint, without restriction, and headed by the able junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. He had carte blanche. He had the time; he had the money; he had the witnesses; he had everything. He held the investigation and then said that he would conclude that day subject to the call of the Chair.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, indeed.

Mr. CAPEHART. The question I now wish to propound is this: If the Senator and others have no fear of the investigation, and feel that their skirts are clean——

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not wear skirts.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then why is the Senator objecting to the investigation?

Mr. McCARRAN. The investigation has already taken place. I did not object to it. I joined in it. The Senator from Indiana is in error. I joined in it and was the minority member of the subcommittee which conducted the investigation. The Senator from Indiana is not advised in the premises.

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is not the present resolution to investigate the Justice Department and the Attorney General?

Mr. McCARRAN. We went forward with the investigation, and carried it out under the able chairmanship of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. The record is made, and I have it before me. Does the Senator from Indiana wish to have me read it?

Mr. CAPEHART. No.

Mr. President, one further question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. If it is a question I will yield; but not otherwise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator requests the Senator from Nevada to yield for one more question.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well. I yield for a question.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am possibly asking the same question I asked before, except that the able Senator from Nevada seems to feel that this investigation has been made. If it has been made, does the Senator think it is necessary to hold the Senate in session all night, and to hold up needed legislation in order to avoid a further investigation? If the Senator feels that there is nothing to be uncovered that is harmful to the Attorney General, or harmful to the Department of Justice——

Mr. McCARRAN. My answer is, indeed no, because the investigation has already been made by a subcommittee, and by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate. The Judiciary Committee of the Senate has, by a record vote, voted to go no further. It has performed its entire function. There is nothing more to be said or done.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada whether, prior to the time when the subcommittee filed its report with the full committee, any request was made for the appearance of any witness before the subcommittee that was denied by the subcommittee?

Mr. McCARRAN. The answer to that is decidedly no; and the answer further is that so far as I know, no member of the subcommittee called for any witness at all before the subcommittee. The chairman alone brought the witnesses before the subcommittee. He had entire control of the situation. He brought all the witnesses he wanted before the subcommittee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Was the Attorney General one of those witnesses?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Attorney General was one of those witnesses.

Mr. BARKLEY. Was there any effort on the part of any member of the subcommittee to prevent the Attorney General from being called as a witness?

Mr. McCARRAN. Not at all.

Mr. BARKLEY. Or to prevent him from being recalled if there was any further testimony?

Mr. McCARRAN. Not at all.

Mr. BARKLEY. Did the head of the FBI, Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, appear as a witness?

Mr. McCARRAN. He was called as a witness and testified at length. His testimony is here before the Senate, and I shall gladly read it, if I am required to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. Was any effort made to restrain his testimony?

Mr. McCARRAN. Not at all.

Mr. BARKLEY. Was there anything to prevent his being recalled if on the previous examinations he had not been fully interrogated with reference to all these matters?

Mr. McCARRAN. Not at all. Moreover, after statements had gone out through the press, apparently, so far as I can construe the situation, those statements must have aroused Mr. Hoover to the fact that he was being misquoted. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover sent a letter over his signature to the chairman of the subcommittee, and that letter is in the possession of the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Has it been made a part of the record?

Mr. McCARRAN. It has not been made a part of the record, but I am advised that it has been filed with the committee. It is not in the record so far as I know.

Mr. BARKLEY. Was the United States district attorney in Kansas City called as a witness before the subcommittee?

Mr. McCARRAN. The United States District Attorney, Mr. Wear, was called as a witness and testified at length, so far as the committee wanted to interrogate him.

Mr. BARKLEY. Was there any complaint on the part of any member of the subcommittee that Mr. Wear had not made a full statement with respect to his connection with this investigation in Kansas City?

Mr. McCARRAN. If there was, I never heard it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Were the three judges called as witnesses before the subcommittee?

Mr. McCARRAN. The three judges were called as witnesses. Let me say further that the three judges each testified that they had placed before them a summary prepared by the United States district attorney, in whom they stated they had implicit confidence, and that on the basis of that summary of the FBI report they had concluded that a Federal grand jury should not be called, because they saw no evidence of a violation of Federal law. Moreover, they testified they knew that the FBI report was available to them at any time, and at their disposal, and was placed before them or placed at their disposal by the United States district attorney. The FBI report consisted of three hundred-odd pages, all of which was before the three Federal judges. Even after that they refused to call a grand jury.

There is one thing in this record that must arouse the interest of any lawyer. There is a distinct difference between a violation of Federal law and a violation of State law. The violation of State laws in the State of Missouri might be ever so prevalent, but was there a violation of the Federal law, so far as the Department of Justice was concerned?

The three judges and the United States district attorney said they saw no occasion for calling a Federal grand jury,

because they saw no evidence of a violation of the Federal law.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Was there any complaint or suggestion on the part of any member of the subcommittee that the three judges had not made a full and complete statement of the matter, so far as they were concerned?

Mr. McCARRAN. Not at all.

Mr. BARKLEY. Was there any suggestion, after they had testified, that there were any other questions that anyone might want to ask them and that, therefore, they should be brought back?

Mr. McCARRAN. Not at all.

Mr. BARKLEY. Was there any witness besides those as to whom I have inquired, the Attorney General, Mr. Hoover, the three judges, and the district attorney, who was called?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not recall any other witnesses; but let me say in that regard that there was other evidence. In other words, there was documentary evidence which was brought forth from the files of the Department of Justice by the able and persistent chairman of the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Were files of the Department of Justice, including the files of the FBI, filed with the subcommittee in the matter?

Mr. McCARRAN. So far as they were called for, they were. But after that, Mr. President, the matter was taken into consideration by the three members of the subcommittee, the able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the very able Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and your humble servant from Nevada. When I went into a meeting of the subcommittee, expecting a consideration and a vote on the whole question, I found that I had nothing to do except to pace the floor and listen to a controversy between the able Senator from Michigan and the able Senator from North Dakota, in which the able Senator from Michigan appealed—and I say that knowing that he is listening to me, and I do not think he will take exception—the able Senator from Michigan appealed, in his appealing way to the Senator from North Dakota to go along and bring in a report on his side of the question. I did not think that the Senator from North Dakota, so far as I could ascertain, was going that way. But I had nothing to do with it. All I could do was to pace the floor and look at the pictures on the wall of the office of the able Senator from Michigan. I waited for the results. There were no results, and we walked out. Finally, when we went before the full committee, the Senator from North Dakota said he had a report of his own to make, and he made it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it true that after all the testimony that any one on the subcommittee asked for had been heard by the subcommittee, the subcommittee, by a vote of 2 to 1, reported adversely to the full committee on Resolution 116?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator states the fact.

Mr. BARKLEY. And the full committee, by a vote of 7 to 6, voted not to report the resolution?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator states the fact.

Mr. BARKLEY. And it was because of that that this resolution is offered to discharge the committee?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that a special Federal grand jury had been called and is now in session in Kansas City?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am so advised by the press. I do not think it is a special grand jury; I think it is the grand jury called in special session.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it true that a special district attorney was appointed to conduct the investigation, and that the special district attorney was the assistant of the former district attorney, the Honorable Maurice Milligan, who, for a number of years, held the position of district attorney in the Kansas City district?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am so advised.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator for that information.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am grateful to the Senator from Kentucky for the inquiry, because it brings out facts which I had not stated.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I will yield for a question.

Mr. TAFT. I wondered how much longer the Senator might speak, and if it would be possible to agree on an hour to vote on the resolution before the Senate, and whether we could vote before 5 o'clock, so that we can go home?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not know how long I may go on, but I shall not agree to anything of that kind.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator agree to a unanimous consent request to vote at 12 o'clock tomorrow?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; because the matter has not been concluded.

Mr. TAFT. In other words, the Senator is determined to prevent a vote, if he can do so?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is stating something which is not a fact. I am sorry.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator objects, if I correctly understand, to voting at any hour that can be now named?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am not objecting and I am not agreeing.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote at 5 o'clock today on the measure which is before the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. I object. I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has the floor, and he will please resume.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator from Nevada tell the Senate whether it is true that every time this pending resolution has been set aside it has been done at the request of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in order that other business might be transacted?

Mr. McCARRAN. I think that is the record. If I am not correct in my answer, the Senator from Ohio can correct me.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in response to the Senator's question——

Mr. McCARRAN. I beg the Senator's pardon. I do not yield. If the Senator has a question I will yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator yields only for a question.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not true that this resolution has been before the Senate for over a week, has been debated from time to time, and that every Senator has had plenty of time to consider all the issues involved?

Mr. McCARRAN. I answer that question by saying that in excess of 127 times, as the RECORD shows, the Republican majority has asked for the floor and has held it against this resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it true that notwithstanding the fact that the resolution had been before the Senate technically for several days, it had not been debated until the Senator from Michigan took the floor today for a long speech, followed by the Senator from Nevada, and that outside of that the resolution has not been discussed at all on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. McCARRAN. I answer that question in the affirmative.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator permit another question?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it not a fact that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] talked about an hour?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is true.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not true that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] talked at some length on the subject?

Mr. McCARRAN. I did not understand the question of the Senator from Ohio, but whatever it was, it is all right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will resume.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, possibly I shall repeat, but I will do so without any desire to do so.

Upon receipt of the FBI report of October 24, United States Attorney Wear and his assistant, Thomas Tello, separately reviewed the evidence contained therein. Assistant United States Attorney Tello, who had previous experience in election irregularity prosecutions, was instructed to examine the report and prepare an analysis of it. This he did. In the view of United States Attorney Wear the analysis was done "fairly and conscientiously."

I refer to the record, page 507:

The United States Attorney furnished a copy of this analysis consisting of some 23 pages to Federal District Judges

Reeves, Ridge, and Collet, the three Federal judges for the district and advised each that the FBI report was available to them. After examination each was of the opinion that the evidence was insufficient to warrant grand jury proceedings.

In this connection the judges testified:

"Senator FERGUSON. And did you read that synopsis?

"Judge REEVES. Yes, sir.

"Senator FERGUSON. From that synopsis, were you asked to determine whether a grand jury should be called?

"Judge REEVES. I was.

"Senator FERGUSON. What was your answer?

"Judge REEVES. That it did not indicate violation of Federal law" (R. 362).

Listen to this, Mr. President. This is the testimony of the three Federal judges. Are all of them involved in this terrible scheme of whitewashing? Is every Federal judge in this country to be condemned? Is this a proceeding whereby we cannot trust our public servants on the bench? Three Federal judges—not two of them, not one of them, but all three of them, and they are in no wise connected—said they did not believe that a grand jury should be called, because no violation of a Federal law was made apparent to them.

Mr. President, I continue to read from the testimony:

Senator MCCARRAN. Now, the FBI report was placed before you?

Judge REEVES No, Senator, it was not. It is my recollection—

Mr. President, notice how carefully the judge presents his testimony—

that I did not see it. It was made available to me.

That is the FBI report, if you please. I read further from the testimony:

Senator MCCARRAN. It was made available to you?

Judge REEVES. Yes, I think it was made available, if I wanted to see it. I had the greatest confidence in Mr. Wear, and have yet.

Senator MCCARRAN. Did you consult with the other judges on the matter of calling the grand jury?

Judge REEVES. Yes, sir; I did.

Senator MCCARRAN. And did you confer with them together in your chambers?

Judge REEVES. We did, Senator.

Senator MCCARRAN. What was the opinion of the other judges?

Judge REEVES. The same as mine, Senator: that there was no factual basis for a grand jury, in this report here.

Senator MCCARRAN. At that time, I take it, you were naturally considering whether or not a Federal law had been violated.

Judge REEVES. That is correct, Senator.

Senator MCCARRAN. You were not, and could not be concerned with the matter as to whether or not a State law had been violated.

Judge REEVES. No, Senator.

Senator MCCARRAN. It was the unanimous opinion of yourself and the other judges of that district you are sitting here now, that no Federal law had been violated, sufficient to warrant the calling of a grand jury?

Judge REEVES. That is right, Senator; that is, there were no facts stated here that warranted it.

Senator MCCARRAN. No facts stated there that warranted it. And you did not go beyond that, to bring in the FBI report, although the FBI report was, you knew, available to you at that time?

Judge REEVES. We did not. The other judges may have, but I do not think they did; I don't think any of us asked for it.

Senator MCCARRAN. But you knew it was available to you?

Judge REEVES. Yes, Senator; we knew that (R. 374–376).

Senator LANGER. I was interested in your observation of a moment ago when you said you had every confidence in the district attorney, Mr. Wear. That is right, is it?

Judge REEVES. Yes, sir; I have.

Senator LANGER. And has anything occurred at all in this matter to change your mind on that?

Judge REEVES. No, sir.

Senator LANGER. And as far as you know, there has been no attempt made of any kind to deceive you or any of the other judges in this matter?

Judge REEVES. Not so far as I am concerned, and I think that is true as to the other judges.

Certainly Mr. Wear has not; he never does.

Mr. Wear was the United States district attorney for that district.

The testimony continues as follows:

Senator LANGER. There was no reason that you or the other judges could not get the FBI report if you wanted it?

Judge REEVES. That is right. Mr. Wear told us it was available to us.

Senator LANGER. And if you got that report and read it, and went over these affidavits that have been described, you could have called a grand jury if you wanted to?

Judge REEVES. Well, we could have, Senator, at our discretion, under the statute.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MCCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Apropos of the discussion a little earlier in the evening, I wonder whether the Senator noticed that there are about 14 Members on the majority side of the aisle listening to the Senator's very able address, as compared with about 4 Members of the Senate on the minority side of the aisle.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Yes; and I noticed that when I asked to have a record read, objection was made, and it was necessary to have a yea-and-nay vote on the question—with the result that my request to have the record read was turned down. I very distinctly remember that.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MCCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. JENNER. When the Senator spoke about the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee and the fact that the subcommittee had various witnesses testify, I wondered whether the subcommittee had invited Jim Pendergast to testify.

Mr. MCCARRAN. The subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, which was controlled by the chairman of the committee, could have invited Jim Pendergast. I never heard of him, and I take it the chairman did not want to hear from him.

Mr. JENNER. Did the Senator ever hear of Tom Pendergast?

Mr. MCCARRAN. I have, in the press.

Mr. JENNER. Did the Senator ever hear of Harry Truman?

Mr. MCCARRAN. Indeed I have.

Mr. JENNER. Was he invited to testify?

Mr. MCCARRAN. The President of the United States?

Mr. JENNER. Mr. Harry Truman.

Mr. MCCARRAN. The President of the United States?

Mr. JENNER. Yes; he is the President.

Mr. MCCARRAN. I do not know. The chairman did all the inviting, and I was not the chairman.

Does the Senator from Indiana have any other questions?

Mr. JENNER. No; I think that is enough.

Mr. MCCARRAN. I think so, too.

Mr. JENNER. Yes.

Mr. MCCARRAN. I am wondering whether the Senator from Indiana would have called the President of the United States.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President——

Mr. MCCARRAN. Just a moment, Mr. President; I cannot yield, except for a question. I yield for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana desire to request that the Senator from Nevada yield for a question?

Mr. MCCARRAN. That is under the rule.

Mr. JENNER. I would say this to the Senator from Nevada, in the form of a question: I would call the President to testify, just as I would be delighted to testify——

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I cannot yield for a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada declines to yield.

Mr. MCCARRAN. If the Senator from Indiana wishes to ask me a question, I shall yield for a question; but I cannot do otherwise because of the strict ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada will resume.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I am sorry about the ruling, because nothing would please me more than to enter into a colloquy with the Senator from Indiana. It would really be very nice.

If the question of calling the President of the United States before a subcommittee of the Senate is involved here—well, Mr. President, let us let it go at that.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] continued in the interrogation. Is addressing questions to Judge Reeves:

Senator LANGER. Mr. Wear said to you, "Now, gentlemen, the FBI reports are available to you if you want them," and if you had taken them and read them and become convinced that there was a conspiracy to violate a Federal law, you could have called a grand jury if you wanted to—you and the other three judges.

Judge REEVES. Yes, sir; we could have done that.

Of course, anyone knows they could have done it.

Senator LANGER. As a matter of fact, one of the three judges could have called a grand jury; is that not right?

Judge REEVES. That is right (R. 377–378).

Senator MCCARRAN. Judge Reeves, there could be any amount of violation of State law, and yet no violation of a Federal law, is not that true?

Judge REEVES. That is true, Senator (R. 423).

United States District Judge Ridge and United States District Judge Collet testi-

fied to the same effect (R. 424, 458). The judges clearly understood, as the analysis submitted by United States Attorney Wear showed on its face, that the information therein contained came from the election commissioners and the investigators for the Kansas City Star. As Judge Ridge testified:

Senator FERGUSON. But you assumed, I take it, that when this synopsis was given to you, that it was a true picture of the entire investigation or full investigation of the FBI.

Mr. RIDGE. No, I did not, Senator, because the first page there told me that it was not that, that it was a limited investigation (R. 431).

That was the testimony of one of the judges who had it within his power to call a grand jury.

The latter two judges also shared the conclusion reached by Judge Reeves. As Judge Ridge said:

Senator MCCARRAN. The fact that a number may have been indicted for violation of a State statute does not of itself carry weight with you to the effect that a Federal grand jury should indict for a Federal violation.

Mr. RIDGE. To this hour no concrete evidence has been submitted to me that would warrant the calling of a Federal grand jury, Senator (R. 455).

On December 19, 1946, the United States attorney wrote the Assistant to the Attorney General informing him of these conferences with the judges and stated they were unanimously of the opinion that there was no ground for a grand-jury investigation.

Mr. President, listen to the answer of one of the Federal judges in that district testifying before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, the committee which is now up to be dishonored, which is now up to be castigated by being discharged because it allegedly did not perform its duty, the committee that is up for a test before the Senate of the United States, of which it is an august major committee.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. Just a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. This is Judge Reeves testifying. He said:

To this hour—

That was when he testified before the committee—

To this hour no concrete evidence has been submitted to me that would warrant the calling of a Federal grand jury.

Anyone may read that in the record. It is there. It is here on my desk.

I now yield to the Senator from Maine for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. What was the approximate date of that?

Mr. McCARRAN. The binder on the record shows Friday, June 6, but it might not be just exactly that date.

Mr. BREWSTER. And the election was in November?

Mr. McCARRAN. The election was in August. It was a primary election.

Mr. BREWSTER. So that 10 months had elapsed, and up to that time this judge had received no concrete evidence that would indicate that there was warrant for calling a grand jury?

Mr. McCARRAN. Ten months had not elapsed between that time and the time the summary was presented to him.

Mr. BREWSTER. I thought the Senator referred to the time he was testifying. He said, "Up to this time."

Mr. McCARRAN. "Up to this hour," he said, while he sat there before the subcommittee—

Up to this hour no concrete evidence has been submitted to me that would warrant the calling of a Federal grand jury.

That was a Federal judge testifying under oath.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is very interesting.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is interesting. It must be interesting to the Senate.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator advise me what happened since then to warrant the calling of a Federal grand jury?

Mr. McCARRAN. Indeed I do not know.

Mr. BREWSTER. There has been something.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not know. There has been a grand jury, I am advised by the press.

Mr. BREWSTER. A Federal grand jury?

Mr. McCARRAN. I understand so.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not rather amazing that it required 10 months, and the presentation of the Kem resolution, and the investigation of the committee, before the Federal authorities discovered this evidence which has been crying to high heaven throughout all these weeks and months?

Mr. McCARRAN. Is the Senator castigating the Federal judiciary?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am asking the Senator from Nevada, with all his learning in the law, how it happened that all these months elapsed, and nobody could discover this evidence which everybody knew was crying to high heaven, until this investigation was under way, and suddenly, overnight, it was decided—am I correct—that there should be a Federal grand jury. Is not that rather amazing?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator asks me a question, "Am I correct?" I will say the Senator is not correct. "Is it crying to high heaven?" I do not know how high heaven is. I do not know anything about that particular realm. I hope that some day I may go there.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it crying in the other direction, then?

Mr. McCARRAN. In any direction—I do not know anything about it. The Federal judges were on the ground, the United States district attorney was on the ground. Does the Senator want to blame the Federal judges for not calling a grand jury while the Kansas City Star was blatting it all over the country? It is not my fault or anybody else's fault. The Federal judges could have called a grand jury on merely a public statement if they had wanted to, but they did not do it.

Why did they not do it? The reason for not doing it was the thing that does not seem to permeate the fine mind of the Senator from Maine, that there is a distinction between a violation of a State election law and violation of a Federal election law. That is a thing which I do not seem to have anyone yet discern.

Mr. BREWSTER. What is the occasion——

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question. May I have an understanding?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is to be understood that when the Senator is yielding to the Senator from Maine he is yielding solely for questions.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

Mr. BREWSTER. What is the occasion, then, for calling a Federal grand jury now, after these 10 to 12 months have elapsed?

Mr. McCARRAN. I cannot answer the question. I wish I could. The district judges could answer the Senator's question. Up to the time they testified before the subcommittee they said, "Nothing up to this hour has warranted the calling of a Federal grand jury." It may be that something has occurred in the interim. I read in the press that the ballots had been stolen from the custody of the State authorities. If that be true, and that be the occasion for the Federal judges calling a grand jury, is that to be the subject of chastising the Department of Justice? I do not know.

Mr. BREWSTER. Did I understand the Senator from Nevada to use some rather unkind word regarding the activities of the Kansas City Star?

Mr. McCARRAN. Unkind words?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes. The Senator used some word—I was not quite clear what the word was—when we were talking about high heaven.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think I said they were blatting all over the country about the conditions that prevailed in some primary election.

Mr. BREWSTER. "Blatting" is a rather uncomplimentary term in my section of the country.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not know about terms in the section of the country the Senator comes from.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is "blatting" a sort of unkind term?

Mr. McCARRAN. It means putting it out all over the country.

Mr. BREWSTER. Do I understand the Senator from Nevada to feel that the Kansas City Star did not do a public service in the exposure of these conditions?

Mr. McCARRAN. Did it expose them?

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Nevada can tell me.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not know. I have never seen the Kansas City Star, so I cannot say whether they were exposed or not.

Mr. BREWSTER. Am I incorrect in my impression that the Kansas City Star put 100 investigators on this case to find out all these instances of fraud and corruption?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am so advised, and that they were paid $3 an hour. I am so advised; I do not know.

Mr. BREWSTER. Do I understand that the Senator from Nevada considers that a reprehensible act?

Mr. McCARRAN. Not at all.

Mr. BREWSTER. Or that they should tell the people about their discovery?

Mr. McCARRAN. No.

Mr. BREWSTER. Then what is the meaning of "blatting"?

Mr. McCARRAN. I will give it to the Senator if I can. Perhaps the Senator would define it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does it not mean something distinctly uncomplimentary?

Mr. McCARRAN. Not at all.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am happy to know the Senator does not mean it that way.

Mr. McCARRAN. Well, what if I did? But I do not. But what if I did—then what?

Mr. BREWSTER. That clears that. Let me ask the Senator from Nevada if he considers that the Federal grand jury would have been summoned this past month if the investigation had not proceeded so far as it did?

Mr. McCARRAN. I take it that the Federal grand jury might be called at any time by the Federal judges.

Mr. BREWSTER. There seems to the Senator from Nevada no interesting coincidence in the continuance of the investigation and the calling of the grand jury—that was purely coincidental?

Mr. McCARRAN. The investigation did not have a thing to do with the calling of the grand jury, so far as I can discern.

Mr. BREWSTER. That was purely coincidental?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not know that it was even coincidental.

Mr. BREWSTER. It had gone 10 months without it, I understand.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not know whether that is coincidental.

Mr. BREWSTER. August to June, without any Federal grand jury.

Mr. McCARRAN. Then what?

Mr. BREWSTER. There was no reason for it?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not know whether there was a reason. The Senator comes to conclusions to which I do not come. I do not know whether there was a reason for it or not.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is what we want to find out, as I understand. Is not that so?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator has found out. The Judiciary Committee has been working on it for many weeks, trying to find out. They found out. They voted on it, voting it down. The Senator now would discharge the Judiciary Committee. That is all there is to it. For what reason? Why does the Senator want to discharge a major committee? For what purpose? Will the Senator answer that? If I may be permitted to put a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair and the two Senators have an understanding that the Senator from Nevada retains the floor as long as he is engaged in this colloquy with the Senator from Maine.

Mr. McCARRAN. All right. If the Senator will confine it to reason——

Mr. BREWSTER. I shall be very happy to answer.

Mr. McCARRAN. All right.

Mr. BREWSTER. Although I shall not be responsible for what some of my guards on my right may do in the process.

Mr. LUCAS. And on the Senator's left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will remind the two Senators that the understanding holds good only between the two Senators.

Mr. LUCAS. May I get in on this?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is not in on the deal.

Mr. BREWSTER. It is the feeling of those who advocate a continuance that the developments to date have indicated the investigation thus far has been most fruitful, because the calling of the Federal grand jury is certainly a step in advance. But whether or not it has answered the challenge as to the administrative authorities of the Government, as distinct from the judicial, I do not say. I share with the Senator from Nevada my great respect for the Federal judiciary.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am glad to hear the Senator say that.

Mr. BREWSTER. Certainly there is nothing in the resolution to suggest that the investigation has proceeded in that direction. The investigation is directed toward the administrative agencies of the Federal Government, and the question of whether they have been derelict in their duty. It seems to me that when 10 months had elapsed without the discovery of derelictions, which it is now evident they consider to exist, there is warrant for continuing further, to see whether further investigation may not be even more productive of beneficial results for the great objectives that we all share in common, in maintaining the integrity of the ballot.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is fine. The Senator pronounces fine sentences. I agree with him thoroughly. Are we to traverse the ground that belongs to the courts? Are we going to say to the courts of Missouri, "We are not satisfied with what you have done?" Are we going to say to the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, "We are not satisfied with what you have done, although you did a lot of work?" Are we going to say "We are going to slap you in the face—we are going to discharge you, and we are going to do something more?" Is that what we are going to do? Is that what the Senator wishes?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sure the Senator from Nevada does not intend to draw about the Judiciary Committee the robes of the judicial office?

Mr. McCARRAN. Oh, no. I refer to the responsibility that belongs to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. BREWSTER. Because certain matters are under the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee, I did not, from such a stalwart individualist as the Senator from Nevada expect it to be a challenge of the right and the responsibility of the Senate to review, in any case where it seemed advisable, the action of any individual or of any committee. I have been associated with the Senator from Nevada for some time. I hold him in very high regard, and I have seen him many times stand alone, or he and I alone together——

Mr. McCARRAN. That is what we are doing now, apparently. [Laughter.]

Mr. BREWSTER. In the things in which we believe. To hear it now suggested that because seven men in this body have decided a thing, the other 89 Members of the Senate have no right to review or even to approach the throne of the all high, is very strange doctrine coming from the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Excepting that the Senator and I have been members of the committee when the vote was 10 to 10; yet we did not move to discharge the committee. Does the Senator remember that?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes—for a very practical reason.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, indeed. We have been on very many committees where the majority was against us, yet we did not move to discharge the committee. If a motion to discharge is to follow every majority vote because it does not suit us, then we shall indeed be discharging committees continually from now on.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not true that if a motion to discharge is never to follow, the result would be the practical annihilation of the deliberative functions of this body, when 13 men—or 7 men, as the Senator points out—could bottle up a bill, and the Senate be without redress? I am sure the Senator does not intend to advocate a philosophy of that character under our democratic institutions.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am always advocating the rule of the majority. I always shall.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator would not advocate the rule by 7 out of 96?

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall always advocate rule by the majority. When the majority has spoken, that is the law.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator permit the majority now to speak?

Mr. McCARRAN. The majority of the committee of which the Senator is a member has spoken.

Mr. BREWSTER. A majority of the Senate?

Mr. McCARRAN. The majority of the committee has spoken.

Mr. BREWSTER. What about a majority of the Senate? Will the Senator permit them to speak?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not know where the majority is, right now. I cannot even see them. [Laughter.]

Mr. CONNALLY. They are asleep. [Laughter.]

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. Just a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California desires to ask a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, indeed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the able Senator from Nevada in view of his statement that he always abides by the will of the majority——

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask whether the Senator would join with me in sponsoring the amendment to the rules I introduced earlier this session.

Mr. McCARRAN. What amendment was that?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It was an amendment providing for cloture by majority rule.

Mr. McCARRAN. No—and I will tell the Senator why. The Senator will not wish to promulgate that rule after he has been in the Senate a little while. The rule of unlimited debate is the one thing that protects a State with a small population against States with large populations. So long as a Senator can stand on the floor of the Senate to defend his State and the rights of his State against the great majority States, then he will be able to protect the rights of his people. When that right is taken from him, the States with small populations are gone.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not my distinguished colleague from the neighboring State of Nevada recognize that a filibuster gives to 1 Senator out of 96 the absolute power of veto to throttle the representative processes of government?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this matter has now been before the Senate for 2 weeks, and I have not seen anyone filibustering except Senators on the majority side.

Mr. BREWSTER and Mr. LUCAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. McCARRAN. I will yield in a moment. The RECORD shows that 127 times since the pending motion was made by the Senator from Nebraska, Senators on the majority side have taken up other matters for consideration by the Senate. The RECORD shows that 127 times other matters have been taken up while the motion was the unfinished business. I do not think there will be any contradiction of that statement. We have not had an opportunity to discuss the resolution. I am not filibustering now. I have been kept here until half past four in the morning by those who are presenting this matter, and the majority have refused to adjourn. I am only discussing a question which the majority have persisted in setting aside, and I have been trying to make my presentation. I have been prepared for nearly 2 weeks waiting for an opportunity to make the presentation, and yet questions of all kinds have been considered, but not the resolution. Appropriation bills have been considered, bills of all kinds have been considered, while the resolution was laid aside.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes. Just be charitable in the question, is all I ask.

Mr. WHERRY. I am always charitable to my distinguished friend, and he knows it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I was interested in the statement the Senator just made respecting the 120 items that were taken up for consideration while the resolution was pending.

Mr. McCARRAN. What I said was that 127 times Senators on the majority side have taken up other matters while the resolution was before the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. And that was done to expedite the work of the Senate under unanimous consent.

Mr. McCARRAN. Surely. It is my purpose to show that we on this side have not blocked the work of the Senate at all. I have not done so, and I will not do so now.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I have not had a chance to ask the question I should like to ask. Will the Senator permit me to ask it?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. In view of what the Senator has just stated, and in view of the fact that the motion—and by the way the motion is that of the junior Senator from Nebraska, not that of the Senator from Missouri, and the calendar is incorrect in that respect—was made on July 17 to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary, and in view of the colloquy just had respecting the rule of the majority, I wish to ask the distinguished Senator, who is well informed on the question of rules, as has been demonstrated tonight——

Mr. McCARRAN. Just a moment, Mr. President. Let me correct the Senator. I do not know anything about rules after the rulings made by the Presiding Officer tonight. I am sorry to say I now know nothing about rules.

Mr. WHERRY. I regret to hear the Senator say he does not know anything about rules. I am quite satisfied he is well informed in that respect. If the distinguished Senator at some time would grant the unanimous-consent request to vote on the motion to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from further consideration of the resolution, the able Senator, who is well informed, knows that then Senate Resolution 116 must first go to the Committee on Rules and Administration. Is that not correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. Really I have not looked into the matter fully. Perhaps the Senator is correct. I would not contradict him.

Mr. WHERRY. I am quite satisfied the Senator from Nevada knows that if the Committee on the Judiciary is discharged from further consideration of the resolution it would be mandatory that the resolution go to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is the Senator now appealing to me to desist?

Mr. WHERRY. No. I am simply asking some questions concerning the mechanics of the procedure, hoping that at some time we may secure a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say that he construes what the Senator from Nebraska is saying as a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, I am endeavoring to ask questions. The Senator well knows that if favorable action were taken by the Committee on Rules and Administration respecting Resolution 116, if it were reported from that committee, the resolution would have to lie over for a day. It would require unanimous consent to have it placed upon the calendar before that time. I am satisfied the distinguished Senator from Nevada knows that after that has taken place it requires 24 hours before consideration can be had by the Senate, unless unanimous consent is granted that the resolution be considered before that time. Then if the resolution is considered by the Senate the distinguished Senator knows that the questions relating to Senate Resolution 116 would be debated all over again. The Senator knows that everything being said tonight could be repeated, and would be repeated.

I am now coming to my question. Would not the distinguished Senator from Nevada permit us to vote on the motion, with the knowledge that we could not even consider Senate Resolution 116 by Saturday night before the time we intend to adjourn, and permit the Senate to take up the work of the Senate which it is so necessary to take up if we are to adjourn Saturday? That is the question I ask my friend from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am not a Yankee but I am going to propound a question to the Senator from Nebraska. Why did not the Senator propound the same question to the junior Senator from Michigan when he held the floor yesterday?

Mr. WHERRY. I have propounded that question to every Senator who is interested in the motion, because I am interested in having as much necessary legislation passed as we can possibly pass. That is the reason we have had to make 127 unanimous-consent requests. But I say now that in view of the fact that this is Friday morning, and in view of the present situation, I cannot see why my good friend from Nevada will not permit a vote to be taken on the motion respecting Senate Resolution 150. If the motion is acted upon favorably the Senator has a right to object to unanimous consent which would have to be obtained before Senate Resolution 116 could be considered before the time it is proposed to adjourn on Saturday.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I will yield in a moment. The sugar-coating on the pill is no doubt very delicious, but I am not going to take the pill.

Mr. WHERRY. The sugar bill is one of the bills in which we are interested. The Senator from Nevada is interested in it. It is desired to have that bill considered.

The sugar bill is one which should be passed. The premium-price bill which the Senator mentioned should be passed. The veterans' bill which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] have been so desirous of having considered should be considered. Then there is the supplemental appropriation bill in which the Senator from Nevada is greatly interested. Also there are conference reports which must be adopted quickly if we are to adjourn by Saturday night. I appeal to the Senator from Nevada, that he give us at least an opportunity to vote on the motion now, or to set an hour when a vote can be had on it, so we can conclude the work of the Senate and adjourn Saturday night.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator from Nebraska and I have been associated very closely, and I have a great love for him.

I do not think there is a man on the floor of the Senate today in whose word I have more confidence.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARRAN. He is a man who keeps his word. Mr. President, I am standing on the floor of the Senate. I am not at all tired. I hope I am not taking too much of the time of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no. I have enjoyed the Senator's remarks.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator from Nevada agree with me that the statement just made by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska is more or less an amazing one, because the Senator admits that the majority cannot secure a vote upon the resolution by Saturday night?

Mr. WHERRY. Without unanimous consent.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct; without unanimous consent.

Notwithstanding that, we are held here all night long in order to get a vote upon something which can never ultimately be decided at this session of Congress. To me that is just a little unusual, and I think the Senator will agree with me.

Mr. McCARRAN. There is nothing more unusual than some things I have seen here tonight, so the unusual is with us all the time.

Mr. President, I am jealous of my position. I want to yield for questions——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair assures the Senator that he still has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. For a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator agree with me that so far as what the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] had to say concerning the rule with respect to filibusters, he is indirectly charging the Senator with filibustering? As the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] stated a moment ago, since this resolution has been before the Senate, 127 times on the Republican side of the aisle Senators have taken up different matters or have spoken from time to time. If anyone has been filibustering or delaying the consideration of this motion, it certainly has not been on this side of the aisle. It has been on the part of those in charge of legislation in the United States Senate. It is surprising to find the able Senator from California asking the Senator from Nevada about the majority rule on the question of a filibuster when if there is any filibustering in the Senate he himself has been adding to it from time to time throughout the past few days.

Mr. McCARRAN. The question propounded by the Senator from Illinois answers itself, I think.

Mr. President, with the permission of the Chair I shall proceed——

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. Was it the purpose of the Senator from Nevada in asking permission to have the clerk read a 3-hour record solely to enlighten Members of the Senate?

Mr. McCARRAN. Was it a 3-hour record?

Mr. BREWSTER. That was my understanding.

Mr. McCARRAN. I did not know that.

Mr. BREWSTER. What did the Senator ask?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator comes to peculiar conclusions. I am sometimes surprised when I see the conclusions he arrives at.

Mr. BREWSTER. How long did the Senator expect it would take?

Mr McCARRAN. Really, I did not know.

Mr. BREWSTER. How long did it take to write the record?

Mr. McCARRAN. I suppose it took several days, but it would not take that long to read it. I have read it several times in a very short time.

Mr. BREWSTER. It was solely to give information to the Senate, and not in any sense to delay a decision?

Mr. McCARRAN. Indeed; and the Senate should have it. Before I get through I intend to read it. The Senator would not permit the clerk to read it, so I must read it. That is all right. It is all fine and dandy. It is all in the game. Before I get to that, I have something else to read.

On December 19, 1946, the United States attorney wrote the Assistant to the Attorney General informing him of these conferences with the judges, and stating that they were unanimous in the opinion that there was no ground for a grand jury investigation.

Mind you, this was the United States district attorney writing to the Department of Justice, under which he was serving. He said that the Federal judges had proclaimed that they would not call a grand jury because there was no violation of a Federal law. The district judges came before the subcommittee and reiterated the statement that, up to the very hour when they were testifying, they knew of nothing that would call for the convocation of a grand jury.

The reason for that is very plain to one who thinks of the law. There is a wide distinction between the Federal law, which is the law of civil rights or civil privileges, and the State law of Missouri in this instance, or any State law. That which is a violation of a State law may not be a violation of a Federal law at all.

The fact is that each of the Federal judges testified he knew that the FBI report itself, containing such statements, was available. Each judge was confident that United States Attorney Wear was honest and frank with the judges, and that appropriate reference to the important statements was made in the analysis.

Bear in mind, Mr. President, that these judges testified before the subcommittee that they had implicit confidence in the United States district attorney; and no one as yet has challenged their right to have that confidence.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. I should like to ask this question to clarify the record.

The Senator was present at the hearing and heard the judges testify; is not that true?

Mr. McCARRAN. I was.

Mr. KILGORE. And there was no impression created upon the Senator that the facts had been kept from those judges, or that they had not been given an opportunity to read the full report?

Mr. McCARRAN. No. The record shows, and I heard them testify, that the summary prepared by the United States district attorney was made available to them; that they severally and collectively reviewed it, and individually and collectively came to the decision that there was no violation of the Federal statute, and therefore they would not call a grand jury. All three of them testified before the subcommittee that they knew that the FBI report, consisting of approximately 300 pages, was available to them. Let me go further and state that the FBI had investigated not only the election commission of the State of Missouri, but those who were employed by the Kansas City Star in an effort to develop the facts in this case.

Mr. KILGORE. From the hearings, was the Senator assured that the judges felt that nothing had been withheld from them?

Mr. McCARRAN. They stated that they had implicit confidence in the district attorney.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator is aware also, is he not, that in the State of Missouri there are five judges, two of whom must be from one of the major parties, and two from the other major party?

Mr. McCARRAN. I did not know that up to this time. That may be true. I did not inquire as to what the political complexion of the judges was. That did not make any difference to me. They were Federal judges, and very fine, honorable men.

Mr. KILGORE. I am speaking of the judges of the election. Of the judges of the election, two must be from one of the two major parties in the last general election, and two from the other.

Mr. McCARRAN. I did not know that.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. In view of what the able Senator says, will he tell us, in cold terms, why this investigation is wanted, in view of what has happened in the past?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I could go at length into my thoughts as to why, but that would not answer the question. It would simply be my thoughts. It is a ladder on which someone would climb to headlines. It is a ladder on which someone would build himself up on the wreck of another man's reputation, perhaps, when he could not prove the ultimate facts. That is all. That is my judgment.

Mr. LUCAS. Has there ever been anything in the committee in connection with the discussion of what should be done, which would indicate what the Senator is saying?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, some things are not indicated, and some things are apparent. I do not want to go into that question.

Mr. LUCAS. I think it is important.

Mr. McCARRAN. I only wish to say that to my mind there is only one object. If it be to intercept those who may have violated the law, then the Federal grand jury is at work now.

If they have to punish the real culprits, if there be real culprits, then the grand jury has indicted already and the United States district attorney is ready to prosecute. But, in my judgment, that is not the aim. The aim is to get at the man in the White House who may be a candidate for the Presidency in 1948; and they could not get at him excepting to throw something by way of innuendo. That is all.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator. It seems to me from the record which has been made before the Judiciary Committee, that practically every fact has been developed that could be developed. In other words, the Judiciary Committee still has the power to make this investigation, without any special committee being appointed to do the work. The committee has the power to do it now if it wants to do it. Yet a resolution is offered to discharge the committee and appoint a special committee to make a further investigation, going over the same things that have been developed in the past, for the sole purpose of making headlines throughout the country and going over Tom Clark's head in order to smear the President of the United States.

Mr. McCARRAN. To my way of thinking, the Senator is entirely correct.

If the Senate will bear with me for a moment, I want the Senate to listen to the instructions given by Attorney General Clark to the FBI. This is a very interesting document, and I want the Senate to have the benefit of it. It was produced by the chairman of the subcommittee. It is a memorandum dated October 11, 1946, to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation from the Attorney General.

I read:

Unknown subjects; Kansas City, Mo. Primary election, October 6, 1946. Election laws.

Reference is made to Assistant Attorney General Caudle's memorandum of October 2, 1946, in the above-captioned matter.

That was the primary election in Missouri.

As indicated in that memorandum, United States Attorney Wear at Kansas City, Mo., on September 25, 1946, forwarded to this Department investigative reports of the Kansas City Star, indicating election irregularities during the August 6 primary in the following four precincts of the Fifth Congressional District: Fourteenth ward, first precinct; nineteenth ward, second precinct; tenth ward, first precinct; first ward, twenty-fifth precinct.

These reports were submitted to the United States attorney by the Kansas City Board of Election Commissioners, who requested that he take steps to initiate an investigation of alleged violations of Federal law in the contest in the Fifth Congressional District. Since that time Mr. Wear has forwarded clippings of articles from the Kansas City Star, reporting these same and additional irregularities in the above-mentioned district. Mr. Wear has informed us that the Star investigation is continuing and the irregularities have been uncovered in some 26 precincts in addition to the 4 on which he submitted material.

Continuing with the instructions given by Attorney General Clark to the FBI.

A study of the material at hand indicates—

I ask the Senate to listen to this—

indicates possible violations of sections 51 and 52, Title 18, United States Code. It is accordingly requested—

Bear in mind this language—

It is accordingly requested that a preliminary investigation be undertaken along the lines indicated below. While many of the irregularities charged amount at most to violations of State law, such as assistance by election officials to voters in marking ballots without filling out necessary oaths of assistance, improper selection of election officers, improper methods of tallying and counting ballots in the absence of a showing of actual miscounting, nevertheless reports of the investigators indicate that persons (1) are officially listed as having voted while claiming they did not vote, or (2) are officially listed as not having voted while claiming they did vote, or (3) appeared at the polling place and found that their names had already been voted.

This is the Attorney General directing the FBI as to the course to pursue. Restricted? Where?

Continuing, the Attorney General says:

These latter irregularities indicate violations of section 51, for if the charges can be substantiated they would amount to a conspiracy to deny to qualified voters their federally secured rights to vote for a candidate for Federal office, to have that vote counted as cast, and to have all legitimate ballots honestly and accurately counted, free of dilution by false or fictitious ballots. Possible violations of section 52, title 18, United States Code, are indicated if election officials, acting under "color of law" in officiating at a primary election which is an integral part of the State's electoral process, either alone or with others perpetrated denials of the rights mentioned above.

It is, therefore, requested that the following persons be interviewed and such information elicited from them as will determine (1) the identity of qualified voters who were deprived of the right to vote for a Federal candidate and (2)—

That is a pretty broad latitude—

the identity of persons with their official position, if any, who stuffed ballot boxes with false or fictitious ballots or failed to count ballots for Federal candidates honestly or accurately, together with all circumstances surrounding the violations:

Is there any restriction there? Then he names the election board as follows:

(1) Ludwick Graves, Richard C. Jansen, William Davis, Joseph R. Stewart, members of the board of election commissioners, Jackson County courthouse, Kansas City, Mo.; (2) Ira B. McCarty and John P. Swift, reporters for the Kansas City Star, who have written articles on the above-described matters, and such other of the Star employees as participated in the Star investigation.

There I digress for a moment to say that the record shows that the Star had approximately 30 men working at two or three dollars an hour to find the facts, all of whom were to be interrogated by the FBI in order to make a report to the Attorney General. This was the instruction of the Attorney General.

Listen to this:

Please give this investigation your special attention and submit reports to me as promptly as possible. Please conduct your investigation in cooperation with the United States attorney at Kansas City, Mo., and furnish him copies of your reports.

That was the Attorney General directing the FBI, giving them carte blanche to go forward with an investigation. If there was anything to stop the FBI, anything to curtail their activities, I have not seen it.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. The United States district attorney is an arm of the Department of Justice, is he not?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not a fact that in the State of Missouri at the present time there is being conducted an investigation of the election by a grand jury impaneled in that State, upon evidence adduced by the district attorney?

Mr. McCARRAN. I did not understand the Senator's question.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not a fact that in the State of Missouri there is and has been an investigation conducted by the grand jury in the United States district court for that district in Missouri, which, of course, is assisted by the district attorney, an arm of the Department of Justice, which is carrying out a complete investigation of the case and has already indicted certain persons?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is correct. And that is not all.

Mr. KILGORE. I wished to get that cleared up.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is correct about that. But, more than that, the State grand jury assembled earlier, and found indictments; and then the Federal grand jury assembled. Some one says that happened because of this investigation, but I challenge anyone to show a connection in any respect.

Mr. KILGORE. Then the investigation of the Department of Justice in this case would produce nothing in the State of Missouri. The things that it is desired to have produced, already have been produced in that State by officials of the United States Government and officials of the State government.

Mr. McCARRAN. An investigation of Tom Clark, of the Department of Justice, will bring forth nothing except an opportunity for someone to throw bricks at someone else.

Mr. KILGORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. CONNALLY. I should like to ask the Senator a question. Before the committee voted, did or did not the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] make any demand for the appearance of any additional witnesses that he wished to have produced?

Mr. McCARRAN. Not that I heard of. No one curtailed him in that respect. The able chairman of the subcommittee subpenaed any witnesses he wanted

subpenaed. He did not consult the minority members, insofar as I was concerned. I did not know whom he was calling. I was there as much as I could be there, but I did not know who was going to be interrogated.

Mr. CONNALLY. When the subcommittee was ready to vote, did he make complaint that he did not want the vote taken then because he wanted other witnesses called?

Mr. McCARRAN. No, indeed. He waited for the call of the chairman of the subcommittee. We assembled at the full meeting, on the regular meeting date for the Judiciary Committee; and at the regular meeting of the committee, there was passed around in the committee room the proposed report of the chairman of the subcommittee.

I wish to say in all fairness to him that I think it was on a Friday that that happened. The committee meets on Monday, and I think it was on the preceding Friday or Saturday that he did hand to the Senator from Nevada a copy of his proposed report.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Illinois for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In the meeting of the committee or in the meeting of the subcommittee, was anything said about the career of the junior Senator from Michigan being wrecked if he did not continue with the investigation?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, as to what went on in the meeting of the subcommittee, let me say that I would call that meeting a meeting in executive session, and I would prefer not to answer that question.

Mr. LUCAS. Was anything said in the executive meeting to the effect that it was necessary to carry on the investigation in behalf of the Republican Party, and especially because of the interest the Republicans would have in the campaign in 1948?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, out of an abundance of caution, in view of the fact that that was an executive meeting, as I regard it, I prefer not to answer that question.

Mr. LUCAS. I regret that the Senator does not answer the question, because I have based my question on the rumor that is floating around, because——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well. Let me ask the Senator one more question: A request was made by Attorney General Clark for this investigation. I ask the Senator whether that request was in line with all previous requests for similar investigations where the question of vote fraud was charged.

Mr. McCARRAN. Entirely so, and the record was not contradicted. But because of the volume of cases that come to the Department of Justice, for many years it had been customary to hold what they call a preliminary investigation. Some people call it a curtailed investigation. It was a preliminary investigation to determine whether there was a violation of Federal law or a violation of State law.

I am advised that several thousand cases are pending in the Department of Justice, involving complaints about violation of election laws. If they were to make a full, out-and-out investigation without knowing whether there was a violation of a State law or a violation of a Federal law, it would be necessary to augment by more than 10 times the personnel of the FBI.

But the first question is whether there was a violation of Federal law, and then proceed from there. That investigation was made by the FBI; and up to the time when they made their report to the United States attorney, as I have recited, there was no evidence of a violation of Federal law, so far as the FBI had then determined.

Mr. LUCAS. Other than what the Senator from Nevada has read to us from this record, was there any evidence which disclosed that the Attorney General, Tom Clark, asked the FBI to make any kind of a restricted or limited investigation of this matter?

Mr. McCARRAN. No. That is the memorandum that was sent to the FBI from the Attorney General, and I have read it. If that be restricted, then I leave it to the judgment of the Senate. It does not seem to me to be a restricted memorandum or direction. It directs the FBI to go into this matter and to report to the United States district attorney.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask a further question: During the time when the hearings were held, a report appeared in the press that Tom Clark or someone in his office had marked the word "restricted" upon this memorandum. I should like to have the Senator explain that matter.

Mr. McCARRAN. No; the FBI representative at Kansas City made a written report to the FBI in Washington. That report was read here tonight. I can get it in a moment, and I shall read it. On that report in his own handwriting, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, on the margin of the page, said this—and I think I quote it correctly:

Were we so restricted?

He was propounding that question either to himself or to his own agents; he was dealing with his own agents, who reported to him, and the agents' report was placed before him, and he said, "Were we so restricted?" If he had turned to the instruction given to him under the Attorney General, under whom he exists, he would have seen what the restrictions were, and the restrictions were just what I have read to the Senate tonight. To my thinking there were no restrictions at all. They were given carte blanche not to inquire as to the violation of State laws, because they could not, but as to the violation of Federal laws they had unlimited power.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I correct in my understanding that Edgar Hoover cleared Tom Clark completely in the letter that was sent to the committee, insofar as any restricted investigation was concerned?

Mr. McCARRAN. The answer is, to my way of thinking, yes. The letter is not in the record, it was not inserted in the record. I thought it should have been inserted in the record, but the record had been closed before the receipt of the letter. It was after Mr. Hoover had testified. The letter was passed around to the members of the committee. I had a copy of it, and I think I have a copy of it yet, and I think the letter is on file with the committee. I am going to read the letter. I find that it is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The letter is addressed to Hon. HOMER FERGUSON, United States Senate, Washington, D. C., and reads:

MY DEAR SENATOR: Since reviewing my testimony before your committee of the Kansas City election situation, comments have been made indicating that portions of my testimony have been misinterpreted and I think that in all fairness both to the committee and to the Attorney General, I should elaborate upon the specific items which appear to be in issue.

As you will recall, the departmental instructions ordering the preliminary inquiry specified specific persons to be interviewed and stated that in addition other employees of the Kansas City Star were to be questioned. As I pointed out in the latter part of my testimony, the some 30 Kansas City Star's investigators were not interviewed inasmuch as we had secured their statements from other employees of the Kansas City Star and it was not believed by the agents conducting the inquiries that any purpose would be served in personally contacting these investigators whose statements were incorporated in our report. However, at the very beginning of my testimony, I indicated to the committee that we had interviewed only the specified persons and had not gone beyond this inasmuch as we were not instructed to do so. As indicated, this was later clarified and the testimony as revised, deleting the phrase "and no one else" on page 58, and the phrase "we were not told to interview them" on page 66 expresses the true facts in the matter.

Does that make itself clear? In other words, he had used certain phrases which he wanted deleted because they did not express the facts. The letter continues:

The fact that we were ordered to make a preliminary inquiry in this case was not unusual. In the summer of 1941 Mr. Maurice Milligan, who you will recall prosecuted the original Kansas City vote fraud case in 1936, as a special assistant to former Attorney General Robert H. Jackson, instituted the policy that unless advised to the contrary in election fraud cases, preliminary inquiry was to be made only upon departmental instructions, after which the facts were to be submitted to departmental attorneys who would study the facts for decision as to further action.

Mr. President, that brings out the fact I tried to emphasize a moment ago, the distinction between the violation of State law and the violation of Federal law. If the FBI were to be called into every violation of State law, as I said before, we would not have FBI's enough; we would have to augment the FBI tenfold. The question is, what violation of Federal law was there, and that is what he was instructed to investigate. The letter continues:

With regard to the Mumford memorandum referred to before the committee, I wish to advise that I used the word "restricted" in my longhand note on the memorandum as a definitive term of my own to determine

whether the Bureau's inquiry had been limited to specified interviews. I did not intend my inquiry as an indication that I had any question in my mind that an ulterior motive had actuated the Attorney General or the Department of Justice with respect to the scope of the preliminary inquiry ordered under the established policy.

That seems to me clear. He did not want people to distort his language. He wanted it to be understood. I read further from the letter:

I think in all fairness I should make the observation that in the years the present Attorney General, Tom C. Clark, has been associated with the Department of Justice, I have had the opportunity of working with him in innumerable cases and I am glad to state that he has not in any way taken any action to prevent any investigation being conducted to its logical conclusion.

There is the FBI answering the whole question. Did the Attorney General of the United States at all restrict the activity of the FBI? The FBI says "No." Who will contradict?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator agrees with me that; as a result of that letter, if there was any restriction at all, it was a restriction which was made by the FBI, and not by the Attorney General's Office?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Senator is just as right as he can be, and if the FBI did restrict its activity, it was the FBI's business based on the FBI's experience, based on the FBI's knowledge of law, based on the fact that the FBI distinguished between violation of State law and violation of Federal law.

Mr. LUCAS. Does not the Senator think it is rather strange that this resolution would not include Edgar Hoover in an investigation of this kind?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; I do not think that would do any good, because there would be no political significance in it.

Mr. LUCAS. He is not running for any office?

Mr. McCARRAN. No, and he is not going to run for any office.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well.

Mr. McCARRAN. He says:

I trust that the foregoing may be helpful to you and the members of your committee in clearing up any misinterpretation which may have arisen with respect to my testimony.

With expressions of my highest esteem and kind personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

J. EDGAR HOOVER.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question. The Presiding Officer has again changed. We have been observing a rule all night that if a Senator holding the floor yields for a question propounded to him he will not lose the floor. Will that be the ruling of the present occupant of the chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). The Presiding Officer will not rule on any questions in advance. He will try to rule on them as they come up.

Mr. LUCAS. A new ruling.

Mr. McCARRAN. That makes me apprehensive.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President I asked if the Senator would yield for a question. I ask that, with the distinct understanding——

Mr. McCARRAN. If I yield for a question, Mr. President, will I lose the floor? Will the Presiding Officer kindly answer that question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The opinion of the present occupant of the chair is that if the Senator yields for a question, under the rules of the Senate he can retain the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator if, like myself, a member of the same committee, listening to the hearings for weeks and months, and knowing about the facts, he did not think it strange that this matter should be brought up now, when under the rules of the committee, and with the present majority of the Judiciary Committee, if they had not completed an investigation, or if they wanted to investigate further, that they did not continue the investigation through the subcommittee? What is the reason for all this? I asked the question in committee, but I did not get a satisfactory answer.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I cannot answer the question. The chairman of the subcommittee brought before the committee all the witnesses he seemed to want. No one restricted his activities. No one objected to any witnesses. He could have reached out and brought in all the witnesses he wished.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The committee had plenty of time; is not that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. So far as I know, it had unlimited time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is there any rule of the committee that would not allow the Senator from Michigan, as chairman, to continue, if the committee wanted to investigate further?

Mr. McCARRAN. None that I know of. The committee could have been going yet.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It could have been going yet; is not that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, indeed—and yet, again.

The fact is that each of the Federal judges testified that they knew the FBI report itself, containing such statements, was available, that each judge was confident that United States Attorney Wear was honest and frank with the judges, and that appropriate reference to the important statements was made in the analysis. Moreover, after listening to these affidavits during the course of these hearings the Federal judges were still of the view that none showed a violation of Federal law. I read the statement. I read now certain inquiries propounded to the Federal judges by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. Thus, Judge Reeves testified:

Senator McCARRAN. In other words, assuming that the facts stated therein were true, it would not have been a violation of the Federal statute.

Judge REEVES. I did not notice anything in the letters that would indicate a violation of the Federal statute; that is, in itself, Senator (R. 393).

Senator McCARRAN. You have already stated to me that taken by themselves, the letters read here this morning did not, so far as you were able to discern, from hearing them read, constitute a violation of a Federal statute?

Let me say the letters read were letters which were read by the chairman of the committee to the judges. So far as I can recall, they appeared to be letters that had been garnered by FBI agents in the course of an investigation of this case, and, in the first instance, they were gathered by representatives of the Kansas City Star. I continue the quotation:

Judge REEVES. Not within themselves, Senator (R. 400).

* * * * *

Mr. REEVES. Maybe I should say that I find some serious violations of the State law, and I perceive in that a concert of action which would be in the nature of conspiracy, but I would be doubtful as to whether or not upon this letter (Estella Carter) alone there was testimony that would show an offense under that statute, that is, section 51 (R. 411).

Senator McCARRAN. Is there anything in there that indicates the violation of a Federal act?

Mr. RIDGE. None at all (R. 434).

ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE AND ACTION BY CRIMINAL DIVISION OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Following the analysis of the evidence by United States Attorney Wear and his recommendations and his report of the unanimous opinion of the three Federal judges, the Civil Rights Section of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice thoroughly analyzed the 355-page Federal Bureau of Investigation report of October 24, 1946, which included the approximately 1,400 afore-mentioned affidavits and statements, and the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures for the House of Representatives, 1946, and all other files relating to this matter.

The Civil Rights Section found that the irregularities in connection with the primary held in the Fifth Congressional District of Missouri in Kansas City amounted to violations of the State law of Missouri and that there was evidence directly relating to only two instances of irregularities concerning the congressional race:

With respect to the fourth precinct, first ward, statements from three persons indicated that they had voted for Walsh, one of the candidates for the Democratic nomination, whereas the official tally credited Walsh with only one vote. The Civil Rights Section found no evidence indicating a conspiracy in this connection, or that the election judges, clerks, or anyone else knowingly violated the Federal law.

In the second instance involving the congressional race, relating to the fifth precinct, second ward, 14 persons had submitted statements claiming that they had voted for Slaughter, also a candidate for the Democratic nomination, whereas the official tally credited him with 6 votes. The Civil Rights Section found no evidence indicating a conspiracy in this connection.

The Civil Rights Section of the Criminal Division, in addition to reviewing the information contained in the Federal Bureau of Investigation report which

had been supplied to the Federal Bureau of Investigation by the Kansas City Star, also reviewed the information contained in that report which had been supplied by the members of the board of election commissioners. The only affirmative information from such officials related to five voters who contended that they had not actually voted and who, after complaining to the election officials, had been permitted to vote, but the Civil Rights Section found no evidence of conspiracy in connection with these incidents or any election violation.

In addition to its review of the Federal Bureau of Investigation report, the Civil Rights Section of the Criminal Division also carefully considered the file submitted by the Special Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures for the House of Representatives, 1946. It was found that committee's investigation was directed largely to the question of campaign expenditures, a matter outside the Federal jurisdiction, since the Federal statutory provision relating to such expenditures specifically excludes primary elections from its scope—section 241, title 2, United States Code. Certain irregularities in the method of counting ballots were referred to by that committee, which were found at most to constitute violations of State laws regulating the manner of counting ballots. The Civil Rights Section found no evidence that anyone conspired in this connection to miscount or falsify ballots.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator permit me to ask Senators whether or not, in view of the fact that the supplemental appropriation bill is ready for consideration, and should be sent to the House today, this being Friday, we could temporarily lay aside the unfinished business, which is the motion with respect to Senate Resolution 150, and proceed to the consideration of the appropriation bill without prejudicing the situation with respect to the resolution and the Senator's rights in connection with consideration of the motion? If the Senator will entertain that suggestion I suppose it would be necessary that there be a quorum call in order that Members of the Senate could be advised respecting the proposal to consider the appropriation bill. If any controversy should develop respecting the bill, a recess can be taken and consideration had of the bill later.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask unanimous consent that I may interrogate the Senator from Nebraska without the Senator from Nevada losing the floor thereby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. LUCAS. Do I understand the Senator's question to be that he proposes to lay aside the unfinished business and take up the supplemental appropriation bill?

Mr. WHERRY. My request is that consideration of the motion respecting Senate Resolution 150 be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the supplemental appropriation bill, House bill 4269.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator propose to take up that bill immediately, or merely to make it the unfinished business, and then that the Senate recess until, let us say, 12 o'clock today, and then proceed to consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHERRY. The bill should be sent to the House today. If we should adjourn now until 12 o'clock——

Mr. LUCAS. Well, let us say 11 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like the Senate to proceed to consider the appropriation bill for a short while in an endeavor to find whether or not controversies respecting it should develop. I think it could be passed without much difficulty and we then could recess until noon today.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have it made the unfinished business, and that the Senate proceed to consider it for a while, so we may find whether any controversies respecting it arise, and if there should be any undue delay we can recess until 12 o'clock.

Mr. McCARRAN. One question I should like to have decided is whether the Senator from Nevada would lose the floor if he should yield now for the purpose stated by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. My unanimous request would be that the pending motion be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the appropriation bill, and that we proceed to consider it for a while. The unanimous consent request would include the request that when we return to consideration of the motion the Senator from Nevada be recognized.

Mr. McCARRAN. That would mean that consideration would be had of the appropriation bill, after which the Senate would return to consideration of the motion now before us?

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, there might be some other unanimous consent requests made to take up other legislation. There is much legislation on the calendar which ought to be passed. There are conference reports which the Senator knows about. I make the request in order to expedite the business of the Senate. If the Senator does not object to the procedure proposed, I believe we should have a quorum call so other Members of the Senate can express themselves. We would not take up anything other than the supplemental appropriation bill tonight.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. It seems to me it is a little harsh on Senators to lay aside the unfinished business for the moment and start debating the appropriation bill at 5:30 o'clock in the morning. I would not object to setting aside the unfinished business if we could all be able to go to bed, and have 5 or 6 hours' sleep.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. There are some uncontested amendments in the appropriation bill. If controversy should arise respecting certain amendments, consideration of them can be put over until later today.

Mr. LUCAS. In that event it would be necessary to have a quorum call.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. My recollection is that the supplemental appropriation bill finally came out of the Appropriations Committee with its unanimous approval. So I doubt very much that there will be any controversy respecting that bill. It contains the foreign relief item, and a number of items which are of tremendous importance to the country.

Mr. LUCAS. The civil functions bill was reported unanimously, but there was considerable controversy over it yesterday afternoon. I believe it will be necessary to have a quorum call before the appropriation bill is taken up.

Mr. WHERRY. I made the suggestion in order to expedite the business of the Senate. If there is objection, we will proceed with the business in hand.

Mr. LUCAS. We would have to have a quorum call, I presume.

Mr. WHERRY. I made the suggestion in the hope it would meet with the approval of the Senator from Nevada. We should have a quorum call so more Members of the Senate can be consulted.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I want to have my position made clear of record. Is the proposal made by the Senator from Nebraska with the understanding that I am not to lose the floor, and that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and not to be taken up at least before the reconvening of the Senate at noon today? In other words, if I yield the floor now and the appropriation bill is taken up and disposed of, and then we should return to consideration of the pending motion, I do not see that much will be gained. I might just as well continue.

Mr. WHERRY. My request was that the motion now under consideration be temporarily laid aside without prejudicing the rights of the Senator from Nevada. He would certainly temporarily lose the floor, but my suggestion is that he should be recognized when consideration of the motion is resumed. It is my request that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4269, and that at the conclusion of consideration of the bill, or before that, if controversy should arise, that a motion be made to recess until noon today, which is Friday. So the Senator from Nevada would not have to worry concerning the matter of resuming consideration of the motion after the Senate has begun consideration of the appropriation bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. As I undestand, the proposition is now that I shall not lose the floor; that no speech shall be counted against me; that the appropriation bill be taken up and disposed of, and when, as, and if it may be disposed of, a recess be taken, or during the consideration of the appropriation bill a recess may be taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Until 12 o'clock today.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, until 12 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair state his understanding of the situation, which is that upon the reconvening of the Senate at 12 o'clock the motion to consider Senate Resolution 150 again becomes the unfinished business of the Senate, and that the Senator from Nevada is again recognized. Is that correct?

Mr. WHERRY. No; that is not the situation. I will restate the request. I do not want in any way to attempt to secure any further concession.

The unanimous consent request is that the motion to take up Senate Resolution 150 be temporarily set aside; that the Senate proceed with the consideration of the supplemental appropriation bill, House bill 4269; and that if any controversy arises, the Senate will take a recess until noon today. At that time I am satisfied that other legislation will be before the Senate, such as conference reports, or further unanimous-consent requests based upon the request I am now making; but that would not displace the motion to take up Senate Resolution 150. It would be the pending business, as it is now. None of the rights of the Senator from Nevada now has would be prejudiced. That is, if the motion to proceed to consider Senate Resolution 150 is again taken up, the Senator from Nevada will be recognized and have the floor in his own right, without having any speeches counted against him.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, with the statement made by the Senator from Nebraska, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, there may be an objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely wished to ask the Senator if he knows that the supplemental appropriation bill, House bill 4269, contains some very important items that could not be disposed of quickly. There is an item for assistance to Greece and Turkey in the sum of $400,000,000; an item for relief assistance to war devastated countries in the sum of $700,000,000; an item for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, and several other items.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not understand that there is to be any curtailment of consideration of that bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thought the Senator from Nebraska indicated that it might be passed in a short time.

Mr. McCARRAN. I cannot conceive of that. I do not know.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield, under the same condition as heretofore.

Mr. BARKLEY. I just entered the Chamber. Will the Senator from Nebraska repeat the suggestion he made a moment ago, for my benefit?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall try to state it again.

I thought in the event the unanimous-consent request which I addressed to the Senator from Nevada met with the approval of the minority leader, a quorum call should be made, and the entire membership of the Senate advised of the request.

Mr. BARKLEY. A quorum call now?

Mr. WHERRY. I thought it was unnecessary to have a quorum call and summon members of the Senate unless it met with the approval of the Senator from Nevada and the minority leader.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me to take up a committee jurisdictional matter, without prejudice to his rights?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, let us get along with this.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I thought we might clear up the other matter.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I do not feel that I can yield too much.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me state briefly to the minority leader that the unanimous-consent request was that the motion to take up Senate Resolution 150 be temporarily set aside and that the Senate proceed with the consideration of the appropriation bill, House bill 4269, and that none of the rights of the Senator from Nevada be prejudiced in connection with the consideration of the motion to take up Senate Resolution 150. If in the consideration of the appropriation bill controversies should arise or if the bill should require too much time, it was my thought that the Senate would take a recess until 12 o'clock noon today.

Mr. BARKLEY. How long would it take to determine whether or not it was controversial?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to leave it to the minority leader and other Members of the Senate. I thought possibly the appropriation bill might be passed without much difficulty and could be ready to go to the House before we took a recess.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I yield to Senators in the colloquy, provided that I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. GEORGE. Is there anything in the agreement which relates to Calendar 610, House bill 2181, the on-farm training bill, about which I spoke last night?

Mr. WHERRY. The only suggestion I made was with respect to the appropriation bill. I had understood that there would be no objection to the appropriation bill.

Mr. GEORGE. I am asking about the other bill also.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the appropriation bill will be followed by a similar request with respect to House bill 2181 and the other veterans' on-the-job training bill in which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is interested. That will probably be followed by the so-called sugar bill. I do not care to state any further priority, but that would be the intention.

Mr. BARKLEY. What would be the intention with regard to other appropriation bills and conference reports?

Mr. TAFT. There are no other appropriation bills. Of course, conference reports are in order at any time. There are two or three conference reports ready to be submitted at this time—the agriculture bill, the Army bill, and the Government corporations bill. They will also have to be taken up.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is a supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the one I am asking to have considered now.

Mr. TAFT. I understand that tomorrow there will come over from the House a very small second supplemental bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, do I correctly understand the Senator to say that the purpose is to follow this appropriation bill with the veterans' bill?

Mr. TAFT. With the two veterans' bills.

Mr. GEORGE. With that understanding, I would not interpose objection. Otherwise I would.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may I ask one question of the Senator from Georgia? I discussed the question of the veterans' bills with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and he thought it might be possible to agree on a 1-hour limitation of debate on the two veterans' bills. Would the Senator be willing to agree to some such plan so that we might get to the other bills which have been presented—the sugar bill in particular?

Mr. GEORGE. I have no objection to any reasonable limitation on debate. In fact, I think it is a very simple question, and that it should have been disposed of already. At least one of the bills should have been disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, how long does the Senator intend to hold the Senate in session before taking a recess until 12 o'clock?

Mr. WHERRY. I will say to my able and distinguished friend from Texas that it is my purpose—and this is my individual suggestion only—that we take up the appropriation bill and start on it. If there are any controversial items which require considerable debate, I will ask that the Senate take a recess until noon.

Mr. CONNALLY. I know; but that is too nebulous a proposal. Who is to decide whether there is any controversy?

Mr. WHERRY. I will leave that to the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator will not leave anything to me. I have been here all night. I have not slept a wink. I have been listening to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. Unless there is some agreement as to when we are to suspend, I shall be inclined to object. I do not wish to object, but human endurance has its limitations.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a suggestion? Why does not the Senator ask to have the appropriation bill made the unfinished business, and then move a recess until 12 o'clock?

Mr. WHERRY. I will say to the distinguished majority leader that the proposal which I made was my own idea.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am making this suggestion on my own, too. I do not know how long consideration of the bill will require. We cannot tell whether it is to be controversial. If there is any debate, or any conversation back and forth, that is controversy.

Mr. WHERRY. The distinguished minority leader knows that I shall not be that technical.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand.

Mr. WHERRY. All I am suggesting is that we proceed with the appropriation bill. If there is no difficulty to speak of, we may be able to pass it in a short time. I shall not attempt to say the minute or the hour, but we should make an effort to pass it and get it over to the House today.

Mr. President, I have made this suggestion in good faith, hoping that we could proceed with the "must" legislation. I am satisfied that we should have an agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and with the consent of the Senator from Texas, it seems to me that after being here all night it would be satisfactory to make the appropriation bill the unfinished business and take a recess until 12 o'clock.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is agreeable to me.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall not renew the request. I have done my level best to iron out the situation with everyone. I cannot see why objection should be made to the unanimous-consent request which I have presented, because it facilitates the very end we are after. We have to send the appropriation bill back to the House. It certainly is not unreasonable, it seems to me, to stay here for a few minutes. I have an idea that we could have passed the appropriation bill while we were talking about it. There may be a few items that are controversial. If there are any, I should be glad to suggest that we recess until noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator agree to stay not later than 7 o'clock?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to accept that.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the Senator meant to say 6 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. I will accept the first proposition, 7 o'clock, and will guarantee that we will get away as soon as we can.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska modifies his unanimous consent request so as to provide for a recess not later than 7 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. Until noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The request is agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, we have been here all night and it is now 20 minutes of 6. This is a very important bill, containing many controversial provisions. It seems to me that we should be given an opportunity to have a short recess before we begin on such an important measure. Why can we not make the appropriation bill the order of business, and then come back at 11 o'clock and consider it?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I thought the request had been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the opinion of the Chair that it has been agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY. I am merely making that suggeston. I think it is a fair one and should be accepted. I am not making any objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4269) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that the bill be read for amendment, the committee amendments to be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Baldwin	Gurney	Moore
Ball	Hatch	Morse
Barkley	Hawkes	Murray
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Myers
Bricker	Hill	O'Daniel
Brooks	Hoey	Pepper
Butler	Holland	Reed
Cain	Ives	Revercomb
Capehart	Jenner	Russell
Capper	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kem	Smith
Connally	Kilgore	Sparkman
Cooper	Knowland	Taft
Cordon	Lodge	Taylor
Donnell	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McCarran	Thye
Dworshak	McCarthy	Umstead
Ecton	McClellan	Vandenberg
Ellender	McGrath	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wherry
Flanders	Malone	White
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
George	Maybank	Williams
Green	Millikin	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The clerk will proceed to state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Legislative branch," on page 1, after line 7, to insert:

SENATE

OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER

For an amount necessary to increase basic salaries in the Senate Press Gallery, beginning July 1, 1947, as follows: Superintendent from $3,820 to $4,320; one assistant superintendent from $3,200 to $3,600; one assistant superintendent from $2,100 to $2,400; two messengers for service to press correspondents from $1,620 each to $1,920 each; in all, $2,485; and the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1948 hereby is amended accordingly.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 7, to insert:

For an amount necessary to increase the basic salary of one clerk from $3,300 to $3,480 beginning July 1, 1947, $250; and the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1948 hereby is amended accordingly.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 11, to insert:

OFFICES OF THE SECRETARIES FOR THE MAJORITY AND THE MINORITY

For an amount necessary to increase basic salaries, beginning July 1, 1947, as follows: Clerks, one to the secretary for the majority and one to the secretary for the minority, from $2,640 each to $2,820 each; in all, $500; and the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1948 hereby is amended accordingly.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 19, to insert:

JOINT COMMITTEE ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Contingent expenses, Senate: For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations created by section 401 of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 (Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress), $100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 3, to insert:

TEMPORARY CONGRESSIONAL AVIATION POLICY BOARD

For salaries and expenses of the Temporary Congressional Aviation Policy Board created by the act to establish a National Aviation Council, and for other purposes, to be available until March 1, 1948, and to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers approved by the Chairman, $50,000: *Provided*, That expenditures hereunder shall be made in accordance with the laws applicable to inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 9, to insert:

Senate restaurants: For repairs, improvements, furnishings, and equipment for the Senate Restaurant, Capitol Building, including personal and other services, $84,000, to be expended by the Architect of the Capitol under the supervision of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 5, to insert:

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Senate Office Building: To enable the Architect of the Capitol to carry out the provisions of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of cost for an additional office building for the use of the United States Senate," approved July 11, 1947, $25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Executive Office of the President—Office for Emergency Management—Office of Defense Transportation," on page 6, after line 5, to strike out:

Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of liquidating the Office of Defense

Transportation, $140,000, of which $60,000 shall be available exclusively for terminal leave.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of the Office of Defense Transportation, including salary of the Director at not to exceed $12,000, and the Deputy Director at $10,000, traveling expenses (not to exceed $50,000), including attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the agency; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600); printing and binding (not to exceed $10,000); not to exceed $4,000 for deposit in the general fund of the Treasury for cost of penalty mail as required by the act of June 28, 1944; personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; $484,000: *Provided*, That the payment of subsistence to witnesses shall be subject to certification by the Director of the Office of Defense Transportation or his designee, as to the necessity therefor: *Provided further*, That in operating any commercial railroad or truck line the Office of Defense Transportation shall pay whatever license or inspection fees and highway use compensation taxes such lines would have been obligated to pay had they continued in operation under the control of the owners thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Assistance to Greece and Turkey," on page 8, line 3, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$3,800,000" and insert "$5,177,900"; and in line 4, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$300,000" and insert "$607,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Defense aid, liquidation lend-lease program," on page 8, line 14, after the word "commodities", to strike out "purchased" and insert "contracted for"; and in line 15, after the word "of", to insert "only."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Relief assistance to war-devastated countries," on page 8, line 24, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$600,000" and insert "$700,000"; on page 9, line 3, after the word "That", to insert "(except from funds allocated therefrom by the President as contributions to the International Children's Emergency Fund of the United Nations under the provisions of said Public Law 84"; and on page 11, line 6, after the word "assistance", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further*, That subject to the limitations and requirements of this paragraph this appropriation shall be available for the transportation of voluntary relief supplies shipped by relief agencies licensed for operation in Europe and in Asia under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Surplus property, care and handling overseas," on page 12, line 1, after the word "purposes", to insert "and in addition military appropriations may be expended for such purposes, in contemplation of reimbursement from an appropriation supplemental hereto, in an amount sufficient to provide reimbursement for such expenditures as are made in excess of the amount appropriated herein."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Independent Offices—Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service," on page 13, line 3, after the word "of", to strike out "$50" and insert "$35."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 9, to insert:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

National Institute of Health, operating expenses: For an additional amount for the activities of the National Institute of Health, $500,000, including the objects specified under this head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1948, to be expended for research activities related to cardiovascular diseases.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Social Security Administration," on page 14, line 20, after the word "administration", to strike out "$12,026,000" and insert "$8,026,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Works Agency—Public Roads Administration," on page 15, line 13, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document Numbered 88 and"; and in line 15, after the word "Congress", to strike out "$336,034.58" and insert "$435,440.42."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Housing Expediter—Office of Rent Control," on page 15, line 24, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$50" and insert "$35."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Labor Relations Board", on page 17, line 16, after the word "law", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for the National Labor Relations Board shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any person appointed as an additional member or as general counsel of such Board (as provided in sec. 3 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended), whose nomination has not been confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, that is quite a controversial amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be passed over for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Selective Service Records", on page 18, line 10, after "(Public Law 658)", to strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$5,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 10, to insert:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans: For an additional amount for "Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans," $5,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the title "Department of Agriculture—Agricultural Research Administration—Bureau of Animal Industry," on page 18, after line 17, to insert:

Animal husbandry: For an additional amount for "Animal husbandry," $17,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 8, to insert:

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

MARKETING SERVICES

Insecticide Act: For an additional amount for "Marketing services, Insecticide Act," $100,000, to be merged with the appropriation under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1948, such total funds to be available for carrying out the purposes of the act of April 26, 1910 (7 U. S. C. 121-134), and the act of June 25, 1947 (Public Law 104), of which not to exceed $4,000 may be used for construction of buildings and the limitation on personal services in the District of Columbia under "Marketing services" is hereby increased by $22,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Sugar Rationing Administration", on page 21, line 5, after the word "vehicles", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, that not to exceed $70,000 may be transferred to the regular departmental appropriation for penalty mail as required by the Act of June 28, 1944, $710,000" and in line 8, after the amendment just above stated, to insert "$210,000, together with the sum appropriated for the Sugar Rationing Administration in the Emergency Appropriation Act, 1948 (Public Law 161), which is transferred to and made a part hereof: *Provided*, That not to exceed $20,000 may be transferred to the regular departmental appropriation for penalty mail as required by the Act of June 28, 1944."

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to know if it is understood that by agreeing to the amendment, we end sugar rationing at once, because $600,000 would be required for terminal pay for the sugar rationing organization. I simply wish it understood for the record that the adoption of this amendment will end sugar rationing at once.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is in the Chamber. Was not there an appropriation of $750,000 in an emergency appropriation? This is supplemental to that; is it not?

Mr. FLANDERS. I have before me a letter from Mr. N. E. Dodd, Acting Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, indicating that the total sum made possible by his amendment is $960,000, of which $600,000 will have to be used for terminal leave payments, leaving $360,000, which will carry the organization for a very short time, only long enough to clean up and put the records in order.

I am not asking that any change be made, but I simply want it known, at the request of the Department of Agriculture, that the adoption of this amendment will end sugar rationing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 21, in lines 5 and 8.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I would merely like to say that, even figuring the terminal leave liability at the full $600,000 which the Senator has mentioned, this amount would still leave them $360,000 for sugar rationing; and the only sugar they are rationing is industrial sugar, and the rationing of industrial sugar expires next March, if they do not liquidate it before then.

If that amount is not adequate, of course the matter is in conference, both the entire $750,000, as well as the $600,000. I am sure we can take care of it in that way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 21, in lines 5 and 8.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Commerce—Office of the Secretary," on page 22, line 10, after "(Eightieth Congress)", to insert "and of the $950,000 herein provided"; and in line 13, after the word "Commerce", to strike out the semicolon and the word "and", and insert "and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 12, to insert:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," $39,520.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I do not know whether we are to go through all the committee amendments first. Is that the understanding? I have an amendment which I wish to offer on page 22.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; that is the understanding.

The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 15, to insert:

Establishment of air-navigation facilities: For an additional amount for "Establishment of air-navigation facilities," $70,000, of which not to exceed $1,750 may be transferred to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Civil Aeronautics Administration," for necessary administrative costs.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was under the subhead "Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce," on page 25, line 6, after the word "Commerce", to strike out "$650,000" and insert "$700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 7, to insert:

Field office service: For an additional amount for "Field office service," $15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of the Interior—Office of the Secretary—War agency liquidation," on page 25, line 24, after the word "expenses", to insert "(except terminal leave which expense shall be borne by the Navy Department.)"

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 19, to insert:

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Construction, operation, and maintenance, Bonneville power transmission system: For an additional amount "Construction, operation, and maintenance, Bonneville power transmission system," $1,184,700, and in addition to the contract authorization included in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1948, the Administrator is authorized to contract in the fiscal year 1948 for materials and equipment for power transmission facilities in an amount not in excess of $790,600.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment under the heading "Bonneville Power Administration" be passed over until we have further discussion of the bill. I have some remarks which I should like to make on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be passed over.

The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to have all the amendments under the title "Bonneville Power Administration" passed over, clear down to line 13 on page 27.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments under that heading and down to that point will be passed over.

The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Indian Affairs," on page 27, after line 13, to strike out:

Alaska native service: For an additional amount for "Alaska native service," $375,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, after line 13, to strike out:

Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies: For an additional amount for "Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies," $250,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 2, to strike out:

Conservation of health: For an additional amount for "Conservation of health," $302,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Park Service," on page 28, line 13, after the word "parks", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$89,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Fish and Wildlife Service—Salaries and expenses," on page 28, line 23, after the word "reservations", to strike out "$30,000" and insert "$50,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Labor—Office of the Secretary," on page 29, after line 5, to strike out:

Contingent expenses: For an additional amount for "Contingent expenses," $15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 9, after the word "binding", to strike out "$15,000" and insert "$7,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Wage and Hour Division," on page 29, line 22, after the figures "$500,000," to insert "and the limitation on departmental salaries is hereby increased by $98,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 2, to strike out:

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

General administration: For an additional amount for "General Administration," $201,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to have that amendment on page 30 passed over. I wish to discuss it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, to which amendment on page 30 does the Senator from Kentucky refer? There are several amendments there.

Mr. BARKLEY. I refer to the amendments on page 30, from line 3 through line 13—the amendments striking out the three paragraphs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments referred to will be passed over.

The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Navy Department—Office of the Secretary," on page 30, line 23, after the word "in," to insert "Senate Document Numbered 82 and", and in line 24, after the word "Congress," to strike out "$55,418.56" and insert "$59,494.56."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 3, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document Numbered 87 and", and in line 4, after the word "Congress", to strike out "$794,761.28" and insert "$1,321,019.10."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of State," on page 31, after line 15, to strike out the subhead "International Refugee Organization."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 16, to insert:

DEPARTMENT SERVICE

Salaries and expenses, Department of State: The limitation of $20,000 contained in the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1948, for the employment of aliens and temporary employment of persons in the United States, without regard to civil service and classification laws, is hereby increased to $40,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 23, to insert:

North Atlantic fisheries: The appropriation "North Atlantic fisheries," contained in the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1948, is hereby made available, on and after July 1, 1947, for personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; temporary employment of persons without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the activity for which this appropriation was made.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 7, to insert:

FOREIGN SERVICE

Salaries and expenses, Foreign Service: There is hereby transferred the sum of $500,000 from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Department of State, 1948," and the sum of $100,000 from the appropriation "Living and quarters allowances, Foreign Service, 1948," in all $600,000, to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Foreign Service, 1948."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 15, to insert:

INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS AND ACTIVITIES

International activities: The limitation of $75,000 contained in the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1948, for entertainment and representation allowances as authorized by section 901 (3) of the act of August 13, 1946 (Public Law 724), is hereby made available for both entertainment and representation allowances.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 33, to insert:

The Institute of Inter-American Affairs: The amount made available under this head for administrative expenses for the fiscal year 1948 is hereby increased in the amount of $116,000, said amount to be for the payment of rent as required in section 306 of the Government Corporations Appropriations Act, 1948.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 6, to insert:

Inter-American Educational Foundation, Incorporated: The amount made available under this head for administrative expenses for the fiscal year 1948 is hereby increased in the amount of $16,000, said amount to be for the payment of rent as required in section 306 of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1948.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 23, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$71,024,900" and insert $73,361,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Treasury Department—Bureau of Federal Supply," on page 36, line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "$50,000,000" and insert "$100,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "War Department—Civil functions—Government and relief in occupied areas," on page 38, line 15, after the word "accomplished", to strike out "$550,000,000" and insert "$625,000,000, and in addition to this appropriation the Secretary of War may, prior to July 1, 1948, enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not in excess of $100,000,000"; in line 18, after the word "*Provided*", to strike out "That when military personnel of the War Department are employed primarily for the purposes of this appropriation, the mileage and other travel allowances to which they may be entitled shall be paid herefrom: *Provided further*"; and on page 39, line 5, after "United States", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available to transport voluntary relief supplies shipped by the Council of Relief Agencies Licensed for Operation in Germany."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Judgments and authorized claims—Property damage claims," on page 39, line 20, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document Numbered 78 and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 24, after the word "Interior", to strike out "$383.20" and insert "$543.14."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 2, after the words "In all", to strike out "$883.18" and insert "$1,043.12."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Judgments, United States courts," on page 40, line 11, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document Numbered 86 and"; in line 12, after the numerals "352", to insert "under the United States Maritime Commission, $71,963.45, and"; and in line 14, after the word "Department", to strike out "$44,496.30" and insert "$55,951.16; in all, $127,914.61."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, in line 5, after the word "Civil", to insert "146."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 7, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document Numbered 84 and", and in line 9, after the word "Department", to strike out "$47,825.27" and insert "$48,300.61."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, after line 10, to strike out:

(d) For the payment of a final judgment rendered against the Government of the United States by a United States district court under the provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C. 921), and which was certified to the Eightieth Congress in House Document Numbered 361 under the Navy Department, $2,899.49, together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest as specified in such judgment or as provided by law.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

(d) For the payment of final judgments rendered against the Government of the United States by United States district courts under the provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C. 931), and which were certified to the Eightieth Congress in Senate Document Numbered 80 and House Document Numbered 361 under the Navy Department, $2,899.49, and under the War Department, $3,022.24; in all, $5,921.73, together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest as specified in such judgments or as provided by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Judgments, United States Court of Claims," on page 42, line 15, after the word "in," to insert "Senate Document Numbered 85 and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 17, after the word "Commission," to strike out "$30,125" and insert "$92,027.10."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 19, after "Federal Works Agency", to strike out "$12,622.69" and insert "$44,973.85."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 20, after "Department of Justice", to strike out "$87,347.21" and insert "$110,916.19."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 22, after "Treasury Department", to strike out "$112,285.85" and insert "$146,057.25."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 23, after "War Department", to strike out "$113,220.61" and insert "$116,392.33."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, after line 23, to insert:

Panama Canal, $122,591.34.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 25, after the words "In all", to strike out "$382,494.38" and insert "$659,851.08."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 3, after the word "numbered", to strike out "46,066 and" and insert "46,066"; in line 4, after the numerals "46,084", to insert "and 46,287"; in line 5, after the word "of", to strike out "$197,908.81" and insert "$203,332.18"; and in line 7, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document Numbered 81 and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Audited claims," on page 43, line 25, after the word "in," to insert "Senate Document Numbered 79 and"; on page 44, line 2, after the words "sum of," to strike out "$51,441,278.18" and insert "$55,452,508.21"; in line 8, after the word "and," to strike out "$6,559.73" and insert "$8,528.06"; and in line 9, after the words "in all," to strike out "$51,447,842.71" and insert "$55,461,041.07."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 19, after the word "in," to insert "Senate Document Numbered 83 and"; and in line 20, after the figures "355," to strike out "$5,568.70" and insert "$7,945.90."

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—General Provisions," on page 46, after line 4, to insert:

SEC. 302 In making expenditures for foodstuffs from funds appropriated in this act for relief abroad, it is the sense of the Congress that preference be given to the purchase, within the United States, of products, which can be purchased with benefit to the national economy, and that such purchases should include articles that are in surplus where possible and practicable.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, line 12, to change the section number from 302 to 303.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments, with the exception of the three which were passed over.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I think there are two more amendments. The Senator from Pennsylvania has one, and I have one which the Department of State wants adopted. It is subject to a point of order, and if there is any objection, it can go over. The whole purpose is to make available to the United States representative to the United Nations organization the allowances which are available to an Ambassador who is serving abroad. Ambassador Austin, who is our representative, has certain extra very heavy expenses. The purpose of the amendment is to make available to him the same sort of allowances for living quarters and the like that are available to an Ambassador representing us in a foreign capital.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me inquire what the status of the bill is. We passed over three committee amendments which are controversial. One of them especially would involve considerable debate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the purpose is to recess and consider those amendments at 12 o'clock.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is what I was about to suggest.

Mr. BALL. I do not think there will be any objection to the amendment I am offering. As I have said, on a single objection it will go out, because it is legislation on the appropriation bill. The Department requested it in behalf of Ambassador Austin, to prevent him having to pay out of his own pocket some very heavy expenses which ordinarily, in the case of an Ambassador abroad, the Government would bear.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator from Minnesota will recall that the Senator from Nevada has an amendment to the bill which is in the nature of legislation, which I should like to have taken up, but not necessarily at this moment, providing I have a right to take it up at a later time when the bill is before the Senate.

Mr. BALL. The Senator's amendment was approved by the committee, and so far as I am concerned, unless there is objection, it could be considered as soon as we dispose of the amendment I have offered.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that we are to recess shortly, I hope the Senator from Minnesota will not press his amendment. Let us have a little time to consider it. It has never been called to my attention before.

Mr. WHERRY. I think that in keeping with the unanimous consent agreement——

Mr. McCARRAN. Would there be any objection to adopting my amendment?

Mr. WHERRY. Of course not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, so far as the amendment which the Senator from Nevada wants to offer is concerned, it restores an amount of $33,300 to the bill, a contribution of funds towards the Boulder City school district which we have been making for years, which the Senate put into the Interior Department bill, and which, in order to reach an agreement with the House, was stricken out in conference. The Senator explained the amendment to the committee, and the committee authorized him unanimously, as I recall, to offer the amendment on the floor. It is legislation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator from Nebraska a few moments ago stated a unanimous consent agreement.

Mr. WHERRY. The agreement was that we lay aside the unfinished business temporarily, which at that time was the motion to take up Senate Resolution 150, and proceed with the consideration of the supplemental appropriation bill, and that if any amendment which was controversial was reached, to put it over, and that at 7 o'clock a recess would be taken until noon. So that if there is any objection to the amendment, I feel duty bound to ask the Majority Leader to recess the Senate until noon, at which time we can give further consideration to all the amendments. I have no objection to the amendment, but if there is any objection, I think that in keeping with the agreement that was made, each Senator should have an opportunity to debate it, and if the debate is to be prolonged, I feel that a recess until noon would be in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senate might adopt this little amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no objection on my part.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota withdraw his amendment in order to enable the Senator from Nevada to offer his amendment?

Mr. BALL. I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 27, after line 10, it is proposed to insert the following new item:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

COLORADO RIVER DAM FUND

Boulder Canyon project: For payment to the Boulder City School District as reimbursement for instruction during the 1947–1948 school year in the schools operated by said district, of each pupil who is a dependent of any employee of the United States, living in or in the immediate vicinity of Boulder City, in the sum of $50 per semester per pupil in average daily attendance at said schools, payable after the term of instruction in any semester has been completed, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary, $33,300, payable from the Colorado River Dam fund.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Minnesota, in charge of the bill, whether he contemplates offering any further legislative amendments that would require suspension of the rules?

Mr. BALL. Yes; I gave notice on behalf of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] that I would offer an amendment on the farm placement program.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator intends to offer that?

Mr. BALL. Yes; I do.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. For what purpose?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have a noncontroversial small matter I wish to present.

Mr. WHERRY. I made a definite agreement with the Senator from Nevada that the appropriation bill would be the only business to be taken up.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then may I inquire of the Senator from Maine if there is a possibility of a call of the calendar, or for discussion of this type of legislation today, so that we might get action on it in the House?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I think it is the general desire, after the matters upon which agreements have been reached are disposed of, that in the latter part of the day there should be a call of the Legislative Calendar and also a call of the Executive Calendar. If that cannot be done this afternoon or this evening, then I hope it will be done tomorrow.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not like to differ with the Senator from Maine, but I do not see how any assurance can be given, until we find how we proceed today. I think we can say that we hope to get to the call of the calendar, beyond the point where it has already been called, sometime late this afternoon or this evening. I do not like to be put in the position of giving an absolutely definite promise to that effect, because I do not know how long the other bills will take.

Mr. WHITE. I thought I avoided a definite commitment. I expressed the hope that we might do so.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I feel duty-bound not to delay the Senate a moment longer, in view of the agreement I made, and I trust the Senator from Washington will not push his request now.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am not pushing my request. I merely wanted to say this——

Mr. WHERRY. Very well; go ahead.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There are several bills which have passed the committee unanimously. They are on the calendar. It seems to me the calendar should be called today, because the House must pass on some of the bills, which are of much more importance than some of the things we are doing.

Mr. WHERRY. All right.

Mr. President, I now move——

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Ne-

braska, as we recess, are we in the midst of the consideration of the appropriation bill?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. No agreement has been made as to anything beyond that?

Mr. WHERRY. I think the distinguished Senator from Ohio should answer that question.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Has any agreement been made on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, to repeat my previous statement, when we get through with the appropriation bills, I, at least, am bound to move or bring up, or ask unanimous consent to bring up, the two veterans' bills to which I have committed myself. That is not a unanimous-consent agreement. The Senator may object when it comes up, but that was my personal statement to the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If the Senator will yield further, because of the state of the calendar and because of the very great importance of Senate Resolution 137, which will serve no purpose whatever unless it is adopted before we recess, I am compelled to object to the making of any agreement to take up any other business than Senate Resolution 137, dealing with the investigation of immigration.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I want to ask the Senator from Ohio whether one of the two bills he mentioned is the sugar bill, which he intends to take up.

Mr. TAFT. I mentioned the sugar bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

POSTPONEMENT OF MEETING OF REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I want to make an announcement to the Republicans: In the first place, the Republican conference called for 10 o'clock today has been indefinitely postponed.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, I also wish to state that the meeting of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, scheduled for 9 o'clock, will be held at 11 o'clock, instead of at 9.

PENSACOLA NATIONAL MONUMENT—REREFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—and I do so with the approval of the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, who is on the Senate floor—that the Committee on Public Lands, be discharged from the further consideration of House bill 3416 and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the request involve discussion of the subject?

Mr. PEPPER. None whatever. It is a mere matter of the Public Lands Committee thinking that the bill should be in the custody of the Armed Services Committee instead of in the Public Lands Committee. I am doing this at the suggestion of the Committee on Public Lands, the chairman of which is now on the Senate floor.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the bill covers an item that was referred to the Committee on Public Lands but the committee, in the meeting this morning, decided the bill should go to the Armed Services Committee, so the Senator from Florida is making the request on behalf of the Committee on Public Lands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3416) to provide for the establishment of the Pensacola National Monument.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

NOMINATION OF PHILIP B. PERLMAN TO BE SOLICITOR GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

As in executive session,

Mr. FERGUSON submitted his individual views as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary on the nomination of Philip B. Perlman, of Maryland, to be Solicitor General of the United States, which were ordered to be printed as Executive Report No. 10.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate recess until noon today.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 12 minutes a. m., Friday, July 25, 1947) the Senate took a recess until 12 o'clock noon the same day.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 24 (legislative day of July 16), 1947:

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Lt. Col. Ralph Parker Eaton, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Herbert Volvenelle Mitchell, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Edward Montague Blight, Finance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 28, 1947.

Capt. Milton Robert Blum, Finance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 30, 1947.

Capt. Lloyd Woodrow Cassell, Finance Department (temporary major), with rank from April 28, 1947.

Capt. William Melville Gold, Finance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 27, 1947.

Capt. Edward Milton Miller, Finance Department (temporary major), with rank from March 12, 1947.

Capt. Frederick Alton Sturm, Finance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Capt. James Wells Utterback, Finance Department (temporary major), with rank from April 16, 1947.

TO CHEMICAL CORPS

Capt. Kenneth William Copeland, Quartermaster Corps, with rank from April 25, 1947.

TO INFANTRY

Maj. Richard D Boerem, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 29, 1947.

Maj. Norman Mahlon Winn, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 13, 1943.

First Lt. Fred DeMasse Clarke, Jr., Cavalry (temporary major), with rank from December 7, 1944.

First Lt. Edward Martin Minion, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 14, 1941.

TO AIR CORPS

Maj. Leo Isaac Herman, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel), with rank from February 2, 1943.

Capt. Richard Leofric Temple, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 27, 1947.

First Lt. William Paul Fife, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1945.

First Lt. George Lamar Jones, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1945.

First Lt. Robert Louis Lansche, Pharmacy Corps, with rank from March 18, 1947.

First Lt. William Pinkley Riddling, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from May 23, 1947.

First Lt. George Kitchen Smith, Quartermaster Corps (temporary captain), with rank from March 18, 1947.

Second Lt. Clyde Barton Smith, Infantry, with rank from June 2, 1946.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 24, 1947

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, who art ever seeking to quicken the heartbeats of our better nature, we pray that we may be more responsive to those finer feelings of soul which are the authentic tidings and prophecies of Thy divinely ordained life for all of us.

Grant that our character and conduct may bear witness to the reality of God, the sovereign authority of the moral law, the worth and dignity of the soul, the spiritual basis of the social order, and the beauty of that life which was taught and lived by our blessed Lord.

May we give ourselves more loyally to the ideals and principles of democracy. Help us to lift mankind out of the low vales of fear and bondage into the lofty heights of faith and freedom. May we be champions of truth and righteousness and justifiers of the ways of God to man.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the

President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On July 21, 1947:

H. R. 379. An act for the relief of Kuo Yu Cheng;

H. R. 553. An act for the relief of Arsenio Acacio Lewis;

H. R. 555. An act for the relief of Edna Rita Saffron Fidone;

H. R. 649. An act for the relief of Antonio Belaustegui;

H. R. 710. An act for the relief of Fritz Hallquist;

H. R. 1176. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Kempton Bailey;

H. R. 1393. An act for the relief of Donna L. I. Carlisle;

H. R. 1493. An act for the relief of Anna Malama Mark;

H. R. 2573. An act to authorize the Director of the United States Geological Survey to produce and sell copies of aerial or other photographs and mosaics, and photographic or photostatic reproductions of records, on a reimbursement of appropriations basis;

H. R. 3056. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Macon, Ga., and Bibb County, Ga., an easement for public road and utility purposes in certain Government-owned lands situated in Bibb County, Ga., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3252. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Long Beach, Calif., for street purposes an easement in certain lands within the Navy housing project at Long Beach, Calif.; and

H. R. 3539. An act to authorize the construction of a chapel at the Coast Guard Academy, and to authorize the acceptance of private contributions to assist in defraying the cost of construction thereof.

On July 22, 1947:

H. R. 436. An act for the relief of Rodger Edgar Lapierre;

H. R. 566. An act for the relief of Choctawhatchee Electric Cooperative, Inc.;

H. R. 1203. An act to provide compensation to persons performing the duties of postmasters at post offices of the fourth class during annual and sick leave of the postmasters;

H. R. 1448. An act to amend section 7 of an act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes, approved July 1, 1902;

H. R. 3053. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Territory of Hawaii an easement for public highway and utility purposes in certain parcels of land in the district of Ewa, Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 3149. An act to amend the act approved December 28, 1945 (Public Law 271, 79th Cong.), entitled "An act to expedite the admission to the United States of alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces";

H. R. 3170. An act for the relief of R. W. Wood;

H. R. 3247. An act to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3672. An act to create an Academic Advisory Board for the United States Merchant Marine Academy; and

H. R. 3744. An act to authorize the construction of a railroad siding in the vicinity of Franklin Street NE., District of Columbia.

On July 23, 1947:

H. R. 205. An act to amend the act approved May 7, 1934, granting citizenship to the Metlakahtla Indians of Alaska;

H. R. 1015. An act for the relief of Fred Pittelli;

H. R. 1888. An act to incorporate the AMVETS, American Veterans of World War II;

H. R. 2167. An act to authorize the inclusion within the Angostura unit of the Missouri Basin project of certain lands owned by the United States;

H. R. 2746. An act to provide secretaries for circuit and district judges;

H. R. 3494. An act to integrate certain personnel of the former Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation and the Bureau of Customs into the Regular Coast Guard, to establish the permanent commissioned personnel strength of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3958. An act to extend temporarily the time for filing applications for patents and for taking action in the United States Patent Office with respect thereto.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 185. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Catholic Society of Alaska for use as a mission;

H. R. 197. An act to transfer part of block 14 and the school building thereon of Petersburg town site, Alaska, used for school purposes, to the town of Petersburg, Alaska;

H. R. 341. An act for the relief of the estate of Reuben Malkin;

H. R. 348. An act for the relief of Dr. Alma Richards and Mrs. Mary Block;

H. R. 405. An act for the relief of Thomas M. Farley, Mrs. Susie Farley, Mrs. Helen Moss, the legal guardian of Donna Louise Farley, and the legal guardian of Melvin Moss;

H. R. 406. An act for the relief of Walter R. and Kathryn Marshall;

H. R. 434. An act for the relief of Lewis H. Rich;

H. R. 640. An act for the relief of Harley Shores;

H. R. 704. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Jane Sherman and W. D. Sherman;

H. R. 821. An act for the relief of Charles W. Taylor, Jr.;

H. R. 893. An act for the relief of Myron R. Leard;

H. R. 914. An act for the relief of George Corenevsky;

H. R. 1091. An act for the relief of Mrs. Georgia Lanser;

H. R. 1379. An act to establish the United States Naval Postgraduate School, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1497. An act for the relief of the estate of George W. Coombs;

H. R. 1535. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Ralph Stanfield, a minor;

H. R. 1565. An act to codify and enact into positive law, title 1 of the United States Code, entitled "General Provisions";

H. R. 1566. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 4 of the United States Code, entitled "Flag and Seal, Seat of Government, and the States";

H. R. 1567. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 6 of the United States Code, entitled "Official and Penal Bonds";

H. R. 1652. An act to provide for the naturalization of certain United States Army personnel—Yugoslav fliers;

H. R. 1737. An act for the relief of Owen R. Brewster;

H. R. 1995. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the return of the amount of deductions from the compensation of any employee who is separated from the service or transferred to a position not within the purview of such act before completing 10 years of service;

H. R. 2005. An act to amend the act of April 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 88), entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of the segregated coal and asphalt deposits of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indian Nations, in Oklahoma, and for an extension of time within which purchasers of such deposits may complete payments";

H. R. 2083. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 17 of the United States Code, entitled "Copyrights";

H. R. 2084. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 9 of the United States Code, entitled "Arbitration";

H. R. 2390. An act for the relief of Elmer A. Norris;

H. R. 2434. An act for the relief of Ruth A. Hairston;

H. R. 2471. An act to provide for periodical reimbursement of the general fund of the District of Columbia for certain expenditures made for the compensation, uniforms, equipment, and other expenses of the United States Park Police force;

H. R. 2507. An act for the relief of the firm of Barrett & Hilp;

H. R. 2511. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim 2 acres of land near Muirkirk, Md., to the Queens Chapel Methodist Church;

H. R. 2550. An act for the relief of Mack Gene Odom, a minor;

H. R. 2607. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of George Wesley Hobbs, a minor;

H. R. 2693. An act for the relief of Public Utility District No. 1, of Cowlitz County, Wash.;

H. R. 3075. An act to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the classification and compensation of employees of the postal service, so as to provide proper recompense in the form of compensatory time for overtime performed by supervisors;

H. R. 3127. An act to provide for the loan or gift of obsolete ordnance to State homes for former members of the armed forces;

H. R. 3191. An act to amend Public Law 301, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved February 18, 1946, so as to extend the benefits of the Missing Persons Act, approved March 7 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, to certain members of the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines;

H. R. 3243. An act for the relief of Roman Toporow;

H. R. 3334. An act granting the consent of Congress to Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Susquehanna River;

H. R. 3361. An act for the relief of J. Rutledge Alford;

H. R. 3376. An act to ratify and confirm Act 10 of the Sessions Laws of Hawaii, 1947, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945;

H. R. 3444. An act to amend section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 3448. An act to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3495. An act for the relief of Andrew C. Extrom and Harry C. Pearson;

H. R. 3739. An act to authorize the Veterans' Administration to acquire certain land as a site for the proposed Veterans' Administration facility at Clarksburg, W. Va., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3852. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia," approved August 7, 1946;

H. R. 3997. An act to exclude certain vendors of newspapers or magazines from certain provisions of the Social Security Act and Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 4043. An act to change the order of priority for payment out of the German special deposit account, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4079. An act to amend the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), as amended June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1976);

H. R. 4254. An act providing for the disposition of farm-labor camps to public or semipublic agencies or nonprofit associations of farmers; and

H. J. Res. 250. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of Robert V. Fleming as a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 174. An act to amend section 26, title I, chapter 1, of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 321), as amended by the act of May 31, 1938 (52 Stat. 588);

H. R. 629. An act for the relief of A. E. McCartney and O. A. Foster; P. W. Woodyard and J. R. Mahon; B. E. Truitt, T. L. Truitt, and W. B. Lacey; G. W. Cox, J. M. Cox, and F. T. Cox; W. W. Cox and Dr. J. W. Cox; Robert Cathcart and Claude Cathcart;

H. R. 2389. An act for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley;

H. R. 2800. An act to amend section 5 of Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3022. An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, gas, and sulfur on lands acquired by the United States;

H. R. 3215. An act to revise the Medical Department of the Army and the Medical Department of the Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3394. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the evacuation and return of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States," approved May 16, 1946, in order to provide for the shipment of the remains of World War II dead to the homeland of the deceased or of next of kin, to provide for the disposition of group and mass burials, to provide for the burial of unknown American World War II dead in United States military cemeteries to be established overseas, to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire land overseas and to establish United States military cemeteries thereon, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3501. An act to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, approved August 9, 1946 (Public Law 704, 79th Cong., 2d sess., 60 Stat. 963), and for other purposes;

H. R. 3726. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions; and

H. R. 3738. An act to amend Public Law 88, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved June 23, 1945.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 192. An act for the relief of Juan Llona;

S. 229. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif.;

S. 257. An act for the relief of Yoneo Sakai;

S. 521. An act to permit the naturalization of Sang Hun Shim;

S. 535. An act for the relief of Adelbert E. Tuller;

S. 609. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claims arising out of the deaths of Norman Ray Pedron and Carl Franklin Morris;

S. 795. An act for the relief of G. R. Below;

S. 892. An act for the payment of claims of the Fidelity Trust Co., of Baltimore, Md., and others, covered by findings of the fact made by the United States Court of Claims, dated June 5, 1944, and contained in Senate Document No. 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session;

S. 939. An act for the relief of Charles Howard Richards;

S. 970. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Harold T. Prosser;

S. 999. An act to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to preference accorded in Federal employment to disabled veterans, and for other purposes;

S. 1006. An act to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended, so as to increase the acreage of sodium leases which may be issued in any State to a person, association, or corporation;

S. 1014. An act to provide for the disposition of internal revenue collections on articles produced in the Virgin Islands;

S. 1026. An act to amend section 101 (b) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944;

S. 1154. An act to amend the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946;

S. 1174. An act to provide for inactive duty training pay for the Organized Reserve Corps, to provide uniform standards for inactive duty training pay for all Reserve components of the armed forces, and for other purposes;

S. 1181. An act for the relief of Robert F. Parks;

S. 1188. An act to authorize the Civil Service Commission, in the promulgation of reduction in force regulations, to give consideration to employees who have incurred injuries resulting in occupational handicaps;

S. 1198. An act to authorize leases of real or personal property by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes;

S. 1215. An act to authorize conversions of certain naval vessels;

S. 1236. An act to increase the minimum allowance payable for rehabilitation in service-connected cases;

S. 1252. An act making certain changes in the organization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes;

S. 1416. An act to amend section 203 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945;

S. 1418. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to control and reduction of pollution in the waters of the New England States;

S. 1426. An act to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, and for other purposes;

S. 1463. An act to amend section 12 of the Immigration Act of 1917;

S. 1480. An act authorizing the conveyance to the State of Delaware of a portion of Pea Patch Island;

S. 1494. An act to amend section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 387);

S. 1505. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Boise, Idaho, to the Boise Chamber of Commerce;

S. 1507. An act authorizing the sale of undisposed of lots in Michel addition to the town of Polson, Mont.;

S. 1562. An act to amend section 102 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 to exclude certain experts and consultants from the coverage of the act;

S. 1574. An act to authorize any agency of the United States Government to furnish or to procure and furnish materials, supplies, and equipment to public international organizations;

S. 1581. An act to provide additional time to the city of Newark, N. J., for paying certain installments on the purchase price of the Port Newark Army Base, and for other purposes;

S. 1582. An act relating to the sale of Paxon Field, Duval County, Fla.;

S. 1590. An act to amend the District of Columbia rent control law so as to provide that schools and universities may recover possession of housing accommodations in certain cases;

S. 1633. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the National Convention of the American Legion to be held in New York, N. Y., August 28 to 31, 1947, and the National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, September 4 to 9, 1947;

S. 1639. An act authorizing the repair and rehabilitation of irrigation works damaged by flood and the prevention of flood damage in the Fort Sumner Irrigation District, and for other purposes;

S. 1641. An act to establish the Women's Army Corps in the Regular Army, to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes;

S. 1661. An act to provide additional inducements to physicians, surgeons, and dentists to make a career of the United States military, naval, and public health services, and for other purposes;

S. 1678. An act to provide for the reincorporation of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 46. Joint resolution authorizing appropriations for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the western land boundary fence project and the Rio Grande border fence project, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 358. An act to provide for settling certain indebtedness connected with Pershing Hall, a memorial in Paris, France; and

S. 706. An act for the relief of William D. McCormick.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 597. An act to protect American agriculture, horticulture, livestock, and the public health by prohibiting the unauthorized importation into, or the depositing in the territorial waters of, the United States of garbage derived from products originating outside of the continental United States, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. WILSON, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. ELLENDER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE PRESIDENT'S FLOOD-CONTROL PROGRAM

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, on July 16, the President sent a message to Congress in which he proposed a vast flood-control program to include the entire Mississippi River Basin. The cost, as proposed, would call for immediate expenditures amounting to $250,000,000, and a total of $6,000,000,000 over a 10-year period. This would be only a beginning. This, as we all know, is in addition to the $45,000,000 which was previously approved by this Chamber for flood control in the Mississippi and Missouri Basins.

No one can rightfully argue that there is a need for protection against the type of devastation which recently occurred

along the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. There is, however, a question as to how this protection should be implemented. A nation already suffering from illusions of financial and material grandeur probably cannot be expected to weigh this matter with the reserve it deserves. For that reason, I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of an editorial which appeared in the Hamilton (Ohio) Journal-News on Friday, June 18:

TRUMAN AND FLOOD CONTROL

President Truman has launched a program to spend $6,000,000,000 for flood-control work in the valleys of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers. The President asks Congress to provide $250,000,000 to get the project started.

The people of the Miami Valley well recall the flood of 1913. The Miami River spread into towns and countryside. Hamilton was completely covered with water, except for the hills on the west side and the county-infirmary hill.

When the floodwater receded, the people of the Miami Valley went to work to clean up the territory and rebuild the damage. They spent millions of dollars repairing and replacing bridges and property of all kinds. They buried hundreds of flood victims.

Then the people of the Miami Valley did another thing. They set out to harness the Miami River against future flood damage. They spent, through the years, more than $30,000,000 to complete the Miami Conservancy District.

Here in the Miami Valley the control of the Miami River was in the hands of citizens and planning was supervised by men of the highest qualifications and integrity. There was no political taint on the Miami Flood Conservancy Board. Every dollar was spent with an eye to economy and there was a dollar's worth of honest return for every dollar of the people's money expended.

The Journal-News refers to this Miami Valley flood of 1913 because President Truman is advocating the spending of $6,000,000,000 to harness the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. The six billions would be only a start. The cost would be many, many millions more and as a governmental project would be most expensive.

By his request, President Truman is asking that all the people of the United States help pay the bill for benefits in the Mississippi and the Missouri Valleys.

All the people of the United States did not help pay the flood-control cost in the Miami Valley. We of this valley dug down deep in our jeans to foot the bill, and this leads to the thought that the harnessing of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers against flood should be paid by the people benefited.

(Mr. BURKE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include an editorial.)

THE SALT LAKE CITY GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the unanimous endorsement by the Salt Lake governors' conference of continuing liberal Federal support for flood control, irrigation, conservation, and power development is to be commended. It gives wholehearted support to those of us who have been fighting in Congress for this just policy.

This sweeping action of the governors' conference should convince Members of the House of Representatives who were instrumental in cutting the Interior Department appropriation bill to the very bone of the absolute necessity of continuing these self-liquidating projects so imperatively necessary to the economy of the West and the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to ask a number of members of my Committee on Public Lands to appear before the platform committees of both national political conventions in 1948 and ask for a plank by each in keeping with the action taken at the governors' conference and the policy of the Public Lands Committee of the House of Representatives as indicated in H. R. 2873 as unanimously reported to the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I listened to the gentleman from California tell us that the governors have endorsed some new program of spending money in reclamation, flood control, irrigation, and so forth.

Mr. WELCH. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan, to save money for the Nation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; save money by spending money. I have heard that tale for 13 years and now I am almost convinced it does not make any difference whether we have any money or not, we can just go on spending. And the more we spend the more we save. The Congress has saved billions upon billions of dollars by the simple process of not spending more—or so runs the story—we "saved" because we did not spend more—or is that just bunk.

But the point I had in mind was this, if we are to spend all this money abroad and the governors also endorse the program of foreign spending, I would like to have them tell us how we are going to get the money to do all the foreign and home spending. I think it is about time some of those governors made up their minds as to whether they are going to spend the money here or abroad; there must be a limit to what is in the "old sock"; and when they do I wish they would tell us where we are going to get it.

MEMORIALS ON DECEASED COLLEAGUES

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this brief opportunity to call to the attention of the Members the fact that they still have time to submit any remarks about our deceased colleagues, pursuant to the authority granted by House Resolution 179 of this session. If this has slipped the minds of anyone, I merely want to refresh the memory.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a statement by an official of the Federal Housing Agency concerning the home-mortgage debt in the United States.

REMOVAL OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF OLD-AGE PENSIONS FROM PARTISAN POLITICS

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on a bill I am introducing today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today in the Congress of the United States a bill which has for its purpose the removal of the administration of old-age pensions from partisan politics.

Under my bill each State receiving Federal old-age-pension funds would be required to place the administration of old-age pensions under the direction of an elective, nonpartisan State administrator of social security. This nonpartisan State administrator of old-age pensions in each State, under my bill, would be elected by the people on a nonpartisan ticket, just as most States now elect their State superintendents of public instruction and the judges of their courts.

The nonpartisan election of judges took our courts out of politics.

The nonpartisan election of county and State school superintendents took schools out of politics.

The nonpartisan election of State administrators of old-age pensions will take old-age pensions out of politics.

It is my firm belief that the welfare of our senior citizens is no less important than that of our school children and courts. If taking the schools and courts out of politics have helped the schools and courts, why not give the same protection to our old-age pensioners?

Such a law will protect our senior citizens from being made the political footballs of designing and selfish politicians who, too often, are more concerned with getting votes for themselves than in getting a square deal for our old-age pensioners.

Let me show by a concrete example how the old folks have and are being made the political footballs of partisan politics.

In the State of Washington the last Republican legislature appropriated more money for old-age pensions than had ever been appropriated for that purpose by any legislature in the history of the State.

Yet, despite the fact that more old-age-pension funds had been appropriated by the Republican legislature than ever be-

fore, the Democratic State administrator of old-age pensions reduced the monthly old-age pension checks, charging that the pensions cuts were made necessary by the failure of the Republican legislature to provide sufficient funds.

I do not believe that these pension cuts were at all necessary. These cuts were made on the eve of an important special congressional election and, I believe, they were made solely for the selfish purpose of endeavoring to influence the results of that election. This heartless action, made solely as a political expedient, has robbed thousands of old-age pensioners in the State of Washington of money to which they were rightfully entitled.

If the administration of old-age pensions in our State had been in the hands of a nonpartisan State administrator of old-age pensions, elected by the people on a nonpartisan ticket, he would have been indebted to the people for his election and not to any political party for his appointment, and no such conscienceless injustice would ever have been perpetrated on the old people of our State.

I want to remove the possibility of any such injustice ever being repeated again in our State or any other State. Therefore I have proposed this law to remove old-age pensions from partisan politics just as our courts and our schools were removed from partisan politics by similar laws requiring that the election of our judges and our school superintendents be nonpartisan.

It is our duty, as Congressmen, to protect our senior citizens from ever being made, anywhere or anytime, the political footballs of selfish partisan politics. We can do this by requiring that the State administrators of social security be elected by the people on a nonpartisan ballot, just as we require that judges and school superintendents be elected by the people on nonpartisan ballots.

This bill will take old-age pensions out of partisan politics and help to assure our senior citizens in all States greater justice.

I have no expectations that this bill can be enacted in the closing days of this session, but I do hope that the committee to which it is assigned will give it thoughtful study during the fall recess and submit it to a vote of the Congress early in the next session. By so doing, this legislation can be enacted in time to go into effect by the time of the next State elections in November 1948.

LANDS BELOW LOW-WATER TIDE LINE

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, little has been said in this House about an issue which directly affects all of our coastal and Great Lakes States, and, indirectly, all States with navigable waters.

Moreover, nothing has been done about the matter.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the recent Supreme Court ruling that the Federal Government is the owner of all lands below the low-water tide line, a ruling originally expected to apply only to California but actually so broad that it casts a shadow on the title to billions of dollars' worth of property, and, in one instance at least, has halted the production of badly needed oil along the Gulf coast.

To state it simply: The Supreme Court, on June 23, legislated. It did not adjudicate. It wrote a new law.

One would think the Congress no longer legislates. Since June 23 the Supreme Court legislates.

I feel that all of my colleagues should give serious thought to this situation. California is not the only State concerned. You from Massachusetts could be deprived of your claim flats. Our friends from North Carolina could wake up one day to find that the Federal Government owns those fishing grounds where so many Members of this House find relaxation.

I call attention to statements made recently at the conference of governors, meeting at Salt Lake City, at which it was predicted the Court's decision would "haunt" every State in the Union, and at which a resolution was passed calling for congressional action to reaffirm State ownership of these disputed under-water lands. There are even grimmer issues at stake.

An immediate threat to our national defense has developed in Louisiana, where one of the Navy's principal oil suppliers—Humble Oil & Refining Co.—has shut down tidelands drilling millions of dollars' worth of operations, pending a clarification of title to the submerged oil lands by Congress.

Fortunately, such authorities as Col. G. H. Vogel, executive director of the Army-Navy Petroleum Board, have swung into action already and are urging the War and Navy Departments to protest any "handcuffing" of private industry at a time when this country is desperately seeking now oil resources.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD an article from the New Orleans Times-Picayune, reporting Humble's decision to abandon its operations in the Gulf, and an editorial from the Los Angeles Times, warning that any interruption in present tidelands oil operations will endanger the national defense.

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune of July 20, 1947]

HUMBLE OIL QUITS DRILLING IN GULF—FIRM REPORTED AWAITING TITLE CLARIFICATION

Humble Oil & Refining Co. was reported Saturday to have indefinitely discontinued preparations under way for oil drilling in the Gulf of Mexico off the shore of Grand Isle until the question of title to the submerged lands is clarified by Congress.

The United States Supreme Court recently held that title to tidewater lands off the coast of California is vested in the Federal Government.

The board of directors of Humble, meeting in Houston, Tex., the past week, officially stopped all construction and preparations for drilling in the Gulf until an act of Congress clarifies and makes certain that titles to submerged lands granted oil companies by the State of Louisiana are vested in the State, according to Louisiana Oil Reporting Service.

NO REASON STATED

C. C. Clifton, district manager for Humble, confirmed that operations had been halted "indefinitely," but declined to state a reason.

Humble had been engaged in constructing two drilling platforms and other preparatory work 3 to 20 miles out in the Gulf, and was building a base of operations for Gulf drilling at Grand Isle, Clifton said. He confirmed the report that contractors have withdrawn their crews from these projects.

Meanwhile the State mineral board is preparing to accept bids on approximately 787,854 acres of offshore lands Tuesday.

Bids have been solicited on approximately 367,854 acres in the Chandeleur Sound area. Maj. B. A. Hardey, chairman of the board, announced after the California Supreme Court decision that there would be no change in the plans to offer this acreage.

MANY ACRES LEASED

Louisiana has consummated mineral leases on hundreds of thousands of acres of offshore lands with oil companies, with the amount involved in the leases totaling millions of dollars.

Humble purchased a piece of land at Grand Isle and had pumped in sand and laid foundations for a warehouse that was understood to be a base of operations for Gulf drilling, according to N. I. Ludwig, Grand Isle hotel operator. Work on the warehouse ceased several days ago.

No change in policy had been announced by other major oil companies active in the Gulf. Earlier in the week, Magnolia Petroleum Co., largest active operator in the Gulf to date, was reported to be driving piling for two immediate wildcat operations off the Terrebonne Parish shore.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times of July 18, 1947]

GOVERNORS SUPPORT STATE TIDELAND RIGHTS

The conference of governors concluded a 4-day session at Salt Lake City with the adoption of a resolution which will go far toward strengthening the hand of California in our fight to win back the oil-rich tidelands recently wrenched from the State by a decision of the United States Supreme Court.

The resolution asks the Congress to enact legislation "acknowledging and affirming ownership of submerged lands and resources in the respective States" and makes reference to the fact that this ownership had been conceded to the States over a long period.

In presenting the resolution, Gov. Beauford Jester, of Texas, said the Supreme Court decision will haunt every State unless new law is written by the Congress. While California is the chief sufferer, losing the valuable royalties from offshore oil drilling, the rights of each of the 48 States are involved.

At present negotiations are going forward with the Department of Justice in regard to the vacuum created temporarily in respect to the royalties from California's offshore oil fields.

California has gained considerable support from the entry of the Army-Navy Petroleum Board into the controversy. The armed services are deeply concerned with the continuation of the development of natural resources and have made it clear that they oppose a policy on the part of the Department of Justice which might suspend or impede the recovery of oil from the marginal lands.

The board is reported to have warned both service department Secretaries that it will endanger the national defense to permit tidelands production to lapse. This might

well occur if the Department of Justice insisted upon cessation of activities in the tidelands, a reexamination of the whole problem and a fresh start on development.

Mr. Speaker, California State officials and representatives of the companies producing in our now ownerless offshore oil fields are struggling along in conferences with the Departments of Justice and Interior, hoping they can work out some kind of interim agreement whereby they will not lose millions of dollars' worth of investments in tidelands drilling and disrupt the urgent need of the armed services.

I hope, when all of us go home for our so-called vacation, that you will give a little time and attention to a situation that affects not only California but every State which wants to uphold its rights.

Please do not forget that the recent Supreme Court decision literally junked more than 50 opinions by the same high tribunal which, since 1842, has held that the coastal States have unquestioned title to their under-water lands—at least to the 3-mile limit. And please remember that the new decision denies even the rights reserved by the Thirteen Original Colonies.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FLETCHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include articles from the New York Times, New Orleans Times-Picayune, and Los Angeles Times.

SECRETARY OF WAR PATTERSON

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Patterson has resigned from his post as Secretary of War after serving in probably the most trying years that any Secretary of War has ever served. Personally, I found him extremely cooperative and helpful. Mr. Patterson served as either Assistant Secretary or Secretary of War for 7 years. Under his leadership this country won a great victory and we are most grateful to him. We should be very grateful for his intense interest in the disabled soldiers. Sometimes Secretaries of War and others forget the disabled, their interest chiefly being in the able-bodied; but Mr. Patterson visited the wounded at the battlefront and in the hospitals in the United States. I believe the Secretary of War more than any one Government official deserves credit for insisting that the disabled of our country receive better prosthetic appliances, better artificial eyes, better arms, better legs, better wheel chairs, and better means of transportation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

RECESS, DO NOT ADJOURN

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, the Marshall plan is so far an embryo. No one knows now what the survey which European nations are conducting on their reconstruction needs will show, or what proportion of the total cost the United States will be asked to finance.

The Marshall plan may hatch out into a beautiful swan, which Congress will be happy to support generously; or it may hatch out into an ugly duckling. It is too early to tell.

For that reason, it seems to me it would be most unwise for this Congress to adjourn sine die. I believe we should recess, leaving the door open to return to work on our own call if the Marshall plan develops in the interval to a place where we are likely to be committed irrevocably to a major segment of new foreign policy.

The chances are that most of us will be for the plan. But we, as elected representatives of the public of this country, should make the decision as to how the plan is implemented. If we adjourn sine die, only the President can call us back before January 3. If we adjourn sine die we are in effect saying to our constituents, "we have delegated our legislative authority to the executive branch for 5 months."

The Marshall plan, even as an embryo, has never been presented officially to Congress. It has been presented unofficially to the Harvard graduating class, to clubs, to the press and radio. But try to pin any member of the State Department down as to what it contains, and he will have to admit it does only these two preliminary things: First, it asks the war-stricken nations to assess their needs; and second, it asks them to suggest a world program for financing those needs, in which the United States would participate.

We were elected to represent our constituents 12 months a year, not 7 months a year. Let us leave the door open to come back and go to work if we ourselves believe there is a job to be done here this fall.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in each instance to include certain quotations and newspaper articles.

LAUNDRIES AND PUBLIC WASHING MACHINES

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include two letters, one to the health commissioner of New York City and the other to the Surgeon General of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, during the past few years a health problem of growing enormity has come into being. Its seriousness seems to have been disregarded for the major part by the health officers of the Nation, the States, and the cities.

Today millions of people in our cities and towns are using communal laundries in one form or another. Thousands of apartment houses throughout the Nation have installed coin-box washing machines. Then there has sprung up the so-called launderette, which is usually a store in which from ten to a dozen of these coin-box washing machines are open to the public.

Having at one time sold washing machines and having also studied bacteriology under the late Paul Luttinger, I was naturally curious as to the effect these services might have on public health. I have studied this problem for over a year and have observed hundreds of washings being done in both apartment houses and in these launderettes. In 95 percent of the operations the procedure is the same. Mrs. Jones comes in, deposits her coin, inserts her wash, and waits until it is finished. Immediately after Mrs. Jones is finished, Mrs. Smith repeats the process in the same machine, and this is continued by family after family throughout the day.

Through tests that I have made myself and through the agency of a reputable laundry in New York I have found that the average heat of the water in these machines is somewhere from 145° to 160° Fahrenheit. Any physician, bacteriologist, or public-health official would inform this Congress that such a degree of heat would not kill bacteria. In fact, in the case of certain species of bacteria it might cause an acceleration of their growth. In but 5 percent of the operations that I observed was a chemical agent of some kind used between washings. Even where these chemicals were used, supposedly to create a condition of asepsis, the user had no knowledge of the efficacy of the chemical involved. Some I noticed had metallic or mercury bases. Others were of phenol origin, either of which may be unsatisfactory and even dangerous. There is no way that a user of one of these machines can determine either the bacteria count of the prior washing, the type of bacteria, or the amount of germs that remain in the machine. It is possible that the germs remaining in the machine may be those of the common cold, gonorrhea, syphilis, pneumonia, dysentery, smallpox, diphtheria, or many other dreaded and violent diseases.

In a series of tests that I had taken by a New York laboratory of a typical communal washing machine I received the following report. A test made of a piece of laundry that had been washed in a machine showed a bacteria count of 610 per cubic centimeter. The type of the organism was a staphylococcus. Its pathogenicity was variable. Another test taken on the machine that did the washing showed a bacteria count on the top of the machine of 49,200 per cubic centimeter. This was also the staphylococcus type and again the pathogenicity was variable. A test taken on the trap of the same machine showed a bacteria count of over 500,000 per cubic centimeter. The type of organism here was gram negative bacilli and the laboratory was unable to determine its pathogenicity. In any of these cases the germs could well have been of a violent disease-

producing type as they have been in other tests that I had conducted.

To date very little effort has been made anywhere in this country to study this problem and to provide the proper regulations. Yet, here is the potential source of what could be the greatest and most deadly epidemic that this or any other country has seen. Every family that uses these glorified septic tanks is constantly being exposed to every type of known illness.

Why the public health authorities of this country have not taken cognizance of this menace is beyond my comprehension. Many of the epidemics of dysentery that have occurred in apartment-house sections and in baby hospitals could be traced directly to this legalized careless use of the machines. Our public health authorities should make immediate investigations and should find ways to curb this menace. The machines can be made sterile by compulsory exposure to live steam for known designated periods of time, or on the other hand, the various health authorities could determine through tests what germicidals are actually effective and insist upon their use after they have been duly approved. In the event of a violation of a local law requiring strict sterilization, the penalty should be of a most severe nature.

Today I am writing to Dr. Thomas Parran, the Surgeon General in charge of the Public Health Service here in Washington, D. C. A copy of my letter will be incorporated in this RECORD as well as the letter that I have addressed to the health commissioner in my own city, Dr. Israel Weinstein.

I ask all of you men of the Congress that when you return to your communities next week that you awaken your health authorities to the danger that exists. Inform them that the bacteria are not only present in the machines, but are also found in countless thousands on every cubic centimeter of the laundry itself. If you do this you will be doing a great service to your community and to yourself.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 23, 1947.

Dr. THOMAS PARRAN,
The Surgeon General,
United States Public
Health Service,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL PARRAN: After considerable study, research, and laboratory tests, I have definitely come to the conclusion that the communal laundries operated either in apartment houses or in so-called launderettes are a menace to the health of our Nation.

While I know that the Public Health Service does not have the power to correct or improve local situations of this type, I do believe that the great force of your office might be used in an advisory or warning capacity.

It is not necessary for me to recite to you that family after family successively use these machines without any intervening medium that would bring about a sterile or aseptic condition. This, despite the fact that some of the garments may have been used by the victims of diphtheria, tuberculosis, syphilis, gonorrhea, cancer, smallpox, dysentery, and many other virulent diseases.

Would it be possible for the Health Service to do some research work in order to ascertain whether there is some chemical compound, the use of which might be made compulsory by local law which would be completely effective? Would it be possible for your Service to recommend to the Nation a course of procedure that would assure the complete obliteration of pathogenic germs in these machines?

I honestly believe that unless some positive action is taken in the near future that this country may find itself suffering from some terrible epidemic.

I sincerely hope that you will give thought to this question and will see to it that proper recommendations are made.

Very sincerely,

DONALD L. O'TOOLE,
Member of Congress.

UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 23, 1947.

Dr. ISRAEL WEINSTEIN,
Commissioner of Health,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR COMMISSIONER: After considerable study, research, and laboratory tests, I have definitely come to the conclusion that the communal laundries operated either in apartment houses or in so-called launderettes are a menace to the health of our community.

As you well know, the water in these machines is not maintained at a sufficiently high temperature to wipe out bacteria whether of a pathogenic or nonpathogenic nature. There is no requirement under existing law that between washings the machines must be sterilized. From my own observation, as quickly as one wash is withdrawn another is inserted.

I have had tests taken by reputable laboratories of the laundry and the machine itself in some of these communal projects. The bacteriological count is amazing. These figures are available to you if you desire them, yet I know that you have ample resources to study the situation more fully than have I.

The circumstance that the people who use the machines are unaware of the dangers that exist is a tragedy. There is no way that they can ascertain whether prior washings have been exposed to the persons of diseased and sickly people. It seems to me that legislation should be passed immediately calling for essential safeguards so that no epidemic might occur. If chemicals are to be used they should be tested and approved by your department. Violations of the proposed legislation should be treated with unusual severity.

I shall appreciate your own efforts to assist in the eradication of this dangerous situation.

Very sincerely,

DONALD L. O'TOOLE,
Member of Congress.

NOMINATION TO JUDGESHIP OF HON. LEO F. RAYFIEL

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I might call the attention of the House this morning to the fact that one of our Members of the New York State delegation, and representing the Fourteenth District, the Honorable LEO F. RAYFIEL, has been appointed by President Truman, and last night was confirmed by the Senate as a judge of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York. Mr. RAYFIEL has served in this House for two terms with distinction, and is presently a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. He is a member of the New York Bar and has been for over 20 years. He comes from a very distinguished legal family. His father, Judge Rayfiel, served on the Court of Special Sessions in New York for more than 20 years. Mr. RAYFIEL has one of those kindly dispositions that will, I am sure, appeal to all litigants who will come before him. He will treat the members of the bar with extreme courtesy, I know, and the President is conferring upon the bar and the people of that judicial district a distinct honor in nominating Mr. RAYFIEL, whose reputation as a distinguished and outstanding lawyer is best evidenced by the unanimous approval of his nomination by the Senate Judicial Committee and his unanimous confirmation by the United States Senate.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'TOOLE. I would like to inform the House that we, of the Brooklyn delegation, have learned to love LEO RAYFIEL. We have great affection for him, and while we are very, very happy to see him go on the bench, we see him go with a great feeling of reluctance. We sincerely hope that from time to time he will come to Washington to see us so that our pleasant associations can continue.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FORAND. I would like to join with the gentleman from New York in paying tribute to our colleague Representative RAYFIEL, and I want to say that the loss that we will suffer here will be the gain of the bench in New York. I commend President Truman for having selected our colleague for that distinguished post.

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentleman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include sundry articles.

Mr. LEA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on three subjects.

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the price of gold.

Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one excerpts from a radio address and a letter, and in the other on the CAA.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in today's Washington Post entitled "Brain Truster" which has reference to Hon. Benjamin V.

Cohen, who has just resigned as counsel for the State Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an editorial and a resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Chicago on housing, and in the other an article on the high cost of living, appearing in the Chicago Sun.

Mr. FLANNAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that later on, notwithstanding the adjournment of the Congress, I may extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of the reciprocal-trade-agreements program and the International Trade Organization.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested to hear the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] a moment ago express his profound interest in the power question, but it brought back the sad memories of his vote against rural electrification on July 18, when the farmers were denied the additional $25,000,000 the Bureau of the Budget had recommended to build rural power lines.

Less than 3 hours later the same House that voted to turn that appropriation down on a roll call voted, without a roll call, to send to Europe $1,265,000,000 to rehabilitate countries that have 90 percent of their farms electrified, while we have less than 60 percent of our farms electrified.

That roll call may show why so many members want to get out of the country and take a trip abroad. They may not want to go home and face the farmers, and the farmers' wives, after that vote on rural electrification.

The head of the REA asked for $300,000,000, and the Bureau of the Budget recommended $250,000,000, but the House reduced the amount to $225,000,000, or $75,000,000 below what the Rural Electrification Administrator said was needed, and $25,000,000 below what the Bureau of the Budget recommended.

These funds will be exhausted in a few months, and untold thousands of farmers throughout the country will be denied the benefits of rural electrification.

It is nonsense to talk about depending on private power companies to electrify the farm homes of the Nation. If we had waited for them to do it, there would not be one farm out of ten with even electric lights in their homes today.

This money will all come back with interest, while the money we send abroad will never come back. Besides, the electrification of these farm homes will add billions to the wealth of this Nation.

There are more than 2,700,000, or more than 40 percent of the farm homes of the Nation, that are receiving no electricity at all.

So far as I am concerned, I would rather provide a half billion dollars, or a billion dollars if necessary, to complete the electrification of the rural areas of this country than to be pouring billions into foreign countries and leaving our own struggling farmers in the dark.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to reply to the gentleman from Mississippi. He is all right in many things, and I admire him for his courage and Americanism, but when he states that the Republicans, who are trying to hold down Government expenses, should give everything over to rural electrification, I certainly do not agree with him. We want everybody to have rural electrification that can have it wisely and judiciously, but we want to do it at the proper time in a business-like manner considering our ability and the business necessity and scarcity of materials and labor. We do not want to get this country in a bad condition, financially it is already there, we must save it. You know our Treasury is in a bad enough condition now. There is a time to economize and that time is here. You know I do not vote for all those foreign expenditures the gentleman from Mississippi talks about. I voted against them and I am glad I did. I want the gentleman to stop dragging in all the time all these power plants to be built all over the country by the Rural Electrification outfit. If they will do that they will have money enough to give every farmer all the electric-power lines he needs and the power will be furnished by the electric companies, and they will furnish power cheaper and cheaper all the time, because the electric companies in this country are reducing their rates all the time; electricity is getting cheaper and cheaper. They have reduced rates and they are going to reduce rates. You just ought to get that in your head and remember it.

Mr. RANKIN. All right, go home and tell the farmers.

Mr. RICH. Oh, we will tell the farmers they will get electricity and we will see that they get it in a good business manner and in due time. We will do all we can for all the American people. We will furnish it if we can stop the REA from building power plants where not necessary, using the money for distributing lines where necessary, and where they do not parallel public-utility lines.

The gentleman from Mississippi is not the only one who wants to help the farmer; the full Republican Party has the desire to help the farmer.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the gold problem.

NEGOTIABLE ASSETS IN THE UNITED STATES OWNED BY FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in recent days we have heard much about our obligations to foreign governments and the question of the responsibility of this Government to become a world-wide Santa Claus. In the Washington Herald, in a recent editorial, the statement was made that foreign countries have more than $18,000,000,000 of negotiable assets in this country. I trust that before this Government continues to give money to other nations and to send our food to other countries that the countries in question be required to use a portion of that $18,000,000,000 to make at least an initial or down payment on some of the commodities this country is producing. The $18,000,000,000 could very well be applied on loans due the people of the United States. An investigation should be made to determine what nations and ascertain the names of individuals to whom these assets belong. Herein may be a source from which America could be repaid for credit already extended.

Mr. Speaker, in view of our commitments abroad, it would seem that the farmers of America should receive a fair price for their commodities which are placed on the market. I notice that the farmers of America are being blamed for the high prices of food commodities. This is an unfair charge against our farmers. The farmer has never failed us in war or peace. Armies march on food; cities thrive on food. There is no class of people who deserve more consideration than the tillers of the soil. Since the farm population of America constitutes a large and important phase of our economy and national prosperity, I am hopeful that on the world market, and in the domestic market of this country, the farmers can receive a better price for the commodities which they produce. I am including an editorial from the Johnson City Press-Chronicle which points out the critical condition in which the farmers of this country find themselves at

this time. I am hopeful that in the national interest, a solution may be found for their problems.

The editorial follows:

GREEN BEANS

Johnson Countians should be told that they are not alone in their disappointment over a falling green bean market. Elsewhere throughout the country vast acreage is being plowed under for lack of a market and in the deep South millions of grapefruit are also being left to rot on trees.

Meanwhile the American consumer reading of a surplus and of plowing under is irritated and amazed because he is being forced to pay sky-high prices for food—and millions abroad go hungry, he hears.

Congress has been informed that unless markets can be found for these foods promptly, a disastrous depression may be in prospect.

War Department sources have been quoted as saying that the tremendous quantities of wheat now being shipped overseas represent only the surplus of the American growers. A farm delegation has urged an agricultural subcommittee to move food surpluses both in canned goods and crops for distribution abroad in the aid-to-Europe program.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, backing this proposal, pictured the country as "tottering on the brink of a deflation." Representative LARCADE, of Louisiana, sees the problem so serious that "unless something is done about these products, we may be approaching the beginning of one of the worst depressions we have ever had."

Witnesses all told the same story—of vast crops of peas, green beans, spinach, tomatoes, and citrus fruits imperiled, or already lost, for lack of a market.

Canners who normally purchase this output were described as overstocked with millions of cases of surplus peas, beans, corn, sweetpotatoes, and citrus juices, and, therefore, not contracting for these crops.

One witness told that in Louisiana 1,000 acres of green beans were plowed under for lack of a market at any price.

Another testified that in Florida the equivalent of 3,000,000 boxes of grapefruit were left on the trees with no one to buy them.

Farmers and processors said that if their surplus products cannot be shipped overseas, it will be necessary to cut back production sharply to the prewar basis, and they want to know as soon as possible what the answer is so they may make their plans.

As this is written, green beans are reportedly selling on the Mountain City market at from 60 cents to $1.50 a bushel. A few days ago the Johnson County bean market collapsed.

In Johnson City the retail price of green beans remained comparatively high.

Local consumers can compute the amount they are paying on a bushel ratio if they consider that approximately 30 pounds of green beans make a bushel. (Beans retailing at 25 cents a pound would thus come to $7.50 a bushel.)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], and it is my belief that no Member of Congress has done as much for REA as has that gentleman. It does seem to me, however, that he is slightly unfair in his comments relative to the action of the subcommittee in its appropriation for REA. There was no evidence given to our subcommittee which would dispute, in my opinion, the fact that the money allocated for loans through REA will not be sufficient to meet all demands without waste and with the proper consideration for the taxpayers of America.

Let us remember that in addition to the $225,000,000 in new money authorized in this bill, there is also the huge amount of $325,000,000 which has not been allocated or expended for construction. In other words, we have $550,000,000 now on hand with which to push this great work. When we consider the scarcity of materials and the high cost of labor, I am fully convinced that this more than one-half billion dollars will be all that can be utilized to the best possible advantage.

Certainly if I, a farmer whose farm home is served by REA, did not feel that there was sufficient money in this bill for that great project, I would join with the gentleman from Mississippi in asking for additional funds. The $550,000,000 now available for construction will push this work as fast as present conditions will permit. We all want to see electricity brought to every farm home in America as soon as possible.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PRESTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. McCOWEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

MYRTLE RUTH OSBORNE AND OTHERS—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 413)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval H. R. 2306, an act for the relief of Myrtle Ruth Osborne, Marion Walts, and Jessie A. Walts.

The purpose of this bill is to pay to Myrtle Ruth Osborne the sum of $7,000 for the death of her husband, Levi Osborne, and for personal injuries sustained by herself; to pay to Marion Walts and Jessie A. Walts the sum of $2,000 for the death of their infant daughter, Beverly Gale Walts; and to pay to Marion Walts and Jessie A. Walts each the sum of $1,000 for personal injuries sustained by them; all as the result of an accident involving an Army vehicle.

It appears that on November 6, 1943, at about 7 p. m., an official convoy of 12 Army vehicles was proceeding in an easterly direction on United States Highway No. 60 between Brandenburg and Fort Knox, Ky., spaced at intervals of about 75 yards, with headlights lighted. The seventh unit in the convoy, a personnel carrier (half-track), was traveling downhill at a speed of between 18 and 20 miles an hour approaching a curve to the left at the foot of the hill. An automobile owned and operated by Marion D. Walts, in which Jessie A. Walts, Beverly Gale Walts, Myrtle Ruth Osborne, and Levi Osborne were riding as passengers, was proceeding in the opposite direction, with headlights lighted, approaching the same curve, at a speed stated by Mr. Walts as about 20 miles an hour and estimated by military personnel as between 40 and 50 miles an hour. At a point about halfway around the curve the two vehicles collided head-on. The civilian vehicle was damaged beyond repair, Beverly Gale Walts and Levi Osborne were killed, and the other occupants of the car sustained serious personal injuries.

While Mr. and Mrs. Walts and Mrs. Osborne stated that they saw no lights on the Army vehicles, the driver and two of the passengers in the Army vehicle involved in this accident stated that the headlights of that vehicle were lighted, and the officer in charge of the convoy stated that the convoy was traveling with headlights turned on.

The statements made by the driver of the Army vehicle involved in the accident and three soldiers who were riding therein and those made by Mr. and Mrs. Walts and Mrs. Osborne are sharply conflicting as to the relative positions of the two vehicles on the road at the time of the collision. The four soldiers stated that the Army vehicle at the moment of impact was on its proper side of the road and the civilian automobile to its left of the center line. Mr. and Mrs. Walts and Mrs. Osborne contended that their car was traveling in its proper lane and that the Army vehicle was on the wrong side of the road. Four photographs, however, were taken of the two vehicles immediately after the accident occurred and before the vehicles had been moved. These photographs clearly show the Army vehicle standing to its right of the center line of the road and the civilian vehicle in head-on contact with the Army car and entirely on its wrong side of the road. Regardless, therefore, of the statements made by the interested parties, the pictorial evidence would appear to show conclusively that at the moment of impact the civilian automobile was traveling on the wrong side of the road and that the negligence of the civilian driver in so operating such vehicle was the sole proximate cause of the accident and the resulting deaths and injuries.

In the light of this seemingly incontrovertible evidence as to the manner in which the accident took place, there is no justifiable basis for an appropriation for the relief of these claimants. Therefore, while deeply regretting this tragic occurrence, I feel obliged to withhold my approval from the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 23, 1947.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal and the message and bill referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered printed.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the business of the day and any other special orders, I may address the House today for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3839) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3839) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 4, 8, 24, 29, 30, 36, and 38.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 13, 14, 26, 32, 33, and 37, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT REPORTS

"Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of Government Reports, including personal services in the District of Columbia; newspapers and periodicals (not exceeding $500); teletype news service (not exceeding $900); printing and binding; not to exceed $1,000 for deposit in general fund of the Treasury for cost of penalty mail as required by the Act of June 28, 1944; not to exceed $500 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600); health service program as authorized by the Act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 658); and the payment of claims pursuant to part 2 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (Public Law 601); $230,000: *Provided*, That no person paid from this appropriation shall receive a salary in excess of $7,500 per annum: *Provided further*, That amounts expended under the authority of Public Law 161, Eightieth Congress, shall be deducted from the appropriation herein made for the fiscal year 1948."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "of which amount there shall be available to the Commission for cancer research work such sums (not exceeding $5,000,000) as the Commission believes can be efficiently used without duplicating the cancer research work of other public and private agencies"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$122,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,612,500"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,900,120"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 5 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the figure "$3,850,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$3,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$9,000,000"; and the Senate agreed to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the salary of any employee of grade 5 or above in the professional service or of grade 11 or above in the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service who was originally appointed in the National Archives to a war-service appointment, except a presently employed veteran of either World War or a member of the active or inactive reserve of the armed forces"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate number 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ", and not exceeding $15,000,000 for reconditioning"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$208,206,774"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$208,206,774"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,320,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$898,040,780"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,964,457,080"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 2, 7, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 25, 28, and 31.

R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
CHAS. R. ROBERTSON,
F. R. COUDERT, Jr.,
JOE HENDRICKS,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
ALBERT THOMAS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CLYDE M. REED,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
GUY CORDON,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3839) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

No. 1: Reported in disagreement.

No. 2: Reported in disagreement.

No. 3: Appropriates $350,000 for the Council of Economic Advisers, as proposed by the House, instead of $400,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 4: Appropriates $257,149,270 for salaries and expenses, War Assets Administration, as proposed by the House, instead of $282,149,270, as proposed by the Senate, with

the understanding that 60 percent of the funds provided shall be available for expenditure during the first 6 months of the fiscal year and with the further understanding that this agency is to proceed with the greatest possible expedition in bringing its work to a close and that at the beginning of the calendar year 1948 it shall make a comprehensive report to the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate setting forth what progress has been made in carrying out this injunction, together with data as to property disposals. Approval of the use of 60 percent of the appropriation during the first 6 months of the fiscal yea. should not be regarded as an invitation to request a deficiency appropriation for the fiscal year 1948, it being the opinion of the conferees that the amount provided is sufficient for the entire fiscal year.

No. 5: Appropriates $230,000 for the Office of Government Reports salaries and expenses, instead of $400,000, as proposed by the Senate the funds provided being restricted to use for work in connection with advertising media liaison, motion-picture liaison, the library, terminal leave, and to provide funds for the month of July. The conferees are of the opinion that full consideration should be given by appropriate authority to the liquidation of this agency at the end of the fiscal year 1948.

Nos. 6 and 7: Appropriates $312,000 for the American Battle Monuments Commission, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $300,000, as proposed by the House; and reports amendment No. 7 in disagreement.

Nos. 8 and 9: Appropriates $175,000,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $250,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the Atomic Energy Commission; and inserts the language of the Senate with reference to cancer research work amended to strike the words "in nuclear physics" from the Senate amendment. The conference committee has every desire to provide for the Atomic Energy Commission all funds necessary to carry its mission to complete fulfillment. At the time of the House hearings plans of the Commission were not complete and the amount requested rested more or less upon conjecture. The House allowed $175,000,000 for cash expenditure instead of the $250,000,000 requested and the House committee, in its report stated that, when the Congress reconvenes in January 1948, additional funds would be allowed, if necessary. The House deemed the sum of $175,000,000 ample for cash requirements for the first half of the fiscal year 1948. The conferees have accepted this view in its action. Whatever may be shown to be necessary for the remainder of the fiscal year 1948 will be allowed.

Nos. 10, 11, and 12: Appropriates $6,200,000 for salaries and expenses, Federal Communications Commission, instead of $6,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $6,400,000, as proposed by the Senate; authorizes the use of $122,500 for travel expenses, instead of $120,000, as proposed by the House, and $125,000, as proposed by the Senate; and makes $3,612,500 available for personal services in the District of Columbia, instead of $3,500,000, as proposed by the House, and $3,725,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 13, 14, and 15: Appropriates $3,590,000 for salaries and expenses, Federal Power Commission, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,390,000, as proposed by the House; authorizes the use of $2,082,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,000,000, as proposed by the House; and reports amendment No. 15 in disagreement.

No. 16: Appropriates $2,900,120 for salaries and expenses, Federal Trade Commission, instead of $2,800,120, as proposed by the House, and $3,000,120, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21: Reported in disagreement.

No. 22: Increases the limitation on funds available for administrative expenses in connection with the item "Veterans' educational facilities" from $3,100,000 to $3,750,000, instead of from $3,100,000 to $3,850,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 23: Appropriates $9,000,000 for general expenses, Interstate Commerce Commission, instead of $8,868,100, as proposed by the House, and $9,268,100, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 24 and 25: Provides $492,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, as proposed by the House, instead of $622,000; as proposed by the Senate; and reports amendment No. 25 in disagreement.

Nos. 26, and 27: Appropriates $1,241,335 for salaries and expenses, National Archives, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,236,335, as proposed by the House; and restores the provision of the House prohibiting the use of funds for the salary of war service appointees above certain grades amended by striking out the letters "AUS" at the end of the provision and inserting the words "of the armed forces".

No. 28: Reported in disagreement.

No. 29: Provides $1,900,000 for necessary expenses of the Philippine War Damage Commission, as proposed by the House, instead of $2,500,000, as proposed by the Senate. The amount recommended by the conferees is provided with the realization that there is some question as to the adequacy of the authorization and with the suggestion that the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate give consideration to the matter with a view to authorizing, if necessary, the appropriation of an additional sum sufficient to perform the work required to be done.

No. 30: Appropriates $5,688,700 for the Securities and Exchange Commission, salaries and expenses, as proposed by the House, instead of $5,988,700, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 31, 32, and 33: Appropriates $1,800,312 for salaries and expenses, Smithsonian Institution, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,700,312, as proposed by the House, provides not exceeding $150,000 for printing and binding, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $125,000, as proposed by the House; and reports amendment No. 31 in disagreement.

Nos. 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, and 40, relating to the United States Maritime Commission: Approves obligational authority not exceeding $8,000,000 for personal services, instead of $7,393,226, as proposed by the House, and $8,832,226, as proposed by the Senate; provides obligational authority not exceeding $15,000,000 for reconditioning and betterment, instead of providing for "conversion, reconversion and reconditioning," as proposed by the Senate, under the item for new ship construction; restores the provision in the House bill providing $100,000 for reconversion of vessels, instead of the provision of the Senate authorizing obligations totaling $4,500,000 for such purposes, and in connection with the reconversion item the conferees were of the opinion that the matter of making allowances for conversion, as distinguished from reconversion, was a question for consideration by the legislative committees with a view to clarification, and, therefore, this subject was left for their consideration; provides obligational authority of $561,000 for maintenance and operation of terminals, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the proposal of the Senate requiring the commission to enter a contract for the sale of vessels before construction is undertaken under certain circumstances; and corrects the total authorized for expenditure during the fiscal year 1948.

Amendment No. 41, relating to maritime training: Appropriates $7,320,000 instead of $4,320,000, as proposed by the Senate, and $8,320,000, as proposed by the House. Although the amount as approved is $1,000,000 below the recommendation of the House, the conferees are agreed that the full program, contemplated under the amount of $8,320,000 contained in the House bill, is to proceed uninterrupted, and that training at schools located at Sheepshead Bay, Kings Point, St. Petersburg, Pass Christian, and Alameda, be given the same number of students provided for under the House version of the bill. In order that the intent of the conferees in this regard may be carried out, it is further agreed that the United States Maritime Commission may obligate and expend 60 percent, or $4,392,000, during the first 6 months of the fiscal year 1948. The conferees are also agreed, and will request, that the respective appropriations committees of the House and Senate, each appoint subcommittees for the purpose of visiting the above-named institutions and to plan the type and extent of training programs to be carried on in the future

Nos. 42 and 43: Appropriates $898,040,780 for administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services, Veterans' Administration, instead of $878,040,780, as proposed by the House, and $919,088,000, as proposed by the Senate, with the understanding that the increase in the House bill figure shall be used for medical assistance of direct aid to veterans; and corrects the total of items for the Veterans' Administration.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

No. 1, relating to the emergency fund for the President. Permits the use of not to exceed $70,000 for the President's Amnesty Board. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 2, relating to the per diem rate for experts and consultants. The Senate amendment reduces the rate from $50 to $35 per diem. The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment retaining the $35 limitation but permitting payment of up to $50 upon the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

No. 7, relating to the American Battle Monuments Commission. Provides for the payment of authorized allowances to officers of the armed forces assigned to the Commission and serving at foreign stations. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

Nos. 15 and 17, relating to the per diem rate for experts and consultants. The Senate amendments reduce the rate to $35 per diem. The House managers will move to recede and concur with amendments retaining the $35 limitation but permitting payment of up to $50 upon the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

No. 18, relating to the Public Buildings Administration. Provides $900,000 for defraying the cost of personal services, travel, and other expenses incident to the return of certain departmental functions to the seat of government. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

Nos. 19 and 20, relating to the per diem rate for experts and consultants. The Senate amendments reduce the rate to $35 per diem. The House managers will move to recede and concur with amendments retaining the $35 limitation but permitting payment of up to $50 upon the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

No. 21, relating to Federal-aid secondary or feeder roads. Provides for the use of funds heretofore apportioned to States and unobligated to pay the State's pro rata for any projects on the Federal-aid and Federal-aid secondary roads in accordance with existing legislation. The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment limiting such use of funds to $11,000,000.

No. 25, relating to the per diem rate for experts and consultants. The Senate amendment reduces the rate to $35 per diem. The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment retaining the $35 limitation but permitting payment of up to $50 upon the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

No. 28, relating to District of Columbia redevelopment, National Capital Park and Planning Commission. Provides for expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of sections 3k, 6, and 16 of the act of August 2, 1946, and makes funds available until expended. The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment reducing the amount from $95,000 to $75,000.

No. 31, relating to the Smithsonian Institution. Provides for the administration, and for the construction and maintenance, of laboratory and other facilities on Barro Colorado Island, C. Z., under provisions of the act of July 2, 1940, as amended. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
CHAS. R. ROBERTSON,
F. R. COUDERT, JR.,
JOE HENDRICKS,
GEORGE W. ANDREWS,
ALBERT THOMAS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous conference report. It is signed by all conferees on both sides of the aisle.

There are a number of items which technically are brought back in disagreement, but, as a matter of fact, there has been complete agreement as to each and every amendment included in this bill.

Briefly speaking, the Senate added about $140,000,000 to the bill as it passed the House. The conferees reduced that increase of $140,000,000 by $119,000,000.

The result is that while the bill is $21,000,000 above the House figure, it is $119,000,000 below the Senate figure. It is $310,000,000 below the budget estimates, speaking strictly of appropriation items. It represents in reduced appropriations, reduced expenditures, recission and additional revenues a general over-all improvement from the standpoint of the United States Treasury as compared with the budget estimates of the President of almost $1,390,000,000.

I wish again to express my appreciation to my colleagues on the subcommittee, both Republican and Democratic, to the investigators and to the committee staff who have contributed to the preparation of this bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if there was any addition made to the appropriation for the Veterans' Administration with reference to hospitals and hospital personnel? At the time of the passage of the appropriation bill the committee stated that if more personnel were needed for the medical service, if a larger appropriation were needed, the committee would go along with the Senate. Was anything done in that respect?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. No representation was made at the Senate committee hearings by General Hawley or anybody else in that connection. However, on the strength of a letter which was subsequently sent to one Member of the Senate and because of a desire to be liberal in this connection, there has been added to the bill the sum of $20,000,000 for the purposes which the gentlewoman has in mind.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. The gentleman will remember that when this matter was before the House I offered an amendment to increase the sum for hospitalization $100,000,000 because General Hawley told the Veterans' Affairs Committee he needed it. I understand the committee has not done anything in the world about that.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The committee has added $20,000,000.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. To go for hospitalization?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes, for General Hawley's work.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Then the committee has done about one-fifth of what it should have done.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. As I have indicated, General Hawley made no representation before the House Appropriations Committee or before the Senate Appropriations Committee that he needed a single dollar in addition.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Is this for hospital construction?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. No. It is for General Hawley's work in the medical field.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does it not seem to the gentleman it would be important to have the subcommittee that handles these appropriations and at least some members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs that does the legislating meet together? Of course, the legislating is done sometimes by the Appropriations Committee. Certainly the Committee on Veterans' Affairs ought to know what transpires, it seems to me, in the Appropriations Committee and vice versa. We should have joint meetings which I think would be of great advantage to the Appropriations Committee, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the Veterans' Administration, and most of all the veterans. Does the gentleman agree?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That raises a broad question. There should, of course, be close cooperation. However, there is a fundamental reason for a division of labor.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION. Is there any rule or practice in the gentleman's committee that permits any Member to appear before his committee to make suggestions?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Any Member of the House is welcome at any time to appear before the committee with any suggestions that he may desire to make.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the committee on this report.

I am pleased to note that when the Public Buildings Administration presented to the Independent Offices Subcommittee on Appropriations of the Senate a schedule for the return of bureaus and agencies to the District of Columbia, the Securities and Exchange Commission, presently located at Philadelphia, was given top priority.

As the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], chairman of our House Committee on Appropriations, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the House, know, I have not only spoken to them but also to other members of the subcommittee, urging that the SEC be moved back to Washington, basing my reasoning on two firm grounds, namely, first, it is far more economical, and, second, it meets the convenience of constituents coming from my district to Washington.

When officials of the Public Buildings Administration appeared before the subcommittee on the budget estimate of $900,000 for return of departmental functions to the District of Columbia, testimony disclosed that, although a tentative program had been scheduled, no definite decision had been reached as to which agencies were to be returned. In view of this situation, the committee deferred approval of the item pending submission of a definite program.

Now that a definite program has been presented, in the interest of economy and convenience to the public, I hope that the approval of this item will be agreed to by the House so that the Securities and Exchange Commission may be returned to the District of Columbia at an early date.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS].

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, it would be adding insult to injury for me to take much time on this conference report. The subcommittee spent almost 4 months in hearings, in formulating the bill, and in this conference report. So far as I know there are no disagreements. We are in agreement on all of these amendments. I think we have done an excellent job and I want to commend my chairman and say that I appreciate the courtesy he has extended to the Democratic Members and to all Members.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add this further word to what has already been said about this conference report. It is a unanimous report. However, I would like to correct an error that is going out by virtue of certain articles that have been written in newspapers of the day to the effect

that the conferees, as well as Members of the House, cut the Atomic Energy Commission by $75,000,000. That is an error. We did not. What we did was this: We invited the Atomic Energy Commission to come back in January, and we have so stated in our report that we did not intend to cut them one dime. As a matter of fact, it is within the contemplation of the joint conferees that come next January we may even grant more than $75,000,000, if needed. The point is our action is not a cut, and we do not want that information to go abroad to the country that we are cutting them a dime. Technically it might be an increase.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Did I understand the gentleman to say a while ago that the bill provided all the funds that General Hawley asked for, or more?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think it is clear that we have provided every dollar that General Hawley asked either committee for. In fact, we are giving him more. He indicated in no way at the House committee hearings or subsequently at the Senate committee hearings, that more was required. On the strength of a letter, however, which he addressed to one Member of the Senate, after the conclusion of the hearings, this additional amount has been approved.

Mr. RANKIN. So you did not reduce the amount below what General Hawley or the Veterans' Administration asked for; is that correct?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The amount now carried for General Hawley includes the full budget estimate and more.

Mr. RANKIN. And all the Veterans' Administration asked for.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, replying to the gentleman from Mississippi, as far as the program is concerned, the bill as now written carries $20,000,000 over and above the amount as it left the House.

Mr. RANKIN. I am asking whether it carries that much over and above what the Veterans' Administration said they needed.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. That is exactly right, because we directed that not a penny be reduced from General Hawley's part of the Veterans' Administration, and in addition thereto we added $20,000,000.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I notice the conference report reduces the amount allowed by the Senate to the Federal Trade Commission by $100,000. It seems to me that in the debate in the Senate that a very good case was made for the full amount allowed by the Senate, as appropriated by the Senate, and I wonder why the amount was reduced by $100,000. That is in item No. 16.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The House allowed $2,800,120. The Senate raised that $200,000 and the conferees split the difference, giving the agency more money than it had during the past fiscal year.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. In order to keep the record straight about the request of General Hawley, I understood that General Hawley did tell the Senate committee in a letter that he did need this extra $100,000,000 Let us get that clear

Mr. HENDRICKS. I want to say to the gentleman from Louisiana that General Hawley did not tell the Senate committee that he did need this extra $100,000,000. In spite of the fact that we said here on the floor that if he needed it, he should inform us to that effect, and that if it was insufficient, the thing for him to do was to go to the Senate and put his case before them, General Hawley did not mention it once. After the hearings were closed, Senator GREEN called General Hawley out and asked him what he needed, and he indicated to Senator GREEN that he needed $100,000,000. That is all that has been done.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Then it is in the record that General Hawley did tell the Senate committee that it needed $100,000,000. I want that to stand in the record.

Mr. HENDRICKS. No, he did not tell the Senate committee that. He told Senator GREEN that.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Did not the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] just state that General Hawley wrote that in a letter?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I said that Senator GREEN called him up and asked him what he needed, after the committee had finished the hearings, and then he wrote and said that he needed $100,000,000. That is the reason they put this amendment in the bill. They gave him $20,000,000.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Then the record shows that he did ask Senator GREEN, a member of the Senate committee for it.

Mr. HENDRICKS. He did not ask the committee for it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. This seems to be a very confused issue, yet to us it is very simple and very clear. The Budget asked for a certain amount of money. The House after discussion with representatives of the Veterans' Administration, including General Hawley, and having told the representatives that we would give them every dollar they needed for the care of veterans, set a certain figure which we understood was acceptable to General Hawley and the others. Upon the floor we said that we had intended to give them every dollar necessary for service to veterans in the hospitals. The committee still says so.

The bill then went to the Senate and hearings were held before the subcommittee of that body. General Hawley appeared and the same thing took place. General Hawley did not ask for any more money than appears in the bill before you today, at any time during the hearings. Later Senator GREEN as an individual called up General Hawley and asked him if he had enough money. At that time General Hawley wrote him a letter, without any substantiation of the reasons, saying he would like to have $100,000,000 more. Senator GREEN, in the committee on the Senate side, moved that $13,900,000 be added to the amount. When the conferees met they added not that amount, but added a full $20,000,000.

It seems to me the House and the Senate both have done everything they could possibly be expected to do and a little more, and have expressed a willingness to go just as far as necessary with the disabled veterans of the United States. It would be a sorry situation if we set up Appropriations Committees, and representatives of the agencies appeared before those committees and, upon being asked if that was enough money they indicated that it was enough money, and then had simply gone outside and called up some Member of the House or some Member of the Senate and said to him, "I would really like to have had $100,000,000 more," and then, as the gentleman from Louisiana suggests, that should become a matter of record that they had officially asked for it. It was never officially asked for. The Veterans' Administration probably will find itself in ample funds, with the amount of money which presently represents not merely the amount asked for by the budget, the full amount, but actually, as the gentleman from Texas said, a little bit more, because we have directed that the additional amount must be applied entirely to the matter of service in the hospitals for veterans. General Hawley has in fact more money than he asked for in either house, or that was asked for by the Bureau of the Budget.

I think the gentlemen who are solicitous, will find that the two committees of the House and the Senate have been even more solicitous. In my opinion, this bill contains an adequate amount of money, and I am one who, as a DAV myself, and representing a district with many DAV's, is most anxious that the full complement of money, the full complement of service in the hospitals, shall be given to the veterans, not only of World War II but of all the wars of the United States.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I say that one of the difficulties with the legislation this year was that the President announced that the veterans' needs had about been taken care of. Also, General Bradley has had no program for the veterans this year. To my knowledge, this is the first time that any Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has had no program to offer to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. When the committee asked General Bradley why he did not recommend any, he said, "I must consider the budget." I think that is one of the difficulties that both our committees faced. But I will say that

the Congress is not excused from having a program for veterans, and our Committee on Veterans' Affairs has had one. And we can see no excuse for not passing legislation that we reported to the House for the most part unanimously.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 3, line 4, insert the following: "of which not to exceed $70,000 may be allocated for the President's Amnesty Board, and."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, amendments Nos. 2, 15, 17, 19, 20, and 25 are identical in language. I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 4, line 11, strike out "$50" and insert "$35."

Senate amendment No. 15: Page 18, line 2, strike out "$50" and insert "$35."

Senate amendment No. 17: Page 20, line 2, strike out "$75" and insert "$35."

Senate amendment No. 19: Page 27, line 13, strike out "$75" and insert "$35."

Senate amendment No. 20: Page 30, line 19, strike out "$75" and insert "$35."

Senate amendment No. 25: Page 38, line 7, strike out "$50" and insert "$35."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 2, 15, 17, 19, 20, and 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendments, insert the following: "$35 (unless a higher rate, not exceeding $50, shall be approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget)."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 7: Page 10, line 21, insert the following: ": *Provided*, That where station allowance has been authorized by the War Department for officers of the Army serving the Army at certain foreign stations, the same allowance shall be authorized for officers of the armed forces assigned to the Commission while serving at the same foreign stations, and this appropriation is hereby made available for the payment of such allowance."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 18: Page 25, line 6, insert the following:

"Return of departmental functions to the seat of government: For all expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia and travel and other expenses of the Public Buildings Administration incident thereto, necessary to provide for the transfer to the seat of government of such bureaus, offices, agencies, or activities of the Federal Government as are designated from time to time by the President, which were removed from, or established at places other than, the seat of government by reason of the national emergency, including the expenses of travel of employees transferred; transportation of immediate families of employees; the expenses of packing, crating, drayage, transportation, temporary storage, unpacking, and uncrating of household goods and personal effects, in accordance with regulations approved by the President; and the payment to employees of special allowances at $5 per day after arrival at destination for 6 days for employees, plus $2.50 per day additional for 6 days for each member of immediate families of employees; $900,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That removal to the seat of government of Government-owned or leased furniture, equipment, supplies, and other property and household goods and personal effects of employees, and costs of restoration of leased office space when required, may be accomplished without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes: *Provided further*, That such sums as may be determined by the Commissioner of Public Buildings to be necessary therefor may be transferred to other agencies concerned for the payment to the transferred employees of the allowances mentioned herein."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 21: Page 31, line 19, insert the following: "Any funds heretofore apportioned to any State and unobligated may be used to pay the State's pro rata for any projects on the Federal aid and Federal aid secondary roads approved under the provisions of section 3 of act of June 8, 1934 (48 Stat. 993), section 4, act of June 8, 1938 (58 Stat. 633), and section 7 of act of July 13, 1943 (57 Stat. 560)."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: On line 1 of said amendment, and after the word "funds", insert the following: ", not exceeding $11,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 28: Page 41, line 24, at the bottom of the page, insert "District of Columbia redevelopment: For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of sections 3k, 6, and 16 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 592), including temporary services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600); not to exceed $50 for deposit in the general fund of the Treasury for cost of penalty mail for the fiscal years 1947 and 1948 as required by the act of June 28, 1944; $95,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert the following: "$75,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 31, page 44, line 16, insert: "for the administration, and for the construction and maintenance, of laboratory and other facilities on Barro Colorado Island, Canal Zone, under the provisions of the act of July 2, 1940, as amended by the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31 and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, a motion to reconsider the various votes by which action was taken on the conference report was laid on the table.

NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947

Mr. HOFFMAN, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 758) to promote the national security by providing for a Secretary of Defense, and for other purposes.

CAMP STEWART, GA.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1627) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War and the War Assets Administrator to take such action as may be necessary to return certain real property at Camp Stewart, Ga., to the former owners thereof, and for other purposes, and that the same be rereferred to the Committee on Armed Services, the chairman having consented.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

AMENDING PUBLIC LAW 88, SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3738) entitled "An act to amend Public Law 88, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved June

23, 1945," with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 15, after "corporation", insert ": *Provided*, That claims hereunder must be filed within 6 months after the enactment of this act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a report.

TO AMEND SECTION 5 OF HOME OWNERS' LOAN ACT OF 1933

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2800) entitled "An act to amend section 5 of Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes," with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 11, after "amended", insert "(except business loans provided by section 503 thereof and not secured by a lien on real estate)."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL INSURANCE CONTRIBUTIONS ACT

Mr. REED of New York, from the Committee on Ways and Means, submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3818) to amend the Federal Insurance Contributions Act with respect to rates of tax on employers and employees, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3818) to amend the Federal Insurance Contributions Act with respect to rates of tax on employers and employees, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, and 5, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, and omit the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, and on page 2 of the House engrossed bill, line 1 and line 13 strike out "to 1956, both inclusive", and insert "and 1951"; and on page 2, lines 4 and 16 strike out "1956" and insert "1951"; and the Senate agree to the same.

DANIEL A. REED,
ROBERT W. KEAN,
NOAH MASON,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
WILBUR D. MILLS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

E. D. MILLIKIN,
ROBERT TAFT,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3818) to amend the Federal Insurance Contributions Act with respect to rates of tax on employers and employees, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: The House bill fixed rates of tax on employers and employees as follows: 1939–49, 1 percent; 1950–56, 1½ percent; after 1956, 2 percent. The Senate amendment makes the rates for all years after 1949, 3 percent. The House recedes with an amendment which provides that the rates of tax shall be as follows: 1939–49, 1 percent; 1950 and 1951, 1½ percent; after 1951, 2 percent.

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3: The House bill provided for continuance on a permanent basis of amendments to the Social Security Act establishing within the unemployment trust fund a separate account to be known as the Federal unemployment account, and authorized appropriations to such fund in amounts equal to the excess of tax collections under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act over the unemployment administrative expenditures. The Senate amendment limits the authorized appropriations to the excess of tax collections for the period ending December 31, 1949, and provides that any amounts in such account on April 1, 1950, and any amounts repaid to such account after such date shall be covered into the general fund of the Treasury. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 4: The Senate amendment provides that there shall be deducted from the total amount of taxes collected prior to July 1, 1943, the sum of $18,451,846 authorized to be appropriated by section 11 (b) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 5: The House bill provided for transfers from the Federal unemployment account to a State's account in the unemployment trust fund whenever on the last day in a calendar quarter the balance in the State's account in such trust fund does not exceed a sum equal to the total contributions deposited in such trust fund under the law of the State during that one of the two calendar years preceding such day in which such deposits were higher. The Senate amendment limits this privilege to the case of calendar quarters ending prior to January 1, 1950. The House recedes.

DANIEL A. REED,
ROBERT W. KEAN,
NOAH MASON,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
WILBUR D. MILLS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill H. R. 3818.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement as above set out.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, and 5, and agree to the same.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. RICH. As I understand this report, the rates in future years have been increased. Is it not a fact that sufficient funds are being received with the rates now carried to take care of everything and create a great surplus?

Mr. REED of New York. We went into this in great detail with the experts and it was found that these rates were sufficient up to 1957.

Mr. RICH. If the rates are all right today and will protect the fund for several years how does the gentleman know they are not going to be all right in 1957?

Mr. REED of New York. That is entirely determined by the actuaries. The rates agreed upon in conference are 1948–49, 1 percent; 1950–51, 1½ percent; after 1951, 2 percent. The experts have said that this was sufficient to protect the integrity of the reserve fund.

Mr. RICH. That is why I cannot understand why you want to increase the rates in 1957.

Mr. REED of New York. In 1957 the covered persons will begin to make heavy withdrawals from the fund. We want to step up the rates gradually. If we announced that it would be stepped up to 3 percent it would be notice to the manufacturers to try to collect that tax now by raising prices, and that would be inflationary.

Mr. RICH. If it is found at that time that there will be a surplus, Congress can act.

Mr. REED of New York. Congress can always act in the meantime.

Mr. RICH. And they can be raised or lowered as necessary.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. TABER, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 4347) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1053), which was read a first and second time, and with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CANNON reserved all points of order on the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that points of order against the bill may be waived.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by myself and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will not the gentleman add to his request that the bill be considered as read?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] asks unanimous consent that debate on the bill be limited to 1 hour, that it be equally divided and controlled by himself and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], at the end of which time the bill is to be considered as having been read.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4347) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4347, the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1948, with Mr. DONDERO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill carries some items that we have heretofore been unable to get into deficiency bills and give them the consideration that they required.

The first item is for special and select committees of the House, contingent expenses, $400,000.

The next item is $3,500,000 for the Civil Service Commission in connection with a law that we passed. The committee does not believe that under the proper operation of the regulations we need any such money as they asked, nor do we believe that a great many functions that they would attempt to exercise can be properly exercised by the Civil Service Commission. We have given them money enough to set up the proposition and to have the FBI go to work on the job, make the fingerprint tests and an examination of their files and report so that we may get rid of the criminal element on the Federal pay roll. We believe we have provided ample funds for the whole of that operation.

We have also provided $500,000 for the Committee on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government for the fiscal year 1948. We have done that believing that will be an ample amount to get them started and to do whatever they need to do. When we get back here next year and they need more money, they will know what they want to do and they will be able to present to us just exactly what they will need so that it can be satisfactorily handled.

We have allowed the Department of Agriculture $2,000,000 for structural work on certain flood-control projects in Iowa and Oklahoma, $1,000,000 in Iowa, and $800,000 in Oklahoma. There are a couple of small items in Mississippi and one other very small item.

We have allowed for the Post Office Department a total of $75,000,000 out of a budget estimate of $163,720,000. That item has been allowed after hearings held by the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee and the language was written here by the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee. It has been submitted to Mr. Donaldson, First Assistant Postmaster General, and he has approved the operation. We do not know but what there will have to be a deficiency in the wintertime on this item. There is a waiver of the apportionment statutes if the Bureau of the Budget authorizes it to be made with reference to that picture. However, that is as far as we felt we should go at this time.

In the Treasury Department we have the item for the Coast Guard, $4,050,000, which will permit the continuation of the long-range safety devices insofar as they have any definite positive program which would be required.

We have also allowed $6,400,000 in the Missouri Basin to the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation for the purpose of flood-control operations. We cut out the projects that were not basically flood control and of an emergency character and allowed things to proceed upon the other items.

There is an item with reference to the Maritime Commission, and there we have a long statement in the report on pages 2 and 3.

We believe that we have provided amply for their needed operations. Frankly, the Maritime Commission did not make a good showing before the committee, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], bore the brunt of the hearing upon that item. We believe that much of their administrative expense could be cut, and we have reduced their operations so that we believe that there will be a rescission of approximately $300,000,000 resulting.

I think that that covers the major items that are involved in the bill. I will not take any more time unless there are questions at this point.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, this is the last general appropriation bill of the session, and with it goes glimmering any illusions we may have had as to the intention of this Congress to carry out the voluminous pledges made of economy and retrenchment. This Congress has spent as much money unnecessarily as any session of Congress that has ever sat, and this bill is a very good illustration of the program that has been consistently followed in that respect. The regrettable feature of our failure to exercise economy is that we have especially failed to exercise economy in our own affairs. We have cut some of the departments pretty deeply, as they should have been cut, but instead of cutting our expenses, where economy should begin—right here at home—we have spent money like drunken sailors. We have not reduced the personnel. We have not retrenched expenditures. We have today the greatest army of supernumeraries in the Capitol ever mobilized here. We are paying them the highest salaries ever paid for clerical service; salaries unparalleled in private business, and paying the largest amount of money to run the House and Senate it has ever cost in the history of the Congress.

In keeping with this headlong extravagance, the subcommittee reported to the main committee an appropriation of $50,000 for extra policemen up here on the Hill. At the last minute we managed to defeat it in the whole committee, but in view of the fact that half of it is over on the other side of the Capitol and will doubtless recur again in conference, I call attention to the purport of that additional $50,000 they want to add to the already topheavy cost of our own establishment.

They wanted to provide extra policemen, to be appointed, of course, under the patronage system. We need extra policemen up here just about as much as the traditional wagon needs a fifth wheel. We have gone through two wars, and if there was any need for surveillance, any need for protection, the need would have become apparent in the excitement and stress of the war. There was no need for extra cops during the war. It did not occur to anybody to increase the force until these piping times of peace gave rise to the emergency. Now that we are back to peacetime conditions they want to bring in extra policemen—at an initial cost of $50,000, not including uniforms, equipment, and other incidental expenses. They offer as an excuse the fact that somebody shot at a Senator over there the other day. If they had had 500 policemen they could not have prevented a fellow like that from shooting at anybody he took a notion to use as a target. When anybody gets ready to shoot any Member of the House, no number of policemen around in the corridors is going to prevent his doing it.

We have lived through such occasions before. A man stood over there in that gallery with a pistol in his hand some years ago menacing every Member of the House. He was disarmed without incident or casualty and no one thought of spending $50,000 for more police. Over on the Senate side, during the war, a

visitor left a camera on the mantel in the Presidential room which exploded shortly after, completely destroying the room. But no one proposed an appropriation for more police. If we had enough police then, certainly we have enough police here to cope with the present situation.

Instead of practicing economy around the Capitol here—where it should be most in evidence—we are practicing profligate extravagance and seizing upon every excuse to hire more retainers and raise more salaries.

In this last bill before us here we insist on raising another salary—on increasing the pay of another House employee. This particular man, I think, is especially competent, and if any man ought to have a salary increase he ought to have it. But after assuring the country that we propose to practice economy, we are continually bringing in bills to raise salaries far beyond what the recipient has ever received before and far beyond what is paid for similar service anywhere in the District of Columbia, or elsewhere. This bill runs true to form. Hire more personnel—although what we have are falling over each other. Raise salaries—although current salaries are out of line with industry. Increase expenditures—when we should be decreasing expenditures. To repeat a trite phrase we often hear on this floor, "Spend and spend, tax and tax, elect and elect."

Then in the same vein there is a special waste of money here under what purports to be flood control.

Flood control is one of the prime needs of the country. But what we need is a systematic integrated program that will handle the situation once and for all. Here we have a program, on a piecemeal basis, that promises nothing more than local relief, if that. To add to the confusion and disorganization, the bill proposes to continue and intensify a concentration of enormous appropriations in what is practically one congressional district. And the particularly regrettable feature of it is that in thus favoring this one district, we are violating one of the fundamental principles that has been followed by the Committee on Appropriations ever since it was established. That principle is that we will not, except under exceptional circumstances, appropriate money for which there is no budget estimate. We have here in what is practically one congressional district four projects on which no budget estimates have been submitted.

On one of these they have asked for an appropriation of $3,500,000; on another for $4,800,000; and on a third for $2,100,000; and on the fourth $1,400,000. All of those are unbudgeted and all are unnecessary in the national program of flood control for the reason that the situation is more than taken care of by three great dams, provided in another bill, one at a cost of $158,000,000, the second for $158,000,000, and the third for $138,000,000, any one of which would serve the purpose so far as over-all flood control of the Missouri is concerned.

Not only are these four unbudgeted projects superfluous but two of these huge dams, elsewhere provided for, costing in the aggregate approximately half a billion dollars, are entirely superfluous in the national flood-control program.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I note that the gentleman from New York said that approximately $6,500,000 were going to the Department of the Interior. Is that all that the Congress is going to do about flood control following the President's message?

Mr. CANNON. Of course, the program presented here is even more fragmentary and more inadequate and will prove even more ineffective than any of the programs that have been suggested by the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman's answer to the question of the distinguished gentleman from Colorado is not exactly accurate, is it? The funds that are provided in this bill, which the regular deficiency committee considered, was an estimate for only $10,000,000. The other funds that the gentleman from Colorado is talking about will be considered by the regular deficiency committee, and you will find that they come under the civil functions of the War Department. They relate to the President's budget estimate. So, when the gentleman answered the distinguished gentleman from Colorado, he did not give exactly the right information. There is going to be more done for flood control besides what is carried in this bill.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman misses the point entirely. We are appropriating here for projects which were unbudgeted and which also are for projects which are superfluous because they are overlapped by projects provided for in other appropriations. Among them are the Garrison Dam, the Oahe Dam, and the Randall Dam, which are within 200 miles of each other and any one of which would serve every purpose except that of local convenience—not part of the national picture. In other words, these expenditures are wholly unwarranted and most of them highly ineffective in achieving the purpose for which proposed.

I heartily approve of the few economies effected in this bill and at an appropriate time will submit a résumé of all of the appropriation bills for this session. I regret to say they fall far short of the announced program of retrenchment..

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has made a characteristic speech. Of course, coming from one who has been so economy-minded as the gentleman from Missouri, I would expect him to say what he did. The RECORD, however, will speak for itself, at least over the period that I have been here.

I am sorry that the gentleman from Missouri finds it necessary every time an appropriation bill is under consideration, to belabor the Republicans for attempting to meet necessary demands of government. One day he is belaboring us for making slashes in Government expense and the next day he criticizes us for appropriating too much money. The gentleman certainly can blow hot and cold at the same time.

The gentleman spent a lot of time talking about a proposal to add 25 people to the Capitol Police force. I do not know why he is talking about it. It is not in this bill. There was a proposal in the Deficiency Committee that was voted—I did not happen to be there at the time the testimony was taken—to provide an additional 25 policemen. They asked for 50. At the regular meeting of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman well knows that the gentleman now addressing you made the motion to eliminate the entire amount, some $53,000, plus $8,000 for equipment and uniforms, from this bill. By unanimous vote of the committee this morning, it was eliminated from the bill. Now, what is he talking about? That item is out. It is not in the bill. But, of course, the gentleman has to have something to talk about, so he talks about a proposal that is not in the bill and is not before the Congress itself for consideration.

A great deal that the gentleman said can be treated in a similar way with respect to his remarks about these reclamation and flood control projects. When the civil-functions bill of the War Department comes before this House, you will see a determined effort on the part of the Republican Congress to deal with that situation. And there is an effort in this bill relating to only $10,000,000, for which $6,400,000 is provided in this bill, to carry out the portion of the President's program that was involved before the deficiency committee. You will see, much to the surprise of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, and others, who live in hopes that the Republicans would not respond to the situation and would not provide the money to take care of the disastrous flood conditions in the country, that the Republicans in this Congress have responded and are going to take care of it and take care of it in the closing hours of this session of Congress, in response to the demands of Republicans not alone, but in response to the demands and requests of the President of the United States, and in response to the demands of the people in the great Middle West and Northwest who have been so severely affected this year by these enormous floods.

When the gentleman says some of these items are unbudgeted, that is true, but they are all items that have been surveyed and approved. Because of the critical character of the situation that exists out there, the Congress will make these funds available and get these projects started.

Now, there is one thing in this bill in which I think you will be interested. Nothing was said about it, and that is why I have requested this time.

The people of the United States and the Congress of the United States have been belabored from one end of the country to the other for the passage of the

Stratton bill which would permit immigration into this country of 100,000 immigrants each year for the succeeding 4 years. Personally, I am one who is in sympathy with the objectives of that bill.

When the people from the Maritime Commission were before this committee a rather startling thing developed in the testimony. They had asked for an appropriation estimate of $350,000 per ship to put seven passenger ships in some sort of state of repair. The total estimate was $2,500,000. You may be interested in this, and I ask your attention because it relates to this whole program of immigration. It will give you some information I do not think you presently have. Under questioning of Admiral Smith, the head of the Maritime Commission, and Mr. Helmbold, who testified for the Maritime Commission, these facts were developed, and you will find them in the printed record of the hearings.

You will recall earlier in the year a piece of legislation came to this House from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries by which the Congress was asked to pass legislation that would waive the safety requirements of the Coast Guard and permit the operation of certain passenger ships in violation of then existing law. Do you remember that? The Congress passed this over the objections and the fight that was made by the now chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from Ohio. He made a vigorous fight in opposition to the legislation but he did not prevail.

What is the situation? These seven ships are engaged almost exclusively in the business of transporting from Germany—and a few from Italy—persecutees who came into this country under the provisions of the Presidential order which granted priority to these people who have been subjected to persecution in Europe. So it was necessary in order that those ships could operate at all in that service that we pass legislation waiving the safety requirements that otherwise would have compelled those ships to be laid up. In this bill they ask for $350,000 per ship to make some repairs to these seven vessels. I asked the Chairman of the Maritime Commission, Admiral Smith:

If you spend these $350,000 on each of those vessels will you put them in shape so that they can obtain certification from the Coast Guard and comply with the safety standards of our law

He said they would not.

After they spend the $350,000 on each of these ships they still would not comply with the law. Then I said:

Admiral, it comes down to this, that you are operating them today bringing these people over to this country pursuant to the law which we passed which authorized a waiver of Coast Guard regulations as to safety.

Admiral SMITH. That is true.

Mr. KEEFE. And if you spend the $350,000 a ship on each of them you still will have to lay those ships up on February 28, which is the limitation period under the existing waiver statute.

Admiral SMITH. That is true.

Mr. KEEFE. So we will be required in the next Congress to enact further legislation further waiving the requirements for safety if you are going to be permitted to operate these ships after February 28.

And he said that was absolutely true. Then I said:

Admiral, have you got other ships that you can put into this passenger service to get these people over here? Supposing the Congress were to pass the Stratton bill and we did open the door to 100,000 immigrants to come over here, would it be possible to bring them over here with existing shipping facilities that are available?

And he said it would not be. I asked him the point-blank question:

Do you know of any shipping available on the face of the earth under the American flag or any other flag that could be put into service that would be available to bring these people over here now if Congress saw fit to pass the so-called Stratton bill?

His answer appears very clearly in the record and his answer was absolutely negative.

Let me read the question and answer briefly:

Mr. KEEFE. There is not a chance to get them out of Europe, whether we pass amendments to our immigration law or not, unless we have these ships to carry them, because you have stated there are no other ships afloat that are available anywhere in the world, is that true?

Admiral SMITH. Yes, sir.

Mr. HELMBOLD. That is, under the American flag.

Mr. KEEFE. Are there under any other flag?

Mr. HELMBOLD. There are not enough under any flag.

Mr. KEEFE. That is what I understood Admiral Smith to testify, that there are not enough under any flag to handle this prospective volume of traffic.

Admiral SMITH. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, being a realist and viewing these situations rather realistically it seems to me that we ought to let the American people, who are interested in this very vital problem, know that what we are doing now is to bring persecutees over here, people who are trying to get out of the territory where they have been most viciously persecuted and we have to do it by utilization of ships that are operating in violation of the safety regulations applying to passenger ships on the high seas laid down by our Coast Guard and the very few ships that are now engaged in that service and are being overburdened, carrying 900 passengers when they should not be carrying over 550, will have to go out of service on February 28 unless we pass further waiver legislation permitting the Maritime Commission to operate ships in violation of our safety code. So it appears, strange as it may seem, with all the facts available, we do not have under the American flag or under the flag of any other nation available shipping to handle the problem of bringing these people to this country, whether we pass the Stratton bill or whether we do not.

Is that not a rather enlightening situation which we find in the testimony of the Maritime Commission relating to this subject? I believe it has a very important bearing on the people who know that we are not going to fool people into thinking that by the passage of legislation here we can provide facilities for bringing people here who are looking hopefully for an opportunity to come to America and live in this great land of ours.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I understand the gentleman to say that even if we passed the so-called Stratton bill we have not facilities to move these people over here?

Mr. KEEFE. We do not have those facilities.

Mr. GRANGER. Where are all the ships we used to have?

Mr. KEEFE. The ships apparently that were built were not suited for the carrying of passengers. I do not know where they are. All I know is that the admiral says there is not sufficient tonnage available any place in the world that is not already allocated and can be used for other purposes that might be devoted to this service.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BRADLEY. The gentleman is absolutely correct. There are no ships available for the transportation of these displaced persons.

Mr. KEEFE. We are getting ourselves all worked up emotionally over these things, we hold out allurement and promise to people by the passage of legislation, but when we get down to the realities of the situation we find we are having tremendous difficulty and must operate ships in violation of known standards of safety in order to bring the few people that are being brought over here now under the present immigration laws.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DONDERO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4347) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION OF HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

JULY 24, 1947.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the Governor of the State of Maryland, I have received the certificate of election of the Honorable EDWARD A. GARMATZ, as a Representative-elect to the Eightieth Congress from the Third Congressional District of that State, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of the Honorable Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. GARMATZ appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4347) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4347, with Mr. DONDERO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

LOYALTY INVESTIGATION FUNDS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I arise in strong support of the appropriation contained in this bill to furnish funds for the carrying out of the President's program of loyalty investigations.

This Government must rid itself of Communists and other subversive employees on its pay roll. It is a job that cannot be delayed until the other body can study and amend and either pass or defeat the civil-service loyalty bill which was considered here in the House only last week.

This problem demands action and under the President's program, already under way and already showing results, you will see further results if proper financing is given by the Congress before we adjourn. A delay of 6 or 8 months more on this important matter is inconceivable and, consequently, I urge the Congress to pass the appropriation contained herein today.

I regret that the Committee on Appropriations has so reduced the estimated amount necessary to do the job to the amount being appropriated today. Surely the job is important enough, the necessity for careful and thorough investigations important enough to both the Government and the loyal employees of the Government, for the Congress to provide sufficient funds for this work.

I am glad that sufficient funds were given to the Federal Bureau of Investigation to carry out most of the job outlined for them. But the Civil Service Commission also requires additional help to carry out its part—and the appropriation for them has been too greatly reduced by the committee.

Especially is this true in the work of investigating new applicants for Federal jobs. Here, as much as in those now working, careful investigation of loyalty of new employees is of vital importance. I am afraid that the failure to provide sufficient funds for adequate work by the Civil Service Commission may handicap getting rid of those who are disloyal and in preventing other subversives from attaining governmental employment status.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to note that the bill and the report contain an item on page 6 of the bill, lines 10 to 16 inclusive, for $100,000 for work on the Yuma project in Arizona. This is a very worthy and a necessary item, as was explained to the committee in the hearings and found in Part II of the hearings on pages 156–159. I would like to add a word to the statement contained in the printed hearings, for I feel that this project of drainage in the Yuma Valley has a double significance. This additional significance may need some explanation.

Here are the basic facts: The Yuma Valley is one of the oldest irrigated districts in the Pacific Southwest. It has been a highly successful project, and it is pointed to with pride by the Bureau of Reclamation as one of the very finest developed by the Bureau during its 45 years of existence. The Yuma Valley project contains about 44,000 acres of rich alluvial land which is irrigated from the Colorado River. It yields abundantly and has averaged, during the years of the recent war, a production of more than $165 per acre in cash crops.

However, the high prices of farm products and the insistent call for production during the war years caused the farmers who constitute the Yuma Valley Water Users Association to redouble their efforts and to make the land produce to the limit. This maximum production called for a maximum amount of water, which water was during that time available in the Colorado River as surplus over and above the project's firm supply of water. Accordingly, this project land was excessively irrigated, and a seepage problem—which may have had more than one cause, but which was undoubtedly caused in part by over-irrigation—caused a good many acres to be forced out of use. This necessitated scientific treatment and careful drainage. This bill is to provide in part for that program of drainage.

Let it be understood that the water users are paying for this cost of drainage, and funds advanced by the Government will be returned to the Treasury. This is not an ordinary drainage problem, but one requiring wells and pumps to reduce the water table over the entire cultivated area, sufficiently to remove the difficulty. It would be worth the cost if there were no other result other than recovering the affected acres and safeguarding all the other acres in the valley by a lowering of the water table. That is the primary purpose of the drainage program, but there is a significant additional benefit which I would not have overlooked.

The Yuma Valley lies along the Colorado River from the city of Yuma extending toward the south to the Mexican border. Although this land during recent years has had abundant water supply from the surplus waters of the Colorado River, it cannot be said to have a superabundance of legally firm water from that river for all time to come. As I have said many times in connection with the Gila reclamation project—and others have repeatedly called it to our attention—there is a scarcity of water in the Colorado River, legally available in firm supply for the suitable lands that could be irrigated. The present surplus is due to the fact that other areas have not yet taken their water.

Now a recent treaty with Mexico provides that this country shall supply Mexico 1,500,000 acre-feet of water annually from the Colorado River. This treaty burden is going to be difficult enough to supply because of the over-all, long-run shortage, but the burden will be less heavy if some—perhaps most—of the water furnished Mexico can be second-hand water which has been used for irrigation within the United States before it goes to Mexico. This would be true of water pumped out of this area. I want to point out that all of the water pumped by this project from the Yuma Valley lands can be furnished directly to Mexico as a credit on the water burden caused by the treaty. When we consider that an acre foot of water every 12 months is equivalent in value to $20 in cash, it becomes apparent how significant the water from this drainage system may be at this point on the border.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. I arise, Mr. Chairman, to urge the Congress to give approval to the provisions of this bill appropriating funds for the FBI and Civil Service Commission to eliminate from the Government, subversive employees. Regardless of what grade or rank an employee of the Government may have, he has no right to retain a position within the Government which he seeks to overthrow and destroy. America must not tolerate them.

In ferreting out these subversives, due caution must be taken that basic American rights of citizenship are protected I hold an abiding conviction that there is inherent within our system of freedom the power and means of purging subversives from Government employment without abandoning the very principles we seek to protect.

I trust the Congress will approve the President's request for sufficient funds with which to do the job and to do it thoroughly.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

RURAL AND CITY DELIVERY SERVICE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I bitterly regret that the Committee on Appropriations has seen fit in this second supplemental appropriation bill to cut the item for rural free delivery from $2,500,000 to $2,000,000. I also regret to learn that the Appropriations Committee has swung the Republican economy ax on the item of $20,000,000 for city delivery carriers. This important item has been stricken entirely from the bill, and a complicated formula has been substituted in its stead.

Many communities in this country have qualified under existing laws and regulations for city delivery service.

Others have qualified for extension of such service. Farmers in many areas are entitled to extended free delivery service. These citizens and taxpayers in these communities are just as entitled to this service as the citizens in any community in the United States. In my own district at least two cities are entitled now to city delivery service, but the service has not been granted, due to the fact that under the Republican economy program funds have not been made available. Mr. Chairman, I hope that these items are restored in full. It is only fair and right that these services be given to every community and every citizen of our country.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

MUST ALASKA BE ANOTHER PEARL HARBOR?

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, the American public has not been informed of the notes and documents exchanged between the United States and Soviet Russia. Our people do not realize the gravity of the international situation.

The Marshall plan means that economic and political warfare is now going on between the two big powers.

Instead of conducting an investigation after the tragic blunder, as we did at Pearl Harbor, let us investigate beforehand so that it shall not happen again at Alaska.

Why Alaska?

This is the only outpost standing between Russian air bases and the undefended heart of American industry, which is centered around the Great Lakes, along the shortest and likeliest route of attack by bombers or guided missiles.

We are spending billions for defense at every conceivable point except Alaska where it is most needed. Most Americans think of Russia as a vast country on the other side of the world, separated from us by two great oceans and land barriers beyond. The startling fact is that the United States in Alaska is but a few miles distant by water from Russian Siberia, and Alaska was once Russian territory.

Reliable intelligence reports inform us that millions of slave laborers are building hundreds of air bases and other military installations in Siberia. And what have we in Alaska? A skeleton military force and a few air strips which are not only incapable of handling big bombers, but cannot service the numbers of reconnaissance planes and fighter planes required to warn us of an attack and to defend us from it.

Make certain of one thing. If we are ever attacked again, the enemy will try to defeat us in the first few hours by paralyzing our great industrial cities. Military men are theoretically aware of this danger to Canada and the United States, but what are they doing to forestall it?

That is what we urgently want to know.

The peoples of this world hunger for peace and they fervently pray that the United Nations may be able to outlaw war. We must face the realistic fact however, that in its present stage of development, the UN is powerless. Europe already is divided into two rival blocs. In this tense atmosphere, an unfortunate incident might touch off war. We must not invite this by our unpreparedness.

While our leaders exercise every moral, political, and economic resource to preserve the peace trying to reach an area of understanding with Soviet Russia, we must not leave our northern flank exposed as a temptation to an aggressor.

May God forbid that we ever again become involved in war, but God help us if we ask for it by our carelessness, as we have done twice in this century.

Alaska must be put on the alert.

Before this Congress adjourns, it must instruct the committee which is scheduled to visit Alaska to go there immediately. And its first order of business must be that of getting first-hand information on the state of our defenses at that strategic point.

In all earnestness I say the armed forces must not be caught sleeping at Alaska as they were at Pearl Harbor.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE].

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that the House will vote adequate appropriations today for the support of our President's loyalty program.

Mr. Chairman, I voted against H. R. 3813 because I thought it lacked the proper protection of the civil rights of the mass of our loyal Federal employees.

However, I am entirely aware that our Government cannot gamble with the safety of our Nation by keeping any employee on its payroll whose loyalty is pledged to a nation other than the U. S. A.

Since it is impossible now to obtain legislation for the correction of this situation, Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members of the House to support our President's loyalty program which is already in operation. We should vote more funds for this necessary work than is proposed in this bill if we expect the job to be done right.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, this bill is noteworthy in that it carries $6,400,000 for the building of dams which the committee has selected on the basis of the double duty these dollars will do in preventing flood damage and in storing flood waters for useful purposes in the Missouri River Basin.

To the extent that the projects provide irrigation water, the projects will be reimbursable under the applicable reclamation laws. The portions of the reservoir costs allocable to flood control will be so allocated in accord with the Nation's established policy. When the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, was passed, the building of dams on the tributaries of the Missouri River largely became the responsibility of the Bureau of Reclamation under an agreement with the Army engineers. That is why these items, to be handled by the Bureau of Reclamation, are treated in this bill, while supplemental estimates for projects authorized to be prosecuted by the Corps of Engineers are being considered in connection with conference action on the bill for civil functions of the War Department.

APPRECIATION FOR CHAIRMAN'S INTEREST

I desire to speak of each of the projects briefly, but before I do so, I want to express appreciation in behalf of the people in the Missouri River Basin for the intelligent and understanding consideration given to this matter by the chairman of the Appropriations Committe, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. In spite of the fact that budget estimates were sent up only a week ago today, and in spite of the large number of matters pressing for attention during these closing days, the chairman not only arranged for hearings but gave them his personal attention.

I want to say for the RECORD, for all who are interested, that without the cooperation and leadership of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], there would have been no opportunity for the House of Representatives to pass upon these items so important to the people of the Missouri Valley at this time.

Now then, as those know who are acquainted with the actual facts in the situation, the President's budget sent to Congress at the opening of the session did not include a dollar for starting any projects for which construction money had not previously been appropriated. That was true as to flood control projects that are handled by the Army Engineers. It was also true as to projects handled by the Bureau of Reclamation. The committees of the Eightieth Congress, fortunately, declined to accept the idea that the urgency and value of a project were fairly measured by whether or not it had received funds from a previous Congress. Funds for some unstarted projects were placed in the regular appropriation bills for the Interior Department and the Bureau of Reclamation by the subcommittees of the House Committee on appropriations which handle those bills.

This was done on the initiative of the Members of the House of Representatives.

FLOODS PROMPT PRESIDENT

A couple of weeks ago, when the havoc and devastation of floods in the Mississippi and Missouri Basins became a national calamity, the President sent to the Congress a special message on the subject and called upon the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation to submit a program of authorized projects selected for their special values in combatting floods.

The Army engineers submitted a program entailing about $300,000,000 worth

of construction. The Bureau of Reclamation submitted a $47,000,000 program. The Soil Conservation Service submitted about a $5,000,000 program.

Those programs went to the White House, on or about the 10th of July. On the 17th of July the Bureau of the Budget, without hearings, selected and sent to Congress estimates totaling two hundred and fifty million, of which two hundred and thirty-seven were Army-engineer projects, ten were Reclamation projects, and three were for the Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service.

On what basis the Budget Bureau made its selections, I do not know. It was evident from our examination of witnesses before the subcommittee on deficiencies that they did not distinguish between flood and power projects.

It will be remembered that on the 18th of July, the House considered a supplemental appropriation bill which, among other things, carried funds for foreign relief. During my remarks on the bill, I raised the question of consideration of the flood-control program. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] stated that hearings would be ordered on those estimates this week. They were held with very satisfactory results.

Army engineer items are to be considered in connection with action of the conferees on the civil functions bill. That is now on the floor of another body. Reclamation and soil conservation items are before us in this bill. The appropriations are based upon the testimony developed during the hearings which the deficiency subcommittee held Tuesday and Wednesday. Representatives of the Interior and Agriculture Departments were heard as well as Members of Congress.

A brief statement on the projects for which specific appropriations are proposed will be sufficient, I am sure, to indicate the merit of each one .

SOIL CONSERVATION PROJECTS

The flood-control projects to be prosecuted by the Department of Agriculture are these:

Little Tallahatchie (Miss.)	$100,000
Yazoo (Miss.)	100,000
Little Sioux (Iowa and Minn.)	1,000,000
Washita (Okla. and Tex.)	800,000

Testimony before the committee indicated that these particular projects are in the nature of pioneer projects. They seek to hold the water where it falls. They are an experiment in the use of terraces and contour strips and diversion works to spread water so that it will go into the soil instead of running off. Their success will be watched with interest throughout the country.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The projects to be prosecuted by the Bureau of Reclamation comprise both started and hitherto unstarted projects. Each one has definite flood-control values, the committee feeling that the only reason for including projects in this final supplemental bill was their urgency from that standpoint. Projects which, while desirable, were not urgent, we thought should be left to the regular departmental bills. That, of course, would include projects which were primarily or even largely for production of power or irrigation.

I shall describe briefly the reclamation projects offered in this bill:

BOYSEN DAM

Boysen Dam is a project on the Big Horn River in the Yellowstone Basin. Testimony indicated that its early completion will protect thousands of acres of rich, irrigated farm lands in the Yellowstone Valley. It drains 7,700 square miles, has a reservoir capacity of 819,200 acre-feet, will cost a total of $20,000,000, and has had prior allotments of $7,100,000. The Reclamation Bureau recommended a supplemental appropriation of $2,000,000; the Budget Bureau, $1,000,000. The committee proposes $700,000, having in mind that this project is getting $4,000,000 in the Interior bill this year.

MOORHEAD DAM

Moorhead Dam is a new project on the Powder River in southeastern Montana. It drains 8,080 square miles and will have a reservoir capacity of 819,200 acre-feet. Its cost is estimated at $9,000,000 and the stored water will irrigate a large amount of land along the river. This is a stream that runs intermittently and is subject to sharp flash floods. The Bureau of Reclamation recommended $1,000,000; the Budget Bureau $900,000. The committee proposes $700,000 believing that will be about the amount of money that can be advantagecusly spent to launch the project in this fiscal year.

BIXBY DAM

Bixby Dam is another new project and is on the Moreau River in the central western part of South Dakota. It drains 1,810 square miles and will have a reservoir capacity of 90,000 acre-feet. The dam will protect eight major highway bridges, several of which have been replaced or repaired at considerable cost to the Federal, State and county governments in recent years. The storage will provide both livestock and irrigation water for about 250 miles. Bixby Dam and works will cost $3,500,000 at present costs. The Indian Service has expended about $45,000 in preliminary plans on the Moreau. The Reclamation Bureau recommended $700,000. The committee is proposing $500,000 as an initial appropriation.

CANNONBALL DAM

Cannonball Dam will be on the Cannonball River in south central North Dakota. It will drain 1,410 square miles into a reservoir of 40,000 acre-feet capacity. Its cost is estimated at $1,400,000. The Bureau of Reclamation recommended $70,000; the committee is proposing $400,000 which represents about 30 percent of its completed cost. The dam will protect valuable farm structures, lands and highways at a relatively low cost, considering its reimbursible features.

HEART BUTTE DAM

Heart Butte Dam is being constructed on the Heart River in central North Dakota and is designed primarily to protect the city of Mandan from floods of very destructive history. It drains 1,810 square miles into a reservoir of 70,000 acre-feet capacity. Its cost is estimated at $3,500,000, with irrigation features. Allotments to date total $1,550,000. The Bureau of Reclamation recommended $500,000; the Bureau of the Budget $400,000. The committee is proposing $400,000 to expedite construction.

KEYHOLE DAM

Keyhole Dam will be located on the Belle Fourche River in the Bear Lodge mountains of eastern Wyoming. It will drain 1,910 square miles into a reservoir of 276,000 acre-feet capacity. Estimated cost of the project is only $2,100,000 with irrigation features. The relatively low per acre-foot cost is explained by the unique Keyhole Dam site in the mountains. In addition to stopping flash floods, it will provide stock water and some irrigation for 150 miles of ranches in northeastern Wyoming and then provide supplemental water to the established Belle Fourche irrigation project in South Dakota. To date $75,000 has been allotted for plans. The Bureau of Reclamation recommended $500,000 at this time. The committee is proposing $200,000 which will initiate construction with about 10 percent of completed cost.

SHADEHILL DAM

Shadehill Dam is being constructed at the junction of the north and south forks of the Grand River in northwestern South Dakota. It will drain 3,070 square miles into a reservoir of 134,000 acre-feet capacity. Floods on the Grand River caused detailed dollar damages of $625,000 in 1943, 1944, and 1945. Another flood this year is estimated to have caused losses of another $350,000, and seriously threatened highway bridges only recently replaced and valued at $75,000 and $50,000. Some lives have been lost and heavy damages caused to Government-owned schools and other buildings at Little Eagle in the Standing Rock Indian reservation which will be protected by this dam. The water will be used for irrigation and the estimated cost of $4,800,000 includes a distribution system. Allotments to date total $545,000. The Reclamation Bureau recommended $2,500,000 to expedite construction; the Budget Bureau nothing. The committee proposes adding $300,000 to the $520,000 made available by Congress in this year's regular bill for the Interior Department.

REPUBLICAN BASIN

Three dams, Bonny, Culbertson, and Enders, are proposed for appropriations of $800,000, $300,000, and $700,000, respectively, in this bill, the amount in each case being the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. On Bonny, the Reclamation Bureau recommended $1,000,000; on Culbertson and Enders, the recommendation was the same as that of the Budget Bureau.

Bonny is a new dam in eastern Colorado which will protect towns and important farm lands in Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska, as well as providing water

for irrigation. It will drain 1,779 square miles into a reservoir of 118,000 acre-feet capacity. Total cost is estimated at $25,000,000.

Culbertson Dam, together with Enders, Medicine Creek, and Bonny, will practically take charge of the headwaters of the troublesome Republican River where repeated floods have taken place and damaged much property. Culbertson will drain 1,893 square miles into a reservoir of 170,000 acre-feet capacity. Reservoir and irrigation works will cost $38,000,000. To date $250,000 has been allotted to plans and surveys. The $300,000 requested will permit getting initial rights of way and preliminary construction.

Enders is to drain 2,240 square miles, will have 74,000 acre-feet capacity, will cost $7,000,000, and has been allotted $2,900,000, of which $1,700,000 is carried in the current Interior bill. The additional $700,000 is to expedite construction.

NARROWS DAM

Narrows Dam will be on the South Platte River in northeastern Colorado, draining 13,397 acres into a reservoir of 660,000 acre-feet capacity, estimated to cost $20,000,000 with irrigation works. In addition to protecting important towns and farm properties, the storage will provide water for irrigating a large body of land. The Bureau of Reclamation requested $300,000 to initiate preliminary construction and the Budget Bureau concurred in this amount which the committee is proposing in this bill.

CEDAR BLUFF DAM

Cedar Bluff Dam is getting under way on the Smoky Hill River in central western Kansas. On a tributary of the Kansas River, like the dams on the Republican, this structure will protect valuable farm lands, highways, and towns, as well as contributing materially to lessening flood heights in Kansas City. It will drain 5,270 square miles into a 300,000 acre-foot reservoir. Total cost with irrigation is estimated at $13,000,000, on which $610,000 has been allotted to date. The Reclamation Bureau recommended $700,000; the Budget Bureau $500,000. The committee is proposing $900,000 to expedite the actual construction of this important flood-control project.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, may I say that I am confident this entire group of projects will commend itself to anyone who is sincerely interested in flood control and water conservation in this country. For myself and for others who have worked for years to get a comprehensive program under way in the Missouri River Basin, I wish to say "thank you" to all persons in the Congress and downtown, who have contributed toward the progress that is registered by the items in this bill today.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the people who live in the Seventh and Eighth Congressional Districts of Iowa are grateful to the Committee on Appropriations for making an additional appropriation of $1,000,000 possible for the Little Sioux River watershed soil conservation project during the fiscal year of 1948. This is in addition to the sum of $141,500 previously appropriated for the fiscal year of 1948. The entire sum is now made available for actual work on the project which is already under way. My colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, Hon. BEN F. JENSEN, who is a member of the Appropriations Committee, and myself, who happens to be a member of the Committee on Agriculture, have been very active in urging this additional appropriation, and we therefore are highly pleased that our joint efforts have borne fruit in the passage of this bill. Now the good work of soil conservation in the Little Sioux River Valley can go forth without undue delay. There is nothing more important in agricultural Iowa than the conservation of its soil and the work being done in the Little Sioux Valley is already serving as a pattern for similar soil conservation projects throughout the country. I sincerely hope similar projects may be started in other parts of Iowa soon so that we may eventually rid our great State of the flood hazards which have so seriously affected the production of food in our area during past years and this year in particular.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS SHIPS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] was speaking on the very important matter of surplus ships and their disposal, a number of Members wanted to know how many ships are scheduled to be disposed of. The question, in my opinion, was not answered, and, as a member of the Deficiency Committee handling this matter, I feel it my duty to give some supplemental information in addition to the very valuable statements already made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Regarding the number of vessels now on hand to be disposed of, I wish to state that, in reply to my question, Admiral Cochrane and Mr. Hunter stated that there are some 5,500 surplus vessels on hand presently, to which 1,778 will be added very shortly, making a total number of vessels to be sold or disposed of at approximately 7,278. With the exceptions of the LST and Liberty ships, these vessels are of 1,500 gross tonnage. Under the present plan, the committee was informed that the Commission will liquidate all of these ships by June 30, 1948.

In response to some inquiry as to the original cost of these ships and disposal price, I suggest the reading of the hearing, which is available for Members and which gives full information. However, to answer the question briefly, I will state that the committee was told that a Liberty ship originally costing about $1,500,000 may bring around $75,000 when sold as junk. An LST costs more than a Liberty ship, approximately $1,700,000, and may also bring about seventy or seventy-five thousand dollars when sold as junk. It is now planned, according to the testimony, to advertise about 412 LST's and some other craft for sale as junk. There was some concern on the part of the membership of the committee over testimony which indicated that it will cost the taxpayer more for the operation of selling, caring for, maintaining, repairing, and guarding this gigantic fleet of surplus vessels than we will receive for them. The taxpayers have hundreds of millions of dollars invested in these ships, and although they represent the Victory fleet, I feel a better method of disposal could be launched upon immediately in order to preserve much of this gigantic investment. I have made several suggestions, and at this time I pass one of these suggestions on to the membership of the House for whatever it is worth.

This committee, of which I am a member, heard in great detail the officials who have charge of stock piling critical material which it is stated we will have to have in case of another emergency. This stock piling is the result of an act of Congress and is authorized by law. This committee is now implementing that law with appropriations. This committee was privileged to read the secret document giving the names of the scarce materials which we will have to have and which we must now buy at very high prices to fill the requirements of this stock pile. Without divulging the names of these materials, I wish to state that I have gone over the list carefully. The number of materials run into the hundreds and the cost runs into billions of dollars. Many of these materials can be found on the very ships we are now about to junk or sell as scrap. Although the admirals assured us that these ships were very well screened and all the valuable material taken, I feel that another screening should be had and additional material taken from these ships and placed in the stock pile. Because we are handling these ships at a great loss and because I feel the scrap, steel, metals, and so forth, should also be placed in the stock pile, I suggest that all of these ships be preserved for some future use against a possible emergency.

My suggestions to some members of the committee was to have these ships cut into scrap and store this scrap iron and other material in various parts of the country in order that it can be put to use when the time arrives that it may be needed. This would not only eliminate the necessity of again having scrap drives over the country but would assure industry an instant supply of badly needed material. It could be used not only in case of emergency such as war but could be available for the manufacture of farm implements of which there is presently a great shortage. In our Federal prison institutions there are approximately 18,000 inmates. The Army and Navy have people detained in certain camps. It has been suggested that perhaps these could be used in some way to dismantle these ships and store this valuable material instead of junking it.

For the information of the House I include in my remarks the questions and answers on this very important subject, as developed in committee:

TIME REQUIRED TO DISPOSE OF VESSELS

Mr. STEFAN. May I ask you this question, Mr. Hunter: As I understand it, today you have in sight 7,278 vessels to be disposed of;

that you have some 5,500 on hand, and probably 1,778 that are coming in, making a total of 7,278. Did I understand you to tell the chairman that you are going to liquidate the entire ship program this year?

Mr. HUNTER. Under the present plan, we will liquidate these ships by June 30, 1948.

Mr. STEFAN. 1948?

Mr. HUNTER. Yes. We are disposing of vessels as fast as we can with the resources available to us, and the marketability of the craft and the interest of people to buy.

Mr. STEFAN. The answer to the chairman's question as to whether it would cost more to dispose of and take care of these vessels than we will get out of them is there is still scrap that would be needed.

Admiral COCHRANE. Of course, we originally expected that we could sell them and bring in more funds.

Mr. STEFAN. I got that answer to the chairman's question that they were being held because of the scrap.

Admiral COCHRANE. The bulk of them would be sold.

NUMBER OF VESSELS TO BE DISPOSED OF

Mr. STEFAN. How many of the 7,278 can be sold? Can they be sold so as to get away from this concern of the chairman that they are going to cost more to sell than we will get out of them?

Mr. HUNTER. May I respond to that question?

Admiral COCHRANE. Yes, certainly.

Mr. HUNTER. In connection with the sales of these craft, the Maritime Commission, I believe, on July 14 of this year, gave authority to the managing director of the Purchasing and Sales Department, which position I occupy, to reduce the price on these vessels successively if needed, provided that no individual price reductions were made in excess of one-third of the prior price, with the idea of disposing of them as soon as possible.

Mr. STEFAN. What percentage of the 7,278 were to be sold and what percentage will be scrapped?

Mr. HUNTER. We believe that 7,000 will be sold.

Mr. STEFAN. Out of the 7,278?

Mr. HUNTER. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. What about the 278; are they to be scrapped?

Mr. HUNTER. That does not include the LST's which are large vessels and not small.

Mr. STEFAN. Then my figures are off?

Mr. HUNTER. Yes; the LST's come in.

Mr. STEFAN. Then there are more than 7,278 to be disposed of?

Mr. HUNTER. Involved in this question, but the LST's being in excess of 1,500 gross tons are handled as large vessels.

Mr. STEFAN. What is the total number of vessels to be disposed of in 1948, that you say you will dispose of by the end of June 1948? I have a total of 7,278.

Mr. HUNTER. Yes; plus 412 LST's.

Mr. STEFAN. Plus that number?

Mr. HUNTER. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. That has to be added to the 7,278?

Mr. HUNTER. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. So there are 7,690, total?

Mr. HUNTER. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. And you are going to sell 7,000; out of the 7,690 how many will be scrapped?

Mr. HUNTER. We anticipate that 690 will be scrapped.

Mr. STEFAN. You anticipate 690 will be?

Mr. HUNTER. And 412 sold by scrapping by the Maritime Commission, and the 278 returned to the Navy.

AMOUNT TO BE AVAILABLE IN 1948 FOR CARE OF SHIPS DECLARED SURPLUS

Mr. STEFAN. How much money are you going to have on hand for the care and disposal of these 7,690 ships for the fiscal year 1948?

Mr. HUNTER. In connection with sales?

Mr. STEFAN. Altogether the total amount to be available.

Mr. HUNTER. All that I have available to me in the Maritime Commission for the fiscal year 1948, covering the 7,278 vessels, is the present request, $289,000, in round numbers, within the bill pending before the committee.

Mr. STEFAN. $289,000?

Mr. HUNTER. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. The Navy gets what? I want the combined total, Mr. Hunter, of the whole appropriation for 1948 to liquidate the program by June 1948.

Mr. HUNTER. Yes; the last figure indicated by the chairman as the probable figure for the custody in the Navy was $4,000,000.

Mr. STEFAN. Well, $4,239,000 is the total amount to end, as of June 30, 1948, the program?

Mr. HUNTER. May I add this further item?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. HUNTER. As I said, the 412 LST's which are in my large vessel sales division are handled within that particular division and I do not have the specific dollar amount of sales to date.

Mr. STEFAN. But the committee can be assured that with an appropriation of $4,289,000 this program will be liquidated by June 30, 1948?

Mr. HUNTER. I can only respond that I and the force under my jurisdiction are going to do their utmost so to do.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, this bill carries $300,000 for the Culbertson Dam on the Republican River, and $800,000 for the Bonny Dam on the south fork of the Republican River. It also provides an additional $700,000 for Enders Dam, which will be a great help to the Frenchman Cambridge project. This territory has, throughout the years, suffered most severely from floods. The inauguration of these projects by the Bureau of Reclamation will be very worthwhile from the standpoint of preventing floods as well as promoting irrigation.

I want the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the chairman of this committee, to know that the people of the Republican Valley deeply appreciate the action that his committee has taken today. I regret that the gentleman from Missouri, the ranking minority member on the committee, has raised so many objections.

I also want to add a word of appreciation to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the rest of the committee. The long hours and the detailed work that has been done by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] are largely responsible for this action today. Contrary to assertions made on this floor by the gentleman from Missouri, this bill is well-planned, the distribution of flood-control dams is equitable, and fair, it is sound from an engineering standpoint, and it is wise planning. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is entitled to much credit for the painstaking, unselfish service that he has rendered. Even though he was prime mover in getting action on this matter, he has dealt justly and fairly with the entire Missouri River Basin and we shall be eternally grateful to him.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is to meet a very urgent need and I hope that it passes without a single dissenting vote.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I trust that when the bill is read for amendment that the amendment I shall offer will be accepted. At this time of the session we are, of course, doing as previous Congresses have done, passing deficiencies and supplementals to fill the gaps that may have occurred.

One of these is the extension of the benefits of the Columbia River to the people who reside in the area drained by the Columbia River. Certainly if it must be that the Federal Government take a dominant place in the development of interstate streams, then those whose labors will refund these investments to the Federal Government should be allowed the availability of the power and the water and the other benefits accruing therefrom.

If we are to protect the Government's investment in such dams as Bonneville and Grand Coulee, it can only be through the sale of power, and, in order to properly sell it, it must be extended to those who so justly deserve it.

I shall offer an amendment to make up for a deficiency in the recently passed Interior appropriations bill. Because of this deficiency, many people living in several places in my district were denied these benefits, and I trust that the House in its wisdom will agree to the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that the committee has recommended appropriation of $200,000 to begin construction of the important Moorhead Dam and Reservoir on the Powder River just north of the Montana-Wyoming line.

This is an extremely important flood-control, irrigation, and silt-control project, on one of the most important tributaries to the Yellowstone.

Plans for this reservoir contemplate that it will have a capacity of 390,000 acre-feet. This large storage will be an important factor in controlling the spring run-off on the Yellowstone River, as well as on the Powder River. Only this spring the county seat of Powder River County, the city of Broadus, suffered floods from the river which could have been prevented to a large extent by this dam. These same flood waters contributed to the dangerous flood conditions in the Yellowstone between Glendive and the Missouri River, where much farm land and several small towns in both Montana and North Dakota suffered flood damage. And, of course, it will be a contribution to the flood-control problem of the entire basin. It is this sort of integrated development which is most needed in the Missouri Basin.

I would like to add that water stored by the Moorhead Reservoir will be available for the irrigation of some 42,600 acres of land lying in the valley floor in

Montana. Numerous individual pumping plants will be used in the irrigation project.

While we are discussing flood control, I would like to call to the attention of the House, and particularly to the members of the Subcommittee on Civil Functions of the War Department, an addition which the Senate Appropriations Committee has made to that appropriations bill. I refer to an item of $171,000 for flood control at Forsyth, Mont., on the Yellowstone River.

This is a project which has been authorized by the Congress, in the act of June 22, 1936, and which is badly needed to protect the city of Forsyth.

Had the Appropriations Committee seen fit to include funds requested for the Mission Dam in the bill now before the House, the Forsyth project might have been somewhat less urgent. The Mission Dam would provide flood protection for the valley. Without the Mission Dam, and with little hope for its construction in the near future, it is imperative that steps be taken at once to construct the levees, revetments, and other devices which alone can protect Forsyth from floods each year. I earnestly hope that the conferees for the House will agree to the inclusion of this item in the appropriation for War Department civil functions.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to say something with reference to the appropriation for the Post Office Department. When the regular appropriation bill was before the House a few weeks ago, I thought then that the appropriation for the Post Office Department was inadequate and the fact that this supplemental bill had to be brought in so soon, has shown that the bill presented at that time was inadequate.

Mr. Chairman, the Post Office Department is, I think, without a doubt one of the very finest agencies of our Government. We have had good service for the most part in the postal service and we want to keep it good. More than that, we want to constantly improve the service. After the regular appropriation bill was disposed of a few weeks ago, I had several matters coming up in the postal service in the district which I have the honor to represent, wherein I was advised frankly that the Department did not have the money in sight to do certain things, even though the matters were well founded. One of the most glaring failures in the regular bill was the total inadequacy of the sum for rural routes. The bill allowed for almost no expansion in this respect whatsoever. I was also advised by the Department that under the regular bill there was little or no room for securing better rental post office quarters. This presented a serious problem because during the war many of the rented quarters had not been repaired due to a shortage of material and labor and in many cases the quarters were simply inadequate to the needs of the office.

I want to compliment the committee, Mr. Chairman, for bringing out this supplemental bill which, while it still does not make as much provision for some vital phases of our postal service as experience may show necessary, yet it does materially strengthen the Department and place it in a position to render better service. I am glad that the majority leadership has yielded to the request of the Department to make more adequate provisions for the great postal service, even though, as I said, experience in the next fiscal year may show still a shortage of funds. I am particularly impressed with the view that even the $2,000,000 carried in this supplemental bill will prove to be inadequate to meet the expansion which may be necessary in the rural delivery service. Certainly this branch of the service has been a great contributing factor to the education, peace, and happiness of the people. Only those who have lived in a rural community, such as I was born and reared in, can appreciate the value of this service. I wish very much the committee could have seen fit to increase this sum beyond the sum specified in the bill. If I have an opportunity to vote for more, I will certainly do so. I have always strongly supported the postal service and I shall continue to do so.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to a particular item in this legislation dealing with the loyalty program. You are appropriating in this bill some $16,000,000 without legislation to implement or support the program. I realize there are difficulties that have arisen with respect to this matter, but I do want to call to your attention for a brief moment the fact that an appropriation is being brought to the floor of the House notwithstanding the fact that you do not have legislation to support it.

I am not going to object to it on that ground. If the money should be expended, it ought to go through. Especially since we are so near the end of the session. Over and over again Members in this House have criticized, and rightly so, bills appropriating money without authorization of law.

That is what you are doing when you vote for this item of more than $16,000,000 included in this bill. This House, did by substantial majority, pass legislation—known as the loyalty bill, that provided substantive law to support this kind of appropriation. The House did well in passing that legislation. We have talked time and again on the platform and over the radio about the administration doing things by Executive order instead of by law. Here is a glaring example of that very thing. These funds are to carry out provisions of an Executive order, dealing with the very important problem of loyalty in Government employment. The President issues an order, that can be modified or changed, by further Executive order, and you have nothing to say about it.

There are some cases where minor matters may be handled, for purposes of expedition, where Executive decrees may be in order.

Here, you are dealing with the very important problem of loyal employees in Government. I say to you it is unfair to the country and to the employees to permit such an important matter to be handled by the order of one man and directed by a commission within the Government.

I wonder if you realize how the matter of loyalty in Government has been handled. At least you know it has been most unsatisfactory. Under this Executive order it should be better, but I call attention to the fact that an Executive order is always subject to change. In fact, the present order has already been modified once.

I can well understand why the Civil Service Commission is anxious to deal with the problem by Executive order. That is the policy of the Commission. I do not think, in dealing with this question the Commission's record in handling this particular problem has been particularly commendable.

I am not going to oppose the appropriation, mainly for the reason that most of the funds are to go to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, who, if its agents have the right kind of cooperations, will do a good job. Furthermore, the Commission cannot continue to complain that it does not have funds with which to handle the problem. It is my understanding that when substantive legislation on this subject matter is adopted, the funds appropriated hereunder will be used in support of such legislation.

I want to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee, who has brought to the floor today a bill which appropriates millions of dollars, whether or not we can be protected in the event that legislation passes the House and Senate so that this matter may be dealt with in a legislative manner.

Mr. TABER. The activities that have been provided for here are the items relating to the FBI's check of employees for loyalty. That would be required either under the Executive order or the bill which was passed by the House. We have also appropriated a small sum, $3,500,000, for the purpose of taking care of the operations of the Civil Service Commission that would be required in connection with the FBI investigation. There are not enough funds provided to permit them to set up these loyalty boards. In any event, the funds provided for the FBI would be available if the situation should be that the loyalty bill should become law. That would be available if the bill should pass for what operations they would have to perform under that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute, which is all the time remaining.

Mr. REES. I want to be assured that in the event of the passage of this legislation, funds hereunder would be used to support the legislation passed by this Congress dealing with this very important problem. I do not object to the legislation, because what I want done is to see that the FBI does a good job, and I want to be sure that the thing is done in a proper manner.

Mr. Chairman, a great deal of propaganda has been spread and many misstatements have been made, in opposition to the loyalty bill that passed the House and is now referred to a committee in the other body.

They talk about safeguards for the employees and the public. I challenge anyone who has carefully read and studied both the order and the legislation to show me wherein either the employee or public is protected better under the Executive order than under the bill. Those who oppose the legislation all talk in generalities.

I wish I had time to go into detail and I do not want to burden this House with a lot of repetition but in view of the fact that this House did pass the loyalty bill by a very substantial majority, I feel I should set forth, briefly, the main comparisons between the Executive order and the loyalty bill.

(a) The bill authorizes a loyalty program by law having the same standards and objectives as the loyalty Executive order. Substantive law is necessary before appropriations can be made for this purpose.

(b) The bill contains important basic safeguards omitted from the Executive order and nonexistent at the present time. These are: First, an appeal procedure to a bipartisan board named by the President and approved by the Senate; second, in the bill disloyalty must be shown by a preponderance of the evidence rather than upon the basis of a reasonable doubt as in the Executive order; third, the bill provides one standard of loyalty applied by one board rather than allowing decisions on loyalty to be made by 57 different departments and agencies of the Government; fourth, under the bill FBI conducts all loyalty investigations, but not under the Executive order; and, fifth, the Executive order may be changed at any time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE].

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, the committee chairman and myself have differed as to the manner in which we should rid our Government of subversive and disloyal elements, but we are in agreement that action should be taken. I feel that the committee has been extremely wise in appropriating this money. I do, however, want to call attention to the fact that the job contemplated under the Executive Order of the President, No. 9835, cannot be fully carried out with this amount of money, and that you cannot expect the Civil Service Commission or the FBI to do the job that is placed upon them under the provisions of that Executive order. Probably there will be criticism that they have not done the job that they should do. I want you to realize that a great deal of that, perhaps, will be because of the lack of funds. I am sure all of us have the same idea. That is, that we would like to get rid of disloyal or subversive people. The question of how we shall do it is left to this Congress. But until we have legislation, then I think the Congress ought to enthusiastically support the noble efforts of the President and give him whatever funds are necessary to discharge those responsibilities. I hope you will not criticize the Civil Service Commission for not doing the kind of job it should do, because of the lack of funds made available in this bill.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. SNYDER. It seems to me a peculiar thing that we have to appropriate money to get disloyal people out of the Government employ. If these agencies were on the job they would know who these disloyal people are and they could get rid of them in the regular course of business without even appropriating 1 cent for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the Clerk may read.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the reading of the bill is waived, and is open for amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Ohio: On page 3, line 10, after the comma, strike out "$500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,000,000."

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I do not find it easy to be in disagreement with the action of the committee in setting up the appropriation for this particular item. I wish, however, to explain this amendment to you, if I may, and would like to have your attention for just a few minutes.

This Congress, by unanimous vote of a House committee and a Senate committee, and by the unanimous vote of both the House and the Senate, enacted legislation to set up a special commission, on an absolutely bipartisan basis, in which the Government would be represented by six members, four from the Congress, on a bipartisan basis, and two from the Executive branch of the Government, and in which the general public would be represented by six private citizens, divided evenly as far as politics is concerned. The President promptly signed this bill, and issued a statement saying this Commission and activity were both long overdue.

The Speaker of this House prevailed upon former President Hoover to take a position on the Commission. The President of the United States appointed James Forrestal, the new Secretary of Defense. He appointed George H. Meade, a great industrialist. He appointed the former Under Secretary of State, Dean Acheson. He appointed Mr. Flemming, the head of the Civil Service Commission. The President pro tempore of the Senate named formed Ambassador Kennedy and Dr. Pollack of the University of Michigan. This is a serious job that is to be done. The Commission will be called together and organized immediately after Labor Day, and expects to start its work then. It cannot do its work properly on $500,000 between the first of September and early in January.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The resolution was agreed to unanimously by the Committee on Expenditures and there was no necessity of any hearings being held. Every Member was impressed by a reading of the resolution and his own knowledge and experience here of the importance and necessity of such a Commission. I wanted to ask the gentleman this question: This Commission has a plan for the next year and a half and its budget has got to be planned now. Is not that correct?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It will have to make its plans when it convenes in September. It was impossible, of course, to appear before the committee and give an accurate estimated budget because the Commission had not yet met; nevertheless, at the direction of Chairman TABER and seven members of the Commission, I appeared before the Appropriations Subcommittee to submit a request for an appropriation of $1,000,000.

I have an idea in my mind that Herbert Hoover, Joe Kennedy, the former Ambassador, that Mr. Howe, the former assistant to President Roosevelt, that Jim Forrestal, that none of these men, are going to waste any of this money and that they can be trusted with the million dollars. If they do not need that much I think I can assure you that they are not going to waste it between now and January, but if they feel that they do need it, then it is necessary for them to have it.

I want to point out one more thing about this legislation. We have passed a budget of something like $37,000,000,000. We have a budget estimate in this bill of $220,000,000-plus, with a recommended appropriation of over $100,000,000, and yet we want to give only one-half of 1 percent of this latter amount for this great commission made up of outstanding citizens—with the exception perhaps of one appointed from the House, to begin this great work, to make a study of 1,141 agencies of Government having the rank of bureau or equivalent, and some 2,300 other divisions of the Government. I doubt you can make a good study or a proper survey, and bring about any economy or efficiency by spending less than $15 on each agency.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am sympathetic to the gentleman's project and what he is trying to do. I think he has a great field where he can save the Government a great many million dollars. Perhaps it would help his cause if he would tell us how he expects to use that additional sum of $500,000.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Certainly. This commission and the individual members expect to plan, and are working out plans before the commission is even called together, to set up a staff that will go into the various agencies and divisions of government, make a careful

study of each, and then bring accurate information before this commission sitting, as it were, as a board of directors of a great corporation. There is no greater corporation in the world than the United States Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. In order to do that I suppose you have to have a staff working in the various and sundry departments simultaneously. It would require a large staff?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is right. We have to prepare the report of findings and hand it in to the Congress by January 1949. The study and investigation has to be completed within a year from the first of next November, I would say, because it will take 2 or 3 months for the Commission to reach its final decisions and prepare its report.

Mr. McCORMACK. And the staff must be the best that can be obtained? They have to be highly qualified persons?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; we have to take them from industry and elsewhere all over America, and get the best men for this job that we can find.

Mr. McCORMACK. And they have to be compensated commensurate with their ability and there are ones that will have to make a sacrifice in order to work during this period?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It is thought some of the men that will head studies of various departments will give their time, but we will still have to have a paid staff on down the line.

Mr. CANFIELD Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Will the gentleman tell the committee whether the Commission has held an organizational meeting?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No. I just explained to the House that the Commission will actually begin work following its organization right after Labor Day. But Commission members are already at work, they are passing between themselves suggestions and ideas so they will be able to start work quickly then, because the President said he wanted them to begin as soon as they could. I talked to the White House this week about this very matter. I know the President is anxious to have this great work done because it will be of great benefit to the Congress, and it will be of great benefit to the President if it brings in any reorganization plans.

What can it harm to vote this $1,000,000 now? All of you can agree that men of the type on the Commission are not going to spend the money if they do not need it. They are not going to waste it. I believe you can trust this group of men with this extra $500,000 I am asking. They will either spend it wisely or, if they do not need it, they will not spend it at all. It seems to me common sense not to handcuff them, not to shackle them, not to strangle this investigation at the very outset.

Mr. McCORMACK. The complexion of the Commission is that it is a very strong Commission of outstanding men and the appropriation of a million dollars would be a message to them of the support of the Congress in giving them the machinery to go ahead and do a real job, and would also convey to the country the fact we want them to do a real job?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes. It would show the people that the Congress had confidence in this Commission.

I hope that the committee can accept this amendment. Certainly it should be adopted. It is very important that it be adopted. You may destroy the usefulness of this Commission in its very inception by this action unless you make this amount at least $1,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. Chairman, it is not a pleasant thing to have to rise to oppose an amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, but when the Appropriations Committee has gone into the thing and spent a very considerable time on it, tried to analyze what the picture is, has provided $500,000 for this activity out of recognition for the high character of the men who have been appointed to serve on this Commission, and when we have provided amply, as we shall demonstrate to you beyond any question for this activity, I feel it is my duty to come here and stand up for a fair amount instead of being stampeded. I think the House and the country is entitled to know what the picture is. Let me say to you that no large salaries can be paid by this Commission. The Commission has the power under the civil-service law and the Classification Act to fix the salaries of the employees of that Commission. That is provided in section 7 of the law under which they are to be appointed. They are not allowed to go out and employ people indiscriminately and in violation of the provisions of the civil-service law. The highest rate that could be paid on a WAE, that is, when and as employed basis, would be $38 a day. Expenses, of course, could be paid.

But, assume that they have 100 people on the roll from the first of September to the first of February, when we will be here and can get a real picture of what they might have in mind—and we have no picture as the thing is presented to us—assuming that they have 100 at that rate, and that is double the average rate on the Government pay roll, that would be approximately $50,000 a month or $250,000. Now, it is apparent from that analysis that they do not need anywhere as much as $500,000, and we have provided amply and liberally for them, and way beyond what they probably will need. I regret that they approach the problem on the basis of trying to get more money when we have amply and adequately provided for them.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman states that 100 persons can do this job.

Mr. TABER. Oh, no.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Or that 100 persons would use $50,000 a month. Does the gentleman have any idea that you can make a survey and a study of this Government and get complete information on all the various agencies of this Government with 100 people or 200 people altogether?

Mr. TABER. I do not believe that you can get any kind of a satisfactory staff that will work and have it going before the first of February beyond that number, and I do not believe that any thinking man who has had experience with the operations of the Government would feel that way.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman think that the former President of the United States, the only living ex-President, has any experience with the Government, or knows anything about organization?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman think that the Secretary of the Navy knows anything about it?

Mr. TABER. Yes; and that is why I do not believe they would get beyond the figure, because I think they would then realize the practical situation of what they were doing.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Well, it is just too bad that they do not agree with the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. There has been no evidence to that effect.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman question my integrity and the testimony that I gave at their instructions?

Mr. TABER. Oh, no; not a bit.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Well then, I would not say that there has been no evidence of that.

Mr. TABER. Well, I do not believe that they had any gathering or that they have made any attempt to lay out the job as yet. That is not the information that was given to us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this amendment should be adopted. I think my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has made out a complete case in support of the amendment in the remarks he made in opposition to it. The gentleman said, as I remember, that 100 persons could do the job.

Mr. TABER. Oh, no; I did not say that. I said I did not believe they could build their staff up beyond an average of 100 for the first 5 months.

Mr. McCORMACK. We will take that statement, but of course they have to plan for a year and a half. A commission of this type has to have the money to make its plans for its duration. Suppose you have an average of 100 persons. You have to have some very able persons on this staff. The average salary of this staff is not going to be $3,000. You have to have specialists.

Mr. TABER. Oh, I allowed six, and that is as far as they could go on an

average under the statute they are operating under.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman overlooks the fact that there are expenses other than salaries. The gentleman has allowed $500,000. With 100 persons, that is an average of $5,000 for salary. With the character of specialists who have to be employed in this service, even under civil-service classifications, the average salary of the specialized help would and should run substantially in excess of five or six thousand dollars. I would say it would be around $8,000 on an average.

A former President of the United States, Herbert Hoover, is a member of this Commission. It seems to me, having in mind the importance of the Commission and the complexion of it, that the House, particularly my friends on the Republican side, ought to be glad of the opportunity to show the confidence they have in the personnel of this Commission, particularly the one who is a former President of the United States, who in his day was the leader of his party, and who is one of the outstanding leaders of the party today.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Does not the gentleman believe we have got into the bad habit in the last 5 or 6 years of giving all the committees all the money they want? We are afraid we might contaminate the Republicans, and we do not want to do that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Speaking on the question of contamination, not on the gentleman's observation, because he covers the whole field, the whole world, and it would take an hour to answer him, I have seen some very strange situations of contamination this year where responsibility has been placed on my friends who for 14 years were in the minority.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman could not explain in 10 years all the extravagance the administration has gone into since 1932. That could never be explained.

Mr. McCORMACK. I could not explain to the satisfaction of my friend if I were to live a thousand years why I and others in past years voted for human beings rather than for big business.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania is asking some irrelevant questions, but, getting back to the issue, it seems to me that the House ought to show its confidence in the membership of this Commission by voting for this amendment. It will enable the Commission to plan for a year and a half ahead. It is good, sound business to allow that to be done. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have frequently been told when I was troubled in mind that time heals everything. What a wonderful thing it is on this day to find the former majority leader, the present Democratic whip, extolling the virtues of former President Hoover—magnificent. The gentleman has stated in the well of the House time and time again, and I have heard it day in and day out, about the Hoover depression. That poor man has taken more abuse than perhaps any man in American history.

I am glad to note that at long last my good friend from Massachusetts has cast out of his mind that sort of attitude and now seeks to base his request for support of the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio on the fact that this Commission is now dignified by the membership of one of America's greatest citizens. I hope the gentleman will continue to recognize the great service which the only living ex-President is rendering to the people of America and the world.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. My friend has made a statement which the record will show is not correct. I have never defamed any man, whether he was President or not. I have never defamed the President of the United States. You never heard me make a personal reference to any President, and I have always referred to Mr. Hoover when I had occasion to use his name as the former President of the United States after he was out of office.

Mr. KEEFE. Now you get the suavity of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further for that sort of talk. I have been here 8 or 9 years and I do not have a faulty memory with regard to those things. Everybody in the House is laughing at that statement, including the gentleman himself, because he knows that if there is any man in the country who has been ridiculed and reviled and his record as President of the United States held up to ridicule time and time again on the floor of the House by your party and members of your party, that man is the distinguished man, Mr. Herbert Hoover, ex-President of the United States, whom you are now extolling as a man of the greatest ability to serve on this committee and make a recommendation to the President of the United States.

I simply say that time does cure everything.

The question before us is a very simple one so far as I am personally concerned. I have no objection to it being a million dollars because the Committee on Appropriations has very definitely stated that they will see to it that this committee has every dollar necessary to enable it to function in compliance with orderly appropriation procedure. The Deficiency Committee simply said, "Here is the $500,000. You are not going to get organized until the 1st of September. Go ahead and obligate and get yourselves in shape, and the committee will see to it that you have $2,000,000 or $5,000,000 if it is necessary to do a job."

My good friend from Ohio knows that and so does the gentleman from Massachusetts and every Member of this House knows it. There is no attempt on the part of the Committee on Appropriations in any sense to belabor or belittle or slap in the face or knock down this committee for which we all have the highest regard.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Of course, the gentleman also understands that the Committee on Appropriations of the House will not be functioning again before next January while this Commission will be attempting to function for about 4 or 5 months.

Mr. KEEFE. I think that is true. The gentleman, however, has made his point perfectly clear. I want to see this committee function. So far as I am concerned, I want to say that the Deficiency Committee, of which I am a member, never had any attitude of belaboring or cutting down or hamstringing its activities. The committee wants this legally constituted committee to function and to function properly and see to it that it gets every cent it needs. But I think it ought to be able to come in here after the first of January when it is organized and then say to the Committee on Appropriations, "Here is our program." You may need $1,500,000 or you may need $2,000,000. That is the time to ask for it.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I feel that the committee is entitled to more explanation regarding this amendment. The committee should know that only one witness appeared before the committee requesting $1,000,000 for this Commission. There was no justification and no figures or details were given. We were merely asked to appropriate $1,000,000 for the Commission. We were told that the former President of the United States, the Honorable Herbert Hoover, would be one of the members. Other names were also mentioned. However, I had the information that the Commission was not yet named and not yet formed. Not one employee had yet been selected and it would be several months in my opinion before the Commission could be organized and before any plan could be decided upon. It would be at least the 1st of September or perhaps later before any expenditures could be made. The committee has had considerable experience in this kind of matters and some members felt that perhaps $50,000 would be sufficient for the remainder of this year and that when Congress returns next January the Commission would have some idea of what they were going to do and how many employees they would have to engage and then the Commission could come before Congress and make requests for funds on the basis of real knowledge. It is unfair to appropriate the people's money for proposed programs which are not backed by real justification. Therefore the committee at first reached a figure of $400,000 for this item. After more discussion and more study I offered a motion in committee to increase the $400,000 to $500,000 because I felt this amount would give the Commission a large leeway to make future plans. This motion carried. I do feel, however, that $1,000,000 is a large amount of money and that if we could save that amount at this time it would be one step toward effecting the economy that the people of the country are demanding of Congress today.

The action of the committee in cutting the request in half was in no way intended to cast reflection upon any of the individuals reported to be the members of this very important Commission. The announcement that the former President of the United States, Mr. Hoover, would be one of the members of the Commission met with much approval by all members of the committee, and it was gratifying to learn the unanimity of the members of the committee in their high regard and respect for the great ability of our former President. The committee was also gratified to hear the names of other distinguished men who we are told will make up the membership of this Commission. We are all hopeful that this Commission will make it possible to mold public opinion in America in such a way as to eliminate obsolescence in Government business and bring about real efficiency and real economy. The amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot get an agreement to close debate on this amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. CANNON. Reserving the right to object, I trust we will have 5 minutes on this side.

Mr. TABER. I saw only three Members standing, including the gentleman.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate close in 15 minutes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, when the history of the Eightieth Congress is written, I do not think there will be a more important piece of legislation that we have passed than the establishment of this special high-class Commission to study and untangle the scrambled lines of administrative procedure of this massive Government of ours.

I do not believe that democracy can survive in the future unless a careful analytical study, comprehensively made by men of capacity to bring about a real reorganization of the Government, is made.

I have sat here during the closing days of this session, when congressional committees have been granted a hundred thousand dollars to study one single problem. Yet, here we have a high-grade Commission, including men of great standing and capacity, chosen to study the most mammoth enterprise in the world's history, a hundred times bigger than General Motors, Ford, and A. T. & T., all rolled into one, and we refuse to start them out with sufficient money to do the job.

As a business man I think one fundamental rule always applies, and that is you get exactly what you pay for. An important job demands the best men available. If you want a $400,000 or a $500,000 study and investigation of this vast $37,000,000,000 Government, then cut the cloth too close and you will get just that. This Commission, made up of men of great ability, if they feel that the Congress wants only a $500,000 investigation, they will cut the cloth to fit and they will not proceed to set up the organization of the specialists, experts, and analysts necessary to go into every phase of this Federal Government of ours and come up with the kind of recommendation that the Congress can depend on and act on. Money spent on this study will save many hundred times its amount if agencies and bureau duplications can be eliminated.

I feel this will be the greatest move for economy that the Eightieth Congress could make, to give this group money enough to do the job and start them off with money enough so that they can set up an organization that will do the job. I feel that we can give the $1,000,000 that has been asked for, confident that men like former President Hoover, Jim Forrestal, and the others will return to the Treasury every single red penny that is not necessary to bring about an effective examination and study of the Government organization.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have been in Congress quite a number of years. I have seen many commissions established, some with $10,000 to spend and others with ten times that amount. I have also seen the reports they have brought back to Congress and frequently the report of the $10,000 committee or commission has been better than the ones that received ten times that much. So it is not the amount of money they have as to whether it will be better by having $500,000 or $1,000,000, both sums are extremely large.

We have brought into this picture now ex-President Hoover. Everybody knows he will do his duty as a sound American and I believe every man who has been appointed to this Commission will do likewise, but $500,000 to start a job like this, even though it is a big job, is a lot of money. It is a lot of money in any man's language. If a man knows he has only $500 to spend, he will be more careful than if he knows he has a thousand. Likewise with a commission.

If it has $500,000 to spend they too will be more careful than they would if they knew they had a million dollars to spend. It is a lot of money. They will keep their eyes on what is happening and they certainly can do a lot of work with that amount of money. The thing that tickles me in the wrong spot, however, is the fact that the gentleman from Massachusetts, the minority leader, tries to dig the Republican Party on spending. Just let me show you what his party has been doing since they took office in 1933—and I have been here most of that time. Oh, his spending record is of the highest; I mean the greatest, you know how they have spent the country into prosperity. Oh, what a joy ride. But remember we have the debt—it is here for the taxpayers to pay or go broke. We have only one honest, honorable thing to do—buckle our belt and have economy in Government and now pay for the joy ride, to the tune of 250 billions and more.

In 1933 we were in the red about $20,000,000,000. The first year after the New Deal came in there was a deficit of $1,784,000,000.

In 1934 the New Deal had a deficit of $2,895,000,000; in 1935 the New Deal had a deficit of $3,210,000,000; in 1936 they had a deficit of $4,550,000,000; in 1938 they had a deficit of $3,148,000,000; in 1939 the New Deal had a deficit of $1,384,000,000 and in 1940 they had a deficit of $3,862,000,000.

This means they raised the national debt to over $40,000,000,000 in 7 years time, a time when we were supposed to be at peace. Then, of course, the war came on and the amount jumped by leaps and bounds. During the time the Democratic administration was in power they did not know what a balanced budget was until this year of 1947 and if we had not had an election last fall, in November, at which time a Republican Congress was elected, we would be in the red this year. Would not that have been a further national calamity?

Now you can see what a majority of the Republicans are trying to do. We are trying to economize. I take my hat off to this Appropriations Committee. The chairman of that committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and every member of the Appropriations Committee is trying to cut down in every way possible so that we can give a good account for every dollar of the taxpayers' money that we spend. That is what we want to do here.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this Committee backs up the Appropriations Committee, which can only do what the membership of the House wants it to do, and backs it up in economy. If this commission needs more money later on, it can get the money.

Mr. Chairman, today we have full employment in this country. Everybody is working; everybody is busy. When we adjourn this commission will have full sway in going through these Government departments. They can get the aid and assistance of the departments and the committee. They ought to be able to get the aid and assistance of many men in the departments because they will not be coming up here on the Hill to answer a lot of questions for Members of Congress and congressional committees.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this Committee will support the recommendation made by the Appropriations Committee and vote down this amendment for $500,000.

Be wise and economize.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am surprised at this difference of opinion among our brethren on the other side of the House with reference on a question relating to the ex-

penditure of money. Up to this time when a question arose as to the spending money in the service of the House they have always resolved the matter by agreeing on the highest figure. I naturally took it for granted that they would follow the usual procedure in this instance.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. That only applies to money spent abroad, not money spent for internal improvement such as rural electrification and rural free delivery.

Mr. CANNON. It certainly includes all money spent by the House on itself.

Mr. Chairman, may I say very sincerely that I am much impressed with both the purpose and personnel of this important commission. I have the greatest confidence in the gentleman from Ohio and in his associates on that commission. But I would not rush in where angels fear to tread and intervene in a family controversy over on that side of the aisle. So let me say I will assume a neutral position and permit them to settle the matter among themselves. However with this reservation: The character and duties of men who will compose this commission are such that they well not be in a position to render continued, sustained service such as will be required on a long and intricate investigation such as is proposed here.

Necessarily they will have to leave the details largely to their staff, and they will merely supervise the work. So, I would like to remind them that in the selection of the staff, those who must be depended on to really do the work, it is incumbent on them to select men of ability who will render a nonpartisan and impartial service, because if they do not, the report will be worthless and a vast amount of time and money will have been wasted. This is a matter in which we should have men of the highest caliber and of the most disinterested impartiality, and with that reservation, Mr. Chairman, I am glad to support the gentleman from Ohio and his Commission, and I am anxious to cooperate in adequately implementing their work.

But, whether it takes $1,000,000 or $500,000 or $250,000 we must necessarily leave to the decision of the other side of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BROWN of Ohio) there were—ayes 54, noes 56.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. TABER and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 80, noes 72.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HORAN: On page 7, after line 12, insert "For an additional amount for the Bonneville Power Administration for the same objects as contained under this heading in the Interior Department Appropriation Act of 1948, to cover service connections in northeast Washington, $405,685."

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, when the Interior Department appropriations bill finally got through conference it contained some $13,500,000 for the Bonneville Power Administration, which distributes the power generated at Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams. When the conference report was reported to the floor it was discovered that a provision that would have served the small users in my district and in other parts of the area which had been inserted by Senate had been stricken out in the conference. An effort was made here to restore that item, without success.

On yesterday I appeared before the deficiency subcommittee holding hearings on the second supplemental appropriation bill and explained the effect of the action of the conference on the Interior Department appropriation bill. Both I and my colleague from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] were very well received. I was informed this morning at the meeting of the whole committee that the item I seek to have here inserted had been taken care of on the Senate side. I checked with the Senate. It is the only one that has been left out. I know the disposition on the part of the subcommittee is to be sympathetic with this item. I call your attention to this item now because it is my understanding that this omission is a complete oversight.

Most of the generating sites in the whole Columbia River are in the district affected by this omission. The inclusion of this amount will serve one city and two counties in my district, which, because of their geographical location, are somewhat isolated. They are sparsely populated, and the people in these counties have gotten together to set up their own distributing system in order to also share in the power generated on the Columbia River. It will serve also three small REA's. This construction is under way now in this area, but the effect of this Interior appropriation will be to stop all construction and deprive these small people of what I think is justly theirs. This is self-liquidating, and this money will be returned to the Treasury.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. As I understand it, the power necessary to supply those areas is now being generated at the Grand Coulee Dam, and unless these lines are provided those people will be denied its use.

Mr. HORAN. That is right.

I hope the Committee will agree to the inclusion of this amendment. I might say I personally feel it is an oversight. I feel that way because other items which were considered in the deficiency committee yesterday were allowed on the Senate side. I think these people are entirely justified in their claims upon this power. I hope the Committee in its wisdom and in justice will allow this item.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this was not included in full in the Interior bill as it came to the House nor as it went out of the House. No amendment was offered to try to include it. It went to the Senate and all of those items went out and a large grid was put in costing about $5,000,000 for power construction at Bonneville. After they had a conference lasting a couple of weeks they worked out a program and came back here.

I do not see how the House can go ahead and put in a lot of other items for special interests in special districts. I think it is about time that we began to do business and have it over with. I do not believe we ought to increase any appropriation at this time or go ahead with anything of that kind.

I did not tell the gentleman from Washington that this was put in in the Senate. I told him that I understood the Senate had put an item in. I did not tell him that it was in. All I knew was what was in the newspaper. He went over to the Senate. But I hope the House will not add this item to the bill. It was not in the bill the way it came from the House, except a very small item. I do not think we should go ahead and upset a conference report that was adopted 2 or 3 days ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to get into the crossfire of this family row now raging on the Republican side between the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN], but I do want to discuss this amendment.

When the Grand Coulee Dam was being built, there were certain interests that wanted to cut it off and make it a low dam. I led the fight to complete the dam, in order to supply that area with cheap electricity for all time to come. I voted with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] a few moments ago against the extra million dollars for the European joy ride that seems to be very, very popular just now.

For that reason, I suggest that Members go home and face the farmers rather than go abroad and listen to people talk they cannot understand.

But here is something that vitally affects the people of the Grand Coulee area. They are entitled to this service. I, for one, shall support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] to provide these lines. It is absolutely useless to build a dam and refuse to build transmission lines.

Oh, I know that is the old scheme of the Power Trust. That is what they tried to do with Muscle Shoals. They were buying power at Muscle Shoals at 1.59 mills a kilowatt-hour 15 years ago, and selling it in sight of the dam at 10 cents a kilowatt-hour. As far as I am concerned, I do not intend for them to get their hands on this power at the Grand Coulee Dam. All this stuff about turning it over to them at the bus bar

you might as well forget, because the American people are going to demand the benefits of their water power. It is public power and should be used for the use of all the people.

The people of Washington are not looking to me to protect their interests, but they are Americans. They live within the area to be served by the Grand Coulee Dam. I voted for money to construct that great dam, and the only way we can ever hope to pay for it is by selling the power to the people of that area. You cannot distribute that power without transmission lines. I was utterly shocked the other day when the House turned down transmission lines for the State of Oregon, who wanted to connect up with the Bonneville Dam.

Now, if that is the program you want to follow, I want to say that I shall not go along with it, but I shall vote for this additional fund, which is less than half what you just appropriated at one fell swoop for additional money for this international program you have set up here that is just leading us on and on into unlimited expenses and probably into international complications.

I shall vote for this amendment, and I hope every other Member of the House will do the same thing, because the people of that area are entitled to the benefits of this great development. The Grand Coulee is the greatest dam on earth today from the standpoint of power generation. The people of that area, as I said, are entitled to its benefits. I think we should see to it that they get those benefits. The way to do it is to provide these transmission lines for that purpose.

I hope the gentleman's amendment will prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HORAN) there were—ayes 31, noes 49.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: On page 9, line 10, strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$2,500,000."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, it seems that the rural people are being overlooked, not only in providing rural electrification, but also in providing rural free delivery.

I am offering this amendment simply to restore the amount that was asked for by the Bureau of the Budget, $2,500,000, which the committee has cut down to $2,000,000.

Every Member of Congress who represents a rural district is getting appeals for the extension of rural routes, and when they send them down to the department and get them approved, the Department comes back and says that it does not know when it can put them into effect because it has not the funds. Yet here, while we are spending billions in Europe, the committee cuts this amount from $2,500,000 recommended by the budget to $2,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, it is an awfully hard matter to get attention when you are speaking for the American farmers. I do not blame some of the Members for wanting to go to Europe on these trips instead of going back home and facing the farmers and their wives, after what has been done in this House, because, believe me, you are going to hear from them when they read the record you made here on rural electrification the other day, and then read this RECORD where you have cut down the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget for rural free delivery for extending mail service to the farm homes of the Nation.

I am offering an amendment merely to raise the amount to what the budget recommended. In my opinion even that will not be sufficient, but it will be an improvement certainly over the $2,000,000 provided by the committee.

The time has come when if we are going to maintain this Government and the American way of life, you are going to have to see to it that the people in the rural districts are provided with those necessities and conveniences that are enjoyed elsewhere in the world, and the one thing they are most interested in, outside of rural electrification, is getting the mail to their doors.

If we are going to provide free delivery to one person we should provide it to all. These routes have already been approved. If you do not believe it go down to the Department and find out; and just why, in the name of common sense, this committee would take it on itself to cut this amount from $2,500,000 down to $2,000,000 when even $2,500,000 is not sufficient, I cannot understand. I hope the House will adopt my amendment providing these additional funds to take the mail to the farm homes of the Nation.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. Chairman, may I point out to the Committee briefly that the Appropriations Committee has provided $129,000,000 in the regular 1948 supply bill for this item. The $2,000,000 herein provided today is in addition to that amount and covers in large part moneys for accumulated leave. The subcommittee in charge of Post Office appropriations unanimously agreed that this is sufficient to carry the Department through the fiscal year. The amendment on which we are to vote should be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 26, noes 58.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DONDERO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4347) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 47, noes 63.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 147, nays 234, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 130]

YEAS—147

Albert	Garmatz	Miller, Md.
Allen, Calif.	Gillette	Monroney
Allen, La.	Goff	Morgan
Anderson, Calif.	Gordon	Morris
Andresen, August H.	Gore	Morrison
	Gorski	Morton
Angell	Grant, Ind.	Mundt
Banta	Hagen	Murdock
Bender	Hale	Nixon
Bennett, Mich.	Hardy	Norton
Bennett, Mo.	Harless, Ariz.	O'Hara
Bishop	Hart	Pace
Bloom	Havenner	Passman
Boggs, La.	Hess	Patman
Boykin	Hill	Patterson
Brown, Ga.	Holifield	Peden
Buchanan	Holmes	Peterson
Burke	Hope	Pfeifer
Burleson	Huber	Philbin
Byrne, N. Y.	Jackson, Calif.	Ploeser
Camp	Jackson, Wash.	Poage
Carroll	Johnson, Okla.	Price, Fla.
Chenoweth	Johnson, Tex.	Price, Ill.
Clippinger	Jones, Ala.	Priest
Coffin	Jones, Wash.	Ramey
Cole, Kans.	Karsten, Mo.	Redden
Cooley	Kefauver	Reeves
Cooper	Kennedy	Riley
Corbett	Keogh	Rizley
Cox	King	Rogers, Fla.
Cravens	Klein	Rogers, Mass.
Davis, Ga.	Lane	Rooney
Davis, Tenn.	Lanham	Sabath
Dawson, Ill.	Larcade	Sadowski
Deane	Lea	Sasscer
Delaney	Lesinski	Schwabe, Mo.
Dingell	Lewis	Seely-Brown
Donohue	Lodge	Smith, Va.
Dorn	Lusk	Snyder
Douglas	McCormack	Somers
Eberharter	McGregor	Stigler
Ellsworth	Madden	Vorys
Engle, Calif.	Mahon	Walter
Evins	Manasco	Weichel
Fallon	Mansfield	Welch
Feighan	Marcantonio	Wilson, Tex.
Fernandez	Mathews	Wolverton
Flannagan	Meade, Md.	Woodruff
Foote	Miller, Calif.	
Forand	Miller, Conn.	

NAYS—234

Abernethy	Gathings	Murray, Wis.
Almond	Gavin	Nodar
Andersen, H. Carl	Gearhart	Norblad
	Gillie	Norrell
Andrews, Ala.	Goodwin	O'Brien
Andrews, N. Y	Gossett	O'Konski
Arends	Graham	Owens
Auchincloss	Grant, Ala.	Phillips, Calif.
Bakewell	Gregory	Phillips, Tenn.
Barden	Griffiths	Pickett
Barrett	Gross	Plumley
Bates, Ky.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Potts
Bates, Mass.	Gwynne, Iowa	Preston
Battle	Hall,	Rains
Beall	Leonard W.	Rankin
Beckworth	Halleck	Reed, Ill.
Bell	Hand	Reed, N. Y.
Blackney	Harness, Ind.	Rees
Boggs, Del	Harris	Rich
Bolton	Harrison	Richards
Bonner	Hartley	Richlman
Bradley	Hedrick	Rivers
Bramblett	Hendricks	Robertson
Brehm	Herter	Robsion
Brooks	Heselton	Rockwell
Brophy	Hobbs	Rohrbough
Bryson	Hoeven	Ross
Buck	Horan	Russell
Buffett	Howell	Sadlak
Busbey	Hull	St. George
Butler	Jarman	Sanborn
Byrnes, Wis.	Javits	Sarbacher
Canfield	Jenkins, Ohio	Schwabe, Okla.
Cannon	Jenkins, Pa.	Scoblick
Carson	Jennings	Scott, Hardie
Case, N. J.	Jensen	Scott,
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Calif.	Hugh D., Jr.
Chadwick	Johnson, Ill.	Scrivner
Chapman	Johnson, Ind.	Shafer
Chelf	Jones, Ohio	Sheppard
Chiperfield	Jonkman	Short
Church	Judd	Sikes
Clark	Kean	Simpson, Ill.
Clason	Kearney	Simpson, Pa.
Clevenger	Kearns	Smith, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.	Keating	Smith, Maine
Colmer	Keefe	Smith, Wis.
Cotton	Kerr	Spence
Coudert	Kilburn	Springer
Crawford	Kilday	Stanley
Crosser	Knutson	Stefan
Crow	Kunkel	Stevenson
Cunningham	Landis	Stockman
Curtis	Latham	Stratton
Dague	LeCompte	Sundstrom
Davis, Wis.	LeFevre	Taber
Dawson, Utah	Lemke	Talle
D'Ewart	Love	Teague
Dolliver	Lyle	Thomas, N. J.
Domengeaux	McConnell	Thomas, Tex.
Dondero	McCowen	Tibbott
Doughton	McDonough	Towe
Drewry	McDowell	Trimble
Durham	McGarvey	Twyman
Eaton	McMahon	Vail
Elliott	McMillan, S. C.	Van Zandt
Ellis	McMillen, Ill.	Vursell
Elston	Mack	Wadsworth
Engel, Mich.	MacKinnon	Wheeler
Fellows	Maloney	Whitten
Fenton	Martin, Iowa	Whittington
Fisher	Meade, Ky.	Wigglesworth
Fletcher	Merrow	Williams
Fogarty	Meyer	Wilson, Ind.
Folger	Michener	Winstead
Fulton	Miller, Nebr.	Wolcott
Gallagher	Mills	Wood
Gamble	Mitchell	Worley
Gary	Muhlenberg	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—50

Allen, Ill.	Granger	Macy
Arnold	Hall,	Mason
Bland	Edwin Arthur	Murray, Tenn.
Blatnik	Hays	O'Toole
Brown, Ohio	Hébert	Poulson
Buckley	Heffernan	Powell
Bulwinkle	Hinshaw	Rabin
Celler	Hoffman	Rayburn
Clements	Jenison	Rayfiel
Cole, Mo.	Jones, N. C.	Smathers
Combs	Kee	Smith, Ohio
Courtney	Kelley	Taylor
Devitt	Kersten, Wis.	Thomason
Dirksen	Kirwan	Tollefson
Elsaesser	Lucas	Vinson
Fuller	Ludlow	West
Gifford	Lynch	Youngblood

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Hoffman with Mr. Vinson.

Mr. Taylor with Mr. Jones of North Carolina.

Mr. Cole of Missouri with Mr. Hays.

Mr. Macy with Mr. Courtney.

Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Blatnik.

Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall with Mr. Smathers.

Mr. Allen of Illinois with Mr. Granger.

Mr. Hinshaw with Mr. Hébert.

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Kirwan.

Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin with Mr. Lynch.

Mr. Arnold with Mr. Heffernan.

Mr. Devitt with Mr. Lucas.

Mr. Mason with Mr. O'Toole.

Mr. Gifford with Mr. Rabin.

Mr. Dirksen with Mr. Kelley.

Mr. Jenison with Mr. Celler.

Mr. Elsaesser with Mr. Buckley.

Mr. Youngblood with Mr. Combs.

Mr. Tollefson with Mr. Kee.

Mr. Poulson with Mr. Clements.

Mr. BISHOP changed from voting "present" to "yea."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RANKIN moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 9, line 10, after the words "rural delivery service", strike out the figure "$2,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$2,500,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 46, noes 163.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPFAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and ninety-two Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. RAYBURN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I want to take the House entirely into my confidence. I assume that on that side and on this side there have been 40 people come to me to get my consent to their calling up bills by unanimous consent. Until I am better satisfied than I am now about some action the House may take on the matter it appears they are trying to transfer from the other body to this body, I think we will not have anything else by unanimous consent. I regret it very much. However, Mr. Speaker, on account of conditions in his family at home, I will not object to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] getting unanimous consent at this time to correct an error in a bill.

The SPEAKER. Does that apply to extensions of remarks?

Mr. RAYBURN. It does, for today.

The SPEAKER. In view of the statement of the gentleman from Texas, the Chair cannot entertain the request of the gentleman from Missouri.

MINERAL LEASING ACT FOR ACQUIRED LANDS

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3022) to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, gas, and sulfur on lands acquired by the United States, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 2, line 4, after "437," insert "30."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FILING OF CONFERENCE REPORTS

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, if I understood correctly the statement of the gentleman from Texas, it would not apply to the business of the House with respect to filing conference reports.

The SPEAKER. As the Chair understood the position of the minority leader, that applies to unanimous-consent requests on anything today.

Mr. RAYBURN. I will not object to filing conference reports, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Those, of course, are privileged.

Mr. WOLCOTT. For the purpose of crystalizing this issue, can the Chair entertain a unanimous-consent request that a committee have until midnight to file a report, and that conferees have until midnight tonight to file a conference report?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would suggest the gentleman submit that to the minority leader. The Chair is perfectly willing to entertain such a request.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I understand that it has been submitted to him indirectly.

Mr. RAYBURN. I will say that for today I will not object to the filing of conference reports or to requests to have until midnight tonight to file them. I will not say that that agreement will carry on for tomorrow and Saturday.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I thank the gentleman.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Banking and Currency have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (S. 1070) to provide for the cancellation of the capital stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the refund of moneys received for such stock, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

S. 1361 AND SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 148

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file conference reports on the bill, S. 1361, and the resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 148.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what are these conference reports? I do not remember the bill and resolution by their number.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the bill, S. 1361, is the bill which activates the USHA in respect to local housing authorities paying the difference between the statutory limitation and the amount it actually costs to construct these dwellings.

Mr. SABATH. What are the conferees agreeing on?

Mr. WOLCOTT. We have not agreed on anything yet. We are in conference this afternoon but we hope to agree before very long. We would like to file the reports tonight so that it will be in order to take them up tomorrow if we do agree.

The resolution has to do with consumer credit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. May I ask the minority leader if the policy which he announced would apply for the rest of the day so far as any unanimous-consent requests are concerned would apply to requests to take bills from the Speaker's desk which have passed the House unanimously for the purpose of agreeing to those bills with Senate amendments.

Mr. RAYBURN. My objection would apply to that also.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Would that be in force tomorrow also?

Mr. RAYBURN. That is a question that somebody else can answer besides me.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3131) entitled "An act to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended."

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendment No. 2 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 758) entitled "An act to promote the national security by providing for a National Security Organization, which shall be administered by a Secretary of National Security, and for a Department of the Army, a Department of the Navy, and a Department of the Air Force within the National Security Organization, and for the coordination of the activities of the National Security Organization with other departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1721. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of injuries sustained by G. R. Below, late of Seattle, Wash.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. PLOESER submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3756) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3756) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 17, 19, 24, 26, 29, and 34.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 11, 12, 16, 23, 25, 27, 28, 30, and 31, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$18,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "one hundred and sixty-one"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided*, That of said unexpended balance, not less than $12,000,000 is to be available for the construction of the Watauga and South Holston Dams"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 13 of said amendment strike out the figure "$4,714,397" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$4,125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Tennessee Valley Authority: Not later than June 30, 1948, and not later than June 30 of each calendar year thereafter, until a total of $348,299,240 has been paid as herein provided, the board of directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority shall pay from net income derived the immediately preceding fiscal year from power operations (such net income to be determined by deducting power operating expenses, allocated common expense, and interest on funded debt from total power operating revenues) not less than $2,500,000 of its outstanding bonded indebtedness to the Treasury of the United States exclusive of interest, and such a portion of the remainder of such net income into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts as will, in the ten-year period ending June 30, 1958, and in such succeeding ten-year period until the aforesaid total of $348,239,240 shall have been paid, equal not less than a total of $87,059,810, including payment of bonded indebtedness exclusive of interest on such bonded indebtedness. Total payments of not less than $10,500,000 shall be made not later than June 30, 1948.

"Amounts equal to the total of all appropriations herein and hereafter made to the Tennessee Valley Authority for power facilities shall be paid by the board of directors thereof, in addition to the total of $348,239,240 specified in the foregoing paragraph,

to the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, such payments to be amortized over a period of not to exceed forty years after the year in which such facilities go into operation."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided*, That $175,000 shall be available only for the audit and revision of past accounting records"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of said amendment strike out the figure "$290,600" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 307. Section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act (Public Law 248, 79th Congress) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 104. The Budget programs transmitted by the President to the Congress for the fiscal year 1949 and each year thereafter shall be considered and legislation shall be enacted making necessary appropriations, as may be authorized by law, making available for expenditure for operating and administrative expenses such corporate funds or other financial resources or limiting the use thereof as the Congress may determine and providing for repayment of capital funds and the payment of dividends. The provisions of this section shall not be construed as preventing Government corporations from carrying out and financing their activities as authorized by existing law, nor as affecting the provisions of section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended. The provisions of this section shall not be construed as affecting the existing authority of any Government corporation to make contracts or other commitments without reference to fiscal year limitations.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 308. Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act (Public Law 248, 79th Congress) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'This title shall apply to the same extent as to wholly owned Government corporations and for the same purposes to the following mixed ownership Government corporations: (1) the Central Bank for Cooperatives and the regional banks for cooperatives, (2) Federal home loan banks, and (3) Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, so long as these corporations have funds of or loans from the Government of the United States.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 9 and 21.

WALTER C. PLOESER,
BEN F. JENSEN,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
F. R. COUDERT, JR.,
GEORGE MAHON,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
ALBERT GORE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HOMER FERGUSON,
CLYDE M. REED,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3756) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DIRECT APPROPRIATIONS

Amendment No. 1 appropriates $18,700,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority, instead of $22,143,500 as proposed by the House and $13,117,521 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2 restores the House language making available not to exceed $3,253,979 of the appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority for the construction of South Holston and Watauga Dams.

Amendments Nos. 3 and 4 earmark not to exceed $5,000,000 of the appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority for chemical plant, instead of $6,686,000 as proposed by the House and $3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; and deletes language proposed by the House and language proposed by the Senate which would have imposed unworkable restrictions upon the use of the funds so earmarked.

Amendment No. 5 strikes out the authority for the Tennessee Valley Authority to purchase aircraft as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6 authorizes the Tennessee Valley Authority to purchase 161 automobiles, instead of 221 as proposed by the House and 100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7 inserts the provision of the Senate earmarking $12,000,000 of the 1947 reappropriated balance of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the construction of the Watauga and South Holston Dams, amended to provide that "not less than" $12,000,000 of such balance shall be available for such construction.

Amendment No. 8 appropriates for the Office of the Housing Expediter $4,125,000, instead of $3,539,080 as proposed by the House and $4,714,397 as proposed by the Senate. The amount proposed by the House was earmarked for liquidation of this Office, and the increased amount is to enable the Housing Expediter to perform his functions pursuant to title I of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 prior to completion of such liquidation.

Amendment No. 9, relating to salaries and expenses, Office of the Administrator, National Housing Agency, is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 10 appropriates $4,000,000 for the payment of contributions to public housing agencies, instead of $2,200,000 as proposed by the House and $5,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11 strikes out the provision that no part of the appropriation for the payment of annual contributions to public housing agencies shall be used to pay such contributions unless the amount otherwise due is reduced by one-half the outstanding reserves on the books of such agency. It is the intention of the managers on the part of the two Houses that the reserves on hand be utilized by the respective agencies for the purposes for which such reserves were created. It is further intended by the managers that the Federal Public Housing Authority shall so exercise its authority with respect to local housing agencies as to effect and maintain a reduction in the amount of the reserves maintained by individual housing agencies as may be excessive.

TITLE II

Amendment No. 12 corrects an error in printing.

Amendment No. 13 restores the proposal of the House whereby the Tennessee Valley Authority is required to pay to the Treasury over a period of 40 years the amount of $348,239,240 representing the Federal investment in its power facilities, and requiring that one-fourth of such amount be paid in each 10-year period of such 40 years; but amends such proposal by striking out the requirement that not less than 40 percent of its net power income be paid into the Treasury each year.

Amendment No. 14 provides that not to exceed $1,400,000 of the funds available to the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration may be used for administrative expenses, instead of not to exceed $1,250,000 as proposed by the House and not to exceed $1,550,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15 provides that not to exceed $3,250,000 of the funds available to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation may be used for administrative expenses, instead of not to exceed $3,000,000 as proposed by the House and not to exceed $3,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16 provides that not to exceed $20,000,000 of the funds of the Federal Housing Administration may be used for administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate, instead of not to exceed $17,624,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17 provides that the amounts available to the Federal Public Housing Authority for administrative expenses shall include not to exceed $2,200,000 of the funds available for administrative expenses for the United States Housing Act program as proposed by the House, instead of not to exceed $2,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18 provides that not to exceed $11,500,000 of the funds available to the Federal Public Housing Authority may be used for administrative expenses, instead of not to exceed $10,400,000 as proposed by the House and not to exceed $13,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19 restores the House provision whereby the number of officers and employees of the Federal Public Housing Authority receiving compensation in excess of $4,500 per annum shall not exceed 20 percent of the total number of employees of the Authority.

Amendment No. 20 provides that $175,000 of the funds available to the Federal Public Housing Authority shall be available for the audit and revision of past accounting records as proposed by the Senate; and, as amended, "only" for such audit and revision.

Amendment No. 21, relating to the Defense Homes Corporation, is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 22 inserts the provision of the Senate for costs of penalty mail for the National Housing Agency by transfer from

funds available for administrative expenses of the Office of the Administrator and the constituent units of the agency, amended to provide for such transfers in an amount not not exceeding $250,000 instead of $290,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23 provides that not to exceed $400,000 of the administrative expense funds of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation shall be available for payment to the Farm Credit Administration for supervisory or other services rendered as proposed by the Senate, instead of $275,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 24 restores the House provision permitting the Federal intermediate credit banks to purchase not to exceed 10 automobiles.

Amendment No. 25 provides that not to exceed $181,250 of the administrative expense funds of the Federal intermediate credit banks shall be available for payment to the Farm Credit Administration for supervisory or other services rendered as proposed by the Senate, instead of $125,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 26 provides that the production credit corporations may purchase not to exceed 15 automobiles as proposed by the House instead of not to exceed 5 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27 provides that not to exceed $232,000 of the administrative expense funds of the production credit corporations shall be available for payment to the Farm Credit Administration for supervisory or other services rendered as proposed by the Senate, instead of $160,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 28 provides that not to exceed $29,000 of the administrative expense funds of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., shall be available for payment to the Farm Credit Administration for supervisory or other services rendered as proposed by the Senate, instead of $20,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 29 strikes out the provision proposed by the Senate authorizing the Virgin Islands Company to borrow $500,000 from the Treasury of the United States.

TITLE III

Amendment No. 30 strikes out the provision proposed by the House whereby no funds of any corporation or agency included in the accompanying bill may be used to pay other than a Government agency for an independent audit unless approved by the Comptroller General.

Amendment No. 31 provides that with respect to the transfer of title to office buildings at the seat of government to the United States, as required by section 306 of the accompanying bill, the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency shall make a final determination of the value of the property in case of disagreement by the Secretary of the Treasury and the head of the transferor corporation, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32 restores the language proposed by the House amending section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945; but with amendments thereto providing that the budget programs transmitted by the President to the Congress thereunder shall be "for the fiscal year 1949 and each year thereafter"; changing the words "making available for use such corporate funds or other financial resources or limiting the use thereof as the Congress may determine" to read "making available for expenditure for operating and administrative expenses such corporate funds or other financial resources" etc.; and striking out the words "Except as provided in such legislation" which preceded the words "the provisions of this section shall not be construed as preventing" etc.

Amendment No. 33 restores the language proposed by the House amending section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945 but with an amendment at the end of such language, "so long as these corporations have funds of or loans from the Government of the United States."

Amendment No. 34 changes the section number to conform with the action taken on previous amendments.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

Amendment No. 9 relates to salaries and expenses, Office of the Administrator, National Housing Agency. The managers on the part of the House have authorized a motion that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That there shall be transferred to this account not to exceed $765,000 of the funds available under sections 303 and 502 of Public Law 849, Seventy-sixth Congress, as amended; such total funds to be available for all necessary administrative expenses of the Office of the Administrator."

Amendment No. 21 relates to the Defense Homes Corporation. The managers on the part of the House have authorized a motion that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

WALTER C. PLOESER,
BEN F. JENSEN,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
F. R. COUDERT, Jr.,
GEORGE MAHON,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
ALBERT GORE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3756) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have some information from the gentleman as to what it contains.

Mr. PLOESER. It is a unanimous report on the part of the conferees on the Government corporations appropriation bill.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, this is the result of the conference between the two bodies on the Government corporations appropriation bill. There is no point of this report in which the House and Senate are in actual disagrement. There is a parliamentary situation which calls for a technical disagreement on two amendments, but outside of that we are in agreement.

The bill as it stands now is, in actual appropriations out of the Treasury $35,040,000, whereas it originally passed the House at $30,097,000. For those administrative expenses which were authorized and limited, that did not come out of the Treasury but out of the capital funds or operating funds of the various Government corporations, the conferees have agreed on $45,535,000 as compared to an original passage in the House of $41,649,000 and as compared to passage in the Senate of $47,235,000.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There was controversy over sections 307 and 308. Will the gentleman advise the House what was done with these sections by the conferees?

Mr. PLOESER. I shall be most happy to. Section 307 of the bill as it left the House was language which intended to make more clear the language which was contained in section 104 of the Government Corporations Control Act of 1945. Changes made in the conferences in this language, I think, meet the objections of all the objectors. As the language comes from the conference it means what we thought it meant when it left the House. It, however, seems to be more satisfactory to more people and the conferees are unanimously satisfied with the work they have done.

Section 308 adds certain additional corporations, mixed ownership corporations, to the same Government control of budgeting that applies to certain other mixed corporations and all wholly owned Government corporations.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does it take in the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation?

Mr. PLOESER. It does take in the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. It takes in the Central Bank for Cooperatives and the Regional Bank for Cooperatives, and the Federal home loan banks.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is the gentleman of the opinion that the limitations placed in the conference report upon these cooperative lending agencies and on the FDIC will not be a restriction upon their activities so that they can do legitimate business?

Mr. PLOESSER. The bill as it left the House did not prevent any of them from doing anything that was authorized in the authority setting them up as corporations. That seemed to point up some discussion and some differences of opinion. I am expressing now the intent on the part of the House and on the part of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Attention might be called to the fact that in the conference report which results in the bringing in of these mixed corporations action is deferred until the fiscal year 1949. If in the meantime FEIP wants to pay back the amount of Federal funds it has, it will be exempted. All are exempted until the fiscal year 1949. In the mean-

time, there will be full and complete hearings to determine whether any change shall be in order. Whether there will be or not I do not know but they are under control up to the fiscal year 1949.

Mr. PLOESER. As a matter of fact, the statement the gentleman from Mississippi has just made not only applies to these mixed corporations that are here put into the bill by this action, but it also liberalizes the same provision so far as all other Government corporations already in the act are concerned. In other words, any corporation that has paid out into private hands and gets out from Government ownership or out of Government credit is permitted to go on its own, which was one of the original intentions of the Government Corporations Control Act. It applies to banks, cooperatives, farm and home loan banks, and so forth.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman feel it would be in the purview of the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Agriculture to pass legislation on the extent of the operation of these corporations without interfering with the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. PLOESER. Well, I imagine the gentleman is most serious in his question.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I certainly am because this is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. PLOESER. There is no question about that.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We think, and I say this in all kindness, that the legislative committee should have opportunity to examine it and to work cooperatively with the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. PLOESER. I may say to the gentleman that the legislation contained in this bill was given a rule unanimously by the Rules Committee, it passed the House unanimously and, furthermore, it is an amendment to the Government Corporations Control Act which did not come out of the Committee on Agriculture but came out of the Committee on Executive Expenditures. It was cleared with the chairman of that committee before a rule was requested and likewise cleared with the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee in the event there might be some confusion as to jurisdiction.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I recognize, of course, due to the Reorganization Act there are some jurisdictional questions involved on legislation. The Committee on Agriculture, however, is supposed to have jurisdiction over farm credit.

Mr. PLOESER. We have no objection to that and do not seek to change the situation.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We hope the Appropriations Committee will recognize that shortly.

Mr. PLOESER. The Appropriations Committee not only recognizes it but is agreeable.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. Will the gentleman be a little more explicit in stating just what changes have been made in the conference report as far as section 307 is concerned?

Mr. PLOESER. I think I can. It is unfortunate there is not a printed bill and the gentleman could not read the changes, but I will do the best I can.

The old language of the bill read in this fashion:

SEC. 307. Section 104 of the Government Corporations Control Act (Public Law 248, 79th Cong.) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 104. The budget programs transmitted by the President to the Congress shall be considered and legislation shall be enacted making necessary appropriations, as may be authorized by law, making available for use such corporate funds or other financial resources or limiting the use thereof as the Congress may determine and providing for repayment of capital funds and the payment of dividends. Except as provided in such legislation, the provisions of this section shall not be construed as preventing wholly owned Government corporations from carrying out and financing their activities as authorized by existing law, nor as affecting the provisions of section 26 of the Tennesse Valley Authority Act, as amended. The provisions of this section shall not be construed as affecting the existing authority of any wholly owned Government corporation to make contracts or other commitments without reference to fiscal year limitations, as such authority may be necessary to the execution of an approved budget program."

The House conferees thought one way about that language. It seemed to confuse some people, and the language was changed in this regard:

The budget programs transmitted by the President to the Congress for the fiscal year 1949 and each year thereafter shall be considered and legislation shall be enacted making necessary appropriations, as may be authorized by law, making available for expenditure for operating and administrative expenses such corporate funds or other financial resources or limiting the use thereof as the Congress may determine and providing for repayment of capital funds and the payment of dividends.

It was here that some of the language was doubted, because we had the language "as provided in such legislation" which we deleted. It now reads:

The provisions of this section shall not be construed as preventing Government corporations from carrying out and financing their activities as authorized by existing law, nor as affecting the provisions of section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended. The provisions of this section shall not be construed as affecting the existing authority of any—

We took out "wholly owned"—

Government corporation to make contracts or other commitments without reference to fiscal year limitations.

Now, that apparently is language which satisfies everyone who seemed to raise some doubt. We think that as a result of the conference we probably achieved the same result as the bill had when it left the House. Perhaps there is a difference of opinion. We were happy to yield to a change in language, but there was no change in substance intended.

Mr. HOPE. Does the gentleman mean by that that as far as the House conferees are concerned their position is exactly the same as it was when the bill was before the House?

Mr. PLOESER. Our position is substantially the same. What did the gentleman doubt about our position? Maybe he might ask a specific question.

Mr. HOPE. Well, the language has been changed. Do I understand that the gentleman is saying that changes in the language do not mean anything?

Mr. PLOESER. Of course, I do not say that, and you could not by any stretch of the imagination get that sort of a meaning from what I said. I said we have made certain language changes which satisfy everyone. Now, there is more than one way of saying that a dress is beautiful. You might say it one way and I might say it another. This language seems to satisfy everyone, the doubting ones and those that do not doubt.

Mr. HOPE. I am not being critical of the gentleman. I prefer the language that the conferees have brought back. I think it is more explicit.

Mr. PLOESER. I think myself it is an improvement. I am sure my good friend would never be unfairly critical.

Mr. HOPE. But I understood the gentleman to say that he did not think that it made any change in the actual meaning of the section and that was what bothered me.

Mr. PLOESER. The intention on the part of the committee and on the part of the House was not to interfere with the proper legal operation of any of these corporations.

Mr. HOPE. I am glad to have the gentleman's assurance on that point.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. As the gentleman knows, I have had a great deal of interest in this bill and in this conference report particularly as it affects the Tennessee Valley Authority. I had examined the bill as amended by the conference committee and have studied the conference report before it was read to the House. I had rather the Senate position be sustained and that no legislation be written in this bill but if that cannot be and since there must be some legislation I think the House conferees have done a very good job in working out their differences with the Senate. If my understanding of it is correct, I am entirely satisfied with it. I feel that under the conference agreement the TVA's integrity is not damaged.

Mr. PLOESER. If the gentleman will permit me to say we did not do all we hoped to do, but we did the best we could.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I did want to ask the gentleman two or three questions. First, in connection with amendment No. 13, on page 8, regarding the amortization provision of the Tennessee Valley Authority. My objection to the original provision was that it was not actually a 40-year amortization; it would be left to the Appropriations Committee instead of to the Board of Directors of the TVA to decide the amount that had to be paid in

each year. Under the original House provision, as I understood it, the Congress could have arrived at any amount it wished TVA to pay back by way of amortization so that TVA might have been required to pay out the investment in power in 20 or 25 years. As I understand, the present language provides that TVA pays the amount allocated to power back over a period of 40 years, and that this payment should be divided into four equal installments at the end of each 10 years and there is no provision for a definite yearly payment.

Mr. PLOESER. No; that is not exactly right.

The House passed the bill providing for a 40-year amortization with a provision that that amortization must be met exactly 25 percent in each 10 years, but in order to reach that amortization, 40 percent of the net income from power resources would be payable annually, in addition to the retirement of their bonded indebtedness, which amounts to $2,500,000 a year. As it comes from the conference, the 40-year amortization remains in, the 10-year-periods provision requiring 25 percent to be cumulatively paid in each period remains in, but the requirement to pay 40 percent of the net revenue from power resources is out. That has a liberalizing effect in that it meets the argument, as I remember it, that the gentleman made in the House originally that there might be extreme years in which they would be hard pressed for operating expenses against their revenues, and it would be difficult for them to make any substantial payments. Of course, the 40 percent allowed that to fluctuate. Nevertheless, this eliminates the requirement of a 40-percent payment. If they are able to pay more than that in 1 year they can do so, but they must pay it within the 10 years. It does not have to be paid in one lump sum.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Do I understand, then, that as the matter now stands, as long as the Tennessee Valley Authority at the end of each 10-year period pays back one-fourth of its investment in power, discretion is left to the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority as to the amount they pay during each of these 10 years?

Mr. PLOESER. That is right.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It was implied in the Appropriations Committee report, and I was afraid that the bill originally meant that it would be on a year-to-year basis, and, of course, a year-to-year basis would be hamstringing the TVA terribly.

Mr. PLOESER. The bill originally did mean that they make an annual payment equal to at least 40 percent of the net revenue.

Mr. KEFAUVER. But as long as they meet a one-fourth payment of the full amount each 10 years, discretion is in the hands of TVA as to the amount they pay each year?

Mr. PLOESER. In addition, it must not be forgotten that they retire $2,500,000 of their bonds every year.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I know. That is a contractual obligation. But so far as the balance is concerned, it is in their discretion just so they meet their quarterly payment at the end of 10 years.

Mr. PLOESER. When the conference agreed on that, I could not help but think that the gentleman from Tennessee would be more happy.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do appreciate the desire of the gentleman from Missouri to make me happy and I am very well satisfied if not happy. Also in connection with amendment 32 the gentleman says: "Page 31, line 5, with the words 'except as provided in such legislation' have been stricken from the bill." Is that correct?

Mr. PLOESER. That is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Then, as I understand, the result of that deletion would be that any legislation affecting section 26 of the TVA act is still left under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. PLOESER. We have removed the jurisdiction from no committee. We have merely amended the Government Corporations Control Act and the TVA Authority has the same exemption that it had in the original Government Corporations Control Act.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I just wanted to be assured of the fact that the TVA then would not be on a year-to-year basis and that any change in section 26 would have to be by virtue of a bill duly filed which would come before the Committee on Expenditures and brought up and considered here.

Mr. PLOESER. Amendments to section 26 would go to whatever committee handled the TVA Authority, but an amendment to the Government Corporations Control Act would go to the Committee on Expenditures.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I mean any amendment to Public Law 248, which is the Government Corporations Control Act.

Mr. PLOESER. The language we used is the exact language of the Government Corporations Control Act.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Also, it was not stated in the statement by the managers on the part of the House, and I know this is a detail, but, as I understand it, on lines 14 and 15 on page 31 at the end of section 307, the language "as such authority may be necessary to the execution of an approved budget program" has been stricken out of the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. PLOESER. It reads, "The provisions of this section shall not be construed as affecting the existing authority of any Government corporation to make contracts or other commitments without reference to fiscal-year limitations."

We pretty well conformed to the language of the Government Corporations Control Act. But there was always ambiguity in section 104.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I had feared this language would seriously impede the TVA in carrying out its necessary operations, which might not be under an approved budget program. I am glad this clause has been removed from the bill. In general all of the provisions in the original House bill to which I objected as being injurious to TVA have been removed. As I said before, I see no need of the amortization plan nor of section 307, but since the objections I made to the amortization plan have been removed and since section 307 does not apply to TVA, I can make no objection to the conference report. In fact, I think, in view of the differences in the bill as it passed the Senate and House, the gentlemen of the subcommittee have done an excellent job in settling the differences. I wish to congratulate both the majority and minority members of the committee for the work they have done.

Mr. PLOESER. Thank you. We appreciate a kind word.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of regret that these sections, section 307 and section 308, cannot be immediately and completely eliminated. They propose a drastic change in law and constitute a backward step in the long and toilsome march toward agricultural equality and a decent American standard of living.

An accurate estimate of the deleterious effect of these proposals may be gleaned from the following excerpts taken from statements by the national farm organizations. So far as I know, not a single farm organization in America approves of these two legislative riders on the pending appropriation bill.

President Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, in testifying before a Senate committee on June 27, said:

> Farmers are shocked and alarmed over the provisions in the Government Corporations Appropriations Act as passed by the House, amending the Government Corporations Control Act, to strike at the heart of basic farm programs which are authorized in basic laws which have been on the statute books for a great many years.
>
> We deeply resent the drastic and unjustifiable action taken by the House in using the appropriations bill as a vehicle for legislation to change basic laws and to permit the crippling of farm programs specifically authorized by law.
>
> I refer specifically to section 307 of H. R. 3756 which amends the Government Corporations Control Act so as to require Congress to pass upon and approve the programs and budget, including the loan programs of these corporations; to limit the use of their corporate funds or other financial resources and to provide for repayment of capital funds and dividends irrespective of the statutory authority governing the leading programs and other operations of these corporations. I also refer to section 308 of H. R. 3756 which would apply the same restrictions to mixed ownership Government corporations, such as the Central Bank for Cooperatives and the regional banks for cooperatives, as the act applies to wholly owned Government corporations.
>
> This issue was thoroughly discussed when the Government Corporations Act was before Congress and Congress decided at that time that these corporations should be permitted to carry on their operations and responsibilities to the extent and in the manner provided and authorized by basic statutes governing their activities, and that those corporations would merely be required to submit their programs for review by the Budget Bureau and Congress to determine whether they are in accordance with the provisions of the statutes.
>
> Some questions with respect to the interpretation of the law arose last year during the consideration of the Government Corporations Appropriations Act and the entire matter was carefully reviewed by the House Appropriations Committee and a very satisfactory agreement was reached as to the

manner in which these appropriations should be handled. We heartily approved of the action taken last year in handling this matter in the Government Corporations Appropriations Act. We were therefore greatly shocked when the House Appropriations Committee this year completely reversed its position and went so far as to include an amendment to the basic law in the appropriation bill. Any such far-reaching revisions in the basic laws should be given thorough consideration and be the subject of public hearings before the appropriate legislative committee, especially when these changes represent a complete reversal of the intent of the original law and when they effect vitally the welfare of millions of farm people.

Mr. A. S. Goss, master of the National Grange; Mr. Charles W. Holman, secretary of the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, and Mr. John H. Davis, executive secretary of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, issued a joint statement on the effect of sections 307 and 308 on agricultural credit, as follows:

Government lending corporations fall into two groups: The first includes those created by Congress under basic legislation which provides ample safeguards in detail for the borrowers, the lenders, the public, and the Government. The second includes those either created directly through legislation, or set up by Executive order, or otherwise, without adequate safeguards. The operations of such corporations have been adequately safeguarded in the public interest through the Byrd-Butler bill of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Sections 307 and 308 of the House bill undermine a Federal policy of over 30 years standing—a policy designed to build up a farm-credit system owned and controlled by farmers in order to provide themselves and their cooperatives an assured source of credit under fair competitive treatment.

It now develops that some members of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Government Corporations have been working for 18 months on the provisions embodied in sections 307 and 308. Despite this long study and preparation, the provisions were sprung on the Congress without allowing the farmer borrowers affected by the proposed drastic charges any opportunity whatsoever for public hearing.

Enactment of sections 307 and 308 would be legislation written into an appropriation bill by an appropriation committee, without public hearing in the House on the legislation involved. It is, therefore, a fundamental issue. It cannot be solved by exempting certain corporations from the effect of the legislation, as has been forcefully pointed out in the report of the Senate Appropriations Committee on the bill. It is an issue that can only be solved by eliminating the two sections in their entirety.

ANALYSIS OF SECTION 307

A. Section 307 provides annual fiscal year limitations and restrictions on:

1. Administrative expenses: The total amount that can be used and for what purpose it may be used.

2. Capital: Total amount that can be used, and the amount that must be returned to the Treasury.

3. Surplus: Total amount to remain for use during the fiscal year and the amount to be declared as dividends to the Treasury.

4. Loans: Total amount of loans that can be made; total amount that could be outstanding at any time; and the kind of loans that can be made.

5. Borrowings: Total sums that can be borrowed on debenture sales and borrowed from commercial banks, and the amount that can be outstanding at any time.

B. In the Farm Credit Administration, the wholly owned corporations with adequate basic legislation are:

1. Federal intermediate credit banks.
2. Production credit corporations.
3. Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.

C. Effect of section 307 on operation of Federal intermediate credit banks.

1. Commitments to borrowers such as production credit associations, agricultural credit corporations, commercial banks, and banks for cooperatives, could not be given until all items under "A" above are authorized in an annual appropriation bill. It would be impossible for the Appropriations Committee or any other committee to determine annually with accuracy the credit requirements for agriculture 18 months in advance.

2. Purchasers of debentures might well hesitate to buy debentures that matured beyond a fiscal-year date because the capital and surplus of the banks might be withdrawn before the debentures matured. This restriction might cause an increase in the cost of debenture money to the banks, hence, an increase in interest costs to farmers.

3. Production credit associations and the banks for cooperatives obtain their major supply of lending funds by rediscounting farmers' loans with the FICB's. By limiting or restricting the borrowing and lending amounts of the FICB's, the lending resources of the PCA's, and the banks for cooperatives the needed loanable funds might not be available.

D. Effect of section 307 on operations of Production Credit Corporation:

1. Ownership by farmers of production-credit associations could be materially retarded and many PCA's crippled if severe limitations or heavy withdrawals of capital were made during fiscal-year periods.

2. Supervision of PCA's by PCC's might be restricted so that PCA's would become unsound in credit policies to a point of jeopardizing the Government's and the farmers' capital in their associations.

E. Effect of section 307 on operations of Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation:

Although not making loans now, the Corporation will need ample administration-expense funds for the collection of outstanding farmers' loans, some of which mature each year for the next 20 years. The amount necessary varies widely with crop and price conditions, and requires the flexibility provided in the basic law.

ANALYSIS OF SECTION 308

Section 308 would place the central and regional banks for cooperatives, which are mixed ownership corporations, under the limitations outlined under "A" above. True, the present law does not provide an adequate basis whereby the farmers' cooperatives—the borrowers—can acquire eventual ownership. But these cooperatives desire the law to be amended so that they can eventually own these banks and assume the responsibility and authority for their operations under general supervision of the Government.

Present basic laws authorize these banks to make loans only to farmers' cooperative marketing associations, farmers' purchasing associations, and farmers' business service enterprises.

Until fiscal year authorizations were approved, no firm loan commitments could be made to borrower associations for the seasonal marketing of farm commodities, for providing fertilizer, seeds, feeds, and other farm supplies, or for rendering farm business services such as those of mutual irrigation associations, freezer locker plants, etc.

Intermediate or long-term financing of from 1 to 3 years or long-term financing running for a long period of years—for processing, storing, and other facilities—would be hazardous because of the uncertainty of future seasonal operating and commodity and facility loans required.

Farmers, and their cooperative enterprises, would hesitate to invest their money in the capital of the banks if these restrictions were present. The life of the banks and their usefulness would be too uncertain. Plans are being made for submitting amendments to the present laws in order that this ownership may become realistic. Placing the banks under the proposed restrictions would not permit borrowers to assume responsibility and authority in operating the banks which they would demand if they put in the funds to own the banks eventually as is their present long-time objective.

GENERAL

Sections 307 and 308 reverse a 30-year trend of congressional action which has pointed toward ownership and control of these farm-credit institutions by their users—the farmers and farmers' cooperatives. The proposed limitations, restrictions, and controls of sections 307 and 308 can lead only to the Treasury as the source for all lending funds instead of leading toward the goal of complete capitalization by farmers.

We, therefore, request your cooperation in having sections 307 and 308 stricken from the Government's corporations appropriation bill, H. R. 3756, now in conference.

Mr. F. V. Heinkel, president of the Missouri Farmers Association, recently issued the following statement:

The charge that cooperatives live on Government credit is not even a half-truth. It is true that the Government has set up a number of banks for cooperatives, guaranteed by Government credit, and designed especially to meet the peculiar needs of farmer cooperatives. But cooperatives have to give a first mortgage when they borrow money from the St. Louis Bank for Cooperatives (the bank which serves Missouri), and we pay interest, too. We are proud to say that this bank has never lost a cent on an MFA loan. The rates of interest are 3½ percent for facility loans and 2½ percent for working capital loans. Our cooperatives also do business with local banks, as your banker can tell you. We even borrow money from local banks at times on better terms than we can borrow it from the St. Louis Bank for Cooperatives.

But even if we could, at all times, borrow money from the St. Louis Bank for Cooperatives for less than we could borrow the money locally, I ask you, is this anything for us to apologize for?

Is it any more special privilege than the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, set up by the Government, to help out our local banks?

Or, is it any more favoritism than the Reconstruction Finance Corporation set up by Government to aid business?

Or, than the minimum wage-hour law enacted by Government to help labor?

Or, than the high tariff wall established by Government to aid manufacturers?

And Mr. H. E. Slusher, president of the Missouri Farm Bureau, writes in a letter just received:

Our Missouri farm people are particularly concerned as the bill might apply to our Farm Credit agencies and the Commodity Credit Corporations. I think it would be a grave mistake to disrupt the functions of as successful a corporation or program as our Farm Credit system, including the Federal intermediate credit banks, production credit corporations, central banks for cooperatives, regional banks for cooperatives, and the Federal land banks. For the first time, the Federal land banks are now owned by the borrowers. Furthermore, the Commodity Credit Corporation is the very heart of our present farm program insofar as maintaining

support prices is concerned. We recognize that the operations of these corporations need to be scrutinized and held responsible to the Congress. Nevertheless, the provisions contained in H. R. 3756, particularly sections 307 and 308 would virtually make unworkable these programs. It is to be hoped that everything possible will be done to prevent such a thing happening to these particular Government corporations, the operation of which have such a direct bearing on the welfare of our farm people.

Sincerely,

MISSOURI FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
H. E. SLUSHER, *President*.

Mr. Speaker, the farm press and the farm organizations of the country are unanimous in their opposition to sections 307 and 308 as carried in this bill. I know of no farm paper or farm official who entertains any different view and who is not deeply concerned over this proposed attempt to change the basic law affecting the farmer. Certainly no one is better qualified to render an authoritative opinion.

However, in view of the stalmate which has developed in the conference, the compromise incorporated in the conference report is perhaps the best agreement that can be reached. Under its provisions the entire matter is deferred one year pending legislative action by the Congress. In the meantime there will be opportunity to write legislation which will preserve the rights and benefits accruing from the original law both to the farmer and the country.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Missouri for his able handling of this bill. He has recently succeeded our distinguished former chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]. I wish to say further that on the Democratic side in the handling of this bill the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] have done the major portion of the work, most of my time having been given to other bills which were pending simultaneously.

It is true that this bill is not as we on the Democratic side would have written it in all respects. We just did the best we could with the problems which we had before us.

I am not in accord with sections 307 and 308 of this bill. I have grave concern about section 308 particularly, but in view of the compromises which were reached it seems to me that some improvement has been made. I was not completely satisfied with the way the TVA was handled. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], ably assisted by the gentlemen on the majority side, did the best they could, and we all did the best we could to maintain the position of the House on the TVA items.

On most items I think, generally speaking, a good job has been done, and there is hardly any course open to us at this stage of the procedure than to accept the conference report.

Mr. PLOESER. I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] ranking member of the minority on this committee. I want to say that the cooperation which the majority on this committee has received this year from the minority members has been most exceptional. In our conference, at times most difficult with the other body, the House line held, unless we thought it was strategic and proper to yield. We have done the best we could. I am grateful for the fine cooperation we have received.

I want to say one more thing on this section 308. There has been some discussion of how it applies to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and there were statements made in the beginning that this would make them bring up their estimated losses for a given future period, to be approved in the budget estimate. Of course that is not true. We are dealing, in the FDIC, with administrative expenses. Losses and loss expense in an insurance company are not normal administrative expenses. They are potentials which cannot be foreseen, and in all the experience over hundreds of years in the insurance business no one would judge them as normal administrative expenditures. The result is that imagination allowed itself to run to the point where it caused considerable misunderstanding on that section. I wanted to make that statement so that it would clear up any doubts. There has been a full and complete statement on the subject, which I made before the Senate committee and later placed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity of expressing my personal appreciation for the nonpartisan, thorough, and diligent study given to the problems related to this bill by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. PLOESER], the former distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. JENSEN], the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE], and the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT]. For my Democratic colleagues I express the same appreciation.

We have worked hard. We have come here unanimously agreed. For that I am grateful.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I think something should be said in behalf of the gentleman who was chairman of this committee when this bill passed the House, and who so ably guided it on its way to the Senate, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]. It is a rather unique situation, in that because of the resignation from Congress of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], there was a shift in the chairmanship of this committee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is now chairman of the Interior Department Subcommittee, and the ball was passed to me after we had scored once and were ready to make another score, we hope. The harmony on this committee and the fine work and spirit exemplified and the exceptionally fine leadership of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is responsible for a better job than we might otherwise have hoped for.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, it would not be fair for me to sit idly by and listen to these kind words in my behalf without saying "Thank you" to the minority members of the committee and to the majority members, all of whom have worked so diligently and so effectively to bring this most difficult bill to final agreement. No one appreciates it more than I do. The committee is now in good hands. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] will handle it in a manner befitting the Congress of the United States.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] to submit a consent request.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I think the conference report should be adopted. With regard to the TVA the situation is this: The House bill contained an amortization plan which I felt substantially nullified section 26 of the TVA act. It also contained a provision in section 307 which would give the Appropriations Committee authority to modify section 26 each year and thereby place TVA on a year-to-year basis. The Senate struck out both provisions. I hoped the Senate position would be sustained in conference. But the House conferees have taken out the objectionable part of the amortization plan and they have exempted TVA from section 307 and, therefore, I feel that the conference report is an acceptable agreement and settlement of the House and Senate differences. I think TVA's great contribution to the Nation has been recognized and I am glad its integrity has been fully sustained. I know that my colleague the gentleman from Tennessee, ALBERT GORE, and the other House Members, have had the best interest of TVA in mind during this entire proceeding and those of us interested in the cause of TVA are grateful to them.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot entertain a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to close consideration of this bill without once more referring to the distinguished service rendered by Mr. Claude Hobbs, executive clerk of the subcommittee, and by Mr. George Harvey, executive clerk of the Appropriations Committee. These men have worked arduously and served exceptionally well.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 9: page 3, strike out all of lines 20 to 25, inclusive.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PLOESER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided*

further, That there shall be transferred to this account not to exceed $765,000 of the funds available under sections 303 and 502 of Public Law 849, Seventy-sixth Congress, as amended; such total funds to be available for all necessary administrative expenses of the Office of the Administrator."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 21: Page 15, strike out all of lines 22 to 25, inclusive, and all of page 16, and line 1 and line 2 down to the word "it" on page 17 and insert "Not to exceed $12,300 for the purposes of liquidation, including $3,000 for payment of terminal leave, shall be available for administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis: *Provided*, That such administrative expenses shall be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation, properly capitalized expenditures, repayment of loans, property operating expenses (including project inventory), charges to surplus and operating reserve, and cost of sales of commodities, services, and property: *Provided further*, That advances of funds made in connection with the operation of housing properties are hereby authorized."

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate No. 21.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 17, 18, and 19.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and proposed by said amendment insert the following:

"For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281–1407) (except the provisions of sections 201, 202, 303, 381, and 383 and the provisions of titles IV and V), including personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; $228,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1948, for compliance with programs under said provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended, pursuant to the provisions of the 1947 programs carried out during the period July 1, 1946, to December 31, 1947, inclusive: *Provided*, That not to exceed $24,500,000 of the total sum provided under this head shall be available during the current fiscal year, for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such programs, including the peanut-marketing quota program, the cost of aerial photographs, however, not to be charged to such limitation; but not more than $7,080,813 shall be transferred to the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided further*, That payments to claimants hereunder may be made upon the certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out the conservation practice or practices and has complied with all other requirements as conditions for such payments and that the statements and information contained in the application for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge and belief, under the penalties of the Act of March 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C. 80): *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order Numbered 9069, of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State or county information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information to individual farmers: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1948 programs (amounting to $150,000,000, including administration, and formulated on the basis of a distribution of the funds available for payments and grants among the several States in accordance with their conservation needs as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That the proportion allocated to any State shall not be reduced more than 15 per centum from the 1946 distribution and that no participant shall receive more than $500) of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended, and programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; but the payments or grants under such program shall be conditioned upon the utilization of land with respect to which such payments or grants are to be made, in conformity with farming practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as determined and approved by the State committee appointed pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended for the respective States: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may, in his discretion, from time to time transfer to the General Accounting Office such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative expenses of said Office in auditing payments under this item: *Provided further*, That such amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary under programs provided for herein: *Provided further*, That the Secretary is authorized and directed to make payments to farmers who complied with the terms and conditions of the agricultural conservation programs, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, if the Secretary determines that, because of induction into the armed forces of the United States, such farmers failed to file, or were prevented from filing, applications for payment under any such program during the period the applicable appropriation for such program was available for obligation, such payments to be made out of the unobligated balance of the appropriation, "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources", in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1946: *Provided further*, That an application for payment on the prescribed form is filed by any such farmer (or the person entitled to payment in case of death, disappearance, or incompetency of the farmer under regulations issued pursuant to section 385 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C., 1940 edition, 1385)) within one year from the date of his discharge from the armed forces, or by December 31, 1947, whichever is later: *And provided further*, That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the Act of July 11, 1919 (18 U. S. C. 201), to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$15,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement the amendments of the Senate numbered 43 and 59.

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
CLARENCE CANNON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
CHAN GURNEY,
CLYDE M. REED,
HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3601) making

appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying report, as to each of such amendments, namely:

PENALTY MAIL

Amendment No. 1, penalty mail: The House appropriated $3,186,000; the Senate, $3,486,000; the House recedes.

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

Amendment No. 17, relating to the limitation on expenditures for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia: The House provided $1,059,000; the Senate, $1,061,840; the Senate recedes. It should be noted that the conferees recommend the lower of the two amounts involved. In this connection, the conferees have been informed by the Department of Agriculture that if the House provision providing for the establishment of a meat-inspection fund is finally enacted, the requirements for authorization for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia for the Bureau during fiscal year 1948 will be reduced to $651,100. In view of the action in the accompanying report whereby the Senate recedes from its amendment by which it had stricken out the proposed meat-inspection fund (amendments Nos. 18 and 19), the conferees herewith direct the Department of Agriculture to limit expenditures for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia under the "Bureau of Animal Industry" appropriations for fiscal year 1948 (other than for meat inspection) to a sum not exceeding $651,100. In so directing, the conferees understand that the General Accounting Office will not treat expenditures for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia under the "Meat-inspection fund" as charges against the aforementioned $651,100.

MEAT INSPECTION

Amendments Nos. 18 and 19, meat inspection: The House appropriated $5,000,000 for the initial contribution to the "meat-inspection fund." The House provided that hereafter all expenses of the meat-inspection service shall be paid from the "meat-inspection fund" and that the Secretary of Agriculture shall hereafter assess and collect fees from the meat packers based upon the cost of the inspection, such fees to be paid into the "meat-inspection fund." The Senate struck out the House provision relating to the "meat-inspection fund" and the assessing of the packers for the cost of meat inspection and provided the budget estimate of $11,140,000 for meat-inspection service. The Senate recedes.

SOIL CONSERVATION PAYMENTS

Amendment No. 42:

Program: The House has proposed a 1947 program of $265,635,044; the Senate, $295,635,044; the Senate recedes.

Administrative expenses: The House has proposed $22,000,000 for administrative expenses at all levels; the Senate, $27,500,000; the conferees have agreed upon $24,500,000.

1948 program: The House proposes no program for the 1948 crop year; the Senate proposes a program of $150,000,000; the House recedes.

Maximum payment to any participant: The House proposes a limit of $500 to any participant under the 1947 program; the Senate proposes no limit for 1947, but proposes a maximum payment of $500 to any participant under the 1948 program proposed by the Senate. The House recedes.

FARM-TENANT LOANS

Amendment No. 50, farm-tenant loans: The House made no provision, the Senate appropriated $20,000,000; the conferees have agreed upon $15,000,000

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

National School Lunch Act

Amendments Nos. 43 and 59: National School Lunch Act: The House appropriated $45,000,000 and provided "That no part of this appropriation shall be used for matching funds from sources within the States derived from the sale of lunches."

The Senate struck out the House provision by amendment No. 43 and inserted new language by amendment No. 59 providing for the expenditure of $75,000,000 for the program from section 32 funds, with no limitation prohibiting the use of funds derived from the sale of lunches for matching purposes. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur in amendment No. 43 which strikes out a direct appropriation of $45,000,000 provided by the House and to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 59 authorizing $75,000,000 of section 32 funds, with an amendment providing $65,000,000, instead of $75,000,000, as provided by the Senate, together with a limitation that no part of the fund shall be used for nonfood assistance.

The conferees on the part of both the House and the Senate have agreed to direct attention to the fact that in the consideration of funds for the school-lunch program they have emphasized that it is essentially a local program and that the States have not done their full share in complying with the spirit of the matching provisions contained in the National School Lunch Act. The conferees of both Houses have also agreed to direct attention to the fact that it has been repeatedly asserted that many State legislatures have adjourned without taking action to provide funds in the nature of contributions to the school-lunch program. The conferees on the part of both Houses desire to make it abundantly clear, therefore, that in connection with a reexamination of this matter for the fiscal year 1949, they are now placing the respective States on notice with respect to their obligations under this program and that failure of the State legislatures to act in the premises will have no effect in determining the future requirements of this program.

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
CLARENCE CANNON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing particularly new that need be offered here by way of discussion on this conference report. I may say that once more the third branch of the legislative establishment known as the conference committee has spoken. It reached an agreement on all items. While there is one item technically in disagreement, it is in agreement, and I shall move directly with respect to that item to recede and concur with an amendment.

The first amendment that we had here before under discussion was penalty mail, but of necessity we could do nothing with it at the time until certain matters of policy in this Agricultural appropriation bill were finally disposed of. So the House recedes on it. There is an increase of $300,000 on penalty mail and, I may say it will require some economies at that on the part of the Department of Agriculture in order to keep within the amount allowed.

The second item that was in disagreement when this matter was before the House was the item of meat inspection. You may recall it was the contention of the House this should be assessed against the industry in the form of a fee. There was a great deal of discussion, sometimes spirited discussion, in the committee on conference, but finally another body bowing to the superior wisdom of the House of Representatives finally receded. So beginning with the fiscal year 1948 meat inspection will be assessed against the industry. There will be an initial economy of $6,000,000 and thereafter something in excess of $11,000,000 a year.

The third item in disagreement was soil conservation payments. You may recall, of course, that the House finally concurred with an amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] which modified the Senate figure somewhat but accepted the Senate language with respect to the 1947 conservation program and deleted the program for 1948. Here too we had a great deal of spirited discussion and the net upshot of the matter is that the Senate agreed as to the amounts for 1947 that are found in the so-called Case amendment. There was, however, a provision which standing alone after the deletion of the 1948 program, technically constituted a modification of the 1947 program to the extent that there would be a $500 limitation upon payments. Obviously, since the contention has been made that we are already committed to this program, it would be difficult, indeed, to sustain any contention that that $500 limitation should apply to 1947. So what we finally did was to agree with the Senate language and modify the figure downward somewhat and to agree to a 1948 crop-year program in the sum of $150,000,000. In addition thereto we compromised also on the administrative part of it. In the House we agreed upon $22,000,000. The Senate included $27,500,000 for administrative expenditures at all levels, including National, State, county, and the community committees, embracing some 110,000 people altogether. The compromise figure is $24,500,000, which should be adequate for all purposes in maintaining a field organization to carry on this so-called AAA soil-conservation payment program.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. I would like to have the gentleman clear up one point for me. The gentleman has stated that the conference accepted the figure of $228,000,000 voted by the House under the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota. At the same time the conference report indicates the full amount as being $265,000,000, which I understand is a carry-over.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There was an advance made by the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of acquiring lining materials that they needed, and of that initial request for $50,000,000, if I remember correctly, there is $37,000,-

000 still available, so that money will be added to the money carried over.

Mr. PACE. The question I wanted to ask, does it not require any legislative language in the amendment to bring that about?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not believe so; at least, we felt that no further legislation was necessary in order to bring that about, because that money is already available on a relationship that has been worked out in the Department.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that was part of the Senate total. They put no language in.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly so, but it is agreed that that money is available for that purpose, and I think that is what the gentleman is interested in.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman has explained to my entire satisfaction, at least, with respect to the $500 payment involved in the Case amendment, which does not apply to 1947.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. RIZLEY. I understand that all references to any limitation in connection with $500 or any other amount is now out of the bill for either 1947 or 1948.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. Let me emphasize that. First, let me emphasize that the $500 limit in payment to a participant in the program does not apply to 1947. It does, however, apply to the program for 1948.

Mr. RIZLEY. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In that connection, if the gentleman will permit, I understand the purpose of this limitation is to make funds go farther and to aid more farmers. If that be the purpose, if the gentleman will permit me—and I have no disposition to detain him—it is my view, for whatever it is worth, that with a program limited to $150,000,000, that instead of providing increased payments for the smaller growers, that this limitation will defeat the very purpose of the program because, as the matter now stands, one application is made for land, because the program goes to the land. This limitation will result in an increase in the administrative funds and a very materially increased one, and it will not cause the smaller growers to receive any more, because the tenants, who are by far in the majority will submit programs, and many more applications will be made, and the administrative costs will be increased, and the result will be, that if anything, the smaller growers will get a smaller amount than he is getting now, whereas, in my judgment, the larger grower will have spent a great deal more than he will get and the smaller grower will get less than he spends, and therefore the smaller grower, intended to be aided here, will not receive any more, in my judgment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am of the opinion that there are at least four reasons why the program will not defeat itself and why it will work out on a select basis. The bill contains language to the effect that the money for payment purposes shall go to the States on the basis of their conservation needs as determined by the Secretary. The second item, the language carried in the bill states that the payments or grants under the program shall be continued upon the utilization of the land with respect to which said payments or grants are to be made. It is going to be a little more selective program in the future.

The third reason why I do not believe it will defeat itself is that it will carry out to a considerable extent the thought the subcommittee had in mind in the first place when they reduced the amount. They felt that those land owners in the country who get the first fruits of the soil and who have a fee ownership they also owe something to their country, to the land, and to the preservation of its natural resources. So it is only fair that when they have the ability they should carry a part of the conservation load. We express that principle in our whole tax structure today. People pay taxes to the Federal Government under the Internal Revenue code on the basis of ability to pay. There is no reason why the conservation load should not be predicated upon the same kind of theory.

I might explain in detail in connection therewith, if you have not already known it, that there are presently in the 1946 program 43,750 participants who received more than $500. I repeat that figure. There are 43,750 participating farmers who received more than $500 in payments. To be exact, those 43,750 received $48,502,000. A little very elementary arithmetic will indicate to you that the average for 43,750 farmers is $1,100.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

When we insert a $500 limitation, this is going to be the effect. The same 43,750 farmers will participate, but they cannot receive more than $500, so that the aggregate that they receive would be $21,000,000-plus. That would make a saving of nearly $27,000,000, and that money might very well be made available on a more selective basis to the people who have greater difficulty in carrying the conservation load. That is the philosophy that was in the minds of the members of the committee when we first addressed ourselves to this problem.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is true, and I have no disposition to argue, but when you eliminate the 43,750 larger landowners you put about 500,000 tenants on there to take their place, and thereby increase the program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the gentleman from Mississippi will agree that where one has the financial capacity to carry a larger share of the conservation load it is not too much to ask.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Unless he is carrying it for his tenants he ought not to get it, but where he is carrying it for his tenants, and they get the benefit of it, it ought to be done.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The fee title, though, is in the hands of somebody who can carry the load.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. May I say to the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee that I as one Member of this House appreciate the difficulties the gentleman and his committee have had ever since the third day of January.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Nothing is ever difficult if your heart is in it.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I call attention to the fact that from a soil fertility standpoint not over 3 percent of the money has been used for soil fertility up to this time. Under the old program it represented less than $50 a farm, and under the new program, if all the money allowed in overhead went for fertilizer, it would be only $25 per farm, because there are over 6,000,000 farms in the United States. So as a matter of fact, all these appropriations can do is dramatize and show the importance of fertilizer in connection with maintaining the fertility of our soil. It is not any approach to maintaining the fertility of the soil, it can only be used for demonstration purposes, to dramatize, as I said, the importance of it as a national asset. Am I right?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the gentleman is right. I am going to suggest to the gentleman from Wisconsin, who has done such yeoman service on the legislative Committee on Agriculture, that in the ensuing year, perhaps over the summer and fall, he and the members of his committee can go over this whole matter and explore it, and can explore many matters in connection with the Department of Agriculture, and be ready to report a program early in January so that it will not become necessary for the chairman of the subcommittee on appropriations to go first to the Rules Committee, and there in that committee battle almost alone to get a rule, and then battle once more against the members of the legislative Committee on Agriculture to persuade the House that they ought to issue a rule. So I do hope that our good friend from Wisconsin over the summer and fall will give almost prayerful attention to this important matter, and will prevail upon the members of his committee to take early action so that we might be spared at least one intervening battle in getting this bill to the floor and across the floor.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The members of the agricultural committee have already anticipated the suggestion made by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois. We have had a bill introduced by the gentleman from Colorado, [Mr. HILL] and the gentleman from

North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] in an attempt to try to meet this problem which faces us to coordinate all these soil activities. Of course, I have no way of knowing what will happen to the legislation. It is going before the full committee. I know that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] will want to apply what he is able to find out in the hearings on the Cooley-Hill bill in the long-term agricultural program of this country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad to have those assurances from my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin. I know much work will be done between now and the time the agricultural appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1949 comes to the floor.

The next item that was in agreement, of course, was the farm-tenant loans. In the fac of the conference which the President convened here in Washington and the statement made there with respect to the increases in land prices, the members of the House subcommittee felt that this matter ought to be put off to one side until we could see more clearly whether there was going to be a little stability and leveling off in land prices just around the corner. The Senate, however, took a contrary view and inserted $20,000,000 in the bill for that purpose. We finally compromised that item and we put in $15,000,000.

The only other item that we were in disagreement on was the item on the national school-lunch program. We were not insensible to the interest manifested here on the floor of the House, and certainly it is the business of the chairman of the subcommittee to be thoroughly realistic. When the vote came on the school-lunch program, it was exactly 184 to 184 on the first round. The chairman of this committee knew then that he was on what scientists probably would call very tenuous or attenuated ground. So, he felt he ought to be in a mood to compromise somewhat. We finally did. In the first place, instead of a direct appropriation the money comes out of section 32 funds. Secondly, instead of $45,000,000 as proposed by the House or $75,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, once more we compromised liberally, and the figure that will be carried in the amendment that will be offered directly is $65,000,000. We are admonishing the State legislatures that next year when the appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1949 comes before us we shall not want to hear and we shall give no credit to the force of any argument that is made that the legislatures forgot to take action before they adjourned and went home and forgot about the school lunch. We propose to send them a copy of this report and we propose to send a copy to the educational authorities in every State so that it will come to the attention of the chief executive of every Commonwealth in the country and to the State educational authorities and the members of the legislatures. After all, they have some responsibility in a national school-lunch program because this is, after all, a local proposition.

I ask you, in all earnestness and sincerity, why should a school-lunch program be carried in an agricultural appropriation bill? You say, "Oh, it relates to food." Does it? The abundant foods do not even have to be purchased by the schools today. I saw the statement of a school in one of the Western States. They got a reimbursement of $1,500 and there was about $40 of abundant food for the whole month. They bought only because they were so disposed and not because the law required them to. This is a cash program. When this money is made available it will be hacked up into quarters and each allocation will be made to the respective States.

Then, of course, it goes to them in cash. This is a cash subsidy for the States today. I was going to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], that this program properly belongs in his bill for the Office of Education, because it is cash and it deals with schools. I cannot see the wisdom of having 431 people in the Department of Agriculture, as an entirely separate entity, giving themselves over to the administration and auditing of the school-lunch program, when the Office of Education, in the Federal Security Agency, is already tooled up in order to deal with the schools of the country. So I suggest once more to the gentleman from Wisconsin that when you devote yourself to these labors during the summer and fall, think seriously about amending the school-lunch program of 1946 with a view of giving attention to the possibility of transferring this program where it properly belongs, in the Office of Education and not in the Agricultural Department Appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. Under the Reorganization bill, the Committee on Agriculture no longer has jurisdiction over the school lunches. That has been transferred to the Committee on Education and Labor, as the gentleman, I am sure, knows.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Fine. I hope my good friend from Kansas will speak to the chairman of the Committee on Education and probably aid in having this matter transferred to the agency in Government where it properly belongs.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACKINNON. With respect to the gentleman's statement that this is going to be called to the attention of the State legislatures next year, the majority of the State legislatures, including my own will not meet next year. So I submit it may require greater deferment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We will bring it to the attention of those legislatures that are in session. I go on the theory that the State legislatures must take judicial notice of the things that are being done in Washington; and if they do not do it, that is their hard luck, not ours. They have a very abiding responsibility in the matter.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. I certainly do want to congratulate the gentleman on his proposal to call to the attention of the different State superintendents of schools the action taken by the committee. But it is not entirely clear to me what it is the conferees want the States to do. It is provided in the School Lunch Act that the matching shall be on a graduated basis through the years and there should be greater State participation through the years. Exactly what is it the conferees have in mind?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Here is what we propose to do, if it can be brought about. In the first place, the States put up only $11,500,000 for the last program. They took credit for $25,000,000 of contribution made by Rotary Clubs, American Legion Posts, Kiwanis Clubs, churches, labor that was supplied. The States have taken credit for it, the theory being that this money was derived from sources within the State. So when they work out the matching provision, which, incidentally, is worked out under order by the Secretary of Agriculture, it looks to me as though the States are shirking in their responsibility in this matter. In proportion as they go up, it might be that finally the Federal Government can come down a little, before it is entirely engulfed by the school-lunch program.

There is a move afoot now in two directions. The first is to increase the number of participating schools. There are 50,000 schools in the program now. There are 225,000 schools that are eligible for the program.

The second force that is operating right now is to have the Federal Government carry the whole load. I stated to the distinguished Senator from Georgia the other day that notwithstanding the fact that the act is on the books, an endeavor will be made somewhere along the line, not too far from now, to modify the act, so that finally good old Uncle Sam, with a debt of $258,000,000,000, should carry the whole load. Then, if you extend the number of schools, you can foresee the figure that people have been discussing in weeks and months, namely, a program that may eventually cost the United States $350,000,000 or $400,000,000.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. Am I correct in my understanding that as for the compromise the funds derived from the sale of lunches are still permitted for matching purposes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right. Within the wisdom of the conference committee it was necessary for the House to recede on the interdiction it had written in the bill when the bill was before us first. So the funds that will be contributed by the youngsters for their lunches under this bill will be considered for matching purposes. My friend from New York shakes his head. I will shake my head in the same fashion as

being in agreement with the sentiment he expresses.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. For the benefit of the RECORD will the gentleman kindly explain the paragraph under the School Lunch Act in regard to the $10,000,000 for equipment and whether or not we now have $65,000,000 or $75,000,000 under the program?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself five additional minutes.

We have $65,000,000 and no part thereof shall be used for nonfood assistance. Let me explain that. Under the National School Lunch Act there is a provision that $10,000,000 shall—that is the language of the act—shall be used for nonfood assistance. That means equipment and so forth. Because we have diminished the amount it was the concensus of the conference committee that all of it should be used for food and none for the purchase of equipment on the theory that equipment purchases could be deferred a little longer. Consequently, when the motion is offered to concur it will be with an amendment containing a proviso limiting the use of the money to feeding purposes as distinguished from equipment purposes.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. I, as one, appreciate the efforts the gentleman has put forth in trying to place the responsibility for the hot school lunch program where it belongs, the States. Regrettable as is the situation in which we find ourselves in having to continue this program, nevertheless we must keep up the fight to put this responsibility back where it belongs, on the States and local communities. Let them carry the program there.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to the gentleman from Illinois that virtue is on our side, and with virtue on our side we shall overcome all the forces of evil that can ever be pitted against this program.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HAND. I hope the gentleman is serious about notifying the schools throughout the country and the State legislatures that the States are not contributing their fair share to this program. Did not the gentleman himself suggest that the Federal Government would withdraw from this program in the course of a few years? I hope the gentleman will continue with his efforts, because I think we ought gradually to withdraw from the program and let the States assume the burden.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That, of course, is a matter for the Congress to determine. It was the original intent of the act when the program started that eventually the Federal Government would withdraw.

Mr. PACE. That is the purpose of the School Lunch Act today, that the Federal contribution is to be decreased and the States take it up.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The difficulty, of course, is the number of schools in it. If the force becomes strong enough they will work for a larger and larger Government share.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, is "Doctor" DIRKSEN now going to try to repair the backbone of the Nation?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. This program is unfair to at least one of the States which has been matching, that is the State of Utah. I think if you read the report you will find that my State not only has matched out of State funds their full share but they have also paid over a hundred thousand dollars additional money for matching purposes, and not one penny of it has come out of the school children.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to the gentleman from Utah that I think we ought to send a citation to the State of Utah.

Now, before I conclude, I think you will be interested in a few tokens. Very many people ask, and particularly Members: "How much money did you actually save?" It is a very pertinent and enticing subject. First, let me give you the budget figures, then I will give you our own figures so they will be easy to remember.

The budget that came before us for 1948 was roughly $1,200,000,000. As the bill left the House it carried appropriations and authorizations of all kinds totalling roughly $850,000,000. The budget figure $1,200,000,000; the figure approved by the House, $850,000,000.

The figure written into the bill by the Senate in round figures, within $2,000,000, was $1,050,000,000. The House figure was $850,000,000; the Senate figure was $1,050,000,000.

The bill as it will be finally passed is $960,000,000.

So that we finally contrived an overall economy in this bill of about $228,000,000. It is not as big as I would wish in view of the demands upon our economy and the need for maintaining a sound fiscal integrity in the country, but at least, it is a start. May I say to you that we have set the stage for something better on the Agricultural appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1949. You see, when you talk about economy you must figure 1948 and 1949 because after all it is part of the same Congress and necessarily it takes time to prepare the stage. I can best exemplify that in this fashion: The full saving on meat inspection becomes effective next year. That will be $11,000,000. There will be a $150,000,000 saving on soil conservation service payments. That will be $151,000,000 below the budget figure for 1947, it will be $51,000,000 below the President's proposed budget figure, as indicated in his message for the fiscal year 1949. So we start out with a very substantial economy in the fiscal year 1949.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I shall insert a table showing the final action on the bill.

Summary of appropriations and loan authorizations in Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, 1948, compared with 1947, House bill, 1948, and Senate bill, 1948

Item	Appropriations and RFC loan authorizations, 1947	Budget estimates, 1948	House bill, 1948	Senate bill, 1948	Bill as finally passed	Bill as finally passed— Compared with House bill (+) or (−)	Bill as finally passed— Compared with Senate bill (+) or (−)
Direct appropriations in agricultural appropriation bill	$643,154,411	$805,141,608	$571,697,388	$664,773,798	[1] $615,615,198	[1] +$43,917,810	−$49,158,600
Permanent appropriations	127,747,348	158,429,710	50,429,710	133,429,710	119,429,710	+68,000,000	−14,000,000
Total, direct appropriations	770,901,759	963,571,318	622,127,098	798,203,508	735,044,908	+112,917,810	−63,158,600
Reappropriations	133,784,292						
Borrowings authorized (From RFC and Secretary of the Treasury)	370,000,000	225,000,000	225,000,000	250,000,000	225,000,000		−25,000,000
Total, appropriations, reappropriations, and authorizations to borrow from RFC and Secretary of the Treasury	1,274,686,051	1,188,571,318	847,127,098	1,048,203,508	960,044,908	+112,917,810	−88,158,600

[1] Assessments against member institutions of the Farm Credit system for examination and supervisory services are appropriated in Agricultural Appropriation Act subject to provision therefor in the Government Corporations Appropriations Act, on which final Congressional action is pending. Therefore, amounts for such assessments are shown in these columns on basis of the Government Corporations Appropriations bill as passed by the Senate.

I think that what we have done that is highly important is that we have established a reasonable, conservative base. Had this figure gone too high it would be the base for future operations of the Department of Agriculture; so it would be even more difficult a year hence to effectuate economies than it was for the fiscal year 1948. So I am very happy at the showing that was made, and I trust in the fiscal year 1949 this very good and patient labor can be carried on.

Before I conclude and offer the motion to recede and concur with an amendment on school lunches, which is only technically in disagreement, may I express to the members of the subcommittee my deep and genuine appreciation for their diligence and for their devotion. There was hardly a session in all the 7 weeks but what every member of the subcommittee was present. The gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] had a committee going, the gentleman from

Washington [Mr. HORAN] had a committee going, as did also the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] had a deficiency committee going, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] had the Government corporations appropriation bill. Every member of the committee was busy with their work, yet they gave so freely of their time, and I am deeply grateful not only for their diligence but for the tolerant viewpoint that they brought to the problems that we sought to wrestle with and hew out into what we thought were sound conclusions.

Finally, as you well know, it would be difficult for a subcommittee to labor on as it does and get to the point of conclusion unless it had most efficient assistance. I not only esteem Arthur Orr the executive secretary of the committee, but I esteem him as a personal friend. I say to him, Thanks a million. And to Paul Wilson, I thank him too for his splendid work that has made our labor in the committee pleasant.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, as bad as this bill is, it is infinitely better than it was when it went to the Senate.

In order to appreciate what is being done here to destroy the plan of agricultural rehabilitation which has meant so much to the farmers of the country, let me merely cite the figures with which we implemented this same bill before the war and after the war.

Just the year before the war began we appropriated in this bill $1,649,500,000. This year, in the pending bill we provided in the bill, for the same purposes, as it went to the Senate, $847,127,098, one-half of the amount we provided for this purpose before the war.

Now, to appreciate what that means let me call your attention to an editorial appearing this week in an important national journal, on the value of money appropriated before the war and after the war.

Here it is:

> There is a marked difference in the purchasing power of a prewar dollar and the dollar you have today. The 1947 dollar has lost about half of its prewar purchasing power.

In other words, my friends, we have provided in this bill, as sent to the Senate only one-half of the number of dollars we provided for the same purpose before the war started. And today even that number of dollars is only equal, in purchasing power, to half that number of dollars before the war.

So what we really sent to the Senate in this bill was only one-fourth of the amount we appropriated for the farmer before the war.

Now, this was not done under a bushel. It was done deliberately after intensive planning begun long before Congress convened for the session. And on that account I especially regretted to hear my friend say that it was easy to do the job because his heart was in it. His heart was in this plan to wreck the farm program which has meant so much to the country. It was a labor of love. Where we serviced the farmer's program with a dollar in 1940, we toss him a two-bit piece in 1947.

And we even begrudge him that much. For we are told just now that the figures originally planned for this bill have to be rationalized in order to conform to the militant spirit of the House as indicated in the vote overturning the committee's plan to eliminate the school-lunch program, and the attitude of the House on soldiers' loans, soil conservation and the rehabilitation of our natural resources.

Now, let us look at the bill briefly, because I have been given only 10 minutes of the hour.

I deprecate the proposition to throw the cost of meat inspection on the farmer. Beginning back something like half a century ago, when there was such an imposition on the public in the standardization of meat and the price and the health of the consumer, in order to insure the quality and value of meat, we enacted the meat inspection law. From its very nature it was a Federal service. And no governmental activity has been more successful or more satisfactory either to the producer or the consumer. Now, it is proposed in this bill to invalidate the system which has been in effect for 50 years and substitute a plan which will preclude uniformity of administration and throw the cost of such inspection as there is on the consumer.

Here is what will happen. Numbers of small packing plants will spring up in every State, and they will engage solely in intrastate commerce. They will not be responsible to the Federal Government because they will not cross State lines. And instead of meat being inspected in interstate commerce and under the responsibility of the Federal Government, they will have no inspection except such as the States may give, and perhaps not at all. It will shift the whole proposition from Federal commerce to State supervision, and what expense there is must be borne by the producer.

The packers never pay such charges. You will recall that during the First World War, when a processing tax was levied, many processors said to the consumer, "There is a processing tax of $2.50 a hundred on hogs. We cannot afford to pay it, so you will have to pay that much more for your meat." When the farmer brought in his hogs, they said, "There is a tax of $2.50 on hogs, and as we cannot absorb it, we will pay you that much less for your hogs." About that time the Supreme Court held the tax unconstitutional and ordered the tax refunded. So the processors said to the Government, "We paid the tax, and the refund comes to us." In that way they collected the tax three times; from the consumer, the producer, and the Government. And that is what will happen here. It may be a small amount. It may be only a fraction of a cent. But the farmer will pay whatever it is and enough extra to make up the breakage.

This bill not only denies funds necessary to support the farm program but it saddles on the back of the farmer expenses he has never borne before.

We are told in the debate just now that when anything is to be done for the farmer, it is Uncle Sam who always pays the bills. But when a similar service is rendered anyone else, nothing is said about Uncle Sam paying the bills, although it comes out of the same pocket. Great business interests have been taken care of this session—for example when a law was passed excusing the railroads from carrying war supplies at the rates contracted when the roads were built with proceeds of public lands—it was money out of the Treasury. But nothing was said about Uncle Sam paying the bill. And here this week we passed a bill to pay the zinc and copper mine owners a bonus—and nothing was said about Uncle Sam paying the bill. Time without number similar laws have been enacted but it is only when some comparatively small thing is being done for the farmer that we are reminded that Uncle Sam pays the bills. And every dollar invested in the farmer is an investment in national prosperity. But for this investment in 1940 and other years the farmer could not have produced in such record-breaking abundance during the war. And without the bumper crops which the farmer contributed to the war effort we could not have maintained production in the war factories or maintained our armies, and the armies of our allies on the war front. Uncle Sam has been repaid and will continue to be repaid every dollar invested in the farm program with interest.

Support of the farm program is being denied in the name of economy. But the farmer is the only one on whom economy is practiced. Note the bill passed here on the floor just a few minutes ago It provides seven great dams for a territory covered practically by one congressional district. Four of these dams are unbudgeted and the other three largely overlap. One good dam—and one of these dams will hold the flow of the river for 2 years—one of these dams will service the over-all flood control of the river, as a whole, as well as the entire seven dams. And the total cost of the dams is approximately $500,000,000. We are denying in this bill, as it passed the House, a mere thirty million for the children of America. We are refusing a hundred million for the veterans. We are denying national agriculture a couple of hundred million for conservation. But we give approximately one congressional district $500,000,000 for projects the major part of which are not essential to the flood control of the river.

This bill is the greatest monkey wrench ever thrown into the national machinery. As originally drafted, it wiped out completely the 1948 program for soil conservation. Not a penny was provided for loan service to veterans who wanted to establish homes on the land. The money appropriated for REA was cut down, and the school lunch, an investment in the lives and bodies of children, was eliminated.

But, fortunately, the Senate intervened and we have been able to salvage something from the wreckage. It is still far from being the bill we should have had—the bill the farmers had every right to expect. But we must accept the inevitable. We must take half a loaf if we cannot get a whole loaf. For that

reason, Mr. Speaker, we support the conference report on this side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I append a tabular summary of the over-all totals of the bill:

Agriculture Department appropriation bill

OVER-ALL GRAND TOTALS

1940 appropriations	$1,649,500,000
1947 appropriations	1,274,686,051
Budget for 1948	1,188,571,318
House bill	847,127,098
Senate bill	1,048,203,508
As finally agreed to	960,044,908
More than the House by	112,917,810
Less than the Senate by	88,158,600

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, where agreement has been reached you may wonder why time is taken to discuss these measures. But today ends a fight that began back in February on the agricultural appropriation bill for this fiscal year, a fight to which I have given untold hours of time and spoken on this floor not less than a dozen times. Everyone believes in economy, but announcement was made that the majority party, the Republican Party, had been elected on that program. In February, I believe it was, we were advised what cuts might be expected in the Department of Agriculture. Many cuts could have been made, should have been made, and have been made. Yet this announcement carried, in my judgment, many eliminations of programs highly vital to the welfare of the United States and particularly to the farmers of this Nation.

At that time I started making every effort to try to save these programs which meant so much, in my judgment, to the American people. From that time until this day that fight has been continued.

I do not question the sincerity of my Republican colleagues on this committee, for whom I have the highest personal regard, but on their judgment with regard to what was adequate and proper for American agriculture we differed most widely. On that question we differed very much on what would be for the benefit of the American farmer, the American people, and this Republic. That fight has continued and the records of this House will show each advance from the drastic announcement in February to the figures included in this conference report has been in many instances bitterly contested and in all instances strongly contested. It has been a continual problem to advance step by step.

I think it was not our fight, but it was the fight of the American people. The people were advised as to just what was intended by these reductions. We spent in this Nation through the action of the Congress approximately $6,000,000,000 in permitting business to reconvert after the war, and yet during the war we called on the American farmers to extend themselves and work harder and misuse their soil and they did just as fine a job as any industry in the United States and yet we on the Democratic side have had a 5-month fight to provide $265,000,000 committed last year as one-third of the cost of redeeming soil depletion, a natural resource vital to the welfare of the Nation.

Here we find, in my judgment at least, that a majority of the Members of the House were unwilling to carry out the commitments which I considered commitments, though they may differ with me, on the soil-conservation program. We have finally brought here a bill which I do not think is too far out of line. It comes to us after the most untiring efforts on the part of the friends of agriculture against the members of this committee who themselves feel that they are also friends of agriculture but whose actions and whose judgments certainly differ from mine as to what is in the best interests of the Nation and of agriculture.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman just mentioned the differences of opinion as to the commitments for this year. Will the gentleman make it plain that there cannot be any difference of opinion as to the commitment next year for at least $150,000,000 for the farmers for the soil-conservation program?

Mr. WHITTEN. I find quite frequently that I do not speak for anybody, but so far as my opinion is concerned there was much discussion as to whether to put a figure in next year's program. I insisted that a program without a figure was no program at all. You cannot have a program without a figure. And if you put a figure in and fix the program and the department announces it and the farmers earn what they are entitled to under it, spending more of their funds than does the Government, I do not think there can be any question but what there is an obligation and an outright commitment. I can speak only for myself and the Members on my own side. But this bill, if you will check it, is not too far out of line with what should have been done for agriculture, in my judgment. This gives $265,000,000 for the AAA payments, and I doubt that more than that will be earned for the reason that the program has been stymied for 60 days as the result of what the House did before. The President recommended $200,000,000 next year and only $150,000,000 is carried in this bill, though to get this program it became necessary to accept the limitation. But each of those places where this bill is improved over the original House action has come back as a result of the untiring efforts on the part of the Democrats on this committee, friends of agriculture on this side of the Capitol and on the other side. In making this advance against the opposition of the Republican Members we have veritably had to fight at every fence post.

In February they announced there would be no funds for AAA payments, no farm tenant purchase program for veterans, drastic reductions in the REA and no school-lunch program, no marketing research funds and no section 32 funds—funds set aside for agriculture as a result of allowing competitive agricultural products to come into this country from abroad. I released those facts to the Nation. The majority Members could not hold to that and our original bill was better than the original announcement the majority Members made.

After a 2-day fight here on the floor we saved $40,000,000 of section 32 funds, and obtained sufficient funds for agricultural research in marketing.

The Senate then improved the bill and when we came back to the House on the AAA payments we, after a hard fight, won on a vote to recede and figures were written into the bill more nearly carrying out the pledge made by this Congress last year. The chairman defeated us on several other votes but only after agreeing to try to work the issues out in the second conference.

Today this report provides $265,000,000 for AAA together with a program that next year provides for continuation of the school lunch, adequate funds for research, and almost enough for the REA. It provides for the farm tenant purchase program and continues for the use of agriculture section 32 funds which by statute belong to agriculture. All of these the Republican majority said they would not provide for when we met in February. It has been a long, hard road, but I feel we have won out. Certainly the great progress made during the past few years to more nearly put the farmer on a comparable basis with labor, guaranteed minimum wages and hours and industry protected by tariffs should not be destroyed. We have saved the farmer for one more year at least.

This we have done in spite of the active opposition of our Republican colleagues or at least most of them. They have approved this report. I would like to believe they have been converted—this the record refutes because most of them have fought to the last ditch to destroy these programs which in my judgment are so vital to the American farmer and the American people. Truly I am glad their original views have not prevailed. It is no wonder that, though I have the highest regard for my Republican colleagues both on the committee and off, I believe it is to the best interest of the American farmer that we have a Democratic rather than a Republican majority.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I want to address myself to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. I happen to come from Wisconsin, a State where the farmers farm their farms and do not lie awake nights figuring out schemes to get money out of the United States Treasury. When he sheds tears, I do not want him to shed any for me, because I will take my chances in telling the people the truth about agricultural appropriations. I might tell them what his administration has done for the fur farmers of this country; how it has wrecked them. I could also call his attention to the fact that, as one Member of Congress, I surely have not been a party to wrecking the sheep industry of this country.

Right in this bill you will find where we are going to get the money for your

school lunches. You will get it out of section 32 funds. Where do you get section 32 funds? You get it by taking 30 percent of the customs receipts. From 25 to 35 percent of the customs receipts come from wool, the wool that is grown on sheep and imported to this country. You take the 30 percent of customs receipts and I would like to know, when Mr. Clayton gets through conniving with these foreign cartels and monopolies that do not dare to set up in the United States because they would come under the Sherman Antitrust Act—I would like to know where you are going to get any section 32 funds to carry on your school lunches, because there will not be any money there if Mr. Clayton has his way about it.

Now, we have enough problems in this country so far as agriculture is concerned. In 1939, the seventh year of the more abundant life, we had 54-cent wheat, we had 5-cent hogs, we had 8-cent cotton. Basically, we are in just as bad shape as we were in 1932. If this soil fertility was of so much interest to these people, why did they use only 3 percent of the money for fertilizer and use 90 percent in a feeble attempt to try to purchase something else?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, we are today taking final action on the agriculture appropriation bill. Much misrepresentation has been made in the press and much thoughtless criticism has been voiced here on the floor of the House in connection with this appropriation. Let us analyze briefly just what agriculture has received from this, the first Republican-controlled Congress in 16 years. The facts speak for themselves. I leave it to the judgment of the people of America as to whether or not my fellow farmers have suffered at the hands of this Congress.

With the terrific drain on the Treasury because of wars in the past and the fear of war in the future, it behooves us to stop, look, and listen—to be even more careful this year in making appropriations. I feel that, taking into consideration the fact that we have a national debt of $259,000,000,000, our Appropriations Committee has been very reasonable. A cut of a little over 18 percent below the budget request has been made. While I have not agreed with every action taken by the committee, on the whole this bill certainly disproves any possible claim that agriculture has been treated unfairly. Let us examine the principal items and my efforts in connection with them in order that the people in our District, the Seventh of Minnesota, may see for themselves just what action their Congressman favored in each instance and why.

PARITY FOR AGRICULTURE

As our Seventh District of Minnesota is one of the greatest strictly agricultural districts in America, the welfare of the farmer is of the greatest concern to me. During my 9 years in Congress, I have fought for one principal objective—parity prices for all farm commodities. The farmer does not want an unreasonable price for what he produces but inasmuch as his expenses have skyrocketed just as much as they have in all other industries, he must receive prices for what he produces which will maintain his position in our national picture—which is to say, he must receive parity prices for every farm commodity.

We all know that when things are scarce prices are high and that high production in all lines means lower living costs. This is true with respect to agriculture just as it is with respect to other industries. However, we farmers do not wish to achieve high production if it merely means low prices for the fruits of our labor and a continued high cost of living. That is not the American way. That is not a square deal for the farmer. We farmers want a square deal and are willing to give one in return. This means we must receive parity prices for the things we produce in order that production will be encouraged.

Without parity what happens? Here is an example. Consider the butter situation. Butter is not being produced today in sufficient volume simply because farmers are not going to milk cows 14 times a week unless there is a reasonable profit resulting from that drudgery. Farmer after farmer sells his dairy herd. Production is lowered. Prices go up to the point where, temporarily at least, the consumer cannot afford to buy the butter. A fair price today would prevent the disposal of those dairy herds.

The number one duty of Members of Congress now is to see to it that the money and machinery necessary to cushion the shock of any possible drop in farm prices shall be available if the need shall arise. I do not have to tell you that prices have dropped after good crop years and may do so again. A small surplus is sufficient excuse for the speculators to break the market. Farm prices are barometers of national welfare. Let us, therefore, make certain that no economic storm be foretold by the farm price barometer. Let us insure that farm prices shall not fall below a reasonable level. We must have the necessary gross national income if we are to continue to meet the huge drains on our Treasury, which will be with us for years to come. Three items alone, the care of our veterans, an adequate national defense, and the interest on our national debt will cost our taxpayers over $20,000,000,000 this coming year—a sum approximately equal to the gross farm income of all the farmers in America.

This Congress, a Republican Congress, has furnished that very necessary cushion against depression by replenishing the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation to its full authorized level of $4,750,000,000. We gave this Corporation a clean slate and canceled its notes of over $600,000,000 due the Treasury—money spent last year for subsidies of various kinds—mostly to benefit consumers. I strongly urged the restoration of the full borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation early this year and suggested the cancellation of those notes. Now our great commodity loan institution has again been given the financial standing necessary to make certain that ample money will be on hand for our price-support programs, and we have the assurance that farm prices will not slide down the toboggan of economic failure.

Last fall I urged the Secretary of Agriculture to place a price support floor of $6 per bushel under our flax production of 1947. Our Seventh District produces more flax than any congressional district in America. When that proposal was agreed to it meant at least an additional $15,000,000 for our 19 counties for the flax crop this year. Our district will receive nearly $45,000,000 for its flax this fall. This illustrates clearly the importance of a price support program which will give the farmers—not the speculators—the larger portion of the returns from what their farms have produced.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, a fair price for farm products is the first essential of a prosperous Nation. A drop of only 10 cents in the value of a bushel of corn means a loss of $300 to the average farmer in the Seventh District. Twenty cents reduction per bushel for barley will cost him another $200, while a fall of a dime per pound for butterfat will create an extra deficit of $150. Our farmers must have the income if we are to be able to pay current prices for labor and everything we buy. Give the farmers of the Nation at least twenty billions in income and we need not fear any economic crisis in our country. The farm dollar exchanges hands seven times a year, creating an income for the Nation of seven times whatever the farmer receives gross for his products.

Our sealing programs, bolstered by the Commodity Credit Corporation, are the most important part of our farm program. We must preserve this program. If a severe drop in prices hits agriculture, it may cost the farmers of the Nation eight thousand millions of dollars in 1 year, or 25 times the much-discussed amount of three hundred millions requested for triple-A payments. Give the farmer parity price and the necessary technical assistance and he will take care of his soil without asking pay for doing so. Let us not trade away for a small subsidy, as most people frankly term the triple-A payments, 10 times the amount of income to which we are rightfully entitled, if we are given parity with other industries.

TRIPLE-A COMMITTEES

We must have and must keep machinery available in each and every township and county ready to start the wheels rolling for placing loans under grain, if they are needed. Mr. Speaker, if there is one part of this bill that I fought for that is the item of $24,500,000 for administrative expenses for AAA. Frankly, I felt discouraged in subcommittee when my original motion for this amount was rejected and only $15,000,000 was allowed in the bill when it came to the floor of the House for consideration. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that I was the only Member of the House who tried to increase this amount on the floor. My amendment was defeated but the Senate agreed with me and wrote in the $24,500,000, as I had urged, and that amount is in this conference report today.

It is because of my personal experience as a farmer that I am convinced of

the great need for keeping the framework of this committee structure intact and available for possible future needs and I have spent many hours trying to convince other Members of Congress of the value of our triple-A committees. Without them, or a similar group, we cannot have a successful farm program, nor would we have any machinery to throw into action if a tailspin in farm prices developed. God help our Nation if any such catastrophe should happen again. A severe fall in farm commodity values is so absolutely unnecessary that it is almost criminal to permit its recurrence. All we need do is keep farm income at a reasonable level and the gross income for the rest of the Nation will, as a matter of course, keep its own relative position.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Next in importance to the farmer receiving a parity price for what he produces is the urgent need of technical advice relative to the preservation of his soil. In this bill, we have made available sufficient money for the nearly 2,000 soil conservation districts throughout America. In subcommittee, Mr. Speaker, I urged that the original allotment of $20,000,000 be increased to $38,000,000, and my suggestion was finally agreed upon. I explained that it is far more important, in my judgment, to keep expanding this technical service until every county in the United States has its benefits, than it is to continue payments to individual farmers for carrying out certain soil-conservation practices.

Give the average farmer the benefit of the advice and planning of technical experts with reference to the soil on his farm and that farmer will carry out those suggestions. He wants to be shown how but he does not demand that he be paid for everything that he does to preserve his own soil. This farmer, my neighbor, and yours, knows as well as any other American citizen, that we must cut the cost of Government somewhere. Triple-A payments are, after all, not as essential nor are they in the same category as other needed expenditures, say, for example, funds for the care of our veterans. We must draw the line somewhere. We are making available $165,000,000 for triple-A payments, however, in this bill, and that will take care of commitments entered into for this year's program.

I have been criticized, Mr. Speaker, for daring to suggest that our farmers, myself among them, could do without the triple-A payments. These same critics do not mention the fact that I have been more responsible than any one man in the House this year for the preservation of our triple-A committees. Nor do they mention the fact that the $38,000,000 given for the expenses of the soil-conservation districts was largely the result of my fight for that amount which I felt was absolutely required to keep all soil-conservation districts operating efficiently. Let us remember that this Republican Congress has given to the Soil Conservation Service 98 percent of what it received in 1947 and 74 percent more than it received in 1943.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can be accused, and rightly so, of suggesting that while we, as farmers, urgently need our price-support programs, our triple-A committees, our soil-conservation districts, our REA, and our extension and research activities, the need is not so critical today for the triple-A payments which scarcely amount, this year, to 3 percent of our farm income in America. Let us put first things first. May I again say, Mr. Speaker, that in the raising of the flax price alone, which I helped to secure, the farmers of my district are obtaining an additional $15,000,000, or at least 10 times as much as our Seventh District would receive in triple-A payments. The money for the flax will come out of the market as it should. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that a fair price out of the market is far more important than is any amount of money out of a debt-ridden Treasury in so-called triple-A payments. Some people cannot see the forest for the trees. My farmers are willing to do their part to keep our beloved Nation solvent.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

The press has been especially unfair with reference to our treatment of REA. This Republican Congress has made available to REA every dime it can use for the coming year without waste and inefficiency. In this bill there is a fund of $225,000,000 for new loan allocations. There was on hand this last July 1 an additional $325,000,000 which, while allocated, has not yet been spent for construction. We have made available, as of this month, $550,000,000 for further expansion and construction. The Department of Agriculture officials informed our subcommittee that it will be at least 20 months before sufficient transformers and materials will be available to take care of all the applicants.

I have objected to the making of loans of millions of dollars to buy up and reestablish deteriorating private utilities, which serve villages and rural areas. There are thousands of farmers who have never had an opportunity to know what electricity in their farm homes can mean. The $225,000,000 we have authorized this year, together with the $325,000,000 unexpended from previous years, should go into the extension of lines. It is not the business of REA to take over defunct utilities serving villages but it is the business of REA to get new lines spread out to every farm home in the Nation. If power is not available to our REA associations at reasonable rates from private utilities, then and only then should REA go into the business of generating that power. The loaning, for instance, of $10,000,000 to take over a property in an area already served means that much less money will be available in districts like ours, the Seventh of Minnesota.

It was a pleasure to bring the splendid repayment record of our REA associations to the attention of our subcommittee during the hearings.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has given REA 90 percent of the amount it requested through the budget. What more can reasonable men ask when we consider the huge national debt which hangs like a pall over our Nation?

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

Mr. Speaker, last December when the foot-and-mouth disease was discovered in southeastern Mexico, many of us immediately realized through our knowledge of this plague just how serious the problem facing both Mexico and the United States is as a result of this outbreak. I joined with Dr. GILLIE, of Indiana, in a request to Chairman TABER of our Committee on Appropriations that just what was needed be determined by sending a few Members to Mexico City for a thorough appraisal of the job. Seven of us made that study and as a result of our report to Congress, Mr. TABER and our Appropriations Committee have arranged to make available whatever funds may be necessary to help our neighbor stamp out this threat to our own great livestock industry. It is my personal opinion that it will require 3 years' time and the slaughter of 2,500,000 cattle and 3,000,000 hogs and sheep before this situation is brought under control. It is impossible to estimate today whether this will require two hundred or four hundred million dollars. When we analyze this agricultural appropriation bill, let us keep in mind that our Republican Congress has, in addition to the nearly $1,000,000,000 herein specified, pledged its word that it will do what it can to prevent the foot-and-mouth disease from making inroads into our $20,000,000,000 livestock industry.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this Republican Congress does not and will not hesitate to expend a half billion dollars, if necessary, to stamp out this disease. Just as we believe in protecting the market prices for farm commodities, as has been proven by the cancellation of the over $600,000,000 in notes due to the Treasury by the Commodity Credit Corporation, we also believe in protecting the farmer's great livestock industry from destruction.

We believe in doing those things for agriculture which protect the very life blood of farming. We place the important things first, Mr. Speaker.

RECAPITULATION

Our Eightieth Congress, condemned by critics who are so partisan that they cannot judge fairly, has in this session and in this bill accomplished the following for agriculture in America:

First. Assured the farmer of 90 percent parity loans on basic commodities by the cancellation of the notes due by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Second. Has helped and is helping to prevent the spreading of the dread foot-and-mouth disease into our Nation. Our loss will be at least $1,000,000,000 per year if this disease comes above our border.

Third. Has given to the Soil Conservation Service approximately the same amount as was made available in 1947. The only cut made has been in the higher administrative brackets where there is duplication of effort and consequently waste of funds.

Fourth. Triple-A payments to the amount of $165,000,000 for 1947 and $150,000,000 for 1948 are assured.

Fifth. Triple-A county and township committees are provided with sufficient funds with which to do a good job. These committees are the very heart of any new farm program.

Sixth. The Farm Home Administration has been allotted $60,000,000 with which to make production loans to farmers who cannot secure credit elsewhere. Farm tenancy will have $15,000,000 for loans for the purchase of farms. Veterans, in addition, can secure loans under the GI bill of rights, administered by the Veterans' Administration. New legislation is pending which will cure the stalemate experienced in the operation of the GI bill in this respect.

Seventh. Forestry and all of its divisions has been given ample money for the protection of that great natural resource.

Eighth. Research, in all phases, has about $50,000,000 in this bill. More than ever before, agriculture has been protected in this field. When we value the development of hybrid corn alone at $500,000,000 a year, we can begin to see how important research is to agriculture. This Congress is far in advance of any other Congress in its appropriations for this purpose.

Ninth. REA has been given ample loan funds for all the extensions the present material and labor situation will permit. There was $550,000,000 available for construction as of July 1.

Tenth. The Extension Service was given every cent it requested. Our Republican Congress has confidence in the Extension Service and intends to enlarge its scope of operation.

Eleventh. Crop insurance has been retained on an experimental basis until we can determine fair premiums. Wheat and flax have paid their way the past 2 years. Cotton has proven to be a very poor risk and the maladministration of this part of the program has resulted in flax and wheat suffering through the curtailment of the program generally. Cotton insurance cost the taxpayers $40,000,000 in 1946. Why not make cotton producers pay a fair premium?

Twelfth. The school-lunch program has been given the entire $65,000,000 requested for food expenditure. The $10,000,000 requested for equipment was eliminated. I supported the full appropriation request, feeling as I do that the children of America are the most valuable asset of our country and that the least we could do was to provide this comparatively small amount, especially when the hundreds of millions of dollars sent abroad for relief are considered.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, this is my analysis of the record of the Eightieth Congress as it pertains to agriculture. As a farmer, I approve of this record and am proud of what we have managed to accomplish toward helping my fellow farmers along the pathway to the goal of financial independence and a just return to them for their 60 to 80 hours work each week to feed the rest of the Nation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, since the present bill was originally introduced in the House several weeks ago, the welfare of the farmer has been seriously threatened by the action of this Congress. The present version of the bill is better than anything previously offered the House this session but it is still very unsatisfactory in many particulars—the pledge to the producers in AAA funds is still not fully met, and the provisions of the 1948 crop year are unsatisfactory.

The farmers of the Nation have the Democrats of the House and Senate to thank for the fact that this bill goes as far as it does in the interest of American agriculture.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, before I move the previous question on the conference report I ask unanimous consent to insert some tables containing information the Members might like.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot entertain such a request at this time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 43: Page 61, strike out lines 5 to 10 inclusive.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr DIRKSEN moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 43.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 59: On page 81, line 12, insert:

"To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act of June 4, 1946 (Public Law 396), there is hereby made available $75,000,000 of the funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1948 by section 32 of the act approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612 (c)), such amount to be without regard to the 25-percent limitation contained in said section 32, and to be exclusive of funds expended in accordance with the last sentence of section 9 of the National School Lunch Act."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DIRKSEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the figure "$75,000,000" where it occurs in said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$65,000,000"; and at the end of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of such funds shall be used for nonfood assistance under section 5 of said act."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, that concludes action on the conference report.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is obliged to say that owing to the objection of the minority leader it will be impossible to entertain the request at this time.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and to include an article.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is obliged to say that the Chair cannot entertain requests for extensions at this time.

RESIGNATION FROM JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 24, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. MARTIN: I hereby tender my resignation from the Joint Committee on Printing.

Sincerely,

TOM PICKETT,
Member of Congress,
Seventh District of Texas.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 328).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That OMAR BURLESON, of Texas, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the Joint Committee on Printing.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 329).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Appropriations.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 104.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Housing (hereafter referred to as the committee), and to be composed of seven Members of the Senate who are members of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, and seven Members of the House of Representative who are members of the House of Representatives Committee on Banking and Currency to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

A vacancy in the membership of the committee shall not affect the powers of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. The committee, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, shall conduct a thorough study and investigation of the entire field of housing, including but not limited to—

(1) the extent of the need for housing in the United States as a whole and in all areas thereof;

(2) the extent, if any, to which shortages in building materials are contributing to the shortage of housing;

(3) the reasons for the existing high costs of building materials and housing and the action which may be taken to reduce such costs;

(4) all factors of whatever kind or nature which contribute to the existing high costs of housing and which prevent the speedy construction of adequate housing to satisfy the needs of the Nation and the action which may be taken to eliminate such factors;

(5) the extent to which archaic building codes and zoning laws contribute to the existing shortage and excessive cost of housing;

(6) the administration and operation of existing Federal laws relating to slum clearance, insurance of mortgages on housing, home loans, guaranties of veterans' housing loans, construction permits, veterans' preference in the renting and purchase of housing, rent control, and all other matters relating to housing;

(7) the availability of private capital and of Government loans to finance the construction of housing;

(8) the organization and operations of Federal, State, and municipal government agencies concerned with housing; and

(9) such other problems and subjects in the field of housing as the committee deems appropriate.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than March 15, 1948, the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation and such other recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 4. The committee shall have the power, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary for the performance of its duties, including consultants who shall receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $35 for each day actually spent by them in the work of the committee, together with their necessary travel and subsistence expenses. The committee is further authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of all agencies in the executive branch of the Government and may request the governments of the several States, representatives of business, industry, finance, and labor, and such other persons, agencies, organizations, and instrumentalities as it deems appropriate to attend its hearings and to give and present information, advice, and recommendations.

SEC. 5. The committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings; to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths, to take such testimony; to have such printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services in reporting such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by them.

SEC. 6. The members of the committee shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the committee, other than expenses in connection with meetings of the committee held in the District of Columbia during such times as the Congress is in session.

SEC. 7. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of disbursements so made.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of the time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and at this time I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is brought in here for the purpose of trying to deal with the housing situation. It provides for a complete and full investigation. The Banking and Currency Committee has given consideration to such legislation and the members of that committee feel that this investigation is essential to the welfare of the country and also because of the fact that there has been so much said in the last few months regarding the housing situation. I know from the sentiment that was expressed in the committee that it wants to do everything possible to aid and assist the veterans. In order that the veterans and the people of this country who need materials to support the housing program may be helped, this committee certainly should be able to do a job that would be in the interest of the country in every respect. I feel sure that we will be doing a good job to pass this resolution.

I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

HOUSING LOBBY FORCES RESOLUTION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, if the Republicans had not been swayed and influenced by one of the rottenest and most powerful lobbies that ever infested Washington, this resolution would not have been necessary. I know and you know that this resolution will not build one single home for the thousands upon thousands of homeless ex-servicemen for whom we have tried to provide homes in the last 2 years.

When President Truman appointed an exceptionally resourceful and capable and honest man as Expediter, Mr. Wilson Wyatt, who prepared a program that aimed to provide homes for the homeless and for the ex-servicemen, the contractors and the real-estate operators through their lobbies started to attack his program. They maintained that if the Expediter were removed and all restrictions and regulations eliminated that they, the contractors, would build plenty of homes at reasonable prices for all. They actually succeeded in scuttling that wonderful program that he had laid out, under which more than 800,000 homes were started, and many of them finished.

It was a mistake that you gentlemen on the left made when you forced too small a sum of money to be appropriated for aiding in the construction of these homes. If his recommendation, which was approved by President Truman, had been carried out, there is no question but that from a million and a half to two million homes would have been built in 1946 and 1947, and that by the middle of 1948 there would have been no home shortage.

LOBBYISTS WON OUT

But you listened to these lobbyists and to these contractors who maintained that they could build homes cheaper and faster if all the restrictions were removed. Well, the restrictions have been removed, and so was the Expediter, and these contractors have had almost a year's time.

What have they built? What have they accomplished? Oh, yes; they have built some homes, but at what price? At a price that these ex-servicemen could afford to pay? Indeed not.

The houses they are building now are priced at $9,000, $10,000, $12,000, $15,000, $25,000. How many ex-servicemen are in a position to buy $12,000, $15,000, or $20,000 homes? You can answer that. I know that there are very few of them. But these are the houses that the private contractors, the real-estate vultures and manipulators, are building and causing to be built, not to relieve the ex-servicemen but merely for personal financial advantage, because it is only the middle and the wealthier class that can afford to pay $15,000, $20,000, or $25,000 for their homes.

BLAME FALLS ON REPUBLICAN PARTY

I do not blame the contractors for all the omissions and delays and the failure to construct cheaper homes that veterans can afford to purchase. When you forced the repeal of price control, immediately the price of all materials going into housing went sky-high. Lumber and all construction materials increased in cost from 100 to 200 percent. Steel and everything else that goes into these homes have increased because the price controls were removed. Consequently even the honest contractors are in no position to build the homes that are so sadly needed.

As to the veterans' emergency housing program, I know that our late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and our present President tried their utmost to bring about the construction of sufficient homes for the boys when and as they were returning. They appealed to the Congress time and time again. They have appealed to you in behalf of the programs they advocated and urged. Unfortunately, no attention was paid to their appeals. We find nearly 1,500,000, some people say 2,000,000 ex-servicemen without homes, living under conditions that are deplorable. This is your fault and you cannot escape the failure.

RESOLUTION WILL BUILD NO HOMES

As I stated before, this resolution will not build any homes. If this committee would be active and earnestly and sincerely go into the housing situation, I would indeed be for the resolution, because then the country would not only have my word but would have the words in the report of the committee. I know that they would, in reporting to the House or to the country, prove everything I say as to the housing situation and who is responsible for the shortage in housing.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BROOKS. May I say to the gentleman that in addition to what he has said this House went on record as taking from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the authority the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had to refinance mortgages for the veterans. Now I get appeals from my section of the country and appeals from the American Legion and other veterans' organizations saying that housing financing and housing construction have reached a standstill throughout many parts of the country because we have taken away the powers the RFC had to finance these mortgage notes.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman for the observation. That fact has been known to me.

WAGNER HOUSING BILL FILIBUSTERED BY HOUSE REPUBLICANS

Mr. Speaker, if last year the Republican members of the Committee on Banking and Currency had not delayed and hampered consideration of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill, until finally they smothered it to death in a committee filibuster, so that it could not be favorably considered on the floor, I myself am satisfied that by now many low-cost homes and housing projects would have been under construction and even occupied by happy tenants, and our Nation-wide shortage would have been alleviated.

It is too late to make amends in this session of Congress, in which again consideration has been delayed and stalled through the machinations of that powerful and selfish lobby, which the President recently called subversive; but it is not too late to plan on early passage in the second session of this Congress.

LONG SOUGHT HOUSING PROGRAM

I have endeavored to the best of my ability for years to bring about a program and policy that would provide homes for the needy people of our country. I have foreseen the situation not only in Washington but all throughout the land. I have cooperated with all the different organizations in that field.

Yet, from your side there were too many who refused to cooperate until we finally brought about the appointment of an expediter. I was immensely pleased when the President at that time selected Mr. Wilson Wyatt because, as I said, he was a man of broad experience and wonderful executive ability. If his program had not been scuttled by the repealing of all the laws that would have aided him in proceeding in accordance with his well laid out plan to supply and build homes at a reasonable price, I know the plan would have succeeded. By this time we would be well advanced toward having plenty of homes for the ex-servicemen and people now without a roof over their heads.

Naturally, I feel that this resolution will be adopted. It means an additional cost upon the country of $100,000. None of that would have been necessary if you had not acted as you did, arbitrarily and contrary to the best interests of the ex-servicemen and against the best interests of our country. But we are confronted with these conditions. There is a shortage of homes.

REPUBLICANS BUILD COMMITTEES INSTEAD OF HOMES

Only a few weeks ago and again a few days ago the President called your attention to it. But instead of building homes, you are building a lot of committees to investigate everything. These investigations will not provide roofs over the heads of the needy and deserving ex-servicemen who served their country so well and patriotically, but it will enrich those contractors who insisted on repealing all the laws which were intended to help bring about the construction of homes so as to have everything their own way.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that I have said enough. I realize this resolution will pass, but I could not resist calling attention to the fact that if there is any blame for the shortage of homes that ultimate blame rests upon the shoulders of the Republican Party, and no investigation can possibly show otherwise. Any investigation would place the burden of responsibility upon the contractors and real-estate operators who were able to impose themselves and their views upon the Republican Party. I hope and I am satisfied that you gentlemen on the left in the future will realize the mistakes that you have made in following the advice and influence of these lobbyists, not only in this respect but in many other respects you have voted in the interest of those who really do not need your aid or assistance. You completely ignored the needs of the American people and of the masses.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, my esteemed friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], who just preceded me, has stated that there is serious need for housing in the United States. In that statement I am in hearty accord. Many of the things which the gentleman said are true, and conditions should be investigated.

The Committee on Banking and Currency of the House, which has jurisdiction over housing, has been a very busy committee since it began hearings about the 1st of February. We have been in daily session, quite often while the House was in session. There has been much emergency legislation which has had to be taken care of.

As a matter of fact, we have not done very much in the Committee on Banking and Currency on legislation that was not urgently required. Much of it is in the field of housing, but it has been more or less a peacemeal program because of the necessity for expeditious action on legislation which has been brought before us. We had to correct certain abuses and do it very quickly. We took cognizance of the fact, for example, that under these strict Government controls, to which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] referred, during the year 1946, when no piece of material which went into the building of a home could be obtained without permission of the Housing Expediter, we completed about 650,000 homes. The last year of free enterprise building was 1941. In that year, without any Government controls, and without the tremendous demand for homes that there was in 1946, we completed 714,000 homes. The Government program, to which the gentleman referred, was recognized as a failure, and we had to act expeditiously to start home construction. I think we can all take heart from the fact that on last Sunday, in a press release by Mr. Frank Creedon, the Expediter, he made a statement that there had been more houses started in June of this year than had been started in any month in 20 years and that in the first 6 months of this year there had been more homes started and finished than in any comparable period in 20 years. I think that proves the value of the services which we gave here in this House in respect to removing the shackles which were deterring the building of homes.

There are many fields in which the House Banking and Currency Committee acts, but none is more important than housing. We all realize that one of the bottlenecks preventing the stabilization of our American economy lies in the lack of housing at the present time. Our population has increased over 10,000,000 since the 1940 census. The number of families has increased about 7,000,000.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Michigan three additional minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. There was, of course, very little, if any, housing constructed during the war except emergency war housing. We now want to find out what can be done to expedite home construction. We want to find out if the bottleneck is in the building-materials field. We want to find out if it is necessary to expand the credit base to make credit available for the construction of homes. We want to find out very definitely the extent to which the Federal Government, the States, the counties, the municipalities should participate in public housing for low rentals.

We recognize, I believe, that there is a field in which the Federal Government should operate in encouraging the construction of public housing. We want to find out how expansive or how narrow that field should be. This study we hope will result in the answer to that and many other problems.

Under the provisions of this resolution, we are without limit to study all phases of the housing problem. After enumer-

ating many of them which prescribe consideration in particular fields we end up by saying that the committee may study such other problems and subjects in the field of housing as the committee deems appropriate. That is all-inclusive, and when we make the report on March 15, 1948, as is required by the resolution, I feel confident that the people of the Nation will feel that the money which will be made available for this study has been very well spent.

The membership of the committee is made up of members of the House Banking and Currency Committee and the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, legislative committees, which will have to do with the housing legislation. So there will be no duplication of effort or overlapping of authority in this study and I believe this is something that is most sensible. We will know from now on, we hope, where we are going in respect to housing and how we can lick the housing shortage.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I am very much pleased to have the gentleman from Michigan admit that there is a serious need for housing. From the actions of his committee I was under the impression that there was no such need, because nothing has been done through two sessions of the Congress.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. Yes; I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think the gentleman should check up on those remarks he has just made, and read the RECORD. If he does he will find this Congress has passed innumerable housing bills this year, all of which have been in the interest of expediting the construction of homes. I do not think the gentleman wants that to stand.

Mr. CARROLL. I intend to point out where I think the gentleman failed not only in the Eightieth Congress but in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman ought to give the facts.

Mr. CARROLL. I intend to give the gentleman some facts which even he cannot refute.

This whole housing program came before the Seventy-ninth Congress. A Republican leader of another body conducted an inquiry and investigation. There was drawn the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, which was passed by another body and came to the Banking and Currency Committee of this House. Nothing was done in the Seventy-ninth Congress about it. Again in the first session of the Eightieth Congress a committee met in another body and again passed out the housing program, calling to the attention of the people of this Nation, this body and this Congress that there was a critical need for housing, setting forth the number of people who needed homes, the veterans who were living in basements and attics, and still no hearing has been conducted by any committee of this body.

We are confronted here today with a concurrent resolution which would be good if it were conducted concurrently with housing legislation which should be going forward at this very time.

What is the purpose of housing legislation? The cry here has been it is socialistic. As a matter of fact, we call the present bill the TEW bill, but it has substantially the same requirement. What does it do? It extends the payback period, it reduces the interest rate, it tends to stimulate local interest in housing problems; it also includes a better housing program designed to create 500,000 units over a period of 4 years in the field of public housing.

The action of this Congress, and I will leave this to the gentlemen on the right, resulted in pulling the plug on public housing in this Nation. The gentleman from Illinois and other gentlemen mentioned the RFC. What has happened? You pulled the plug on small home builders and small banks. That is your contribution to housing, I say to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I am not opposing this resolution, but whenever they say to me that we now need to appoint a committee to find out if there is a need for housing, I say the need must be apparent because you passed a rent-control bill.

Next you want to know whether high costs exist today in the field of housing. Let me say to you that one of the things that has happened in the housing field is that the builders have priced themselves out of the market. The veteran today cannot buy a home, the veteran does not have enough money to buy a home; moreover, he cannot live in a home that is selling on the market for ten or thirteen thousand dollars because the average pay of a veteran is about $2,500 a year. He cannot possibly pay more than $40 or $50 a month.

Mr. GROSS. How about labor?

Mr. CARROLL. I cannot yield.

The very purpose of the housing program before the other body was to stimulate planning in local areas. Here is what is happening in Denver today. All of the veterans groups are cooperating. They are working with labor and with the city officials in order to determine if they can get land which is tax delinquent so they can build homes. They are working at the local level. All over America people have been looking to the Congress for legislative action.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. CARROLL. The people of America have been looking to this Congress to do the few things they have been asked of them. As I have said, this is not a great Government program, where we are subsidizing, where we are spending money, where we are standing back of the contractors and the builders. We are the secondary defense. That is the thing that the people have asked this Congress to do.

May I say that when they talk about an investigating committee, you have had scores of witnesses, veterans groups, and contractors, who have come in here and testified to the need of housing. Let me digress for a moment to show how important this thing is to the Nation. This is the No. 1 economic problem of this Nation. This is the problem that strikes at the very moral fabric of the Nation. Take a look at your divorce cases; take a look at your juvenile delinquency and your crime. All of these things are wrapped up in housing, adequate housing, for the people. That is why the veterans' groups all over this Nation are fighting for housing, perhaps save one group.

Now, gentlemen, I am not speaking against this resolution, but may I say to you that it should have been a concurrent investigation coupled with a great housing program. I sincerely believe—and I do not make of this a political question, that many Republican Members and many Republican veterans want to see a housing program come out of committee. I have great admiration and respect for the ability of the gentleman from Michigan, and if he would put his great ability in back of the housing program, this House would pass one. I have that much respect for the gentleman from Michigan. By the same token, because of his great ability and because of his leadership, I can almost lay at his door the responsibility that there is not this great housing program.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I make this observation to the gentleman from Colorado and to the gentleman from Michigan. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs reported out the Donohue bill, day before yesterday which would provide 200,000 low-cost rental units for the veterans of this country. We passed it after hearings which indicated the need for veterans' housing. The bill now can be brought up under suspension of the rules in the next few days over here if they can prevail on the House leadership to bring it up, and provide the veterans of this country with some housing. The hearings plainly showed that we do not need another investigating committee to show that the veterans of this country need housing. We have a bill reported out of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and if it can be brought up under suspension of the rules in the next few days, we can still do something for the veterans in this session of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to suggest to the gentleman that he might check that bill with the Bureau of the Budget to see whether or not it is in accord with the program of the President. It might be enlightening. I wonder what report they had on that from the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would like to answer that. I do not care

whether it is in line with the Bureau of the Budget or anybody else. Now, that is the very thing I have argued about in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I do not care whether General Bradley wants it or not. As a matter of fact, he does not. I do not care whether President Truman wants it or not. The time has come for this Congress to act. I told them in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs that we do not have to ask General Bradley; we do not have to ask anybody if there is a housing shortage for veterans in this country. So, we reported it out of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and it is up to the Republican leadership here to bring it up in the next 2 days, or say to the veterans of this country that you do not intend to do anything for them.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I wonder if the gentleman could give us any assurance that the President would not veto the bill if we sent it down there?

Mr. CARROLL. I should like to answer that. I am surprised that the majority leader would propound such a question when the President is on record here with a message speaking to this Congress repeatedly about a housing program, aside from the point that the gentleman from Oklahoma raises.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the further answer is this, that we have our job to do and somebody else has his job to do. The second job, whether or not there will be a veto, cannot be passed upon until we do our job.

Mr. CARROLL. That is obvious.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. I think this is a very worthy resolution, but I do not think we should pin too much hope on it. Under the terms of this resolution, this committee has no power to report legislation, it can simply make recommendations. We know what is needed right now.

Mr. CARROLL. That is a very good point, one that I intended to make, and I am happy the gentleman called it to my attention. This is a committee to go out and find out what everybody knows, that there is a housing shortage, to find out what everybody knows, that houses cost a great deal of money. Moreover, the committee will come back to this Congress and make a report in March of 1948. You must not forget the significance of this. 1948, they tell me, may be a political year. But in 1948 you will have a committee making a report, and it is entirely possible there may be a housing bill which will become organized perhaps in 1949 or 1950.

While the Seventy-ninth Congress has acted upon this, the Eightieth Congress has not acted. We are further away today from housing than we were in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. However much we may be in disagreement on this resolution, the gentleman will agree with me that on the question of the desperate need for housing for veterans, and for others, for that matter, an overwhelming majority of the Members of this House believe that housing is needed by whatever method it might be acquired.

Mr. CARROLL. If the Members of this body had a chance to vote on some of these important measures on housing, both Democrats and Republicans, in my judgment, would vote them through.

Mr. DINGELL. There will be no danger of a veto. Let us take a chance on that.

Mr. CARROLL. There is no doubt about that.

I have talked about the social impact of this legislation. Let me talk for just a minute or two about the economic impact. The building industry is a $6,000,000,000 industry. We talk about full production and full employment. We can make a substantial contribution to our own economy, to continued prosperity, by such a program as I have outlined. It is not original with me. I have talked about the membership of another body. We need this for Americans.

I have heard a great deal here in 6 or 7 months about the topic of communism. If you want to get rid of communism, if you want to make America safe, if you want to make democracy strong, you have to do something about it. Do not do it in a negative way. This is a positive approach to make our own democracy strong.

One point further: We talk about the high cost of living. You know what the veteran is going through today. There have been percentage increases in the cost of shoes, clothing, and food. Another body passed unanimously Senate 1394, the veterans' subsistence bill. Why? To give these men an opportunity to meet the rising cost of living. This is only another example, in my humble judgment, of a bankrupt leadership that refuses to permit this sort of legislation to come to this floor. It is bottled up today, and this Congress will not get a chance to act upon the veterans' subsistence increase to meet the cost of living. I charge them with failure to do the job in increasing veterans' subsistence. I charge them with failure to do anything in regard to housing. This committee will go out and investigate labor, they will investigate a few costs, and when they come back here you will have no information that is not already contained in the Senate hearings on the housing bill, on which there has been no action to date.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not true that a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor is already authorized to conduct an investigation about the cost of labor in building residences?

Mr. CARROLL. That is my understanding.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think I can with a great deal of safety predict that one of the recommendations that will be made will be that we cannot get housing because labor is receiving too big a wage.

Mr. CARROLL. That is exactly right.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The result will be that we will be told that labor is to be kicked around again, but we will not get any housing as a result of this investigation.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

When the President of the United States speaks about a powerful lobby working in this Nation, this body should take cognizance of that fact with positive action.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with deep and keen concern to all of the comments from the minority side of the aisle relative to veterans and the deep concern that they feel for veterans. I am sure they are perfectly sincere and that that concern is spoken out of the feelings of their hearts and not just for the RECORD.

I, too, have deep concern for veterans, being one myself and there are a great many of them on the Republican side of the aisle.

While these millions of veterans were overseas fighting the battles of this country and when the then majority of the House of Representatives had control of this House, what was done about housing? There was not a great deal done. I remember the things you blew up and put on maps. That was one type of housing. There was another type that you poured and hoped that it would set. But while those veterans that you are talking about were out fighting and while the control of the House of Representatives rested with the now minority, there was nothing accomplished in the way of housing for veterans, and let that be written for the record. There was a lot of harnessing of the tides for electric power and a few other things that it is not necessary to go into at this time, but the rat hole had to be reamed out larger in order to pour in all the money that was poured into the housing project—alleged.

There is need for a comprehensive survey of what is going on in housing. I think that what we need in government is what we have in the military. It is called an estimate of the situation. What is being done? Where is the bottleneck? Where are we going to come out on this business if you just drift?

This has no relation to real-estate lobbies or construction lobbies, nor is it a question of pointing a finger at each other and saying, "It is your fault; it is not my fault." The question is to find out what we have to do and then go ahead and do it and get it done.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the gentleman doubt that there is any housing shortage today?

Mr. JACKSON of California. No; I am not doubting that there is a housing shortage. I am a victim of the shortage myself. I do not have a house either.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the gentleman think that the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill would do something toward solving that problem?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I think we should investigate all of the plans and all of the possibilities and then decide what we should do, and go ahead with a vengeance and get it done.

Mr. SMATHERS. If the gentleman agrees that there is a housing shortage, then what is the need for further investigation if the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill as has been proposed will help produce houses?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. The administration of the gentleman from Florida—that is, the Truman administration—came here during the last Congress with a great program called the Wyatt program. They said, "You have to give us $600,000,000 in subsidies. That is the heart of the program." The House did not give it to them. The Senate put in $400,000,000, and we finally agreed to it. They spent $38,000,000 of that $400,000,000, and the program did not produce any housing. If there is a housing shortage today it should be laid right smack at the door of the Democratic New Deal administration which controlled the Government for 14 years and which permitted this situation to come about. What we are undertaking to do now is to find out something that will do the job. As a matter of fact, the papers carried the information that in the month of June more houses were constructed than had been built in years. That is what has taken place just from the fact that you have a Republican administration in Washington again and the people are beginning to get some things done.

Mr. JACKSON of California. All that the people of this country have received during the past 10 years from the now minority side of the aisle are blueprints. You cannot live in a blueprint—it takes shingles and nails and hardware and things to build a house. I am convinced that those houses can be built. They will be built. Let us find out what to do and then go ahead and do it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, as the Member who introduced a comprehensive housing bill—the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill (H. R. 2523, March 12, 1947), which was reported out of the Banking and Currency Committee of the other body, but has not been considered by the same committee in the House—we must be realistic about that; and as the Member who over a month ago asked for a very comprehensive investigation of housing (H. Res. 247, June 17, 1947), when I was convinced that in no other way could we get this comprehensive housing bill passed, I trust I will be pardoned if I ask the Members for a little less heat and a little more light on this trying subject.

The latest figures on permanent housing unit starts bear out my deep concern that at the present rate we are in for a housing shortage of from 5 to 10 years; for, despite the fact that they are the best figures in years, as has been truly said here, they still show that we have only started 369,000 permanent housing units in the first 6 months, just 19,000 more than we had started in the first 6 months of 1946. That promises us 750,000 housing units in 1947, when, with our present deplorable situation, which we all realize only too well, we should have started not less than twice that number in the first 6 months of 1947, and should start not less than twice that number during the rest of the year.

The resolution before us for a joint committee to investigate the national housing shortage is the very least that we must do at this time before the session ends; for I am by now most regretfully convinced that there is no chance of passing the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill before this session ends, or passing it at all, without such an investigation.

There exists a basic difference of view between some Members of Congress who sincerely believe that the private building industry—free enterprise—now almost completely uncontrolled, after the recent enactment of the housing and rent-control bill of 1947, will be able to fill our housing needs, perhaps even for the lower-income groups, too, and those Members of whom I am one, who are convinced that the critical housing shortage is a liquidation of the war emergency and that the Government must help materially in this emergency. If we needed any proof of that, the desperate plight of the two to four million veterans of World War II, especially the newly marrieds, living doubled up or in bad housing, would be an eloquent enough answer. I cannot see how this basic difference of view can be resolved except by laying the whole issue bare in a complete investigation. I am convinced that such an investigation, fair and complete, will uncover facts so drastic as to compel us to pass the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

But we cannot wait a day beyond the minimum time essential for those Members of Congress who need to be convinced, to convince themselves that comprehensive housing legislation is essential to a solution of this great emergency problem.

House Concurrent Resolution 104, which we are considering, is a comprehensive one. It permits a probe equally into the costs and practices of labor, of material suppliers, of mortgagors, and of land sellers. It permits inquiry into governmental housing activities, municipal, State, and Federal. It permits inquiry into costs of financing and into the capability to deal with the housing shortage of private individuals and of government entities. It permits a thorough investigation into the archaic municipal building codes, themselves so largely responsible for high construction costs.

There are four cautions, however, I would like to leave with the joint committee to be appointed under the resolution.

First. I trust that the joint committee will report not on March 15, 1948, the final time limit permitted by the resolution—we cannot wait that long—but on January 3, 1948, at the opening of the second session of the Eightieth Congress.

Second. Though not specifically mentioned in the resolution, that the select committee will consider rural housing inadequacies, both farm and nonfarm, which are very serious; as well as city housing inadequacies for veterans and nonveterans.

Third. That the joint committee will consider maintenance costs and management practices for rental housing, also critically important as an incentive to construction, and which must be considered now.

Fourth. That the operations of the housing and rent-control law of 1947, just passed should be taken under review, as we are all aware of the problems and inadequacies which have arisen.

The House must note, too, that the joint committee being composed of members of the House Banking and Currency Committee and of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, can bring about necessary legislation promptly in the second session. That is a very important point. They can act on what they find out, and act immediately.

The country will have a right to hold Congress to strict account on the issue of housing after this investigation. The report of the joint committee, we have a right to expect, will be definite in its recommendations and will assume that degree of responsibility which is commensurate with the seriousness of the problem.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. GOFF].

Mr. GOFF. I think this is a highly constructive resolution and should be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot entertain that request.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSS].

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] for introducing this resolution. As every Member of Congress knows, the lack of housing is our country's most pressing problem, and those who are suffering most by the housing shortage are the returned veterans. Those who stayed at home have been frozen into the available living quarters. The veteran is housed in some temporary make-shift home or living with his in-laws. He has taken about as much of both as he can stand.

The Federal Government has made again and again and again lavish

promises which it was unable to keep. Private industry said if the restrictive Federal controls were removed the production of houses would soon go into high gear. Now it is a fact that during 1947, since controls were reduced or removed, starts and completions of housing units have been stepped up; 358,800 permanent houses have been started during the first 6 months of this year; 75,000 were started in June of this year, as compared with 30,000 in the same month last year. It is reported starts of housing units have taken a decided spurt during July, but what is being done is not enough. We all know that we are producing only a fraction of what we should be and are capable of producing.

Mr. Speaker, the patience of these veterans is wearing thin. They are tired of trying to raise families under the roof of promises. I hope this committe will jump into the investigation with both feet and pull no punches. Whatever monopolistic practices are found to exist, whether they are being indulged in by labor or business, let us expose them.

Each group in the construction industry is saying to the other group: "It is your fault." The finger of blame for exorbitant prices, black markets, and labor racketeering is being pointed at each group by the other group.

I believe this committee will find out who is guilty. And, Mr. Speaker, the most effective way of melting away these iron barriers to full production of these houses is to turn the white-hot heat of public exposure on them.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see this special joint committee consider calling an immediate conference of the leaders of all the various segments of the building industry. As the most effective way to dissipate abuses is by public exposure, so is the bringing together of interested parties around the conference table, and the thorough airing of views and opinions, the most effective way of resolving differences. I sincerely believe that such a conference would result in a pronounced stepping up of starts in much-needed rental housing. I respectfully urge the gentleman from Michigan and the members of his joint committee to give careful consideration to holding such a conference now.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POTTS].

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, we have a dreadful housing situation in my congressional district. I know the people of my district are deeply concerned with seeing that it is eradicated as soon as possible.

The minority has indicated that it has great concern for the veterans. I may say to the minority that it has no monopoly in that regard for we on the Republican side are as equally interested in the welfare of the veterans and the introduction of this resolution is a step in that direction.

In my congressional district an attempt was made last year on a temporary housing basis to erect a substantial number of Quonset huts. It was anticipated that up to last August, when we had our registration for voting in New York, that enough veterans would have moved in there to require three new election boards. August came, November came, and we had an election day; then we finally got into 1948 and we had exactly three veterans living in that area. That was supposed to be covered by three election boards. That is what has hapened in every case where you have had this stifling control which eliminated the incentive to build homes.

You cannot give the people reasons in cases like that. They want to see the finished product. Therefore, I am glad this resolution has been introduced because it is going to tell us exactly what has been the cause and I may say that the minority, of course, is not interested in knowing the reasons. It never has been.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FLETCHER].

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I want to support the remarks made by the majority leader relative to the increase in building in the last few months. I hold in my hand release No. 912, dated July 19 and 20, 1947, by the Office of the Housing Expediter. I read from that release:

> A new 20-year high in housing starts and completions was reached in June, Housing Expediter Frank R. Creedon said today as he announced figures for starts and completions of new permanent dwelling units for the month of June and for the first 6 months of this year. June starts and completion figures are on the basis of preliminary reports.
>
> Continuing the upward climb of the previous months, 75,000 new permanent houses were started in June as compared with 72,500 in May of this year and 64,100 in June 1946.
>
> During the first half of 1947 a total of 358,800 new permanent houses were started, compared with 340,100 during the same period last year. Housing starts in 1946 was the highest since the middle twenties.
>
> June's completions of 62,800 new permanent units were also a new postwar high, more than double last June's 30,600.
>
> During the first half of 1947 a total of 362,800 new permanents were completed, compared with 128,600 for the same period last year.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that control over building materials was taken off by this body is just now beginning to be felt. There is no question but what we must go after this housing problem in a manner which will bring more and better housing. We must make a thorough investigation, then come back here next January at which time a constructive housing program will be brought to this floor for consideration and enactment into law.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

JULY 24, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Respectfully,

HENRY M. JACKSON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3839) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21, 25, and 28 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3818) entitled "An act to amend the Federal Insurance Contributions Act with respect to rates of tax on employers and employees, and for other purposes."

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman will state it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Am I correct in stating that the Speaker will recognize Members for suspensions of the rules and unanimous-consent requests tomorrow?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize some Members for suspensions tomorrow.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understood that the Speaker will recognize Members for veterans' legislation under suspension.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not know where the gentlewoman gets her information. The list has not been made out as yet, but the Chair will recognize those who are on the list tomorrow.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. While there is life there is hope.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Would the Chair inform the House whether any more res-

olutions or any more legislation will be taken up today?

The SPEAKER. No. The program for the day is completed.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the Speaker.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker,a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman will state it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I was at the telephone, and I understood that the minority leader said he would object to any unanimous-consent requests tomorrow; is that correct?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair might state for the information of the House that the minority leader states that his objection will not apply to anyone who has a special order, as these special orders were granted before he announced his position.

THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION, RECORD AND FORECAST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the first session of the Eightieth Congress is drawing to a close and it is now well to review what has been done during the session, so that we can best see what remains to be accomplished during the coming momentous legislative year of 1948, before the Eightieth Congress passes into history. The inscription on the National Archives building in Washington is "What Is Past Is Prologue." As a Member of Congress I have learned to appreciate the wisdom and significance of those words.

The Eightieth Congress had innumerable problems, both domestic and foreign, to cope with. It has done many things; much still remains to be accomplished. When I campaigned in 1946 I had as my twin slogans "Peace and Jobs." Looking back on this session, I believe we have been greatly preoccupied with peace, because of our activities in the field of foreign affairs. Much time has been given to appropriations for the costs of Government, to labor legislation, to budget policy and taxes, and to wartime controls of rents, credit, and other commodities; but our hearts have been especially troubled by the problem of peace in a postwar, torn world.

As a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have been privileged to be intimately concerned with every aspect of the foreign-affairs problems which came before us. I believe that we have already made the greatest of our policy decisions in peacetime, and that though there will be, and should be, much debate on contents and procedure, and on other practical details of enormous significance, the basic issue has been resolved by this Congress. That resolution dedicates the United States to three principles in foreign affairs:

(a) That we will participate in the world's reconstruction with our vast technical and material resources and with our skills and leadership;

(b) That we shall insist from those we aid on self-help first, and on practical judgments and practical solutions equivalent to those we call good business; and

(c) That we will practice applied democracy in our own activities and will encourage it in the nations with whom we deal.

By enacting the Greek-Turkish assistance bill, the Foreign Relief Bill, the resolution to authorize United States participation in the International Refugee Organization, and finally by passing appropriations of almost $1,500,000,000 to implement these and other foreign affairs measures, this Congress decided that it was not isolationist, that the United States had a major role to play in the world by which peace and economic stability might be obtained, and that the Congress was determined that the United States should play it.

But these accomplishments of the first session still leave much vital and necessary legislation in the field of foreign affairs to come. The Marshall plan is only a concept now, but by the time the Congress reconvenes on January 6, 1948, it is likely to be a very real thing. For we shall then have in hand the plan for their own economic rehabilitation of the 16 western European nations now meeting in Paris, and the results of the investigations of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and of the Select Committee on the needs of reconstruction overseas and on our capacity to meet them. Incipient in and running through the problems of world reconstruction will be the twin problems of what to do with our defeated enemies, Germany and Japan.

During the next session the Congress will have to deal with more problems involving foreign affairs then ever before in our peacetime history. Much of the work done by various agencies of the United Nations will come before us for approval. The extension of the reciprocal trade agreements program and the role the United States is playing in the International Trade Organization will come up for discussion. We shall be called on to decide on joining the World Health Organization.

Great matters of hemisphere security will also come up for consideration. The House Committee on Foreign Affairs, after extensive hearings, reported favorably on H. R. 3836, a bill providing for inter-American military cooperation through standardization of military equipment and military training among the other American Republics and Canada. It will be brought up and acted upon in the next session. By the time we again convene two momentous Inter-American conferences will have been held. The conference at Rio de Janeiro, often postponed and required to be held by the Act of Chapultepec (adopted at the last Inter-American Conference held in Mexico City in March 1945), to consider an inter-American treaty whereby the American states may meet in common, "threats or acts of aggression against any American Republic"; and the conference at Bogota on inter-American military defense.

If these great challenging problems are not enough we have such issues as Palestine and the ferment in the Middle East to contend with, the problem of civil conflicts in China and of the new governments in India and the whole movement of pan-Asia. In Palestine, especially, the issue between international justice and decadent colonialism are sharply drawn. If in the face of solemn international covenants undertaken to the Jewish people—now martyred and desperate in Europe—the illegal barriers to full immigration into Palestine cannot be made to come down, then the cause of peaceful justice in the world has suffered a mortal blow. The United States is a party to this international covenant and will count heavily in the result, if it demonstrates a willingness to implement the United Nations recommendations on Palestine. We must see that our historic Palestine policy is translated into action. As is well known to this House I have been working hard to bring this action about.

Important international financial problems will be before us dealing with the operations of the world bank and of our own Export-Import Bank. The question of the St. Lawrence seaway is likely to arise—a matter which has been pending for 10 years and is critically important to the prosperity of millions of people around the Great Lakes and of great significance to Canada and other countries.

Yet our main challenge is likely to be the working out of our relations with Russia and with her satellite countries of Eastern Europe. For unless we can build a peaceful and prosperous world, and that is likely to mean one in which the Soviets are also included, we can have no real security at home; and we must labor under enormous appropriations for our Military Establishment, the utilization of much manpower for this purpose and the uncertainty of living in a dangerous and explosive world. The greatest ingenuity and patience will be called for from us. We must, I am convinced, stand firmly by our principles of individual freedom, respect for human rights, the sanctity of contracts and international agreements, freedom of thought, religion, and communication, the security of private property and of our private economy and opportunity for all nations to develop their own destinies peaceably. But at the same time, without appeasement or weak compromises, we must be trying to effect measures of cooperation—especially economic—with the Soviets. Our best chance to do this is through the medium of international organization furnished by the United Nations. But in so doing we must be watchful to preserve the national integrity and allow the development of higher standards of living for other peoples. In dealing with all of these problems we must understand and cling tenaciously to our declared and historic policy that men ready for freedom and self-government shall have them. It is a monumental task, yet one which we must successfully perform if we are to have peace. We cannot fear conflict, but we must move heaven and earth to avoid it.

Our problems in the field of domestic affairs have been and will continue to be of enormous importance. They determine the basis of our daily lives and the extent of the strength which will enable

us to help keep the peace and contribute to our own and the world's prosperity. In this first session we have still been dealing with many of the economic and social dislocations caused by war, and with the challenge of making a private economy work for the benefit of all the people with a minimum of Government interference, after years under strict Government controls. Congress passed legislation in the first session dealing with labor, taxes, Presidential succession, veterans, civil-service retirement, rent, and continuance of some other wartime controls, and a host of other bills. Congress lifted may wartime regulations and restrictions, such as those on installment credit, reduced the scope and size of many Government agencies, like the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, provided for an Army-Navy merger under a single head of national defense, which I strongly supported, and dealt with economy in the operation of Government agencies and departments.

A comprehensive labor bill, the Taft-Hartley bill, was enacted. I voted against it, as I believed that it was punitive and that on the subject of strikes threatening national paralysis—as in the coal scare—it was not effective. I had recommended provisions for permitting seizure by the Federal Government of struck essential national industries, and their operation on the minimal basis required by the public health and safety. The next months should tell us how the Taft-Hartley bill will really work. My attitude on labor legislation may be summed up by a phrase I used in a speech on a labor bill. I said: "I consider it the duty of the Congress in legislation affecting labor to legislate with a scalpel and not a cutlass."

Material reductions were effected in appropriation bills covering the expenses of the Federal Government. I voted for some and against others. On the whole, I would say as appropriations are a 1-year proposition, that whether Congress did the right thing or not—whether it cut too sharply—will be seen from how the departments and agencies operate in the coming fiscal year. The costs of Government had to come down after the war, and the people must be sympathetic to the efforts made to achieve economy by this Congress.

An effort was made by the Republican majority to reduce taxes to help those of modest income to meet the high cost of living. I voted for such tax reduction, but the whole effort failed due to presidential veto. The whole tax structure is being reviewed during the congressional recess and I shall strive to help bring about a more rational tax structure, helping especially those with modest incomes.

Many wartime controls were abandoned, but some like rent and certain import and export controls were continued. I believed that we should have had a rent-control extension to June 30, 1948; but the law that was passed—after considerable doubt that any rent-control bill would pass unless it carried an across-the-board increase—decontrols some types of housing and permits rent increases by agreement between landlord and tenant on the rest—the term of this law is to March 31, 1948. Many problems have already arisen under this law and we shall know in the next months whether the situation can right itself through the action of States and municipalities and the discipline of landlords and tenants, or whether Congress will have to act. Certainly tenants need not be pressured into making ill-advised leases as I am convinced that rent control, State or Federal, must continue as long as the housing shortage remains acute.

On the No. 1 domestic problem, and what I consider to be Congress No. 1 "must"—housing—Congress did relatively little until the close of the session when a resolution passed for a joint House-Senate investigation of the national housing shortage. This was an investigation which I had demanded over a month earlier, by introducing House Resolution 247, when I became convinced that I could not get action at this session on the comprehensive housing bill the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill which I had introduced in the House early in the session, March 12, 1947.

I am confident that this housing investigation will show the catastrophic housing shortage to demand a comprehensive housing bill like the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Had we passed that bill this session, I am convinced that the next 6 months would have seen an enormous upward surge of housing construction. As it is the whole outlook for a greater number of permanent housing units to be built this year than last year, and for housing for moderate- and low-income families and urban redevelopment and slum clearance is uncertain at the least, unless private builders do miracles. The drive to pass the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill must continue.

The housing investigation will serve a useful purpose as it should lay bare the causes for the vastly increased costs which have so impeded the construction of needed homes. This will require the investigators to proceed with an even hand in the fields of labor, materials, land costs and financial costs, and to expose the archaic municipal building codes, and any monopolies and trusts which have been contributing to the current high costs and the national housing shortage. We all have a right to expect that if, as I am convinced, comprehensive Federal housing legislation is found necessary by the investigation, it will be asked for frankly and at the very earliest day, which if we are not called back in the Fall is at the opening of the next session on January 6, 1948. I shall continue to do everything I possibly can to help solve the housing shortage so that millions of our people including thousands in my own district, can live decently and healthfully, at rents that they can afford to pay, and in a manner commensurate with the resources of our country.

Among other problems which should be dealt with at the next session of Congress aside from housing, are the national responsibility for health and for the education of our youth, the improvement and strengthening of the whole social-security system in terms of benefits, duration and types of coverage, and material increases in the level of minimum wages.

The House of Representatives has passed the anti-poll-tax bill which is a measure of justice to millions of our fellow Americans in the Southern States, but much more needs to be done. The antilynching bill must be passed in the next session. The bill for a national Fair Employment Practices Commission must also be passed, to assure all of our citizens regardless of race, creed, religion, or color of equal opportunity and security in employment. I am a cosponsor of the Ives-Fulton FEPC bill now pending in the Congress (H. R. 3034).

One of Congress' first obligations in the next session will be to see that the millions of people who suffer from lack of adequate medical care have an opportunity to share in the benefits of medical science. The state of our national health is one of our principal natural resources, and I believe that we can work out a legislative plan which will neither be socialized medicine nor medical care only for indigents, and yet which will meet the general need for adequate medical care. I was successful during the session in my fight to have expedited the reports on over-all research programs for heart disease, cancer, and polio called for from the special commissions to be created under the National Science Foundation bill, which was passed by the Congress. I also introduced a comprehensive bill, H. R. 3762, for a great research program to find causes and cures for heart and cardiovascular diseases, which is sponsored by the American Heart Association, the leading professional agency in the field.

Federal aid to education is also a primary obligation. The educational standards of our democracy will determine the caliber of our citizens, and with the problems which lie ahead it is in the national interest that that caliber be very high.

Veterans' legislation will demand attention. Congress provided at this session for the cashing of terminal-leave bonds, a measure of simple justice for which I voted; but much remains to be done on subsistence allowances for veterans who are studying under the GI bill, on veterans' housing, and on veterans' rehabilitation.

World humanitarian responsibilities will also demand our attention. During the first session of the Eightieth Congress I joined with Senator IVES, of New York, in introducing legislation to permit war-orphaned children to be admitted into the United States free of our quota laws, for adoption by United States citizens (H. R. 2446). I hope that we shall get action on this bill in the next session. I was also privileged as a member of the subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee to be instrumental in getting House action just before the dead line which enabled the United States to join the International Refugee Organization, the international organization for the care and resettlement of displaced persons and refugees. But the Stratton bill providing for the admission of 400,000 of the displaced and persecuted persons of Europe into the United States over the next 4 years, without changing our permanent basic immigration quota system,

failed to be acted on. I called these displaced and persecuted unfortunates the "walking dead" of Europe in advocating the International Refugee Organization resolution. By the next session of Congress the International Refugee Organization will be working on the resettlement of the displaced persons and will be seeking our cooperation in a resettlement plan. Whether through the Stratton bill or other suitable legislation, the most elemental dictates of humanity as well as self-interest demand that we shall cooperate in the prompt resettlement of these unfortunates.

Finally, one of the greatest challenges of our time is in our ability to make our private economy work in the United States, so that individual freedom is preserved and economic security is afforded to our people. Heretofore, we have shown great ability in increasing production, and in establishing high standards of living, but we have been derelict in providing adequate security and continuity for these conditions and have suffered terrible depressions which have shaken our society to its roots.

We should be looking into our whole economic organization in business, industry, finance, agriculture and government to determine how we may stabilize our economy to avoid or at least to cushion major depressions. This will involve herculean efforts to deal with the high cost of living. Our efforts must be to make higher incomes mean more goods and comforts and not higher prices for the same or less goods.

Our greatest domestic threat lies in the present runaway cost of living which is jeopardizing our domestic prosperity and may engulf us in an awful depression.

With all these problems to be dealt with, we must at the same time keep the foundations of our Nation secure, guard ourselves against subversives and totalitarians of the extreme left as in communism, or of the extreme right as in nazism, preserve civil liberties and free institutions and make our Constitution work. In a defense of civil liberties on the floor of the House I said, "There can be a tyranny of the Congress, as there can be a tyranny of the President or of the Supreme Court." It is our solemn duty to guard against all tyrannies.

The glorious history of almost 160 years under the Constitution gives us faith that with God's help we shall deal with out problems effectively and go on to the glorious future which is our destiny.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDOWELL). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

UTAH CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, just 100 years ago today the Mormon pioneers entered the Salt Lake Valley. This band of 143 men, 3 women, and 2 children were not in search of gold, nor were they lured by the love of adventure, nor the promise of free land. But rather they were the chosen vanguard of a sturdy group of American pioneers who were seeking a place where they might live in peace, and be allowed to build homes, establish community life, worship according to the dictates of their conscience, and thus establish a civilization on a western-most frontier.

We might well pause today to pay tribute to these pioneers who braved untold hardships and began their historic trek West, after having been driven from their homes on three previous occasions. Yet these people were utterly unprepared to undertake a journey across half a continent, but the pressure became so intense that their leaders decided that they should begin their movement across the Mississippi in January. They were not a group of hardy frontiersmen, but men, women, children, and children to be born en route, who began this exodus. The slow journey of suffering people across Iowa made it evident that it would be necessary to concentrate on reaching the banks of the Missouri River and recoup strength for the long journey the following year. Like other great movements, its propelling power was a deep religious conviction.

It was during this troubled drive across Iowa that these pioneers volunteered to contribute 500 men to the armed forces of the United States in the war against Mexico. While they could ill afford to lose 500 of their best men at such a time originated, to be released to join their families in Salt Lake City in 1847 and 1848.

Today we pay tribute to these pioneers who braved untold hardships and began their historic trek West, after having been driven from their homes on three previous occasions. These people were utterly unprepared to undertake a journey across half a continent, but pressure became so intense that their leaders decided they should begin their movement across the Mississippi in January. They were not a group of hardy frontiersmen, but men, women, children, and children to be born en route, who began this exodus. The propelling power of this great movement—like that of the *Mayflower*—was a deep religious conviction.

During this troubled drive across Iowa 500 of these pioneers volunteered for the armed forces in our war against Mexico. While they could ill afford to lose 500 of their best men at such a time their leaders felt that it was an opportunity to prove their loyalty and devotion to their country, despite the fact that they had themselves been offered no protection. Thus, the Mormon Battalion originated.

The details of this hazardous trek to Salt Lake is too lengthy to cover at this time, but to most historians the facts are well known. Suffice to say, that when this toiling caravan crossed what is now Wyoming, and began the hardest part of the journey over the Wasatch Mountains their leader, Brigham Young, was stricken with mountain fever. So the main body went ahead and a scouting party entered the valley a few days before the leader's wagon reached the summit of Emigration Canyon where Brother Brigham, as he was affectionately called, was raised from his sick bed to see the valley below. After gazing in silence for some moments he spoke those now famous words: "This is the place."

Immediately upon their arrival these pioneers set about to prepare the land so that they might plants crops. After several plows were broken trying to pierce the parched desert, a dam was thrown across a creek, now known as City Creek, and waters were diverted into ditches to soak the arid soil. Thus was introduced the first systematic irrigation by Anglo-Saxons in America. Within a comparatively few years the desert was transformed and a new commonwealth shaped by hard toil and piety. It was determined from the very beginning that there were to be no isolated settlements on farms, but rather for the sake of their religious, social, and cultural institutions, they built their communities on streams of water flowing from the mountains. It did not take them long to discover the value of irrigation water, and to make water of all streams the property of the State. It was these pioneers who established the doctrine that an individual could acquire and use water only so long as he put it to beneficial use. The great task then and now is to bring the water to the land where it can best be utilized.

Since food was the first concern of the pioneers when they arrived in the Salt Lake Valley, it was only natural that every man should assume his full responsibility for its production. Thus their leader devised the plan of giving to each man a piece of land which was to be used for the production of the food needed by his family. So farming became the first industry in Utah in point of time, and is still one of the greatest sources of wealth. Though tillable acreage in comparison with total land areas is not vast, the limitation is considerably offset by a remarkable fertility of the soil.

In 1939 the total crop land harvested was 966,088 acres. In the early days Utah farms were small, ranging from 5 to 20 acres, but today the average size of a farm, including pasture land, is 287.4 acres. The principal crops are hay, barley, wheat, potatoes, oats, and rye.

In 1940 Cache County ranked twentieth among counties in the Nation in the number of acres of sugar beets and seventeenth in the production of sugar beets. Utah counties rate high in the production of alfalfa for hay, onions, celery, cantaloupes, tomatoes, and fruit of all kinds.

Food was the first concern of these pioneers when they arrived in Salt Lake Valley, so each man was allotted a parcel of land upon which to produce his share. Thus farming became the first industry in Utah in point of time and is still one of the greatest sources of wealth.

Utah holds a unique place in the western beet-sugar industry. In 1852, Mormon pioneers, cut off from the world, needed sugar desperately, and new industries to make her settlers self-supporting. So an heroic attempt was made to establish the first sugar factory. Machinery purchased in France was brought to America by boat, thence across the plains a thousand miles by 52 ox-drawn wagons. Though the initial effort failed its momentum resulted, nearly 40 years later in the erection and successful operation of the first factory to be built with American made machinery and the first to make sugar from

beets grown on irrigated farms, at Lehi, Utah, in 1891.

Just as Utah's pioneers led in the discovery and development of irrigated farming, so also, approximately 20 years later, other Utah farmers discovered that vast sections of arid western lands could be made to grow abundant dry-land crops. Struggling against all the obstacles of a newly settled land, Utah pioneers guaranteed themselves a much-needed food supply and willed a system of farming to future generations—which last year produced approximately 87 percent of the winter wheat crop in Utah—when they discovered and developed practical methods of dry farming.

Soil conservation has always been practiced in Utah in relation to dry farming, since the alternate crop-fallow system is almost universally used. The State is helping to pioneer the newly discovered range forage-crested wheatgrass. Imported from Siberia, the grass is a perennial and will incease the feed value of our arid ranges from 100 to 500 percent.

One of the largest upward trends toward increased production and expansion of Utah's agriculture is in the fruit industry of the State. Carload lots of Utah orchard produce is shipped from the State to western and eastern markets. These crops have established a national reputation for their fine flavor which is attributed to the soil.

Every housewife who does her own marketing knows Utah celery, a special variety and quality of celery produced in the State for which it is named, is nationally famous. The success of this product seems to be the natural conditions, particularly ideal near the Great Salt Lake, where the average daily temperatures and cool nights are conducive to crispness. Approximately one-half of this crop is shipped to out-of-State markets.

Utah already has a thriving dairy industry which is destined to play an even larger place in the State's industries in the future. From a beginning with the arrival of several head of cattle with the pioneers in 1847, the dairy industry has grown to a volume that supplies 29 churning plants, 22 cheese factories, 5 dried milk plants and 3 condensed milk plants.

With markets spreading from the east to the west seacoasts, Utah's poultry industry, aided by its large cooperative associations, has become the poultry hub of the intermountain country. The Northwest Turkey Growers' Association, with headquarters in Salt Lake City, is believed to be the largest cooperative turkey marketing organization in the country.

Utah has likewise become one of the leading States in the country's livestock industry because of its high endowment of grazing areas. Besides the vast reserves supervised by the Forest Service, there are 25,000,000 acres of grazing lands under Government administration. Grazing these desert and mountain regions the year around are 2,500,000 sheep, 500,000 cattle, 45,000 goats, 82,000 horses, and 2,000 mules.

Utah ranks sixth among the States in sheep and wool production. The topography and climate of Utah are ideal for the production of a wool industry. Most flocks use the desert areas as a winter range, where snowfall is sufficient to provide water, yet seldom heavy enough to cover the forage. At the approach of spring there is a migration to the rolling hills; and later in the season, to the higher ranges.

Though the Federal ranges are the basic support of beef cattle produced in Utah, the fact remains that the industry is extensively promoted on private farms. Upward of 4,000 farms grow beef cattle as a source of income. They utilize, in the main, pasturage that is not tillable because of being too rocky, too wet, or too dry. The State likewise has many large ranch projects where both breeding stock and cattle for the market are produced on a big scale.

When Samuel Brannan, who had taken a group of Mormons by ship to what is now San Francisco, met the party of overland pioneers at Green River, Wyo., and tried to induce President Young to go to the rich, sunny California coastal area to settle because of the greater opportunities, and later when such pressure was given to this move by the discovery of gold in California, little was known of the mineral wealth of this great region to which this band of pioneers had come. Today, Utah is second among the 48 States in the production of copper and lead; third in silver and zinc; and sixth in the production of gold. Its rank is second in the total value of mineral production. There are 210 known minerals in the State, some of which are found nowhere else in the world. In 1943 the value of the metals of Utah was $124,348,439, or a little more than 20 percent of the Nation's total.

Estimates of the reserves of ore containing 50 percent or more iron, range from 88,200,000 to 110,000,000 long tons. This, together with the presence of large deposits of coking coal and limestone, has made economically possible the development of an iron and steel industry in the State. One of the first industries to be developed in pioneer days was that of making iron for their early machinery needs. This industry has grown until today the great Geneva steel plant has an annual capacity of 1,654,000 tons of pig iron. Open-hearth capacity at the Geneva steel plant upon final completion will be 1,200,000 tons of steel ingots annually.

The bituminous coal resources of Utah are beyond calculation. Underlying veins are said to total about one-fifth of the area of the State. A century of development has hardly scratched the surface of this fabulous storehouse of high-grade fuel. The increasing interest in coal as a potential source of oil and gasoline, along with its known values as a basic source of varied products—including such items as sulfa drugs, nylon, and plastics—gives Utah's coal reserves tremendous significance.

The great oil shales in the Uintah Basin in Utah contain 25,680,000,000 barrels of recoverable oil, according to careful estimates.

Manufacturing in Utah embraces a wide variety of products. There are 602 plants, large and small, employing as of March 1944, 20,893 workers with a first-quarter pay roll totaling $11,756,815.

Oil refining is one of Utah's most important industries. Crude oil is supplied from Colorado and Wyoming fields by a 600-mile pipe line. A modern plant for the production of aviation gasoline has recently been completed.

Easy access to enormous coal fields assures fuel for the generating of electric power in unlimited amounts. There are a number of privately-owned systems, just as there are a number of communities served by municipal electric systems. More than 90 percent of all the homes, including farm and ranch homes, are electrified.

A total of over 8,000,000 acres makes Utah rank as one of the first 10 States of the Union in national forest area. The 10 national forests of Utah include practically all the mountainous areas in the State. Thus the national forests are an essential part of Utah's economic life. They protect the watersheds which sustain irrigation and nurture the grasses on which more than 100,000 cattle and more than 500,000 sheep depend for their summer range. Thus do the forests make an essential contribution to the two leading industries of the State—agriculture and livestock. Utah's prominence in forest conservation stems from early and official recognition by foresighted leaders that the prosperity of the State is directly dependent on the wise utilization of its forests, its streams and its ranges.

It must be remembered that freighting and stage companies developed with the California gold rush, with the principal routes through Salt Lake City. The pony express, established in 1860 between St. Joseph, Mo., and Sacramento, instituted what was known in those days as rapid communication. Approximately 80 riders and four times that many station keepers and other employees were hired, making possible a dash across country bringing California within 10 days of Missouri. The strategic middle route also was chosen for the first transcontinental railroad. By 1868 the Union Pacific, building west from Omaha, and the Central Pacific (now Southern Pacific), building east from Sacramento, had reached Utah. Two golden spikes and two silver spikes were driven May 10, 1869, when the two lines met at Promontory, which is just northwest of Ogden. Today every community in Utah is served by air, rail, and highway facilities through main-line connections with major transcontinental transportation systems.

Utah excels for clean and wholesome homes. Every tree and every lawn has been planted and carefully nurtured with painstaking care so we are proud of the beauty of our homes, our gardens, and the clear running water in our gutters that border our wide streets. The owning of homes, the planting of flowers, lawns, shrubs, and trees was enjoined by our first leader, Brigham Young, until according to the 1940 census, Utah topped all other States in the percentage of owner-occupied dwellings. The national average was 43.6 percent and Utah's average was 61.1 percent. So the people of Utah have taken seriously the

counsel of its first leaders which was to own their own homes.

One of the first cabins built by those pioneers was designated as a public school. The University of Deseret—now the University of Utah—was founded by the Territorial legislature just 3 years after the arrival of the pioneers, and it served both as an institution of higher learning and to administer and supervise all education in the Territory. Education has been enjoined upon the Mormons by their leaders from earliest days. Counties levied and collected school taxes from the beginning. The State legislature passed an act requiring attendance at school until pupils are 18 years old. The United States Office of Education figures show today that more Utahans per 1,000 graduated from high schools any other State. The number of Utahans graduated from universities who have gained prominence in professional and technical fields is exceptional. It is generally conceded that Utah has one of the best, if not the best, educational systems in the United States, in that a minimum of a high-school education is made available to every child in the State.

Only this year, in recognition of the high standard, and the quality of its educational leadership, the National Educational Association elected Dr. Glenn E. Snow, a Utahan, as its president, and he is the son of one of the early pioneers.

I have briefly reviewed the growth of the State of Utah, its increase in population from 149 to over 600,000, its agricultural, mining, and industrial development. However, greater than all these are its people.

The Utah pioneers, in their great western march, were typical in their American pioneer traditions. They were the sons and daughters of pioneers, principally from the New England States. They brought with them to this new frontier great ideals and cultural desires. They were not content to limit their pioneering development to the field of sowing and reaping alone, but were determined to provide an opportunity for intellectual and physical development at the same time. Many Utahans have excelled in the field of science, music, literature, philosophy, politics, and athletics. I regret their names are too numerous to mention here.

Every one of us is proud of the heroism and the accomplishments of all our military personnel who served in the late and other wars. We know the winning of the last war was a joint enterprise. Patriotism and sacrifice were no respecter of State boundaries, but the facts of record I am proud to report.

The attack at Pearl Harbor found a distinguished son of Utah as the captain of the battleship *Arizona*, where he, true to tradition, went down with his ship.

A son of Utah was the leader of the first American Eagle squadron of the RAF, and he holds top score in the Eagle rank.

A son of Utah was navigator on the initial Doolittle raid on Japan, and, although he was captured, he lived to tell the story.

A son of Utah, at the age of 29, became the youngest general in the United States Army when commissioned.

Utahans made up three recruit platoons, who became known as the Modern Mormon Battalion of the Marine Corps.

A Utah family gave four sons in the cause of freedom.

I could go on and on, but let these high lights suffice.

The immediate followers of Brigham Young were taught that the discovery of America, the struggle for independence, the adoption of the Constitution were no mere passing incidents, but were a part of the plan of an all-wise providence. Because of these beliefs and by the very nature of their beginning as an organized entity, these pioneers did not, and their descendants do not, look to foreign countries for spiritual or political leadership. The Utah pioneers believed, and their descendants believe, that the peace and salvation of the world depend upon the preservation and adherence to the Constitution of the United States and the governing laws consistent with it. Foreign isms and ideologies have no place in this society.

Today the people of Utah will unveil a monument commemorating their pioneers, and no doubt the chorus will swell, "All is well, all is well."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE MARSHALL PLAN TO THIS NATION AND TO THE WORLD

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, far too often Americans regard the foreign policy of the United States as a fixed pattern, slow to react to changed conditions. Other Americans look on our foreign policy as the handiwork of a few individuals in the State Department out of touch with the trends and temper of the people of our country.

Neither conception is at present correct. American foreign policy—and when I say American foreign policy I mean the foreign policy of the American people—is a sensitive, flexible guide to our relations with other countries. As conditions here and abroad change, so does American foreign policy. This is as it should be. The swift current of events abroad often cannot await the letter of protocol, although we have never departed from diplomatic channels in dealing with other nations. It has been a case, instead, of speeding the diplomatic processes to meet the changes.

In recent months we have seen several examples of the manner in which American foreign policy adjusts to new conditions and political developments abroad. Perhaps the most publicized of these examples was the coup d' etat in Hungary engineered by Communists and powered by the sheer force and brutality of professional revolutionists trained in the sinister school of Red terrorism.

A political turn-over of such magnitude certainly would call for a reevaluation of our policy toward Hungary. The presence of a Communist premier, of course, means a closer alinement with the Soviet Union and this alinement would be a major factor in our new policy toward Hungary. Changes were in order and changes were accordingly made in our policy.

In the field of economic rehabilitation, the American foreign policy must also react to new developments. In this connection, the State Department recently has given rise to a new and far-reaching proposal for the economic reconstruction of Europe. The press has labeled it the "Marshall plan." Actually, it is not a plan, but simply a statement by Secretary Marshall calling on European nations to take inventory of their resources and establish a basis of self-help as a prerequisite of future aid from the United States Government.

This principle of self-help, which is as old as the world itself, has nevertheless taken on new significance in the past few weeks. In the capitals of Europe, nations have moved to swift action by this simple, yet vital statement of intentions by the American Secretary of State.

Foreign Minister Bidault, of France, and Foreign Minister Bevin, of Great Britain, heartily endorsed the Marshall proposal and, as joint hosts, immediately sent out invitations to 22 European countries to meet in Paris to discuss means of helping themselves in accordance with Secretary Marshall's statement.

Fourteen nations quickly accepted. Eight, including the Soviet Union and seven other eastern European nations within the Soviet sphere of influence, declined. I have no desire at this time to explore the motives of the Soviet Union. But the mystery which shrouds the latest action of Russia certainly cannot conceal from the world outside the Kremlin the brutal and cynical fact that the Soviet Government has now turned its back on cooperation to save Europe.

The Marshall plan is a straightforward proposal for the economic survival of Europe. But it is no less a proposal for the survival of western civilization. Our civilization was born in Greece, was transplanted to Europe and after going underground in the Middle Ages, made its way to England and thence to the United States. Today that civilization is threatened by the forces of hunger and want from within and by the forces of communism and tyranny from without.

The Marshall plan is not another proposal for the relief of hunger and want. It is not a stop-gap measure designed to give temporary succor to the ailing. To use the Secretary's own words at Harvard University June 5, "any assistance that this Government may render in the future should provide a cure rather than a mere palliative." In other words, this proposal is for reconstruction rather than relief, for lasting effect rather than piecemeal expediency.

Obviously, many questions in the minds of our people cannot be answered at this time. Perhaps foremost among these questions is: How much will it cost? To this, no proper answer can be given now. Sixteen European nations today

are engaged in taking inventory, discovering how much they can do for themselves and for each other. When that tally is completed, they will present a balance sheet to the United States Government for determining its help in meeting the remainder of their needs.

The United States has much to gain from the stabilized, prosperous Europe the Marshall plan envisions. Prewar Europe was rich in raw materials and agriculture and although the war laid waste much of the land, despoiled the resources and killed or wounded millions of men needed to till the soil and operate the machinery, the hope prevails that a considerable percentage of the prewar production may yet be reclaimed.

Coal, bauxite, and wheat in France, iron ore and timber in Sweden, textiles and coal in Belgium are only a few of the materials which would revitalize the European economy and bring a high level of prosperity to the western world. The United States has a great and lasting stake in a high level of prosperity. The level of our imports and exports and the prices of the products would be affected. Indeed, the economy of the United States and the economy of Europe are linked in a manner which necessitates cooperation and constant vigilance. And, finally, the strain on the American taxpayer would be diminished and ultimately eliminated entirely with Europe paying its own way.

Until now I have abstained from mentioning the cultural benefits which would accrue to the United States from a Europe whose intellectual energy and collective artistry could be released once again with full vigor in a continent free of economic restraints. Europe, from whence Rembrandt and Leonardo and Shakespeare and Balzac and Beethoven have enriched and spread a great civilization and culture around the world, would be in a position once more to make its cultural contribution to a world suffering from war and its weakening aftermath.

The fear is often expressed that the United States Government, in its anxiety to reestablish the European economy, will stimulate the rise of a militant Germany. Although it is true that the United States figures German production as a vital factor in the restoration of prosperity in Europe, I believe such fears are unfounded. The level of German production in key manufacturing industries is strictly controlled by international agreement and no policy, present or future, of the United States Government would pursue prosperity at the price of war.

In this connection it would be well to speak of one German asset which occupies a prominent position in the future of Europe. That asset is coal from the Ruhr. Secretary Marshall did not exaggerate when he said recently that coal is the fundamental raw material essential to the rehabilitation of Europe. His statement, issued at a news conference, put into sharp focus the importance of the Ruhr in European recovery plans. Production of coal in the Ruhr mines today is only 50 percent of their prewar output and if the European nations devise any formula whatsoever for their rehabilitation, it must surely include expanded coal production and export from the Ruhr.

I am cognizant of the confidence millions of Americans place in the United Nations. These people are asking why the Marshall plan and other direct aid programs cannot be approached through UN. In the case of the Marshall plan, the State Department is leaving to the participating nations of Europe the recommendation on whether the aid should be granted through UN. If the participating nations are in agreement that the aid would be most effective if granted through the UN, the United States Government will consider such a course. It will not be bound, however, by recommendations of the European countries. In final analysis, Congress will decide this country's course of action.

The Marshall plan, as I have said, is not a detailed chart for the solution of the many and varied ills of Europe. It has not yet crystallized into a definite shape. Rather, the Marshall plan leaves to Europe the initiative in producing a concrete program through its self-inventory.

There is danger in the fact that because the Marshall plan is giving us a fresh start in Europe many Americans will consider our past efforts wasted. Nothing could be further from the truth. To be sure, our past attempts to aid Europe were necessarily founded on expediency. Each individual case called for special treatment based on individual needs and conditioned by the political and economic factors in each country.

The Marshall plan seeks to do away with piecemeal grants. The State Department believes the time has come when European nations which, in the final analysis, have most to gain from a cooperative, prosperous Europe, should draw up a blueprint for their own reconstruction.

Let me emphasize the word "reconstruction." Because the Marshall plan is definitely a proposal for reconstruction and not merely for stopgap relief. From June 1945 to January 1, 1947, the United States Government sent $9,767,000,000 to European nations in the form of loans, credits, grants and contributions to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

This aid has by no means been wasted. The recipients of such aid have been able to maintain their meager rations only through such assistance. Starvation and disease have been averted largely through our efforts. Now the next step is a formula to give permanence and direction to our assistance.

All true friends of world peace, wherever they may reside, hope and pray that European nations will be able to devise such a formula. The 16 nations which met at Paris to work out programs of self-help form a reservoir of great skill which, largely because of the war, has been permitted to lie barren and unproductive. Two hundred and fifty million people were represented at Paris. They live in an area about half the size of the United States. They are honest, intelligent, realistic people who want to rescue their futures from the grim uncertainty of a prolonged armed truce and economic privation.

The Marshall plan offers a new hope to those millions who live in the shadow of poverty but who are too proud to accept gifts or doles. They do not want gifts or doles. That is why the rank and file of Europeans, as realists, look on the Marshall plan as an inspiration and a challenge. They want to work, produce, trade, and guarantee for themselves and their children an opportunity to stake a claim in what we Americans have called the pursuit of happiness.

But as realists they also see in the United States a country—unquestionably the only country—which can provide the assistance necessary to make possible through self-help the restoration of European economy to anything approaching its prewar position in the world. They also see in the United States the only Nation which will help while maintaining a hands-off policy in the internal affairs of the recipient nations. This is quite proper. The United States Government has no desire to use the weight of its position to influence purely administrative and political decisions which rightfully belong to the people of Europe.

Therein lies the strength of the Marshall plan. It suggests initiative rather than demands obedience; inspires ambition rather than rewards inactivity. It is a genuine, sincere proposal for the economic advancement of all Europeans and, in a larger sense, for the prosperity of the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

GERMAN COAL AND EUROPEAN RECOVERY

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, recently, I read a speech by Harold E. Stassen delivered at Swarthmore College, wherein he stressed the need for the rehabilitation of Europe. He pointed out a significant fact of which, unfortunately, too few people in our country are aware; namely, that German coal production is, to a large extent, the foundation of a sound European recovery. After some investigation on my own part, I too have come to that conclusion. Furthermore, I have found that if this needed coal were available to Germany's victims, our own expenditures in Germany and elsewhere would be considerably reduced.

As a matter of fact, at Potsdam, the Allies stressed the importance of the exportation of German raw materials, especially coal, because this would not only help Germany's neighbors, but provide the means whereby the Germans could import the necessities of life. Before the war, Germany used to export great quantities of coal and coke to Europe. In 1935, for instance, over 50 percent of Europe's metallurgical coke originated in Germany. Germany's war machine was largely built around its coke industry. This can be seen from the tremendous rise in production of metallurgical coke which increased 100 percent in the years 1933 to 1938.

In the past, Germany used enormous quantities of coal in the iron, steel, and power-generating industries, and as a basis for the production of heavy chemicals, synthetic oil, plastics, and so forth. Now, if Germany were to be allowed a peacetime economy as contemplated in the level of industry agreement of March 26, 1946, she most certainly would not need for her own consumption, this tremendous production of coal. It would follow that Germany would have much greater quantities of coal for export than during the years when Hitler was rearming for war. I should like to point out again, that the Big Four agreed that Germany should play her role in the reconstruction of Europe by utilizing her coal resources for purposes of reparations and as a source of revenue for which to pay for her imports of food and other supplies.

You will recall that we were told 2 years ago by newspapermen and radio commentators, that the German industrial machine was shattered by bombs during World War II. This belief is based on a misunderstanding of the effects of Allied strategic bombing. It was officially reported by the United States Strategic Bombing Survey that bombing knocked out sectors of Germany's economy.

This is true, but the bombing survey indicates quite clearly that Germany's heavy industries escaped this punishment and remained largely intact. According to this bombing survey of 1945, most of the iron and steel furnaces of Germany are ready for production or could be put into operation with only minor repairs. Incidentally, I understand that most of these damages have already been repaired. A typical illustration is provided by the damage inflicted on the big coal mines in the Ruhr. Of 120 big coal mines in the Ruhr area, only 15 had been badly damaged at the end of hostilities. Six months later, all the 15 damaged mines were largely repaired and working again.

In this connection, I should like to point out that Germany's domination of the European economy was based on her hard-coal resources. Over 80 percent of the hard-coal production is concentrated in the western area of Germany, now under the control of the British and French authorities. The hard-coal resources now under Polish control only accounted for 16 percent before the war. It is evident, therefore, that the coal resources in the Ruhr and in the Saar, are of essential value to put Europe back on her own feet. I should also like to point out that while in 1933, the production of hard coal in Germany amounted to approximately 109,000,000 tons, by 1943, or 10 years later, the German mines were producing about 197,000,000 tons.

Notwithstanding the tremendous increase in German consumption during the 4-year preparation for war in 1937, Germany still found enough coal to export to Europe. The total exports in that year amounted to about 45,000,000 metric tons of which France received about 10,000,000 tons. Belgium and Luxemburg 9,000,000 tons, Italy 8,000,000 tons, and the Netherlands 7,000,000 tons, and believe it or not during the height of World War II, when the German war machine was taxed to capacity and when Allied bombings were greatly intensified, Germany was still in the position to supply large quantities of coal to the neighboring countries.

After the downfall of German armies, our forces wanted to find out what made the German system tick—how the German Army was able to receive all the tremendous quantities of coal and other raw materials. So they made an investigation of the German files, and discovered that from 1940 to 1943, Germany, in addition to sustaining her own war economy, shipped an average of 37,000,000 tons of hard coal to her neighbors. Incidentally, more than 75 percent originated from the Ruhr and only about 10 percent from Upper Silesia. From the captured documents, it was estimated that in 1944, Germany produced the staggering total of 215,000,000 tons of hard coal. These figures tell the story. They reveal the tremendous potential of Germany's coal resources and indicate quite clearly that Germany can make the greatest contribution to the recovery of Europe by increasing her production and export of coal. This is based on the following premises which were conceived by the Big Three at Potsdam:

First. Germany's economy for peace will require less coal for home consumption.

Second. The removal of plants for reparations will create new markets for German coal in Europe.

Third. Greater production of coal will absorb a large number of German unemployed.

Fourth. Next to food, coal—as Mr. Stassen indicated—is the most critical raw material needed for Europe's economy.

Fifth. Exports of coal will help materially toward payment for needed German foodstuffs.

Under a peacetime German economy, a maximum of 94,000,000 tons of hard coal could be made available for export, assuming that production of coal was at the wartime level and that consumption was at peacetime levels. At present Europe's recovery requires 100,000,000 tons a year. Allowing for the present state of the rolling stock and other difficulties, it is only fair to assume that in the near future, Germany could export at least 50,000,000 tons of hard coal to Europe, and note this, Mr. Speaker, at the prevailing prices, the export of 50,000,000 tons of coal to Europe can provide Germany with about $750,000,000 worth of revenues which would enable her to import the necessary foodstuffs and would thus materially help relieve the burden of the American taxpayer. But Germany's coal production is lagging behind. From the very beginning of the German occupation, coal was used as an economic lever to thwart the reconstruction of Europe.

At Potsdam, it was agreed that for a period of 8 months ending April 1946, Germany would export 25,000,000 metric tons of coal to her neighbors and former victims. The coal-consuming nations are still awaiting the promised deliveries. In the case of France, for instance, only a fraction of the coal was delivered, and in November 1946 the commander of the British zone unilaterally decided to stop all exports of coal to France.

Major General Erskine, deputy to the military government in the British zone, was chiefly responsible for the almost complete stoppage of coal to France and other countries. On November 15, 1946, he explained his move in the following declaration:

> The necessity for stimulating moribund German industries through the utilization within western Germany of hard coal mined there, led to the decision.

General Erskine was serious about this because the military government in the western zone advocated that coal should be exported in the form of machines, rather than in raw form, because such exports would be more valuable to Germany's economy in the long run. This was a fundamental violation of the Potsdam agreement and has had a very bad effect on Germany's victims. Let us take the case of France, for instance.

Mr. Hoover, in his recent recommendations on Germany, complained that "we are supplying France with Ruhr coal which could be used in the manufacture of exports from Germany with which to pay for food." This, of course, is a repetition of the argument advanced by Erskine and others who were completely out of sympathy with the intent of the big three at Potsdam, but more than that, Mr. Hoover gives the impression that France is receiving huge quantities of coal from Germany at the present time. The American people, I believe, are entitled to know the following facts about German coal and France:

First. Coal, which is the base of European industry, is being deliberately withheld in order to use it as a political and economic weapon.

Second. Present German consumption of coal per head and per year is greater in Germany than in France.

Third. At present, Germany retains 79 percent of the coal produced in the Ruhr and only 21 percent of the coal is exported to her neighbors.

Fourth. The present coal production in the Ruhr averages about 220,000 tons per day, which is only about 50 percent of the prewar coal output.

Fifth. But France not only fails to receive coal as reparations from the Ruhr, but she must pay in dollars for the small quantity of coal sent to her by Germany. These dollars, contrary to Mr. Hoover's implications, are actually being used by the AMG to pay for food imported into Germany.

Sixth. Under the Monnet reconstruction plan France will need to import in 1947 about 19,000,000 tons of coal. On the basis of present estimates, however, France will be lucky to get 5,000,000 tons in 1947. Because of this France will be forced to import about 14,000,000 tons of coal from the United States, paying the fantastic rate of $22 per ton, compared with $12 a ton for the same grade of coal in the United States, and this, mind you,

only if the European Coal Organization in London approves the French request.

Seventh. Furthermore, I should like to emphasize the fact that Germany gets the best currency in the world, namely dollars, for the 21 percent of coal she exports. It is also interesting to note that while the German miners in the Saar under French direction are working on an approximate ration of 3,800 calories, German coal production in that region is up to 80 percent of prewar levels. In the British zone, where most of the hard coal is to be had, the miners are getting about 4,000 calories a day, but the production of Ruhr coal is approximately less than half of the prewar quantity. It is evident, therefore, that food is not the only important factor in the failure to produce and export coal. Incidentally, the Wall Street Journal recently discussed the coal crisis in Europe and stated very clearly that "all German-produced coal is tossed into a huge coal pool and divided up by the European Coal Organization. German industries—get this—get first call on it." This, in brief, is the situation regarding German coal and France, a situation which Mr. Hoover did not see fit to examine in detail.

There is another excuse for the withholding of coal from Germany's victims—namely, that Germany needs coal in order to produce the necessary mining machinery, which, in turn, would help to increase production in the Ruhr mines. First of all, I should like to point out that this is an argument advanced not only by some of our own officials in Germany but by the German tycoons of the coal industry in the Ruhr. As a matter of fact, it was these industrial war lords who cooked up this argument and then passed it on to our own occupation authorities. The facts are, however, that in order to produce 115,000,000 tons of hard coal, which is about double the present production, only 290,000 tons of iron and steel products in the form of mining machinery are required. This is not a staggering figure and can be easily met within the limits of the allowed German steel production, which, at present, is 5,800,000 tons. In other words, the argument advanced to date justifying the withholding of the sorely needed coal can only be accepted if one is willing to repeat the blunders of 1919. I might say that, just as in 1919, we are lending an ear to the slick arguments of the Germans.

A typical illustration is provided by Dr. Lahr, minister president of the North Rhine Province and formerly in a leading position with the German steel combine. In early 1947 Dr. Lahr was asked to explain the low production of coal from Germany. He replied that he did not see any reason why Germany should work hard to produce coal, especially since the Allies have allowed Germany only a steel production of 5,800,000 tons. Therefore, Dr. Lahr indicated that he was quite satisfied with the reduction of coal production which has been occurring.

Is it not clear, Mr. Speaker, that Dr. Lahr is sabotaging the export of German coal to suffering Europe? Yet, this man retains his position, and his views are highly valued by British officials. I am certain that the withholding of deliveries of coal to Germany's victims will continue so long as certain interests continue to dominate postwar Europe, and so long as the Germans responsible for the misery of this war-torn world remain in charge of the German coal production and exports.

Before the war, coal was handled by various German coal cartels, which deliberately placed quotas on coal to various countries in Europe in order to discourage the development of the industries of Germany's neighbors. But, Mr. Speaker, the situation has not fundamentally changed since Germany's defeat on the field of battle. Believe it or not, the most powerful German coal cartels are still functioning. Furthermore, they are being directed and controlled by Germans who were key figures in the prewar cartel set-up. Those who were in charge of the production, distribution, and export of coal before the war, are today still operating these German coal combines.

It is quite apparent to me that Germany's victims could strengthen their economies by sufficient industrialization through steel. It is also quite apparent to me that it is far better to ship the coal from the Ruhr to the French iron ore centers in Alsace Lorraine than to pursue the opposite procedure which, under Hitler, has contributed to the domination of Germany over Europe. Even in our own country today, we are departing from the practice of shipping iron ore to the coal centers of Pittsburgh and are now building our steel plants around the iron-ore deposits of the Great Lakes. This makes sense to me, Mr. Speaker, as it does to our own industrialists. But not only is this economic common sense, but for Europe, it would have healthy political implications. Specifically, it would mean that Germany would no longer be the blacksmith of Europe. It would no longer mean that Germany would retain a monopoly in certain key industries. It would mean that Germany would no longer retain a monopoly in certain key industries. It would mean that there would be a better economic equilibrium. It would mean that Germany's victims would be strengthened economically, and hence, able to ward off any future German pressure.

The coal question, therefore, is not an isolated detail in the general question of European recovery—it is, in many ways, the heart of the problem, not only of recovery, but of world peace. A more equitable distribution of Germany's coal reserves to her neighbors would not only bring that needed prosperity in Europe, but would stabilize conditions in that part of the globe and relieve our own taxpayers of expenditures which are mounting daily.

In view of the fact that coal plays a major role in the rehabilitation of war-torn Europe, it would seem to me that our Government would be lending every effort to see to it that German coal was delivered to the liberated nations. The importance of coal, not only to Europe, but to the American taxpayer, can be gleaned from the following fact: Namely, that since the end of the war, the United States alone has contributed more than $11,000,000,000 for the reconstruction of Europe—approximately 4,500,000,000 of which has gone to Great Britain, 2,000,000,000 to France, 150,000,000 to Belgium, 360,000,000 to the Netherlands, close to a billion to Italy, and about 100,000,000 to Norway—New York Times, Sunday, June 8, 1947.

General Marshall, in his recent speech at Harvard, indicated that the United States was seriously considering some over-all economic plan for rehabilitating Europe. Well, Mr. Speaker, I can think of no better way for General Marshall to take the bull by the horns than to insist that the production and delivery of coal from the Ruhr be expedited in every possible way. Here is the grand opportunity for our Government to relieve our own taxpayers and at the same time afford Germany's victims a concrete opportunity to rebuild for peace.

I firmly believe that if our Government took the leadership in breaking the deadlock on German coal for the benefit of Germany's victims, our prestige would grow enormously among the peoples of Europe. For, in the long run, these war-weary people are not interested so much in ideologies as they are in their economic welfare and security. If we take the necessary steps, we can thereby do more for our cause than any abstract theory. I urge that the Senate look into this matter and request that the Secretary of State discuss this with us. In such a discussion, I would recommend that we suggest the following to the Secretary of State:

First. The elimination of German control over the production and distribution of coal in the Ruhr.

Second. The setting up of quotas, percentagewise, for all of Germany's victims on the delivery of German coal. This guarantees a minimum amount of coal for each of Germany's victims, regardless of how much coal the Germans produce.

Third. The elimination of the German coal cartel.

Fourth. The elimination of all high officials who were connected with the German coal cartel under Hitler.

Fifth. I would also strongly recommend that all measures be taken to put an end to sabotage among German workers and managers with respect to the protection of German coal.

These are necessary measures that must be taken and I feel certain that if they were implemented, the present scandalous situation whereby the Ruhr mines produce only half of their prewar coal output, would be brought to an end, and the entire political and economic picture in Europe would change in a short time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

LONG-RANGE FARM PROGRAM

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, from January until June the House Committee on Agriculture has conducted a protracted field day for farm leaders and legislative representatives of farm organizations and others desiring a sounding board for orations concerning our agricultural economy. For weeks and

months orators have come from far and near and have talked long and loud about a mythical long-range agricultural program.

In subtle fashion the steering committee of the Republican Party has been trying to lead the country to believe that although the Democratic Party had control of both Houses of Congress for 14 years, it failed to provide the farmers of the Nation with a well-rounded, long-range farm program. They do not seem to realize that our farmers are intelligent, well-informed citizens, with a deep sense of appreciation and that this intelligent segment of our economy fully understands and realizes that more legislation beneficial to agriculture and to the welfare of farmers was enacted into law during the 14 years of Democratic control of Congress than had been enacted in behalf of agriculture during the entire history of the Republican Party.

The many sad lessons which our farmers learned under the last Republican administration are still burning in their memories. They have not forgotten the starvation prices they received for the products of their labor. They have not forgotten the foreclosures, the bankruptcies, and the bank failures that swept away their life's savings. During the present session of Congress the farmers of this Nation have again had a taste of the lack of leadership of the Republican Party in behalf of those who till the soil. This brief experience has indicated clearly that the Republican Party would cut the heart out of every program which has been beneficial to the farmers of America.

Republican spokesmen talk constantly about a Federal-farm program. Its leadership is groping in the dark while its Appropriations Committee is arbitrarily swinging the axe of economy without regard to the devastating effects which such false economy will have upon the farm program which we now have. In a campaign characterized by vicious criticisms and violent denunciations, the Republican Party gained control of both Houses of Congress, the peoples' Government, and we see the pitiful spectacle of a political party suddenly enriched with great political power.

Certainly the intelligent people of this Nation know that we already have a permanent long-range Federal-farm program. This great farm program was built step by step and act by act during the Democratic administrations of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, and the farmers of this Nation will not let it be sabotaged, weakened, handicapped, or abolished.

OUR PRESENT FARM PROGRAM

The farm program we now have provides the means for maintaining an adequate supply of food and fiber for both domestic and foreign markets; it enables farmers to mitigate the evil effects of surpluses and shortages on both farmers and consumers by balancing production with consumption in keeping with the law of supply and demand; it provides for needed shifts in production and encourages diversified farming and the orderly marketing of farm commodities and for national goals in production and for goals of production on individual farms and for a broad and comprehensive research and marketing program.

Our farm program provides for marketing agreements, marketing quotas, acreage allotments, price-supporting loans, a soil-conservation program on a Nation-wide basis, the protection and preservation of the fertility of the topsoil of the farm lands of America, and encourages farmers in the arts of good farming. The program provides for the furnishing to farmers of full information regarding all problems of distribution and marketing; it encourages farm home ownership and provides aid and assistance to worthy tenant farmers in their efforts to acquire and to equip farms of their own.

The present farm program provides adequate agricultural credit on reasonable terms and at reasonable rates to farmers to finance the purchase or improvement of farm homes and to carry on farming operations; it provides for rural electrification on a Nation-wide basis, to the end that the farmers of the Nation might be able to enjoy the blessings of electric light and power; it provides all-risk crop insurance at least on a limited basis and on a limited number of commodities and embraces a comprehensive program for insect and pest control; it provides programs for the diversion of surplus agricultural commodities into new industrial uses, into other than normal trade channels, and into relief and welfare programs, and the present program provides for the subsidizing of agricultural surpluses into foreign markets and for the mitigation of the effects of tariffs and trade barriers on our agricultural economy, and for an Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations.

All of the programs I have mentioned are certainly essential elements of any well-rounded long-range agricultural program. It may be that there are other programs which should be added, and certainly all of the programs now in existence should be supported, perfected, and strengthened.

ADEQUATE SUPPLY OF FOOD AND FIBER

The first essential element of the long-range agricultural program is the providing for and maintaining of an adequate supply of food and fiber to meet the needs of our domestic and foreign markets. Under our present farm program our farmers, with less labor, less machinery, and with less land in production are now producing 33⅓ percent more food than before the war. This magnificent record of performance has amazed the world. American farmers have well demonstrated their ability to produce an abundance, and production is no longer a major agricultural problem in America.

SURPLUSES AND SHORTAGES

Under our present farm program farmers are able to cope with the law of supply and demand, to adjust production so as to keep production in line with consumer demand, to obtain needed shifts in production, and to mitigate the ill effects of great surpluses and acute shortages, surpluses which are devastating to farmers and shortages which are burdensome to consumers. We have leveled the hills and valleys of American agriculture by encouraging diversified farming and by providing the technique of production goals. Before planting time the Department of Agriculture analyzes the domestic and foreign economy and estimates approximately how much of each crop will be needed to provide ample surpluses for domestic and foreign consumption and for normal carry-over. These estimates are then submitted State by State to farmers and agricultural leaders. The result is a goal for production related to needs and to land-use problems in every county of the country. Every farmer knows in advance of planting how much production is needed from his farm. Under the system we have developed, all of the producers of a single commodity in all of the different areas of the country cooperate in a Nation-wide program, and exercise a degree of control over their own business, which they were never before permitted to enjoy.

Industry has always been able to control production and to keep supply in line with demand. This program of cooperation and control is not a program of scarcity nor is it a selfish program in the interest of the farmers of America. It takes into consideration the Nation's consumers and the need for an adequate supply and normal carry-over. By our support-price program farmers are encouraged to meet the national goal of production, a goal which is deemed adequate in the interest of both producers and consumers. Farmers are discouraged from overproduction and surpluses by the withdrawal of the support price and in some cases by penalties. Only after two-thirds of the producers of any particular commodity have expressed their approval of marketing quotas, in a free and unfettered referendum or election, can penalties be imposed for overproduction. This is democracy in action.

When there is need for changing our pattern of production to fit changing demand conditions, we have the system of acreage allotments and marketing quotas provided in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. Although the act includes only the commodities in which costly surpluses are most likely to occur, it would be a relatively simple matter for Congress to add other commodities if it appeared necessary or desirable. The marketing quota law clearly provides that when surpluses appear likely, the Secretary of Agriculture, by appropriate proclamation shall put acreage allotments and marketing quotas into effect, but such acreage allotments and marketing quotas shall not remain in effect unless approved by two-thirds of the producers, voting in a referendum. If after the proclamation has been issued by the Secretary there is a substantial change in demand conditions or trends, the Secretary is authorized to increase acreage allotments and marketing quotas so as to assure an adequate supply.

This part of our well-rounded, long-range farm program has actually meant more to the tobacco farmers of North Carolina and other tobacco-producing States than all of the farm legislation which has been enacted in all of the Republican administrations throughout the entire history of this Republic. The record clearly indicates that these programs have neither been burdensome to

consumers nor costly to the Government. In fact, our farmers have paid the costs and the Government has actually collected from farmers an amount substantially in excess of the cost of administration. These control programs have encouraged diversified farming and hundreds of acres which might otherwise have been planted in tobacco have been diverted to the production of grain, meat, and dairy products, of which there is not now and never has been an adequate supply. These programs have likewise encouraged good soil-conservation practices and a preservation of our soil resources.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT

Another improvement in the stabilization of farm income was achieved by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937. This law has been used to great advantage by the producers of milk, fruit, and vegetables which are shipped in interstate commerce. Everyone knows of the great hardships which milk producers in some of our metropolitan areas have suffered. It has been a picture of surpluses and shortages, of fall in prices, and milk strikes. Farmers had no voice in setting the prices which they received for their milk. This act sets up democratic procedures whereby producers can elect to have the price of milk fixed according to formula, and whereby, when necessary, the quantity of milk moving into a market may be regulated. In the case of fruits and vegetables, it provides orderly marketing methods so as to help avoid glutted markets and ruinous prices and yet adequate protection is provided for the consumers.

THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

A vital part and parcel of a well-rounded long-range farm program was provided by the passage of the act of Congress creating the Commodity Credit Corporation, a corporation which has meant much to the farmers of America. This corporation has developed a businesslike method of handling commodity loans. In commodity-loan programs the Corporation has made a financial profit of millions of dollars for the taxpayers of the Nation and has saved the fortunes of our farmers. At the same time consumers have been protected. If the calculations and estimates of our agricultural experts could in all respects be accurate, which in the very nature of farming cannot, of course, be possible, commodity loans would neither be necessary nor desirable. In spite of our best planning and in spite of our best estimates, we realize, of course, that unusually good weather may still give us great surpluses and bad weather may give us crop failures and acute shortages.

DIVERSION PROGRAMS

In the event surpluses occur, we have provided programs to divert agricultural commodities into other than normal channels of trade and commerce, and into new industrial uses. Great quantities of surplus agricultural commodities have been diverted into the school-lunch program, which has meant much to the health and happiness of the school children of the Nation. Quantities of surplus agricultural commodities have also been diverted into industrial uses and into relief or welfare programs. We have also provided for the subsidizing of the sale of surplus agricultural commodities in foreign markets.

EQUALIZING THE INEQUALITIES OF TARIFFS

One of the most important sources of funds for handling surpluses was provided in 1935, when the Agricultural Adjustment Act was amended and what is generally known as section 32 funds came into existence. This section sets aside for the benefit of agriculture an amount equivalent to 30 percent of the import duties collected by our Government, such funds to be used in expanding agricultural markets at home and abroad. These funds have been the major source of aid to our producers of crops other than the six basic agricultural commodities. From funds provided by section 32 seasonal surpluses have been prevented from breaking the farmer's market and likewise encouraged increased production during the war, when increased production was needed. The use of section 32 funds and the diversion of surpluses is a basic part of our farm program. Yet the Republican-controlled Appropriations Committee of the House slashed both section 32 funds and the school-lunch program, and would have completely deprived the farmers of the benefit of section 32 funds had not the committee been overridden in a hard-fought battle on the floor of the House.

EVER-NORMAL SUPPLY

The reverse of the surplus picture is shortages. No farm program which did not take into consideration the Nation's consumers could be justified. To protect consumers against shortages and crop failures we have provided for an ever-normal supply. Through commodity loans and by other means we are able to carry over enough of the basic crops each year to give reasonable protection against crop failures, yet we have attempted to assure returns to our farmers commensurate with their labor and production. I have already pointed out that a part of our program is designed to accomplish this goal. To assure a normal supply at all times many incentives have been offered and made available such as commodity loans and surplus-removal programs. American agriculture was better prepared for the shock of war than any other segment of our entire economy. Our fields were flourishing and our warehouses were filled with an abundance of food and fiber. American agriculture is ready and anxious to do its part in the postwar world and to make its contribution to the devastated areas and to distressed people. American agriculture, however, will insist upon fair and equitable treatment and for a free and unfettered opportunity to function as the Nation's greatest business. After all no other business in America is comparable in either manpower or money to that of agriculture.

PARITY

We have evolved over a period of years the concept of parity. Republicans may talk for years but they will never be able to throw out or to discard the parity concept. Its inherent justice is too well established and too fully appreciated by the American people. Under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 when cooperating producers of basic crops receive less than parity prices the Secretary of Agriculture is empowered to make such payments as may be necessary to bring their returns up to parity or as near thereto as available funds will allow. All that is necessary is for Congress to appropriate an adequate amount of money. On the other hand, if it seems preferable, prices may be supported at the market places rather than by making direct income payments. This we have been doing under the so-called Steagall amendment which expires at the end of 1948. An extension of this law would take only a simple act of Congress. My personal opinion is that the parity formula might need some slight changes to bring it up to date and we might need to increase the scope of crops covered by the general program of marketing quotas and parity payments. The point I wish to emphasize is that we have the basic law, a law and a program which has been tested, perfected and approved by the great majority of the farmers of the Nation, and the merits of the program have been approved by the citizens of this country generally.

We have witnessed the effectiveness of this program—the well-rounded farm program of the Federal Government—in my own State. The farmers of North Carolina in 1932 received only $98,000,000 for the products which they marketed. Just think of it. It was a nightmare, a tragedy which haunts us even now. By 1940, and this was before the war, the agricultural income of North Carolina had more than doubled and stood at $167,000,000. In the good year of 1946 it was $714,000,000. When the farmers of North Carolina look at this record, do you think that they will want this program of theirs destroyed or jeopardized? The same situation exists in all the other farming areas of America. Yes; we have a farm program, one that is vital to the life and welfare of American farmers.

SOIL CONSERVATION

Thinking people throughout the Nation realize that the work of erosion in making a half million acres of land unfit for cultivation each year is a national disgrace. To provide protection of our national soil resources, we have embarked upon a soil-conservation program which is all-embracing and national in scope. After years of destruction we now have a workable plan for saving our soil and eventually reaching the point where we will be increasing rather than decreasing our productive acreage. Prior to the inauguration of this program of soil conservation we were losing a million acres of land each year and under the program the rate of loss has been cut in half, but there is still an urgent need for a continuation of the soil-conservation program. We have provided a two-way approach. Under agreement with individual farmers the Soil Conservation Service is working out plans farm by farm to determine the proper uses and conservation needs of each field. Farmers are then given assistance, through the soil-conservation districts in terms

of technical guidance and in the use of heavy machinery needed for terracing, ditching, leveling, or the building of dams. Such an acre-by-acre, field-by-field, and farm-by-farm approach is the only way we can put our soil on a sustained productive basis. At the same time, through the agricultural-conservation program, we are making small payments to farmers to induce them to carry out soil-conservation practices recommended by farmer committees in their particular States and counties. Though these payments are small they constitute an incentive and actual financial aid and assistance to farmers to engage in practices which they would not otherwise be inclined to do or financially able to do. All Americans have a vested and vital interest in the soil resources of the Nation.

The latest available figures show that in 1945 this program accounted for the following improvements on the farm lands of my native State, North Carolina: One and three-fourths million acres of cover crops and green manure; lime applied to almost a half million acres; phosphate applied to one-third million acres; contour cultivation on 45,000 acres; 16,000,000 acres of permanent pasture seeded or reseeded; and 17,000,000 square feet of waterways protected by sod from erosion. In addition there were thousands of acres of farm lands improved by other practices. These two programs, as I have said, have cut our soil losses in half in little more than a decade. Certainly the same situation obtains to a more or less degree in other States of the Union. The Republican-controlled Appropriations Committee of the House furthered soil conservation by cutting payments for the agricultural-conservation program practices in half this year and by promising to end the program entirely in 1948.

Since there is a definite similarity between the programs of the Soil Conservation Service and certain of the soil-conservation programs carried out under the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, and since to an extent there is a duplication of effort and activity, the programs should be coordinated in the interest of efficiency, economy, and better service to more farmers. This is a simple task and can be accomplished by the passage of legislation which I recently introduced and which is now pending before the House Committee on Agriculture. The activities of the Soil Conservation Service and certain of the activities of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration should be coordinated with the Agricultural Extension Service, and no vital part of either program should be abolished or discontinued, but rather should be strengthened and expanded to the end that much needed advice and assistance might be given a much larger number of farmers.

PROGRESSIVE AND DIVERSIFIED FARMING

Our present farm program makes available to farmers information and instructions concerning diversified farming and the proper use of farm machinery and equipment. If any criticism in this regard is justified it can only be on the basis that we have provided too many agencies to furnish advice and assistance to farmers. Actually we have the Extension Service, Soil Conservation Service, the Argicultural Adjustment Administration, and vocational agricultural teachers. Certainly not even Republicans would advocate abolishing any of the vital activities of any of the agencies I have mentioned. Yet at the same time, it is obvious that the activities of all of such agencies should be properly coordinated. The entire farm program tends to encourage and to promote diversified farming, the rotation of crops, and shifts in production.

ADEQUATE CREDIT ON REASONABLE TERMS

In terms of credit needs, our farmers divide roughly into two groups: One, those who have sufficient knowledge and ability to make a successful go of farming and only need adequate credit on fair and reasonable terms; and, two, those who need both credit and guidance. The credit needs of both these groups break down again into long-time credit for land purchase or improvement and short-time credit for operational purposes. The basis for our long-time credit for the average farmer was laid down years ago through the establishment of the cooperative Federal land banks. Incidentally these institutions were authorized under a Democratic administration. In 1933 the Democratic Congress provided short-time credit for farmers by establishing the farmer-operated production credit associations. We also provided for Commissioner loans and established the banks for cooperatives. Under this program North Carolina farmers now have $15,000,000 outstanding in production loans and some $14,000,000 in long-time mortgage loans. In addition thereto loans in substantial amounts have been made to various cooperatives.

In 1937 we established a program to give assistance to the second group of farmers who needed both credit and guidance. We authorized and provided funds for the Farm Security Administration. Actually, at one time there were three agencies of the Federal Government engaged in making direct loans to low-income farmers who could not obtain adequate credit elsewhere—the Farm Security Administration, Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Office, and regional agricultural credit corporations. Realizing the tremendous waste of manpower and money, Congress merged or consolidated the vital activities of the three agencies, discontinued some of the programs of doubtful value, and enacted the Farmers Home Administration Act and gave it permanent status. Here again, to cite North Carolina figures, we find that as of the end of last year some 34,000 families in my State had received operating loans under this program amounting to over $38,000,000. Over 91 percent of the amount due on these loans has been repaid. In addition, some 2,700 tenants, sharecroppers, and veterans have received loans to buy farms. Though these loans run for 40 years, over one-fourth of them have already been repaid in full and many more are paid up for a number of years in advance.

This year the House Republicans showed their interest in providing credit for these low-income farmers to purchase farms by voting to cut off all appropriations for that purpose. In so doing they kicked out one of the most important rungs of the ladder leading to ownership of the family-type farm. Only by the force of the Democratic minority and the terrific pressure of public opinion will any funds be provided for these very essential programs.

FARM HOME OWNERSHIP

I take great pride in the fact that I participated in the preparation and passage of the Farm Security Administration Act of 1937 which provided for the first time a Federal program of aid and assistance to worthy tenant farmers in their fight and struggle toward farm home ownership. I take even greater pride in the fact that I was the author of the Farmers Home Administration Act which continued and made permanent all of the worth-while features of the Farm Security Administration and merged the same with the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Office and the regional agricultural credit corporations, all of which three agencies were engaged in making loans to low-income farmers who could not obtain adequate credit from other sources. This program has enabled many worthy young tenant farmers to become home owners and enjoy the great pride of home ownership.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

No well-rounded long-range farm program would be complete which did not contemplate making available to the farm homes of America the blessings and benefits of electric light and power. We therefore established the Rural Electrification Administration and have made available to farmer cooperatives loans amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars as a result of which hundreds of thousands of farm homes of America have been lighted and the farmers of our country are enjoying the blessings of the God-given power of electricity. Certainly not even the most ardent Republican would be in favor of cutting off the lights in the farm homes of this Nation. The rural electrification program is a part of our farm program and it should be adequately financed and further expanded until every farm home in America has the benefit of electric light and power.

CROP INSURANCE

To protect the individual farmer against crop failures we have the Federal Crop Insurance Act. The idea of crop insurance for farmers is so logical and so obvious that I am surprised that even the Republicans didn't think of it. Anyway, we now have such a program. Though it is still in an experimental stage and does not apply to many crops, we should have it worked out on a sound basis and extended to producers of all major crops within a few years. In my own State of North Carolina wheat and cotton insurance have been made available to all the farmers, and tobacco insurance is being tried on an experimental basis in a small number of counties. Last year we had a bad cotton crop in much of our cotton area and this

program was a godsend to a large number of those farmers. Here again the House Republicans have attempted to wreck the long-range farm program which they claim to seek, by drastically cutting down the appropriation for and the scope of Federal Crop Insurance.

INSECT AND PEST CONTROL

Many acts of Congress constitute an adequate program for insect and pest control and our present national farm program contemplates even a more intensified effort to render aid and assistance to the farmers of the Nation in combating the devastating effects of insects and pests.

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

We have in the present farm program an office in the Department of Agriculture known as the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations. While this office should be made a potent factor in the life and welfare of American agriculture, the Republican economy bloc in Congress has so restricted appropriations for this activity and has thereby so effectively handicapped the officials of this agency of the Government that it cannot possibly effectively and efficiently carry on a worth-while program in the interest of our farmers. This office should be revitalized, adequately financed, and efficiently staffed, and should have under its control and supervision all of the representatives of American agriculture in all foreign countries. There never was a time when our foreign trade was more important, nor a time when an efficient and effective Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations was so urgently needed.

RESEARCH AND MARKETING

Our present national farm program embraces a broad and comprehensive research and marketing law which if efficiently administered and adequately financed should enable us to find new uses for agricultural commodities and new markets both at home and abroad; it should result in an improvement in the techniques of proper distribution.

The war showed us the value of the agricultural production research which this Government has long carried on. That program, which is carried on by our various agricultural experiment stations, was established by the Hatch Act under a Democratic administration, that of Grover Cleveland. But if we are to have an up-to-date agricultural program, we must carry our research much further than the basic elements of production, to which it has been primarily confined. This need has been well taken care of by recent Democratic Congresses. The Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935 set up nine regional laboratories to study production problems of the region which were too large for any State experiment station to undertake alone. Included among these is the laboratory in Michigan, studying diseases of poultry; the laboratory in South Carolina, which is breeding vegetable seed adapted to the South; another in Alabama working on diseases of animals; one in California working on certain problems of irrigated land; one on pasture grasses in Pennsylvania; and several others.

Then in 1938 we set up four regional laboratories to work on new uses of agricultural products—particularly new industrial uses. These laboratories are already having a great influence upon the industries using agricultural products. You are no doubt familiar with work of the North Central Laboratory in working out the method whereby penicillin could be produced commercially, thus saving thousands of American lives, both during the war and since. There were numerous other discoveries of these laboratories which were of great value in the war effort.

The third of these acts was the Research and Marketing Act which we passed last year. It is designed to bring research in marketing and utilization up to par with production research, as well as to provide needed marketing services to farmers. I consider it one of the great landmarks in agricultural history. I thought the Republicans felt that way about it too, for they all voted for it. However, when it comes to backing up their good intentions with appropriations, the House Republicans were not willing to appropriate half the amount which the Congress had considered necessary to do this job.

FARMER COMMITTEES

In administering and executing the various programs which constitute the essential elements of our well-rounded permanent farm program, success or failure depends upon farmers themselves. We have set up an organization to carry out the action portion of each of the programs. We have organized community, county, and State committees which help in formulating and carrying out on the local level the farm program of which they are justly proud. This is one of the world's finest examples of democracy in administration. Probably no one aspect of the program has been so universally approved as has this. Certainly a farmer cannot call a program bureaucratic when he and his neighbors run it. These farmer committees handle all of the individual planning, checking, and the administering of our agricultural conservation program. They handle acreage allotments and marketing quotas where they are in effect. They handle the price-support program and the commodity loans on the local level. They sell all-risk crop insurance. In an emergency the Department of Agriculture can reach just about every farm in the Nation in the short period of a few days. This was done during the war and it can be done again if the situation demands it. If, however, the Republican leadership has its way, the farmer committee system will be abolished and the entire farm program will be imperiled.

CONCLUSION

The well-rounded long-range permanent farm program we now have should be adequately financed and administered in the interest of both producers and consumers. While it has been administered by farmers it has won the approval of consumers. It is a program which has that flexibility which is so essential to the needs of these uncertain and rapidly changing times. It has proven its worth in the deep cold of depression and in the intense heat of war. And what is more important, it is already in existence and is functioning in the interest of our farmers.

Republicans know all about this farm program. They would not openly and boldly advocate the repeal of a single part or parcel of it; yet with sinister political motives and in subtle fashion they will gnaw at its vitals until they have killed it. They are trying to focus the attention of the farmers of America on some sort of an imaginary farm program about which they have not told the Congress or the country anything at all. What kind of a long-range farm program are they talking about? If the program we have now is not what they want or wish it to be, why do not they "stop beating around the mulberry bush" and tell us what part of it they want to repeal or to destroy? The truth about it is Republicans have voted for and supported just about every part of our present program, but now that they have come into the possession of great power they seem to feel that it is necessary for them to do something drastic. The fact is they do not seem to know just what to do, but one thing certain that they are willing to do is to cut the heart out of the farm program by failing to provide adequate funds which are essential to proper performance and appropriate administration. The farmers of the Nation must make the choice—prosperity on the one hand or prostration on the other. Under Democratic policies and programs we have come a long way. Shall we continue on the road of prosperity, or shall we go through the wringer again and fall into the pits of bankruptcy?

As a Representative of the people of the Fourth Congressional District of North Carolina, and as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, it has been my pleasure and privilege to have participated in the preparation and in the passage of every piece of farm legislation which has been enacted since my election to Congress in 1934. During my first term in Congress I was elected as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, and I have been intensely interested in the building of a permanent agricultural program, which for the first time in 14 years may now be jeopardized or abolished, but so long as I am a Member of Congress and of the House Committee on Agriculture, it shall be my purpose to protect and to preserve every worth-while program which has been provided for the farmers of this Nation, and I shall hold fast to the substance rather than to reach for the shadow. I shall, therefore, not be willing to abandon the present farm program and to reach out for some imaginary advantage which might prove to be worthless and ruinous to our farm population. Economic isolation means economic ruin to American agriculture. We must have world markets for American farmers.

The building of a national farm program has not been an easy task. During the comparatively brief space of time that I have served in Congress 197 public laws have been enacted in behalf of agiculture and many hundreds of bills have been considered. A farm program

must be flexible and subject to change with changing conditions. The laws governing the Department of Agriculture are listed under 60 titles, 224 listed subdivisions, 270 pages of indexes. This will give an idea of the magnitude of the task of building a farm program for the greatest nation on earth. Present and future demands at home and abroad for the products of our fields are greater today than at any time in all history. The world is in desperate need of both food and fiber. The situation challenges every farmer in America. The future plans and programs for American agriculture should be formulated and directed by men of foresight and vision, men who realize that agriculture is the most important business of this Nation and that this Nation is the most important and most powerful nation on earth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

HOUSING SHORTAGE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, this Congress will adjourn Saturday. It will have considered action on many matters of varying importance, but it will not have taken any action to meet the most pressing problem with which this country is now confronted—the severe ever-growing shortage of housing which faces our veterans and others of moderate income.

The majority party has appropriated about $35,000,000,000. It has voted subsidies and given protection to many industries in this country, but it has refused to appropriate a dollar of Federal money for relief in the field of emergency housing. The only action the majority party has taken in housing was to pass a rent-control bill, which had a joker in it—the so-called 15-percent clause, which requires tenants to make decisions about future costs and prices that at this Congress with all of its resources could not make. It seems to me that on Saturday we are going back to the people who sent us here with a good deal on our conscience.

The Senate Committee on Banking and Currency in its report on S. 866, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, made the following statements:

> At the start of 1947, there were about 2,200,000 married couples in nonfarm areas living as extra families doubled up in homes with other families and about 300,000 married couples were living in hotels, rooming houses, tourist camps, and similar places. The net number of new families which will be formed during 1947 is estimated at about 500,000. Even allowing for the most optimistic estimates as to the number of dwellings which will be completed during 1947, it is obvious that at the end of the year more than 2,000,000 families will still be in need of homes of their own.

This situation will call for the construction, according to both the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Redevelopment of the special Senate Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, and the Senate Banking and Currency Committee of the Seventy-ninth Congress, of about 1,500,000 homes a year during the first postwar decade, including about 1,250,000 houses a year in nonfarm areas and 250,000 in the farm areas.

I have used these sources because they may be considered to be the average estimate of our experts of our future housing needs. With this goal of 1,500,000 new homes a year as our required construction rate, let us see whether in 1947, 2 years after the war has ended, we are achieving that goal. Controls have been lifted, and private enterprise in the construction industry has had full jurisdiction over its activities. We should be well on our way. What actually are the facts?

During the first half of 1947 a total of 358,000 new permanent homes were started and a total of 362,800 were completed, obviously far short of a rate necessary to fulfill the minimum goals stated in all estimates of our housing needs. This is a situation that the majority party in this House has refused to face. The Committee on Banking and Currency has refused to consider the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill. This committee has been too busy to even hold hearings on the only housing bill that offers any real hope to the homeless and doubled-up veterans of World War II. The situation in my home city of Boston is typical.

The Bureau of the Census, in a recent survey, stated that there were 160,000 veterans of World War II in the Boston area in July of 1946. Forty-two percent of the veterans who were married among this group were living in rented rooms or doubled up. Their need is drastic.

In the papers in the city of Boston there have been great headlines announcing the beginning of housing projects in various parts of the State. I have here a headline from the Boston Post of several days ago. The headline is "Rent to be $80 in new project," and then the story goes on to say:

> Over-all rental costs for five-room units in the 308-unit development that is under construction at Lexington and Belmont Streets, Watertown, the largest rental housing project to be insured by the Federal Housing Administration in New England, is expected to be in the neighborhood of $80 a month, may be somewhat lower and could be higher, it was learned yesterday.

How many veterans can afford to pay $80 a month? According to the same Census survey the average pay of veterans in the Boston area amounts to $37 per week, and you cannot afford an $80 a month apartment on $37 a week. The ironical part is that the Post story says:

> Veterans will be given 30-day priority in applying for occupancy.

The builders of this project are safe in making that promise. The plain fact is that veterans' priority has gotten to be a joke.

The inflated costs of building have priced new homes right out of the price level that veterans can afford to pay. This is the situation facing every veteran in this country today. It is the most important problem they face.

The majority party of this House has done nothing to help these men meet this great problem. They have spent $35,000,000,000. They have subsidized industries. They have late this afternoon called for an investigation of the housing shortage. Since before the war ended we have been making investigations. The facts are known. This gesture by the Republican Party is a fraud—in order to draw attention away from their crass ignorance of this problem during the 7 months they have been in control. They have always been receptive to the best interests of the real estate and building associations, but when it came to spending money to secure homes for the people of this country, they just were not interested.

I was sent to this Congress by the people of my district to help solve the most pressing problem facing the country—the housing crisis.

I am going to have to go back to my district Saturday, a district that sent probably more boys per family into this last war than any in the country, and when they ask me if I was able to get them any homes, I will have to answer, "not a one—not a single one."

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman has made a very fine speech on housing. I should like to call to his attention that this afternoon the body at the other end of the Capitol passed the bill S. 1543. This bill permits the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to finance loans of GI's for housing construction, up to $100,000,000. This bill will be over in the House tomorrow morning, and it has the sanction of the Senate. It is entirely possible for the body to take up this bill and put through this piece of legislation, and thereby help the housing program throughout the Nation and the GI's that need housing so badly.

Mr. KENNEDY. I certainly agree with that.

Mr. SARBACHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. SARBACHER. Will the gentleman inform the House what the administration of the party to which the gentleman belongs did for the last 14 years? They were very progressive in providing fox holes for veterans. What did they do in providing housing for veterans?

Mr. KENNEDY. The administration recommended and advised immediate passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill.

Mr. SARBACHER. They were in control of the preceding Congress, I believe.

Mr. KENNEDY. This is a situation which certainly existed before the war. I do not say that all the Democrats have gone along. I make no pretense to that. But I say it is the policy of the administration. Fifty-five Democrats signed the petition to bring up the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and two Republicans have signed it. You are in control, and it seems to me it is up to you.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. HUBER. During the consideration of the Patman Emergency Housing Act in the Seventy-ninth Congress it was amended to prevent the establishment of

ceiling prices. I say that was done for the benefit of the speculators and that signalled the approach of wild skyrocketing prices and brought about the condition that exists today.

Mr. KENNEDY. I certainly agree with the gentleman.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 192. An act for the relief of Juan Liona, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 229. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 257. An act for the relief of Yoneo Sakai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 521. An act to permit the naturalization of Sang Hun Shim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 535. An act for the relief of Adelbert E. Tuller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 795. An act for the relief of G. R. Below; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 939. An act for the relief of Charles Howard Richards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 970. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Harold T. Prosser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 999. An act to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to preference accorded in Federal employment to disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1006. An act to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended, so as to increase the acreage of sodium leases which may be issued in any State to a person, association, or corporation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 1014. An act to provide for the disposition of internal revenue collections on articles produced in the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. 1026. An act to amend section 101 (b) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1154. An act to amend the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1181. An act for the relief of Robert F. Parks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1188. An act to authorize the Civil Service Commission, in the promulgation of reduction in force regulations, to give consideration to employees who have incurred injuries resulting in occupational handicaps; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1215. An act to authorize conversions of certain naval vessels; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1236. An act to increase the minimum allowance payable for rehabilitation in service-connected cases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 1252. An act making certain changes in the organization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1416. An act to amend section 203 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1426. An act to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1463. An act to amend section 12 of the Immigration Act of 1917; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1505. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Boise, Idaho, to the Boise Chamber of Commerce; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1507. An act authorizing the sale of undisposed of lots in Michel addition to the town of Polson, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 1562. An act to amend section 102 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 to exclude certain experts and consultants from the coverage of the act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1574. An act to authorize any agency of the United States Government to furnish or to procure and furnish materials, supplies, and equipment to public international organizations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 1581. An act to provide additional time to the city of Newark, N. J., for paying certain installments on the purchase price of the Port Newark Army Base, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1582. An act relating to the sale of Paxon Field, Duval County, Fla.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 1590. An act to amend the District of Columbia rent control law so as to provide that schools and universities may recover possession of housing accommodations in certain cases; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1633. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the National Convention of the American Legion to be held in New York, N. Y., August 28 to 31, 1947, and the National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, September 4 to 9, 1947; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1639. An act authorizing the repair and rehabilitation of irrigation works damaged by flood and the prevention of flood damage in the Fort Sumner Irrigation District, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 1641. An act to establish the Women's Army Corps in the Regular Army, to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1661. An act to provide additional inducements to physicians, surgeons, and dentists to make a career of the United States military, naval, and public health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. J. Res. 46. Joint resolution authorizing appropriations for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the western land boundary fence project and the Rio Grande border fence project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 981. An act to amend section 2 of the act of January 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 21), relating to the refund of taxes illegally paid by Indian citizens;

H. R. 2938. An act to amend section 1 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 497, 5 U. S. C., sec. 488), fixing the price of copies of records furnished by the Department of the Interior; and

H. R. 3191. An act to amend Public Law 301, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved February 18, 1946, so as to extend the benefits of the Missing Persons Act, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, to certain members of the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines;

H. R. 3243. An act for the relief of Roman Toporow;

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 358. An act for the relief of Julian M. Thomas;

S. 364. An act to expedite the disposition of Government surplus airports, airport facilities, and equipment, and to assure their disposition in such manner as will best encourage and foster the development of civilian aviation and preserve for national defense purposes a strong, efficient, and properly maintained Nation-wide system of public airports, and for other purposes;

S. 483. An act to relocate the boundaries and reduce the area of the Gila Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes;

S. 526. An act to promote the progress of science; to advance national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes;

S. 682. An act to regulate the interstate transportation of black bass and other game fish, and for other purposes;

S. 706. An act for the relief of William D. McCormick;

S. 753. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to defer the collection of certain irrigation construction charges against lands under the Flathead Indian irrigation project;

S. 1262. An act to provide a central authority for standardizing geographic names for the purpose of eliminating duplication in standardizing such names among the Federal departments, and for other purposes; and

S. 1368. An act to amend section 2455 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to increase the size of isolated or disconnected tracts or parcels of the public domain which may be sold, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 981. An act to amend section 2 of the act of January 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 21), relating to the refund of taxes illegally paid by Indian citizens;

H. R. 2938. An act to amend section 1 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 497, 5 U. S. C., sec. 488), fixing the price of copies of records furnished by the Department of the Interior;

H. R. 3191. An act to amend Public Law 301, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved February 18, 1946, so as to extend the benefits of the Missing Persons Act, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, to certain members of the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines;

H. R. 3587. An act to provide for the establishment of a temporary Congressional Aviation Policy Board; and

H. R. 4106. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 25, 1947, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

971. A letter from the rear admiral, United States Navy, Army and Navy Munitions Board, transmitting 50 copies of a supplement to the confidential report on the stockpiling transmitted on this date by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

972. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of all claims paid under part 2 of the Federal Tort Claims Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

973. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

974. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease under the terms of Public Law 8, Eightieth Congress, for the 30-day period ended June 28, 1947; to the Committee on Agriculture.

975. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report concerning the conversion of two price-minus contracts between the United States Maritime Commission and Froemming Bros. to one selective-price contract; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

976. A letter from the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to section 4 of Public Law 520, Seventy-ninth Congress, a report detailing the activities with respect to stock-piling under that law between January 1 and June 30, 1947; to the Committee on Armed Services.

977. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on audit of Inland Waterways Corporation and subsidiary, Warrior River Terminal Company, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 414); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1050. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 4347. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1053). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 3016. A bill to amend subsection 200 (c) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 1055). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3899. A bill to amend section 12 of the Immigration Act of 1917; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1056). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. BOLTON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Senate Joint Resolution 117. Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 1057). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SADLAK: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. House Joint Resolution 246. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the poultry industry in the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1058). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4070. A bill to carry into effect certain parts relating to patents of the treaties of peace with Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania, ratified by the Senate on June 5, 1947, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1060). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 3875. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to control and reduction of pollution in the waters of the New England States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1062). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4326. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 1063). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3778. A bill to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25); with amendments (Rept. No. 1064). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report on safety in air navigation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1065). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 4140. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1066). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 4244. A bill to authorize assistance to certain veterans in acquiring specially adapted housing which they require by reason of the nature of their service-connected disabilities; without amendment (Rept. No. 1067). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 3748. A bill to provide additional compensation to widows and other dependents of certain veterans; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1068). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 1335. A bill to provide that the rates of compensation for disabilities incurred in active military or naval service other than in a period of war service shall be equal to 90 percent of the rates payable for similar disabilities incurred during active service in time of war; with amendments (Rept. No. 1069). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 3565. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide loans for the construction of low- and medium-cost homes for veterans; without amendment (Rept. No. 1070). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 4160. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1071). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Fifth intermediate report by subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments authorized to investigate the State Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 1072). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr HARNESS of Indiana: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Second intermediate report of the subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments authorized to investigate publicity and propaganda of Federal officials of the War Department, as it relates to universal training; without amendment (Rept. No. 1073). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 1070. An act to provide for the cancellation of the capital stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the refund of moneys received for such stock, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1076). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4331. A bill for the relief of Bertha M. Rogers; without amendment (Rept. No. 1054). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4177. A bill for the relief of William L. Cunliffe; without amendment (Rept. No. 1059). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1627) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War and the War Assets Administrator to take such action as may be necessary to return certain real property at Camp Stewart, Ga., to the former owners thereof, and for other purposes, and the same was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TABER:

H. R. 4347. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 4348. A bill to facilitate the admission of foreign workers desiring to perform agricultural work in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 4349. A bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act, 1924, to increase the penalties specified in such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr BUCK:

H. R. 4350. A bill to amend sections 3, 4, 9, and 14 of the act of June 18, 1934, relating to the establishment of foreign trade zones; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4351. A bill to amend sections 3, 4, 9, and 14 of the act of June 18, 1934, relating to the establishment of foreign-trade zones; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 4352. A bill to equalize income and excise tax revenues, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4359. A bill to repeal the special estate and gift tax provisions relating to community property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4354. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States district courts to adjudicate and report to the Congress their judgments with respect to claims of American nationals for private war losses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK:

H. R. 4355. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to require the nonpartisan election of State administrators of old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COMBS:

H. R. 4356. A bill to provide technical and research assistance to the fire-fighting services of the Nation by the establishment of a Federal research agency for the determination of the explosion and fire hazards of chemicals, fertilizers and agricultural materials, explosives, gases, dusts, and similar flammable and explosive materials endangering life and property; and for the development of effective safety measures for the prevention of explosions and fires in chemical, agricultural, and other industries, and shipping areas where flammable and explosive materials are being handled in shipping and transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 4357. A bill to raise the minimum-wage standards of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4358. A bill to authorize the naturalization of parents of veterans without regard to certain requirements of the naturalization laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4359. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, for the purpose of permitting States and political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof to secure coverage for their officers and employees under the old-age and survivors insurance provisions of such act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4360. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4361. A bill to amend the Articles of War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4362. A bill to provide for the payment of retroactive death pension to widows and children of veterans after 7 years' continued and unexplained absence; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4363. A bill to empower the Supreme Court of the United States to promulgate a code of ethics for attorneys at law practicing before the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 4364. A bill to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Sauk Rapids, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOMENGEAUX:

H. R. 4365. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. O'HARA (by request):

H. R. 4366. A bill to vest the Commissioners of the District of Columbia with the control and jurisdiction of the District of Columbia Armory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WEST:

H. R. 4367. A bill authorizing the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Hidalgo, Tex.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GEARHART (by request):

H. R. 4368. A bill to increase the amount of articles acquired abroad by residents of the United States which may be brought into the country free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 4369. A bill to clarify and make certain freedom of expression; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 4370. A bill to aid the associations, groups, organizations, and institutions encouraging participation of the youth of the country in athletic and sports programs by making surplus athletic equipment available to such associations, groups, organizations, and institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. STEFAN:

H. R. 4371. A bill to amend section 506 of the General Bridge Act of 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TWYMAN:

H. J. Res. 251. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the coming of the Swedish pioneers to the Middle West; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. Con. Res. 111. Concurrent resolution to authorize the reprinting of certain hearings held on universal military training in the Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. Res. 326. Resolution to end threat to international security in Indonesia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. Res. 327. Resolution to create a select committee to review the valuable contributions to the war effort of manufacturers of war materials during World War II and to recommend a suitable form of recognition for such contributions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REES:

H. Res. 330. Resolution providing for funds to carry on investigations, studies, and surveys in the civil service and Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4372. A bill for the relief of Samuel Fadem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 4373. A bill for the relief of Elias James Walker Kosmopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN of New York:

H. R. 4374. A bill for the relief of Uldric Thompson, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4375. A bill to authorize the cancellation of deportation proceedings in the case of Vincent (Vincenzo) Allegretti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART (by request):

H. R. 4376. A bill for the relief of Lawrence Joseph Armanine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 4377. A bill for the relief of the Consolidated Steel Corp., of Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 4378. A bill for the relief of Vojko Svarcenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 4379. A bill for the relief of the Harbor Boat Building Co., the Wilmington Welding & Boiler Works, and B & R Machine Works, of Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 4380. A bill for the relief of J. V. and Zena Mendoza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

H. R. 4381. A bill for the relief of the Yellow Cab Transit Co., of Oklahoma City; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBSION:

H. R. 4382. A bill for the relief of the estate of William R. Stigall, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:

H. R. 4383. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agnes M. Burke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 4384. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Vice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

764. Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin presented a resolution by local No. 184, UAW-CIO, Racine, Wis., urging passage of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JULY 25, 1947

(Legislative day of Wednesday, July 16, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Albert Joseph McCartney, D. D., minister emeritus, Covenant-First Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

When thou prayest enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door pray to thy Father which is in secret, and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly.

Teach us, O God, the wisdom of this advice. Amid all the turmoil and confusion of this day's work, help us to preserve this sanctuary of silence within the heart where we can be still and know that Thou art God. Give us the listening ear, that we may catch the whispered accents of Thy counsel whenever we

would turn to the right hand or to the left, saying, "This is the way; walk ye in it." Throughout the weary and testing hours of this day may we ever remember that "the eternal God is our refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms."

In the name of Jesus. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 24, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, July 25, 1947, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1508. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance," approved March 9, 1945 (59 Stat. 33); and

S. 1515. An act to make surplus property available for the alleviation of damage caused by flood or other catastrophe.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 758) to promote the national security by providing for a National Security Organization, which shall be administered by a Secretary of National Security, and for a Department of the Army, a Department of the Navy, and a Department of the Air Force within the National Security Organization, and for the coordination of the activities of the National Security Organization with other departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1361) to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit loans, capital grants, or annual contributions for low-rent-housing and slum-clearance projects where construction costs exceed present cost limitations upon condition that local housing agencies pay the difference between cost limitations and the actual construction costs.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 148) to authorize the temporary continuation of regulation of consumer credit.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2857) to extend second-class mailing privileges to bulletins issued by State conservation and fish and game agencies or departments; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. REES, Mr. TWYMAN, and Mr. LYLE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4002) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. TIBBOTT, Mr. SCRIVNER, Mr. KERR, Mr. MAHON, and Mr. NORRELL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4069) to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. KNUTSON, Mr. REED of New York, Mr. WOODRUFF, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. MILLS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 238) to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. KNUTSON, Mr. REED of New York, Mr. WOODRUFF, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. MILLS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 104) to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Housing, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 185. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Catholic Society of Alaska for use as a mission;

H. R. 197. An act to transfer part of block 14 and the school building thereon of Petersburg town site, Alaska, used for school purposes, to the town of Petersburg, Alaska;

H. R. 341. An act for the relief of the estate of Reuben Malkin;

H. R. 343. An act for the relief of Dr. Alma Richards and Mrs. Mary Block;

H. R. 405. An act for the relief of Thomas M. Farley, Mrs. Susie Farley, Mrs. Helen Moss, the legal guardian of Donna Louise Farley, and the legal guardian of Melvin Moss;

H. R. 406. An act for the relief of Walter R. and Kathryn Marshall;

H. R. 434. An act for the relief of Lewis H. Rich;

H. R. 640. An act for the relief of Harley Shores;

H. R. 704. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Jane Sherman and W. D. Sherman;

H. R. 821. An act for the relief of Charles W. Taylor, Jr.;

H. R. 893. An act for the relief of Myron R. Leard;

H. R. 914. An act for the relief of George Corenevsky;

H. R. 1091. An act for the relief of Mrs. Georgia Lauser;

H. R. 1379. An act to establish the United States Naval Postgraduate School, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1497. An act for the relief of the estate of George W. Coombs;

H. R. 1535. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Ralph Stanfield, a minor;

H. R. 1652. An act to provide for the naturalization of certain United States Army personnel—Yugoslav fliers;

H. R. 1737. An act for the relief of Owen R. Brewster;

H. R. 1995. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930 as amended, to provide for the return of the amount of deductions from the compensation of any employee who is separated from the service or transferred to a position not within the purview of such act before completing 10 years of service;

H. R. 2005. An act to amend the act of April 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 88), entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of the segregated coal and asphalt deposits of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indian Nations, in Oklahoma, and for an extension of time within which purchasers of such deposits may complete payments";

H. R. 2390. An act for the relief of Elmer A. Norris;

H. R. 2434. An act for the relief of Ruth A. Hairston;

H. R. 2471. An act to provide for periodical reimbursement of the general fund of the District of Columbia for certain expenditures made for the compensation, uniforms, equipment, and other expenses of the United States Park Police force;

H. R. 2507. An act for the relief of the firm of Barrett & Hilp;

H. R. 2511. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim 2 acres of land near Muirkirk, Md., to the Queens Chapel Methodist Church;

H. R. 2550. An act for the relief of Mack Gene Odom, a minor;

H. R. 2607. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of George Wesley Hobbs, a minor;

H. R. 2693. An act for the relief of public utility district No. 1, of Cowlitz County, Wash.;

H. R. 2800. An act to amend section 5 of Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3055. An act to permit the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War to supply utilities and related services to welfare activities, and persons whose businesses or residences are in the immediate vicinity of naval or military activities and require utilities or related services not otherwise obtainable locally, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3075. An act to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the classification of employees of the postal service, so as to provide proper recompense in the form of compensatory time for overtime performed by supervisors;

H. R. 3127. An act to provide for the loan or gift of obsolete ordnance to State homes for former members of the armed forces;

H. R. 3334. An act granting the consent of Congress to Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Susquehanna River;

H. R. 3361. An act for the relief of J. Rutledge Alford;

H. R. 3376. An act to ratify and confirm act 10 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1947, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945;

H. R. 3444. An act to amend section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 3448. An act to amend the Federal Home Bank Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3495. An act for the relief of Andrew C. Extrom and Harry C. Pearson;

H. R. 3738. An act to amend Public Law 88, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved June 23, 1945;

H. R. 3739. An act to authorize the Veterans' Administration to acquire certain land as a site for the proposed Veterans' Administration facility at Clarksburg, W. Va., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3852. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia," approved August 7, 1946;

H. R. 3997. An act to exclude certain vendors of newspapers or magazines from certain provisions of the Social Security Act and Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 4043. An act to change the order of priority for payment out of the German special deposit account, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4079. An act to amend the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), as amended June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1976);

H. R. 4254. An act providing for the disposition of farm-labor camps to public or semi-public agencies or nonprofit associations of farmers; and

H. J. Res. 250. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of Robert V. Fleming as a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION BY STATION WDAY FOR LEGISLATIVE NEWS FURNISHED

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, all during this session radio station WDAY, one of North Dakota's outstanding broadcasting stations, has conducted a most commendable program which has permitted the Members of Congress from its coverage area to report, in a nonpolitical way, the progress of legislation, allowing them freely to express themselves.

The Members of Congress have greatly appreciated this service and wish to commend Station WDAY for making the service possible.

I ask unanimous consent that a telegram I have just received from Station WDAY be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARGO, N. DAK., *July 24, 1947.*

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.:

As the first session of the Eightieth Congress of the United States draws close to its final hours, the newsroom of WDAY wishes to express its thanks to the Senators and Representatives from the Northwest for their cooperation during this session in the presentation of Washington news. Through their help we have been able to give this area one of the most complete reports of daily Washington news and of special topics of particular interest to the people of this area. Their response to queries for specific information has at all times enabled us to answer similar queries for information from WDAY's listeners. To Senators MILTON R. YOUNG and WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota; Senators JOSEPH BALL and EDWARD THYE, of Minnesota; Senator HARLAN BUSHFIELD, of South Dakota; and Representatives CHARLES ROBERTSON and WILLIAM LEMKE, of North Dakota; HAROLD HAGEN, of Minnesota; and FRANCIS CASE and KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, the WDAY newsroom extends thanks on this final broadcast of the weekly Washington report.

JACK SWENSON,
News Editor, WDAY.

ATTACKS BY FINANCIAL LOBBYISTS UPON FORMER SENATOR WHEELER

Mr. REED. Mr. President, there has been much comment, verbally and in the press, about lobbies and lobbyists representing various interests concerned with legislation in this session of Congress.

So far, I have not observed mention of one of the most active lobbies, with some of the most skilled lobbyists. I refer to the lobby and lobbyists representing insurance companies and other institutional railroad security holders in their efforts to prevent passage of the so-called Reed bills, presented by Representative CHAUNCEY W. REED in the House, and by myself in the Senate. These bills provide a plan for financial railroad reorganization, including railroads now in the hand of the United States courts.

Harry C. Hagerty, representing the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., could perhaps be given the title of head of the financial lobbyists seeking to defeat this legislation. Mr. Hagerty did not always confine himself to the truth. He appeared before the Senate Interstate Commerce Subcommittee handling this legislation. In a printed statement offered on June 5, of this year, to the Senate subcommittee holding hearings on S. 249, Hagerty used the following language:

> About 6 p. m., one Friday afternoon, in June 1946, when some probable opponents of the legislation (S. 1253, 79th Cong.) were en route to their homes for the week end, Senator Wheeler skillfully guided the bill to passage in the Senate.

This is a malicious falsehood. There is not the slightest foundation for any such statement. I worked closely with Senator Wheeler in writing and handling S. 1253, throughout the entire session. I joined with Senator Wheeler for weeks in trying to secure an opportunity from the then majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] to present the bill. It went to the floor of the Senate at the first opportunity afforded. S. 1253 had been on the Senate calendar for some time, with unanimous committee approval, and everybody knew it would be called up at the first opportunity.

Mr. Hagerty and his group of corporation lobbyists have been active and talkative around Washington this year in opposition to the Reed-Myers amendments to S. 249, which proposes a bill similar to S. 1253 of last year. Mr. Hagerty's lobbyists are credited with saying that:

> We were caught asleep last year. We are better organized this year, and S. 249 with the Reed-Myers amendments will never get out of the committee. We have that fixed.

This attack upon Senator Wheeler was made at a time when he was out of the country. However, an opportunity was afforded to Senator Wheeler, upon his return, to file as part of the printed record an answer to Mr. Hagerty's remarks.

The same group was active in circulating rumors that Representative REED would not be able to get his bill out of the House Judiciary Committee. Both bills were reported favorably by the respective committees.

The lobbyists for New York financial interests were correct in their claims that Representative REED would not be able to get the rule necessary for consideration of his bill on the floor of the House. The rule was denied.

They also circulated a report that Senator REED would never be able to get consideration of his bill, after the House acted on their version of the same subject. The Senate bill was being held for favorable action on the part of the House. As such action was not had in the House, there was no occasion to test their boasting.

I have confidence in the Senate committees, including the Republican Policy Committee, and I am quite sure they were wrong.

Financial lobbyists other than Harry Hagerty attacked former Senator Wheeler, long-time chairman of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee. One of them was E. W. Bourne, New York lawyer, who described himself as "engaged largely in railroad reorganization work since enactment of section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act." Mr. Bourne charged Senator Wheeler with unethical conduct in connection with legislation and railroad proceedings before the Interstate Commerce Commission.

This attack was made while Senator Wheeler was out of the country. I offer for the RECORD a copy of a letter dated June 18, written by Senator Wheeler to me, as chairman of the Interstate Commerce Subcommittee. I ask to have it printed in the RECORD as part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 17, 1947.*

Hon. CLYDE M. REED,
Chairman, Subcommittee
of the Interstate and
Foreign Commerce Committee,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CLYDE: Upon my return today from South America, where I have been for a considerable length of time, the statements of certain witnesses appearing before your subcommittee holding hearings on S. 249, with the amendments proposed by you and Senator MYERS, were brought to my attention. In view of the fact that with you on last year I was a cosponsor of similar legislation and filed several reports with the Senate in connection therewith, I feel impelled to correct at least some of the misstatements and misimpressions made by opposition witnesses, which might otherwise appear unanswered in the record of your hearings.

Mr. Harry C. Hagerty, appearing on behalf of the Security Owners Association and the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., in referring to S. 1253, stated that "when some probable opponents of the legislation were en route to their homes for a week end, Senator Wheeler skillfully guided the bill to passage in the Senate." In this regard you will remember the many efforts that you and I made to get the Senate leadership to set aside time for the debate and vote upon this bill, and that the only time that could be allotted was the very time when the bill was considered. Thus the time was not that of our choice but that impelled upon the leadership by other pending measures. In any event, the legislation was again passed by the Senate without objection; in other words, unanimously, when the vast majority of the Senators were present. I recall this clearly because not only

this legislation but other important legislation was considered on that particular day.

The same witness charges that the two reports submitted by me on this legislation were inaccurate. In view of the length of time that has elapsed since filing these reports, the least that can be said is that this general nonspecific challenge is belatedly made. The first of the two reports was filed with the Senate on February 7, 1947. It was promptly given wide distribution throughout railroad and financial communities and created extensive interest in informed circles. Many articles discussing this report appeared in the press and periodicals. Twenty days after the filing of the report, this witness and a number of his associates testified before the committee. Not one of them challenged a single figure or conclusion contained in the report. When the hearings were continued into March and other witnesses appeared, only one of them raised any question as to the accuracy of that report. This single instance indicates that if there had been even a slight error of fact or judgment contained in the report it would have been found by the magnifying glass to which it was subjected by interested parties. One of the receivers for the Seaboard Air Line Railway said the report gave an erroneous impression of their action in connection with the purchase of the railroad's obligations at a discount. He pointed out that the receivers had bought large quantities of debt, saving millions of dollars for their security holders. This was the method of debt shrinkage proposed by President Truman when in the Senate and favored by many other Senators. The statement in our first report on this question had been based on information supplied by the Commission, but it was promptly amplified in our second report satisfactorily incorporating the information furnished by the Seaboard receivers.

The second report was filed with the Senate on April 11, 1946. It again had the widest circulation. I never received from this witness or any of his associates a criticism of the report. Furthermore, I wish to call your attention to the fact that he does not specify any error of fact or conclusion based thereon. His is merely a general charge of inaccuracy made 14 months after the report was filed. As I stated before and as is indicated by the reports, the statements are fully supported by specific citations to the source of information. Much of the information was quoted verbatim from the sources cited. These sources included the Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Reserve Board, Federal Reserve Bank of New York, standard financial manuals, the Association of American Railroads and similar accepted, reputable repositories of corporate data. In addition, they included verbatim testimony given by witnesses, including Mr. Hagerty, who recently challenged the report before your committee.

A second witness, Mr. William Wyer, who appeared before your subcommittee and challenged the accuracy of these reports is an accountant. He also testified as an expert on behalf of the Railroad Security Owners Association. His statement does not appear to challenge the accuracy of any figures supplied by the Commission, the Federal Reserve, the AAR, etc., and incorporated in the two committee reports. He objects to the conclusions drawn from such data and seeks to draw accounting conclusions from them which are different from those contained in the report. In determining the relative weight to be given the conclusions of this witness as an accounting authority, in comparison to the committee reports, I wish to direct your attention to certain facts respecting him. He first appeared some years ago as a witness before the Interstate Commerce Committee at some of whose sessions I presided, and during other sessions when Senator (now President) Truman presided. (See hearings pursuant to S. Res. 71 (74th Cong.) pp. 528–529, 562–565, 578–605, 1105, 1109, 1118, 1129, 4733–4738, 4758, 5031–5063, 5065–5096, 5137–5139, 5141–5216, 5249–5269, 5271–5322.) The witness, then as now, qualified himself as an expert on railroad financial affairs and, in particular, the affairs of a large railroad for which he had acted as treasurer and chief accountant. (Ibid, pp. 579–580.) His transactions in that position were analyzed before the committee by the late Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Joseph B. Eastman, who told the committee categorically that the accountings conducted by that railroad treasurer were false. (Ibid, pp. 541–545.) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation presented the committee with evidence showing that this railroad, on the basis of false financial statements prepared by or under the supervision of this railroad treasurer, obtained large railroad loans. (Ibid, pp. 1112–1113, 1116.) The head of the RFC's Railroad Division informed this treasurer that the transaction effected by him was crooked. (Ibid, p. 1142.) Evidence was also presented to the committee that the RFC had transmitted these facts to the Department of Justice for action. The Department replied that the statute of limitations barred criminal prosecution for that transaction. (Ibid, pp. 1112–1113.) This same railroad treasurer who appeared before your committee the other day as an expert to challenge last year's committee report was given permission by the committee on numerous occasions to explain away the charges against his accounting and financial reports made when treasurer of the railroad in question. (Ibid, e. g. 1129, 5031–5063, 5210–5216, 5249.) On one of those occasions, when Senator (now President) Truman was presiding, this witness finally admitted that his financial entries on reports had been false. (Ibid, 5061–5063.) At a subsequent hearing he retracted this admission and Senator Truman told him, on the record of the hearing, that his testimony of retraction was in the same category as his railroad accounts. (Ibid, p. 5269.)

Subsequently the Interstate Commerce Commission called the attention of Congress to the accounting methods to which this railroad official had resorted.

The third witness, Mr. E. W. Bourne, appearing before your committee recently on behalf of an institutional bondholding group leveled slanderous implications and innuendoes at me and my son. I wish to categorically deny them, lest they be used by this lawyer or his ilk to support future slander by stating that his charges went undenied in the record. But for this probability, I would not accord recognition to his insinuations as to my character and integrity. I am wholly unacquainted with this witness and, therefore, must conclude that his defamation is aimed not at me or my son personally, but is part and parcel of his long campaign as a hireling seeking to expropriate junior security holders in bankruptcy railroads of their property. He and his associate, the accounting witness aforementioned, will obviously lend themselves to any reckless statement or enterprise to protect their obsolete reorganization plans which are designed to impoverish junior security holders and enrich senior creditors. It may be noted in passing that the efforts of this witness are paid for by the debtor but are for the benefit of his clients, a few creditors.

Sincerely.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I resent the constant misrepresentation and distortion of the facts, on the part of these and other lobbyists, and their attacks upon Members of Congress and upon my friend and former colleague, Burton K. Wheeler.

INVESTIGATION OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE IN CONNECTION WITH ALLEGED ELECTION FRAUDS IN MISSOURI—MOTION TO DISCHARGE

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I read on the first page of the calendar of business for today that the pending business is the motion of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 150, to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from further consideration of Senate Resolution 116, which, Mr. President, is the resolution regarding the inaction of the Department of Justice in connection with the investigation of the Kansas City vote frauds. Of course, the President pro tempore is correct in saying that that business has been temporarily laid aside for the consideration of the appropriation bill to which he has referred.

Mr. President, the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska has been the unfinished business of the Senate for more than a week. Since my name is associated with Resolution 150 and Resolution 116, I have been the recipient of a large number of letters from all over the United States. Many of these letters have enclosed editorial comment.

I brought to the Senate this morning three such editorials, selected as a sample of all the rest. The first is an editorial from the New York Sun of July 23, 1947, headed "Stifling an investigation." This is sent to me by a lady in New York who says that in doing so she is acting for "the entire family."

The second is an editorial from the Washington Post of yesterday, headed "Missouri compromise." In asking that this editorial be inserted in the RECORD, I should like to invite attention to the fact that I have previously, in the last two or three days, inserted editorial comment from the Washington Evening Star and the Washington Times-Herald, and I now add a third Washington paper, the Washington Post.

Finally, Mr. President, I ask to have inserted an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, of Boston, of July 23, 1947, a paper with a national circulation, and long famous throughout the length and breath of the land for its independent, high-minded, fair editorial comment. This editorial is headed "Last Chance to Retrieve."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the three editorials to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Sun of July 23, 1947]

STIFLING AN INVESTIGATION

Though investigation of an inquiry sounds a little complex, it may work out into a simple enough political issue for general understanding in 1948. Republican Senator JAMES P. KEM, of Missouri, has tried, without success, to win authorization for a resolution to investigate the Department of Justice's inquiry into the primary election of 1946 in the Fifth Missouri Congress District. Democratic obstruction has blocked passage of this resolution.

What Senator KEM asks is not an inquiry into the primary election itself, which a Missouri grand jury has already found to be

tainted with fraud. It was at this primary election that Roger C. Slaughter, Democratic candidate for renomination as Representative, was purged at the express wish of President Truman and with the all too effective help of the Pendergast machine in Kansas City. Those Kansas City wards which in previous years had given suspiciously large majorities to every favorate of the machine last year provided the votes to defeat Slaughter, but Enos Axtell, winner in the Democratic primary, was himself eliminated at the polls in November. What Senator KEM seeks to find out is why the Federal Bureau of Investigation, subordinate to the Attorney General, made so limited an investigation, why it confined its inquiries to half a dozen or so possible witnesses. It is significant that the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, certainly never a Republican organ, believes that KEM is right and that such Democrats as HATCH and MCCARRAN, who have opposed the investigation, are wrong.

If the Democrats are successful in stifling this inquiry they will be inviting the public to use its imagination at will. An investigation, on the other hand, might provide a generally satisfactory explanation of why the Department of Justice conducted the kind of inquiry it did.

[From the Washington Post of July 25, 1947]

MISSOURI COMPROMISE

Senate Democrats are inevitably adding to the suspicion that in blocking the inquiry into the Missouri vote scandal they have something to hide. This seems to us abysmally poor politics. The mere attempt to suppress a probe by the Senate Judiciary Committee has made the matter a sure issue in the 1948 campaign, regardless of the facts in the case. Moreover, if, as the administration contends, the Justice Department did nothing to whitewash the original investigation, then the Senate bloc has done a disservice to Attorney General Clark. If his skirts are clean, Mr. Clark should welcome an opportunity to tell his story fully.

The issue now has gone far beyond the attempt by President Truman to purge Congressman Roger Slaughter at last summer's primary. The mechanics of the steal engineered by the Pendergast machine in Kansas City are now being brought out by a Federal grand jury and the FBI. These facts will come to light irrespective of congressional action. It will be impossible to camouflage them. But there are other relevant questions which ought to be answered by the administration. The country has a right to know why the preliminary FBI investigation was so restricted in scope and why the matter was dropped by the Department of Justice until outside pressure forced the administration to take it up again. Possibly there is a logical explanation for this seeming effort to call off the dogs. But certainly the obstructionism of the Senate Democrats only weakens the administration's pose of innocence.

Doubtless, as has been charged, there is some political motivation behind the Kem resolution which the Democrats are blocking. But no smear the Republicans could concoct would be worse than what the Democrats are doing to themselves. For when the facts do come out, they will do so with far more damaging effect than if the Democrats had aided the inquiry. Quite apart from any partisan considerations, the disclosures to date thoroughly warrant a congressional investigation both of the primary and of the inexcusable dalliance in following up the irregularities. By hamstringing the effort to get at the truth, the Democrats have only contributed to the smell of a situation that is already highly obnoxious.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, of July 23, 1947]

LAST CHANCE TO RETRIEVE

One of the saddest things about Congress is that it cannot even reach after an election fraud without getting into partisan politics up to its eyes. The current battle over whether the Senate should or should not investigate charges that somebody held back the FBI in the Kansas City vote-fraud case seems no exception.

Making due allowance, nevertheless for all the axes waiting to be ground, and any taints in motives, we believe the Kansas City story is bad enough, on the very face of it, so that every questionable stone should be turned.

The Republicans have campaign ammunition to gain and nothing worse than a fizzle to lose by such an investigation. The Democrats risk much either way. But we doubt that anything Senate probers might dig up would be as damaging in the 1948 campaign as public suspicion that worse things had been covered up.

We do not believe Mr. Truman himself had anything to do with the irregularities. But he did unwisely put a finger in a local primary election. He did accept the aid of the unregenerate remnant of the old Pendergast machine in that election. And ever since evidence of fraud was first unearthed by the Kansas City Star, and later by a Jackson County grand jury, his handling of the matter has worked a clumsy disservice to himself, his party, and to faith in democratic processes generally.

The hour is late. There is much that Mr. Truman has lost by these fumblings that he cannot retrieve. But he can call off the Democratic Senators who are threatening a filibuster, and let the Senate have a closer look at the Justice Department's behavior if it wants to.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary which is engaged in the consideration of the nomination of Roy W. Harper, to be United States district judge for eastern and western districts of Missouri, may hold a hearing during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, BUREAU OF MINES OF INTERIOR DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 102)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior, amounting to $500,000, fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (S. DOC. NO. 101)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Commerce, amounting to $300,000, fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF A NAVAL LANDING CRAFT TO EX-NAVY-ARMY-PERSONNEL CLUB, LAKE JACKSON, TEX.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Ex-Navy-Army Personnel Boating Club, of Lake Jackson, Tex., had requested the Navy Department to transfer a naval landing craft to be used in the training and recreation of its members; to the Committee on Armed Services.

COACHELLA VALLEY DIVISION OF ALL-AMERICAN CANAL PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report by the Bureau of Reclamation of that Department, on the engineering feasibility, the total estimated cost, and the allocation and probable repayment of these costs of the distribution system and flood-control works on the Coachella Valley division, All-American Canal project, California (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

INTERIM REPORT ON POTENTIAL WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENTS IN COLORADO RIVER BASIN

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, an interim report dated July 19, 1947, on the status of the investigations of that Department on the potential water resource developments in the Colorado River Basin (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Lands.

CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the 30-day period ended June 28, 1947 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY COMMISSIONED OFFICERS' BILL OF 1947

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the distribution, promotion, separation, and retirement of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AUDIT REPORT OF INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION AND SUBSIDIARY CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Inland Waterways Corporation and subsidiary corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. R. 3332. A bill creating the St. Lawrence Bridge Commission and authorizing said Commission and its successors to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y.; without amendment (Rept. No. 758).

By Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

H. J. Res. 218. Joint resolution providing for the representation of the Government and people of the United States in the observance of the two-hundredth anniversary

of the founding of the city of Reading, Pa.; without amendment; and

S. Res. 156. Resolution increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; without amendment.

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1551. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell to Anthony P. Miller, Inc., a parcel of unimproved land adjacent to the Anchorage housing project at Middletown, R. I.; without amendment (Rept. No. 756).

By Mr. BALDWIN, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 1260. A bill to amend section 107 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934; without amendment (Rept. No. 757).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1302. A bill to aid the associations, groups, organizations, and institutions encouraging participation of the youth of the country in athletic and sports programs by making surplus athletic equipment available to such associations, groups, organizations, and institutions, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 764).

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1632. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain troop kitchen railway cars to the War Department, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 765).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 4308. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662), as amended, relating to the acceptance of decorations, orders, medals, and emblems by officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations, neutral nations, or other American Republics; without amendment (Rept. No. 766).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 468. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Imperial Palace, Dramatic Order Knights of Khorassan," to increase the amount of property which the corporation may hold from $100,000 to $5,000,000; without amendment (Rept. No. 760);

S. 1431. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edna Mary Jakimowicz; without amendment (Rept. No. 759);

H. R. 890. A bill for the relief of Jessie Thompkins; without amendment (Rept. No. 762);

H. R. 3690. A bill to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act; with amendments (Rept. No. 763); and

S. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day; with amendments (Rept. No. 761).

By Mr. BALL, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 4347. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 767).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1725. A bill for the relief of Fred S. Tutton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY (by request):

S. 1726. A bill to amend the act relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the national interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

S. 1727. A bill to authorize and direct the Interstate Commerce Commission to investigate freight rates which are applicable with respect to shipments within, to, and from the Mountain-Pacific rate territory; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 1728. A bill for the more economical operation of the general supply fund of the Bureau of Federal Supply, Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1729. A bill for the relief of Gudrun Emma Ericsson; and

S. 1730. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna V. Reyer, Alexander A. Reyer, and Vitaly A. Reyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 1731. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide annuities for custodial personnel of the Bureau of Prisons who have rendered at least 20 years of service; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1732. A bill for the relief of the Yellow Cab Transit Co., of Oklahoma City; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1733. A bill to authorize payment to certain enrolled members of the Seminole Tribe of Indians under act of July 2, 1942 (Public, No. 645, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on Public Lands.

(Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. WAGNER) introduced Senate bill 1734, to amend the Social Security Act by providing for a national system of unemployment and temporary disability insurance, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1735. A bill to establish two migratory waterfowl zones in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1736. A bill to provide for continued research for the purpose of developing improved prosthetic appliances for veterans; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MOORE:

S. 1737. A bill to amend the Judicial Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 1738. A bill for the relief of Ferd H. Gibler; and

S. 1739. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Patricia Schwartz and Beatrice Schwartz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. J. Res. 154. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one-hundredth anniversary of the poultry business in the United States; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. J. Res. 155. Joint resolution rescinding an order of the Federal Power Commission authorizing redevelopment of the Wilder Dam project; to the Committee on Public Works.

NATIONAL UNEMPLOYMENT AND TEMPORARY DISABILITY INSURANCE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Social Security Act by providing for a national system of unemployment and temporary disability insurance, and I request that an explanatory statement of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1734) to amend the Social Security Act by providing for a national system of unemployment and temporary disability insurance, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. WAGNER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. MURRAY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURRAY EXPLAINING PURPOSE OF BILL TO BROADEN AND LIBERALIZE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

The bill provides for:

1. Broadening unemployment insurance protection to cover about 10,000,000 jobs now excluded, such as agricultural labor, domestic service, employees of nonprofit institutions and employees of small firms.

2. Payments of benefits to an insured person out of work due to sickness or disability. Only two States—Rhode Island and California—now provide such protection to insured persons.

3. Payment of insurance benefits ranging from a minimum weekly benefit of $5 to a maximum weekly benefit of $30, depending in each individual case upon the previous wages of the insured individual and the number of his dependents. Illustrative benefits for a man earning about $40 a week in wages are as follows: Single man, $20; man and wife, $26; man, wife, and children, $30.

4. Payment of benefits for a maximum duration of 26 weeks, after a 1-week waiting period. In the case of the unemployment insurance, the maximum duration of benefits may be increased to 52 weeks if funds are adequate.

5. Substituting a single simplified national system of unemployment and disability insurance for the present complicated State-by-State system.

6. Establishment of a National Advisory Council and State and local advisory bodies to advise on all aspects of the program and to assure decentralization of administration.

INVESTIGATION OF REORGANIZATION OF RAILROADS

Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. MYERS) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 157), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Whereas many railroads in the continental United States are in the hands of trustees because of insolvency proceedings brought under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act; and

Whereas the mileage of these railroads is approximately 25,000, and the investment in road and equipment amounts to several billion dollars; and

Whereas many of these roads entered bankruptcy in 1933, 1934, 1935, or 1936, 10 to 14 years ago, and the earnings of these roads in recent years have been sufficient to accumulate large cash amounts, and have placed such roads in a solvent position; and

Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission, which approved reorganization plans for most of these railroads nearly 7 years ago, has ignored vastly changed financial conditions in which these railroads are now situate, and is permitting wholly unwarranted and

unnecessary forfeiture of hundreds of millions of dollars in securities to take place; and

Whereas court proceedings involving some very important railroads are in such a condition that it is difficult if not impossible to approximate the time when reorganization under section 77 will be completed, and it is feasible for a number of these roads to retire part of their indebtedness, at a discount, and to refund or extend the maturity date of the balance of their indebtedness, and it further appears desirable to discharge such railroads from bankruptcy proceedings without the necessity of drastic reorganizations under section 77; and

Whereas Congress is witnessing the anomaly of the Supreme Court of the United States refusing to review a lower-court decision approving an original reorganization plan for one railroad which would have wiped out $45,000,000 par value of stock and creditors' claims while at the same time the creditors of that railroad have agreed upon and the Interstate Commerce Commission has approved a new reorganization plan which avoids any forfeiture of security values; and

Whereas the continued holding of roads that have become solvent in trustee or receiver operation as insolvent roads, and further effort to reorganize, under section 77, railroads which no longer need such reorganization, are contrary to the general public interest, contrary to sound public policy, and are bringing into disrepute the administration of justice by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the courts; and

Whereas the President of the United States has joined with Congress in going on record in favor of modifications of present reorganization legislation and in favor of the principles proposed by the appropriate committees of the Senate and House of Representatives in 1946, and in favor of the principles enacted by Congress in 1946, and the President has further urged the strengthening of such proposals and the adoption of further provisions to carry out those general principles: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a complete and thorough investigation of administration by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the courts, and actions of trustees, and all other parties in interest, and counsel therefore, with reference to plans of reorganization and proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended. The committee is directed to report to the Senate as early as practicable, with such recommendations as to changes in existing law as may be found desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

INVESTIGATION OF CHARGES AGAINST OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL CONTROLS IN COMMERCE DEPARTMENT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 158), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Whereas the Office of International Trade in the Department of Commerce controls, by a system of licenses, exports of agricultural and other products; and

Whereas such Office of International Trade is alleged to claim that it has issued such licenses for export of agricultural and other products on the basis of so-called historical records; and

Whereas it is alleged that, while said Office of International Trade claims to be issuing export licenses on the basis of historical records that, in fact, such Office is issuing licenses arbitrarily and through favoritism and other considerations and without regard to historical records; and

Whereas it is alleged that export licenses issued as above stated and services promising to procure such licenses are now being peddled on a so-called black market; and

Whereas information is current that export licenses covering agricultural and other products may be secured without undue delay by and through the employment of certain agents; and

Whereas such allegations and charges are bringing said Office of International Trade and the Department of Commerce into bad repute: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the allegations and charges made against the said Office of International Trade, and that the committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable data the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable, and as follows:

First, that a list of all applications for export licenses, giving the name or names and the address of each applicant for export licenses, and the number or amount of the commodity covered in such application made prior to July 1, 1947.

Second, a list of all export licenses issued prior to July 1, 1947, covering agricultural and other products and the number or amount of the commodity embraced in each said export license.

Third, all information developed with regard to the program being followed by said Office of International Trade in the issuing of such export licenses; and

Fourth, recommendations of needed legislation with respect to the subject matter mentioned in this resolution.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee shall not exceed $10,000 and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

PRINTING OF REPORT OF PRESIDENT'S TEMPORARY COMMISSION ON EMPLOYEE LOYALTY

Mr. McGRATH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 159), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the report of the President's Temporary Commission on Employee Loyalty be printed as a Senate document.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 25, 1947, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 358. An act for the relief of Julian M. Thomas;

S. 483. An act to relocate the boundaries and reduce the area of the Gila Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes;

S. 526. An act to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes;

S. 706. An act for the relief of William D. McCormick; and

S. 1368. An act to amend section 2455 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to increase the size of isolated disconnected tracts or parcels of the public domain which may be sold, and for other purposes.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR THE FOREIGN SERVICE INSTITUTE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would like to acknowledge from the Secretary of State a request for the appointment of Senators to serve as members of the Advisory Committee for the Foreign Service Institute. The Foreign Service Institute was established under authority granted by the Congress by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, providing training and instruction to officers and employees of the Foreign Service and of the Department of State and to other officers and employees of the Government for whom training and instruction in the field of foreign relations is necessary.

In response to the request of the Secretary of State the Chair appoints the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH].

JOSEPH J. PICKETT—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 99)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith without my approval S. 484, "To authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Joseph J. Pickett a patent in fee to certain land."

The effect of this measure would be to terminate the trust under which the United States now holds the lands allotted to and inherited by Mr. Pickett on the Crow Indian Reservation, and to require a conveyance of the lands to him free from the restrictions on alienation now imposed by law. Whether the consent of Mr. Pickett would be a prerequisite to such termination and conveyance is a matter on which the terms of the bill are silent.

The situation here presented is one which involves the performance of trust agreements that the United States is bound faithfully to execute, as distinguished from the continuance of a personal disability. Mr. Pickett, in common with other Indians, is entirely free to purchase lands or other property, and to sell the same as he pleases. What is here in question is land that forms a part of the ancestral tribal holdings of the Crow

Indians, and a part of an area which, pursuant to various arrangements with these Indians, has been divided among the individual members of the Crow Tribe. Mr. Pickett obtained a share in this division of the tribal patrimony solely because of his membership, or that of his ancestors, in the Crow Tribe. Under the terms of the allotment arrangements, and the implementing statutes, he has no right to alienate the lands allotted to or inherited by him without the consent of the United States, acting in its capacity as trustee of the lands. With respect to most of the area described in the bill, such approval may now be granted by the Secretary of the Interior should it be found that Mr. Pickett is competent to manage his affairs.

In the performance of the existing trust obligations consideration must be given to the question of whether a sale of the lands would promote the best interests of all concerned. These include Mr. Pickett, as the beneficiary of the trust, and the Crow Tribe, as a party to its creation and maintenance. Indicative of the interests of the latter is the fact that the Crow Tribe expressly stipulated, in the basic allotment agreement, that a restriction upon alienation, whether by voluntary conveyance or by operation of law, should be incorporated in every patent.

The record in the present case clearly indicates that termination of the trust would be contrary to the best interests of Mr. Pickett. The lands that would be released exceed the average Indian holding in quality and extent, and yield a good rental income. Conditions of age and health prevent Mr. Pickett from engaging in active farming operations, and, combined with lack of experience, restrict his opportunities for other types of business undertakings. The proceeds of properties sold in the past have not been successfully reinvested by him, and apart from the trust lands his only source of income is a retirement pension from the United States. Partially dependent upon him for support are a wife and three small children. All things considered, the future security of Mr. Pickett and his family would appear to lie in the retention of the trust lands, which constitute his principal capital asset, rather than in risking the loss of this sound investment through more speculative ventures.

The record also clearly indicates that termination of the trust would violate the best interests of the Crow Tribe. The economic well-being of this group of citizens is vitally dependent upon the continued ownership and use by them of the remaining Indian grazing lands on the Crow Reservation. Mr. Pickett's holdings are scattered through four different grazing units in one of the best grazing areas on the reservation, and control a key water supply. They are for the most part surrounded by other lands in Indian ownership. The sale of these holdings to a non-Indian would isolate adjoining Indian lands, would cut them off from necessary water, and would render the position of some of the surrounding Indian landowners precarious indeed.

In these circumstances it seems to me that the responsibilities of the United States for the faithful discharge of its trust obligations preclude the termination at this time of the existing trust of the lands allotted to and inherited by Mr. Pickett.

I also wish to point out that the Congress has established, by general law, procedures under which cases such as the present may be adjusted in ways both equitable and practical. Under existing statutes applicable to the Crow Reservation, the Secretary of the Interior would have authority, upon application by Mr. Pickett, to sell for his benefit one-half of his 640-acre homestead, and any of the other lands allotted to or inherited by him, should a sale of part of his capital assets become essential for his support. Such a procedure would not entail the disregard of Indian interests, and of Federal responsibilities for their protection, that is inherent in the present bill, however well-intentioned.

For these reasons, I am constrained to withhold my approval from S. 484.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 25, 1947.*

GIDEON PEON—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 100)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith without my approval S. 403, authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Gideon Peon.

The effect of this measure would be to enable Mr. Peon to terminate at will the trust under which the United States now holds the lands allotted to him on the Flathead Indian Reservation, and to permit him to demand a conveyance of the lands free from the restrictions on alienation now imposed by law.

The situation here presented is one which involves the performance of trust agreements that the United States is bound faithfully to execute, as distinguished from the continuance of a personal disability. Mr. Peon, in common with other Indians, is entirely free to purchase lands or other property, and to sell the same as he pleases. What is here in question is land that forms a part of the ancestral tribal holdings of the Flathead Indians, and a part of an area which, pursuant to various arrangements with these Indians, has been divided among the individual members of the Flathead Tribe. Mr. Peon obtained a share in this division of the tribal patrimony solely because of his membership in the Flathead Tribe. Under the terms of the allotment arrangements, and the implementing statutes, he has no right to alienate the lands allotted to him without the consent of the United States, acting in its capacity as trustee of the lands. Such approval may now be granted by the Secretary of the Interior should it be found that Mr. Peon is competent to manage his affairs.

In the performance of the existing trust obligations consideration must be given to the question of whether a sale of the lands would promote the best interests of all concerned. These include Mr. Peon, as the beneficiary of the trust, and the Flathead Tribe, as a party to its creation and maintenance. Indicative of the interests of the latter is the fact that the treaty confirming the Indian title to the Flathead Reservation expressly declared that the reservation should be for the exclusive use and benefit of the Flathead Tribe, and that non-Indians should not be permitted to reside thereon without the permission of the tribe.

In the present case the record does not clearly indicate that termination of the trust would be to the best interests of Mr. Peon. The lands that would be released currently yield him a rental of more than 6 percent on their estimated value, and the possibilities for reinvesting the proceeds of a sale are linked by current market conditions.

On the other hand, the record does clearly indicate that termination of the trust would violate the best interests of the Flathead Tribe. The economic well-being of this group of citizens is vitally dependent upon the continued ownership and use by them of the remaining Indian grazing lands on the Flathead Reservation. Mr. Peon's allotment is so located that its sale to a non-Indian would tend to diminish the utility of adjoining Indian lands, and to hamper the development of workable Indian grazing units in the area. Consolidation of scattered tracts into such units is essential if the Flathead Indians are to enjoy a decent living.

In these circumstances it seems to me that the responsibilities of the United States for the faithful discharge of its trust obligations preclude the granting to Mr. Peon of the right to terminate at will the existing trust of the lands allotted to him.

I also wish to point out that the Congress has established, by general law, procedures under which cases such as the present may be adjusted in ways both equitable and practical. These procedures afford room for accommodating to each other the legitimate aspiration of Mr. Peon to have the fullest possible measure of freedom in managing his business affairs, and the equally legitimate aspiration of the Flathead Tribe to preserve its ancestral homelands as a source of livelihood for its members. Under existing statutes applicable to the Flathead Reservation, the Secretary of the Interior would have authority, upon application by Mr. Peon, to offer his allotment for sale, at not less than its appraised value, to the Flathead Tribe or to any of the members thereof, whichever may be the higher bidder. If such efforts did not result in a sale at a fair price being consummated within a reasonable time, I believe the Secretary of the Interior would be justified in concluding that adequate recognition had been given the interests of the tribe and its members. An application by Mr. Peon for termination of the trust and the issuance of a patent in fee could then be considered favorably, if supported by

an adequate showing of Mr. Peon's qualifications. Such a procedure would not entail the disregard of Indian interests, and of Federal responsibilities for their protection, that is inherent in the present bill, however well-intentioned.

For these reasons, I am constrained to withhold my approval from S. 403.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 25, 1947.*

THE ST LAWRENCE WATERWAY DEVELOPMENT

[Mr AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio discussion on the subject of the St. Lawrence waterway development, participated in by himself, Senator WILEY, Dr. N. R. Danielian, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL TRIBUTE TO SENATOR IVES BY THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial commending Senator IVES, from the Washington Post of July 25, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LATE HENRY FORD—ADDRESS BY HON. SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address by Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill, on Sunday, April 20, 1947, reviewing the life of the late Henry Ford, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUMMARY OF AGRICULTURAL COORDINATION ACT OF 1947

[Mr STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a summary of the Agricultural Coordination Act of 1947, prepared by the Farm Bureau Federation, which appears in the Appendix.]

BOARD OF FOREIGN SCHOLARSHIPS APPOINTED BY THE PRESIDENT

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a White House release regarding the Board of Foreign Scholarships appointed by the President, a statement by himself regarding the same subject, and an editorial entitled "Value in a Foreign Study Plan," from the Kansas City Star of July 20, 1947, which appear in the Appendix.]

LOBBYING AT THE CAPITOL—ARTICLE BY JOSEPH AND STEWART ALSOP

[Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Little Foxes," published in the July 25, 1947, issue of the Washington Post, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1948

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is the continuing consideration of House bill 4269, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4269) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

INFORMATION SERVICE, STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, yesterday I said I would make a motion to take up for consideration Order No. 602, House bill 3342, which is the bill involving what is called the Voice of America. I realize that motion is not in order at this time. I hope—and I am very earnest in the expression of the hope—that the leadership of this body will permit a vote on this bill before we finally adjourn and return to our homes.

The only thing I can do now, in the present parliamentary situation, is to ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid aside in order that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of House bill 3342, and I make that request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico submits a unanimous-consent request. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it will be impossible to grant the request at this time, in view of the unanimous-consent agreement made relative to the appropriation bill.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator gives me a ray of hope. He says "at this time."

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. May I hope that possibly we may have a vote during this session?

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want the ray to grow too bright, but I will say that at an opportune time the Senator will have just as much right as any other Senator again to ask unanimous consent, or even to make a motion; but under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into earlier this morning it will be impossible to grant the Senator's request at this time, and I deeply regret to have to object to the request of my distinguished friend from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from New Mexico has said——

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a question?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico if I may indulge the hope that the motion of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 150 may be reached for a vote at the present session of the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. Is the Senator asking me that question?

Mr. KEM. Yes; as one of the determined clique who have barred a vote on the measure for more than a week.

Mr. HATCH. It is perfectly agreeable to me to have the Senate vote on the Senator's resolution, and if the Senator from Missouri will ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed immediately to vote on it, the Senator from New Mexico will not object, and I hope that Senators on the other side of the aisle will be as generous with my request as I am with that of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, hope springs eternal in the human breast. I now ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the motion of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 150.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All the Senator has to do is to ask for the regular order, because that is the business of the Senate.

Mr. KEM. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the regular order be now taken up.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in the absence of members of the Judiciary Committee who are involved, and in the absence of unanimous consent——

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. No unanimous-consent request is necessary, is it? The Senator from Missouri has demanded the regular order, has he not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri asked unanimous consent. It is that on which the Senator from Kentucky is commenting.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, in view of the unanimous-consent agreement entered into this morning that, following the enactment of certain legislation, the Senator from Nevada would have the right to the floor, of course I think it is unfair to the Senator from Nevada to propose such a request at this time, and on that account I am compelled to object.

Mr. KEM. I have been under the impression that the minority leader was in charge of the filibuster against the motion.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a gratuitous and incorrect statement. I have not been in charge of any filibuster. There has been no filibuster. There has been more time consumed on the majority side since the resolution was taken up—four times as much as has been consumed by anyone on the minority side.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, that is a gratuitous and incorrect statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, if we are going to contest in gratuities and incorrections, I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I may remind the Senator from Kentucky that he was the one who first used the expression.

Mr. BARKLEY. We entered into an agreement here. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All the various hopes expressed by Senators will be recorded in the Journal and the RECORD. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is in charge of the appropriation bill.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the suggestion so that I may make an inquiry?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. So the RECORD may be clear, the Senator from Nebraska referred to a unanimous-consent agreement made earlier today. What was that agreement, may I ask?

Mr. WHERRY. It was that the pending business before the Senate—the motion of the junior Senator from Nebraska to take up Senate Resolution 150—be temporarily displaced, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4269, that none of the rights the Senator from Nevada had at the time

he was discussing the motion to take up Senate Resolution 150 should be lost to him, and that the maximum time in which the Senate was to discuss H. R. 4269 would be limited by 7 o'clock a. m.; after which the motion to recess until 12 o'clock noon today was agreed to.

There was also a statement made by the senior Senator from Ohio to the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that within the limitation of 1 hour each the two so-called veterans' bills, having to do with the ceiling on trainees in industry and on the farm, would be given the next priority in the consideration of the agenda upon which the Senate is now working.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is the Senator telling me that the statement of the Senator from Ohio to the Senator from Georgia and to the Senator from Oregon is any part of the unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. WHERRY. Except this, that the Senator from Ohio stated that he would move to take them up in the event that unanimous consent——

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is what I wanted to ascertain.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the statement of the Senator from Ohio was that he would try to get consideration for the two bills. He was to make the attempt.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; he would try.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I want that distinctly understood, because I heard the Senator from Ohio say he would undertake to have the bills taken up for consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I understand that it is no part of a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. WHERRY. I stand corrected. I do not want to be technical.

Mr. REVERCOMB. There is no technicality.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, anyone could be technical about any bill. It is my understanding that at the conclusion of the consideration of the appropriation bill, the Senator from Ohio said he would try to see that the two veterans' bills would be considered. I am asking the distinguished Senator if we may proceed. I think if we put the time on the appropriation bill, we shall conclude it, and that will be the assurance of the Senator from West Virginia that we shall get to the other bill just as quickly as possible.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say that I put the question to the Senator, because I want it perfectly clear in the RECORD what the unanimous-consent agreement is. I thought the unanimous-consent agreement was—and I want the able Senator to pay attention to what I am saying at the moment——

Mr. WHERRY. I am trying to find it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That the motion of the Senator from Nebraska in relation to Senate Resolution 150 would be laid aside, that House bill 2469 be taken up and disposed of, and that the Senator from Nevada would not lose his rights on the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. And that that was the end of the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. WHERRY. Prior to that time, the Senator from Georgia raised a question in connection with a bill in which he is interested—I think it is Calendar 610, House bill 2181 relating to institutional on-farm training for veterans—as to whether or not it was a part of a unanimous-consent agreement. It was then that the Senator from Ohio rose and stated that he would try to have the bill considered at the conclusion of the consideration of the appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair give to the Senator from West Virginia some information?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall be delighted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is no unanimous-consent agreement on the Senate record except to proceed with the consideration of the appropriation bill. Any subsequent arrangements will be at the discretion of the Senate. The Senator from West Virginia will have his opportunity.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4269) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I have just suggested the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the first amendment passed over was——

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I have suggested the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is what I was going to suggest, myself. I did not know the Senator was suggesting it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Morse
Baldwin	Hawkes	Murray
Ball	Hayden	Myers
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Brewster	Hill	O'Daniel
Bricker	Hoey	Overton
Bridges	Holland	Pepper
Brooks	Ives	Reed
Buck	Jenner	Revercomb
Buchfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kem	Saltonstall
Cain	Kilgore	Smith
Capehart	Knowland	Sparkman
Capper	Langer	Stewart
Chavez	Lodge	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Cooper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Tydings
Eastland	McGrath	Umstead
Ecton	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	McMahon	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wherry
Flanders	Malone	White
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
George	Maybank	Williams
Green	Millikin	Wilson
Gurney	Moore	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Chair suggests to the Senator from Minnesota that there are three committee amendments which have not been passed upon as yet, and in the ordinary course we would revert to those amendments.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I suggest that we revert to the first committee amendment passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the first committee amendment passed over, which is on page 17, line 16.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 17, line 16, after the word "law", it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for the National Labor Relations Board shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any person appointed as an additional member or as general counsel of such Board (as provided in section 3 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended), whose nomination has not been confirmed by the Senate."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the first committee amendment which was passed over.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I can explain the amendment very briefly. As the Senate well knows, the three positions mentioned in the limitation—the two additional members of the National Labor Relations Board and the general counsel of the Board, who is a very important official under the new Taft-Hartley Act—were all provided for in that act. They will administer and put into effect many major changes in the National Labor Relations Act, which were included in the new labor-management law. That act, Mr. President, was vetoed by the President, who in his message denounced it in the strongest possible terms, but it was enacted into law over his veto by two-thirds of both Houses of Congress.

Nominations for the three positions were not sent to the Senate until Monday of this week, I believe it was, very late. We were able to hold hearings for about 5 hours on Wednesday afternoon, on those nominations, and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as I understand, has reported all three nominations to the Senate.

In the Appropriations Committee, I offered the limitation provided in the amendment, feeling that simply because of the sharp and complete difference of viewpoint between the Congress and the President respecting the legislation

which these three officials will administer and carry into effect, it was more important than ever that before these officials entered upon their duties their nominations should be passed upon by the Senate as required by the law. In other words, simply because of the difference between the Chief Executive and the Congress on this legislation, which difference was fundamental, it seemed to the committee that it would be wise to provide that none of these officials should serve unless they had actually been confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. President, should the Senate not act, or refuse to confirm any of these nominations, it will not seriously impair, in my opinion, carrying out the act. The amendments to the Wagner Act in any event do not become effective until August 23. The Board can function with three members, and should one of those members become incapacitated, the limitation would not apply to an appointment by the President to fill the vacancy. If the general consul should not be confirmed—I have no doubt he will b because I think his nomination was reported unanimously by the committee—but even if he were not confirmed the Board could appoint an acting counsel who could carry on the functions of the general counsel. It will be only 5 months until the Senate meets again and can act on any nominations which the President may make.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment. While it has happened before that upon the adjournment of Congress some sort of limitation has been included in an appropriation bill providing that no compensation shall be paid to any appointee who has not been confirmed by the Senate. it has been a rare occasion indeed when the Senate has included such a limitation in a bill.

This limitation does not prevent the President from appointing members of the Board and the general counsel in the event the Senate does not confirm the nominations of those who have been appointed. It merely provides that they cannot receive any pay. They would have to serve without pay for 5 months. I do not know what the President would do in regard to these appointments if the Senate should fail to confirm these three nominations. I have an idea that if the Senate were to reject any one of them outright the President would not give such a person a recess appointment. If the Senate fails to act upon it, the President may be justified in giving a recess appointment to his nominee whose nomination has been allowed to lapse.

Surely the Senate does not wish to put itself in the position of requiring that even for so short a period as 5 months anyone appointed by the President, if he should be required to fill a vacancy on the Board, would have to serve without pay. We do not want to create a situation in which no one but a rich man can be appointed on the Board, or as general counsel of the Board.

The fact that the committee has reported these nominations encourages me to hope that this amendment would be ineffective, because if the nominations were confirmed the amendment itself would be without effect.

Let us consider the history of this legislation. It was urged by the proponents of the legislation that it was all important to increase the membership of the National Labor Relations Board, and also that the general counsel should be independent of the Board itself. He is appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. In effect, he is the czar of the National Labor Relations Board, because he is not beholden to them for anything. The sponsors of this legislation evidently felt that it was important to have such a man as general counsel and that it was important to increase the membership from three to five. Haste was urged in the legislation because of exigencies which might arise or emergencies growing out of a labor controversy.

So if we are to assume that the sponsors of this legislation acted in good faith—which I do—in urging the increase in membership and setting up the general counsel, it seems very inconsistent to me, in an appropriation bill on the very eve of the adjournment of Congress, to provide that in the event we do not confirm any of these nominations the President may appoint only someone who has enough money to work for the Government for 5 months without being paid. That is an incongruous situation. It is an unfair situation. It is an utterly inconsistent provision for the Senate of the United States to take. Therefore I am opposed to the amendment, and I hope it will not be adopted. If it is adopted, I hope that the confirmation of these nominations will nullify the effect of the amendment. But there is no way to know, at this stage of the session, what will happen.

I think the President has been very fair in these nominations from a political standpoint. The general counsel is said to be a Republican of very considerable experience in dealing with labor matters. One of the appointees on the Board, Mr. Gray, of Buffalo, is also said to be a Republican of standing and experience. The other appointee served with us for 6 years as a Member of the United States Senate. We know him. Some of the Members of the Senate who served with him undoubtedly disagree with him about some things, but he is a fair-minded man. He is an experienced man. He is an able man and an outstanding lawyer. In my judgment, he will be a very creditable, acceptable, and useful member of the Board.

I hope that all these nominations will be confirmed so that there will be no hiatus between the operation of the law and any future event or exigency which may arise.

It seems to me a little unusual, in view of the insistence of the sponsors of the legislation upon an increase in the membership of the Board and the setting up of a wholly independent general counsel, that we are now confronted with the proposal that unless we confirm these appointments neither they—if they should be given recess appointments—nor anyone else could draw any compensation from now until next January, or such other time as the Senate might confirm any nominations to any of these positions.

Therefore I oppose the amendment. I hope it will not be included in the bill, because I think it would be a disservice to the country and to the Board, and would put the Senate in a very false light to include this rider or limitation in the appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 17, line 16.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I think it would be very unfortunate if the amendment proposed by the committee were adopted. The framers of the so-called Taft-Hartley Act clearly believed that the 5-member National Labor Relations Board was the right sized Board to function most efficiently. It is very important that the Board function efficiently during the first few months of its existence as a new Board. Therefore, if two members were not permitted for any reason to serve on the Board, or were financially unable to serve for nothing, it is perfectly obvious that it could not work at its best, which would be very unfortunate.

Furthermore, it would appear that the amendment is aimed at two men. I do not like legislating for one or two men. It sems likely that the nomination for general counsel will be approved before we adjourn tomorrow night. No substantial opposition to him has arisen from any quarter. But it also seems likely that there might be protracted debate upon two nominations for the National Labor Relations Board, which would necessitate putting the vote on their approval over until next January.

I believe we should have a full Board between now and January. I also believe the two men nominated for the Board would be confirmed if there were time to debate the matter and reach a vote on their confirmation at this session. It appears perfectly possible, however, that their confirmation may be delayed for 5 months. In the meantime, why should we not have a full Board at work so that the greatest value possible can be derived from the new Labor Relations Act? It seems to me very unwise to adopt any amendment to the bill which might prevent the act from being administered as efficiently as possible.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I should like to say that I do not think the committee feels too deeply about this amendment. I think that when it was put into the bill we were of the opinion that the interim appointments would be barred completely. Further study has convinced us that an interim appointee could actually serve. The only thing that would be stopped would be his drawing pay from the appropriation. I think there are probably a number of persons who would not hesitate to serve without pay.

I shall support the amendment on the fundamental consideration that because of the extremely sharp division on this measure between the President and the Congress the Senate should pass on these nominees before they actually serve.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 17, line 16.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment which was passed over.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 26, after line 19, to insert the following:

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Construction, operation, and maintenance, Bonneville power transmission system: For an additional amount "Construction, operation, and maintenance, Bonneville power transmission system," $1,184,700, and in addition to the contract authorization included in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1948, the Administrator is authorized to contract in the fiscal year 1948 for materials and equipment for power-transmission facilities in an amount not in excess of $790,000.

In addition to the contract authorization contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1948, and the additional contract authorization contained herein, the Administrator is authorized to contract in the fiscal year 1948 for materials and equipment for the Idaho Panhandle power transmission facilities in an amount not in excess of $489,000.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, this is an appropriation and a contract authorization for the construction of two transmission lines connected with the Bonneville Power Administration. They are feeder-lines off the main grid connecting two great dams. The Senate approved the projects in the Interior Department bill, but after a very long and arduous conference the House was adamant in refusing to include them in the bill and insisted that the whole agreement we had worked out would go overboard if the Senate insisted on these items which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] considered essential to the whole project. The Appropriations Committee agreed to provide in the bill for those two lines and the following one, which is in the same situation, but is located in the Panhandle of Idaho, in order to give the Senator from Oregon one more opportunity to see if he could persuade the House to go along.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my senior colleague [Mr. CORDON] is attending a committee meeting at the present moment. Hence, in his behalf I want to make a very brief statement urging Senate approval of the Bonneville item in the supplemental appropriation bill. Unless this appropriation providing for transmission facilities for the lines known as the Detroit-Eugene, Eugene-Reedsport, and Reedsport-Coos Bay transportation facilities, is granted, the people in this section of the State of Oregon will continue to be denied the electric power which they so sorely need for their industrial development, as well as for their home and farm needs.

I think it is very unfortunate that this amount was not left in the Bonneville appropriation, but that is now water over the dam, so to speak. The issue before us is whether or not Congress is going to be fair and just to the people in the so-called Portland to Eugene to Reedsport transmission-grid area, or is going to permit factors within the Congress over which they have no control, and personal antagonisms against some Bonneville officials entertained by some Members of Congress, to cause the potential electric-power consumers of this section of Oregon to be denied what I consider to be their just right insofar as having made available to them Bonneville power is concerned.

As my senior colleague would tell the Senate if he were on the floor, he and I have had a great many representations during the year from the people in this section of the State of Oregon, particularly in the Florence, Oreg., area. The record is perfectly clea. that these people have suffered unnecessary losses and inconveniences because of their inability to secure sufficient power from Bonneville, and that goes, of course, also for all the farmers and consumers who would be served by these transmission lines if the appropriation is granted.

I have worked very closely with the senior Senator from Oregon on this matter, as I do on all matters affecting the State of Oregon, and I want to assure the Members of the Senate that they can absolutely rely on the representation which the senior Senator from Oregon has made to all concerned in regard to justification of this particular appropriation request.

The senior Senator from Oregon, to my knowledge, has never made an appropriation request for the State of Oregon or any other State that cannot be absolutely justified by the facts.

I, too, wish to assure the Members of the Senate that here is an absolutely deserved and justifiable expenditure of Federal funds. It would be false economy not to grant it. I say that because if this section of the State of Oregon has made available to it Bonneville power, every dollar of cost of these transmission lines will be returned to the economy of the country and to the Treasury many times over, because of the new wealth which would be created by this power development and the new tax dollars which will flow from these wealth-creating projects.

Hence, Mr. President, I strongly urge that the Senate approve of the item in question.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I understood that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] was very much interested in this amendment. He is not at this time on the floor, and I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BALL. I suggest that we pass over the amendment temporarily and proceed with the next amendment. I think all the Senator from Oregon wanted to do was to make a statement with reference to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be temporarily passed over.

Mr. HILL. I have just received word from the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] to proceed and dispose of the amendment to which reference was made a moment ago.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate will revert to the amendment on page 26. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on that page.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the third and last committee amendment on which action remains to be taken.

The amendment was, on page 30, after line 2, to strike out:

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

General administration: For an additional amount for "General Administration," $201,000

Grant to States for public employment offices: For an additional amount for "Grants to States for public employment offices," $9,460,000.

REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATION

The appropriation "Traveling expenses, Department of Labor, 1948," is hereby reduced by $360,000 and such amount shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 30, beginning on line 3.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, there are three amendments there.

Mr. BARKLEY. There are three amendments which relate to the Department of Labor, but the third one is not necessarily intimately connected with the other two.

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the House appropriated $201,000 as an additional amount for general administration of the United States Employment Service. That was stricken out by the first amendment. It also provided $9,406,000 for grants to the States. There was quite a controversy a few weeks ago over the question of where the United States Employment Service should be, whether it should be retained in Washington or should be turned back to the States. It was turned back to the States by action of the Congress. That did not and does not mean that there is not a commanding obligation on the part of the Federal Government in its relationship with the States and with the program of employment, or the limitation or reduction of unemployment. I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota to explain why it is that the committee has eliminated all of that appropriation for administrative service and also for grants to the States.

Mr. BALL. I will ask the Senator to yield so that I can make an explanation of what is involved in the three items.

The first item for general administration is $201,000, which is an additional amount for administration of the Farm Placement Service. That service during the war was under the United States Employment Service, under the Wagner-Peyser Act. During the war, as the Senators will recall, by legislation on successive appropriation bills we placed on the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges the task of bringing in from foreign countries needed farm labor and, in addition, operating local farm-placement services in the various States. The legislative authority for that has been

on a calendar-year basis. It will expire on December 31, and the funds of the Extension Service will be expended. Several bills on this subject have been introduced in both Houses, but neither Committee on Agriculture has reported and neither the House nor the Senate has passed a measure to place this service permanently in the Extension Service or to place it permanently in the Department of Labor and the State employment services.

So the House allowed this amount of $201,000 for the Department of Labor's cost of supervising a farm-placement program in the State employment services for the period of 6 months from December 31 to June 30 of next year.

In the grants to States for public employment offices, $1,460,000 of the total of $9,460,000 is for grants to finance the farm-placement service at the State level. In addition to that, the deficiency appropriations subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee increased by $8,000,000 the amount for grants to States for running their regular employment service. The Senate committee struck out that $8,000,000, and struck out the item below, which is a rescission of $360,000 in the appropriation for travel for the Department of Labor, because the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill, which went through a long conference, was signed by the President only several weeks ago, and the Appropriations Committee did not like the idea of having the House attempt to change that bill almost before the ink on it was dry. So we wanted to strike out the $8,000,000 increase in grants to States for the regular employment service, as well as the rescission in the travel appropriation; and we wished to take the bill to conference and make the House committee justify the increase.

I think the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor and Federal Security feels that some increase in the grants to States for their regular activities is justified, and something will be done in conference.

The $1,460,000 item, however, and the $201,000 were stricken out by the Senate committee after hearing from the American Farm Bureau, which strongly opposes the return of this farm placement service to the United States Employment Service. I believe that the representatives of the American Farm Bureau testified that they would prefer to have no appropriation and no farm placement service rather than to have it in the United States Employment Service. The committee struck out the item here, and authorized the Senator from Minnesota to move to suspend the rule and to offer an amendment appropriating $1,360,000 to the Extension Service, to continue the farm placement service in the Extension Service for another 6 months.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As chairman of the Labor-Federal Security Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, let me say that we had this item up in connection with the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill. I believe the Senator from Kentucky will recall that we had a colloquy on the floor at that time regarding the matter. If the Senator will recall, during the previous fiscal year there was allotted for grants to States approximately $42,823,000. In the budget $71,728,000 had been recommended, which sum the House had allowed in the bill as passed by it, and it was in the bill as it came to the Senate.

The subcommittee and the full Appropriations Committee applied a 20-percent cut to those grants to States. Under the circumstances, inasmuch as the various States had come before the Congress and had asked that that work be turned back to them, and since they said that if it was turned back to them they could perform the service on a more economical basis than the Federal Government could, we did not think it was unreasonable to apply a 20-percent cut; and I have here a series of tables which show that in a good many of the States—I would say in an overwhelming number of them—in the period of time between the time when they previously had the service and the time when it was taken over by the Federal Government and subsequently was returned to them, there was a tremendous growth in the overhead expense, far greater than the growth in the burden they had to carry.

I wish to call to the attention of the able Senator from Kentucky the following language in the Wagner-Peyser Act, which relates to this situation, because there is certainly no question in the minds of the members of the Appropriations Committee, or in the minds of any of us who went into this question, that the amount which shall be allocated to the States is solely and strictly within the hands of the Congress of the United States, and that it would be a bad precedent if we were to let the States start making drafts upon the Federal Treasury merely for the amounts which they might feel they would like to have.

I call attention to section 5, which provides:

> For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and $4,000,000 for each fiscal year thereafter, up to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938.

Then:

> (3) And thereafter such sums annually as the Congress may deem necessary.

I call to the attention of the able Senator from Kentucky the fact that the Senate allowed, and it was finally accepted in the conference committee, the sum of $57,000,000, as compared with $4,000,000, which a few short years ago the Congress, in passing the act, thought would be reasonable Federal contribution.

I say to the Senator from Kentucky that I believe the proper legislative committee should go into this matter to determine what would be a proper proportion for the Federal Government to contribute to the States and for the States to match.

I believe that it is wrong in principle and is extravagant to have one agency of government, namely, the Federal Government, raise the funds and turn them over to the States, where another agency spends the money, without having worked out some equitable distribution plan or arrangement as to the bearing of the cost.

For that reason, plus the additional fact that the Labor-Federal Security bill has received final action by the Congress only within the last 2 weeks, I do not feel that this additional amount should be provided in a supplemental appropriation.

If the conference committee, in going into this matter, is convinced that some additional funds are needed, I, as chairman of the subcommittee, would have no objection to having a slight additional amount provided. But the purpose was to get this matter into conference and to let them demonstrate the need for whatever additional funds they might wish to have.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it might be well to inform the Members of the Senate of the events leading up to this apparent impasse in the matter of the farm-labor supply. During the war, as all of us know, the Department of Agriculture, through the Extension Service, conducted a very efficient farm-placement program, bringing farm labor in from outside the United States, and also recruiting farm labor from our cities and certain States where there was surplus labor. That was not, at the time it was created, intended to be a permanent program. The USES had authority to place farm workers up to that time, but during the war the work was done almost wholly through the Extension Service.

When the war was over, feeling that something should be done, on the 21st of last March, as I recall the date, Congress enacted legislation continuing the program for the Extension Service up until December 31, 1947. But there was inserted in the bill a proviso that the Employment Service might also place farm labor if it had the opportunity to do so. We did not, however, provide any funds to enable it to do so, so the program as it stands now is with the Extension Service until December 1 of this year.

In June of this year another bill came before the Senate and House Committees on Agriculture which would have made this a permanent program under the Extension Service. The bill was sponsored by the Farm Bureau Federation, I believe, although I am not sure who sponsored it. At any rate, the Farm Bureau Federation and other farm organizations testified before the Senate Committee on Agriculture. The Farm Bureau Federation indicated, as has been stated, that they were determined that this work should be carried on by the Extension Service. The other farm organizations were against fixing it in the Extension Service, but merely asked that it be placed with the Department of Agriculture. Both sides were so set that it appeared that whichever way the committee wrote the bill finally and brought it to the floor of the Senate there would be opposition. I might say, too, in this respect, that none of the farm organiza-

tions covered themselves with glory. None of them expressed any willingness to meet the others half way in an effort to draft a bill which would be fair to all.

A subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was appointed to see if a bill could be perfected, and, as I have said, we found both sides adamant, the Farm Bureau Federation on the one side, the other farm organizations on the other, neither willing to give an inch. Before the subcommittee could work out a bill the House Committee on Agriculture shelved the bill completely and said they were not going to take any action on it this year. That left the situation in this shape: The present program under the Extension Service will expire December 31 of this year. The employment services of the States have authority to place farm workers, but they have no money unless some is appropriated in the pending bill.

Apparently the Farm Bureau Federation has persuaded the Committee on Appropriations to strike out any appropriation for the purpose of placing farm labor with the Employment Service. The result may be that there will be no farm placement service whatsoever the coming year, due to the fact that the farm organizations have spent greater effort in fighting against each other than in trying to get together and work out a program on which they could agree.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that the program as administered by the Extension Service has been very well handled. It has given satisfaction generally to the farmers of the country. It is quite likely that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate might have brought out a bill which would have placed it with the Extension Service, although I am not sure as to that. The committee itself was divided. The fact remains, however, that unless some appropriation is made to the Employment Service, or something is done to relieve the situation, there will be no farm placement service at all this year.

There is no assurance that the House will accept the provision which is proposed to be offered to the bill making an appropriation in the neighborhood of a million and a half dollars for the Extension Service, rather than run the risk of having no placement service for the farmers whatsoever.

I should like to see some appropriation made for the Employment Service so that there may be assurance of some service to the farm people in the matter of getting help. Even though it may not be the very best, it will be much better than nothing at all, and it looks to me as if we will get nothing at all unless we make some appropriation for the Employment Service.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I have not the floor, but I yield so far as I can.

Mr. PEPPER. In connection with what the Senator from Vermont has said, there is already basic authority for the United States Employment Service.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. And the House has appropriated funds to enable the United States Employment Service to function in the general field of employment, including agriculture.

Mr. AIKEN. That is also correct.

Mr. PEPPER. There was enacted by the last Congress a limitation upon the emergency war program, to make it expire December 31 of this year.

Mr. AIKEN. That action was taken by this Congress.

Mr. PEPPER. I should have said that the enactment was by this Congress.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the limitation was the 31st of March.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield, and, if so, to whom? To the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Alabama to ask the Senator from Vermont a question.

Mr. HILL. On April 28, 1947, the 28th of the past April, about 90 days ago, Public Law 46, Eightieth Congress, which was House bill 2102, an act to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm-labor supply program, and for other purposes, became the law.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct about that.

Mr. HILL. The first section reads:

Be it enacted, etc., That the farm labor supply program conducted pursuant to the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public Law 229, 78th Cong., 2d sess., title I), as amended and supplemented, including the exemptions relating to the admission of farm laborers authorized by section 5 (g) of such act, may be continued up to and including December 31, 1947, and thereafter shall be liquidated within 30 days.

In other words, the present Congress, some 90 days ago, put an end to the temporary status of the Farm Employment Service, and let the Farm Employment Service go back where it was originally put by the basic act creating the employment services, farm service and city and other services. So we acted 90 days ago.

The act makes it very clear that if the law is permitted to stand as Congress intended it to stand some 90 days ago, the Extension Service will continue to play its part in the farm labor employment program, because the act provides, in subparagraph (b) of section 2:

The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Labor shall take such action as may be necessary to assure maximum cooperation between the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges—

That is, the Extension Service about which we are speaking—

and the State public employment agencies in the recruitment and placement of domestic farm labor and in the keeping of such records and information with respect thereto as may be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State unemployment compensation laws and of title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended (58 Stat. 295).

In other words, this whole question was settled by Congress about 90 days ago, and settled by substantive law, as it should have been settled, settled by legislation reported from the appropriate legislative committee.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the action of the House in providing the money is in furtherance and fulfillment of the basic legislative policy of the Congress.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct. The House shelved the bill which would have continued the placement program under the Extension Service exclusively. Therefore, I do not like to take the chance of having no service at all.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will yield, the House has definitely shelved that bill and said there shall be no bill. That is true, is it not; certainly so far as this Congress is concerned?

Mr. AIKEN. The House Committee on Agriculture voted to shelve the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think the situation is clear. Under the basic Wagner-Peyser Act, the service was placed in the United States Employment Service. While the war continued it was transferred by Executive order to the Department of Agriculture. It was, as the Senator from Vermont has said, on a year-to-year basis. I think the Senator from Minnesota agrees to that. We did, from year to year, by appropriation bill, provide for taking care of that service while it was in the Department of Agriculture. Under Public, No. 40, which was passed at this session of the Congress, as the Senator from Alabama has already indicated and as the Senator from Vermont has indicated, the service in the Department of Agriculture is terminated on December 31 next; so it will not be there. It automatically goes back, under the Organic Act, or under the Wagner-Peyser Act, to the United States Employment Service. The Senator from Minnesota has in prospect an amendment, upon which I understand he will seek suspension of the rules, which requires a two-thirds vote, to put this service in the Department of Agriculture permanently. On the 31st of December, if we do not appropriate any money for the service to be carried on in the United States Employment Service and the law terminates as to the Agricultural Department, as the Senator from Vermont says, there will be no service anywhere, and the function will terminate automatically by lapse of the law. The legislation which is involved, in part at least, in the amendment the Senator from Minnesota will offer, has been considered by the Agricultural Committees of both the House and the Senate. Both have up to now—and if we adjourn tomorrow, that means, of course, it will be for this session—declined to report to either House legislation transferring the service permanently to the Extension Service in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senate subcommittee, appointed to consider the matter, saw no use in continuing its efforts after the House had definitely said "We are not going to permit the bill, placing this with the Extension Service, to come to the floor." If the House Agricultural Committee would not approve it, we knew full well that the House as a whole would not do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. In view of what the House Committee on Agriculture has done, the House has included the appropriations which the Senate committee has stricken out. If the three amendments are adopted, and if they should be agreed to in conference, there would be no funds for the administration of this service, either in the Department of Agriculture or in the Labor Department, or in the United States Employment Service; that is correct, is it not?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that, Mr. President, I think all the amendments on this subject should be rejected, so that this service may continue to operate.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. In a moment. Reference has been made to the Farm Bureau Federation, for which I have the greatest respect, and of which I am an active member, qualified, and all that, as a farmer. I have had a communication from my very dear friend, for whom I have affection and regard, Mr. Edward O'Neal, in regard to this matter; but the farmers are not unanimous in regard to it. I have a very strong communication from those who are assisting to administer the law and to carry out the program of the Congress in my own State, asking that it be left in the United States Employment Service rather than be thrown into controversy as to whether it should be permanently transferred to the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The farm organizations, other than the Farm Bureau Federation, asked that it be placed with the Department of Agriculture, but they were insistent that the Department of Agriculture be not bound to operate through the Extension Service. It was unfortunate that there was a division among the farm groups. The responsibility, if there is no service at all, will largely fall upon them.

I think the program has been splendidly administered by the Extension Service; I presume better than it would be through the USES, which has not had the farm experience the Extension Service has had. I, too, have admiration for the Farm Bureau. I was a Farm Bureau member for a long, long time before Ed O'Neal was, and I have been ever since; but I think the organizations have not performed the service for their members that they should have, as a result of being so adamant.

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot claim to have been a member that long, because I am not that old.

Mr. AIKEN. I was not old enough to join, when I joined.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOEY. I wish to associate myself with the Senator from Kentucky in the position which he takes about the amendments. I think the vice of the matter is that if the amendments are adopted, and if then the amendment is adopted which is later to be offered, to provide an appropriation for the Department of Agriculture, we would be permitting the Appropriations Committee to legislate, and we would be grafting legislation on the appropriation bill. It is legislation which the Agricultural Committees of both the House and Senate have declined to pass. I think it would be an unfortunate situation to have the Appropriations Committee inaugurate legislation to supplant the existing law, and the determination of this matter by the Agricultural Committees of the House and Senate. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has very properly said that the Senate Agriculture Committee considered three bills, one of them to deal with this matter as it now is; another to leave it in the Department of Agriculture, which would set up a different organization; and the third, to put it in the USES. It seems to me the matter ought to be determined in a regular and orderly way by the committee whose authority and jurisdiction it is to determine it. That would mean the Agriculture Committee. We already have a law, as the Senator from Alabama pointed out, that will take care of this situation, if the appropriation is permitted to remain; but if the amendment is adopted, which is to be offered in lieu of the amendments stricken out, striking out the amount that goes to the Employment Service, then, of course, it would be transferred to the agricultural fund. The agricultural fund operates on a calendar-year basis. This would extend it to June 30 of next year, on the fiscal basis. Therefore, in the middle of the year, we would have a program probably terminating or changing from one agency to another. It seems to me it is not a good idea and it is not good policy to have the Appropriations Committee inaugurate legislation which the two Agricultural Committees of the House and Senate have declined to pass. On the other hand, they passed legislation authorizing the extension of the present service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from North Carolina. His objection to the elimination of the appropriation is extremely valid, as is his objection to the effort on the floor of the Senate, in the closing days of this Congress, on an appropriation bill, to determine a matter that has been before the Agricultural Committees of both the House and Senate in this session, which they have not determined as yet.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I wonder if I could suggest a way in which this matter could be settled in a hurry.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is one of the objections we were making.

Mr. BALL. I may say that I share the views of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that.

Mr. BALL. My personal view is that this service should be in the United States Employment Service; that there should be one employment service instead of two.

Mr. BARKLEY. I realize that the Senator shares my view. I appreciate it. That confirms me in my belief that I am correct.

Mr. BALL. I suggest that we would settle the issue very rapidly if I should ask unanimous consent that we temporarily pass over the pending committee amendments so that I may then move to suspend the rule pursuant to notice given, to offer the amendment which is on Senators' desks, which would provide an appropriation for the Extension Service. Obviously if we cannot secure two-thirds to suspend the rule to do that, then the committee amendment should be rejected.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no objection to laying the amendments aside temporarily so as to take up the Senator's amendment, upon which there must be a two-thirds affirmative vote in order that it may be considered.

I may suggest to the Senator that if he fails to secure the two-thirds, then the appropriation may be restored.

Mr. BALL. I think it should then be restored, though not the whole amount of $9,460,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the circumstances I do not object to the suggestion that the amendments be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the pending amendments be temporarily laid aside so that he may propose a motion. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to make a very brief statement regarding the whole problem, because it is very apparently a controversial issue in my State. I have been deluged by representatives on both sides of the issue, by farm leaders in my State, and I do not want to appear to the farm leaders in my State as unwilling to take a position in regard to the matter. In fact, I think it would surprise them if I do not take a position on the matter. Hence, I sought, Mr. President, to try to find out what the facts are in regard to the matter, because I at least wanted to put into the RECORD a statement of facts as I was able to find them. So I asked the USES to give me some material on the basis of which I could prepare a memorandum. It will take me but a brief time to present the memorandum. I think it ought to be in the RECORD from the standpoint of having in the RECORD at least a statement of historical brief on this problem.

Mr. President, I am opposed to amending H. R. 4269 to continue the farm-labor-supply program in the Department of Agriculture through June 30, 1948. This proposal constitutes substantive legislation and is contrary to the general practice of this body that substantive legislation should not be included in appropriation measures.

Moreover, Mr. President, the proposal flies in the face of previous actions only recently taken by both the House and the Senate, as referred to a few minutes ago by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. After extensive hearings before the appropriate House and Senate committees, Public Law 40 was approved on April 28 of this year. That law provides that the emergency farm-labor-supply program hitherto administered by the Department of Agriculture shall

be liquidated on December 31, 1947. It also provides that during the interim, the United States Employment Service and the affiliated State services shall not be limited in carrying on farm-labor recruitment and placement activities originally provided for by the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933. The proposal to amend the bill now before us would continue the farm-labor-supply program in the Department of Agriculture until June 30, 1948, and contradicts the recently expressed will of the Congress.

Within the past few weeks both the Senate and House Committees on Agriculture held hearings on identical bills which proposed to transfer farm placement responsibility permanently to the Department of Agriculture. It was the view of that House committee that there is no justification for maintaining duplicate employment office facilities and that the responsibility for farm placement activity properly belongs with the public employment service.

I think that is especially true, Mr. President, in view of the fact that this service now falls within the jurisdiction of the States. If we do not have confidence in keeping with the general principle which would cause us to transfer this service to the States, if we do not have confidence in our State officials, Mr. President, who are certainly very close to the farm leaders and the farmers of their respective States, then I do not know in whom we can place confidence.

Neither the Senate nor House committee has seen fit to report the bill favorably.

BRIEF HISTORY AND STATUS OF THE FARM PLACEMENT SERVICE OF THE PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT SERVICE SYSTEM

Public Law 40, passed by the Eightieth Congress, approved April 28, 1947, provides for the liquidation of the emergency-farm-labor program in the Department of Agriculture and resumption of the Farm Placement Service by the United States Employment Service on January 1, 1948. This law was passed after extended hearings by the Committee on Agriculture as to the timing of the transfer back to the USES.

The proposed legislation in H. R. 3367 raises a new issue: Whether the public employment service system is to be dismembered by permanent transfer out of the USES of the Farm Placement Service. This issue was decided in 1933 when legislation was passed to provide services to all segments of the labor market in one over-all system, which is the USES and its affiliated State employment services. I emphasize the State employment service. In my judgment at least they are now the primary administrative force dealing with these employment problems. The decision that there should be one system (rather than a number of services) has remained the will of Congress.

The farm placement function was temporarily delegated by the War Manpower Commission during the war to the Department of Agriculture because the war emergency required in connection with farm placement extraordinary activities beyond those of peacetime service—for instance, transportation and housing activities.

The proposed legislation in H. R. 4269 would repeal Public Law 40, and would be the first step in the dismemberment of the public employment service system. In order for the Farm Placement Service to remain a specialized service of the over-all system no legislation in addition to Public Law 40 is needed.

FARM PLACEMENT SERVICE AFTER WORLD WAR I

Following World War I, there was maintained by the United States Department of Labor through the intervening years prior to the enactment of the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933, in varying degrees throughout the country a semblance of a Farm Placement Service to employers and workers in the harvesting of wheat, particularly in the State of Kansas. Later this very limited service was extended to the cotton-growing areas of States immediately to the west of the Mississippi River. During that period the personnel of this farm placement assistance and the activity were maintained on a bare minimum, in fact a skeletonized basis.

THE WAGNER-PEYSER ACT

With the passage of the Wagner-Peyser Act of June 6, 1933, specific provisions were established "to maintain a Farm Placement Service." As the USES, working with the States, encouraged and developed a Nation-wide system of free public employment offices, there began, on a very modest scale, the development of a Farm Placement Service. By the year 1935 a small but identifiable service had been established.

This nucleus began an effective program by the spring of 1936. Its effectiveness was the result of learning that the Farm Placement Service is a specialized function of the employment offices, which requires a knowledge of all acreages planted to crops in every county in every State, along with a knowledge of the average yield, and accurate estimates of the labor requirement for each activity related to crop production and harvesting. As time went on, the farm placement program within the USES and the State employment services accumulated know-how of anticipated labor supply and demand information in agricultural areas, the type, kind, and number of workers who voluntarily move from area to area, and the most effective means for recruiting workers in labor surplus areas for use in areas needing more workers.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE FARM PLACEMENT SERVICE

The placement figures indicate the development of the Farm Placement Service within the USES. In 1935 the Farm Placement Service made approximately 200,000 farm-labor placements, or so the people in the USES assure me. By 1937 such placements had increased to half a million; by 1940, to a million and a half, and in 1942 to 3,300,000. It must be kept in mind that during the period 1935 to 1940 in many areas there was widespread unemployment. It was as big a job to intelligently direct and advise workers following the crop harvests on the probable demand for workers as it was to recruit workers. This was necessary in order to prevent, to the extent possible, movement of workers into an area in such numbers that employment was not available to them and which oftentimes resulted in a heavy relief burden on the community because the workers became stranded.

TRANSFER OF THE FARM PLACEMENT SERVICE

In 1943, when the USES was the operating arm of the War Manpower Commission, WMC Directive 17 transferred the farm-placement function of the USES to the War Food Administrator, as a war-emergency measure in order for farm-labor recruitment for the duration of the emergency to be augmented by a transportation- and camp-facilities program. Following its transfer to the War Food Administrator in the Department of Agriculture, the emergency farm-labor program was transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture and the program was divided into two parts: (1) domestic labor and (2) foreign labor and camp program. The domestic-labor function was assigned to the Federal Extension Service and to the State extension services of the land grant colleges. The foreign labor and camp portion became the labor branch of the Production and Marketing Administration.

Facts repudiate criticisms at this time leveled at the farm-placement program within the USES. Even after the farm-placement function had been transferred to the Department of Agriculture, during the year 1943 the Department of Agriculture and its State affiliates requested the USES to continue to carry this funtion under reimbursable agreements in 28 States. In addition, in many of the States where no agreements were made, the local employment offices continued to serve agricultural employers and workers.

RETURN OF FARM-PLACEMENT SERVICE TO THE USES

In the fall of 1945 at the annual meeting of the Executive Committee of Land Grant Colleges, this group discussed with the Secretary of Agriculture the status of this emergency responsibility which had been delegated to them during the war. At that time they stated that they desired to be relieved of this responsibility, because they felt it interfered with their basic function of extension education in agriculture. As a result of this feeling expressed by land-grant college representatives, a small committee was appointed for the purpose of reviewing this assignment and to determine what recommendation should be made to the Secretary relative thereto. This committee gave a report to the Secretary of Agriculture in the spring of 1946 from which the Secretary's office developed a draft memorandum addressed to the President of the United States requesting that the Farm-Placement Service be returned to the USES. This proposed letter was discussed with the Director of the USES in the latter part of June 1946. As resumption of the Farm-Placement Service by the USES required advance planning the two agencies agreed that it would probably be wise to allow the emergency farm-labor program to continue in the Department of Agriculture during the remainder of 1946, and in

the interim period to work out an orderly transfer between the agencies to assure no break in the service to farmer-employers and to workers.

The two agencies after agreeing upon this approach immediately began a series of conferences to effectuate the decision reached.

Shortly after the Eightieth Congress convened, while the Employment Service was preparing a budget estimate to cover its resumption of the Farm Placement Service, H. R. 2102, February 19, 1947, was introduced. After full hearings by the Congress, this bill became Public Law 40, April 28, 1947. By this law the Congress decided that the emergency farm labor program in the Department of Agriculture should be liquidated by the end of the calendar year 1947. Section 2a of this law recognizes the responsibility of the USES. In view of the language of Public Law 40, the USES and its affiliated State employment services are proceeding with plans for resuming this basic responsibility in the system of the public employment offices, which has been one of the major functions of the Employment Service since enactment of the Wagner-Peyser Act in 1933.

In the light of the desire of Congress to eliminate peacetime overlapping and duplication of functions of agencies, Public Law 40 assures that the present duplication of Employment Service facilities will be eliminated. The Farm Placement Service as a part of the over-all Employment Service program of the USES and its affiliated State employment services provides to agricultural employers and workers alike a continuing placement service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a memorandum headed "Facts regarding Farm Placement Service."

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACTS REGARDING FARM PLACEMENT SERVICE

1. EMERGENCY LOCATION OF PROGRAM

The farm labor program was assigned to the Department of Agriculture as an emergency measure during the war, the basic legislation having remained unchanged in the Wagner-Peyser act. (United States Employment Service and affiliated State employment services.)

2. RECENT ACTIVITY CONCERNING EMERGENCY FARM LABOR PROGRAM

This program has been extended by appropriation on three separate occasions, the most recent of which was Public Law 40 which was passed in April and provided for final liquidation of the program December 31, 1947, and return of the function of farm placement to the United States Employment Service.

3. CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

The House and Senate Committees have just recently considered legislation (hearings on S. 1334 and H. R. 3367) which proposed to set up the farm placement program permanently in the Department of Agriculture and has rejected this legislation, leaving the basic authority of the Wagner-Peyser Act which requires that the United States Employment Service and affiliated State Employment Services maintain the farm placement service.

4. BUDGETARY ACTION

The House Appropriations Committee reviewed and approved the supplemental budget request which provides $1,460,000 for grants to States and $201,000 for the administrative expenses of the USES in resuming on January 1, 1948, the responsibility for the farm placement service.

5. THE INSERTION OF SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE IN PLACE OF APPROPRIATION REQUEST IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL BILL H. R. 4269

The deletion of this money from the present appropriation measure being considered by the Senate and the substitution of language to continue the farm placement program in the Department of Agriculture, (1) proposes substantive language in an appropriation measure, and (2) such action in this instance is in direct contradiction to the will of Congress as expressed in Public Law 40, of this Congress.

Such language would again provide a 6 months' extension of the emergency farm labor program which would again extend the problem of transferring the program back where it belongs into the middle of another crop year. A transfer of the function at that time would be disruptive—it would not be disruptive to transfer the program on January 1.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have made this statement of a historical review of the development of the Farm Placement Service because I think the farmers of my State and the farm leaders of my State, who do not seem to be in agreement with regard to the issue now before the Senate, at least ought to have available to them what I believe to be the historical facts regarding the development of this service.

With that statement in the RECORD, I have no objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, unanimous consent is granted, and the Senator from Minnesota may present his further suggestion.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, pursuant to notice given under rule XL, I now move to suspend the rule so that I may offer an amendment to the pending bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed to be offered by the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 21, after line 6, it is proposed to insert the following:

FARM-LABOR-SUPPLY PROGRAM

Supply and distribution of farm labor: That part of the authority and funds with respect to providing an adequate supply of workers for the production, harvesting, and preparation for markets of agricultural commodities by the recruitment and placement of domestic agricultural workers as provided by the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act of 1944, as amended and supplemented, are hereby continued through June 30, 1948, and in addition to the amount hereby continued available, there is hereby appropriated the sum of $1,350,000 for such purposes, to be merged with the funds hereby continued available: *Provided*, That not less than $1,250,000 of such additional funds shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner and for the purposes specified in section 2 of said act: *Provided further*, That (except as provided in Public Law 40, 80th Cong.) no part of the funds appropriated or heretofore appropriated shall be available for the payment of transportation, housing, or subsistence of agricultural workers.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is not necessary that a point of order be made against the amendment before the motion to suspend the rule can be made?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Except as a point of order is made, the question about the suspension of the rule does not arise.

Mr. BARKLEY. I make the point of order against the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is sustained.

The question now is, Shall the rule be suspended for the purpose of considering the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL]?

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Morse
Baldwin	Hawkes	Murray
Ball	Hayden	Myers
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Brewster	Hill	O'Daniel
Bricker	Hoey	Overton
Bridges	Holland	Pepper
Brooks	Ives	Reed
Buck	Jenner	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kem	Saltonstall
Cain	Kilgore	Smith
Capehart	Knowland	Sparkman
Capper	Langer	Stewart
Chavez	Lodge	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Cooper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Tydings
Eastland	McGrath	Umstead
Ecton	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	McMahon	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wherry
Flanders	Malone	White
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
George	Maybank	Williams
Green	Millikin	Wilson
Gurney	Moore	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Minnesota to suspend the rule.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to propound a question to the Senator from Minnesota. We have a farm labor problem in my State, particularly in connection with the harvesting of soft and hard fruits. According to the information I receive from the State of Washington, there will be needed this fall a certain amount of Mexican labor which has always been imported to handle the fruit crop, because, as the Senator knows, it has to be done quickly. How would the amendment affect that situation?

Mr. BALL. It would not affect it this fall at all. As the law now applies, the Farm Placement Service which is now under the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture, will, on January 17, revert to the United States Employ-

ment Service in the Department of Labor, in the various States. I have moved to suspend the rule, on behalf of the committee, so that I can offer an amendment which is subject to a point of order, which will continue it for another 6 months in the Extension Service. Then we shall go back to the language of the House bill. The House put in an appropriation so that the service would be transferred on January 1, and there is an item of $201,000 for the United States Employment Service.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Insofar as this fall is concerned, the situation remains the same as it is. Is that correct?

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I should like to have an expression from the Senator from Minnesota as to the future of the farm camps. They have been very helpful in Virginia and, I understand, elsewhere. I have been informed that the amendment affects that situation, because, in any event, at the end of the calendar year such camps will be discontinued and the camp properties disposed of. Is that correct?

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

The other day we passed a bill providing for the disposal of those camps, which were set up primarily to take care of labor imported from Mexico and Jamaica. That program terminates on January 1; and the amendment for which I am seeking suspension of the rule, on behalf of the committee, merely continues and makes available funds so that the Extension Service can operate the local employment offices in the various States to recruit labor within the States primarily for the farms.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I should like to ask another question. The Farm Bureau Federation takes the position that the Extension Service and the county agents, who operate under the Extension Service, do a better job for the farmers than is done by the Employment Service of the Federal Government and the employment services of the States. I have been told that the House is so much opposed to continuing funds for the operation of the service by the Federal Government under this program that if we now vote for the Senator's proposed amendment to continue the operation under the Extension Service we shall have the principle without any funds with which to operate it. I should like to have an expression as to that point.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, if the rule is suspended and if the amendment is adopted, then the whole question will be in conference, because the House appropriated the funds to the Department of Labor, and if the Senate adopts this amendment it will appropriate the funds to the Department of Agriculture's Extension Service. The conferees would agree on putting the funds in either one place or the other, I should think. So there is no danger of being without any appropriation for this purpose.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Is there any danger that if we take action today on the Senator's amendment, the result will be a failure to appropriate any funds at all for the operation of this Service after the end of this year?

Mr. BALL. No; there is no danger of that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wonder whether there was any testimony before the committee or whether the Senator has any information regarding the treaties with Mexico and with other countries, and whether all those treaties have been culminated and whether the quotas have been exhausted.

Mr. BALL. They were not treaties. They were agreements for the importation of farm labor, and the agreements terminate on January 1.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But so far as the Senator from Minnesota knows, for this fall the treaties or conventions have been made; have they?

Mr. BALL. The agreements have been made; yes.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question, if he will yield to me.

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I hold in my hand a telegraphic message which I received in Washington on July 23 from Mr. Michael J. Carroll, who, as I recall, is director of the State Employment Service. He signs the message as "Director."

His message reads as follows—and I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota if he has any comment on the point made in the message by Mr. Carroll:

JEFFERSON CITY, MO., *July 23, 1947.*

Hon. FORREST C. DONNELL,
Senator, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Received word that Senate subcommittee has stricken from omnibus appropriation bill appropriation for local farm placement and has also set up inhibition against return of farm placement to States until June 1948, contrary to Public Law 40. We have entered into agreement to carry on limited farm placement activity under arrangement between labor and agriculture as directed by Public Law 40. Complete farm placement can be accomplished by this State on early return of the activity with reasonable funds. The Missouri State Employment Service is best equipped to perform this activity. Continued restriction and overlapping authority on farm placement retards placement of veterans and other labor with farm employers, resulting in inadequate exposure of readjustment and unemployment compensation claimants to job opportunities.

MICHAEL J. CARROLL,
Director.

I should like very much to have the Senator give us his views with respect to the point thus presented by Mr. Carroll.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the amendment which I shall offer on behalf of the committee, if the rule is suspended, is the one to which the correspondent of the Senator is objecting in that communication. The committee felt that this service should remain in the Department of Agriculture until June 30, 1948, so as to give the legislative committees one more chance to determine the issue finally.

It is the opinion of the Senator from Minnesota as an individual Senator, not speaking for the committee, that the basic argument made by the Senator's correspondent is correct, and that we should have only one employment service in the State, namely, one coordinated with the Unemployment Compensation Division.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to ask a further brief question, with the Senator's permission. I have received a telephone message from another gentleman in whom I have much confidence because of his great familiarity with employment service and unemployment compensation matters. He takes the following position, in the course of his message, which I shall not read in extenso—in one sentence:

Referral of agricultural labor should be made by the same agency making referrals to commercial and industrial employment and coordinated with unemployment compensation.

I gather from the Senator's comments that he regards as correct the position thus taken by the gentleman who has telephoned my office. Do I correctly understand the Senator?

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to repeat the statement I previously made, although perhaps I should make a brief statement at this point, in view of the fact that some Members of the Senate have entered the Chamber since we discussed this matter a while ago.

The House Appropriations Committee approved the appropriation for this service as it is now. The motion to suspend the rule, filed by the Senator from Minnesota, is for the purpose of making in order the offering of an amendment to change that situation, so that this matter would go into conference with greater controversy as between the two Houses with regard to this service for this fiscal year. It really does not affect anything except the last half of the fiscal year. As was stated a while ago, it really affects only the last half of the fiscal year beginning the first of January, because it is not to be disturbed for the other 6 months of this year.

The House appropriated $210,000 for administrative purposes and approximately $9,600,000 for grants to States. It has been stricken out by the committee, but at least a portion of it will be restored if the amendment which it is the purpose of the Senator from Minnesota to offer is not agreed to and if the motion to suspend the rule is not agreed to.

It seems to me that under the conditions which now exist, the wisest thing to do is to defeat the motion to suspend the rule, and to accept the House appropriation for this fiscal year.

Both Agricultural Committees of the House and Senate have turned down what is now attempted to be done.

Mr. President, this is legislation on an appropriation bill. If the motion is defeated and if the amendment is not permitted to be offered and if the House provision is retained, that will simplify the

matter insofar as the conferees are concerned, whereas to adopt the motion to suspend the rule and to adopt the amendment would, I am afraid, create such controversy and confusion between the two Houses that we might run a great risk of injuring the Service, no matter where it may be put for this fiscal year.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, does the Senator from Kentucky believe that we shall run more risk of losing the fund for this year if we adopt the motion to suspend the rule and thereafter adopt the amendment which the Senator from Minnesota intends to offer if the rule is suspended?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do. I do not say that we would lose it, but I would say we would run a greater risk of losing it than we would with the bill as sent to us by the House of Representatives.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Does the Senator from Kentucky understand that the House committee is trying to work out a plan?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Agriculture Committees of both Houses have had this problem before them all this session. They have declined to do anything. It is a matter of legislation. They will have the remainder of this session and this fiscal year in which to work out a program that will be permanent law.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I believe many farmers in Virginia and elsewhere would like to see the work done by the Extension Service, but I understand that the House would not agree to that.

Mr. BARKLEY. They have not done so, and they have declined to report a bill of that sort. Therefore, that multiplies the difficulties between the House and the Senate in connection with an appropriation bill at this stage of the session.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota is legislation on an appropriation bill, is it not?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is.

Mr. OVERTON. And it is legislation, is it not, which should be handled by the Agriculture Committees as such?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true. They have had it before them, and have not acted on it. They have declined to take any action up to now.

Mr. OVERTON. As the junior Senator from Virginia states, the people in Louisiana prefer to have the Agricultural Department handle the matter, but under the circumstances I think the Senator from Kentucky is correct.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Has the Senator been advised, as I have been, that the committee on the House side not only has not acted affirmatively in reporting a bill, but by affirmative vote in the committee has tabled the bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the true situation. I did not care to make the statement quite that strong, but that has happened. They have considered the matter, and not only declined to act affirmatively, but up to now they have killed the legislation by tabling it. So the amendment seeks to do on an appropriation bill what at least the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has declined to do, and what the House committee has refused to do by tabling the legislative proposal involved in the amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Does the Senator feel, as does the Senator from Oregon, that were the question purely an undecided question, as I understand it was, now, so far as the House Legislative Committee considering the legislation is concerned, that committee has affirmatively refused to recommend the legislation, and in effect acted adversely upon it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CORDON. That has changed my position.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to ask the Senator a question. It is correct, is it not, that in the States the theory of the coordination of the unemployment compensation and the employment services, at least in part, is that when a man applies for unemployment compensation he should be first given the opportunity, and, in the second place, required to use reasonable efforts to avail himself of the opportunity to secure employment before he can secure unemployment compensation. That is the theory of the coordination of the two functions?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. If a man should go to an unemployment-compensation office and should say that he was a farmer and would like to work on a farm, would it not be advisable that the same agency which handles the employment referrals of men who come in and say they would like to work in factories, should be the same agency which handles referrals to farms?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think so, and that is evidently a strong reason why the House committee has turned down the legislation, and why the Senate committee has not acted upon it. It certainly is an inconvenience for a man to go to an employment office seeking a job on a farm, and be told that there is another agency that handles his case. It certainly seems to be in the interest of efficiency and coordination for such a man to find out what he can get and what his rights are at the place which he visits for that purpose, and which is advertised and held out by our Government and by the State governments as the place for him to go.

Mr. DONNELL. I take it, therefore, that the Senator would agree that ultimately, at any rate, there should be invested in the employment service, as definitely as in some other branch or agency, the referral of men for agricultural employment, as well as industrial employment?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am very much inclined to that belief.

Mr. DONNELL. If I do not unduly trespass on the Senator's time, may I ask him with respect to the same sentence which I presented to the Senator from Minnesota, and ask whether he would agree with this view:

> Referral of agricultural labor should be made by the same agency making referrals to commercial and industrial employment and coordinated with unemployment compensation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that is a sound suggestion, and, unless I were convinced pretty strongly to the contrary, I would adhere to it.

Mr. DONNELL. The gentleman who called my office on the telephone made this point. He said:

> If the Agricultural Placement Service is operated in conjunction with State employment offices a saving of at least one-half of the cost of that Service will result. Duplication of facilities and personnel result from the separate operation of the Agricultural Placement Service.

I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky if he agrees, generally speaking, with the observation made by this correspondent.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think obviously that would be the result. There would be greater economy and efficiency, but beyond all that, I think it is a problem which we should leave to the legislative committees until they have been able to determine what permanently shall be done with this agency, without trying to do it on an appropriation bill, which at best would be only temporary.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, this entire question was before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and was given a great deal of study and thought by the committee. We agreed, as a committee, that we would extend the service to December 31, 1947, and it was so recommended to the Senate. I think the entire question will need further study later.

There is a concern in the minds of the farm people that in the event this service is taken from the Extension Service and placed in the USES, it will be in an office too far removed from the producing group, and the Extension Service, having representatives in every county, has given the service closer cooperation in connection with the employment question. So far as the question we are considering today is concerned, it will be administered up to December 31 of this year, and then I think the entire question needs to be reexamined and it should be determined what shall be done about the problem.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, in committee I was in favor of the legislation, and so voted, in the belief, based on the information I had at that time, that the question was still being considered and was undetermined in the Agricultural Committees of the two Houses. That being the case, it appeared to be altogether reasonable that we adopt the legislation, and maintain the farm employment recruitment in the Extension Service, where it has been highly satisfactorily handled, so far as recruitment of labor for agriculture is concerned, until such time as the committees might determine the legislative question.

However, since that vote was taken I have been advised that the House Committee on Agriculture has acted in the premises, and has acted adversely to the

continuation of the Employment Service in the Extension Service. I hope that we may have in USES, if farm-labor recruitment is to be placed there, more affirmative action than that agency has heretofore evidenced in the handling of the employment problem. Referral of labor is not sufficient. While this activity was in the hands of the Extension Service, there was a campaign of active recruitment of farm labor, not simply referral of the unemployed, but an affirmative seeking of farm labor and a placement of such labor where it was needed. I can see no reason why the same type of affirmative action cannot be had under the State agency which takes care of other unemployment cases. I realize that an affirmative program must be worked out if the needs of agriculture for its seasonal labor are to be fully met.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, it would seem to me that if the principles to which both the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Minnesota have agreed in the last few minutes—and possibly earlier this morning; I do not know—are sound, as they agreed they are sound, namely, that the referrals of agricultural labor should be made by the same agency making the referrals to commercial and industrial employment, coordinated with unemployment compensation, if the agricultural placement service acted in conjunction with State employment offices, a very substantial saving would result, whereas duplication of facilities and personnel results from the separate operation of the agricultural placement service.

I say, Mr. President, it seems to me that if those are sound principles, and both Senators have so agreed, the logical procedure for the Senate in my judgment would be to reject the motion made by the Senator from Minnesota to suspend the rule; and, in the second place, at the appropriate time, to reinstate in the bill the portion stricken out on page 30, which relates to the financing of the United States Employment Service. So, Mr. President, I submit, first, that the action to be taken should be to reject the motion to suspend the rule, and, in the second place, to take the further step of reinstating into the bill an adequate provision of a financial nature, for the United States Employment Service.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HILL. I agree wholeheartedly with the Senator in what he says about cooperation. I should like to call his attention to the provision in the act of April 28, 1947, which was passed less than 90 days ago, providing for the Farm Employment Service to be returned to where it originally was, together with the State employment services. That act, subsection (b) of section 2, reads as follows:

> (b) The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Labor shall take such action as may be necessary to assure maximum cooperation between the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges and the State public employment agencies in the recruitment and placement of domestic farm labor and in the keeping of such records and information with respect thereto as may be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State unemployment compensation laws and of title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended (58 Stat. 295).

In other words, the Congress, by the act of April 28, 1947, sought to write in strong language the very thought expressed by the distinguished Senator from Missouri, that there shall be cooperation, and that maximum use shall be made of the Agricultural Extension Services of the land-grant colleges.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator from Alabama for calling attention to the provision. It seems to me it is perfectly clear that if a man goes to the Unemployment Compensation office desiring unemployment compensation, since the question as to whether he is entitled to it is dependent at least in large part on whether or not he can get a job, he should be offered the opportunity at the most effective place to get that job, whatever job he may want. Therefore, it seems to me that the logical place for the administration of this function of offering agricultural employment is the agency which handles commercial and industrial employment.

Attention is called to the experience shown by a statement made by a gentleman who called my office in regard to the matter. I quote substantially from his statement:

> Now the agricultural placement service being operated by the Department of Agriculture benefit claimants are not being referred to agricultural work. First, because agricultural job orders are not placed with the State public employment service but with the county agent of the Agricultural Extension Service and, second, because no funds are available for the States to operate agricultural placement services.

Continuing, he says:

> There are approximately one million workers who move between agricultural work and industrial employment and such claimants should be exposed to agricultural work in testing their eligibility for employment benefits.

He concludes this portion of his message with this significant sentence:

> Innumerable unemployment claims are now being paid unnecessarily because this cannot be done.

I think, Mr. President, if I can for the moment get away from the more or less abstract language of the message to a specific illustration, that if I am out of a job and go to the unemployment compensation office in my State, and ask for unemployment compensation, and if I am told, "We do not find anything in a factory or a commercial institution for you," and they stop there; then I am entitled to unemployment compensation. But if they further state to me, "We will now see if we can obtain a job for you working on a farm," obviously to the extent that they are able to secure farm employment for me, my claim against the unemployment compensation fund will be reduced. So it seems to me perfectly logical, as my informant says, that "Innumerable unemployment claims are now being paid unnecessarily because this cannot be done," because there is no exposure, as he calls it, to agricultural work "in testing their eligibility for unemployment benefits." So, Mr. President, again I insist that appropriate action to be taken by the Senate at this time is to refuse to suspend the rule, and, thereafter, to reinstate in this bill the provision, or at least an adequate provision, for the United States Employment Service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota to suspend the rule for the indicated purpose.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, in view of the vote, I suggest that the Senate reject the first amendment on page 30, namely, the item of $201,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I move to modify the second committee amendment, by reinstating the language, but changing the amount to $1,460,000. That is the amount for the Farm Placement Service. The other $8,000,000 was an increase of grants to States, which the chairman of the committee that handled the regular bill has requested us to make them justify in conference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I want to be sure that I correctly understand the action just now taken. Did the Senator say that $1,460,000 will provide in his judgment for the placement of farm labor?

Mr. BALL. It is the amount earmarked in both the House and Senate committee reports for the Farm Placement Service.

Mr. DONNELL. And may I inquire, what is the $8,000,000, which in addition to the $1,460,000, makes up the item of $9,460,000 in the House bill?

Mr. BALL. That is the over-all increase in the grants to States for operating their employment services, which is an increase over an amount agreed upon in a bill which the Senate passed about 2 weeks ago. The chairman of the subcommittee that handled the bill asked us to strike that out and to take it to conference, and make the House justify it.

Mr. DONNELL. If it is a fair question, Mr. President, the Senator does not consider, does he, that the United States Employment Service, particularly as applicable to the farm labor placement, will be crippled by reducing the $9,460,000 to $1,460,000?

Mr. BALL. All the House allowed for the particular purpose was $1,460,000.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I understand the situation, the Senator is proposing to reduce, when the committee of the Senate has acted on the proposal, the $9,460,000, to $1,460,000, which takes care of the farm placement program. The remainder of it will go into conference, and that out of the conference, if the exigencies require it, there will come a sufficient amount, an adequate amount, as agreed upon by the conferees, for any increase in the grants to the States. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. BALL. That is correct. The Senator's amendment would restore the full budget estimate for the Farm Placement Service, but would take to conference the $8,000,000 additional for grants to States, which the House provided after the regular bill had passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will indulge me, I shall be compelled to leave the Senate in a moment and I should like to call his attention to the language of the conference report. This is on page 8 of the report of the committee under the item "Treasury Department, Bureau of Federal Supply, Salaries, and Expenses."

I shall read the language, if the Senator will permit:

The committee has not approved the request of the Treasury Department for $2,700,000 to enable the Bureau of Federal Supply to finance the first year of a 5-year interdepartmental project for a unified Federal Catalog System. The committee is of the opinion the project is a worthy one; however, there is no assurance that once the system is developed, it will be used by all Government agencies. The committee recommends that legislation be enacted providing for a unified Federal Catalog System and until such time as this is done, it is not felt that time and funds should be expended on such a project.

As a member of the committee, I understood that the language was inserted in the committee report merely to explain why the committee did not allow the budget estimate of $2,700,000 for this purpose. It appears that some of the departments and agencies of government are now carrying on cataloging with funds which they have available for that purpose, but that there has been a misunderstanding that the committee's report directed them to discontinue the cataloging. I think that understanding of the committee's language is erroneous, and I rose to ask the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, who is in charge of the bill, if I am not correct in stating that the language of the report merely gave a reason for not allowing the appropriation, but was not intended to interfere with any such activities as are being carried on within the agencies or departments by the use of other funds which have been made available.

Mr. BALL. The Senator from Georgia is entirely correct. The committee in its report certainly did not intend to place any limitation on funds available in other items, but was referring merely to the budget estimate of $2,700,000 for a special project.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, there are two amendments on page 29 which we adopted early this morning, which should be reconsidered. They are a part of the same farm placement as was discussed a moment ago. I ask that the votes by which the committee amendment on page 29, line 6, and the committee amendment on the same page, line 9, were agreed to, be reconsidered, and that the committee amendments be rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made. The votes by which the amendments were agreed to will be reconsidered, and without objection, the amendments are rejected.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 33, after line 23, it is proposed to insert the following:

UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN UNITED NATIONS

The appropriation "United States participation in United Nations," contained in the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1948, is hereby made available for the furnishing of living quarters for the use of the Representative of the United States at the seat of the United Nations and this shall be accomplished by utilizing the authority contained in the second proviso of the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Foreign Service," in the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1948, with respect to the furnishing of living quarters for the use of the foreign service; and for making allotments to the United States Mission to the United Nations to defray the unusual expenses incident to the maintenance of an official residence for the United States Representative to the United Nations in the same manner that such allotments are authorized to Foreign Service Posts by Section 902 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, several Senators have called my attention to a paragraph amending the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, beginning in line 16 on page 22, which sets a 60-day limit on appeals from regulations made by the Department of Commerce in liquidating that agency. Frankly, I do not understand just what the functions of the Department of Commerce are going to be. I have been told that changing "sixty days" in line 24 on page 22 to "120 days" will cure the situation, and I offer such an amendment, so that it may be sent to conference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 4269) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. BALL, Mr. BROCKS, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. TYDINGS conferees on the part of the Senate.

PROVISION FOR FUNDS FOR GREEK AND TURKISH AID

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to say only a few words about an item in the appropriation bill which has just been passed. It refers to aid to Greece and Turkey.

I congratulate the committee upon adopting that provision. At this particular time in the history of the world, and in view of the posture of international affairs, it is of the utmost importance that the United States make good on the bill recommended by the President to extend economic and other aid to Turkey and to Greece.

Mr. President, as is well known, the United Nations appointed a Border Commission to visit the Greek border fronting on Yugoslavia, Albania, and Bulgaria. That Commission has reported, and from its report it is perfectly plain that irregular bands from Yugoslavia, Albania, and Bulgaria have been agitating and probably crossing the border into Greece, stirring up Greek elements wherever possible. That has brought about a very critical international situation. That area is a very sensitive spot.

We must be firm in the stand which we have taken under the leadership of the President to make it possible for Greece to resist aggression on her borders.

There are several kinds of aggression being practiced in Europe. One is the aggression of infiltration and pressure of an economic and political character; but this is aggression by force of arms. World War II was fought by the Allies in order to resist and put down aggression by warlike nations upon their peaceful neighbors. That is what is happening now on the northern border of Greece.

Without help from the United States, the Greeks would probably not be able to maintain the integrity of their territory or the independence of their Government, but it would be influenced by incursions from other nations—neighbors seeking to overthrow the Government of Greece and institute in lieu thereof a communistic state.

I assume that the action in the House of Representatives will be favorable. I wish to urge upon the Senate conferees, if the question should arise—which I do not anticipate—that they remain firm in the promises which we have made with reference to Greece and Turkey. We must stand firm. We must aid the Greeks in resisting incursions into their territory and maintaining the prestige and independence of the Greek Government.

In a lesser degree, the same reasoning applies to Turkey; but the most imminent situation is in Greece. It is disclosed by the report of the boundary commission that the difficulties there are imminent and critical.

A few days ago the United States proposed in the United Nations Security Council a semipermanent commission appointed to represent the Security Council and the United Nations along the Greek frontier, to observe from time to time the conditions existing there, and to advise and keep informed the Security Council of the United Nations.

Mr. President, I am very greatly gratified that the bill carries funds for Greek and Turkish aid.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 794. An act to authorize the sale of a small tract of land on the Cherokee Indian Reservation, N. C.;

S. 892. An act for the payment of claims of the Fidelity Trust Co., of Baltimore, Md., and others, covered by findings of fact made by the United States Court of Claims, dated June 5, 1944, and contained in Senate Document No. 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session;

S. 1418. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to control and reduction of pollution in the waters of the New England States;

S. 1463. An act to amend section 12 of the Immigration Act of 1917;

S. 1480. An act authorizing the conveyance to the State of Delaware of a portion of Pea Patch Island;

S. 1494. An act to amend section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 387);

S. 1582. An act relating to the sale of Paxon Field, Duval County, Fla.; and

S. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to establish a commission to formulate plans for the erection, in Grant Park, Chicago, Ill., of a Marine Corps memorial.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1350) to authorize relief of accountable officers of the Government, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 859) to provide for the exploration, investigation, development, and maintenance of the fishing resources and development of the high seas fishing industry of the Territories and island possessions of the United States in the tropical and subtropical Pacific Ocean and intervening seas, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 174. An act to amend section 26, title I, chapter 1, of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 321), as amended by the act of May 31, 1938 (52 Stat. 588);

H. R. 3215. An act to revise the Medical Department of the Army and the Medical Department of the Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3394. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the evacuation and return of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States," approved May 16, 1946, in order to provide for the shipment of the remains of World War II dead to the homeland of the deceased or of next of kin, to provide for the disposition of group and mass burials, to provide for the burial of unknown American World War II dead in United States military cemeteries to be established overseas, to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire land overseas and to establish United States military cemeteries thereon, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3501. An act to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, approved August 9, 1946 (Public Law 704, 79th Cong., 2d sess., 60 Stat. 963), and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2173) to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ALLEN of California, Mr. MILLER of Nebraska, and Mr. DEANE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2659) to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance, and provide for the medical and scientific treatment of persons found to be alcoholics by the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ALLEN of California, Mr. MILLER of Nebraska, and Mr. DEANE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3045) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe the processes and procedures for recording instruments of writing in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ALLEN of California, Mr. MCMAHON, and Mr. ABERNETHY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4140) granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. FERGUSON submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3756) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 17, 19, 24, 26, 29, and 34.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 11, 12, 16, 23, 25, 27, 28, 30, and 31, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$18,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "one hundred and sixty-one"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided*, That of said unexpended balance, not less than $12,000,000 is to be available for the construction of the Watauga and South Holston Dams"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 13 of said amendment strike out the figure "$4,714,397" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$4,125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Tennessee Valley Authority: Not later than June 30, 1948, and not later than June 30 of each calendar year thereafter, until a total of $348,239,240 has been paid as herein provided, the board of directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority shall pay from net income derived the immediately preceding

fiscal year from power operations (such net income to be determined by deducting power operating expenses, allocated common expense, and interest on funded debt from total power operating revenues) not less than $2,500,000 of its outstanding bonded indebtedness to the Treasury of the United States exclusive of interest, and such a portion of the remainder of such net income into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts as will, in the 10-year period ending June 30, 1958, and in each succeeding ten-year period until the aforesaid total of $348,239,240 shall have been paid, equal not less than a total of $87,059,810, including payment of bonded indebtedness exclusive of interest on such bonded indebtedness. Total payments of not less than $10,500,000 shall be made not later than June 30, 1948

"Amounts equal to the total of all appropriations herein and hereafter made to the Tennessee Valley Authority for power facilities shall be paid by the board of directors thereof, in addition to the total of $348,239,240 specified in the foregoing paragraph, to the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, such payments to be amortized over a period of not to exceed forty years after the year in which such facilities go into operation."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided*, That $175,000 shall be available only for the audit and revision of past accounting records"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of said amendment strike out the figure "$290,600" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 307. Section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act (Public Law 248, 79th Congress) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 104. The Budget programs transmitted by the President to the Congress for the fiscal year 1949 and each year thereafter shall be considered and legislation shall be enacted making necessary appropriations, as may be authorized by law, making available for expenditure for operating and administrative expenses such corporate funds or other financial resources or limiting the use thereof as the Congress may determine and providing for repayment of capital funds and the payment of dividends. The provisions of this section shall not be construed as preventing Government corporations from carrying out and financing their activities as authorized by existing law, nor as affecting the provisions of section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended. The provisions of this section shall not be construed as affecting the existing authority of any Government corporation to make contracts or other commitments without reference to fiscal year limitations.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 308. Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act (Public Law 248, 79th Congress) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'This title shall apply to the same extent as to wholly owned Government corporations and for the same purposes to the following mixed ownership Government corporations: (1) The Central Bank for Cooperatives and the regional banks for cooperatives, (2) Federal home loan banks, and (3) Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, so long as these corporations have funds of or loans from the Government of the United States.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 9 and 21.

HOMER FERGUSON,
CLYDE M. REED,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

WALTER C. PLOESER,
BEN F. JENSEN,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
F. R. COUDERT, JR.,
GEORGE MAHON,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
ALBERT GORE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to speak about the conference report, because it carries within it what to me is a very offensive section. I refer to the portion of the bill which submits the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to the control of the Bureau of the Budget, which in the final analysis is a political control.

Mr. President, I am not speaking in any sense critically regarding the conferees—and this particularly applies to my colleague [Mr. FERGUSON], who has presented the report. I know that the Senate conferees completely sympathize with the view which I am now expressing, and I know that they yielded in this particular instance only because they felt that they had no alternative under the circumstances. But I feel sure that the Senate conferees would be very happy to return to another conference if the Senate were to order it. I have the feeling that if the Senate were to adopt an eloquently affirmative position, as it did the other day in connection with amendments to some of the other bills, in this instance the House would yield to the Senate's point of view.

The general idea of bringing all Government corporations under full and intimate governmental control, including the control of the Bureau of the Budget, is a perfectly sound and advisable objective, and I have no quarrel in the world with it. Not only have I no quarrel with it, but I completely approve of it. But I respectfully submit that the Government corporations which are thus involved have no relationship to the character of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which is not a Government corporation in the same sense that is meant when other Government corporations are brought under control. I submit that it is fabulous nonsense to talk about the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, in the light of the place that it holds in the basic economic system of the United States, in the same breath with other Government corporations, or to attempt to submit it to the regular Budget Bureau controls which it is here attempted to apply.

Mr. President, I ask Senators to remember back 15 years, to the days of the bank holidays. I ask them to remember the utter paralysis in America as the result of the bank holidays. I ask them to remember that those bank holidays did not flow so much from insolvent banks as from the general lack of confidence in American banks. The banks themselves, when they finally went through the wringer, in 9 cases out of 10 proved that they had been solvent. It was not their lack of solvency which ruined the country for a decade; it was the lack of public confidence in them, regardless of the nature and character of their assets.

It was under those circumstances that Congress created the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and from the moment it was created and from the moment it opened its doors there has never been a succeeding moment in the life of the Nation when there has been the slightest lack of public confidence in our banking system. As a result we went all through those perilous holidays when everything else was collapsing on all sides. We went all through them without a single bank failure in the land. If it had not been for the contribution which the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation made to the life of the Nation at that time, I dread to think what the outcome might have been.

Mr. President, an institution of that sort has some degree of sacredness about it when it comes to tampering with it, by legislative indirection in an appropriation bill. As the bill came to the Senate from the House it contained a provision which subordinates the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to the Bureau of the Budget. What does that mean? It means, in the techniques, that the budget of the FDIC must be annually submitted in advance to the Bureau of the Budget and approved by it. As a matter of elementary common sense, tell me how it would be possible to create a budget involving total contingencies. What is the budget of the FDIC for the next 12 months? It is a reflection of whatever the banking health of the Na-

tion is for the next 12 months. If there should be numerous bank failures over the land and the FDIC must staff itself to administer numerous failures and equip itself to take over vast areas of banking assets, that is one kind of a budget. If, on the contrary, the FDIC is to continue to succeed in maintaining banking solvency upon an even keel, we need a far lesser administrative structure and require none of the allocations of emergency funds. How in the world can the FDIC on January 1 provide itself with a budget to submit to the Bureau of the Budget until it knows whether the fiscal year is to be a healthy fiscal year in respect to the banking life of the Nation? If the FDIC is doubtful about the year to come and has to build up a large budget in anticipation of its doubts, I know of no surer way to precipitate a crisis in the United States than to have the budget of the FDIC necessarily increased in anticipation of bank failures made public to the world on New Year's each year.

I submit, Mr. President, that in the very nature of this tremendous public trust it is absolutely impossible to deal with it on any such budgetary basis as was proposed in the House bill, as was eliminated by the Senate, and as has been partially restored in the conference report.

Mr. President, that is not all. I remind the Senate that twice this year the legislative committee of the Senate which has jurisdiction over the FDIC has flatly refused to put it under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of the Budget, which, I repeat, is a political institution. Twice the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, which has jurisdiction over the FDIC, has refused to do the precise thing which is done by indirection in this conference report. If there was ever a demonstration of the vice of legislative riders, here it is.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The distinguished Senator from Michigan is so eminently correct that I want to add only that on the Democratic side of the Banking and Currency Committee on each occasion we have refused to put the FDIC under the Budget Bureau because it operates on the banks' money, and the Bureau of the Budget has nothing to do with it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator. Of course, the Senator is entirely correct. That is the legislative record on the floor of the Senate, as the able Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] can testify. The Senator's committee has led on the floor of the Senate in denying directly the thing which is now sought to be done indirectly.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senate Banking and Currency Committee reported favorably a bill which was passed by both Houses. I think the Senator from Indiana was the author of the bill. That bill denied anyone the right to place the FDIC under the Budget Bureau. I agree 100 percent with the able Senator from Michigan that it should not be permitted to be placed under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Was not this whole matter considered by the committees and by both Houses of Congress when the Congress passed the Government Corporation Control Act, and at that time this very action which the Appropriations Committee now seeks was denied? Is not that correct?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Alabama is entirely correct. Whenever it has been tested there has been but one answer.

This is the first time there has ever been the shadow of success for what I assert is an assault upon the independence of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which, in turn, is a fundamental assault upon the basis of American confidence in American banking. I do not understand why it creeps into this bill, particularly in view of the fact that the Budget Bureau does not want this control, that the Treasury Department does not want it and recommends against it; in view of the fact that the FDIC warningly urges that this is a most seriously dangerous thing to do; in view of the fact that all American banking interests are opposed; in view of the fact that all legislative committees of the Congress are opposed, and certainly in view of the fact that the depositors—90,000,000 of them—who sleep nights because they can depend upon the FDIC, do not want the first step taken in the direction of breaking down the independence of this institution.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I want to refer to the remarks of the Senator from Indiana. If I am not correct I hope he will correct me. The Banking and Currency Committee, to which this matter was referred, under the able Senator from Indiana, voted unanimously not to make such a change, did it not?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to remind the Senate of one thing——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the FDIC is similar to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. And also similar to the office of the Comptroller of the Currency. Neither of those agencies is under the Budget Bureau. No one so far as I know has ever thought seriously of suggesting that they be placed under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of the Budget. The FDIC does not operate on funds from the Treasury; it operates on assessments made on the bank, just as the Federal Reserve System operates and just as the office of the Comptroller of the Currency operates. Is not that correct?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is entirely correct. The FDIC is on all fours with the Federal Reserve System with respect to the fiscal structure of the American economy. No one has yet had the temerity to propose that the Federal Reserve System should be robbed of its independence and subordinated to a political bureau of the Government. Yet, here is an institution which is even more sensitive with respect to the necessities for its independence, and we confront a conference report which for the first time proposes to make it possible for political controls to determine what happens.

I am not so much afraid of what the political controls would do, because I assume that they would have an adequate respect for this institution. But I am saying that the fundamental importance and value of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is psychological; it is the faith that for 15 years America has demonstrated it has in this institution. At the moment when the FDIC is about completing $1,000,000,000 of earnings of its own, so that it can eliminate all Government capital, at this time when there is a billion dollars of money available in the Treasury of the FDIC, if the American people read that, at long last, in Washington something is going on which indicates that the political powers are restless and will remain restless until they can get their hands upon this great institution, the effect will be most deplorable.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Were sections 307 and 308 of the bill restored in the conference?

Mr. VANDENBERG. They were.

Mr. AIKEN. They are the sections which tear down——

Mr. VANDENBERG. They tear down the Farm Credit Organization; that is correct.

Mr. President, there is a great deal to be said for the objection which is to be made against an equivalent raid on the independence of the farm cooperative institutions.

Mr. AIKEN. In other words, these sections tear down some of the most useful agencies of government.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is correct. I shall leave the further discussion of that matter to those who are more familiar with it. I am confining myself to this fundamental conception, because I submit, Mr. President, that the one thing in the economic life of the United States which is basically essential is the maintenance of banking confidence, which is dependent, fundamentally and primarily, upon the continuing independent sanctity of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sorry that I have not been able to be in the Chamber during all the discussion, and I have missed some of the debate. But the

amendment the Senator is arguing has to do with the section which was added to the bill in the House of Representatives, and was stricken out by the Senate Appropriations Committee. The reason given at the time was that it was legislation on an appropriation bill, and that the matter should be studied by the proper legislative committee, rather than by the appropriations committee.

As a matter of fact, we had this matter before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, and we discussed rather at length this very idea of making the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation subject to the Budget Control Act. That committee decided that it was not proper to do so. I believe the committee was unanimous in reaching that decision.

Some members of the committee felt that the administrative expense should be subject to budget control; and, as a matter of fact, Mr. Harl, chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, told us that already there was submitted to the budget the administrative expenses for each year.

Based upon that, the regularly constituted legislative committee of the Senate rejected the idea of placing the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation under the control of the Budget Control Act. In other words, we did exactly what the Senate Appropriations Committee said should be done: We studied it. After studying it, we rejected it. I think it is an unsound principle to be written into a bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. He has reviewed a situation which, in some respects, already has been submitted by other Senators.

Now let me conclude, Mr. President, because I do not think it is necessary to labor this point. I wish to remind the Senate that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has no place in the same category or bracket with the other Government corporations to which this bill is fundamentally dedicated. I remind the Senate that the FDIC does not get one penny, not one nickel, of tax money; and it never has. It is entirely dependent upon its own premiums. In the operation of its premium account, it has finally accumulated $1,000,000,000 of assets, so that in the next 2 years there will not even be a nickel of Government funds in its capital structure.

Here is an institution which has bailed itself out from zero, in respect to its own finances, and today is the finest example of fiscal ability and success, even as a corporation, that can be found in this Nation. Here is an institution which in 15 years has resulted in a banking record in the United States without the loss of one penny to one bank depositor in the United States. That has happened in a decade and a half. Here is an institution which is totally successful by every possible degree or manner of measurement which can be applied to it. Here is an institution which the Bureau of the Budget does not want to tamper with, which the Treasury does not wish to have anyone tamper with, which the banking fraternity in the United States wishes to remain independent, which the legislative committees of the Senate have twice insisted must remain independent.

Here is an institution which does not deserve the proposed treatment at this eleventh hour in the Eightieth Congress—and I say it with great feeling, Mr. President—particularly under the auspices of the Republican Party, which is supposed to have some particular dedication to the preservation of private enterprise, and some particular aversion to the needless application of governmental controls. So I submit that under all these combined circumstances, it is not only a travesty, but it is a crime, if this conference report is adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] that the Senate agree to the conference report.

Mr. FERGUSON obtained the floor.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I have requested the Senator to yield to me, and he very kindly has done so, because I should like to take some time on the matter which has been discussed just now by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. I wish to say that I agree with him 100 percent. I wish to make the point that the same argument applies with reference to the Home Loan Bank System.

I should like to go into that matter in detail. However, I am called to a meeting on the second supplemental appropriation bill, and I cannot remain in the Chamber to discuss this matter. I hope, however, that in the discussion which will follow, the principles which have been announced by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] as applying to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, will be shown to apply with, equal force to the Home Loan Bank System, which has no place under the present corporations act.

I should like to discuss it at length. I cannot at this time.

I thank the junior Senator from Michigan for giving me the opportunity to make these few remarks.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I send to the desk a conference report and ask permission that it be considered. It is the conference report on the continuation of the consumers' credit activity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I object, and my reason for objecting is that we now have before us, an important conference report which should be disposed of. I think the conference report we are considering will be rejected and will have to go back to conference. Therefore, Mr. President, the constant interruptions being made are unnecessary and unwise. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is raised.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I wish to make just a brief statement with reference to the report. I wish to say that I should like to associate myself with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] in their remarks in opposition to the conference report bill. I communicated with the banking commissioner in my own State, and he is heartily opposed to the bill, as I believe most of those concerned in my State are. I hope the conference report will not be agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I realized when I submitted this conference report what I was bringing back to the Senate. I realized that there was great and serious objection to it, indeed, enthusiastic objection. But at times one in a conference faces a situation, as we have in the last few days, which makes him feel that he is compelled to return to the Senate for further instructions, as it were, in order that he may try again.

In this particular case it was impossible even to do business with the House conferees without first considering the two sections now being discussed. The Committee on Appropriations eliminated them. We knew they were legislation, and would have been subject to a point of order if they had originated in the Senate, but they originated in the House, where the rules were suspended so they could be adopted. The conferees came into conference adamant in their position to keep the sections in the bill.

We made some headway, I feel, when we struck out the word "use" on page 31, and I think I should explain that. The language is "for use such corporate funds or other financial resources." The word "use" was stricken out, and inserted was the language "expenditure for operating and administrative expenses." We were trying to limit the bill at least to the operating and administrative expenditures so that it would not cover losses of insurance or other than operating expenses.

Mr. President, at the end of section 308 we were able to insert this language:

> So long as these corporations have funds of or loans from the Government of the United States.

That meant that when a corporation was able to buy out, these sections would not apply.

Then, Mr. President, the words "for the calendar year 1949 and each year thereafter" were inserted, because we felt that if we had to accept the Government corporations appropriation bill with these two sections in it we would at least have a show of getting legislation from the proper legislative committee on the subject.

Mr. President, what I am saying may sound like an apology for bringing back such a report, but I think every member on the conference committee felt we had done the best we could. We were in a bad situation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator certainly owes no one any apology for the report he brings back in connection with the Government corporations appropriation bill. What he has just said is entirely true. He and his coconferees

on the part of the Senate made substantial and valuable headway in the direction of at least partially protecting the FDIC, if they confronted the situation in which they could not protect it completely. I congratulate the Senator and his fellow conferees on the work they did. I am sure the Senator equally agrees that if he could have a unanimous vote of the Senate behind him in one more conference in an effort to do a still better job he would be as happy as I would be over that result.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, even without a unanimous vote the junior Senator from Michigan is willing to abide by the decision of the Senate, and return to the conference, and I know that every member of the conference committee will do everything he can to carry out the wishes of the Senate, and to return with a bill, if possible.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. As one of the members of the conference committee, I wish to say, with all the force that is within me, that I agree totally with the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan. The Senator well knows that when I signed this conference report I did it reluctantly, with the understanding that I could make what observations I cared to make on the floor of the Senate to see if possible if the FDIC could not be taken out from under title I and put back only as a Corporation to be audited, rather than to be further controlled under title I of the act.

I think it unnecessary to develop any more arguments. I believe I understand how the junior Senator from Michigan feels about the matter. I am satisfied that if the Senate wants to go along and vote the conference report down, as has been suggested by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, the Senate conferees will be fortified in the position they can take in a further conference with the conferees on the part of the House. Personally I think the report should be voted down, and I am perfectly willing to make the fight if the Senate wants that done.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I rise to support, very briefly, what the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has said. He was the chairman of the Senate conferees, and I was one of the members of the conference. I attended four and a part of the fifth session with him.

The House conferees came in with a determination to discuss no items in the bill at all until the language in sections 307 and 308 was straightened out to their satisfaction. After the second meeting the conference broke up, and we did not return and renew our conference for several days. We then went back, and the House conferees had the same determination, and it was then that we drafted the language, which, as the senior Senator from Michigan has said, substantially improves the two sections.

I feel the same as do the senior Senator from Michigan and the junior Senator from Michigan. We do not want these sections.

But we are up against the fact of supporting the TVA and various other governmental agencies, and it was for that reason we finally made the effort to draft this language, to put off the effect of the provision for one full year, in order to permit legislation next year, if desirable, and then we proceeded to work out figures in the other sections. If the Senate feels, as it apparently does, as evidenced by speeches of its members, that different action should be taken, I am certain that the junior Senator from Michigan and the other conferees will try to follow out their judgment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I want to say that besides striking out the FDIC sections 307 and 308, which were restored in conference it would strike crippling blows at almost all the farm credit organizations, making it very difficult if not impossible for some of them to do business. It puts them in a position of having to go to the Bureau of the Budget before the beginning of each year and to estimate the amount of the loans which they will make during the year, regardless of what the weather may be, or what unforeseen conditions may arise. I had intended to speak at some length on this, but judging from appearances, the temper of the Senate is such that it intends to send the bill back to conference in no uncertain manner, and express its wholehearted opposition to these sections. Therefore I shall content myself with what I have said, and not speak at any greater length.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, as stated before by members of the conference committee, we did not have the opportunity to have a vote in the Senate upon these two sections, because they were stricken out by the Appropriations Committee. We now have the opportunity to vote upon this matter, and I hope the Senate will have a yea-and-nay vote. I hope that there may be a quorum call before the vote, and that the vote will disclose to the House exactly how the Senate feels about the matter.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, this question is of such importance to my constituents in Illinois that I desire to read into the RECORD at this point a telegram I received from Harry C. Hausman, secretary of the Illinois Bankers' Association. The association is greatly concerned, along with other banking organizations throughout the country, over the provision of House bill 3756, which is now being considered:

CHICAGO, ILL., *July 22, 1947.*

Hon. SCOTT W. LUCAS,
United States Senate:

This association is gravely concerned, along with the other banking organizations throughout the country, over a provision in H. R. 3756 now being considered in conference committee. Section 308 of this bill calls for inclusion of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation under the control of Bureau of the Budget. FDIC is supported by the assessments paid by 14,000 insured banks. These banks have nothing but praise of the achievements of FDIC and the careful and efficient manner of its management, both of which stem from its independence and flexibility of action. The problems of FDIC are those of a private insurance corporation. These banks have in the past and will in the future pay the cost of maintaining this corporation as the steel beam under American confidence in the banks of this country and these banks are opposed to any legislation that will tend to destroy the confidence of their 90,000,000 depositors. By including FDIC in section 308, the operations of the corporation are gravely hampered and the lawmakers would thereby plant doubts in the minds of these depositors. The net effect of inclusion of FDIC would be to deprive it of a permanent insurance fund, paid for by the banks, and subject it to the vagaries of appropriation bills. No more unfortunate news could be received by the country than news that Congress has determined at this time when the insurance fund has reached over $1,000,000,000 to encroach upon the independence of FDIC. Since FDIC is supported exclusively by bank assessments, banks and depositing public have the right to insist that it must be kept independent in fact as well as name. Section 308 does not have effect of but does actually destroy independence of FDIC. This association urges every possible effort to remove FDIC from section 308. May we count on your support?

HARRY C. HAUSMAN,
Secretary, Illinois Bankers Association.

Mr. President, I subscribe to the thoughts that are expressed in that telegram. From the beginning of the FDIC until now, this is the first time that either branch of Congress, or the Congress itself, has attempted in any way to interfere with the orderly arrangement and working of that important institution. I hope the Senate will follow the lead of the Senator from Michigan, and that the conference report will be recommitted to the conferees.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a somewhat lengthy telegram received from the Iowa Bankers Association, of the State of Iowa, in support of the position of the senior Senator from Michigan on this issue.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DES MOINES, IOWA, *July 22, 1947.*

Hon. B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We respectfully urge you in your important position to do everything you can to eliminate permanently section 308 of H. R. 3756 which section would put the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation under the Federal Budget. That corporation being one supported by the member banks of the Nation is of no financial cost whatever to the taxpayers. It has been and continues to be inimitably managed in the interests of bank depositors. The corporation should not be handicapped nor shackled in its efforts to give the Nation's bank depositors and particularly the small depositor the greatest possible protection. We once tried out here in Iowa putting our State banking department under our State legislative budget. It just wouldn't work; it bid fair to completely wreck the efficiency of the

department's administration by the State superintendent of banking here in Iowa. The Iowa General Assembly quickly followed the requests of our State banking department and our State association and the information and data they submitted on the experiences of a banking department trying to operate under the uncertainties of getting sufficient appropriations to protect bank depositors as they have a right to expect and which the banking industry want to give and without cost to the Iowa taxpayers, and therefore the Iowa Legislature discontinued that budgetary requirement years ago. If it would not work in Iowa, certainly there are grounds to believe that the budgetary idea for the FDIC will also find great difficulty in operating in a national way. Let us not even experiment with it in a national way. It can be a costly experiment for depositors whose interests should by all means come first and remain paramount. Thanks for your contemplated help and that of Senator WILSON to whom a like wire goes.

Kindest regards.

IOWA BANKERS ASSOCIATION,
R. H. MILLER, *Chairman*
FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE,
W. H. BRENTON, *President*.
FRANK WARNER, *Secretary*.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it has been my intention to have something to say in opposition to the provision in reference to the FDIC. In view of the very strong arguments made against the provision by the very distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, and the very practical statement made by the Senate conferees, the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan, I shall not delay the Senate. I think I know the temper of the Senate. I believe the Senate will overwhelmingly vote down the conference report. I wish, however, to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD five editorials from leading publications in this country, such as the American Banker, of New York City, the Chicago Journal of Commerce, the Philadelphia Inquirer, and so forth.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Banker, New York City, July 9, 1947]

KEEP FDIC INDEPENDENT, URGES PENNSYLVANIA BANK LEADER

WILLIAMSPORT, PA.—Warning that bank deposit insurance and bank supervision could readily become politically dominated was voiced by George Shotwell, president of the Pennsylvania Bankers Association, and president of the Williamsport National Bank, commenting on a rider on House bill 3756, which would place the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation under control of the Bureau of the Budget.

"Shifting of the FDIC from status of an independent corporation, able to move quickly and efficiently, to that of a politically controlled agency, constitutes a warning of which the bankers of this country should take immediate cognizance," he said, "since the force and effect of such a step could easily lead to an involvement of the Federal Reserve System and the office of the Comptroller of the Currency. All three agencies are supported wholly by bank assessments, fees paid by the banks for examinations and similar collections, receiving nothing from the Treasury and asking nothing from it.

"It is a well-established fact," he added, "that the operation of the FDIC has been highly successful. It has grown to be a billion-dollar corporation which now intends to retire the advance originally made to it by the United States Treasury and Federal Reserve System, of approximately $289,000,000. We should exert every effort to preserve the individual status of agencies so vitally involved in the operation of our independent banking system."

[From the Chicago Journal of Commerce of July 7, 1947]

UNDERMINING THE FDIC

Some 14 years ago the public stopped depositing its money in mattresses and resumed the use of banks for that purpose. Almost single-handed the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has been responsible for restoring confidence in our banking system.

Congress is now acting upon a bill—H. R. 3756—which would seriously undermine that confidence. Section 308 of the measure, already passed by the House and now in committee before the Senate, would treat the FDIC as a wholly owned Government corporation.

By transferring the FDIC from title II to title I of the Government Corporation Control Act Congress would oblige the agency to submit an annual budget program for the following fiscal year, with estimates of operations, administrative expenses, and borrowings. By thus gravely hampering its flexibility of operations, our lawmakers would plant doubts in the minds of the holders of 90,000,000 deposit accounts—doubt that the FDIC could continue effectively to carry out the Federa deposit-insurance law.

No longer possessing a permanent insurance fund, the FDIC would find itself subjected to the vagaries of appropriation bills. Such a change would hardly create peace of mind on the part of depositors.

The FDIC is not supported, for the most part, by public funds. Of present resources of some $1,100,000,000, the banks have paid in $700,000,000 in assessments. Months ago the FDIC offered to return to the Government its original stake.

The FDIC is under constant scrutiny. Yearly it reports to Congress and to the Comptroller General, who audits the financial transactions of the Corporation. Its 14,000 insured banks also keep watch with Argus eyes. The FDIC has been run efficiently and without "venturing into unwarranted fields." The Comptroller General has described its accounting system as "well conceived, and its accounts are well supervised and kept."

As Chairman Maple T. Harl, of the FDIC, pertinently observes, "neither the comptroller of the currency nor the Federal Reserve System, both of whom operate with funds similar to ours * * * are budgeted or audited. It seems to me the same reasons should apply to the FDIC."

If Congress is avid to correct abuses and bad management, it has a broad field for action within the Government itself without hounding a semiprivate corporation which has done a first-class job since its inception.

[From the American Banker, New York City, July 3, 1947]

CONNECTICUT BANKS HIT BUDGET BUREAU CONTROL OVER FDIC

MANCHESTER, VT.—Richard Rapport, Connecticut commissioner of banking, appealed to bankers of the State to take an active part in the opposition of bankers elsewhere, and Federal and State bank supervisory authorities, to the inclusion of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation under the United States Budget Bureau control, as proposed in a measure placed before congressional committees in June.

Following Mr. Rapport's statement, the convention of the Connecticut Bankers Association here directed that the following resolution be sent to Connecticut Representatives in Congress and to the State's Senators:

"*Resolved*, That it is vital to the preservation of the banking system of our country and particularly vital to the protection of depositors that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation be continued as a completely independent agency, free from any possible political pressure or political involvement; that the inclusion of the FDIC in section 308 of H. R. 3756 is an example of recurring attempts to destroy that independence, and, therefore, that the FDIC should not be included in section 308 of H. R. 3756."

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of July 8, 1947]

KEEP HANDS OFF FDIC

Howard A. Loeb, chairman of the Tradesmens National Bank & Trust Co. of this city, calls timely attention to a dangerous measure, already approved by the House and now pending in the Senate Appropriations Committee, to bring the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation under political control.

This is a proposal tied into the Government corporations appropriations bill to place FDIC under the Bureau of the Budget.

As Mr. Loeb points out, this might result, during times of stress, in limiting the aid the Corporation could give to endangered banks, or in delaying it, which would be equally perilous. FDIC funds are contributed by the banks to protect deposits.

The system, as an independent agency, has worked remarkably well. It has not been extravagantly conducted. It should be let alone. The provisions in this bill affecting its independence and, possibly, its safety, should be eliminated.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of July 7, 1947]

MOVE FOR POLITICAL CONTROL OF FDIC HIT

Not only would the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation lose its independent status but its effectiveness would be seriously endangered if the House-approved Government Corporations Appropriations Act, 1948, now pending before the Senate Appropriations Committee, is enacted into law, Howard A. Loeb, chairman of Tradesmens National Bank & Trust Co., warned yesterday.

Loeb said that by placing the FDIC under the control of the Bureau of the Budget, with its appropriation fixed months in advance, the FDIC, in the event of unforeseen or unpredictable economic developments, might find itself unable to come to the assistance of banks requiring aid due to lack of funds to pay the cost of maintaining a staff to handle substandard assets taken over.

He said that FDIC administrative expenses are wholly proportionate to conditions prevailing in the banking world.

"The FDIC," Loeb said, "has done a very constructive piece of work, without fear or favor, and one devoted entirely to the best interests of depositors. Through its supervision of banking it has aided in strengthening the banking system and it would be extremely detrimental, particularly at this time, to end its independent status and place it under political control."

POLITICAL CONTROL SOUGHT

He also warned that if the FDIC is made subject to the Government Corporations Appropriations Act and its budget were under the control of the Budget Bureau, thus denying the right of the Corporation to use its own funds arising out of premiums paid by the banks and income on investments; it may foreshadow similar action with regard to the Federal Reserve System and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency.

"From all indications," Loeb said, "this proposed legislation may be the first step of a move to bring all three bank supervisory agencies under political controls. All three are supported wholly by the banks. The salaries of the Comptroller of the Currency and those of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System are paid by the banks out of current income.

LOSS OF INDEPENDENCE

"If this measure is enacted, it will not only mean the loss of the FDIC's independence, but it will also mean the possible use of bank-paid assessments, that in the past were a reserve against loss by bank depositors, to aid other Government programs."

Loeb added that attempts to pass similar legislation in the past had been halted before they reached advanced stages. In the present instance, the House Banking Committee, "where it could have been given careful consideration and its dangers and possible results properly appraised," was bypassed and the measure passed through the House Appropriations Committee instead.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. VANDENBERG and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Moore
Baldwin	Hawkes	Morse
Ball	Hayden	Murray
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Myers
Brewster	Hill	O'Conor
Bricker	Hoey	Overton
Brooks	Holland	Pepper
Buck	Ives	Reed
Bushfield	Jenner	Revercomb
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Kem	Saltonstall
Capper	Kilgore	Smith
Chavez	Knowland	Sparkman
Connally	Langer	Stewart
Cooper	Lodge	Taft
Cordon	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	McClellan	Thye
Eastland	McFarland	Tydings
Ecton	McGrath	Umstead
Ellender	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ferguson	McMahon	Watkins
Flanders	Magnuson	Wherry
Fulbright	Malone	White
George	Martin	Wiley
Green	Maybank	Williams
Gurney	Millikin	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, before a vote is taken on sending the bill back to conference, I want to say that in sections 307 and 308 of the bill there is the most brazen attempt to destroy farm credit in America I have ever seen since I have been in the Congress. The credit agencies which would be crippled by adoption of these sections are the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, the Production Credit Corporations, the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, and the banks for cooperatives, and section 307 would also apply to the Commodity Credit Corporation, making it difficult, if not impossible, for those agencies to continue the work which they have done so well during the last few years. I hope the Senate will express its sentiments by voting unanimously to send the bill back to conference. So far as I am concerned, I never will accept any conference report on this bill which carries those sections, which are deliberately designed to cripple the farm lending agencies of America.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with what the Senator from Vermont has said. I desire to place the greatest emphasis I can on what he said respecting the Farm Credit Administration. We must not impair, hamper, or cripple the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. BARKLEY. Can the Senator from Vermont tell us what is the genus of these efforts in the bill to cripple the farm agencies, including the Commodity Credit Corporation and the lending agencies to which he has referred?

Mr. AIKEN. It would be very difficult to be sure whether it comes from overgrasping Federal agencies and their officials, or from a certain group of overgrasping bankers who would do everything within their power to destroy farm credit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to agree to the conference report on House bill 3756. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator from Oregon correct in understanding that if a Senator wishes to approve the conference report he will vote "yea," and if he wishes to send it back for further conference he will vote "nay"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A vote to reject is a "nay" vote.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REED. I have a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I am informed that if he were present and voting, he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent. These Senators, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are unavoidably detained. If present and voting, they would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family. If present and voting, he would vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], who is absent because of illness, would vote "nay," if present.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who is necessarily absent, would vote "nay," if present.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], who are detained on official business, would vote "nay," if present.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], who is necessarily absent, would vote "nay," if present.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, and who has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], would vote "nay" if present.

The result was announced—yeas 1, nays 83, as follows:

YEAS—1

Russell

NAYS—83

Aiken	Hatch	Moore
Baldwin	Hawkes	Morse
Ball	Hayden	Murray
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Myers
Brewster	Hill	O'Conor
Bricker	Hoey	Overton
Brooks	Holland	Pepper
Buck	Ives	Reed
Bushfield	Jenner	Revercomb
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Cain	Kem	Smith
Capper	Kilgore	Sparkman
Chavez	Knowland	Stewart
Connally	Langer	Taft
Cooper	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McCarthy	Thye
Dworshak	McClellan	Tydings
Eastland	McFarland	Umstead
Ecton	McGrath	Vandenberg
Ellender	McKellar	Watkins
Ferguson	McMahon	Wherry
Flanders	Magnuson	White
Fulbright	Malone	Wiley
George	Martin	Williams
Green	Maybank	Young
Gurney	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—11

Bridges	O'Daniel	Tobey
Capehart	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Downey	Robertson, Wyo	Wilson
McCarran	Taylor	

So the conference report was rejected.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate further insist on its amendments still in disagreement and request a further conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the same conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. REED, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. OVERTON, and Mr. WHERRY conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 3756, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
July 24, 1947.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21 to the bill (H. R. 3756) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by said amendment insert: "*Provided further*, That there shall be transferred to this account not to exceed $765,000 of the funds available under sections 303 and 502 of Public Law 849, Seventy-sixth Congress, as amended; such total funds to be available for all necessary administrative expenses of the Office of the Administrator."

Mr. FERGUSON. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the Senate amendment No. 9.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its

reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4336. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; and

H. J. Res. 245. Joint resolution amending Public Law 27, Eightieth Congress.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 338. An act to amend the Plant Quarantine Act approved August 20, 1912, as amended, by adding a new proviso to section 1;

H. R. 72. An act to increase the number of authorized aviation stations operated by the Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H. R. 673. An act to repeal certain provisions authorizing the establishing of priorities in transportation by merchant vessels;

H. R. 1239. An act to permit vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and points in the continental United States;

H. R. 1341. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif.;

H. R. 1565. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 1 of the United States Code, entitled "General Provisions";

H. R. 1566. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 4 of the United States Code, entitled "Flag and seal, Seat of Government, and the States";

H. R. 1567. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 6 of the United States Code, entitled "Official and Penal Bonds";

H. R. 1633. An act to amend section 16 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia";

H. R. 1714. An act to exclude certain interns, student nurses, and other student-employees of hospitals of the Federal Government from the Classification Act and other laws relating to compensation and benefits of Federal employees, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2054. An act to amend the act of April 14, 1930, to provide increased retired pay for certain members of the former Life Saving Service;

H. R. 2083. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 17 of the United States Code, entitled "Copyrights";

H. R. 2084. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 9 of the United States Code, entitled "Arbitrations";

H. R. 2109. An act to amend section 1003 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 3022. An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, gas, and sulfur on lands acquired by the United States;

H. R. 3043. An act to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3131. An act to extend for 3 months the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended;

H. R. 3541. An act to define the functions and duties of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3619. An act relating to the sale of the Mission Point Lighthouse Reservation, Grand Traverse County, Mich.;

H. R. 3818. An act to amend the Federal Insurance Contributions Act with respect to rates of tax on employers and employees, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4084. An act to authorize the creation of additional positions in the professional and scientific service in the War and Navy Departments.

INSTITUTIONAL ON-FARM TRAINING FOR VETERANS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 610, House bill 2181, relating to institutional on-farm training for veterans, with the understanding that debate on the bill shall be limited to 20 minutes, the time to be controlled by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not want to object—for I wish to help expedite the business of the Senate, if possible, there is on the calendar Order No. 602, House bill 3342, which not only I want very much to see considered, but I think the whole country is desirous of having a vote on that bill. May I ask the Senator from Ohio if he would be willing to indicate whether or not we might take up that bill, limit debate, and have a vote on it?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it is not my intention to make any such motion, if that is what the Senator wishes to know.

Mr. HATCH. I ask the Senator from Ohio if he would indicate a slight willingness to proceed along the line I have just suggested.

Mr. TAFT. I think it would be deceptive to indicate any such slight willingness.

Mr. HATCH. Then I judge from what the Senator from Ohio has said, namely, that it would be deceptive for him to indicate such a willingness, that he is unalterably opposed to taking up the bill and having a vote on it.

Mr. TAFT. Let me say that so far as the Voice of America program is concerned, the proposal came before us and was fully considered in the Appropriations Committee. Hearings were held on the entire question. In spite of the lack of legislative authority, I withdrew my objection and let the appropriation go through. It was my understanding, at least, that that settled the matter for this year, and that we would take the rest of this year to consider the question of authority. For that reason I feel very strongly that we should not consider this matter until we have full opportunity to debate it.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have the floor, and I do not care to yield further.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I thought I had the floor. I apologize to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio does have the floor. The Chair advises the Senator from New Mexico that the Senator from Ohio obtained the floor when the Senator from New Mexico concluded.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from New Mexico had not concluded. The Senator from New Mexico yielded to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair apologizes, but he had no way of knowing.

Mr. HATCH. I did not yield the floor. Such was not my intention; and I object to being forcibly taken from the floor in that manner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair regrets that he recognized the Senator from Ohio when the Senator from New Mexico concluded. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I merely wish to address a remark or two to my good friend from New Mexico. I think I thoroughly understand his position on this matter. Let me say to the Senator from New Mexico——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I yield the floor. I have no desire to retain the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico now desire the floor?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. My protest was voiced only against the procedure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair duly apologizes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I accept, I am sure, as graciously as the Chair offers his apology. There is nothing personal involved.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. No; I shall not yield now. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. Is a motion in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion is not in order, because there is a pending motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to take up the so-called Kem resolution.

PROMOTION OF FOREIGN RELATIONS BY INTERCHANGE OF PERSONS, KNOWLEDGE, ETC.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be laid aside and that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 602, House bill 3342.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HATCH. I do not yield.

Mr. TAFT. I thought the Senator from New Mexico had finished.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from New Mexico has not finished.

House bill 3342 is to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills

between the people of the United States and other countries.

In connection with the unanimous-consent request which I have made I desire to make a few remarks. I do not care to yield the floor; I do not care to yield at all.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield for a point of order?

Mr. HATCH. I certainly have a right to be recognized on the pending matter. I have a right to retain the floor. I think I shall yield to my friend from Massachusetts. I wonder what his point of order is. No; I do not yield at all.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HATCH. No; I do not yield.

Mr. President, I am afraid to yield even for a question, for fear I shall lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico will please proceed.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from New Mexico will proceed in his own time, in his own right, and according to his own desires.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield so that the Senator from Missouri may state his point of order?

Mr. HATCH. I do not.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has just suggested to me that my unanimous-consent request is not in proper form, in that I failed to ask that the pending business be laid aside temporarily. I now amend my unanimous-consent request to include the word "temporarily"—that the pending business be temporarily laid aside in order that the Senate may proceed to a vote on House bill 3342. On that subject I desire to speak for a little while.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Nebraska for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask whether a unanimous-consent request is debatable if it is objected to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent request has not been objected to.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not yield for any purpose except for a question. I have a right to discuss my unanimous-consent request. I am claiming the floor, and I expect to continue.

Did the Senator from Nebraska desire to ask me a question?

Mr. WHERRY. No.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I shall take up this bill, title by title, and section by section, not only so that the Senators may know, but that the country may know what is going on in the Senate of the United States. I want the country to know, Mr. President, that the Senate of the United States and the Congress of the United States are so anxious, so eager to go home that they will not permit a Senator to discuss or debate this question. As I said yesterday, I am not asking a single soul to vote for this bill. If the Senate wants to vote against it, that is all right; but I shall demand that the Senate express itself, that it go on record, that it give the privilege to individual Senators to vote either yes or no. If I can have that assurance, Mr. President, if the leadership on the other side will say, "Certainly, we will call up this bill. We will limit debate; we do not want to debate any length of time, possible 15 or 20 or 30 minutes, but we will have a vote on it," I will surrender the floor.

Again, Mr. President, I beg a poor boon from the Senate of the United States. I ask only a chance to vote; that is all. Has the time come in this country, a country of free, democratic institutions, when Senators will not even accord the privilege of a vote? Mr. President, it is a pretty sorry record that is being written this day in the Senate of the United States. I do not care how good a bill may be or how bad it may be, Senators should have the right to vote on it. As I said yesterday, here is a bill which was considered by the House committee for many days, which was debated at length on the floor of the House, and passed by that body by a 3-to-1 vote and which was also considered fully by the Senate committee; and yet the Senate will not even allow a vote on it.

Again I say, Mr. President, we are writing in the book of history a sorry and a sordid page which will rise up and confront free people everywhere. This is a Republican bill, Mr. President. I am a Democrat, and I am begging the Republicans to vote for their own bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HATCH. Yes; for a question only.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from New Mexico agree with the junior Senator from Oregon that when it comes to applying the principle he has laid down, namely, that we ought to have a vote on any bill, good or bad, it applies also to the so-called Kem resolution?

Mr. HATCH. Yes. I said that this morning. I offered to yield to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]. I told the Senator from Missouri that I would vote for his resolution. I am not inconsistent. I am taking the position for which I have stood all my life, and I hope the time will never come when I recede from that position, that freemen ought to have the right to speak freely, and ought to have the right in the Senate of the United States to vote freely. May I ask those on the majority side if they will be willing to accord to us who believe in this bill this small consideration?

Mr. TAFT. Did the Senator ask me a question?

Mr. HATCH. No. Does the Senator want to ask me a question?

Mr. TAFT. I thought the Senator asked me a question.

Mr. HATCH. No; I cannot yield. I should like to, and I want to be courteous——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Nebraska may ask me a question and that I shall not lose the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if he will permit us to vote first on the Kem resolution?

Mr. HATCH. So far as I am concerned, yes.

Mr. WHERRY. If that can be accomplished, the situation might be worked out.

Mr. HATCH. So far as I am concerned, my answer is "Yes," and I have no hesitancy about it. Is the Senator proposing something? We might get somewhere. I am not sure, however, because I have not the time and I am not in charge. When I see hesitancy on the other side of the aisle and see other Senators talking to the Senator from Nebraska and patting him on the shoulder, perhaps he went wrong in making his suggestion. But I say to the Senator from Nebraska that if we vote on the Kem resolution, which is a resolution to discharge a committee, the question would still be present, and that would not be quite fair. I want to be perfectly honest and perfectly fair with the Senator from Nebraska. Frankly, I would be glad to trade a poor, insignificant resolution relating to politics and nothing else for a resolution which may affect the peace of the world.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HATCH. No; I do not yield.

Mr. President, as I was saying, if that is the sort of trading that has to go on in the Senate of the United States, I shall meet it, and I shall meet it before the people, too.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Missouri for a question?

Mr. HATCH. No; I do not yield to anyone for any purpose.

Mr. President, the hour is almost 4 o'clock in the afternoon. I tell the Senate that we shall be here quite a while. We might even have another all night session, and make ourselves as ridiculous as we made ourselves last night, which is exactly what the Senate did. The Republicans have charged the Democrats with filibustering, but the Republicans took all night long last night, in filibustering against their own measure. Mr. President, let us talk turkey. Those are the facts.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. No; I do not yield to anyone for any purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I should be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Missouri; I should like to engage in colloquy, with questions back and forth; but I am afraid that someone would make a point of order and I would be taken off the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from New

Mexico that under the ruling which the present occupant of the chair made last night, the Senator from New Mexico would have a perfect right to yield for a question, without in any way jeopardizing his position on the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator who happens to be occupying the chair at this time that I appreciate full well his frankness, his wisdom, and his desire to rule wisely and justly at all times on matters of parliamentary procedure, and the position which I now take is no reflection whatever upon the present occupant of the chair.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I know that the Senator from New Mexico would receive a fair ruling from the present occupant of the chair; but the Senator from New Mexico has noticed some rather strange proceedings around here during the last day or two; and because on yesterday, when the Senator from New Mexico rose to pay a compliment to the Senator from New Jersey——

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. No; I do not yield.

Mr. President, as I was saying, because on yesterday when I rose to pay a compliment to the Senator from New Jersey, a point of order was made against me, I must decline to yield, in order to make sure that I protect my position on the floor.

Mr. President, I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the Senator from New Mexico has the floor.

Mr. HATCH. And I intend to occupy the floor, and I intend to occupy it for some time. That is not a threat. I know that a filibuster cannot be conducted to force the passage of legislation. If it could be, if that were possible, if I had the physical and mental strength, I would stand on this floor from now until doomsday, if necessary, to force a vote on the bill to which I have referred. However, I cannot force a vote. All I can do is stand here and demand that the Senate of the United States have the courage to go on record regarding the bill. I do not wish to argue the bill. I do not wish to debate it for a minute. I would be happy if the Republican leadership would take the words of their own author of this bill, the honorable and distinguished Representative MUNDT, of South Dakota, who made as fine a presentation before our committee as ever was made before it, and I should like to have the Senators on the other side of this aisle take Mr. MUNDT's words and be guided by them, not by my words. If they are not satisfied with that—and I shall read his words directly—I should like to have them take the words of Representative LODGE, the brother of our own colleague in this body. Mr. President, I defy any Member on the other side of the aisle to take the words of Representative LODGE and vote against this bill. This is a Republican bill that I am talking about, and I, a Democrat, am asking and pleading with and begging the Republicans to pass their own bill. What a situation this is!

Mr. President, do you know what it is all about? I shall tell you. It is about a desire to adjourn, to quit their business, to quit the work for which they were elected by their constituents, to lay down on their jobs and quit, and go home on Saturday night.

Mr. President, what is so important about July 26? Why should the Senate quit at that time? Senators on the other side of the aisle are going to boast about the accomplishments of this Congress. They are going out to the people of the country, and they will tell them what wonderful things they have done. Mr. President, a great deal has been said by Senators on the other side of the aisle about the New Deal. I shall be perfectly willing to meet any Senator who sits on the other side of the aisle and go on the platforms of this country and debate the New Deal against the Old Deal—the Old Deal which found the farmers bankrupt and impoverished, the Old Deal which saw the banks closed, and long lines of depositors trying to get their money back.

I should like to talk about the New Deal and the Old Deal, Mr. President, if that is what is desired. I should like to talk about the hundreds and the thousands of persons who were unemployed all over the country, from the East to the West, and the North to the South. I should like to talk about how hungry they were, how hopeless they were.

Mr. President, I do not wish to get into a political discussion. The bill we are discussing is not political. I am wandering; I confess I am wandering, and whatever comes into my mind I talk about, as other Senators do when they take the floor under circumstances like the present. I would not arouse the antagonism of my Republican friends. I realize that they have the majority in this body. Voting solidly, they can kill any legislative proposal or they can pass any. I do not want to raise political considerations.

I said yesterday, Mr. President, that I served as a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations. There were two members on the subcommittee. One was the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. I was the other. I never worked with a man who tried to consider legislation in the light of his country's needs in a finer and better way than did the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. No; I cannot yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I was proud and happy to serve with a man who had such a patriotic urge and disposition, and I can tell the Senate and I can tell the country that there was not one single partisan influence that motivated the Senator from New Jersey. He sought only his country's good, and I tried to help him in that endeavor. That is why I am so antagonistic against the procedure which we face here today. I expect to continue my antagonism until we can get an honest vote on the bill. I do not care about politics. If the passage of the bill would elect the Senator from Ohio President of the United States I would still vote for it; and I grant that is a considerable concession for a Democrat to make, and I say that with no reflection on the Senator from Ohio. I think he is an able, patriotic statesman, who also, in his way, and according to his lights, is trying to serve his country; but his lights, Mr. President, are terribly dim.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I call the Senator to order.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I was paying the Senator from Ohio a compliment, and if I lose the floor because I say that I consider the Senator from Ohio to be an honest, intelligent, patriotic statesman, I am willing to lose the floor. That is exactly what I have said. I did say that I thought his lights were terribly dim at times, and blinded. He makes some awful blunders and mistakes, just as I do, Mr. President.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from Florida desires to propose a unanimous-consent request. I am perfectly willing to agree to his request provided I do not lose the floor. May I yield for that purpose?

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator from Florida be kind enough to tell us what the request is?

Mr. HATCH. May I yield for that purpose, without losing the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may yield for the purpose of having the Senator from Florida state what the unanimous-consent request is. At that point the Chair will decide what the position of the Senator from New Mexico will be from then on.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Mexico. This is the situation. We have as a visitor today, a man who has just recently called on the President of the Senate, a member of the Senate of the Republic of Colombia. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and I on separate occasions had the honor to visit the Senate of Colombia, and this fellow senator has come to honor our body. Under our rules he has the privileges of the Senate floor. I merely want to rise in the Senate and state that we are happy to have him here, and allow the Senator from Rhode Island the same privilege. The Senator from Colombia does not expect to address the Senate, but we desire to accord honor to our visitor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I join in the unanimous-consent request of the Senator, upon the condition that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Reserving the right to object, I think it will be very enlightening for the Senator from Colombia to see the kind of procedure being followed in the Senate of the United States at this time. I have no objection.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from Colombia is at the door at this moment, and the Senator from Florida is about to welcome him.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before our visitor arrives?

Mr. HATCH. If I may do so without losing the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. How long does the Senator from New Mexico expect to hold the floor?

Mr. HATCH. I do not know. There are many things I want to say, and I am in no hurry about adjourning and going home, either.

Mr. LUCAS. I had hoped the Senator might give us some information about the matter, because there are important legislative matters to be taken up.

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF HON. H. S. PARMENIO CÁRDENAS, A SENATOR OF THE REPUBLIC OF COLOMBIA

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate stand in informal recess to welcome a distinguished visitor, H. S. Parmenio Cárdenas, a Senator of the Republic of Colombia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senate will now stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate being in recess, at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m. H. S. Parmenio Cárdenas, a Senator of the Republic of Colombia, escorted by Senator GREEN and Senator PEPPER, entered the Chamber and took the place assigned him in the well of the Senate, where he was introduced individually to the Members of the Senate.

At 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m. the Senate reassembled, when it was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. KNOWLAND) in the chair.

INSTITUTIONAL ON-FARM TRAINING FOR VETERANS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if we may have order, I should like to propound a unanimous-consent request to which Senators may listen. I should like to have a little bit of order and a little bit of listening——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from New Mexico is about to propound a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it is immaterial that the Senator from Ohio is not interested. I merely wanted to join in the unanimous-consent request that he made a while ago, upon this one condition, that I be recognized after the measure he mentioned has been completed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object to that.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, under those circumstances, of course, necessarily I must proceed. But I want the RECORD to show and I want the country to know, too, that I am perfectly willing to yield for the transaction of necessary business. I should be glad to yield to have taken up and disposed of veterans' legislation. The only thing I ask is that I be recognized when it is over. To that request, the Senator from Ohio objects—or does he?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think I objected. I do not know how often I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's objection was heard.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the record is written. May it so stand. But, Mr. President, I regard as unnecessary and uncalled for the situation in the Senate in which the effort is made to compel Senators to do things, to try to force them against their will. I shall be courteous, Mr. President, to those who are courteous to me. If discourtesy is shown to me, I regret to say that I shall be human enough to reply in kind.

Mr. President, I renew my request that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of veterans' legislation, and that at its conclusion I shall be recognized to address the Senate upon such subjects as I may care to discuss.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, do I have the floor?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have not yielded the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to state the parliamentary situation. The Senator from New Mexico a few moments ago made a unanimous-consent request, to which objection was made. As the Chair understands, the Senator from New Mexico is now repeating what in effect is his unanimous-consent request, because due to the parliamentary situation the only way by which the purpose to which the Senator alludes could be effectuated is by unanimous consent of the Senate. Since the Senator has requested unanimous consent, the Chair must determine whether unanimous consent will be granted.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I withdraw my request.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request of the Senator from New Mexico is withdrawn.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I wish to make a suggestion to him.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if I can yield and not lose the floor, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. I agree to that condition, so far as I am concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that may be done.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, yesterday when the Senator from New Jersey sought consideration for his bill, there was some discussion. I told the Senator then, as I feel now, that if he would confine his bill to the investigation provided for at the end of the bill, section 10, it would be entirely agreeable to me. For some reason, the Chair ruled that the resolution then submitted by the Senator from New Jersey was not in order, and the resolution could not be taken up for immediate consideration, because of the unanimous-consent agreement then pending.

My position today is the same as it was yesterday. It seems to me that the cart has been put before the horse—to pass the bill, and then provide in section 10 for a commission to ascertain about it. If we are to have a commission to find out about it, let us have the commission first, and then we can write the kind of bill which the commission thinks should be written.

If the Senator from New Mexico would be satisfied with such a resolution, I do not think there would be objection, though I do not know. I would certainly have no objection. I think the resolution could be adopted at once, if that would be a suggested solution of the problem.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I should not be satisfied with that resolution. I think the bill should pass. But, Mr. President, I am a practical man. I know something of the situation with which we are confronted. I am trying to get results. I am not merely talking for the sake of talking. As a matter of fact, the resolution to which the Senator refers was largely my own work; it was my resolution; and I think it should be adopted, whether the bill is passed or not; and because I believe in it, I am not going to assume a dog-in-the-manger attitude. If the Senator is willing now to agree to the resolution offered by the Senator from New Jersey, if I may ask unanimous consent that the resolution now be called up and acted upon, and that I not lose the floor by such request, I shall be glad to propound it. May I make the request upon those conditions?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, what was the proposal?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico suggests that if the resolution submitted by the Senator from New Jersey relative to an investigation of a matter in which the Senator is interested, relating to overseas broadcasts, and so forth, can be taken up now without jeopardizing the Senator's rights on the floor, he would certainly be willing to have it taken up at this time.

Mr. HATCH. Reserving the right to object, I will say to the distinguished Senator that if the resolution is adopted, I shall have no desire to continue my present discussion.

Mr. TAFT. Would the Senator be satisfied then that we may proceed with, so to speak, the general plan that has been made?

Mr. HATCH. The Senator has asked me a question, which I must answer truthfully and frankly. Even though the resolution should be adopted, if I had the opportunity, if I could be recognized to move to consider the original bill, I should do so. I shall not filibuster on that question.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object, then, to the request.

Mr. HATCH. I am sorry, Mr. President. I have tried to reach an agreement. I thought I made myself perfectly clear.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. HATCH. I cannot yield except for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator if it would interrupt his remarks if I should hand to him a list of the regular appropriation bills passed at this session of the Congress, showing the amount recommended by the budget, the amount passed by the House, the amount finally passed by the Congress, and the net reductions or increases in each bill, with the amount of the reduction in expenditures, for this session of

the Congress, in the appropriations as sent down by the budget department.

Mr. HATCH. No; it would not interrupt me. It would probably change my train of thought; and I have a definite train of thought, Mr. President. I should like to discuss the particular resolution to which reference has been made, and I should like to discuss the evidence before the committee of the House and before the Senate committee, as to the meaning of the bill itself to the country.

I should like to, and I shall if I am compelled to, Mr. President, take up, witness by witness, the testimony which has been given, to show to the Senate how important this measure is and how wrong it is for the Congress to adjourn and go home without taking action on it. Those words are beginning to have a significance for me and a connotation which I do not like, because I realize that the bills on the Senate calendar, while considerable in number, are not nearly so numerous as the bills which remain in the various committees of the Senate. In the Committee on Public Lands, of which I am a member, there are many bills which have not yet been acted upon and will not be acted upon if we adjourn on Saturday and go home and leave our work unfinished and undone.

Mr. President, I have talked about this subject before, but I am very earnest in what I say, that there is not a businessman in the country, conducting a large or small business, who would lock his doors and go home for 5 or 6 months' vacation. After all, Mr. President, the business of Congress is business. I, for one, happen to believe that it is my business. I, for one, believe that the duties we discharge here day by day are of far greater significance perhaps than any of us realize.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a suggestion?

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator could frame the suggestion in the form of a question so I would not lose the floor I should be delighted to yield to my colleague, who has worked so hard on this proposal, I may say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico yields for a question.

Mr. SMITH. May I put a preamble to my question by saying that I want to express to my colleague my appreciation of the work we did together on the bill, and my intense interest in the bill. But in the interest of making progress now, I am going to ask the Senator from New Mexico if it is possible for us to bring up immediately, by unanimous consent, Senate Concurrent Resolution 29, which is the resolution the Senator from New Mexico himself originally drafted, and which was previously section 10 of the bill we are discussing; and whether if we can have that resolution adopted the Senator from New Mexico will be willing to yield the floor in order that we may proceed with our program?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from New Jersey if he believes the adoption of the resolution by the Senate today would meet with the concurrence of the House? Has the Senator spoken with any Members of the House on the subject?

Mr. SMITH. I may say to the Senator that I talked with the author of the Mundt bill, and of course while he and I both would like to see the measure acted upon at this session, I think the author of the bill, Representative MUNDT himself, feels that if we can have the resolution adopted, so the investigation can be made this summer, our bill still will be on the calendar and can be brought up, if we want to have it considered on the opening day of the session in January, and we can receive a report, favorable or unfavorable, from the committee which would go to Europe to study the matter without at all abandoning the proposal in which we are so much interested. I do not want to misquote Representative MUNDT, but I believe he would agree with me that that would be the wisest course to pursue.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in the light of what the Senator from New Jersey has said, I now ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 29. To the distinguished Senator from Ohio I will say that I shall make no conditions to that request as to my regaining the floor. If necessary I will take my own chances on securing the floor. I make that request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 29?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, would the distinguished Senator from New Mexico agree to a time limitation under which the resolution might be discussed?

Mr. HATCH. I do not think it needs any discussion. Simply call it up, and it will speak for itself. Let the Senator from New Jersey read it.

Mr. WHERRY. And adopt it without any debate?

Mr. HATCH. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I very much hope that the suggestion made by the Senator from New Jersey will have the prompt approval of the Senate. I happen to be one of those who did not look with favor, and who does not look with favor now, on the bill as a whole, but I can wholeheartedly support the appointment of a committee and the study of all the problems involved. I very much hope the resolution will be promptly adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to call attention to the fact that since July 17 the pending business has been the motion of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 150, to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from further consideration of Senate Resolution 116. That has been the pending business since July 17. I am at a loss to understand why, under the present circumstances, a request should come from the other side of the aisle for unanimous consent to take up another matter ahead of that matter which is now pending before the Senate, and until and unless some fair and equitable arrangement is made for a vote on my resolution, I propose to object to any request for a unanimous consent coming from any of the gentlemen who have participated directly or indirectly in the filibuster against the motion of the Senator from Nebraska to have my resolution considered.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President——

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have not yielded the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection has been heard.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I will say——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator permit the Presiding Officer to state the parliamentary situation? The Senator from New Mexico has not lost his right to the floor. The Chair is trying to protect him in his right. But the Senate should proceed in an orderly fashion. The Chair understands that the Senator from New Mexico temporarily permitted this discussion to take place to see if we could not arrive at a unanimous-consent arrangement, and the Chair feels that, as a matter of good faith, the Senator from New Mexico is still entitled to the floor if that arrangement cannot be worked out.

The Chair understands that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] has objected to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from New Mexico. Objection having been heard, the situation returns to the state in which it was prior to the discussion which has just taken place.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not true that when a unanimous-consent request is submitted and an objection is then made, the Senator necessarily loses the floor, and that therefore the Senator from New Mexico has spoken four or five times on the same subject, which is the so-called Kem resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say that we have been proceeding on a basis whereby the Senator from New Mexico has not been willing to yield, except for the purpose of answering questions. At the request of the Senator from New Jersey an attempt was made to secure a unanimous-consent agreement. It was the Chair's understanding that the Senator from New Mexico would not have yielded for that purpose except with the express understanding that his position on the floor would not be jeopardized. For that reason the Chair will rule that, objection having been made, under the conditions as stated, the Senator from New Mexico now has the floor, and is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. Not now. I wish to make an observation or two.

The ruling of the Chair is the kind, fair sort of ruling which I would expect from the Senator from California.

But the objection that I had lost the floor when I was trying to be courteous, when I was trying to be fair, is not fair, and is not just. It does not do the Senator from Ohio credit.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. No; I will not yield, because the Senator will object and say that I have lost the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Not at all.

Mr. HATCH. No; I will not yield, and I do not yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to say that I did not object.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not yield. The Senator from Ohio is violating the rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield. The Senator from New Mexico will proceed.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I should like to have some definite understanding. For the first time in the history of the United States Senate, I venture to say, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] has said that he would not agree to a unanimous-consent request because it came from the other side of the aisle.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President——

Mr. HATCH. I do not yield; but I heard the Senator from Missouri——

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I wish to say——

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico declines to yield.

Mr. HATCH. The question as to whether a unanimous-consent request should be agreed to——

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico declines to yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HATCH. I do not yield for any purpose.

Mr. President, the question in this body always ought to be, when a request is proposed, Is it a fair request? Is it a reasonable request? and not whether it comes from a Republican or a Democrat.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. But, Mr. President, I bow to the powers that be. I bow to majority which controls this body. I now wish to propose a unanimous-consent agreement, first, that I do not lose the flood by so doing.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] may be recognized in order that he may propound a unanimous-consent request, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a question from the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HATCH. Yes; I yield for a question only.

Mr. KEM. Did the Senator from New Mexico correctly understand me when I said that I would not agree to a unanimous-consent request coming from any Senator who participated directly or indirectly in the filibuster against the pending business, in which I am interested?

Mr. HATCH. I did not so understand the Senator. I am sorry if I misunderstood him.

But, Mr. President, I have the floor, and I think the implication of the Senator from Missouri was perfectly plain. Earlier in the day when he propounded his request I said, not once, but twice, that I would not object to it.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. No; I do not yield.

Then, for some strange reason known best to himself, the Senator from Missouri objected to my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. President, I want my unanimous-consent request submitted to the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Jersey may propound a unanimous-consent request without my losing the floor by reason of extending to him the courtesy of making the request.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We have a parliamentary situation in which the interest of the public business should be facilitated as much as possible. It is difficult for the Chair, unless sufficient time is given to the Chair, to state the parliamentary situation or the requests.

The request has been made by the Senator from New Mexico for unanimous consent that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] may be permitted temporarily to displace the unfinished business with his resolution.

At this point the Chair recognizes the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] to see whether he wishes to make an objection to the request. The position of the Senator from New Mexico has not been jeopardized up to this point.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that no Member of this body has a higher regard for the Senator from New Jersey than I have. It is difficult to decline any request which he makes. However, when he acts for and on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico it is necessary to apply the maxim facit per alium facit per se.

It is clear that the request is made by the Senator from New Jersey at the request of the Senator from New Mexico. I previously objected to the request of the Senator from New Mexico, and I now object to the request of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

Mr. KEM. In order that the Senator from New Mexico may understand why I am objecting, let me tell him again. He previously stated that it was for some strange reason known only to myself. Let me say to the Senator from New Jersey that the reason I am objecting to his request is that it comes from a Senator who participated in the filibuster and is now participating in the filibuster against the unfinished business.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have another idea. I am still trying to expedite the business of the Senate.

Mr. BALDWIN and Mr. SMITH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Connecticut for a question?

Mr. HATCH. No; I yield only to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from New Mexico if he will yield the floor to me for the purpose of——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair say that so long as the Senator from New Mexico has the floor the Senator from New Mexico is entitled to yield for a question, or to yield provided he can obtain unanimous consent to do so without jeopardizing his position. The Chair wishes to state that so long as the present occupant of the chair occupies that position, once the Senator from New Mexico takes his seat, the Chair understands that his duty as presiding officer is to recognize such Senator as he believes to be entitled to the floor under the rules of the Senate. The Chair will not bind himself to recognize any particular Senator. That will have to rest in the judgment of the Chair.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I regret very much the situation which prevails. I should be very happy to agree with my friends on the other side to any plan that can be devised for taking up the concurrent resolution and passing it. I have made every conceivable gesture I know how to make, and I do not know what to do under the circumstances except to continue to hold the floor.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HATCH. I should be glad to yield to the Senator from New Jersey. I should be delighted to have him present the concurrent resolution for consideration and strike my name from it. I should be glad to have him present it in his own right if that could be done by my yielding to him; but the situation is such that I simply cannot do it. I know that the Presiding Officer cannot give any advance information that he will recognize the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HATCH. No; I cannot yield. I think I have been just as courteous and kind as I could have been.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair respectfully suggests that if the Senator should decide to yield the floor, he might leave it to the discretion of the Presiding Officer as to who should be recognized at that point.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have never had too much trouble with presiding officers, whether the President pro tempore or someone else. I have found that inherent within them is the element of decency and fair dealing which can always be trusted.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. Before presenting the concurrent resolution, let me say to the Senator from Missouri that I originally submitted the concurrent resolution yesterday. It was my resolution, and I invited the Senator from New Mexico to join me in sponsoring it. I submitted it for myself, as one of the proponents of the bill to which reference has been made. I want to see the concurrent resolution passed in order to have the investigation continued during the adjournment.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 29, and ask that it be passed by unanimous consent, if that can be done.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 29. Is there objection?

Mr. KEM. Mr. President——

Mr. BALDWIN. Reserving the right to object, let me say that I am deeply interested in the Mundt resolution. I believe that we must take some such action as is suggested in that resolution. Whether this particular measure is a correct one I am not now prepared to say. But I do say this, Mr. President, that there are on the calendar matters of great importance to the whole country. There is on the calendar a resolution calling for a study and examination of consumer prices, in order that we might do something to stop the inflationary trend of prices of the things which people eat, wear, and use in their homes. There is on the calendar a bill which deals with the matter of housing. There is a bill which deals with the whole system of promotions for the Army and Navy, which is designed to integrate a program of promotion into law so that we may have a sound measure for the promotion of our officers in the Army and the Navy. That is vitally important, because they need to be assured of their future. There is a bill giving a widowed mother of a veteran lost in the war equal status with veterans' widows under the civil service in which the Senator from Maryland and I are interested—

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SMITH. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has the floor. He asked for unanimous consent to consider Senate Concurrent Resolution 29 and temporarily lay aside the pending business. The Senator from Connecicut objected to that and is now, as the Chair understands it, giving his explanation for his objection.

Mr. SMITH. He reserved the right to object. I would like to say to the Senator from Connecticut that I am perfectly willing to limit debate on the resolution to 15 or 20 minutes.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, if by the process of seizing the floor and threatening to hold it indefinitely a Senator can delay business of great importance to this Nation, in order to get a vote on his bill, then every other Senator in this body is entitled to exercise the same privilege; and the result will be utter confusion. Under the rules of the Senate there is provision for a policy committee which, Mr. President, is charged with the job of organizing the procedure of the business of the Senate. Otherwise we would get nowhere. The policy committee, through its chairman, has announced the procedure which we are trying to follow in order that we may adjourn on the day set. I object, Mr. President, to this method of seizing the floor and holding up business indefinitely. This is a method which can be used to advance a bill in which a Senator may be particularly interested. I say that, Mr. President, because there are pending before the Senate matters of very grave importance, at least as important as is the resolution in which the distinguished Senator from New Jersey is interested and the bill in which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico is interested.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I ask unanimous consent that the rules be suspended and that Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 29 be placed at the end of today's calendar, where it will be reached when the calendar is called. We fully intend to call the calendar before we adjourn today.

Mr. HATCH. Reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has the floor. He yielded it temporarily to the Senator from Ohio who offered a unanimous-consent request that Senate Concurrent Resolution 29 be placed at the end of the calendar, where it will be called when the calendar is called today. As the Chair understands, the Senator from New Mexico has reserved the right to object to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Preliminary to an objection, I want to say that the words of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] are entirely uncalled for. The Reorganization Act does not create a policy committee to dictate to and run the Senate of the United States. When the Senate assumes that it has to bow down, there will not be any business conducted. That is not my attitude. I have tried my best to get any kind of an agreement I could get. I think the suggestion which was made by the Senator from Ohio is a very good one. I shall not object to it. I hope it may be agreed to. I hope the concurrent resolution may go to the end of the calendar, as he has said, and then before the day is over we may at least discuss it. I join with the Senator from Ohio in the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LODGE. Reserving the right to object, I should like to take advantage of the opportunity to ask the Senator from Ohio what prospect there is that we will get to the bills to which the able Senator from Connecticut referred as being so important?

Mr. TAFT. I think there is every prospect, may I say to the Senator, if we can proceed. There is an agreement for a time limitation on two veterans' bills. The sugar bill, which is of present importance, will not take very long. The Senator from West Virginia tells me that his resolution which follows will not take more than an hour. He will yield, and the calendar will then be called. That should certainly be within less than 3 hours, I should think.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to say to the Senator from Ohio that he has not included in his enumeration any one of the three bills which I consider to be very important. I refer to the investigation of the high cost of living——

Mr. TAFT. Those bills are on the calendar and are to be called. I hope they will go through. If they do not, I shall be glad to move to take them up.

Mr. LODGE. I refer to the study of the high cost of living, the study of what is the matter with the housing situation, and the bill to remove the deadwood from the Regular Army, without doing which we cannot in good conscience ask the mothers of America to let their sons go into the service. There are a lot of dodos that have to be weeded out.

Mr. TAFT. Those bills are on the calendar, and we have every intention of calling them. We hope that they will go through promptly.

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection.

Mr. SMITH. The understanding is now that the resolution for which I asked consideration will go at the end of the calendar and will be reached some time today?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. I have no objection.

Mr. TAFT. I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 610, House bill 2181, and that the debate on the bill be limited to 30 minutes, the time to be equally divided between the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. LODGE. I object. The bill is utterly discriminatory to Massachusetts and Illinois, and, I think, possibly to Wisconsin.

Mr. TAFT. I did not propose the bill myself, but the committee agreed to put it on the calendar. It was my purpose to vote to recommit it to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with instructions to make a thorough study of all on-the-job training. The Senator is also free to move to amend the bill.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, does the Senator intend to move to recommit the bill?

Mr. TAFT. That is my motion; but, of course, the Senator from Oregon will oppose it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I object. This is a very discriminatory measure, as it stands; and I object to having it taken up.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the pending business be postponed until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me say that the purpose of my motion is to remove the unanimous-consent requirement, so that we may take up bills on motion, in the order which I have indicated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio that the pending business be postponed until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles, and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar as indicated:

H. R. 4326. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 245. Joint resolution amending Public Law 27, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4140. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

INSTITUTIONAL ON-FARM TRAINING FOR VETERANS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2181, Calendar No. 610.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, that motion is debatable; is it not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. LODGE. I intend to discuss it.

Mr. President, I wish to say at the outset that I am in favor of the objectives of this bill. I believe that on-the-farm training is a most desirable thing. But I say so, having in mind the very happy and successful experience which we have had with it in Massachusetts.

So I say that on-the-farm training is a very desirable activity. It is one which has been conducted with success and benefit to young men in my State and in a great many other States, and I definitely believe that this institutional on-the-farm training program should be recognized in all parts of the country as a full-time training program. But I definitely do not agree that House bill 2181, to which we have arrived now by a rather peculiar series of motions, is the answer to this problem.

The part of the bill to which I vigorously object is section 4 (c), which requires organized group instruction in agricultural and related subjects of at least 200 hours per year at an educational or training institution, before the on-the-farm training can qualify under this bill. In other words, this bill makes the mistake which, unhappily, so often is made here: it completely ignores the man who is engaged in urbanized agriculture.

Millions of people are engaged in urbanized agriculture. The amount of compensation which they would receive under this bill, as compared with that received by other persons in agriculture, is a very sorry thing. In Massachusetts, and perhaps in various other States, for some time we have had a real on-the-farm program. A large number of veterans engaged in this program are employed in agricultural work, rather than on their own farms. There is the point to be remembered. The man who works, let us say, for the Carnation Milk Co. or for the Deerfoot Co., a company in my own State which makes sausage, is engaged in agriculture, but not in the same way that a man who owns his own farm is engaged in agriculture. The difference is that the time of the man in the first-mentioned group is not his own. These people, working, as they are, under the Massachusetts program, must spend at least 48 hours a week on operational, skilled training on the farm, even though that means a total of 50 or 60 hours a week or more. These veterans could not possibly hope to meet the requirement for 200 hours of instruction at some institution, which this bill imposes as a minimum requirement.

It seems to me, and I am sure it will seem to you, Mr. President, and to anyone else who stops to consider the bill candidly, that it is utterly unrealistic to suppose that a veteran could reasonably expect to go somewhere for 200 hours a year, and also continue in a job on a farm at the same time. His job would suffer very materially. If that much time is taken out of a man's job, the job will not amount to anything. Even if the job were not completely destroyed, although in most cases I think it would be, it certainly would not be a real job; it would be just part time.

Mr. President, I am reliably informed that the enactment of this bill would mean that at least 75 percent of the veterans engaged in the program in Massachusetts would be dropped out. I certainly cannot subscribe to a measure which will have such an effect.

A moment ago I referred to Illinois. I have before me a letter from Mr. J. E. Hill, who is the State supervisor of the agricultural education program at Springfield, Mass. Mr. Hill writes under date of July 17, 1947, as follows:

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
VERNON D. NICKELL, EXECUTIVE OFFICER,
BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION,
Springfield, July 17, 1947.

I have your letter of July 10 giving additional information concerning the status of H. R. 2181. I sincerely hope that H. R. 2181 as originally submitted does not pass. The Lodge amendment—

That is the amendment which I submitted this winter, to take care of the situation—

would change the bill so that it would be completely satisfactory to Illinois. H. R. 2181 without the Lodge amendment—

Mr. President, note this carefully—

would completely disrupt our program and reduce our enrollment from some 15,000 to 7,000 or less.

Assuring you that I appreciate your efforts in helping solve this problem satisfactorily, I remain,

Yours very truly,

J. E. HILL,
State Supervisor, Agricultural Education.

Mr. President, it would be unreasonable to expect me to support legislation which would have that effect in my State, and which I believe would have a similar effect in other States. I feel that there is a good proposition here, but that the bill is half-baked, has not been thought through or fully analyzed or carefully drafted.

The bill seeks to impose rigid bureaucratic standards on the States, and it seeks to put the farm boy into a bed of Procrustes, to stretch him out if he is too short for it, or to jam him in if he is too long for it—all in the name of uniform standards, if you please.

I was astounded to hear the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] say last night that the States are not measuring up to the minimum standards. I think that statement creates a very false impression. The point is that the standards are different—not that the standards are better. The standards set forth in this bill are different.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. What I meant to say was that so far as I was concerned I had no objection to any amendment. I did express the hope that it would not lower the minimum standards which were fixed in the bill. They may not be very high, as it is. I do not know that I have the slightest objection to the Senator's amendment.

Mr. LODGE. I very much appreciate the Senator's statement. It is characteristic of the Senator from Georgia to make it. It may be that I misunderstood. I thought I heard him say last night that the States which could not come in under the program were not up to the standards of the law, and I do not believe that is the case at all.

Mr. President, I will make my point clear by giving some examples. Let us take the case of veteran Jones. He works, let us suppose, on one of the large commercial dairy farms, such as Carnation Milk or Deerfoot Farms in my own State. He wants to start in and learn the dairy business on that farm from the bottom to the top. They start him out in the feed department, and he works a minimum of 48 hours a week, and probably from 56 to 60 hours in all. This bill would require him, in addition, to participate in 200 hours of classroom instruction at some school.

A man can take on just so much work and no more. He needs a little time to himself for rest and recreation. So veteran Jones quite rightly feels that he ought to be treated the same way as his friend veteran Smith, who is taking on-the-job training in, let us suppose, a Ford agency, is treated. The Ford agency is not obliged to say to veteran Smith: "All right, you want to prepare yourself to be in the Ford agency business. We will put you out on the floor and we will start you in with a grease job, and from there on we will move you on up to the

mechanical department, but, Mr. Smith, you will have to attend, in addition, at least 200 hours a year in addition to your full day here in classroom work at the school in the next town." Veteran Smith learns his job on the job—that is why these benefits are called on-the-job-training benefits.

The GI bill has entirely different prerequisites for veterans who desire formal schooling. A man can go to an agricultural school, under this bill, if that is the way he wants to learn how to be a farmer. But most educators agree that the best way to learn the ins and outs of farming is to learn it on the farm and not in a classroom. In my opinion, it is something of a joke to call this bill on-farm-training bill, when it requires—and I want to stress this—something which no other type of on-the-job training requires, namely, a minimum of 200 hours of classroom instruction.

I do not say that a certain amount of classroom instruction may not be wholly desirable in certain allied agricultural subjects. I do not want to take the time to go into that right now, but I would be the first to realize that it is probably more effective to teach certain subjects in the classroom rather than on the farm. I want to be reasonable about this. What I object to is for us to say in this bill: "You must have 200 hours of classroom instruction or else you can't qualify for these benefits." That is bureaucracy, rigidity, at its worst. The varying situations in different States may call for entirely different approaches. In some States or in some communities it may be perfectly feasible to have 200 hours of assembled, classroom instruction. In other States, the training program may call for only 100 hours, or 50 hours, or 10 hours. I do not think it possible to make a hard and fast rule about a subject like this, but that is precisely what this bill seeks to do. And if it would spell certain disaster to the Massachusetts program, as I am told it would, I wonder what effect it would have in such States as Wyoming, or Montana, or Texas, or Georgia, where the distances from farm to classroom are double and triple what they are in the East. The answer seems perfectly clear to me: There just will not be any veterans enrolling in on-farm training, and accordingly the activity will be wasted.

From the very moment that H. R. 2181 was introduced in the Senate, I have been trying to find a solution to this problem. As I said earlier, I favor the objectives of the bill, and I want to see it passed in such a form that it not only can be made realistic and workable, but also in such a form that it will not ruin programs which have operated successfully and effectively to date in my own State of Massachusetts and in several other States.

Therefore, I offered an amendment to the bill which would have solved this difficulty. It simply provided that where it is discovered that a variation in the proportion of hours of assembled instruction and individual instruction will better serve the conditions within a given area, any program mutually agreeable to the regional office of the Veterans' Administration and the responsible State authority which substantially meets the total number of training hours called for in the act shall be recognized as complying with the requirements of the act. In other words, the amendment provided the flexibility in this matter of classroom work which those who have had practical experience with that type of farm training believed necessary. My amendment did not disturb the total hours or any other provision of the bill. All it sought to do was to loosen the entirely too rigid provisions regarding the proportion of hours of assembled instruction and individual instruction.

By requiring the approval of the regional office of the Veterans' Administration and the State approving agency, my amendment safeguards the program against the certification of any spurious or illusory programs. So nobody can make that objection.

For reasons unknown to me, the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reported the bill without my amendment, although full hearings were held on it and, I understand, the chairman of the subcommittee, the able junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] expressed himself as being wholly satisfied that the amendment was proper and necessary, and he helped it along.

However, since the bill was reported without what I consider to be an absolutely vital provision, I am forced to register my objection to the entire bill. I feel in this case it is certainly better to have no legislation at all than have such a bill as H. R. 2181 on the books.

Mr. President, I have here the testimony in the hearing before the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Mr. Harold A. Mostrom, of Massachusetts, who is a great authority on on-the-farm training, the director of the Essex County Agricultural School, in Athol, Mass., testified. I should like to read a few excerpts from what he said:

> Mr. MOSTROM. Well, without any amendment, we believe that because the program calls for 200 hours of assembled instruction, that the great majority of our veteran students would have to drop out of the program, because a large portion of those in training are engaged in employed agricultural work rather than on their own farms. Their time is not their own, and because they are working under our program of a minimum of 48 hours a week on operational skilled training on the farm, and for most of them that means 50 or 60 hours a week or more, they feel that they could not possibly meet a requirement that called for them to be off the farm a total of 200 hours during the year.

Mr. President, I could proceed and talk about this for 4 or 5 hours, in fact, I could probably talk about it for 15 or 16 hours. I do not want to say I could beat the record in the Senate for length of time, but I feel I could at least equal it. But I am not going to do that. I have made just a brief statement of the facts in the case, and I hope that the motion which has been made by the Senator from Ohio will not prevail. If it does prevail, then I shall offer the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have a vote on the motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2181, relating to institutional on-farm training for veterans.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the Senator understand there is a time limitation upon the debate in the agreement?

Mr. TAFT. Such a request is agreeable to the Senators who are interested but other Senators may object. I cannot agree for them. Senators interested in the bill have agreed to such a limitation.

Mr. LODGE. I am interested. The Senator did not speak for me?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Massachusetts is interested. I cannot speak for him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio to consider calendar 610, House bill 2181, an act relating to institution on-farm training for veterans. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" appear to have it.

Mr. LODGE. I ask for a division.

On a division, the motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2181) relating to institutional on-farm training for veterans, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments, on page 2, lines 16 and 17, to strike out "Administrator, which when taken as a full time course," and insert "Administrator. Such course shall be considered a full-time course when it"; and on page 4, line 25, after the word "found", to insert "by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs or the State approving agency."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with instructions to make a thorough study of all on-the-job and on-the-farm training. I propose to make the same motion with regard to the next bill, which deals with on-the-job training. Mr. President, I make that motion simply in order that it may be before the Senate. It is debatable.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, may I make an inquiry of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Was consent given to limited debate?

Mr. TAFT. I want to make the motion, first——

Mr. GEORGE. I merely want to state that I have no objection to a limitation on debate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the motion be limited to 15 minutes on each side, the time to be controlled by the Senator from Oregon and myself. I shall be glad to yield the most of my time to the Senator from Massachusetts, if he wishes to take it, in connection with his amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the bill, and I want to

have sufficient time to explain it and the reasons for it. In light of past experience, 15 minutes does not go very far—a Senator yields to someone, who immediately is off to the races, and the 15 minutes is gone.

Mr. TAFT. I confine my unanimous consent request to action on the motion to refer. If that motion is defeated, then the Senator may proceed to offer his amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I discussed at some length this measure last night, and I do not care to repeat what I then said. The Senator from Oregon, in charge of the bill, will have full control of it. I of course express the hope that the bill will not be recommitted.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1948

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, is it in order for me to take about 2 minutes to read a short statement?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Do I have the floor?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I withhold my request until the Senator from Maryland makes a short statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wish to put in the RECORD a short statement.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Do I have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In answer to the question propounded by the junior Senator from Oregon——

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to say to the Senator from Oregon that I shall not take more than 2 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. I understand that.

Mr. TAFT. I propounded a unanimous consent request which has not been acted on. I suggested I would withhold that until the Senator from Maryland presented a short statement.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator propounds the request, I have no objection to his doing so in my time; but I think the record is that I have the floor. I was recognized by the Chair, and I have not yielded the floor. I permitted the Senator from Ohio to proceed, and I should have no objection to permitting the Senator from Maryland to proceed. The parliamentary inquiry I desire to raise is, Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. First, however, is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. TAFT. I withhold the request until the Senator's statement has been made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. In order to keep the Senator in position where he will not lose the floor, I would like to ask him if he knows that the figures I am about to give have been prepared by the experts of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and show the name of the appropriation bill, the amount of the budget request for each appropriation bill, the amount of the bill as it passed the House, and the amount of the bill as it passed the Congress, or the Senate, in the event that it has not reached the President, and the net saving on each bill. Let me say on the 14 regular appropriation bills, the reduction below the Budget Bureau's estimates, according to the figures of the Senate Appropriations Committee, are as follows:

The Treasury-Post Office bill, $882,614,100; Labor-Federal Security bill, $105,455,000; the hoof-and-mouth disease appropriations, nothing; Interior Department appropriation bill, $102,135,000; State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill, the amount of reduction is $147,613,000; the Navy appropriation bill, $244,234,000; the agricultural appropriation bill, $190,141,000; the military establishment bill, $100,173,000; the government corporations appropriations bill, $18,391,000; the independent offices appropriation bill, $192,519,000; the legislative appropriation bill, $20,899,000; the War Department civil functions appropriation bill, an increase of $157,200,000; the District of Columbia appropriation bill, a reduction of $293,000; and the supplemental appropriation bill, $246,607,000, making a total reduction in government expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, of $2,093,000,000. That does not include the $800,000,000 of tax refunds, which were taken out of an appropriation bill, but the $800,000,000 in tax refunds was not a reduction in governmental expenditures, so that the net reduction in governmental expenditures for the fiscal year that has taken place was $1,293,875,000. The amount of money recommended by the Budget Bureau to the Congress on all these bills was $27,948,583,089. The amount of the bills, as they passed the Congress, was $25,854,708,081, leaving a net reduction in the House and Senate on the bills in question of $1,293,875,000.

I mentioned this only to bring out the point that that is the extent to which the Appropriations Committee in the House and in the Senate, and the House and the Senate thereafter, have reduced the recommendations of the Budget Bureau in cutting the expenditures of the Federal Government.

I should like to have this table printed in the RECORD in detail for all to see. It does not take into consideration, either, any deficiency appropriations which may be passed after we convene in January, nor does it take into consideration the $400,000,000 of authorization for the armed services only a few days ago, and has just recently passed, but for which appropriations will not be made, in part, until January; so that unless we have swollen revenues, as a result of increased prosperity in the country resulting from the present rates, it is not likely that we will have any surplus in the Treasury on June 30, 1948. However, if we continue to hold down expenses and if we continue to receive these abnormal revenues due to prosperity in the country, the prospect of a surplus will be rather bright. But as of the moment we face the fiscal year 1948 with only a reduction of $1,293,000,000 in the estimates of the Budget Bureau, or the Presidential estimates. I think the country should know that. I have been working with the staff of the Senate Appropriations Committee in preparing this table, which I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in detail in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Appropriations, fiscal year 1948

Bill	(1) Budget request	(2) House passed	(3) Passed Congress or Senate	Difference between Budget request and final action
Treasury-Post Office	$4,099,123,550	$3,202,050,750	$3,216,509,450	[1] $882,614,100
Labor-Federal Security	1,779,614,039	1,684,586,780	1,674,158,631	105,455,408
Hoof and mouth	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	
Interior	296,135,000	161,413,000	194,000,000	102,135,000
State-Justice-Commerce	698,786,000	538,976,000	551,175,000	147,613,000
Navy	3,513,000,000	3,135,481,000	3,268,766,000	244,234,000
Agriculture	805,141,000	572,172,000	615,000,000	190,141,000
Military Establishment	5,716,791,500	5,280,982,000	5,616,618,000	100,173,500
Government corporations	50,137,000	36,097,000	31,746,000	18,391,000
Independent offices	8,500,497,000	8,167,869,000	8,307,978,000	192,519,000
Legislative	76,153,000	54,895,000	55,254,000	20,899,000
War civil functions	382,727,000	339,186,000	539,927,000	[2] 157,200,000
District of Columbia	95,793,000	95,930,000	95,500,000	293,000
Supplemental	1,925,683,000	1,603,199,000	1,679,076,000	246,607,000
Total	27,948,583,089	24,942,837,530	25,854,708,081	2,093,875,008
Less tax-refund reduction				800,000,000
Actual reduction				1,293,875,008

[1] Includes $800,000,000 tax-refund reduction.
[2] Increase over President's original request.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills and joint resolutions of the Senate:

S. 609. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claims arising out of the deaths of Norman Ray Pedron and Carl Franklin Morris;

S. 1505. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Boise, Idaho, to the Boise Chamber of Commerce;

S. 1590. An act to amend the District of Columbia rent-control law so as to provide that schools and universities may recover possession of housing accommodations in certain cases;

S. 1633. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the national convention of the American Legion to be held in New York, N. Y., August 28 to 31, 1947, and the national convention of the Veterans of

Foreign Wars of the United States to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, September 4 to 9, 1947;

S. J. Res. 130. Joint resolution relating to safety in bituminous-coal and lignite mines of the United States; and

S. J. Res. 138. Joint resolution to provide for returns of Italian property in the United States, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 629) for the relief of A. E. McCartney and O. A. Foster; P. W. Woodyard and J. R. Mahon; B. E. Truitt, T. L. Truitt, and W. B. Lacy; G. W. Cox, J. M. Cox, and F. T. Cox; W. W. Cox and Dr. J. W. Cox; Robert Cathcart and Claude Cathcart.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4263) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, Mr. STEFAN, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. KEEFE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. KERR, and Mr. MAHON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1326) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, with an amendment; insisted upon its amendment; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HOPE, Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. FLANNAGAN, and Mr. COOLEY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1020) to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended with an amendment; insisted upon its amendment; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. VORYS, Mr. JUDD, Mr. FULTON, Mr. RICHARDS, and Mr. MANSFIELD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the following bill and joint resolution of the House:

H. R. 4069. An act to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II; and

H. J. Res. 238. Joint resolution to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3678) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 19, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, and 92 to the bill, and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 11, 16, 21, and 24, to the bill, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2389) for the relief of Harriett Townsend Bottomley; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. JENNINGS, Mr. SPRINGER, and Mr. FEIGHAN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 4263) making supplemental appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

AMENDMENT OF PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1946

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives, insisting upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1020) to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, agree to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. CORDON, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. MALONE, Mr. DOWNEY, and Mr. MCFARLAND conferees on the part of the Senate.

RELIEF OF ACCOUNTABLE OFFICERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1350) to authorize relief of accountable officers of the Government, and for other purposes, which were on page 1, line 11, strike out "for any reason whatsoever", and on page 2, strike out all after line 13, down to and including line 2, on page 3, and insert:

SEC. 2. This act shall not operate to repeal the provisions of the paragraph of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1919, relating to relief of disbursing officers of the Navy (41 Stat. 132; U. S. C., title 31, sec. 105), and the act entitled "An act to authorize relief of disbursing officers of the Army on account of loss or deficiency of Government funds, vouchers, records, or papers in their charge," approved December 13, 1944 (58 Stat. 800; U. S. C., title 31, sec. 95a).

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives, insisting upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1326) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, agree to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. STEWART conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN SECOND-CLASS MAILING PRIVILEGES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2857) to extend second-class mailing privileges to bulletins issued by State conservation and fish and game agencies or departments, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. LANGER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. LANGER, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. MCKELLAR conferees on the part of the Senate.

HARRIETT TOWNSEND BOTTOMLEY

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2389) for the relief of Harriett Townsend Bottomley, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WILEY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MOORE, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. KILGORE conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF HOUSING ACT OF 1937—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MCCARTHY submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1361) to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit loans, capital grants, or annual contributions for low-rent-housing and slum-clearance projects where construction costs exceed present cost limitations upon condition that local housing agencies pay the difference between cost limitations and the actual construction costs,

having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 2. The United States or any State or local public agency assisted by Federal funds made available with respect to housing shall continue to have the right to maintain an action or proceeding to recover possession of any housing accommodations (except as provided in the proviso of section 209 (b) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947) operated by it where such action or proceeding is authorized by the statute or regulations under which such accommodations are administered, but no such action or proceeding shall be maintained prior to March 1, 1948, if in the opinion of the administering authority such action or proceeding would result in undue hardship for the occupants of such housing accommodations, or unless in the opinion of such authority other housing facilities are available for such occupants."

And the House agree to the same.

JOE MCCARTHY,
J. WM. FULBRIGHT,
By J. M.,
JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
By J. M.,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
HENRY O. TALLE,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

CONTROL OF DANGEROUS WEAPONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KEM submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 493) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia, approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 edition), having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That section 4 of the act entitled 'An Act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia, to provide penalties, to prescribe rules of evidence, and for other purposes', approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 edition), be amended by changing the last period to a colon and adding the following language: '*Provided*, That arrests, without a warrant, and searches and seizures pursuant thereto, may be made for violation of this section, by police officers, as in the case of a felony, upon probable cause that the person arrested is violating this section at the time of the arrest; but no evidence discovered in the course of any arrest, search, or seizure authorized by this proviso shall be admissible in any criminal proceeding against the person arrested unless at the time of such arrest he was carrying a pistol or other dangerous weapon on or about his person.' "

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend section 4 of the Act entitled 'An Act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia, to provide penalties, to prescribe rules of evidence, and for other purposes', approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 edition)."

JAMES P. KEM,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOS. P. O'HARA,
JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
T. G. ABERNETHY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. KEM. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report. I call attention to the fact that the report was signed by all the conferees with the exception of the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I should like to be registered as voting against the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GURNEY submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3678) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 36.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 26, 27, 28, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,388,286,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$21,469,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,549,755,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,170,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$154,032,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$83,299,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$699,646,960"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$374,055,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$82,474,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$829,272,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$430,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$69,534,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$129,386,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$191,353,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$320,739,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$245,532,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$19,890,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$134,000,000" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$67,828,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$43,039,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 11, 16, 19, 21, 24, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, and 92.

CHAN GURNEY,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
CLYDE M. REED,
STYLES BRIDGES,
ELMER THOMAS,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
HARVE TIBBOTT,
EBERTT P. SCRIVNER,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
W. F. NORRELL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 3678, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
July 25, 1947.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 19, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, and 92 to the bill (H. R. 3678) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount named in said amendment insert "$5,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount named in said amendment insert "$2,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount named in said amendment insert "$2,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount named in said amendment insert "$15,000,000."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 11, 16, 21, and 24.

The motion was agreed to.

DEATH OF ROBERT J. WATT

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I wish to make an announcement before the limitation of debate becomes effective. I have just been informed that Mr. Robert J. Watt, who was the workers' delegate at the ILO, and who for the past many years has represented our country at international labor conferences, suddenly died on shipboard on the way back home. He was a friend of practically every Member of the United States Senate, and I know all Members of the Senate will be shocked, as I was shocked, to hear the news of the death of Mr. Watt.

When I left Geneva Mr. Watt apparently was in the best of health, and was carrying on in his usual splendid way and contributing much to the deliberations which took place there. He also contributed much to the establishment of good will between our country and other countries. He was the chairman of the labor group at the ILO Conference this year. That was a great honor bestowed upon him and upon America also.

I know Members of the Senate will be sad, as I am sad, at hearing this news.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say that the news just announced by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is indeed shocking to the junior Senator from Oregon. Bob Watt was one of my very close personal friends. I worked with him continuously for 2 years on the War Labor Board. He was a great labor statesman. Labor and employers and the public generally have suffered the loss of a great leadership so sorely needed in these critical times.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, we have just received the sad intelligence of the death of Mr. Watt. I wish to say that I was associated with him rather intimately in the United Nations when it had its organization meeting in London in January and February of 1946.

Mr. Watt was a man of fine personality. He was an outstanding labor representative. But he was more than that. He was a representative of all our people, with a broad grasp of public affairs, and he contributed much toward the successful meetings in London, in which I was intimately associated with him.

In the contest which took place there we were resisting the recognition of what was known as the WFTU, the World Federation of Trade Unions, which was largely communistic in its membership, and which included most of the communistic labor organizations of Europe. We successfully prevented its being recognized as a member of the United Nations Economic and Social Council.

At a later meeting in New York that organization was given limited and indirect representation, but Mr. Watt aided us effectively and resisted diligently and vigorously the aggressive tactics of that organization, communistic as it was in its nature.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am deeply shocked and personally grieved to hear the news of the death of Robert J. Watt. He was a citizen of Lawrence, Mass., and was the legislative representative of the American Federation of Labor at the State House in Boston at the time I was chairman of the house committee on labor and industry. I worked with him very closely. I came to know him very well. Never did a man work more diligently and more effectively to perform the duties assigned to him. Never was there a man who worked harder for what he believed to be the right, and he fought with skill.

Mr. Watt was a man of his word. Men could absolutely count on every statement he made. He was a constructive figure. He was a believer that the greatness of America fundamentally lies in American unity. For that reason he was peculiarly well fitted to represent the United States abroad at this time in world history when there are so many selfish people who are seeking to preach hatred between man and man.

He was a fine father, husband, and friend.

I last saw him a few months ago in the Foreign Relations Committee room before his departure for Europe, and he was in his usual state of good humor and confident optimism.

I mourn his passing, and I hope his family and those he left behind will derive the strength to which they are entitled from the thought of his life, so full of service to his fellow men.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I desire to add a brief word to what has been said by my colleague from Massachusetts respecting Robert J. Watt, who was a personal friend of mine for the last 24 years. I watched him steadily grow in stature. I saw him start as the legislative agent of the A. F. of L. council, become its secretary-treasurer, and then come to Washington, and later become a well-known international figure.

Mr. Watt was always friendly. I know how proud he was of his wife and his boy and his girl, and of the career his children have made for themselves with his help.

As a citizen of Massachusetts, engaged in politics and in government affairs, I have been personally helped by Robert J. Watt on many different occasions.

I have had many interesting arguments with him and have always regarded him to be a man of great intellectual capacity and integrity, and with a fine sense of humor.

I join with my colleague and other Senators in mourning his loss.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues in expressing sincere and deep regret at learning of the sudden passing of Robert J. Watt. I, like many other Senators here, have known Mr. Watt for many years. We all have had a very high respect and admiration for him because of his high integrity and well-known ability in representing the cause of organized labor, which he has served in this country with such signal success for many years. He was a man of great honor, a man of intense sincerity and integrity, and I feel that I have lost a sincere friend, and that labor has lost one of its ablest advocates in this country.

INSTITUTIONAL ON-FARM TRAINING FOR VETERANS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. May I renew the request?

The PRESIIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request submitted by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to limit debate on the motion of the Senator from Ohio to recommit House bill 2181 to 15 minutes for each side? The Chair hears none, and the request is granted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am sure that I can dispose of our side of this controversy in 15 minutes.

The first point I wish to make is that I am satisfied that if Members of the Senate will pause long enough to consider the merits of this particular bill they will oppose and vote against the motion of the Senator from Ohio. I shall vote against it because I know that the great majority of Members of the Senate do not want to follow a course of action in the Senate which discriminates unfairly and undeservedly against farm veterans. That is exactly what we are asked to do. It is the basic issue in this debate. I do not intend to let anyone get away from that issue.

If we do not take action on this matter I am satisfied, as the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] pointed out last night, that when we adjourn General Bradley will go back to the old arrangement under which the farm veterans will receive only part-time pay for on-the-job training.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry that I cannot yield. I have only 15 minues.

Mr. President, we cannot justify discriminating against the farm veterans, because the on-the-job-training program for the farm veterans is exactly as sound in all respects as is the on-the-job training for veterans working in industry, in filling stations, or in any other occupation which permits an on-the-job-training program.

In regard to the position taken by the Senator from Ohio, let me say this—and it is the only other thing I wish to say about his position, because I think it is such an untenable position that nothing further needs to be said than the two points which I make against it:

Everything the Senator from Ohio said last night in regard to the on-the-job-training program for farm veterans really goes to the entire question of whether we are to have an on-the-job-training program at all. If his position is to prevail, then what we ought to be doing is repealing the entire on-the-job-training program for veterans. I do not believe that the Senate is willing to do that.

Irrespective of what abuses developed in the on-the-job-training program prior to the Seventy-ninth Congress, I believe that we put in the necessary checks against those abuses, upon the recommendation and representation of General Bradley, in the closing days of the Seventy-ninth Congress. By the ceilings we imposed at that time we gave to General Bradley the checks which he needed. If Senators will read the testimony which he gave before our subcommittee, they will see that the action which we took in the Seventy-ninth Congress did check the great financial abuses which were developing under the on-the-job-training program for veterans before any ceiling was imposed. So I do not believe that we can justify this afternoon following the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio of discriminating against farm veterans because of his objections to the principle and policy of having an on-the-job-training program for veterans. If we are to have it—and there is no proposal to repeal it—then it ought to apply with equal justice to farm veterans as well as to city veterans.

Let me direct attention to some of the statements made by my good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I may say to him that, as chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill, I find myself in the position where my personal view in regard to his amendment is contrary to the action taken by the committee. I shall vote as I did in committee, for his amendment as offered; but as chairman of the subcommittee I must say to the Senator from Massachusetts that we considered his amendment carefully. We listened to farm education representatives from Massachusetts and Illinois. Personally I think they made a good case for themselves. But the committee directed that certain letters be sent out to agricultural educators and the deans of great schools of agriculture. They took the problem up with their faculties.

I do not wish to be held too closely to a statement of the exact number of letters, but my recollection is that we received 10 or 12 letters from the deans of agricultural colleges. The general view of those letters was that it would be unwise to adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts, because they felt that the effect of that amendment might be the lowering of standards. I do not believe that it would have that effect. Why do I not believe it? I do not believe it because I think the standards should rest with the State approving agency. It is up to the respective States to decide what the standards are to be and their record to date is one of maintaining very high standards.

I have confidence that our respective States will maintain a high standard of instruction, and I think so far as instruction of farm veterans is concerns, many times certain techniques can be better taught on the farm than they can be done in the classroom of some Smith-Hughes High School program. So I am perfectly willing, as an individual Senator, to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts. But I wish to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I think it would be an unfortunate mistake if, merely because we might not be able to pass his amendment—and I think we can pass his amendment if he will offer it—we were to sacrifice the whole program. I do not agree with the Senator from Massachusetts on one point, namely, that this program has not been worked out very carefully by the agricultural educators. After all, those educators have directed the development of the program.

The provisions in this bill as to the number of hours of instruction were worked out with General Bradley and his associates in the Veterans' Administration, after conferences and consultations with the agricultural educators of the country; and this is the program upon which they agree.

Mr. LODGE rose.

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry that I cannot yield to the Senator. He will have an opportunity in his own time to comment on my arguments.

What the Senator from Massachusetts is proposing—and let this be clear to the Senate—is that the State authorities be given the opportunity and the right to vary the proportion of the hours of instruction as between classroom instruction and farm instruction. Thus in the proposal for group instruction of 200 hours a year, if the State authorities want to have 150 hours of such instruction on the farm and 50 hours in the classroom, the Massachusetts authorities say that ought to be within their discretion. As an individual Senator, I agree. However, the subcommittee disagreed. I am confident that Massachusetts, Wyoming, California or any other State, charged with the responsibility of carrying out the objectives of this legislation, can be depended upon, through State officials, acting in good faith to carry out the objectives of the program. I am satisfied that if it is found in any particular State by the directors of the program that it would be better to have 150 hours of instruction on the farm rather than in the classroom, both the veteran and the Government will get their money's worth.

I use only one example. Let us take the question of irrigation. Suppose the farm veteran is in a State where irrigation is, after all, the one problem on which he needs instruction more than upon any other. I can well understand

that the best place to give him such instruction, after he receives certain classroom instruction in farm engineering, is out on the irrigation projects themselves. He should be given demonstrations in how to install the tiling——

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry that I cannot yield because of the limitation of time.

Mr. THYE. I merely wish to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. MORSE. I am trying to cover the case for this bill in 15 minutes. The Senator will have an opportunity to question me in his own time.

I think that decision should be left to the discretion of the State officials. That is why I am willing to support the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts. After listening to the representatives of Massachusetts and Illinois, I am still perfectly satisfied that if this bill should be passed without the Senator's amendment, those officials would make the necessary adjustments so as not to sacrifice this program.

What is the alternative? The alternative is that the veterans would have to to go back on a part-time or partial-payment basis. They would not get their full $65 if single, or $90 if they are married. They would get what the Veterans' Administration would give them under the partial-payment plan which was issued, to which the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] objected last summer.

In closing this comment—and I shall use the rest of my time to answer questions—let me say that this is a program which has been thoroughly studied. It is a program which is necessary to do justice to the veterans. It is a program which gives to the veterans approved instruction which has been very carefully arranged by the agricultural extension experts. I think we would be most unfair to the farm veterans of the country if we were to follow the course of action proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] this afternoon.

This proposal came out of our committee by a vote of 10 to 3, in a 13-man committee. As chairman of the subcommittee, I make this plea this afternoon because I conducted the hearings. The hearings are printed. They were carefully and conscientiously conducted, as every member of the full committee has admitted to me when we discussed the question in the committee. In view of the record which we have made, as chairman of the subcommittee, I feel that the majority of the committee ought to be supported, rather than the minority of three on the committee who refused to go along with our report.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wanted to ask the distinguished Senator from Oregon one question. We have been speaking about the farm boys who gave up their education under the GI bill of rights to take courses in farming. How can a farm boy in the West or South today go to an educational institution? They are already overcrowded, as the distinguished Senator knows.

Mr. MORSE. They do not want to; they want this farm training under a program which has been worked out on a very education-standard basis. If one will turn to page 8 of the report he will see where the number of hours came from, how the Director of the Veterans' Administration came to select the hours. They are the hours used in the administration of Public Law No. 16, dealing with veterans who come under our rehabilitation program.

This is not a fly-by-night program. It is not a hastily devised program. It has been designed by the best minds of the country dealing in the field of agricultural education. I am at a complete loss to understand how in the closing hours of the session, when the House has already passed the legislation, thought should be given to the proposal of the Senator from Ohio to postpone action, knowing very well that a motion to recommit, even under instructions, will mean, to all intents and purposes, the killing of this program. It is not fair; it is not right. The 10 men who voted for it in the committee ought to be supported this afternoon by voting down the motion offered by the senior Senator from Ohio

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. As the Senator has so aptly stated, when the States do not have adequate educational facilities in may instances farm boys are taking training on the farm at less cost to the Government.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota for a question.

Mr. THYE. I wish to ask the Senator if it is his opinion that if the on-the-job trainees should not have classroom work they would be deprived of a certain benefit which they get only in the classroom with other on-the-job trainees under a capable instructor, such as studying feed formulas, accounting, and problems pertaining to farming which they could well take in a group in a classroom?

Mr. MORSE. I will say to my friend from Minnesota that I do not take the position that the boy should not have that sort of instruction. I take the position that we ought to have confidence in our State approving agencies and let them determine whether the boys should have class-room instruction or should not have class-room instruction. The sensible way to work it out would be to give the discretion to the State agencies, so that as to certain types of training they can do it in a classroom if they can best teach it that way, but on the farm if they can best teach it on the farm. I used the irrigation example to illustrate my point.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator will yield for another comment in relation to the on-the-job training program, so far as it relates to agriculture, I know of a good many communities in which young men are taking on-the-job training. They go to the high schools and have agricultural classes 2 hours once a week and go over all of that which relates to accounting, feed programs, all types of herd management and cow testing.

Mr. MORSE. It is a technical short course in agriculture?

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. It is excellent.

Mr. THYE. Yes. The instructors go out on the farms a certain number of hours a week and proceed to work with the young men on the farms in solving the problems which may confront them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. TAFT. Would the Senator from Massachusetts like some time?

I shall be glad to yield up to 5 minutes of my time.

Mr. LODGE. I should like, first of all, to compliment the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] on the way in which he conducted hearings on this subject. I have heard from many people who were present at the hearings glowing accounts of his fairness and of the intelligent and thorough way in which he studied this subject. Let me say this, however, to the Senate, and particularly to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], that even if the amendment which I offered is adopted it will not in any way lessen or interfere with the training of the young man who wants to have 200 hours of instruction which is provided for in the bill. My amendment simply makes it possible for young men in States like Massachusetts, Illinois, Wisconsin, and others, who have gone ahead and worked with the Veterans' Administration on an on-the-job basis, instead of on a classroom basis, to continue to do it that way if they want to. Let me also say that if the bill does not pass at this session, if the motion of the Senator from Ohio is successful, the program will continue in Massachusetts, Illinois, Wisconsin, and, I think, Montana and other States, because those are the States which have already gone ahead and worked something out with the local Veterans' Administration offices.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. They will continue; but the Senator is overlooking the fact that in all probability they will not continue at the $65 to $90 subsistence rate. That is what is so unfair to the students in Massachusetts or any other State if we do not pass this bill. I hope we will pass it with the Senator's amendment.

Mr. LODGE. I think a bill could be worked out which would recognize local differences. I cannot help but feel that there is an intelligent way to make allowance for these schemes which have already been put into effect as a result of local gumption and local initiative. It is not necessary to try to standardize the whole thing. Let me say that I have been in communication with the people in Massachusetts who are most interested in this program. It is their hope that this bill can be reworded so as to accomplish the recognizing of local differences. In the meantime, until that is done, the

present program will continue until January.

Therefore, in view of the attitude of most people, I shall vote to recommit this bill. If that is not successful, then I shall move my amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not want to repeat the argument which I made yesterday, but it seems to me that the additional arguments presented by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] indicate in what complete confusion is this whole matter of on-the-job training including on-farm training. My motion is to recommit it to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with instructions to make a thorough study of all on-the-job training. I think there ought to be on-the-job training, and I think there ought to be on-farm training, but the way it has been organized and on the one hand, with the very loose requirements of the Veterans' Administration and, on the other hand, the rather complicated provisions of this particular bill, it seems to me that we are in danger of enlarging this part of on-the-job training to an indefinite size. The number of veterans participating in the program has been steadily increasing. On September 30, 1946, there were 54,000 trainees; on January 31, 1947, there were 98,000; on March 31, 1947, there were 130,000. It is estimated by the Veterans' Administration that if it is continued in its present way, practically every veteran who is on the farm will take advantage of the course largely for the purpose of drawing the subsistence allowance. We face the serious danger of extending it until it replaces the WPA idea, until every veteran gets the idea that, regardless of instruction, which is merely incidental, merely a side issue, he is entitled to $65 a month simply because he is a veteran.

We encountered the same situation in connection with the general on-the-job training. I propose to make the same motion in regard to the other bill, which provides an increase in the ceiling for on-the-job training, and therefore provides an additional incentive to veterans to participate in on-the-job training, on strictly educational grounds, of course. There are a limited number of persons who can give full time; but if this program continues, every one of the 15,000,000 veterans will be in some kind of on-the-job or on-the-farm training. Before that point is reached, I think a thorough study should be made, and accordingly I think we should recommit the bills, for the purpose of having the study made.

Anyone who reads the letter of General Bradley of June 4, which is addressed to me and which is printed in the committee report, will find that it is, in effect, a minority adverse report. He does not like the idea of expanding on-the-farm training.

Finally, on June 6, I received from General Bradley a letter saying:

> The Veterans' Administration has been advised by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that enactment of the proposed legislation would not be in accord with the program of the President.

Mr. President, if these two bills go to the President, I think he will veto them. It seems to me that we should now give more consideration to the subject than we have given to it thus far. This bill was passed in the House of Representatives during the call of the Consent Calendar. Practically no one paid any attention to it there. I have talked to Members of the House of Representatives, and most of them did not even know that the House passed such a bill. No adequate consideration was given to it there.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that this bill be recommitted to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio that House bill 2181 be recommitted to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Morse
Baldwin	Hill	Murray
Ball	Hoey	Myers
Barkley	Holland	O'Conor
Brewster	Ives	O'Daniel
Bricker	Jenner	Pepper
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Cain	Kem	Robertson, Va.
Capper	Kilgore	Russell
Connally	Knowland	Saltonstall
Cooper	Langer	Smith
Cordon	Lodge	Sparkman
Donnell	Lucas	Stewart
Dworshak	McCarthy	Taft
Eastland	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Ecton	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McGrath	Thye
Ferguson	McKellar	Umstead
Flanders	McMahon	Vandenberg
Fulbright	Magnuson	Wherry
George	Malone	White
Green	Martin	Williams
Gurney	Maybank	Young
Hatch	Millikin	
Hawkes	Moore	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio to recommit House bill 2181, Calendar No. 610, with instructions.

Mr. MORSE and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Chair restate the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio to recommit House bill 2181 to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with instructions to make a complete study of on-the-job and on-the-farm training.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained on official committee business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—31

Baldwin	Hawkes	Revercomb
Ball	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Brewster	Jenner	Smith
Bricker	Kem	Taft
Brooks	Lodge	Thye
Cain	McCarthy	Vandenberg
Capper	Malone	White
Dworshak	Martin	Williams
Ecton	Millikin	Young
Ferguson	Moore	
Gurney	Reed	

NAYS—45

Aiken	Hoey	Maybank
Barkley	Holland	Morse
Butler	Ives	Murray
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor
Cordon	Kilgore	O'Daniel
Donnell	Knowland	Pepper
Eastland	Langer	Robertson, Va.
Ellender	Lucas	Russell
Flanders	McClellan	Sparkman
Fulbright	McFarland	Stewart
George	McGrath	Thomas, Okla.
Green	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Hatch	McMahon	Umstead
Hill	Magnuson	Wherry

NOT VOTING—19

Bridges	Hayden	Tydings
Buck	McCarran	Wagner
Bushfield	O'Mahoney	Watkins
Byrd	Overton	Wiley
Capehart	Robertson, Wyo.	Wilson
Chavez	Taylor	
Downey	Tobey	

So Mr. TAFT's motion to recommit was rejected.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the pending bill and ask that it be stated. Then I shall move its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, it is proposed to strike out the quotation marks at the end of line 5 and to insert:

Where it has been found that a variation in the proportion of hours of group instruction and individual instruction on the farm will better serve the conditions in a certain area, any program acceptable to the State approving agency which meets the total number of training hours called for in this act (including assembled instruction, individual instruction, and assigned and supervised related home study and supervision in operational skills by the farmer trainer under the direction of the institution) shall be recognized as complying with the requirements of this act;

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, for the benefit of Senators who may not have been present within the past hour or so, I should like briefly to state the purpose of the amendment.

As the bill now stands it discriminates against on-the-farm-training programs which have been developed in Massachusetts, Illinois, Wisconsin, and I believe in Montana, and perhaps in some other States, in that it gives no credit for the time which a young man spends while employed on a farm. In other words, the on-the-farm training which certainly is a valuable training, is not given any credit under the bill as it now stands, and it is obligatory for the young man to take 200 hours of college work. The amendment makes it possible for the States I have enumerated, that have worked out these programs with the Veterans' Administration and have made their contracts on this basis, to see them through to the end of the year and to continue these useful and beneficial programs. I am very happy to say that the Senator from Oregon, who was chairman of the subcommittee, gave this matter a very careful hearing and study, and he has been good enough to assure me of his willingness to accept this amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I would say that in my opinion the amendment can be worked out. I have no objection to it.

I hope that it will be approved by the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Massachusetts that as chairman of the subcommittee I must make the report for the committee that the amendment was voted down in committee. I personally was in favor of the amendment. I am personally in favor of the amendment now. I am satisfied that any fears of the Lodge amendment will not materialize into any detriment to this program, and I am satisfied personally that the Lodge amendment will perhaps improve the program in a good many States that are now following the Massachusetts-Illinois pattern. But we did go into it, and it would be most unfair and unethical of me as chairman of the subcommittee not to make it perfectly clear that the committee itself rejected the Lodge amendment. However, I want to state to Senators that if they will go into the record of the testimony and into the record they will find that the Massachusetts and the Illinois plans are of very high order. I am satisfied that the program provided in the bill will not be jeopardized by the Lodge amendment. I, personally, not as chairman of the subcommittee, but in my own individual right as a Member of the Senate, will vote for the Lodge amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is one slight committee amendment that needs to be offered. It was adopted by the committee, but there was a mistake made when the matter was typed, and it did not get into the final bill. It reads:

On page 5, add a new paragraph at the end of section 4, to read as follows:

"The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to contract with approved institutions for such courses where the Administrator finds that the agreed cost is reasonable and fair."

Of course, it is the same provision that is in the program for on-the-job training in commercial establishments. All we did when we adopted the amendment in committee was to make the provision the same for on-the-farm training as for industrial training. I can assure the Senate it was approved by the committee and the only reason it is not in the bill is because of the clerical error in copying.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the committee amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 2, lines 16 and 17, strike out "Administrator which, when taken as a full-time course" and insert "Administrator. Such course shall be considered a full-time course when it."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 25, after the word "found", insert "by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs or the State approving agency."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, at the end of section 4, it is proposed to insert a new paragraph, to read as follows:

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to contract with approved institutions for such courses where the Administrator finds that the agreed cost is reasonable and fair.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

INCREASED ALLOWANCE AND COMPENSATION FOR ON-THE-JOB TRAINING

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 431, Senate 1393.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill to increase the permitted rate of allowance and compensation for training on the job under Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) as amended.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on the bill before the Senate be limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes to be allotted by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and 15 minutes by myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request submitted by the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as chairman of the subcommittee considering Senate bill 1393, known as the ceiling bill for the on-the-job training program, I have just two or three points I want to make.

I think I can take less than 15 minutes, which I am sure will be a pleasant surprise to my colleagues.

The bill comes to us out of committee with a full committee vote of 11 to 2, so that 11 members of the committee on Labor and Public Welfare recommend the passage of the bill. What it proposes to do is to increase the ceilings for the on-the-job training program from $175 for single veterans to $200 for single veterans, and from $200 for married veterans to $250 for married veterans. That is the proposal so far as the money increases in the ceilings are concerned.

The second point I want to make, Mr. President—and it is one that I find, in private conversations, so many of my colleagues are not aware of—that the bill does not increase the subsistence allowance itself one dollar. It remains for single veterans $65, and for married veterans $90. No change is made, I may say again, Mr. President, in the subsistence allowance itself.

The third point I want to make is another point that some of my colleagues do not understand, so far as the operation of the bill is concerned. Let us assume now, for the sake of argument, that the bill is passed, and that the $200 for single veterans becomes the wage ceiling. What that means, Mr. President, is that under my bill the veteran only receives money from the Government under the subsistence allowance if the subsistence allowance of $65 for a single veteran and the wage paid him by the employer do not exceed $200. For example, if the employer should pay the veteran worker $190 for wages, then under my bill the veteran would receive only $10 from the Government out of the subsistence allowance. In other words, the subsistence allowance is always cut down if the wage paid by the employer, plus the subsistence, exceed the ceiling.

The original ceiling of $175 for single veterans and $200 for married veterans was hastily passed in the closing days of the Seventy-ninth Congress, and every man who was in that Congress I think will admit it. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is on the floor. He and

the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] also, and I think the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], will recall that in the closing days of the Seventy-ninth Congress I had pending before the Senate a bill which sought to eliminate the age requirement as far as the GI educational benefits were concerned. The Senators will recall that the bill, prior to my amendment, limited the age to 25 years for a veteran who sought the educational benefits under the GI bill of rights. I submitted an amendment to the GI bill removing that age restriction so that any veteran, irrespective of age, should have the educational benefits of the bill.

I think it was about the second day before adjournment—and I remember it as though it happened today—the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and, I believe also the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and two or three other Senators, I think the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] also, took me out into the Democratic conference room and said, "Now look here, we want to help you get your bill through, but protests have been made by the Veterans' Administration as to certain abuses that have developed under the on-the-job training program, because we find that there are applicants for training for the vice presidency of some banks receiving as much as $500 or $600 or $700 a month from the bank itself and collecting also their $65 subsistence allowance"—because at that time there was no ceiling. I went into conference on the matter, and they said "We will help you get your bill through if you will accept an on-the-job training wage ceiling as a rider to your bill". They frankly so stated on the floor their reason for the wage-ceiling rider when we subsequently came to debate the bill. So we agreed in the closing hours of the Seventy-ninth Congress to accept the recommendation of General Bradley himself for a ceiling of $175 for single veterans and $200 for married veterans.

We have tried it since that time, and it has been found to be, as I think the hearings had before my committee show conclusively, to be a ceiling that is too low. There were a great many recommendations made to the committee for increases in the ceiling. The American Legion, through their legislative representative, came before us and made very clear that it was the position of the American Legion that all ceilings should be removed, and we should go back to the position in which we found ourselves before the ceiling rider in the Seventy-ninth Congress was adopted. We as a committee took the position that we could not adopt the position of the American Legion, because we were satisfied from General Bradley's testimony given to us again this year, that it would lead to abuses in the on-the-job-training program.

Then there were other proposals before the committee, as the record will show, for higher ceilings. I think one bill provided $350 a month for married veterans, and I think the bill introduced by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] provided for $300 a month. At least the amount was considerably in excess of what we came out with by way of a compromise. We have come out with this compromise proposal which I think is a very fair, just, and deserved compromise, of $200 for single veterans and $250 for married veterans.

Mr. President, I want to say, and I am sure my colleagues on the subcommittee who voted with me and my colleagues on the full committee, 11 of us altogether, will also assure the Senate, that we have retained a ceiling which will prevent the abuses which developed under the old system, but at the same time will do justice to veterans.

There has been a change in cost of living since the action was taken before, and we think that more veterans ought to be brought into the program, and more will be brought into the program under our bill.

Mr. President, all I can say is that if we are going to keep this program at all, and I think we should, we ought to make this equitable adjustment in the on-the-job training program, especially in view of the fact that we are not changing the subsistence allowance itself.

As to General Bradley's position in this matter, Mr. President, may I say this: The Senator from Ohio is correct in regard to the bill we just passed, because I think the order which General Bradley issued last summer showed that he was against what we subsequently adopted today for farm veterans. But as to the present bill, General Bradley does not testify either for or against it, because he very rightly takes the position that it is a matter of policy to be determined by the Congress.

In closing I want to express myself on this veterans' legislation these words: I have worked hard and fought hard to get my veteran legislation before the Senate. The hour is late in the present session of Congress. Here we have a bill which I think we should pass and get it on its way to the House. It is going to require some House action. I deeply regret, Mr. President, that some of our Republican leaders on the House side are not prone to pass any veterans' legislation of this type at the present session of Congress, because they take the position in their statements to me, and not only that, but they apparently took the position this afternoon in their statements to some veterans' organizations, that they are not inclined to bring this matter up for a vote in the present session of Congress, because the President himself in his state of the Union message expressed himself as being against any further veterans' benefits in the present session of Congress.

Let me say, Mr. President, that on this particular bill we have a letter from the Veterans' Administration which I do not think is subject to the interpretation which some of the leaders in the House on veterans' legislation are giving. I read only the last paragraph, but shall ask that the entire letter be printed in the RECORD. I read:

> The Veterans' Administration has been advised by the Director, Bureau of the Budget, that there is no objection to the presentation of such report to the committee and that this bill could not be considered to be in accord with the program of the President.

Mr. President, I ask that the letter in full be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 18, 1947.

Hon. ROBERT A. TAFT,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TAFT: Reference is made to the report furnished to you under date of June 10, 1947, which was an estimate of cost on S. 1393, Eightieth Congress, "A bill to increase the permitted rate of allowance and compensation for training on the job under Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) as amended."

The Veterans' Administration has been advised by the Director, Bureau of the Budget, that there is no objection to the presentation of such report to the committee and that this bill could not be considered to be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

OMAR N. BRADLEY,
General, United States Army,
Administrator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to say to my friends of the Republican Party on the House side that I am willing to draw the issue on veterans' legislation by having the Republican majority in both Houses of Congress do what I think they ought to do, namely, pass this deserved legislation for veterans and then put it on the doorstep of the White House, and let us see whether or not the President will sign it. I happen to be one who believes that the merits of the legislation are so sound that given an opportunity to sign it, the President would sign it irrespective of any statement he made in his State of the Union message. Be that as it may, I do not think it is for the Republican leadership in the Senate or in the House to determine what the President's policy ought to be in regard to this legislation or to follow what they think the President's views may be.

We ought to determine, as the Republican majority, whether or not we are willing to do justice to the veterans in this session of the Congress. I submit that this bill, along with the other legislation I have heretofore submitted, and which has been passed, is deserved legislation, decidedly in the interest of the veterans and of the public welfare.

I close by saying that I do not want to see my party, either in the Senate or in the House, sell the veterans short by not passing this deserved legislation when we have the opportunity to pass it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield if I have any more time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has four more minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show that I finished in less than 15 minutes. It is pretty good for me to close the session that way.

I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. If my memory serves me correctly, the Senator has accurately stated what took place during the closing days of the last session of Congress. We found ourselves in a very tight and difficult situation due to the fact that the Congress was about ready to close, and we were trying to do the very best we could for our veterans under the circumstances.

I also wish to say that the Senator is exactly right when he says that the evidence before our subcommittee shows definitely that the present ceilings are too low, and that those ceilings should be raised. I want to join with the Senator in the very eloquent plea he has made here this afternoon in urging the Senate to raise the ceilings.

I might add, if there is a minute left, that no one could be more devoted or more indefatigable in his efforts in behalf of the veterans of the country than is the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the approach suggested, at least, in the speech of the Senator from Oregon, that the two parties ought to compete for veterans' favors, I think is a very dangerous policy to suggest. I think that was his final appeal. My judgment is that action ought to depend on the merits of the particular proposal, and what it involves and means.

This bill would increase the cost to the Government of the United States of veterans' allowances by approximately $85,000,000. It is contrary to the program of the President. General Bradley's letter of July 18, only a week ago, states that the Veterans' Administration has been advised that the bill could not be considered to be in accord with the program of the President.

As I have stated several times, I believe that the on-the-job training program presents the greatest danger that we face today in building up a perfectly tremendous veterans' expense, already amounting to $7,000,000,000 a year and capable of almost indefinite expansion.

We have also a long report from the Director of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, which clearly disapproves the bill. This report discusses the fact that the whole on-the-job idea was inserted into the original GI bill without much thought. There was virtually no discussion of the few words which were inserted in the original bill which authorized it.

There was widespread surprise and concern when this little-understood provision of law was utilized rapidly a year ago to enable hundreds of thousands of fully employed veterans to obtain subsistence allowances of $65 or $90 a month while their employers provided them with on-the-job training in a variety of occupations, many of which were far removed from the skilled occupations to which apprenticeship applies. No one can question the importance of apprenticeship courses.

For example, there were courses for soda-fountain managers, stock clerks, all types of salesmen, gasoline-station attendants, and managers, farm laborers, and so on. Many of these occupations were those in which the cost of training had always previously been absorbed by the employer as a part of the normal cost of doing business.

To a large extent these payments are not particularly for the benefit of the employee. They relieve the employer from paying the employee what he probably would otherwise pay him anyway.

As soon as people caught on to this so-to-speak easy method of drawing allowances the number of on-the-job trainees jumped from 25,000 in January 1946 to 400,000 at the end of July, with still a large backlog of veterans who had made application but who had not yet been put on the rolls to get their subsistence allowances. There appeared to be no limit to the number of veterans who could be trained on the job, short of the limit of 10,000,000 veterans in full-time employment. To provide subsistence allowances to all of them would vastly increase the Federal budget.

When it comes to college, boys usually go for 2 years, 3 years, or 4 years, and then they are through. A certain number of individuals want that kind of training. In the on-the-job training program, any one of 15,000,000 veterans can choose a new occupation at any time for the next 10 years. He can go into that training course, whatever it is, and proceed to draw allowances until his pay reaches a figure of more than $3,000 a year. There is a ceiling on what they get from the employer, plus what the Government gives them. If they are earning as much as $2,100 a year today, in the case of a single man, then they do not receive anything. But a veteran receives enough to bring his income up to $2,100 in the case of a single man, and $2,400 in the case of a married man. The bill proposes to increase the allowances so that the single man will receive an allowance up to $2,400, and the married man up to $3,000.

The average monthly earnings of all manufacturing production workers in November 1946, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, was $198 a month, or approximately $2,400 a year. It is proposed to help those men get $3,000 a year, and to draw taxes from the working men of the country whose average income in manufacturing business—and that is relatively high, compared with other occupations—is only $2,400. We are taxing people who earn $2,400 in order to raise this particular group to $3,000. The average median monthly earnings of all employed veterans in June 1946 was approximately the same, about $2,400 a year; and we are taxing all the other veterans who earn that amount of money in order to pay veterans who earn less, and bring them up to $2,400. Of course, there is an educational feature; but my belief is that the whole question should be reexamined.

The Veterans' Administration apparently has felt—I think mistakenly—that it had to take practically any course suggested by any State, and say, "Here is on-the-job training." If a man wants to train to be a bank president, as long as he is a bank clerk he draws enough to bring his income up to $2,400, under this bill, if he is single, or $3,000 if he is married. The higher we go the greater the incentive for more veterans to take advantage of what seems to me, on the whole to be very easy money. They receive instruction. In most cases they would receive just about the same instruction if there were no payment. The employer is not paid for giving the instruction. There is no tuition. Yet these men are permitted to draw this money for receiving instruction which employers have always given free, and which they will give free today if we do not continue these on-the-job training allowances. I think there are legitimate cases, but I feel that the subject ought to be strictly examined, and that the bill should therefore be recommitted to the committee to consider the problem before we make the program still more attractive, and before we put $85,000,000 more into it—before we invite 15,000,000 veterans to find on-the-job training in some business by which they can take advantage of these payments.

Unfortunately, the attitude of a few groups is that this is becoming a payment to which every veteran is entitled as a matter of fact, because he is a veteran, and not because he is learning anything. When we reach that point it means, in effect, that the allowances will be paid to all 15,000,000 veterans; and if we do that, the cost will run up to $15,000,000,000 or $20,000,000,000 for veterans alone

I therefore move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with instructions to make a thorough study of all on-the-job training.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio to recommit the bill to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with instructions.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator has enumerated many abuses which apparently have developed under the on-the-job training program. Is it not a fact that if those abuses exist, they are largely the result of the administration of the program by the Veterans' Administration, and should they not be corrected by General Bradley and his assistants?

Mr. TAFT. I am not capable of saying whether that is the fact. It seems to me that the Veterans' Administration has been in general very lax in accepting these courses. Their position is that under the terms of the GI bill of rights, if a State approves a certain course they are practically bound to accept it. If that be true, the law should be changed. That is what I want the committee to study. I think General Bradley has washed his hands a little too much. He has said, "I do not approve of it, but I cannot do anything about it." I think there is possibly some basis of criticism, although I do not like to make the charge myself without knowing any more about it than I do.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Barkley	Hill	O'Daniel
Brewster	Holland	Pepper
Bricker	Ives	Reed
Brooks	Jenner	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnston, S. C	Russell
Byrd	Kem	Saltonstall
Cain	Kilgore	Smith
Capper	Knowland	Sparkman
Chavez	Langer	Stewart
Connally	Lodge	Taft
Cooper	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McClellan	Thye
Donnell	McFarland	Tydings
Dworshak	McGrath	Umstead
Eastland	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ecton	Magnuson	Watkins
Ellender	Malone	Wherry
Ferguson	Martin	White
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Young
Gurney	Morse	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to recommit to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with instructions, Senate bill 1393.

Mr. MORSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are detained on official business. If present and voting the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

I announce further that if present and voting the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 57, as follows:

YEAS—20

Ball	Ferguson	Reed
Brewster	Gurney	Taft
Bricker	Hawkes	Vandenberg
Butler	Hickenlooper	White
Byrd	Kem	Wiley
Cain	Millikin	Williams
Capper	Moore	

NAYS—57

Aiken	Holland	Murray
Baldwin	Ives	Myers
Barkley	Jenner	O'Conor
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	O'Daniel
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Chavez	Kilgore	Revercomb
Connally	Knowland	Robertson, Va.
Cooper	Langer	Russell
Cordon	Lodge	Saltonstall
Donnell	Lucas	Smith
Dworshak	McClellan	Sparkman
Eastland	McFarland	Stewart
Ecton	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McMahon	Thye
Fulbright	Magnuson	Tydings
George	Malone	Umstead
Green	Martin	Watkins
Hatch	Maybank	Wherry
Hill	Morse	Young

NOT VOTING—18

Bridges	Hoey	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	McCarran	Taylor
Capehart	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McKellar	Tobey
Flanders	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Hayden	Overton	Wilson

So the motion to recommit with instructions was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1393) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proviso in paragraph 6 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That in no event shall the rate of such allowance plus the compensation received exceed $200 per month for a veteran without a dependent or $250 per month if he has a dependent or dependents."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to take a moment to express to the Senator from Ohio my sincere and deep appreciation for the cooperation he has extended to me in regard to the veterans' legislation. He and I have been trying to get this legislation before the Senate for days. I want the Senator from Ohio to know that, although we differ on the merits of the legislation, I appreciate his cooperation in helping me to get it before the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

MORTGAGE INSURANCE UNDER NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. TAFT obtained the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to inquire of the distinguished Senator from Ohio in regard to Senate bill 1720, Calendar No. 762, to amend the National Housing Act, as amended. The bill was unanimously reported from the Banking and Currency Committee by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK]. Does the Senator from Ohio believe we can reach that bill tonight?

Mr. TAFT. I suggest to the Senator from South Carolina that when we reach the call of the calendar, he request unanimous consent to revert to that bill, if we fail to have it passed during the call of the calendar. Then we can see what we can do with it.

We have the sugar bill and one other bill before we begin to consider the calendar at the point where we ended the call of the calendar yesterday. But during the call of the calendar, the Senator from South Carolina may request unanimous consent to return to a previous bill, of course.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senator, except to mention the fact, which he knows, that in providing for the continuation of the RFC, we left out certain refinancing provisions. Unless this bill is passed and sent to the House of Representatives, the Federal Housing Administration will be left without funds after October.

Mr. TAFT. I understand.

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall appreciate the efforts of the Senator from Ohio to have the bill considered.

Mr. TAFT. I understand, and I shall do my best.

MEETINGS OF APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, before yielding the floor, I wish to make an announcement on behalf of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

The second supplemental deficiency bill will be marked up at 7 o'clock p. m.

The full committee will meet at 8 p. m. to consider the mark-up by the subcommittee of the second supplemental deficiency bill.

The conference committee on the appropriations for civil functions of the War Department will meet at 7:30 p. m.

The conference committee on the first supplemental appropriation bill will meet at 8:30 p. m.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I am a member of these appropriations committees, I shall appreciate it if the Senator from Ohio can give me some indication of when he thinks we shall have an executive session.

Mr. TAFT. I doubt that we shall have an executive session tonight. The present plan is to deal with the sugar bill. I do not know how long the consideration of that bill will take. I hope it will not take too long.

Then we shall have the resolution of the Senator from West Virginia, relating to an investigation of immigration, with the understanding that if that takes an hour and still is not disposed of, we shall lay it aside, and shall take up the calendar, returning to that bill after the calendar is disposed of.

That is the general plan.

Mr. TYDINGS. What would be the program?

Mr. TAFT. After last night's session, I would hope that we might be able to take a recess by 10 or 11 o'clock this evening, and have one last call of the Executive Calendar tomorrow. There is not so much business for tomorrow, and I see no reason why there should not be a full consideration.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, does the Senator feel he can now give me assurance that some time either tonight or tomorrow there will be a call of the Executive Calendar?

Mr. TAFT. I think I can give assurance that that is the intention.

AUTHORIZATION TO COMMANDANT, UNITED STATES COAST GUARD, TO GRANT WAIVERS FOR EMPLOYMENT OF CERTAIN ALIEN SEAMEN

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I should like to ask for immediate consideration of a House joint resolution which is in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, not having been reported to the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from further consideration of House Joint Resolution 245, amending Public Law 27, Eightieth Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I now ask for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 345) amending Public Law 27, Eightieth Congress, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUGAR ACT OF 1948

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4075, Calendar No. 608, the so-called sugar bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] that the Senate proceed to consider House 4075.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4075) to regulate commerce among the several States, with the Territories and possessions of the United States, and with foreign countries, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the present Sugar Act expires December 31, 1947. Those of us who are especially interested because of the activities in our States in the growing or processing of the beets or the cane, have been anxious as to the further course of covering legislation.

For a time it appeared that a simple extension would be the most that could be hoped for, this because of the apparent inability of the interested parties to get together. Those of us in the Congress especially interested counseled the representatives of the producers and processors that more than a simple, short extension could not be had unless a wide area of agreement could be achieved. In reaching agreement among the numerous interests involved, there had to be reconciliation of many points of conflict. The mainland cane- and beet-sugar producers and processors were not in agreement.

There was appearance of some division of opinion between the agencies of the Government which are interested. Secretary of Agriculture Anderson took an active interest in helping to put this bill together.

The accords which were reached came somewhat as a surprise to many of us. There was not a single interest that received everything it wanted. Every interest had to sacrifice a part of its ambition. I believe those sacrifices were made because it was apparent that a simple extension statute would not give the stability to the industry which is required in this transitional period.

Secretary Anderson, appearing before the House Ways and Means Committee on June 21, 1947, well expressed the official viewpoint toward the bill. He said:

> With that in mind it was suggested that we confer with the Department of the Interior because it has a responsibility to Puerto Rico and Hawaii.

He is referring to efforts to get together.

> The Department of the Interior looked at the bill carefully. The Secretary of the Interior phoned me after he had had an opportunity to study it, to say he was in full agreement with the purpose of the bill, and they would be able to support it, because they felt it was of great value that the domestic areas were in agreement on it. I then suggested they consult the Bureau of the Budget and the State Department and other branches of the administration, and I am now in a position to say to you I am confident that the administration will be pleased to support a bill such as has been drawn if it should be favorably acted upon by this committee and by the House in turn, and finally by the Senate.

The bill before us represents the result of all those negotiations, adjustments, and conciliations.

The bill in substance is a 5-year extension, with changes, some of the more important of which will be specially mentioned, of the sugar-control legislation which has been in effect in this country since 1934.

Included in the features of that existing control system are these. A quota system dividing the sugar needs of the Nation among those who historically have supplied them. Our sugar needs from year to year are estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture. Benefit payments are provided for our producers. These are contingent on not employing child labor, paying labor bills, and on observing requirements as to the amount of sugar to be produced.

An excise tax is levied on the processor, which in theory is supposed to equal the benefit payments, but which in practice has exceeded the amount of those payments. It must be thoroughly understood that this is a temporary measure, that every Senator voting for the bill reserves unimpaired his own philosophy and freedom as to permanent sugar legislation and as to other agricultural policies.

Let us look at some of the new features of the bill before us. Section 201 would modify the method of estimating the quantity of sugar needed to meet the requirements of consumers in the continental United States. Under the Sugar Act of 1937 the estimate is made on a consumption basis in an amount not less than the average per capita consumption during the 2-year period 1937–38, which amounts to 102.6 pounds.

That per capita standard is omitted, and there is a provision directing the Secretary in making consumption estimates to take into consideration certain standards with a view of providing a supply of sugar which will be consumed at prices which will not be excessive to consumers and which will fairly and equitably maintain and protect the welfare of the domestic sugar industry.

The standards to be taken into consideration include the level of consumption during the preceding year, any deficiency or surplus in sugar inventories, changes in population and demand conditions, level and trend of consumer purchasing power, and the relationship between the prices at wholesale for refined sugar and the general cost of living in the United States, as compared with the relationship between the prices at wholesale for refined sugar and the general cost of living in the United States during 1947, prior to the time when controls on sugar were brought to an end.

The Secretary does not have to give any special weighting to any of those factors, but he must consider all of them and reach his decision. The over-all controlling guide is the provision which requires the establishment of a supply of sugar which will be consumed at prices which will not be excessive to consumers, and which will fairly and equitably maintain and protect the welfare of the domestic sugar industry.

There are also new provisions for the establishment of the quotas.

Under the act of 1937 the quotas for sugar-producing areas, both domestic and foreign, are based upon percentages of the estimate of consumption requirements, so that annual quotas vary depending upon the amount of such estimates.

Section 202 of the bill establishes fixed quotas for the domestic-producing areas totaling 4,268,000 short tons, raw value. An additional 952,000 short tons are allocated to the Philippines under the Philippine Trade Act of 1946. The difference between the fixed amount for the domestic-producing areas and the Republic of the Philippines and the estimate of consumption requirements is apportioned to Cuba and foreign countries other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines, on the basis of the same percentages ratios as are now provided in the Sugar Act of 1937, namely,

98.64 percent to Cuba and 1.36 percent to full-duty countries.

Let me give an estimate of what the Philippine deficiencies predicted over the next few years: 752,000 tons in 1948, 552,000 tons in 1949, 302,000 tons in 1950, and 202,000 tons in 1951 and 1952.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. As the Senator recalls, in the committee there was a discussion with respect to the language of the bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture, if the Secretary of State finds that any foreign country denies fair and equitable treatment to the nationals of the United States, its commerce, navigation, or industry, and so notifies the Secretary—that is, the Secretary of Agriculture—to withhold or withdraw any increase in share, and so forth. A considerable number of American nationals have claims against the nationals of Cuba. It may be that some of them have claims against some public authority in Cuba. They felt that instead of simply giving authority or discretion to the Secretary of Agriculture, in the event the Secretary of State found that our nationals were being treated unfairly, there ought to be a mandatory provision with respect to his authority to press for the collection of claims in behalf of American nationals against people in Cuba. After discussing the matter in the committee it was decided not to offer an amendment of that sort, for obvious reasons which need not be gone into here. But there are numerous claimants in the United States against institutions and individuals in Cuba, who ought to be paid. There is no reason I know of why they should longer be denied settlement of their claims.

Out of deference to the diplomatic situation existing at this time, an amendment was not offered making it mandatory that the Secretary of Agriculture, upon a finding by the Secretary of State, proceed in a way that would seek to enforce payment of those claims. I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado, the very able and fair chairman of the committee, what he thinks our attitude ought to be, what his attitude ought to be, and what the attitude of the State and Agriculture Departments ought to be, as well as the attitude of the Cuban interests with respect to the payment of these just and honorable claims which our nationals have growing out of the sugar situation?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It seems to me, of course, that Cuba should pay acknowledged and adjudicated claims. There are many claims, I assume, which have neither been acknowledged nor adjudicated. There might be some technical difficulties with respect to adjudicated or acknowledged claims; but certainly a nation which is the beneficiary of the riches which flow to it from what we are granting in this act in the way of entry of Cuban sugar into this country ought to be willing to pay the just debts of American nationals. I see no reason why the subject should not be covered as it is in the bill. I believe it would be a mistake to make action compulsory on the Secretary. I believe that he should have flexibility of discretion, so that he may act justly, so that there would be no reason for proceeding harshly or in an arbitrary manner, and so that he would have leeway for the preservation of friendship and the attainment of justice to our nationals.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the reply of the Senator from Colorado. I should like to ask him whether his interpretation would be made along this line: In the case of the payment of just claims, claims which have been adjudicated or adjusted by any process by the Cuban people or the Cuban Government, or whatever agency may have incurred the indebtedness, if there were a deliberate refusal to pay such just and honorable claims, would not that be regarded as a denial of fair and equitable treatment to the nationals of the United States, under the language of the bill?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think that if the denial were arbitrary, with the intention of defeating a just debt, it would be proper ground for invoking the provisions of that paragraph.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's reply. Of course, we all sympathize with Cuba. We admire Cuba. We admire her people. We have had an intimate association with them for half a century, growing out of the Spanish-American War. None of us wants to do an injustice to the Cuban people or the Cuban Government or become arbitrary ourselves in dealing with them. Yet at the same time I think no one can deny our right to be interested in a reciprocal performance of the mutual obligations which exist between the two countries and their nationals.

In that accommodative situation and in that atmosphere, I have, myself, although requested by constituents of mine, declined to offer an amendment making it compulsory, on the ground and in the hope that it could be worked out amicably so that claims of our people would be adjusted and paid without a rigid requirement that the Secretary of Agriculture, under any finding of the Secretary of State, would be compelled to proceed in a certain way. Does the Senator from Colorado feel that that is a fair and just attitude, not only on account of our own nationals, but because of the situation between our country and Cuba in such matters?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should think that Cuba would not object to seeing that the just claims of our nationals are paid. I am grateful that the Senator has not offered an amendment which would make action compulsory, because, after all, each claim has to be studied. There may be surface indications that lend the appearance of justice to a bad claim. But certainly with such matters in mind, I think that our Secretary of State should use his good offices to see that these claims are paid.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, I do not know all the details of the various claims which have been asserted and are being asserted by American nationals. I think it would be most unfortunate if there were any arbitrary refusal on the part of Cuba or her nationals to meet our own people in a spirit of accommodation and in a desire to liquidate these claims, whatever they may be, based upon the merits of the claims individually. I am not speaking of them en masse or en bloc or in groups. It may be that they vary in their merits. It may be that some claims have been longer delayed in their payment. Others may not have been adjudicated to the point where the exact amount may be known. But in any case there should be no effort on the part of our friend and neighbor, and I hope there is none, to delay unnecessarily the liquidation and payment of these claims in behalf of American citizens.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah and Mr. CHAVEZ addressed the chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Colorado yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, before we leave this subject I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado a question. In the committee report, page 4, there is the following paragraph:

> It is the intent of the committee that the nonpayment of valid claims which have been adjudicated or acknowledged by foreign countries shall constitute unfair or inequitable treatment within the meaning of section 202 (e). Representatives of the State Department appearing before the committee concurred in this construction of the language of section 202 (e).

My question is this: The Sugar Act is administered by the Department of Agriculture. Is there a concurrence of opinion between the Department of Agriculture and the State Department in agreement with the paragraph which I have read?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Whether there is a concurrence I cannot say; but the State Department has approved this paragraph and the Department of Agriculture has approved the bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. There would be only one Department to pass upon what would be done to a defaulting nation, and that would be the State Department?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I wondered about it because the question arose in the House of Representatives. The understanding is complete within the committee, is it not, that the Agricultural Department will accept the judgment of the State Department?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Oh, yes; the Agricultural Department would have nothing to do with the prosecution of those claims or with the diplomatic interchanges necessary to have something done about them.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Massachusetts has several sugar refineries within its boundaries, and I would like to ask the chairman of the Finance Committee if this bill, in his opinion, protects the sugar refineries in the United States.

Mr. MILLIKIN. In my opinion, it does.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does it give them all the raw sugar to which they are entitled?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It gives them all to which they are entitled under all the circumstances with which we are dealing. I do not believe that anyone who has joined in shaping this bill is 100-percent satisfied. If anyone were 100-percent satisfied, it would be a bad bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator compare the benefits to Puerto Rico with those to Cuba in connection with the sugar program?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Cuba is the largest sugar producer in the world. Puerto Rico is a smaller sugar producer, but a very important one. Puerto Rico has a fixed quota under this bill, as has Hawaii and as has our domestic cane producers and our domestic beet-sugar producers. Puerto Rico has a definite quota which she can count upon putting into our market. Cuba has a varying quota with a minimum approximately equal to 28.6 percent of the consumption under the measurement requirements of the 1937 Sugar Act.

Mr. LANGER. How much does Puerto Rico furnish?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I will give the Senator the exact figures, and I think this is a good place to put them into the RECORD. Does the Senator wish to know the quota, or what they actually supply?

Mr. LANGER. The quota.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Cuban sugar quota is a quota which varies and which is measured by adding together all of the fixed quotas, taking the estimate of consumption of the Secretary of Agriculture, subtracting the two, and giving Cuba 98-and-a-fraction percent of the result.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that Puerto Rico cannot compete with Cuba because of an Executive order issued by a former President—I think is was Mr. Wilson—whereby ships coming back without cargo can bring in sugar at a much less rate than the rate at which it can be shipped by Puerto Rico?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would say that is not correct. Puerto Rico is shipping sugar into this country.

Mr. LANGER. Yes, but that is because there is a shortage of sugar. Where there is overproduction the situation is different.

Mr. MILLIKIN. This bill will meet the precise point to which the Senator is referring, because Puerto Rico will get an absolute fixed quota.

Mr. LANGER. Will it be at a fixed price?

Mr. MILLIKIN. There will be no fixed price.

Mr. LANGER. If there is no fixed price and Cuba gets the benefit of these cargoes of sugar at a less rate than the rate at which Puerto Rico can ship it here, why is not Cuba getting an advantage?

Mr. MILLIKIN. With reference to the price, the Secretary of Agriculture is supposed to make an estimate of consumption on a yearly basis. This estimate, measuring as it does the supply, has a profound effect on price.

Mr. LANGER. I am afraid I did not make myself clear. Suppose there is an overproduction of sugar, and suppose Cuba wishes to sell sugar and Puerto Rico wishes to sell sugar. The American buyer can buy sugar cheaper from Cuba than from Puerto Rico, because of the advantage under the President's executive order; is not that correct?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would not say that each country could land its sugar in this country at exactly the same price.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. In the sugar bill, has any provision been made relative to the free shipment of Cuban sugar or the shipment of Cuban sugar at a lower price than Puerto Rican sugar, due to the Executive order of a former President?

Mr. MILLIKIN. There is nothing in this bill that bears on that subject.

Mr. LANGER. How will it affect our people out West? In the Red River Valley there are hundreds of thousands of acres of land on which thousands of our farmers wish to produce sugar. Under this bill, will there be a limitation on the acreage, or will there not?

Mr. MILLIKIN. We shall have a fixed quota. The fixed quota will give room for expansion. The bill is temporary.

I may say to the Senator that there, again, each interest wishes to have more than it has. Inasmuch as I come from a beet-sugar area, I wish that that area had a larger quota. The cane-sugar people wish they had a larger quota. Everyone wishes to have a larger quota. But I think the quotas of the bill represent the best that can be worked out at this time.

Let me say that this is a 5-year bill. It is temporary legislation. We can look at it again in the future. In the meantime I may say that we are not producing as much sugar as we are allowed by the quota. We have room to grow.

Mr. LANGER. In the Senator's opinion, under this bill what will be the percentage of increase of acreage in the United States, over the acreage in 1938?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I cannot state it in terms of acreage, but I can state what we produced, as compared to what our quota is.

Under the proposed act, the domestic beet-sugar people have a quota of 1,800,000 short tons.

Let me give the Senator some of the history for the production in the last few years in regard to domestic beet sugar.

In 1940, we produced 1,897,000 tons of beet sugar.

In 1941, we produced 1,588,000 tons.

In 1942 we produced 1,726,000 tons.

In 1943 we produced 998,000 tons.

In 1944 we produced 1,056,000 tons.

In 1945 we produced 1,278,000 tons.

In 1946 we produced 1,523,000 tons.

Somewhere here I think I have a later figure. But those figures will give the Senator an idea that our quota under this bill is higher than our production of sugar in most of the recent years, although not higher than what we have produced in some past years.

Mr. LANGER. Of course, there would be no provision in law on this subject, I suppose; but has any investigation been made as to whether the peons of Cuba are going to get a decent wage for the production of sugar?

Mr. MILLIKIN. We are able to impose certain controls as to our domestic sugar, but we have no right to impose controls so far as a foreign country is concerned.

Mr. LANGER. Then the big banking institutions that own this sugar land in Cuba can pay 50 cents a day or $5 a day, so far as this bill is concerned, can they?

Mr. MILLIKIN. This bill does not attempt to regulate wages in Cuba.

Mr. LANGER. So our farmers and producers will be in competition, if we may call it that, with producers in Cuba, without having any provision made for a decent standard of living for the peons of Cuba.

Mr. MILLIKIN. With this exception: If quotas were not provided by this act, and if we had a three-quarter-cent tariff, which is the tariff with Cuba, our farmers would not be producing any sugar. This bill will prevent that from happening.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I apologize to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. He rose before I did.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the bill does not provide and cannot provide for control of wages in Cuba.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That point should be made clear.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But it does provide, in a unilateral way, that this country can tell Cuba when a claim is just and when it is unjust. Subsection (e) of section 202 so provides, does it not? Is not that what it means?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have stated that we have no right to regulate wages in Cuba, and we do not attempt to do so. That is an internal matter affecting the citizens of Cuba.

The paragraph to which the Senator takes exception relates to the claims of American nationals against Cuba.

Mr. LANGER. Very well. Then we do not have the right to tell Cuba what she shall pay in wages, but we do have the right to tell Cuba whether such claims are just, whether such claims should be paid, or whether the claims should be executed without allowing the Government anything to say about it? Is that the interpretation of section 202, subsection (e)?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, that paragraph, under its terms, gives certain discretions to the Secretary of State. I do not believe for one moment that it could properly be assumed that he would

act in an arbitrary manner in reference to such claims. His job is to preserve peace between this country and other countries.

In the colloquy I had with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, I hope I made it very clear that to my mind it will be a mistake to make it mandatory upon the Secretary of State to enforce his opinion in these matters, and that the best we can do is to give him discretion, which, I respectfully suggest, we must assume will be exercised wisely and in the interest of good foreign relations.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to say a word in that connection, I may say to the Senator from New Mexico that, as I understand the provision, certainly the language of the bill does not give the Secretary of State the power himself to adjudicate any claim. But it merely provides, as the report itself shows, on page 4, that this particular section shall become effective when claims have been adjudicated or acknowledged by foreign countries as being valid.

So the adjudication of the claim is to be handled according to the customary procedure now followed, and is not affected by anything in this bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am sorry I cannot agree with that because I interpret subsection (e) in a different way. Who finds whether or not a country has been equitable and just to our citizens? Our Secretary of State. Who puts in the claim? Our Secretary of State.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is mistaken about that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know that the Senator from Wyoming has been right many times, but I do not believe he can be right 100 percent all the time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The legislative intent of this provision is clearly stated in the report and it has now been stated by the Senator in charge of the bill in response to the inquiry of the Senator from New Mexico. The claims which are the subject of this particular section are those claims which are adjudicated and acknowledged by the foreign countries. In other words, there is nothing in the bill which in any way alters or changes or adds to or subtracts from the present method of adjudicating the claims of nationals against a foreign country. But it is provided in the bill merely that when a claim has been so adjudicated and so acknowledged then this provision dealing with the new quota which is being extended to foreign countries may be so administered as to be an effective instrument for collecting an already acknowledged claim.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish I could agree with the Senator from Wyoming as to that interpretation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the legislative history, and what has been said in the report, and what has now been said on the floor of the Senate, would be taken into consideration in any court.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish I could agree with the Senator from Wyoming. I cannot do so, but I do not desire to interrupt the Senator from Colorado in explaining the provisions of the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If the Senator is going to offer his amendment, I should like to go into it more fully at that time, rather than divert to it now.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. A moment ago the Senator was discussing quotas for various domestic producers. Is it not a fact that irrespective of the determination made for our subsequent requirements, all domestic producers shall receive 4,268,000 tons?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. And if the determination, let us say, should be 7,500,000 tons, Cuba would get 98 64 percent of the difference between 7,500,000 and the aggregate that is allowed to the domestic producers, which would include continental producers and Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, plus the Philippines?

Mr. MILLIKIN. We would have to add the Philippine deficit in that.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am assuming in my question that the Philippine Islands will produce their entire production. If there should be a deficit, then under another section of the bill 95 percent of the deficit would go to Cuba?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. And the remainder to foreign countries?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is exactly correct?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

I should like to explore briefly a little further the paragraph of the bill to which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico objects.

Section 202 (e) is a new provision under which the Secretary is authorized to withhold or withdraw any increase in the quota for any foreign country over that provided for such country under the Sugar Act of 1937 upon a finding and notification by the Secretary of State that such country denies fair and equitable treatment to nationals of the United States, its commerce, navigation, or industry. In the event that any quota, or any portion thereof, is withheld or withdrawn pursuant to this section the amounts so withdrawn are to be allocated proportionately among the domestic producing areas, and if the domestic areas are unable to fulfill such amounts so allotted them the amounts unfilled may be allotted by the Secretary to foreign countries which do not deny fair and equitable treatment to nationals of the United States.

It has been brought to the attention of the committee that there have been instances where nationals of the United States have been unable to collect pecuniary claims from foreign governments notwithstanding the fact that, in many instances, the validity of such claims has been acknowledged by, or adjudicated in the courts of, such foreign countries.

It is the intent of the committee that the nonpayment of valid claims which have been adjudicated or acknowledged by foreign countries shall constitute unfair or inequitable treatment within the meaning of section 202 (e). Representatives of the State Department appearing before the committee concurred in this construction of the language of section 202 (e).

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I refer to the last paragraph of the report:

> Representatives of the State Department appearing before the committee concurred in this construction of the language of section 202 (e).

That is the language of the bill. Did the committee inquire from the same representatives of the State Department whether they approved of the language?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have made inquiries, and the State Department approves.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Did the committee have any statement in writing from the State Department?

Mr. MILLIKIN. No; we had nothing in writing.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does not the Senator think that in a matter of this importance the committee should have something in writing from the State Department? Whom in the State Department did the Senator ask to say that they approved of that particular language?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I made inquiries of the gentlemen who are in the division of the State Department which would be concerned with matters of this kind, and they told me that the State Department approved of that language.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair ask the Senator at that point for his opinion whether similar language appears in some other international documents?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes; I shall come to that right now. I had intended reserving it until the Senator brought up his amendment.

There is nothing new whatever about language of this type to protect nationals of the United States from being discriminated against. The Trade Agreements Act under which we make our reciprocal trade agreements contains this language; I am quoting from United States Code, title XIX, section 1351:

> The proclaimed duties and other import restrictions shall apply to imports the growth produce or manufacture of all foreign countries whether imported directly or indirectly; provided that the President may suspend the application to articles the growth produce or manufacture of any country because of its discriminatory treatment of American commerce or because of other acts or policies which in his opinion tend to defeat the purposes set forth in this section.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. The only concern I have about this matter is whether it imposes

upon the Cuban Government and people any obligation with respect to nationals of this country which is not a reciprocal obligation upon the Government of this country with respect to the nationals of Cuba. A little while ago I fear we tarnished somewhat our distinguished record for giving independence to the Philippines by assuring privileges for America in the Philippines which, so far as I know, we did not assure the Philippines in respect to the United States.

Mr. President, that is not mutuality; that is not the good-neighbor policy; that is not the policy I believe the people of this country wish to pursue. I wish to be very clear that this is a reciprocal obligation that the same benefits which we confer upon our business people with respect to the right of penetration into Cuba shall redound to the nationals of Cuba who wish to penetrate into the economy of the United States. Less than that is unworthy of a great country, and I am sure the able Senator from Colorado would not knowingly associate himself with it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to say that the language in this bill which we are discussing is associated with a definite privilege which we are extending to Cuba. Whether Cuba makes the same claims with respect to any privilege that she extends to us, I am not in a position to say. I do not think that this pretends to be a complete statute of reciprocity. It is not a reciprocity statute at all. It is a unilateral action, in which unilaterally we confer great benefits on Cuba, and attach what seems to me to be the modest provision that our nationals shall not be discriminated against.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I have not examined critically this provision, but I heard something to the effect that the purpose of the amendment is to require certain Cubans to pay some debts to somebody in the United States. I am sure I may have been out of the chamber when the Senator gave the previous explanation. Would the Senator succinctly tell me what the basis of this thing is?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I believe that there are claims by American nationals against the Cuban Government and agencies of the Cuban Government, which have been adjudicated or acknowledged as just, which have not been paid. That is one category. And now, without mentioning Cuba—in a sense I think it is unfortunate that we single out a particular country for discussion here in this debate—without mentioning Cuba, there are other types of discrimination which injure good international relations. There are shipping restrictions. There are restrictions against work opportunities for our nationals. It is sometimes impossible for American nationals in business in certain foreign countries to send in their own auditors to look into their own businesses, built there with their own capital. This sort of clause is not necessarily related to the single matter of claims. I think it goes to other forms of discrimination.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, are these claims related to the Sugar Act in any way, or are these merely claims that grow out of something disassociated from the sugar quota or the Sugar Act which is now in force?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I may say to the Senator that so far as I know they are not directly associated with sugar. They constitute as far as I know a miscellaneous group of claims against Cuba and Cuban agencies, which have been acknowledged as just, or adjudicated, and there are many claims in addition which have not been adjudicated and which have not been acknowledged.

Mr. PEPPER. Is not the effect of this provision that we are now discussing that unless the Cuban Government settles the claims in a way satisfactory to the United States, they cannot take advantage of the quota provisions allowed them under the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It does not go that far. In the first place, the right of the Secretary to withhold the privileges of this act goes only to certain increases that will be above a minimum which Cuba would get in all events. The provision has in contemplation a distinct privilege which we are bestowing upon Cuba, and in connection with that, we are asking that Cuba be just to our nationals.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow this observation, during the war Cuba did a particularly generous thing, a reciprocally advantageous thing to us. We lacked sugar, and Cuba had sugar, and she furnished it to us. Now, we have determined the quota that Cuba may send into this country. But, Mr. President, what seems to me, if I may say so, to be the wrong approach of this provision, is for us in a sugar bill dealing with sugar quotas to lay down conditions which the Cuban Government must meet with respect to certain claims that some of her nationals, or her Government may owe to nationals of the United States.

Mr. President, it seems to me that if there are any unpaid Cuban claims, surely that is a matter of direct negotiation between our Government and the Cuban Government. I have sufficient faith in the good will of the Cuban Government and their known confidence in our good will to believe that our two countries can bring about the adjustment of any differences between them. But for us, here in the Congress, to go outside the executive branch of the Government and to say that the Cuban people cannot enjoy the right to send sugar into the United States unless some Cubans, who may not be sugar growers at all, pay certain claims to somebody in the United States, seems to me to be the wrong approach to this matter, and to impose a condition which I believe it is not in the furtherance of our friendship to impose in this legislation.

If the President or the State Department tell us that they have tried to settle the claims, and the President asks us to put a sort of embargo on Cuban exports into this country until they meet his demands, then I would be willing to consider the President's recommendations; but I am not disposed, without a recommendation from the President or the State Department—which I am not advised of, and, so far as I know, does not exist—to have the American Congress place a condition in the sugar bill under which the people of Cuba cannot enjoy the quotas we prescribe for them, unless somebody in Cuba pays certain claims to somebody in the United States, which claims apparently have not been paid.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I understand the Senator's viewpoint. I merely want to suggest that in connection with the great privilege which we are bestowing upon Cuba, it certainly can be argued that it is not inappropriate to say, "Give us a little reciprocation in the way of fair treatment to our nationals."

I do not know whether the distinguished Senator from Florida was in the room when I read from our Reciprocal Trade Act.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; Mr. President, I was present and heard that.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I want to read a provision which also is in our law, which gives us the power to protect ourselves against discriminations having to do with shipping. I shall quote from the United States Code, title 46, section 142. I am simply trying to make it clear that these protective measures in our laws are not at all unusual. The Senator a while ago referred to the Philippine Trade Act. We have a protective clause of that kind in the Philippine Trade Act.

Section 142, of title 46, reads as follows:

> Whenever any foreign country whose vessels have been placed on the same footing in the ports of the United States as American vessels (the coastwise trade excepted) shall deny to any vessels of the United States any of the commercial privileges accorded to national vessels in the harbors, ports, or waters of such foreign country, the President, on receiving satisfactory information of the continuance of such discriminations against any vessels of the United States, is authorized to issue his proclamation excluding, on and after such time as he may indicate, from the exercise of such commercial privileges in the ports of the United States as are denied to American vessels in the ports of such foreign country, all vessels of such foreign country of a similar character to the vessels of the United States thus discriminated against, and suspending such concessions previously granted to the vessels of such country.
> * * *

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, Mr. President; I am glad the able Senator from Colorado read that language, because I think that is the way to handle such a situation as this. The Senator will note two things about the language which he read. First, it says in substance that if other people do not allow our ships to go to their ports without discrimination, then we will not, perhaps, allow their ships to come to our ports without discrimina-

tion. That is in respect to the class of vessels.

The second, and the important, thing I noted in the language the Senator read is the fact that the Congress gave the power to the President to determine when to use a prohibition which the Congress placed in his hands as a weapon. We do not exercise it arbitrarily here in the Congress. If we should state that the Chief Executive of our country, who represents us in negotiations with other countries, shall have certain power, when he makes demands with respect to practices detrimental to our commerce and they are not met by foreign countries, I would be willing to have that provided in this case, but the Senator from Colorado is proposing an entirely different thing. These claims are not in respect to the Sugar Act or the sugar question, and, in the second place, we do not give our President authority to impose these conditions and restrictions if Cuba does not meet our just demands. We in the Congress arbitrarily impose them.

I think the language the able Senator read is exactly the way the matter should be handled, but it is different from the way it is handled in the Sugar Act.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I have read language to the Senator which is closely related to a single subject matter. I have also read language which is much broader. I have also referred to the Philippine Trade Act where similar protective provisions are included.

The Senator has mentioned that he would have a more approving feeling toward the legislation if the President were involved. It is inconceivable to me that the Secretary of State would initiate any important actions against an independent government like Cuba without the knowledge or approval of the President of the United States.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator tell us whether either the President or the State Department has recommended or been consulted with upon this amendment?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I understand the State Department has approved the paragraph.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator know that of his personal knowledge? If he does, of course I shall take his word for it. I wondered if there was any communication from the State Department.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have talked to representatives of the State Department who assured me that is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to add a word?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will say to the Senator from Florida that it is my understanding that the provision was written into the bill at the request of the State Department. It did not come from any Members of the Senate or, so far as I know, from any Members of the House who have been interested in securing extension of the Sugar Act.

Mr. PEPPER. Can the Senator tell us whether anyone encouraged the State Department to make such recommendations, or did the State Department initiate the contact with the Congress and voluntarily make the recommendation?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The State Department initiated the inclusion of the paragraph in the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I will make one more observation and then, probably, will not take the time of the Senator hereafter.

Mr. President, the best relations the United States Government has had in its history, I believe, were in the days when the good-neighbor policy was the foreign policy of the Government of the United States, when we did not take advantage of our power to impose upon any weaker people conditions that were peculiarly advantageous to us.

It seems to me an extraordinary thing, without us hearing anything about it, that there are unpaid claims of some American nationals from the Cuban Government, or somebody, that the President of the United States has not been able to collect, and that we have got to impose what amounts to an embargo on Cuban sugar exports into the United States in order to get her to pay those claims. It is a surprising doctrine to me that the Congress has become the collecting agency of American creditors. I think that is detrimental to our good relations with our sister Republic of Cuba. I am afraid they will regard it as another evidence of the "big stick" on the part of the United States Government. That is not in the interest of peace. That is not in the interest of the best understanding and the warmest friendship between our two great countries. I exceedingly regret the effort which is made in the bill to make the Congress of the United States the collecting agency for some American creditors about whom we do not even know—at least, so far as I am concerned, that is true—while we are considering the legislation.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I can only say that I have learned with the deepest regret that our State Department initiated the provision which is contained in the bill. It is contrary to the conditions we have been trying to develop in our relations with our South American neighbors. It flies in the face of the good-neighbor doctrine. I deeply regret that it is included in the bill and I am surprised to learn that the State Department initiated it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, while we are granting these great privileges to other countries I think we have a right to ask in turn that our own nationals be treated fairly. There cannot be any other foundation for wholesome and healthy foreign relations. I do not believe the Secretary of State is going to use his office as a collection agency. He has a duty to perform with respect to the just claims of American citizens. If he did not perform them we would criticize him. I do not see any harm in equipping him with a little bit of quid pro quo which will help him do justice to the people who are offering this great privilege to Cuba.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator speaks about a little quid pro quo. I think that is a masterpiece of exaggeration, for the Senator's little quid pro quo amounts to the power to strangle this good neighbor of ours down in the Caribbean, because if we shut off her sugar we shut off her life's blood and we kill her.

As I understand, the claims in dispute, the justice of which I do not pretend to judge, were incurred under another administration, and are strenuously disputed by the present administration of the friendly Government of Cuba. I simply want to point out that when we are putting the power in the Secretary of State to shut off sugar importations from Cuba if the claims against Cuba are disallowed, we are giving the power to the Secretary of State to execute a death warrant on that Republic.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It has been made very clear that the language does not contemplate pushing claims which have not been adjudicated or which have not been acknowledged.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was about to add one further statement. The Senator from Connecticut is mistaken if he believes that the provision of the bill would permit the State Department or the Department of Agriculture, or require the Government of the United States, in any way to shut off imports. It deals only and exclusively with the excess quota which is here granted, a quota which heretofore was assigned to the Philippines, and to which the domestic producers had some claim.

Moreover, it ought to be made clear again that this provision does not make the United States a collecting agency. It does not make the Congress of the United States a collecting agency. It is clearly stated that the meaning of this provision is simply that when a foreign country, by its own judicial processes, by its own constitutional act, acknowledges a claim, then the failure to pay that claim shall be regarded as unfair and inequitable treatment. But this does not take away from any foreign country the right and the power to adjudicate claims according to its own system of adjudication.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In view of what has been said, I am bound to make my comment on the situation.

I concede that the Government of the United States and the Government of Cuba are entitled to have a reciprocal arrangement under which they each insist upon the recognition of the claims of the other; and a general protocol or

convention to that effect is perfectly sound. If, ultimately, it is violated, I know of no reason why the Government of the United States should not be entitled to look to any recourse available to it. But I cannot for the life of me understand why such an arrangement should be part of a sugar treaty, to be paid in terms of sugar, when it involves a fundamental question of reciprocal rights.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the sugar benefits which are provided for Cuba are the basis of the reciprocal rights to which the Senator refers.

Mr. VANDENBERG. May I ask the Senator another question? Let us have the record perfectly clear that there is not a single thing about this particular section which is of the slightest interest to our domestic sugar growers, our domestic sugar processors, or producers. They have no interest whatever in it. Is that true, or is it not?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is true. The Government of the United States, not the producers or processors, is giving this fabulous cornucopia of benefit to Cuba; and as a related act of reciprocity, if we wish to put it that way, it has been provided that our own nationals shall be treated fairly.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Are not the purposes of the bill "to regulate commerce among the several States, with the Territories and possessions of the United States, and with foreign countries"? What is there in this particular section, section 202, subsection (e), which has anything to do with the purport of the bill which we are now considering? Senate bill 1584, a companion bill to the House bill now being considered, was introduced by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. What was the purpose of those Senators in getting together? Was it to make the Congress of the United States or the State Department a collection agency or was it, as the bill says, "to regulate commerce among the several States, with the Territories and possessions of the United States, and with foreign countries"? I ask the Senator what was the purpose of those Senators in getting together?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The purpose of the sponsorship was to sponsor a sugar bill, and that is what we have here.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is not the Sugar Act a stabilization act to stabilize the sugar industry?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is one of the purposes of the act.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not a fact that section 202, subsection (e), is a brand new section which has never before appeared in a sugar bill?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It is also a brand new thing for Cuba to have the increase in sugar which is granted to her by this bill—at the expense, one might argue, of the American producers. Therefore it is not entirely inappropriate, I suggest, while we are doing this generous and fine thing for Cuba, to ask that our own nationals be treated fairly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Colorado has emphasized two or three times that we are doing a great act for Cuba. I think he used the expression "a great cornucopia," or outpouring. Is it not true that Cuba happens to purchase great quantities of our products?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And that it is of mutual advantage to trade with Cuba?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Exactly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does not she purchase our machinery and our automobiles?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Among other items from my own State, she purchases rice. I think she is the largest purchaser of rice produced in Arkansas.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think it is quite fair to leave the impression that this is purely charity. We are trying to promote mutually beneficial trade, are we not?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator is correct. Also, it should be remembered, our own people who raise sugar beets, or would like to do so, buy those same things.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator from Michigan had the correct view. Since this is a treaty dealing with trade, the kind of procedure provided in section 202 (e) is wholly unwarranted.

If this question were to be decided by an international court, or by arbitration, as our differences with Mexico are decided, that would be another thing. All our difficulties with Mexico are covered by arbitration. In connection with the water treaty, which received so much attention from the able Senator from Colorado last year, the great point was made as to the fine relationship which we enjoyed through the practice of arbitrating our differences with Mexico. That would be a very different thing, and I would have no objection to such an arrangement.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The distinguished Senator was not in the Chamber when I read from two or three precedents which show that this is no unusual measure of protection for the United States to take.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Even if it is not unusual, I think it is very bad.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator give us a definition of "nationals" in line 18 on page 8?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should say that a citizen of the United States is a national of the United States.

Mr. LANGER. Would that include a corporation, a bank, a partnership, or an association?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I believe it is broad enough to include a bank, corporation, or association.

Mr. LANGER. So if Cuba owed a bank in this country, and the bank wanted to collect, it could go to the office of the Secretary of State, and he would have the power under this section to say, "We will not buy sugar unless you pay that debt."

Mr. MILLIKIN. I cannot think of that turn of events. If we are going to try to get American capital into foreign countries—and that seems to be a part of our national policy—I do not see how we can do it except by following the corporate form. If we follow the corporate form, it seems to me that we must give it protection as well as individuals or associations.

Mr. LANGER. Frankly, I cannot follow the reasoning of the distinguished Senator. If a bank in this country loans money to Cuba, why should it loan it unless it has some security? Why should our Government permit a sugar deal to protect the investment?

Mr. MILLIKIN. In the first instance, it is not a question of why we should protect the investment, the first question is, Why should not Cuba protect the investment?

Mr. LANGER. Why should we hold a pistol at Cuba's head?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would not favor that.

Mr. LANGER. In that section of the bill it is stated that the Secretary shall have authority to withhold or withdraw any increase in the share of the domestic consumption requirements provided for such country. Why is not that holding a pistol to Cuba's head?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Any time there is a right to withdraw from a contract or a right to terminate any kind of an arrangement or do that which might inconvenience or injure someone else, the argument can be made that there is a pistol at the other fellow's head. It

seems to me it is a lurid way of expressing something that probably will not happen.

Mr. LANGER. But it may happen.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I doubt very much that it would happen. But let us look at it. We are giving Cuba a great increase in the cut in the American sugar market, and we want the fair and just debts of our nationals paid. Is that putting a pistol to Cuba's head?

Mr. LANGER. That is exactly what it is.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not view it that way.

Mr. President, under the existing Sugar Act it has been within the power of the Secretary of Agriculture to exercise a certain regulation over the wages of the employees of the farmers and over the prices received by the farmers for their cane sugar or their beet sugar. In the case of cane sugar on the mainland of this country and also in our possessions it often happens that the processor is also a big owner of the production, and it can be reasoned from that that he has the opportunity to depress wages and, possibly, to depress the price of the product which is offered to his plant.

I assume that that is the theory on which the act grants those regulatory powers. But in the beet-sugar areas only approximately one-fifth of the acreage of diversified farms is given to the production of beet sugar. Beet sugar is competitive with a number of other crops. It is competitive with beans, with wheat, potatoes, and forage crops. It is so competitive, in fact, that during the war, because the other crops carried higher prices under the encouragement of the Government, there was a certain drop in beet-sugar production. The labor that works on sugar beets is competitive with the labor that works on the other crops in the same area. The processor there does not control the production of the beets. The farmer himself controls the production of the beets, and he is in position to deal at arm's length with the processor. The processor has to obtain the beets because he has an enormous investment in his plants. He has to make his contracts with the farmer. If he cannot make a good contract, the farmer can go into the production of beans, wheat, potatoes, or other crops. Therefore, so far as a price is concerned, it is an arm's-length price, and there is no just reason why the farmers in those areas should be subjected to that kind of control.

We have added in the Senate an amendment designed, in brief, to eliminate the sugar-beet areas from those provisions. There has been objection to that amendment. We are confronted with the necessity of getting a sugar bill by tomorrow. Therefore, most reluctantly, I shall offer a motion to amend the bill by striking that provision; but I wish to say that at least so far as I am concerned, the subject is open whenever we come to the consideration of future sugar legislation.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Colorado that I am very happy to hear him say that he is intending to make a motion to strike, because if he had not I would have been compelled to make such a motion myself. I think that is the proper thing to do. It is an unnecessary provision.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 23, to strike out all of paragraph (3) of subsection (c) of section 301.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, as I understand, that simply means that the paragraph is stricken out, and the House provision on that subject will be taken?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That was added in the Senate. It was proposed from the floor of the House and was defeated there. So, in order to save discussion here and to save a possible stalemate in conference with the House, I am asking that that provision be stricken.

Mr. PEPPER. So that the provision protecting the grower and the worker, which appeared in the 1937 bill and which has appeared in a subsequent bill and is incorporated in the House bill, will also go into the Senate bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to address a question to the Senator from Colorado. Is this a committee amendment which has not been acted on by the Senate?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the amendment has not been adopted, rather than moving to strike, would it not be a question of merely not approving the committee amendment?

Mr. MILLIKIN. If it is permissible I should like to move that the paragraph be stricken. It is also agreeable to me that the amendment be voted down; but before the question is put I should like to say this: The Secretary of Agriculture has written a letter to the California Beet Growers Association, Ltd., under date of July 17, 1947, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., July 17, 1947.

CALIFORNIA BEET GROWERS ASSOCIATION, LTD.,
Stockton, Calif.

GENTLEMEN: In connection with the proposed Sugar Act of 1948 which is now before the Senate, Mr. Gordon Lyons has told us that your association is particularly concerned about the timing of the fair and reasonable wage determinations if the legislation as finally enacted should provide for such determinations in the sugar beet areas.

We have refrained from making advance statements as to how we propose to administer specific provisions of the proposed legislation because most of such provisions must necessarily be administered in the light of conditions existing at the time the specific provisions are applied. However, the question which Mr. Lyons has raised is one which can be answered by a general policy statement which can be made at this time.

In making determinations of fair and reasonable wages it will be our policy to make the necessary studies, hold the necessary public hearings, and issue the formal determinations in such manner that the determinations can be announced prior to the time the labor, to which such determinations are applicable, is performed. It will be our policy to issue the determinations in such manner that it will not be necessary for farmers to make retroactive wage adjustments as a result of such determinations. This, of course, does not apply to areas in which wage scales are tied directly to average prices for sugar.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON.

This letter from the Secretary of Agriculture makes it easier to take the action which I am proposing, because a great deal of the objection has come from the fact that the wage determinations have been made after the workers have been paid and have scattered all over the country. Great inconvenience, uncertainty, loss, and annoyance have resulted from that.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the situation, if this amendment is not agreed to, it will mean that the bill will be in exactly the same language as it was when it was passed by the House, and thus the bill will not have to go to conference. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct; it will then be passed by the Senate in exactly the same way as the House has passed it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I think it is most unfortunate to include in the sugar bill the provision found in subsection (e) of section 202, with reference to the action of foreign governments in regard to debts owed to American citizens. In the present posture of the world's affairs, we have been endeavoring to bring about continental and hemispheric solidarity with the Latin-American nations. We are soon to have a conference with them at Rio de Janeiro. I think it is most unfortunate that the financial or commercial motive should be brought up.

This subsection provides that—

(e) If the Secretary of State finds that any foreign country denies fair and equitable treatment to the nationals of the United States, its commerce, navigation, or industry, and so notifies the Secretary, the Secretary shall have authority to withhold or withdraw any increase in the share of the domestic consumption requirements provided for such country by this act as compared with the share allowed under section 202 (b) of the Sugar Act of 1937;

And so forth. Mr. President, these matters should be handled through diplomatic channels, as they always have been. We are not the guarantors in respect to the commercial transactions of American citizens who go to foreign countries to do business. When they go to foreign countries for that purpose,

they take the hazard incident thereto, just as they do at home.

Of course, I wish to see American nationals receive their just dues; but this provision puts upon us the moral duty of adjudicating these claims and saying what claims are just and what claims are not just.

I know the report says they must be agreed upon or adjudicated, but I find nothing in the bill that provides a limitation as to what is to be adjudicated or acknowledged.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I wish to say that it was made very clear in the House report, and it has also been made very clear in the discussion here that that is what is meant.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, we are not legislating on the basis of reports or on the basis of what is said in the discussion on this floor. We are legislating on the basis of what is written into this bill.

A lawyer who is trying a law suit, looks to the statute, unless it is ambiguous or uncertain, in which case he may rely upon the action of legislative bodies in considering it, or upon contemporary constructions.

But now we are considering the language of this bill. It gives to the Secretary of State himself the right to pass on these matters; but we know that the Secretary of State himself will not be able to pass on all of them. Some person at the head of the Latin-American Bureau or the head of the Cuban Bureau or the head of some other bureau, will determine these matters. Then, instead of acting in the interest of peace and fair dealing and good will, this procedure will stimulate quarrels, perhaps, over insignificant amounts of money, for that matter, between the United States and foreign governments.

I hope very much that the Senator from Colorado in his wisdom and good judgment, which are manifest on many occasions, will not insist upon retaining that clause in the pending bill. I wish to see the Congress enact a sugar bill, of course; but I wish to see the Congress enact a sugar bill that we can stand upon, and on the basis of which we can look the world in the face, and not appear as a Shylock demanding either a pound of sugar or a pound of flesh.

So I hope the Senator from Colorado will agree to have the provision removed from the bill. I do not wish to see our international relations based upon money considerations, or considerations of how many ounces of gold are to be received. I want our foreign relations placed on a high and lofty plane. The only way we can do that is to treat other governments as equals, and not attempt to coerce them or put pressure upon them.

For instance, a United States national who has left New York and has gone to a foreign country and engaged in business there, may have a good claim or a bad claim on the basis of some transaction in which he has engaged in the foreign country. But the claims of such persons can be examined in a proper and impartial way, and the foreign government can see to that. So I hope this clause will not be retained in the bill.

We should let these claims be settled by diplomatic means. We have treaties with most foreign nations. I cannot enumerate them all now; but, of course, we have trade treaties with most of the nations of the world, and usually such treaties contain provisions relative to the handling of commercial transactions and the settlement of disputes connected with them, either by means of tribunals or in other ways.

So I appeal to the Senator from Colorado not to base this bill upon the cold, hard-boiled consideration of how many dollars we can squeeze out of someone on the threat that we will not let them have a sugar quota unless we can exact from them an agreement as to a system of requiring the payment of the claims of our citizens.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, that was not my purpose.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, that is why I ask the Senator from Colorado to agree to have the provision deleted from the bill. I knew it had been suggested by someone else.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I repeat, that in a bill in which we are giving Cubans very generous and handsome treatment, it is not inappropriate also to have in the bill a provision which will assure fair treatment of our nationals. I do not think that is something at which Cuba should take offense. Certainly it is not something at which a United States national should take offense.

I think it cannot possibly jeopardize our international relations. Many persons believe that these things should be on sort of a two-way road, and that when we are dealing generously with other nations they should deal generously and fairly with our nationals.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator that we have an ambassador in Cuba, we have an American embassy with a staff, an enormous staff, and all sorts of employees who may present these claims to Cuba and insist upon fair and equitable treatment. Relations between Cuba and the United States since the Spanish-American War, as the Senator knows, have been on a rather fatherly sort of basis, and I want them to continue that way. I do not want to endanger the cordial relations for a few pounds of sugar. We sell commerce in Cuba. If one goes to Cuba and wants to ride up from the station he gets in a Ford, or a Plymouth, or some car of that kind, that we are selling down there. It is the business of the seller to get his money. We cannot send a policeman around with every shipment of commerce to Central or South America or anywhere else.

I hope very much that the good intentions which I know the Senator from Colorado possesses, and the policy about which I know he is so greatly concerned, will cause him to withdraw this provision.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I would not want the Senator to get the impression that I have a light-hearted view of this matter. The House of Representatives has passed this provision and it is in the Senate bill. To take it out might pull down the whole thing in dispute with the House, and I think the provision is something which can be sustained on its merits. Most respectfully I say, I do not believe it should be taken out of the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, when did a House bill become so sacred that because a provision is in a House bill the Senate cannot amend it? All day we have been amending House bills, and that is what we have been doing all session. They amend our bills, do they not?

Mr. President, the House of Representatives does not mind amending Senate bills. The Senator says "Why, it has not only passed the House, but it is in the Senate bill." Suppose it is in the Senate bill; we can amend the bill, can we not? We have a right to amend it if it appeals to our judgment that it should be amended. The Senator says it may kill the whole bill. This is such a trivial thing on which to hang the fate of the whole bill, whether some claimant gets what he has been demanding that Cuba pay him, and Cuba has not seen fit to pay him.

All these claims are not wrapped up in garments of sacredness. Some of these claims, I have been told by diplo nats and others, do not smell very aromatic. Some of them are of doubtful value. I am not going to vote to carry this provision in this bill which places our intercourse with foreign nations on the dollar basis. Here is a great bill, a great measure, which affects the whole world, which affects the people of the United States. Every housewife is affected by sugar. Yet it is said, "Well, if they don't pay some of these claims we are not going to let them have a quota."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Even if we put it on a dollar basis is it not true that during the war and up to the present Cuba has been very fair in the price of sugar when she could have, as some other countries we know of very well have, taken advantage of the situation and charged exorbitant amounts for sugar, which I think is still the only really rationed article in this country. Is not that true?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not sure as to all the details, but I have always understood that was the fact.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator recalls that after the last war sugar went up in price to 25 cents.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is not 25 cents now. I think it is only around 10 cents a pound retail. I do not know what the treaty calls for at the wholesale level, but it is much less than that. I think the Senator from Colorado knows it to be true that during the war, when we were very anxious to get all the sugar from Cuba we could get, we had very decent treatment so far as the price was concerned.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not care to take up more of the time of the Senate, but I do very much hope the Senate will strike out this section. I am very anxious to get the sugar bill through, the people of Texas want it passed. Some prominent Texans have been here for some time interested in getting the sugar bill through. But when we get the sugar bill through, I want the right kind of a sugar bill passed, not a one-way street sugar bill. Let us get one that is fair and that is based upon good will between the nations of the earth.

Mr. CHAVEZ. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The bill is subject to amendment, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I move to amend by striking out subsection (e) of section 202.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, line 17, it is proposed to strike out subsection (e), which reads as follows:

(e) If the Secretary of State finds that any foreign country denies fair and equitable treatment to the nationals of the United States, its commerce, navigation, or industry, and so notifies the Secretary, the Secretary shall have authority to withhold or withdrawn any increase in the share of the domestic consumption requirements provided for such country by this act as compared with the share allowed under section 202 (b) of the Sugar Act of 1937: *Provided*, That any amount of sugar so withheld or withdrawn shall be prorated to domestic areas on the basis of existing quotas for such areas and the Secretary shall revise such quotas accordingly: *Provided further*, That any portion of such amount of sugar which cannot be supplied by domestic areas may be prorated to foreign countries other than a country which the Secretary of State finds has denied fair and equitable treatment to nationals of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate long, but I do wish to repeat what I stated to the Senate night before last. Senate bill 1584, and the House bill we are now considering, have only one purpose, namely, to stabilize the sugar industry. Let me read the purposes of the bill:

To regulate commerce among the several States, with the Territories and possessions of the United States, and with foreign countries; to protect the welfare of consumers of sugars and of those engaged in the domestic sugar-producing industry; to promote the export trade of the United States; and for other purposes.

Amongst the other purposes there is nothing whatsoever that has to do with the bill being made a vehicle for collection purposes.

Mr. President, no one wants to help a foreign country, even a little one like Cuba, to pay its just debts to our nationals, including corporations, which are involved in the section we are considering, more than I do. But there is a proper way to do it. There is a proper way to collect such debts and to ascertain what they are. I think a country such as ours actually should be ashamed of itself that it has to come to the point of inserting in the law a provision such as subsection (e) of section 202 in order to carry out the caprice or whim of American nationals, which are two or three corporations of the United States, and doing it the way here proposed.

Mr. President, is that what we have been preaching? Is that what we fought for? Is that the basis of our policy in Greece and Turkey and China and elsewhere? Is it in keeping with our so-called good-neighbor policy?

Possibly Senators do not think it is important. Of course we can do what is suggested. We are powerful, and there are the votes to pass the legislation, but it is not going to set well.

In a few days, the President of this body and the Senator from Texas will go forth on a noble mission to Brazil to try to spread doctrines we have been preaching—good will and the good neighbor policy. Imagine the look on the faces of the representatives of small countries, such as Cuba and others, when they see the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Michigan, representing the leading country of the world, coming among them after the enactment of such a bill as this. They will not, of course, directly say it to the faces of the Senators; but in their minds will be the thought, "Yours is the most powerful Nation on earth, and yet it finds it necessary to prod Cuba by passing legislation of this type." We can do it if we want to; but is it right, is it neighborly, is it even good manners? Should we preach to any nation in the world, be it Communist or otherwise, about our sincerity of purpose, about our idea of trying to do what is right, and then pick on little Cuba, who might not think she owes those debts. Who is going to decide as to those things? Do we do it that way in everyday life? Somebody says to CHAVEZ, "You owe me $50." And I say "I do not." We go to court about it; but I have my day in court. Let me say that the nationals who seek the payment of claims are of the class to which the Senator from Texas has referred. In this group there is not a claimant who is what we call a natural person. They are only "persons" in the sense that a corporation or agency is called a person in law. Who decides as to the claim? The Secretary of State. Who decides as to the righteousness of the claim, as to the correctness of the claim? Our Secretary of State. Is that good will? Is that international justice? Is that what we have been preaching?

Senators, it is a serious matter, so serious that I made an appeal to this body night before last concerning it. Let us not boast of our might, but let us show the world, including small countries, that we can be just and fair. Let not a great industry such as the sugar industry of the United States say that the Congress of the United States is its "sugar daddy" and the United States of America will collect for it a few million dollars, or whatever the amount may be. It is not right; it is not fair; it is not American; it is not what we stand for. We are not alone in thinking that way.

I want to read an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of yesterday morning. It is headed "Cuban Indignation." It reads as follows:

Cuba, neighbor and friend—

Put this provision in the bill, and while she will be our neighbor, and will have to be our friend, yet she will not feel like being our friend—

Cuba, neighbor and friend, has a real grievance against the United States which is so well justified that we hope the Senate will rectify it. The grievance concerns a section in the pending sugar bill which says that if the Secretary of State finds that any foreign country denies fair and equitable treatment to Americans, he is empowered to deny that country benefits accorded under the bill. This is meant to obtain for American nationals payment of private claims they have against the Cuban Government. Such an interpretation, given by Representative HOPE to the House of Representatives and concurred in by the State Department, has created a furor in Cuba.

Why not? When we were poor, when we were small, we would have resented it, and rightly so, if England had enacted legislation of the type here proposed. According to House bill 4075, if the Secretary of State finds that any foreign country denies fair and equitable treatment to the nationals of the United States, he is empowered to deny that country the benefits accorded under the bill.

So perturbed are the Cubans that they threaten to keep away from the coming Rio meeting of the American Republics to work out a system of hemispherical defense.

They are going to be there. They are not going to stay away from Rio or Brazil. But I will wager they wish they were powerful enough to be able to say, "We resent an insult, and the fact that we are now being treated without the respect that should be accorded to any dignified country, such as the dignity and the respect that we pay to humble men in the street."

The club that the State Department has inserted in the sugar bill is a reversion to the big stick policy toward our continental neighbors.

President Coolidge said that "The person and property of a citizen are a part of the general domain of a nation, even when abroad."

I believe that is exactly what the Senator from Colorado had in mind when he stated that American nationals should be protected. I believe they should be protected, but I would not carry it to the extent here proposed.

This attitude was abandoned under the good-neighbor policy. Instead of collecting debts arbitrarily, we decided to put our faith in common principles developed at successive inter-American conferences. The latest pledge was laid down in the Act of Chapultepec. Here the rule was adopted "on conciliation, unrestricted arbitration, or the application of international justice in the solution of any difference or dispute between

American nations, whatever its nature or origin." Cuba, which is regularly meeting payments on her foreign debt, has pleaded with our Government to live up to this undertaking and has pledged herself to go before any conciliation board.

But under the Sugar Act there would be no such thing as a conciliation board. The Secretary of State of the powerful United States would decide the matter.

There is no excuse for our trying to collect the claims of our citizens by this form of legislative intimidation.

Actually that is what it is, legislative intimidation by a powerful country, telling a country that exists by the sale of her sugar, "We will starve you if necessary, if you do not pay corporation A something, in the city of Philadelphia or New York." Probably this is correct, and probably it should be done.

The claims, not being the result of a marketed loan in the United States, are in no special class to themselves. They are inextricably mixed up with the claims of Cuban nationals incurred by old administrations in Havana. They are thus part of Cuba's internal debt. Yet we are threatening to subject the Cuban Government to the embarrassment of making it give the American claimants a privileged position. This is a poor return for Cuba's help to us during the war. We trust the Senate will not allow a bill to go through containing such a flagrant violation of our pledges and our professions. Let the offensive clause be stricken out, and then the State Department could go about the job of composing our nationals' claims through the machinery provided for, as suggested by Cuba and as called for by our obligations.

That is the end of the editorial in the Washington Post of day before yesterday, and it is correct.

Mr. President, it is my firm conviction that every nation, large and small, including England, should pay its debts. Russia should pay her debts. Cuba should pay her debts. But in procuring payment of debts by nations who owe us money, let us follow the well-established customs existing among nations who want to do what is right.

Mr. President, I want to impress upon Senators that the good-neighbor policy has meant much to the smaller nations of this hemisphere. We are the largest nation in this hemisphere. The smaller nations look to us for guidance; they expect from us justice. Today a Senator from a neighboring country, Colombia, appeared on the floor of the Senate. He was presented to the Members of the Senate by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. Speaking in Spanish to me he said, "Senator, we look to the United States to help us, to direct us, to set us an example for the future. It is our desire to be as democratic as you are. It is our desire to have the people of other nations respect us as they respect you, because you treat the people of all nations fairly and justly."

Mr. President, if the bill is passed in its present form, there will be many who will not like it. It will operate to our disadvantage, in spite of all the Senators who may be sent to Rio. My friend the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and my friend the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] will be received with open arms, but with suspicion. They will be received as good citizens should be received. But they will be told, "You come to us and speak honeyed words. Your Nation signed the Act of Chapultepec. Your people speak of neighborliness and good-will policies. Nevertheless, the body of which you are Members passed a bill which would intimidate Cuba into paying its debts, whether just or not."

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Myers
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Ball	Hill	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Holland	Overton
Bricker	Ives	Pepper
Brooks	Jenner	Reed
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Kilgore	Russell
Capehart	Knowland	Saltonstall
Capper	Langer	Smith
Chavez	Lodge	Sparkman
Connally	Lucas	Stewart
Cooper	McCarthy	Taft
Cordon	McClellan	Taylor
Donnell	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Dworshak	McGrath	Thye
Eastland	McKellar	Tydings
Ecton	McMahon	Umstead
Ellender	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Fulbright	Martin	White
George	Maybank	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Williams
Gurney	Moore	Young
Hatch	Morse	
Hawkes	Murray	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] to strike out subsection (e) of section 202 from the pending bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REED. I have a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are unavoidably detained. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], who is unavoidably detained, is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. The Senator from Washington, if present and voting, would vote "nay," and the Senator from New York, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who is necessarily absent, would vote "nay" if present.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. The transfer of that pair to the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] has previously been announced by the Senator from Kansas. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea" and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—40

Aiken	Kilgore	O'Daniel
Byrd	Knowland	Overton
Chavez	Langer	Pepper
Connally	Lucas	Robertson, Va.
Cooper	McClellan	Russell
Eastland	McGrath	Smith
Fulbright	McKellar	Sparkman
Green	McMahon	Stewart
Hatch	Magnuson	Taylor
Hayden	Maybank	Tydings
Hill	Morse	Umstead
Holland	Murray	Vandenberg
Ives	Myers	
Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor	

NAYS—42

Baldwin	Ellender	Millikin
Ball	Ferguson	Moore
Barkley	George	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Gurney	Reed
Bricker	Hawkes	Revercomb
Brooks	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Buck	Hoey	Taft
Butler	Jenner	Thomas, Okla.
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Thye
Capper	Lodge	Wherry
Cordon	McCarthy	White
Donnell	McFarland	Wiley
Dworshak	Malone	Williams
Ecton	Martin	Young

NOT VOTING—13

Bridges	Kem	Wagner
Bushfield	McCarran	Watkins
Cain	Robertson, Wyo.	Wilson
Downey	Thomas, Utah	
Flanders	Tobey	

So Mr. CHAVEZ' amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, when the amendment was offered, the distinguished Senator from Colorado had not finished discussing the bill. I was waiting until he reached the provisions of section 302 to address an inquiry to the Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I shall be very glad to have the Senator place in the RECORD the correspondence which he has. It is very illuminating.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I believe I shall make a statement in my own time.

The question has been raised by some of the producers within the State of Florida as to the provisions of subsection (b) of section 302. They have been somewhat concerned. In subsection (b)

the word "may" is used in the second line of that subsection in describing the powers of the Secretary of Agriculture with reference to the distribution of the proportionate shares of the quota among the producers of sugar.

The producers in the State of Florida who have been concerned have wanted the word "may" changed to the word "shall" so as to require mandatorily of the Secretary of Agriculture that he must, in considering the distribution of quotas, consider the two factors which are mentioned in that section, namely, the past production on the farm and the ability to produce on the farm.

The Senator from Colorado anc I have discussed that question and have taken it up with the Sugar Section of the Department of Agriculture. We have been told by the Chief of that Section that in construing the identical provision of the 1937 act it has always been held and interpreted that the word "may" means exactly the same as the word "shall", and that it is mandatory under this provision for the Secretary of Agriculture to consider, in the distribution of quotas, both factors, that is, past production, and ability to produce.

After discussing that matter with the chief of the Sugar Section, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and I requested a formal statement from the Secretary of Agriculture in the nature of an interpretation and amounting almost to an administrative ruling. I have here and would like to have printed in the RECORD at this place in my remarks an interpretative ruling of the Secretary of Agriculture as embraced in a letter dated July 16, 1947, addressed to me.

There being no objection, the letter was order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, July 16, 1947.

Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in response to your request as to the interpretation of the Department of Agriculture of section 302 (b) of the Sugar Act of 1937, the text of that section being identical with the wording of the same section in S. 1584. We understand that some of the Florida growers are concerned about the interpretation of this section.

Section 302 (b) provides that "in determining the proportionate share with respect to a farm, the Secretary may take into consideration the past production on the farm of sugar beets and sugarcane marketed (or processed) for the extraction of sugar and the ability to produce such sugar beets or sugarcane * * *." Inasmuch as the law prescribes that only two factors, past production and ability to produce, be used in determining proportionate shares for a farm, the Department has always construed "may" in section 302 (b) as requiring the Secretary to take into consideration both factors. There is no collateral provision in the proposed legislation, S. 1584 or H. R. 4075, or any legislative history in connection with these bills, of which we are aware, which would either suggest or require that a different interpretation should henceforth be adopted by the Department.

The report on H. R. 4075 by the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives confirms our interpretation. The following statement appears on page 8 of Report No. 796 of the House of Representatives: "The proportionate shares (acreage allotments for farms are to be established on the basis of past production on the farm and aoility to produce sugar beets or sugarcane thereon."

If you have any further questions about this section, we shall be glad to respond promptly.

Sincerely yours,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the final passage of the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I want to say one word. Florida has been in a very unfortunate situation relative to the sugar question, because production in our State came late. Historically, our sugar industry actually began in 1929 When the sugar quota law went into effect in 1935 it was based upon the historical background of the producing areas of the country. That is to say, quotas were awarded to the producing areas on an historical basis. Accordingly, our State, which we have been pleased to call the sugar-bowl of this country, has been limited in its ability to produce sugar by the result of the quota system restricting our production. We have therefore felt that we have suffered by the imposition of restrictions upon our productive capacity in the Everglades area of Florida. The entire Florida delegation has fought since the Sugar Act has been the law of the land, to get an increased quota, which we felt we deserved. There has been a constantly enlarged quota allowed to us. During the war we extended our production and our processing facilities.

We have not been altogether satisfied with the quota which will be available to us under this bill. Perhaps other areas of the country are not satisfied either. We do feel that we can live for the present under these limitations in the quota system. We hope the quotas will be deferred as long as possible, at least for the next few years, while there is still a shortage of sugar for the consumers of our country.

We do appreciate the cooperation which has been extended to us by the able chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Colorado, in recognizing our peculiar problem in Florida and in assisting us sympathetically, as all the proponents of the bill have done. But we do hope as time goes on we can expand our productive capacity to meet the greater demand.

So we are accepting this bill under the present circumstances with the hope that we shall have the sympathetic interest and cooperation of others who understand our peculiar situation and that there will be more satisfactory legislation in the future.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I have heard a great deal of discussion tonight as to whether cane sugar or beet sugar got the advantage under this bill, and we have debated and tried to strike out, but lacked two votes of doing it, an amendment which was peculiarly harsh to a small but friendly neighboring country. There has been no discussion whatever concerning the basic problem involved in this bill; that is, whether we are dealing justly with Cuba in giving her only the quota she had before the war, except the unfilled portion, for the next 5 years, of the quota of the Philippines, under the Philippines Trade Act.

I think it is generally recognized that the Philippines in 1948 will fill at least half of their quota, and in 1949 will probably fill all of their quota. That means that only for 2 years, as I see it, will Cuba get any benefit whatever from that source.

The second proposition which I have not heard mentioned is whether this bill is in the best interests of the consumers of sugar in this country. We have 2 States which produce cane sugar, and there are 14 States which produce beet sugar. I recognize that they made a very valuable contribution in increasing their production during the war, and I would be very happy to see them get a liberal part of the increased market. But I frankly do not think, Mr. President, that in framing the bill, we have given due and proper consideration to the 140,000,000 consumers in this country, because in giving so large a percentage of our future anticipated needs to the domestic market we are contemplating a subsidy which we will have to keep in operation.

In normal times Cuba can produce sugar for 2 cents a pound. We shall not see the time for many years when we can produce sugar in this country for less than 4 or 5 or 6 cents a pound. We are going to subsidize that market and make our consumers pay in the retail price the difference between that subsidy and what they could have bought it for on a freer market.

I say, Mr. President, with full recognition of the fact that I am wasting my time in saying it, so far as the passage of this bill is concerned, that we have not in framing the bill given due regard either to the proper treatment of Cuba or to the best interests of the consumers of sugar in our own country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 4075) was passed.

USE OF SURPLUS BUILDINGS AND LANDS FOR COMMUNITY PURPOSES

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the Armed Services Committee has had controversies in the past 2 or 3 months respecting pieces of property which are proposed to be deeded to communities for several purposes. This morning our committee reported favorably a Senate concurring resolution relating to surplus buildings and lands for community properties. The concurrent resolution would

request the War and Navy Departments to hold the property and land in question until March 5, when Congress can have an opportunity to look at the problem again and advise the kind of program to be followed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to report an original concurrent resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. With the indulgence of the Senate, the Chair would like to say that he is familiar with this problem. It involves a great number of pieces of public property in many States. It is merely a stop-gap procedure, and suspends action pending further investigation and consideration, and in the opinion of the Chair should be adopted.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is any of the property in question owned by the War Assets Corporation?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes. The measure provides that the land shall be held in the possession of the Army or the Navy, or War Assets Administration, and would not permit the Army or the Navy to declare it surplus until Congress has an opportunity to look over the plan.

Mr. LANGER. It does not include land owned by the War Assets Administration?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes; it does include certain lands owned by the War Assets Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 31) relating to surplus buildings and lands for community purposes was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the War Department, the Navy Department, and the War Assets Administration are requested to delay until March 15, 1948, in reporting as surplus, or in disposing of (1) any lands or permanent structures located thereon declared by any State, municipal, or local government, or political subdivision thereof, through its proper authorities, to be suitable and desirable for its use for educational, recreational, medical, or scientific purposes, or for its use as a public park or place of historic interest, or (2) any lands or permanent structures located thereon which would be transferred for, or devoted to, such purposes or uses under the provisions of any bill or joint resolution pending in Congress if such bill or joint resolution should be enacted into law. This resolution shall not be deemed to prevent or delay the disposition of any such lands or permanent structures to any State or political subdivision thereof under existing provisions of law.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, acting jointly, and the War Assets Administrator, acting individually, are requested to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on or before January 15, 1948, the location, general description, and fair market value of any property described in the first section of this resolution which has been reported as surplus or which it is contemplated will be reported as surplus or disposed of.

INVESTIGATION OF IMMIGRATION SYSTEM

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate consider Calendar No. 595, Senate Resolution 137.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that following the disposition of this resolution I shall move to proceed with the call of the calendar of unobjected-to bills, beginning where we left off yesterday, at Calendar No. 749. In any event, I shall so move 1 hour from this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I have a statement of approximately 5 or 10 minutes in length.

Mr. TAFT. I cannot yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 137, Calendar No. 595.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 137) to make an investigation of the immigration system, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with additional amendments.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I realize that in the closing hours of this session of the Congress many Senators are interested in particular pieces of legislation which they are anxious to have considered, and I am in full sympathy and understanding with each Member of the Senate in regard to any subject of legislation which he may desire to have called up.

However, I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to Senate Resolution 137, which deals with an investigation of the immigration system of our country.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, may we have order? I am anxious to hear the Senator from West Virginia, but I am unable to hear him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The occupants of the galleries will be in order.

The Senator from West Virginia will not proceed until the Senate and the occupants of the galleries are in order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, this resolution is unlike most of the measures on the calendar, in that it does not have to go to the House of Representatives, to be acted upon by it, but it becomes effective upon adoption by this body. Similarly, it does not require signature by the President.

I may say that this resolution contains nothing which grants any greater power or authority than the Senate Judiciary Committee now possesses. The whole force of the resolution is to enable the Judiciary Committee to set up a staff to study the immigration subject in its various phases.

Mr. President, on March 25, I had occasion to lay before the Senate detailed information and statistical data relating to immigration and naturalization. At that time I stated that the subject of immigration at this time is particularly important, that there are thousands upon thousands of people in the torn countries of Europe who seek entrance to the United States, and that the situation is similar to that which came as an aftermath of the First World War.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken.

The Senate will be in order. Senators will take their seats.

The Senator from West Virginia may proceed.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I thank the Presiding Officer for calling the Senate to order.

I invite the attention of my colleagues to this question, for I desire to have the Senate dispose of it as soon as possible, so that we may reach a decision one way or the other upon this subject, because unless this resolution be adopted before the Congress adjourns, its force and effect will be entirely lost, inasmuch as the real purpose of the resolution is to enable the Judiciary Committee to study this subject during the recess or adjournment of the Congress, so that when the Congress convenes in January, the Senate may be better advised as to the various subjects relating to immigration.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I assume that it will not be possible to investigate this matter properly unless the various centers in European countries are visited. Is that true?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I will say to the Senator that no plan has been drawn up for the investigation. This resolution authorizes the appropriation of a sum of money for the investigation. The committee has worked earnestly on the subject, and we have found that we need an additional staff.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the committee have no plan? If the committee has no plan, what will a staff be needed for?

Mr. REVERCOMB. We shall need investigators and we shall need an appropriation for the investigation of various subjects.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is why I say that the committee will need a plan in regard to visiting other countries. It will need a plan; will it not?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I have no plan as to that, and I have nothing to offer as to that.

As I have said, the situation today is similar to that which came as an aftermath of the First World War, except that the present situation is more extensive.

In March of this year, I also stated that one of the very purposes of my remarks before the Senate was to urge upon the Congress an early and complete investigation and revelation of the entire immigration situation. I shall not now undertake again to recite the

information which I detailed, which had been gathered through the Judiciary Committee, and which I set before the Senate in March; but in support of this resolution, I should like to direct the attention of the Senate to certain general problems relating to immigration and naturalization with which this Nation is confronted, and which have prompted me, along with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], to submit Senate Resolution 137, which calls for a full and complete study and investigation of our entire immigration system. At this point, let me say that this resolution has been reported favorably, by unanimous vote, both by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, to which it was referred in due course.

Over the course of years, Mr. President, the Congress has formulated the policy of this Nation with reference to immigration. Although that policy is crystallized into law, reports are continuously forthcoming to the effect that there are wholesale violations of that law. Although I touched upon this theme in my remarks on March 25 of this year, at which time the distinguished Senator from Idaho referred to an estimate of the Attorney General that illegal alien entries totaled 2,000 daily—I do not know the source of that statement, but it is just such statements and information which come to the committee that really require an investigation—let me say that just recently further information was brought to my attention, to the effect that in the New York area alone it is estimated that there are from 100,000 to 250,000 aliens who are there in violation of the immigration laws of the United States, and the immigration authorities in that area have informed the staff of the Judiciary Committee that they are currently some 32,000 cases behind in their investigations of reported cases.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, again I request that there be order in the Senate Chamber. This subject is very important. I simply cannot hear what the distinguished Senator from West Virginia is saying.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair respectfully requests all Senators to cooperate in maintaining order in the Senate. The Senator from West Virginia is making important remarks regarding a resolution of importance to the Senate. It is very difficult for the Chair to cooperate in this matter unless he has the cooperation of the Members of the Senate and also of the occupants of the galleries.

The Chair requests Senators who desire to carry on conversations to retire to the cloakrooms.

The Senator from West Virginia may proceed.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. What is the basis of the Senator's estimate that there are 150,000 illegal entries by aliens?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I stated that a report made to a staff member of the Judiciary Committee, upon a recent visit to Ellis Island, where he went at the direction of the committee to make some inquiry, was that there are from 100,000 to 250,000 aliens in the New York area alone, in violation of the immigration laws of the United States.

Mr. McMAHON. Who was the individual?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not know the individual who gave this statement. It was given to me by a member of the staff of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. President, it is not a question of whether anyone agrees or does not agree with the law and policy of the immigration into this country or the policy with respect to who may or who may not be admitted into the country, but I assert that the law must be enforced, and that it is the duty of the Congress to make adequate provision for the administration of the law and its enforcement. This cannot be done unless we have before us the facts, and these facts can be gleaned only by thoroughgoing study and investigation of the entire immigration system such as is proposed by the resolution.

Mr. President, I wish to pay high tribute to the small staff of the Committee on the Judiciary for the work they have done, for what they have undertaken and achieved by way of securing information since the first of this year. But it is not sufficient. The staff cannot do it and attend to the other work of the committee.

Generally speaking there are two phases to the problem of the enforcement of our immigration laws. The first deals with the exclusion before entry into the United States of persons who are not entitled under the law to admittance. The second phase deals with the expulsion after entry into the United States of persons who are not entitled under the law to remain. May I just mention briefly certain questions with reference to each phase which in my judgment should be explored as a prerequisite to the formulation of intelligent legislation dealing with the enforcement of our immigration laws?

First, with reference to exclusion procedures, it would appear that insofar as possible the processing of prospective immigrants should be made at the ports of embarkation.

Mr. President, information has been obtained by the committee staff and conveyed to me, to the effect that many of the immigrants, particularly visitors, students, and travelers, who, it will be understood, come under special entry rights and not under the quota, are carelessly processed and dealt with in ports of embarkation and as a result constitute a log jam in our ports of entry when it is discovered that their credentials are improper. It has been suggested that perhaps much of the problem could be solved if legislation were enacted which provided for the assignment of immigration experts to the chief world ports of embarkation who would act as advisers to the consuls in the issuance of visas and the processing of immigrants.

Another question pertaining to the exclusion phase of the problem is the matter of stowaways who are increasing in numbers.

I will say to the Senate that there is before the Judiciary Committee at this time a bill proposed by the Attorney General placing a very severe fine upon any boats where stowaways are found. That has become a terrific and a grave subject, to be dealt with by the immigration authorities. It is much less a problem in the case of airplanes, because a stowaway is easily detected, or cannot get away with the idea of a free ride on an airplane, but in the case of the boats it is becoming an increasingly serious problem, we are advised by the immigration authorities of our country.

I have introduced and we are already studying legislation which attempts to deal with this problem. Still another avenue on which it is desired that study be directed is with reference to some system of coordinating the activities of other law enforcement agencies with that of the immigration service in exclusion work. May I say that from the standpoint of administration it is exceedingly more difficult to deal with an expulsion case than it is an exclusion case because after an alien illegally gains admission to this country there are various procedures prescribed which greatly complicate the problem. Moreover the alien frequently forms ties here which have strong humanitarian appeal and makes his expulsion almost an act of exile or cruelty.

This brings me to the second phase of the enforcement of our immigration laws, namely expulsion procedures. Before an alien can be expelled from the United States the law provides for certain hearings and there is provision for discretionary relief in a limited class of hardship cases. There is also possible relief available through the passage of private bills by the Congress.

Mr. President, I may say that the Committee on the Judiciary has an immense docket of private bills for relief of persons who are facing deportation from this country, and the House has many bills; its calendar on that subject is large.

The question arises, Are these procedures adequate? Is the discretionary relief available sufficiently broad? Should there be a statute of limitation applicable to aliens who are subject to deportation? We have pending before us a bill on that subject. Should there be a limit on the scope and operation of private immigration bills? These are not merely hypothetical questions, Mr. President, but have already been posed by bills which have been introduced in this session of the Congress—bills which can be properly considered only in the light of facts developed by a thoroughgoing study and investigation.

At this point, Mr. President, may I say that there have been introduced in the House and Senate during this session over 60 general immigration bills, ranging all the way from total exclusion of all immigrants to the complete elimination of immigration barriers.

Mr. President, of the 60 bills, 22 are today pending in the Committee on the Judiciary. Two bills I know of would stop the entry of aliens into this country for a period of 5 years. I recall one bill that is pending that would stop entry so long as there may be a million unemployed people in the United States. The effect of that would be to stop entry all the time because generally there are that number of unemployed.

Earlier this month we received a bill dealing with displaced persons. I wish to say that not until July did the Committee on the Judiciary have referred to it any bill upon the subject of displaced persons. The bill in the House of Representatives known as the Stratton bill has been pending before the Committee on the Judiciary of that body. Hearings have been held at length, and I am advised that those hearings are still open. No report has been made by the subcommittee to the full committee in that instance.

When I speak of 22 bills in the Senate and 60 bills in both the Senate and the House of Representatives, I am speaking of general bills; I am not referring to the bills for special relief. These general bills represent very sharp and divergent views.

I doubt if there is any question publicly thought of today upon which there is more division of opinion than upon the question of immigration. That is very well disclosed by the contents of the bills which have been introduced by the Members of the Senate and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

I cannot subscribe to a procedure which would result in piecemeal, patchwork legislation with reference to so vital a subject as our immigration laws. Therefore, I have taken the position that these laws should, during the adjourned period of Congress, be considered in a broad perspective, but only after a careful study of the over-all immigration problem; because only with the facts before us, regardless of our feelings, regardless of our views, that may be taken only with the facts before us, Mr. President, can we proceed to intelligent and lasting legislation. Unless we have sound legislation upon the subject, particularly in the face of the great feeling and drive that exists upon it today, we are going to regret very much in days to come, perhaps, any step haphazardly taken.

With reference to the over-all problem of our immigration policy, I want to speak a few words. I believe we may start with the proposition that immigration has played an integral part in the economic growth of our country, as well as in its history. We did not have immigration laws for nearly a hundred years after the founding of America.

The first immigration law came in 1868, but it was a law inviting immigration. It was a law to protect the immigrant from the American citizen. It set up a commissioner that invited immigration. The people who have come here from generation to generation have doubtless played a very important part in the development and in the progress of the country; but the situation must be faced in the light of facts today, not as they were 25 years ago or even 50 years ago, certainly not the time of our first immigration laws. That the United States has greatly benefited through the years, spiritually, economically, and socially, by the addition to our ranks of immigrants from other shores is not open to argument.

From time to time, however, it has been necessary for us to reexamine our policy as to who in equity and good conscience should be admitted into the United States, keeping in mind the best interests of this country. These questions may well be posed today: Are our present quotas proper? What is the present capacity of this country to absorb immigrants in view of the present economic and social conditions? Is our method of determining eligibility to admittance sound? What are the results of experiments in Canada of a selective immigration system? Upon that point, let me say that Canada began in 1945 to give a very definite study to this question. Those who advocated the opening of the doors to all people said that Canada had vast resources of undeveloped land, that it would be a great boon to Canada to admit the people from the world, particularly those who had been so harassed, so hurt in the great war that had closed.

Canada appointed a Royal Commission on the subject. The result was a surprising one to those who had advocated the course to which I have referred. They found that they did not have the undeveloped resources that some had said they had. Canada closed her doors to all immigration in 1946, except people from the British possessions and citizens of the United States, and except those that she selected through commissions set up in Europe, and those she selected were farm workers who have had an experience in farming for 8 years. The last report furnished to me through the committee showed that Canada had admitted about 4,000 Polish citizens, who have gone to the farms and to dairies of Canada. Under the Canadian rule, a man must know where he is going.

A farmer asks for the alien to come. The government sees that the alien is well looked after, that the man who asked for him has shelter for him, can pay him the proper existing wage. The government can move that man any time that it sees fit. After 2 years, if he has earned citizenship, he can and does become a citizen of Canada. I refer to that as the Canadian system that has been set up in our neighboring country to the north.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator whether or not Canada has experienced difficulty with the problem of illegal entry?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am not advised on that subject of illegal entry, but I cannot think that she has not experienced it, because we have experienced it, and doubtless Canada has, too; but I cannot answer definitely, because I have not explored that subject.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, he referred to the fact that Canada had established commissions in Europe to do the screening and selecting.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct.

Mr. LODGE. Does he know how those commissions were constituted, whether they were diplomatic personnel or civil service personnel or boards of prominent citizens, set up for the purpose, or whether the Army did it?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I cannot answer that question definitely, but it is my understanding that special commissions were sent abroad from Canada into the larger cities. They were sent to Greece, they were sent into Poland, they were sent to Norway, they were sent to France, and into different countries. They screen and select the persons under the laws of Canada to come to Canada. I may say to the Senator that that is one complaint that has come, that our officers, there, perhaps have not been careful enough, and they send them in from ports of embarkation to America; they are caught here as not complying with the laws, and held.

Mr. LODGE. I understand from the Senator, then, that Canada apparently held that the routine immigration procedures were not adequate to cope with this special situation?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Entirely so. I would judge that from Canada's action in the matter and in the creation of these commissions. I will say to the Senator it appeals very much to me as a rather sound course to be considered by any country dealing with the subject of immigration. These and other complex problems can be answered only after study and investigation, such as would be permitted and obtainable under this resolution.

Now, Mr. President, I shall speak with reference to that group of aliens who have been given the designation of displaced persons? It has been suggested by some that Resolution 137 constitutes a delaying tactic. That is exceedingly unfortunate, because I know that many people have been misled by that. Nothing could be further from the truth. Instead of being a delaying tactic, let me say that unless the resolution be passed and we have the opportunity to study this question in the interim between the two sessions, we shall find ourselves as far as information is concerned when we meet again in January just as we are today. There is no delay. The resolution is not delaying anything.

The House has been considering this subject for some weeks. The bill under consideration in that connection is the Stratton bill. The House subcommittee is not ready to report the bill to the full committee. During the present session there will be no action upon that bill which deals with the subject of displaced persons.

Mr. President, I have wondered about the source of certain statements which are being made in this connection. I have wondered where the story originated that delay was being indulged in. I will say, Mr. President, that instead of delaying, what we now propose to do will be the means of obtaining information which we may have in our hands when Congress reconvenes.

Mr. President, I think I have an answer respecting the question of the origin of the story that we are attempting to delay the matter. In the New York newspaper PM of July 18, 1947, I find this headline printed in big type:

Scheme to delay DP entry 2 years charged.

The article continues:

Earl G. Harrison, chairman of the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, charged last night that a move is being made in the United States Senate to stall action on the entry of displaced persons "for 2 years at least, possibly until they are dead."

Harrison assailed the resolution of Senator CHAPMAN REVERCOMB, Republican, West Virginia, calling for a broad investigation of immigration laws and policies, including the displaced persons situation.

The statement asserted that the problem already had been thoroughly investigated and that passage of the resolution "will kill all the disabled persons in Europe before they can obtain hospitality in America."

Mr. President, I do not know Earl G. Harrison, but I do know that if he is quoted correctly in that statement published in the newspaper PM he is either very ignorant of the resolution or he has made a vicious, misleading statement.

The resolution itself, as reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, provides that a report shall be made not later than March 1, 1948. Therefore, when Harrison says it will cause delay for 2 years, he is bound to know that he is not telling the truth.

Mr. President, we often have such things said about us in the newspapers. The unfortunate part of it is that this organization, the Citizens Committee for Displaced Persons, has many groups throughout the country. They are putting on a very strong, vigorous campaign. Any organization has a right to do that. Any organization has a right to espouse its cause and to organize. But no organization has the right to mislead the people of the country or to tell what is untrue.

We have now pinned it down to this, that either PM is guilty of misquoting Earl G. Harrison, or Earl G. Harrison is guilty of stating an untruth, and willfully misleading the people of the country.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator a question. The distinguished Senator from West Virginia mentioned that the investigation would not cause delay.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes.

Mr SALTONSTALL. By placing these displaced persons, so-called, in with the old immigration problem are we not making it unnecessarily difficult for ourselves in relation to that part of the problem? The displaced persons in our camps today have been pretty well screened. Investigation has been made and it has been ascertained what their nationalities are, what their religions are, and so on. So is not the problem, so far as legislation is concerned, quite a simple one, to decide how many of those individuals we want to take in, and under what conditions and by what methods we want to take them in? If we include them in the immigration problem as a whole, are we not unduly complicating the problem and causing delay?

Mr. REVERCOMB. And, let me add to the Senator's question, which ones we want to take, and where they will go when they come here?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. No; we are not delaying that procedure. I cannot feel that the procedure we are now proposing to take will cause delay, for it provides the only effective means of studying the problem in the interim.

Mr. President, an amendment was offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] together with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL]. It was suggested to me by them that first a report with respect to displaced persons be made not later than January 10. That is entirely satisfactory to the committee. It has met with the approval of every member of the committee, and they have joined in offering the amendment. So there will be no delay in that respect.

I have had the charge of delay brought home to me, because I have received two or three telegrams from individuals whom I know, good people, people who in their hearts have a deep feeling of sympathy, as I think everyone has, for these unfortunate people. They have written to me to oppose the amendment because it would delay. Where do they get that expression "delay"? They are members of the organization to which I have referred, which seems to be headed by Earl Harrison. I made this statement to Senators so they may give such weight as they may please to statements made by Mr. Harrison henceforth.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator accept an amendment, that after the word "advisable" at the end of section 2, a colon be inserted, and the following language:

Provided, however, That the committee shall report its findings and recommendations in a separate report with respect to displaced persons in Europe on or before January 10, 1948?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Oh, yes, I will be glad to accept that amendment. As a matter of fact I was going to offer such an amendment. I shall be glad to accept it.

Mr. FERGUSON. The reason I have pressed for recognition by the Senator, so that I might ask whether such an amendment would be acceptable, is that I must attend a meeting of conferees. I wanted to be sure that such an amendment would be acceptable.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; I can assure the Senator from Michigan that it will be accepted.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from West Virginia as to how much he is requesting in the resolution for the purpose of making the investigation?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Fifty thousand dollars.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the resolution call for trips around the world, or into Europe or Asia, to look into the subject of these displaced persons, or just what will the functions of the committee be?

Mr. REVERCOMB. The resolution would set out a staff consisting of two stenographers, five investigators, one clerk, and it provides for per diem allowance for eight persons. This is a 7-month job. Then it provides for transportation for investigators and committee members, $10,000. It provides for general expenses, $4,996.01. I may say that these figures, under the rule, were taken to the official who fixes such rates and salaries, in order to conform with proper procedure. The resolution was submitted to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and was favorably reported by that committee. In committee it was examined item by item.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that. I have no doubt but that the Senator and his committee, and the investigators, if they are going to do the kind of job that ought to be done, should be compelled to go to Europe, where the displaced persons camps are, and interview such displaced persons, or at least interview the authorities who are in charge of the displaced persons.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I will say that I do not know what member or members of the committee will go. I have made no plans myself for going.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not questioning that. The only thing I ask the Senator is whether such trip and investigation would not be necessary if a proper investigation is to be made? It cannot be done here in Washington. If it could be done in Washington, $50,000 would not be needed. It could be done through the regular standing committees, or subcommittees thereof.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I will say to the Senator that we are going into more features than that of displaced persons.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to know about the other features. I have been hearing a great deal about displaced persons.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator was not present during the earlier part of my statement.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sorry. I regret it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The subject of displaced persons is the feature to which first attention will be given, because a report must be made by January 10. So far as going to Europe on a trip is concerned, that would be determined by the committee itself. I have no plans on the subject.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not making any point about that. The only thing I am trying to find out is whether the scope of the investigation would permit the investigators or the committee to go to any place outside the continental United States in order to make a proper investigation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In my opinion it would permit them to go anywhere in the world to make a proper investigation.

Mr. LUCAS. That is an answer, and I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. When this discussion began the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] suggested that we be limited to an hour. I do not know exactly how far we have gone. It has been suggested that 15 minutes remain. I ask the distinguished Senator whether he intends to take the entire time, or whether he will yield to me to make the remarks which I wish to make. I am perfectly willing to wait, if it is understood that at the conclusion of the call of the calendar I may obtain the floor to discuss this question.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I want the Senator to have all the time he desires. However, my understanding is that we are to continue for an hour or so, and then take up the calendar, and when the calendar is finished we shall resume this work until we complete it—and complete it quickly. I want a decision one way or the other.

Mr. SMITH. That is all right, so long as the situation is understood.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Chair may make a statement at this point, with reference to the statement of the Senator from West Virginia that the Senate would proceed for an hour or so on this subject, as the Chair understood the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio, which was made just before 9:50, it was that the Senate should proceed with the consideration of the resolution for 1 hour, and that at that time the Senate should proceed to the call of the calendar; and that when the call of the calendar was completed, this question, among others, would come up for consideration.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is entirely correct; and at this time I am very glad to have the Senator from New Jersey take the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is the hour up?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the hour is not up. The Senator from West Virginia suggested that the Senate should proceed for an hour or so. The Chair thought it was well to clear the record at this point. The hour will be up at 10:50.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to make the point——

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I do not want this discussion to come out of my hour.

Mr. WHERRY. I think it is important enough to let other Members of the Senate know that we expect to proceed with the call of the calendar, beginning at 10:50.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, am I to understand that the distinguished Senator from West Virginia wishes me to continue, now, or wait until he concludes?

Mr. REVERCOMB. If the Senator desires to proceed, I wish he would proceed now.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me before he takes his seat?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I understood that the Senator had yielded to me.

Mr. STEWART. No; I want the Senator from West Virginia to yield to me. If the Senator from New Jersey has the floor, I shall seek the floor in my own time. I want the Senator from West Virginia to yield for a question if he still has the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. STEWART. If the Senator from New Jersey has the floor, I shall speak in my own time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say to the Senator from Tennessee that I expect to resume the floor later, and I shall be delighted to discuss the question with him.

Mr. STEWART. I have been trying to get the attention of the Senator from West Virginia, in order that I might ask him to yield to me. However, in the interim it seems that the Senator from New Jersey has obtained the floor, so my ambitions are totally without further hope of reward. I wish to talk with the Senator from West Virginia in his time or my time, on the subject of displaced persons, or misplaced persons, or immigration, or whatever the Senator from West Virginia or anyone else desires to call it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall be delighted to hold such a discussion with the Senator after the call of the calendar.

Mr. STEWART. Will the Senator indicate about what hour of the night he expects to obtain the floor?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am not yet advised as to the hour.

Mr. STEWART. I shall endeavor to remain in the Chamber.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, this is such an important subject that I feel we are justified in having adequate debate. I wish to say in the beginning that I fully appreciate the importance of the purposes of the resolution submitted by the Senator from West Virginia. I appreciate the importance of the subject which he aims to study, and I heartily agree with him that such a study should be carried on in all detail, and that we should know what our immigration policy should be.

Mr. President, we have a problem which I submit is not merely an immigration problem. We have a problem which reaches out further than the mere question of the immigration policy of the United States. We have a problem which has been bequeathed to us by World War II.

I wish to emphasize to all who may hear me that that problem consists of such factors as these: There are now 1,000,000 people, victims of the Germans, in the occupied areas, with complete uncertainty as to their fate, and unable to represent themselves. One might say, "Why is that the concern of the United States?"

The next point I wish to make is that of the 1,000,000 persons, 600,000 are in the American zone in Germany. The American Army is feeding 600,000 of those people today in the American zone. The Congress has legislative responsibility for the people whom we are now feeding in the American zone. I wish to note at this point that in making that statement I am not saying for one moment that those 600,000 people should be brought to America.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I shall be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator believe that because we are feeding those people in Germany we should bring them here?

Mr. SMITH. I just made the statement, if the Senator had listened to me——

Mr. STEWART. I heard the Senator, but I could not do anything but ask him a question. That is the only purpose for which he will yield. I shall be glad to comment further if the Senator will yield for a comment.

Mr. SMITH. I should much prefer to make my statement, because our time is to be limited. The Senator from Ohio asked us to dispose of this question as rapidly as possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. SMITH. The responsibility for 600,000 people in the American zone in Germany is on the United States of America at this moment. Those people have been coming there for the 2 years since hostilities ceased. They come from all classes and conditions of people. At the moment I shall not go into the question of what kind of people they are. That is one of the problems which I concede we must study.

But we must determine the question of what the policy is to be with respect to those people. Are we going to permit them to be taken to Russia and made slaves, as other people have been who have been removed to Russia? Are we going to insist that they be sent back to the countries from which they came? They were afraid of the conditions there, and if they go back they will be subject to being purged or otherwise liquidated.

Is there any other way to deal with this question except to face it squarely as a question of resettlement? I submit that there is no other way to deal with it. That was one of the first questions taken up by the United Nations. We established the so-called IRO, or International Refugee Organization, in order to deal with this problem.

I am not saying yet that a single person should come to the United States,

but I am saying that at this point in my discussion the United States has responsibility for 600,000 people, and that it is costing us more than $100,000,000 a year to feed them. Our Army has the responsibility for their care.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at that point?

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator mentioned the United Nations organization. Can the Senator tell me what the United Nations organization is doing, if anything, toward the solution of this problem?

Mr. SMITH. I can tell the Senator what I am advised up to this moment they are doing. The IRO, the International Refugee Organization, was established. As will be recalled, the organization began when we passed the necessary legislation to assist in establishing it. An American whom I am happy and proud to say I know very well is in charge of that organization. He is in Geneva today. He is organizing the activity there to find out from the various nations of the world what can be done with this problem and with these unfortunate people—people who, because of their convictions, resisted the Nazis and have been placed in concentration camps, and are left as victims of their own sincere convictions.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am wondering, in view of the answer of the Senator, whether this measure can do anything to augment or aid the committee which is set up under the United Nations organization to do the very thing which we all want done.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. SMITH. I will yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from Illinois has asked whether the committee could do anything to aid. The fact is, as the Senator from New Jersey has said, that we are confronted with this proposition. It is now in our laps. We have 600,000 persons in our zone whom we are taking care of, and under the IRO we are urging our country and other nations to take those unfortunate people. But our own country has made no provision whatever to receive any of them. All this resolution does is to permit us to study the question, to give them some little hope that perhaps our country will do something for them.

Mr. SMITH. If I may continue, I want to make a complete picture, and then I shall be glad to yield for questions, because I think we should have questions from all over the Senate floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield further?

Mr. SMITH. I should prefer not to yield for a few minutes, if I may postpone answering questions.

We have a larger problem and a different problem than simply an immigration problem. The problem is, as I have stated, the responsibility for 600,000 people in our zone, our relations with the United Nations, and our cooperation with them in trying to find an answer to the problem after the setting up of the International Refugee Organization. We have made a contribution in the personnel of the staff and in the head of the organization, who is trying his best to set up some plan whereby, as promptly as possible, all the nations of the world that may have room for these people may be invited to take their share. So I have discussed with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] the point that the problem is bigger than simply an immigration problem. As an immigration problem it belongs distinctly and clearly to the Judiciary Committee. I have never questioned that for a minute. I have said it also belongs, in part of its area, to our Foreign Relations Committee. The members of the Foreign Relations Committee are profoundly concerned because of their contacts with the United Nations organization and their responsibility for the IRO. The Armed Service Committee is immediately concerned with the matter, because they are responsible for the American Army. The American Army today is feeding those people.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield for a question.

Mr. McMAHON. How much does it cost?

Mr. SMITH. About $100,000,000 a year; and under the arrangement with the IRO by which all the nations in the IRO take over, we will continue to pay $75,000,000 of the total. I have felt that any committee which is set up should be composed of those who represent that part of our Government which is interested in this problem and which has this responsibility. It is a problem of the Foreign Relations Committee, and, I think, also of the Appropriations Committee; to a certain extent, it is a problem of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, because important labor questions are involved in the whole picture. It is simply a question of how we can have an adequately staffed committee, with adequate personnel to take care of all these problems. In my judgment, we should send a group to Europe this summer that will take care not alone of the immigration question, but of other problems. When that is settled, then the question comes up as to what the regulation should be as to admittance. It has never been suggested that we should by one iota violate any of our immigration laws. Any person coming into this country must enter in compliance with our immigration laws. The question is whether we are prepared to take whatever our share may be and be prepared to cooperate with the other nations of the world in one of the most important and outstanding problems which faces the world today.

So I have asked the Judiciary Committee if they would be willing to appoint members, and I have asked the Foreign Relations Committee to appoint one or more. I would have the chairman of the committee appoint those members. I would ask the chairman of the Armed Services Committee to appoint one or more, and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee to appoint one or more. When the question is asked as to how many should go abroad, I cannot see that it is possible to say anything but that as many as possible should go abroad and see those people, see what kind of people they are, and whether they are fitted for our type of civilization. It is a broad subject of national policy, and not simply a question of immigration law and protection of the people who come to this country through the gates of immigration.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator has spoken of certain of the problems. Can it not be handled better if it is not tied in too closely with the whole immigration problem?

Mr. SMITH. I agree entirely. I do not think the Senator from West Virginia has any intention of tying it in behind these other things. He wants to make it the first order of business in January.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am not only following the suggestion of the Senator from Michigan, but it is in accordance with the amendment offered by the committee itself.

Mr. SMITH. I agree.

Mr. President, I should like to know how much more time remains, because I want to propound certain questions which it seems to me are very relevant in connection with the matter, and will help to clarify our thinking.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are approximately 2 minutes left before the hour.

Mr. SMITH. Two minutes will hardly be sufficient to cover the ground that I want to cover, because I think it is a vitally important question.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If the Senator would like to address questions to me tomorrow, I shall be very glad to try to answer them.

Mr. SMITH. Does the Senator understand that I shall have the floor to continue and to direct my questions, or will the Senator have the floor?

Mr. REVERCOMB. There will have to be an agreement about that.

Mr. SMITH. I think that is a perfectly fair suggestion. I want also to reserve the point that I may want to come back with further suggestions in regard to the best way to deal with this matter. I will yield the floor to the Senator from West Virginia tomorrow morning.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I want to join in this discussion when it is resumed. There

are certain things in connection with the matter which I think ought to be clarified, in order that we may know what sort of investigation is to be made, where it is to be held, and the results of it.

I hope an opportunity will be given, when this matter is resumed—tomorrow, I assume—for some of us who are interested in the matter to discuss it a little further.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hour has expired.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR TAYLOR

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we now proceed to the call of the calendar of measures to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 749.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. TAYLOR. Earlier in the evening, I made it known that I had a few remarks to make, which probably would take approximately 10 minutes. I did not obtain the floor at that time, and so I was unable to make the remarks then.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to do so at this time, before the call of the calendar is commenced.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I withhold my unanimous-consent request. I hope the Senator from Idaho will not take more than 10 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not think I shall.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho has requested unanimous consent that he be permitted to proceed for 10 minutes. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, the integrity of certain representatives of the press has been called into question and the ability of my executive assistant has been called into question and the propriety of certain actions of the junior Senator from Idaho has been called into question. Therefore, I feel that this matter should be discussed briefly.

I was thinking of using the word "facet," so I looked it up in the dictionary to see if it was the proper word to use for the purpose I had in mind, and in doing so I found the word "facade" which means the chief front or face of a building. Mr. President, this matter has many facades, although that word is not generally used in that way. Also in the dictionary I saw the word "fabulous," and it applies to this matter; it means fictitious, fable, passing the limits of belief, incredible. Mr. President, this matter is all those things. It has many facets, more than one facade, and it is fabulous.

So I shall read to the Senate an editorial from Statewide, a publication recently issued in the State of Idaho, at Boise. It speaks for itself, although I may interject a comment or two as I proceed to read it.

The title of the editorial is "Editors Go East."

The editorial reads as follows:

EDITORS GO EAST

"Waste and extravagance" is a theme that Senator HENRY DWORSHAK repeats week after week in his column Capital Gleanings. This is a column that Statewide has not printed, even if it does appear in a number of Idaho weekly papers. We felt that it might be slanted just a wee bit toward selling Idahoans on another 6 years in the Senate for DWORSHAK.

Three Idaho newsmen and one woman journalist have made recent jaunts to Washington and a fourth is reported to be on his way.

Each has written a series of stories on Washington under this editor's note:

"* * * is spending a few weeks in the National Capital writing his view of national affairs which are of interest to Idahoans."

First to go was Bob Werner, Orofino publisher. In his footsteps followed L. R. Scott, American Falls publisher; Nick Ifft, Pocatello editor; and Louise Shadduck, Coeur d'Alene reporter.

Statewide became interested in these Washington sojourns, for we knew that few Idaho publishers could afford the time or the expense of a trip to the National Capital. This investigation was stalemated momentarily in Washington, D. C., when a Senate employee refused to reveal names on the pay roll under his jurisdiction.

Senator DWORSHAK revealed the necessary facts when he invited Statewide to go to Washington. This invitation was rejected since this trip would be financed by Federal funds.

An explanation of this eastward movement of Idaho newspapermen was contained in a letter sent by Senator DWORSHAK.

Mr. President, now comes a quotation from the letter, and here is where the qualifications of my executive assistant are called into question. I quote from this letter from Senator DWORSHAK to Statewide:

"Under the Reorganization Act adopted by the Seventy-ninth Congress (against which I voted)—

Mr. President, the reference is to my colleague the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], not to me—

each Senator was authorized to employ an administrative assistant. Senator TAYLOR has employed a young man named Keefer as his assistant, and I presume that every other Senator has likewise employed an assistant with the exception of myself. Instead of employing a regular administrative assistant, I thought it would be much better to have Idaho newspapermen serve for brief periods as my assistant, in which case they collectively draw the same salary as assistants of other Senators. If I am criticized for such procedure, it cannot be on the basis of unnecessary Government expense, but rather because I take the position that Idaho newspapermen are as well qualified as Mr TAYLOR's assistant, or other senatorial assistants, to serve in this capacity."

Mr. President, I selected my executive assistant after careful consideration of the matter; and I resent the implication that anyone can just pick up any old editor, at any place, at any time, and bring him to Washington for 1 month, and that he can do as good a job as my carefully selected executive assistant can. I wish he were here; I would show him to you, and you would immediately see that I did not select him for his beauty, but, rather for his sterling qualities. [Laughter.]

But, Mr. President, to continue to read the editorial:

Statewide cannot respect Senator DWORSHAK's statement that "I do not desire any publicity at this time."

This paper believes that Senator DWORSHAK should have explained at the beginning that Idaho newsmen were taking a vacation on Government funds.

Statewide believes this paragraph of DWORSHAK's letter has a hollow ring: "I presume justifiable criticism could be directed at me if I were to limit this program to Republican editors; however, I have invited Democratic and independent editors to take advantage of this opportunity, and in all cases have specifically stated that I would require no political loyalty, but wanted them to function with complete freedom without restrictions."

Who are the four DWORSHAK invited to Washington? Bob Werner is a former employee of DWORSHAK'S; L. R. Scott, of American Falls, is an old-guard Republican—

I can swear to that, Mr. President—

Nick Ifft, of Pocatello, is also a Republican editor—

Mr. President, I can swear to that. He is the editor of the newspaper in my home town—

Louise Shadduck, of Coeur d'Alene, is a prominent young Republican.

Let's see what they sent in these dispatches from Washington:

Wrote Nick Ifft: "There is a feeling of satisfaction in knowing our interests in Idaho are in the hands of a man of the caliber of Senator HENRY DWORSHAK. * * * We have seen him in action, watched him work, and know that there isn't a State which has a more industrious, sincere, and energetic representative on 'the Hill.' He puts in long hours—

Mr. President, let me say that if a Senator has a good executive assistant, he does not need to put in such long hours. [Laughter.]

I read further from the editorial:

his committee work alone making demands on his time and energy which are far beyond those most of us devote to our positions or jobs."

Louise Shadduck voiced the same refrain:

"'A comparatively easy day,' says Idaho's Senator HENRY DWORSHAK after a continuous 10 hours of congressional labor."

And from another of her dispatches: "Idaho's Senator HENRY DWORSHAK, whose faithful following of his desire to get away from the large Government outlays has won admiration of his colleagues * * *."

Quotes from Bob Werner and L. R. Scott are not momentarily available, but in a recent editorial Scott wrote:

"It will be interesting to the people back home to learn that current gossip in Washington is to the effect that if TAFT or BRICKER are nominated for President, the nominee for Vice President probably will be none other than HENRY DWORSHAK."

[Laughter.]

Mr. President, I dissociate myself from these sentiments.

We believe that these visits of Idaho newsmen to Washington fall under the category of shoddy politicking with DWORSHAK and

the visitors equally guilty of a reprehensible subterfuge.

Newsmen—

Woe unto you newsmen. [Laughter.]

Newsmen who accept funds from Government officials, no matter under what guise it comes, are indulging in the practices that made the press of France venal. This debasement of the French press led to corruption that weakened the nation until it toppled when the Germans gave one lusty shove.

Mr. President, I should just like to read a very brief editorial from the Twin Falls Times-News. This is a paper of large daily circulation, perhaps the second largest in our State, and it bears out what is said here.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR. I should like two more minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized for three additional minutes. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAYLOR. I thank the President pro tempore.

The heading of this editorial is "Gossip About DWORSHAK." It reads:

GOSSIP ABOUT DWORSHAK

We have been getting reports right along that HENRY DWORSHAK, United States Senator from Idaho, is gaining in stature in Washington. In fact, it is not an uncommon occurrence for Senator DWORSHAK to be found in conference now and then with some of the biggest wigs in the Republican Party.

It will be interesting for the people back home to learn that current gossip in Washington is to the effect that if TAFT or BRICKER is nominated for President, the Republicans' nominee for Vice President probably will be none other than HENRY DWORSHAK.

Surprising as that might seem, there are several reasons why the Republicans might choose DWORSHAK. The Idaho Senator has an excellent personality which, with his speaking ability, makes a good combination. He could probably do an effective job of winning western support for his party.

Here, Mr. President, is the main reason why they are going to nominate the junior Senator from Idaho as Vice President:

Then there's another factor not to be overlooked—Idaho's other United States Senator, GLEN TAYLOR, New Dealish Democrat. TAYLOR is commanding altogether too much attention on such issues as labor and reclamation for him to be ignored by his opponents. With DWORSHAK, another westerner, up for Vice President, TAYLOR might find it more difficult edging himself into the spotlight.

[Laughter.]

Mr. President, I wish to say that I am happy to have brought this great honor to the State of Idaho, that we are about to have a Vice Presidential candidate, and while I may never attain that height, I at least have by my efforts raised myself up to such heights that they must nominate my junior colleague for Vice President so that he may outshine me. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I have just received a great shock. I have just been informed of a fact, if indeed it be a fact, that almost destroys my faith in mankind.

I have just shown, Mr. President, how I, by my humble but sincere efforts, have struggled onward and upward until I had achieved a certain prestige and, according to the Republican press of my own State, a degree of fame as a liberal statesman. A defender of those who labor, an advocate of developing our great State of Idaho.

As I say, Mr. President, I have reached these modest heights only to find that by my very efforts and achievements, I had caused my junior colleague to be catapulted upward to stand upon my shoulders where his outstretched hands are eagerly reaching for that coveted prize, the Vice Presidency of the United States of America. The gaudy bauble is almost within his grasp. Even though I occupy an inferior position I am happy. My efforts are about to bring the Vice Presidency to my junior colleague and a great honor to Idaho.

If TAFT or BRICKER is nominated DWORSHAK is Vice President. But, Mr. President, I am disillusioned. The people of Idaho are absolutely ungrateful. My efforts to make HENRY DWORSHAK Vice President have come to naught.

You ask what has happened, Mr. President? I have just been informed that the Idaho Republican leadership has announced that they are supporting Mr. Dewey.

INCOME TAX LEGISLATION

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, the tax bill is dead for this session, and, although there has been a lot of heat and a lot of breast-thumping over this corpse, I think that deep down inside of every one of us, of every Member of Congress and of every citizen who on the one hand knows what that bill really contained and who on the other hand loves his country, there is a real sense of relief that this iniquitous legislation to lower taxes for the very rich in a veritable windfall and to lower them for the average wage earner by exactly 54 cents a week is a dead duck in this Congress and for this year.

At the same time, however, many citizens are still unfamiliar with the details of the Republican-sponsored tax bill which Mr. Truman twice was forced to veto as the wrong kind of bill at the wrong time. Many citizens, average-income citizens, are still under the impression that this bill would have done them some real good. They recognize, of course, that the very rich would have reaped a windfall from it, but they thought that they would have received some substantial tax relief themselves.

For that reason, I have had some tables prepared showing exactly what this tax-reduction bill would have done, and showing it in terms everyone can understand. These tables show what the taxes were for various income groups in 1939, before we began raising taxes in preparation for defense and war needs; what they are now, and what they would have been under the twice-vetoed tax bill; they show, further, what percentage of increase in a man's taxes since 1939 would have been removed; they show the percentage of increase in his take-home pay under the twice-vetoed legislation; and they show what the actual increase in a taxpayer's take-home pay would have been, both annually and, more important, by the week.

I do not want to debate the twice-vetoed tax bill at this late date in the proceedings, but I want to point out just one or two things these tables disclose so glaringly.

They show, for instance, that the take-home pay increase for the average wage earner, the family man with two children, earning $2,500 a year, under this twice-vetoed bill would have been the magnificent sum of 54 cents a week, whereas the man making $50,000 a year would have had a take-home pay increase of nearly $100 a week—$92.73, to be exact—and the scale shoots up like that with the $100,000 a year man getting his weekly pay raised by this legislation by $239 a week, the $500,000 a year man getting a raise of $1,255 a week, and the $6,000,000 a year man taking home more than a half million dollars more a year, or $10,384 a week. This bill would have been good for him, fine and dandy.

Another tabulation, equally revealing, shows how the lower-income groups—not poor people, but average wage earners earning about $50 a week or so—would have had about 30 percent of their increase in taxes since 1939 removed by this legislation, whereas the top-income groups, those making $250,000 up, would have had from 65 to 98 percent of their wartime increases in tax rates wiped off the books.

Another tabulation shows how the persons earning up to $8,000 would have had their take-home pay increased by from 1 percent to less than 4 percent by this bill, whereas those in the very high brackets would have had their take-home pay increased anywhere from 20 to 62 percent. That is a big percentage of increase in take-home pay, I should say. I should also say that had these fortunate taxpayers in the very high brackets succeeded in getting their tax windfall as proposed by the Republican Party, they certainly would have felt obliged to show their appreciation in an appropriate manner to the Republican campaign next year.

I have got another table here which I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD with these remarks. It shows how many taxpayers there are in each income classification in Pennsylvania. It is also very interesting, especially in relation to this tax bill.

It shows that there were 3,299,341 taxpayers in the State in the tax year 1943. They are the best figures—the latest figures—I could readily obtain and they may be a little out of date. But they are symptomatic. They show that of these 3,299,341 taxpayers in 1943, all but 103,563 earned less than $5,000; that is, about 3 percent earned more than $5,000 a year and about 97 percent earned less.

Yet you will notice from these previous tables that the big windfalls come at the very narrow funnel end up in that group of 3 percent, with those at the very top getting the gravy whereas other taxpayers, even those earning up to $8,000 a

year would get a weekly take-home pay raise of less than $5 a week, and the average worker getting only 54 cents a week more. There are 2,723,813 taxpayers out of the 3,299,341 of 1943 who earned less than $3,000 a year and whose tax reduction would amount to 54 cents or a dollar ten or so a week and none of them would have gotten as much as $2 a week more to spend.

Mr. President, that means 82 percent of all Pennsylvania taxpayers would have gotten nickles and dimes in tax reductions, to a maximum of $1.87 a week for a single man earning $3,000 a year, but most of them getting $1.10 or 54 cents a week more. Another sizable group, 15 percent, earning from $3,000 to $5,000, would have gotten their taxes reduced by from $1.10 a week—about $57 a year—up to, at the most, $3.56 for a single man earning $5,000. Most, of course, even in this group would get less.

At the other end of the scale, among the top 3 percent earning $5,000 a year or more, are 2,619 taxpayers whose incomes in 1943 were $50,000 a year or more. Now this is a sizable number of big income earners in that class, and most of them are good Republicans and many are good contributors to the GOP. Yet, although they make up only a tiny fraction of 1 percent of all taxpayers in Pennsylvania, they would be the only group which would really feel the tax-relief advantages of the Republican bill to any substantial degree, and they would feel it to the tune of an increase in their take-home pay of from $92.73 a week up to somewhere in the neighborhood of $7,000 or $8,000 or more a week to spend. Of course there are only a very few at the very top to receive such a tremendous tax reduction, but there would be 2,600 taxpayers in Pennsylvania enjoying at least $5,000 more a year to spend while 2,723,813 Pennsylvania taxpayers have from $28 to $97 more to spend. And new State taxes will eat up most of the increased spending money the average taxpayers in Pennsylvania would have received under this wrong-wrong twice-vetoed tax grab bill of the Republican Party.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point some tables which I have prepared.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of individual income taxes for 1939, under present law,[1] and under the House bill (H. R. 1), for specified amounts of net income and for specified family relationships

Net income before personal exemption	Tax paid in 1939 [2]			Present law tax			Tax under the House bill (H. R. 1) [3]		
	Single person, no dependents	Married person—		Single person, no dependents	Married person—		Single person, no dependents	Married person—	
		No dependents	2 dependents		No dependents	2 dependents		No dependents	2 dependents
$1,000				$95			$67		
$1,500	$14			190	$95		133	$67	
$2,000	32			285	190		228	133	
$2,500	50			380	285	$95	304	228	$67
$3,000	68	$8		485	380	190	388	304	133
$3,500	86	26		589	485	285	471	388	228
$4,000	104	44	$12	694	589	380	555	471	304
$4,500	122	62	30	798	694	485	638	555	388
$5,000	140	80	48	922	798	589	737	638	471
$6,000	216	116	84	1,169	1,045	798	935	836	638
$8,000	378	248	156	1,720	1,577	1,292	1,376	1,262	1,034
$10,000	560	415	343	2,347	2,185	1,862	1,877	1,748	1,490
$15,000	1,104	924	831	4,270	4,047	3,639	3,416	3,238	2,911
$20,000	1,834	1,589	1,469	6,645	6,394	5,890	5,316	5,115	4,712
$25,000	2,804	2,489	2,327	9,362	9,082	8,522	7,490	7,266	6,817
$50,000	9,334	8,869	8,621	25,137	24,795	24,111	20,110	19,836	19,289
$75,000	19,484	18,779	18,403	43,477	43,092	42,323	34,781	34,474	33,858
$100,000	33,354	32,469	31,997	63,541	63,128	62,301	50,833	50,502	49,841
$250,000	129,284	128,294	127,766	191,772	191,340	190,475	153,417	153,072	152,380
$302,896 [4]	165,271	164,571	164,711	237,500	237,500	237,500	190,000	190,000	190,000
$500,000	305,224	304,144	303,568	407,897	407,465	406,600	342,460	342,074	341,300
$1,000,000	680,184	679,044	678,436	840,147	839,715	838,850	729,210	728,824	728,050
$2,000,000	1,450,174	1,449,019	1,448,403	1,704,647	1,704,215	1,703,350	1,502,710	1,502,324	1,501,550
$5,000,000	3,790,164	3,788,994	3,788,370	[5] 4,275,000	[5] 4,275,000	[5] 4,275,000	3,823,210	3,822,824	3,822,050
$6,000,000	4,580,154	4,578,969	4,578,337	[6] 5,130,000	[6] 5,130,000	[6] 5,130,000	[6] 4,590,000	[6] 4,590,000	[6] 4,590,000

Net income before personal exemption	Percent of increase in tax since 1939 removed by House bill (H. R. 1)			Percent of increase in take-home pay from 1946 represented by reductions in House bill (H. R. 1)			Actual annual dollar increase in spending money under House bill (H. R. 1)			Weekly increase in take-home pay under House bill (H. R. 1)		
	Single person, no dependents	Married person		Single person, no dependents	Married person		Single person, no dependents	Married person		Single person, no dependents	Married person	
		No dependents	2 dependents		No dependents	2 dependents		No dependents	2 dependents		No dependents	2 dependents
$1,000	29.5			3.1			$28			$0.54		
$1,500	32.4	29.5		4.4	2.0		57	$28		1.10	$0.54	
$2,000	22.5	30.0		3.3	3.1		57	57		1.10	1.10	
$2,500	23.0	20.0	29.5	3.6	2.6	1.2	76	57	$28	1.46	1.10	$0.54
$3,000	23.3	20.4	30.0	3.9	2.9	2.0	97	76	57	1.87	1.46	1.10
$3,500	23.5	21.1	20.0	4.1	3.2	1.8	118	97	57	2.27	1.87	1.10
$4,000	23.6	21.7	20.7	4.2	3.5	2.1	139	118	76	2.67	2.27	1.46
$4,500	23.7	22.0	21.3	4.3	3.7	2.4	160	139	97	3.08	2.67	1.87
$5,000	23.7	22.3	21.8	4.5	3.8	2.7	185	160	118	3.56	3.08	2.27
$6,000	24.6	22.5	22.4	4.8	4.2	3.1	234	209	160	4.50	4.02	3.08
$8,000	25.6	23.7	22.7	5.5	4.9	3.9	344	315	258	6.62	6.06	4.96
$10,000	26.3	24.7	24.5	6.1	5.6	4.6	470	437	372	9.04	8.40	7.15
$15,000	27.0	25.9	25.9	8.0	7.4	6.4	854	809	728	16.42	15.56	14.00
$20,000	27.6	26.6	26.6	10.0	9.4	8.3	1,329	1,279	1,178	25.56	24.60	22.65
$25,000	28.6	27.5	27.5	12.0	11.4	10.3	1,872	1,816	1,705	36.00	34.92	32.79
$50,000	31.8	31.1	31.1	20.2	19.7	18.6	5,027	4,959	4,822	96.67	95.37	92.73
$75,000	36.2	35.4	35.4	27.6	27.0	25.9	8,696	8,618	8,465	167.23	165.73	162.79
$100,000	42.1	41.2	41.1	34.9	34.2	33.1	12,708	12,626	12,460	244.38	242.81	239.62
$250,000	61.4	60.7	60.7	65.9	65.2	64.0	38,355	38,268	38,095	737.60	735.92	732.60
$302,896 [4]	65.8	65.1	65.3	72.6	72.1	71.0	47,500	47,500	47,500	913.46	913.46	913.46
$500,000	63.7	63.3	63.4	71.0	70.7	69.9	65,437	65,391	65,300	1,258.40	1,257.52	1,255.77
$1,000,000	69.4	69.0	69.1	69.4	69.2	68.8	110,937	110,891	110,800	2,133.40	2,132.52	2,130.77
$2,000,000	79.4	79.1	79.2	68.4	68.3	68.0	201,937	201,891	201,800	3,883.40	3,882.52	3,880.77
$5,000,000	93.2	93.0	93.1	62.3	62.4	62.5	451,700	452,176	452,950	8,688.27	8,695.69	8,710.58
$6,000,000	98.2	98.0	97.9	62.1	62.1	62.1	540,000	540,000	540,000	10,384.62	10,384.62	10,384.62

[1] Internal Revenue Code, as amended by Revenue Act of 1945.
[2] Assumes maximum earned net income.
[3] Assumes taxpayer is under 65 years of age.
[4] Point at which 15 percent reduction of present law tentative tax would take effect under House bill for single person with no dependents. Point is $303,396 for married person with no dependents, $303,896 for married person with 1 dependent, $304,396 for married person with 2 dependents, and $304,896 for married person with 3 dependents. Taxes are calculated at these different points for the different relationships.
[5] Taking into account maximum effective rate limitation of 85.5 percent.
[6] Taking into account maximum effective rate limitation of 76.5 percent.

Individual income tax returns filed in Pennsylvania for the tax year 1943

[Income classes in thousands of dollars]

Type of return and income classes:	Number of returns
Form 1040–A (adjusted gross income classes):	
Under 1	424,812
1 under 2	689,487
2 under 3	523,265
Form 1040 (net income classes):	
Under 1	180,455
1 under 2	418,440
2 under 3	487,354
3 under 4	371,864
4 under 5	100,101
5 under 6	31,268
6 under 7	15,742
7 under 8	10,134
8 under 9	6,970
9 under 10	5,578
10 under 11	4,254
11 under 12	3,343
12 under 13	2,770
13 under 14	2,303
14 under 15	1,904
15 under 20	6,601
20 under 25	3,836
25 under 30	2,310
30 under 40	2,660
40 under 50	1,271
50 under 60	809
60 under 70	488
70 under 80	306
80 under 90	221
90 under 100	180
100 under 150	360
150 under 200	116
200 under 250	47
250 under 300	24
300 under 400	27
400 under 500	19
500 under 750	17
750 under 1,000	1
1,000 under 1,500	1
1,500 under 2,000	
2,000 under 3,000	1
3,000 under 4,000	1
4,000 under 5,000	1
5,000 and over	
Total	3,299,341

Source: Bureau of Internal Revenue.

ADDITIONAL REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following additional reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TAFT, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

H. R. 3632. A bill to extend the time within which applications may be made to the Railroad Retirement Board for certain refunds from the Unemployment Trust Fund; without amendment (Rept. No. 768);

H. R. 3682. A bill to extend the period for providing assistance for certain war-incurred school enrollment; without amendment (Rept. No. 769); and

H. R. 3870. A bill to authorize certain expenditures from the appropriation of St. Elizabeths Hospital, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 770).

REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—ADDITIONAL REPORT ON FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, according to monthly personnel reports submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, Federal personnel within the United States during the month of June decreased $59,277 from a total of 1,914,333 in May to 1,855,056 in June. Excluding War and Navy Departments, personnel decreased 14,094 from the May figure of 1,209,546 to the June figure of 1,195,452. The War Department within the continental United States decreased 37,913 from the May figure of 391,129 to the June figure of 353,216. The Navy Department within the United States decreased 7,270 from the May figure of 313,658 to the June figure 306,388. (See table I.)

Outside the continental United States, Federal personnel decreased 6,932 from the May total of 263,759 to the June total of 256,827. The majority of the workers outside the United States were industrial workers. (See tables II and IV.) Exclusive of War and Navy Departments, there was a decrease of 535 from the May figure of 55,321 to the June figure of 54,786.

The consolidated table, presenting figures on personnel inside and outside the United States, shows a total decrease of 55,212 from the May total 2,178,092 to the June total of 2,112,880. If the War and Navy Departments' reductions are excluded, there was a decrease of 13,632 employees in the executive branch of the Federal Government from the May figure of 1,264,867 to the June figure of 1,251,235. (See table III.)

Industrial employment during the month of May decreased 19,772 from the May total of 596,369 to the June total of 576,597. Of this total reduction, 19,724 industrial workers were eliminated by the War and Navy Departments, and only 48 by the other agencies and departments. The term "industrial employees" as used by the committee refers to unskilled, semiskilled, skilled, and supervisory employees paid by the Federal Government, who are working on construction projects such as airfields and roads, and in shipyards and arsenals. It does not include maintenance and custodial employees. (See table IV.)

I ask unanimous consent to present the report and request that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was received and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, PURSUANT TO SECTION 601 OF THE REVENUE ACT OF 1941 ON FEDERAL PERSONNEL, MAY–JUNE 1947

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH JUNE 1947, AND COMPARISON WITH MAY 1947

According to monthly personnel reports submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, Federal personnel within the United States during the month of June decreased 59,277 from a total of 1,914,333 in May to 1,855,056 in June. Excluding War and Navy Departments, personnel decreased 14,094 from the May figure of 1,209,546 to the June figure of 1,195,452. The War Department within the continental United States decreased 37,913 from the May figure of 391,129 to the June figure of 353,216. The Navy Department within the United States decreased 7,270 from the May figure of 313,658 to the June figure of 306,388. (See table I.)

Outside the continental United States, Federal personnel decreased 6,932 from the May total of 263,759 to the June total of 256,827. The majority of the workers outside the United States were industrial workers. (See tables II and IV.) Exclusive of War and Navy Departments, there was a decrease of 535 from the May figure of 55,321 to the June figure of 54,786.

The consolidated table, presenting figures on personnel inside and outside the United States, shows a total decrease of 55,212, from the May total of 2,178,092 to the June total of 2,112,880. If the War and Navy Departments' reductions are excluded, there was a decrease of 13,632 employees in the executive branch of the Federal Government from the May figure of 1,264,867 to the June figure of 1,251,235. (See table III.)

Industrial employment during the month of May decreased 19,772 from the May total of 596,369 to the June total of 576,597. Of this total reduction, 19,724 industrial workers were eliminated by the War and Navy Departments, and only 48 by the other agencies and departments. The term "industrial employees" as used by the committee refers to unskilled, semiskilled, skilled, and supervisory employees paid by the Federal Government, who are working on construction projects such as airfields and roads, and in shipyards and arsenals. It does not include maintenance and custodial employees. (See table IV.)

TABLE I.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during June 1947, and comparison with May 1947*

Department or agency	May	June	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except War and Navy Departments):				
Agriculture Department	88,909	89,072	163	
Commerce Department	35,916	35,409		507
Interior Department	47,307	48,142	835	
Justice Department	24,293	23,249		1,044
Labor Department	6,030	5,002		1,028
Post Office Department	468,001	470,280	2,279	
State Department	8,084	7,844		240
Treasury Department	98,414	93,879		4,535
Emergency war agencies:				
Office of Defense Transportation	96	91		5
Office of Scientific Research and Development	100	74		26
Selective Service System	1,567	1,084		483
Postwar agencies:				
Council of Economic Advisers	42	44	2	
Office of Government Reports	139	135		4
Office of Housing Expediter	9,253	8,594		659
Postwar agencies—Continued				
Office of Temporary Controls: Office of Price Administration [1]	1,115			[1] 1,115
Philippine Alien Property Administration	2	2		
Price Decontrol Board	5	5		
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission	4,165	4,214	49	
War Assets Administration	44,733	41,421		3,312
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	3	3		
Bureau of the Budget	603	564		39
Civil Aeronautics Board	532	536	4	
Civil Service Commission	3,476	3,483	7	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	115	116	1	
Federal Communications Commission	1,306	1,242		64
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,170	1,159		11
Federal Power Commission	766	763		3
Federal Security Agency	32,487	31,339		1,148

[1] The decrease of 1,115 employees indicated here for the Office of Price Administration is due to the abolishment of OPA as such. However, these employees have been distributed to the Commerce Department, the Agriculture Department, the Office of Housing Expediter, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

TABLE I.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during June 1947, and comparison with May 1947*—Continued

Department or agency	May	June	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—Continued				
Federal Trade Commission	584	591	7	
Federal Works Agency	24,694	24,331		363
General Accounting Office	10,759	10,629		130
Government Printing Office	7,884	7,786		98
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,271	2,281	10	
Maritime Commission	10,900	10,313		587
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	5,897	5,920	23	
National Archives	394	384		10
National Capital Housing Authority	283	277		6
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	18	19	1	
National Gallery of Art	311	312	1	
National Housing Agency	14,937	14,657		280
National Labor Relations Board	824	816		8
National Mediation Board	111	110		1
Panama Canal	554	658	104	
Railroad Retirement Board	2,673	2,645		28
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	7,723	7,592		131
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,170	1,159		11
Smithsonian Institution	504	519	15	
Tariff Commission	231	230		1
Tax Court of the United States	123	123		
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,098	14,258	160	
Veterans' Administration	223,974	222,046		1,928
Total, excluding War and Navy Departments	1,209,546	1,195,452	3,661	17,755
Net decrease, excluding War and Navy Departments			14,094	
Navy Department	313,658	306,388		7,270
War Department	391,129	353,216		37,913
Total, including War and Navy Departments	1,914,333	1,855,056	3,661	62,938
Net decrease, including War and Navy Departments			59,277	

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during June 1947, as compared with May 1947*

Department or agency	May	June	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except War and Navy Departments):				
Agriculture Department	1,459	1,388		71
Commerce Department	3,082	3,094	12	
Interior Department	4,421	4,839	418	
Justice Department	382	382		
Labor Department	84	80		4
Post Office Department	1,472	1,507	35	
State Department	13,671	13,595		76
Treasury Department	710	653		57
Emergency war agencies: Selective Service System	27	32	5	
Postwar agencies:				
Office of Housing Expediter	44	39		5
Philippine Alien Property Administration	96	108	12	
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission	1	1		
War Assets Administration	487	520	33	
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	95	94		1
Civil Aeronautics Board	13	14	1	
Civil Service Commission	5	5		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	1	1		
Independent agencies—Continued				
Federal Communications Commission	36	37	1	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	3	3		
Federal Security Agency	1,106	1,199	93	
Federal Works Agency	319	291		28
Maritime Commission	324	251		73
National Housing Agency	47	47		
National Labor Relations Board	2	2		
Panama Canal	25,477	24,767		710
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	122	126	4	
Smithsonian Institution	8	8		
Veterans' Administration	1,827	1,703		124
Total, excluding War and Navy Departments	55,321	54,786	614	1,149
Net decrease, excluding War and Navy Departments			535	
Navy Department	52,403	52,044		359
War Department	156,035	149,997		6,038
Total, including War and Navy Departments	263,759	256,827	614	7,546
Net decrease, including War and Navy Departments			6,932	

TABLE III.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during June 1947*

Department or agency	May	June	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except War and Navy Departments):				
Agriculture Department	90,368	90,460	92	
Commerce Department	38,998	38,503		495
Interior Department	51,728	52,981	1,253	
Justice Department	24,675	24,631		44
Labor Department	6,114	5,082		1,032
Post Office Department	469,473	471,787	2,314	
State Department	21,755	21,439		316
Treasury Department	99,124	94,532		4,592
Emergency war agencies:				
Office of Defense Transportation	96	91		5
Office of Scientific Research and Development	100	74		26
Selective Service	1,594	1,116		478
Postwar agencies:				
Council of Economic Advisers	42	44	2	
Office of Government Reports	139	135		4
Office of Housing Expediter	9,297	8,633		664
Office of Temporary Controls: Office of Price Administration [1]	1,115			[1] 1,115
Philippine Alien Property Administration	98	110	12	
Price Decontrol Board	5	5		
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission	4,166	4,215	49	
War Assets Administration	45,220	41,941		3,279
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	98	97		1
Bureau of the Budget	603	564		39
Civil Aeronautics Board	545	550	5	
Civil Service Commission	3,481	3,488	7	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	116	117	1	
Federal Communications Commission	1,342	1,329		13
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,173	1,159		14
Federal Power Commission	766	763		3
Federal Security Agency	33,593	32,538		1,055
Federal Trade Commission	584	591	7	
Federal Works Agency	25,013	24,622		391
Independent agencies—Continued				
General Accounting Office	10,759	10,629		130
Government Printing Office	7,884	7,786		98
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,271	2,281	10	
Maritime Commission	11,224	10,564		660
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	5,897	5,920	23	
National Archives	394	384		10
National Capital Housing Authority	283	277		6
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	18	19	1	
National Gallery of Art	311	312	1	
National Housing Agency	14,984	14,704		280
National Labor Relations Board	826	818		8
National Mediation Board	111	110		1
Panama Canal	26,031	25,425		606
Railroad Retirement Board	2,673	2,645		28
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	7,845	7,718		127
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,170	1,159		11
Smithsonian Institution	512	527	15	
Tariff Commission	231	230		1
Tax Court of the United States	123	123		
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,098	14,258	160	
Veterans' Administration	225,801	223,749		2,052
Total, excluding War and Navy Departments	1,264,867	1,251,235	3,952	17,584
Net decrease, excluding War and Navy Departments			13,632	
Navy Department	366,061	358,432		7,629
War Department:				
Inside the continental United States	391,129	353,216		37,913
Outside continental United States	156,035	149,997		6,038
Total, including War and Navy Departments	2,178,092	2,112,880	3,952	59,164
Net decrease, including War and Navy Departments			55,212	

[1] The decrease of 1,115 employees indicated here for the Office of Price Administration is due to the abolishment of OPA as such. However these employees have been distributed to the Commerce Department, the Agriculture Department, the Office of Housing Expediter, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the continental United States, employed by executive agencies during June 1947*

Department or agency	May	June	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except War and Navy Departments):				
Commerce Department	1,310	1,509	199	
Interior Department	7,209	7,596	387	
State Department	318	328	10	
Treasury Department	4,590	3,861		729
Postwar agencies:				
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission	557	487		70
Independent agencies:				
National Housing Agency	10	9		1
Panama Canal	2,241	2,193		48
Tennessee Valley Authority	7,007	7,211	204	
Total, excluding War and Navy Departments	23,242	23,194	800	848
Net decrease, excluding War and Navy Departments			48	

Department or agency	May	June	Increase	Decrease
Navy Department	253,909	249,891		4,018
War Department:				
Inside continental United States	194,429	184,098		10,331
Outside continental United States	124,789	119,414		5,375
Total, including War and Navy Departments	596,369	576,597	800	20,572
Net decrease, including War and Navy Departments			19,772	

REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—REPORT ON FEDERAL LENDING (S. DOC. NO. 103)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from Mr. BYRD, chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, transmitting pursuant to law, an additional report of the joint committee on the subject of Federal lending.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures just laid before the Senate is the result of a study on Federal lending which has been compiled for the committee as a supplement to a previous study on assets of wholly owned Federal corporations.

The study reveals a cumulative total of $109,500,000,000 in loans under a hodge-podge of Federal-lending programs. This figure includes the estimates for fiscal years 1947 and 1948.

In the total are $57,250,000,000 in domestic direct loans, $44,750,000,000 in domestic guaranteed loans, and approximately $7,000,000,000 in foreign loans.

As of June 30, 1946, there was a principal outstanding of $5,800,000,000 on direct loans.

The data are a result of extensive study on the lending activities of 30 various Federal agencies, both corporate and noncorporate.

In view of the current demand for retrenchment and economy in all fields of Government activity, it appears evident from the study that the lending activities should be scrutinized by the Congress with a view toward curtailing programs wherever possible and liquidating nonessential loans with the thought of applying the receipts as a reduction of the public debt or to the general cost of government.

Tables and statistical data on Federal loans covering the period of 1934 to 1948, which the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures requested and received from the agencies of the Government, will be transmitted to the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate as an aid in their respective deliberations to curtail, if necessary, the operating budgets and the lending activities of each agency making Government loans.

At the same time this report is designed to assist other committees and individual Members of the Congress in their deliberations with respect to the liquidation or the reincorporation of corporate lending agencies by June 30, 1948, under the provision of the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 597).

In addition, the study serves the dual purpose of revealing factual data concerning the noncorporate lending agencies of the Federal Government while showing the urgent need for retrenchment in all phases of Federal lending activity.

Detailed information on loans made is available through June 30, 1946. This data shows the type of loan or purpose for which made, by agency and the fiscal status of the loans as of the above date with the exception of RFC and its subsidiaries which is as of March 31, 1947.

Of the $47,584,589,258 total of direct loans made by 27 agencies, there is principal outstanding of $5,882,996,197. Cash repayments amount to $32,885,379,283; renewals, $6,588,025,813; charge-offs, $420,409,081; losses incurred on collateral sold on foreclosed loans $191,534,346; and other credits to principal $1,616,244,536. Principal and interest in default as of June 30, 1946, amount to $365,774,089.

In addition to this, three agencies have guaranteed lending activities. The Veterans' Administration has a loan-guaranty program that involves over $10,000,000,000 including the estimates for fiscal years 1947 and 1948. On this amount there is a contingent Government liability of almost $5,000,000,000. The Navy Department has a total disbursement of over $2,750,000,000 in guaranteed loans with an estimated loss of $1,200,000. The War Department has a loan program of various guaranteed and other loans in the amount of $32,657,441,012, with a principal outstanding of $465,151,785.

The tremendous total of funds used for domestic lending is further augmented by loans made to foreign governments and entities. The Export-Import Bank of Washington has a total of actual and estimated loans of this nature through 1948, of $2,942,044,040. The cumulative total of the loans made through June 30, 1946, is $987,444,040. Of this amount there is a principal outstanding of $722,772,866. The Treasury Department through the fiscal year of 1947 extended a line of credit to the United Kingdom in the amount of $1,500,000,000 and estimates $1,900,000,000 for expenditures in fiscal year 1948. Other foreign loans which were made to Greece, Turkey, China, and Great Britain total $600,000,000.

Further data is reported in the form of factual information relating to loan purposes, interest rates, terms of loans, and collateral or securities required by each Federal lending agency, so that the Appropriations Committees and other appropriate committees and the Members of the Congress may have complete information on all of the lending functions of the Federal Government.

Submission of the previous study may be noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 28, 1947, page 5917. Since the previous study was referred by the President to the Appropriations Committee, it is respectfully requested that this supplement be referred to both the Appropriations Committee and the Committee on Banking and Currency for their information, and printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations; and, without objection, a copy of the report will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. TAFT, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Abe Murdock, of Utah, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 5 years;

J. Copeland Gray, of New York, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 2 years;

Robert N. Denham, of Maryland, to be general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 4 years; and

William O. Boss and Martin M. Cummings, for promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Maj. Gen. Edward Sedley Bres, and sundry other officers for appointment in the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States.

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Civil Service:

Sundry postmasters.

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

Additional bills were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. MURRAY introduced Senate bill 1740, to encourage the flow of capital into small and intermediate sized independent business enterprises and to promote the development of such enterprises by the establishment of a permanent Federal Small Business Corporation, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MYERS introduced Senate bill 1741, to continue rent control until February 28, 1949, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

FEDERAL SMALL BUSINESS CORPORATION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for the establishment of a permanent Federal Small Business Corporation, and I request that a statement by me may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the statement of the Senator from Montana will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1740) to encourage the flow of capital into small and intermediate sized independent enterprises and to promote the development of such enterprises by the establishment of a permanent Federal Small Business Corporation, introduced by Mr. MURRAY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. MURRAY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURRAY

If there is any Member of this Congress who has failed to express his anxiety for the preservation of our system of small business, I am unable to name him. Yet, in session after session of the Congress well-conceived legislation, designed to aid American small business, is permitted to die a quiet death in committee or expire on the Senate calendar.

American small business has always been the first to feel the effects of an impending recession and the last to benefit from good times. We know that during the last depression the corporate giants of American monopoly industries came through virtually unscathed, while hundreds of thousands of independent small businesses fell by the wayside.

We know that reliance on the criminal and civil sanctions of our antitrust laws has not been enough to prevent the steady and increasing absorption of American industry into fewer and fewer large-scale corporations. We know that the negative legalistic antitrust approach is ineffective, particularly when year after year we see the Congress denying adequate appropriations to the Justice Department's Antitrust Division and the Federal Trade Commission. One of the last reports issued by the Small Business Committee under my chairmanship revealed that following World War II the largest 250 American corporations acquired control of 67 percent of the total industrial capacity of the United States. These mergers, particularly where the merging corporations are large organizations, are accelerating the growth of monopoly at a dangerous rate.

If Congress really seeks to preserve small business, then, in addition to recognizing the need of enforcement of antimonopoly laws, it must recognize that the time has come to provide certain affirmative aids to small business. If Congress is to prevent a further decline of the role of independent small business in our economy, if Congress is to preserve the competitive free-enterprise system, then it must, in addition to providing for a genuine and vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws, provide specific and positive aid to small business that will help it to overcome some of the artificial and arbitrary handicaps it suffers as a result of the monopoly control of the American economy.

Mr. President, I am sending to the desk a bill establishing a Federal small-business corporation which will have specific authority and responsibility to aid small business in three major fields: (1) by providing for the financing of small and medium sized businesses by making available loan capital and equity capital for terms from 1 to 10 years; (2) by providing a program of Government insurance of exports; (3) by providing for review of all Government contracts to insure that the terms of such contracts do not unreasonably discriminate against small business.

Legislation covering one or another of these three fields has been introduced in recent sessions of Congress by able Senators. I have felt it desirable, even necessary, to consolidate in one Government agency the three basic operating functions which can help small business overcome the artificial barriers it faces.

For the purpose of its loans, guaranties, and purchases of preferred stock, the Corporation will be given a capital stock of $125,000,000, subscribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. It may have outstanding obligations up to $1,000,000,000. No loan, purchase, or guaranty for any one business may exceed $250,000. Of the total loans outstanding at any one time, at least 50 percent must be concentrated in the really small loans and purchases, by virtue of the limitation which provides that at least 50 percent of the total funds outstanding must be invested in loans which aggregate not more than $50,000 for any one concern. The loans or purchases may be made either directly or through commercial banks which may thereafter rediscount or resell to the Corporation.

The recent report of the Committee for Economic Development on the special problems of small business confirms that small business has increasing difficulty in obtaining financing as the requirements move from short-term to long-term loans. The most serious financing problem for small business is adequate permanent or equity capital. And notoriously, small businesses in the South and the West have had to pay interest rates far higher than the national average. Finally, the commercial banks are more inclined to fail small business in times of stress when it is most in need of credit assistance. This bill provides the kind of long-term consistent financing which, under a national policy of aiding small business, will help to level out the exaggerated peaks and valleys of the business cycle for small business.

In the export field thousands of small American manufacturers are denied adequate opportunity for participation because they cannot compete with foreign rivals who are backed by their government export insurance or because the American manufacturer has inadequate capital to provide the longer credit terms offered by foreign exporters.

Title 3 of the bill would establish a foreign-trade insurance division in the Corporation which would have the same responsibilities and functions as those set out in an earlier bill introduced by Senator PEPPER and myself, S. 414.

Finally, the Corporation is given authority to review all Government bids and contract offers from the standpoint of determining whether the terms or the size of the individual bids unnecessarily discriminate against small business enterprise. Where such discrimination is found, the Corporation is authorized to recommend to the agency involved and to the President a new form of contract which would provide fair opportunity to small business to participate.

Mr. President, this Congress, despite the fact that its members individually pay lip service to small business, has failed to provide a single piece of legislation which could be fairly called antimonopoly or pro small business. The American people will not be deceived by mere protestations of friendship for small business. Small business will answer in words like those of Emerson: "I cannot hear what you say because the things you do to the contrary thunder in my ear."

The bill I introduce today represents the crystallization of studies conducted by a number of Senators over the years. It represents a real opportunity for this Congress to do something for the preservation of the competitive free-enterprise system.

CONTINUATION OF RENT CONTROL

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to continue rent control until February 28, 1949, and I request that it be printed in full in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1741) to continue rent control until February 28, 1949, introduced by Mr. Myers, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the body of the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of title II of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 and all regulations, orders, and requirements thereunder shall be continued until February 28, 1949; except that as to offenses committed, or rights or liabilities incurred, prior to such termination date, the provisions of this title and such regulations, orders, and requirements shall be treated as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper suit, action, or prosecution with respect to any such right, liability, or offense.

SEC. 2. Section 201 (b) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Congress, however, recognizes that an emergency exists and that the statement and purposes set forth in section 1 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, are still applicable with respect to rents for housing accommodations. The Congress, therefore, finds that it is necessary to impose certain restrictions with reference to housing accommodations as hereinafter set forth."

SEC. 3. Section 202 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 202. As used in this title—

"(a) The term 'person' includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, or any other organized group of persons, or a legal successor or representative of any of the foregoing.

"(b) The term 'housing accommodations' means any building, structure, or part thereof, or land appurtenant thereto, or any other real or personal property rented or offered for rent for living or dwelling purposes (including houses, apartments, rooming-, or boarding-house accommodations, and other prop-

erties used for living or dwelling purposes) together with all privileges, services, furnishings, furniture, and facilities connected with the use or occupancy of such property.

"(c) The term 'defense-rental area' means any part of any area in which rents were regulated on February 29, 1948, under the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, and any areas hereinafter designated and placed under regulation pursuant to the authority of this act, as amended.

"(d) The term 'rent' means the consideration, including any bonus, benefit, or gratuity demanded or received for or in connection with the use or occupancy of housing accommodations, or the transfer of a lease or such accommodations.

"(e) The term 'maximum rent' means the maximum lawful rent for the use of defense-area housing accommodations.

"(f) The term 'defense-area housing accommodations' means housing accommodations within any defense-rental area.

"(g) The term 'documents' includes records, books, accounts, correspondence, memoranda, and other documents, and drafts and copies of any of the foregoing.

"(h) The term 'district court' means any district court of the United States, and the United States Court for any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States; and the term 'circuits courts of appeals' includes the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

SEC. 4. Section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, is amended as follows:

"SEC. 204. (a) Whenever in the judgment of the Housing Expediter, such action is necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, he may, by regulation or order, establish such maximum rent or maximum rents for any housing accommodations in a designated defense-rental area as in his judgment will be generally fair and equitable and will effectuate the purposes of this act, making due allowance for appropriate adjustments in cases where a maximum rent for a housing accommodation was established under a lease executed pursuant to section 204 (b) of the act on or before December 31, 1947, and in cases of housing accommodations, the construction of which was completed on or after February 1, 1947, or which are additional housing accommodations created by conversion on or after February 1, 1947. So far as practicable, in establishing any maximum rent for any defense-area housing accommodations, the Housing Expediter shall ascertain and give due consideration to the rents prevailing for such accommodations, or comparable accommodations, on or about April 1, 1941 (or, if prior or subsequent to April 1, 1941, defense activities shall have resulted or threatened to result in increases in rents for housing accommodations in such area inconsistent with the purposes of this act, then on or about a date (not earlier than April 1, 1940), which in the judgment of the Housing Expediter does not reflect such increases), and he shall make adjustments for such relevant factors as he may determine and deem to be of general applicability in respect of such accommodations, including increases or decreases in property taxes and other costs within such defense-rental area. In designating defense-rental areas, in prescribing regulations and orders establishing maximum rents for such accommodations, and in selecting persons to administer such regulations and orders, the Housing Expediter shall, to such extent as he determines to be practicable, consider any recommendations which may be made by State and local officials concerned with housing or rental conditions in any defense-rental area. Whenever the Housing Expediter shall find that, in any defense-rental area or any portion thereof specified by him, the availability of adequate rental housing accommodations and other relevant factors are such as to make rent control unnecessary for the purpose of eliminating speculative, unwarranted, and abnormal increases in rents and of preventing profiteering, and speculative and other disruptive practices resulting from abnormal market conditions caused by congestion, the controls imposed upon rents by authority of this act in such defense-rental area or portion thereof shall be forthwith abolished; but whenever in the judgment of the Housing Expediter it is necessary or proper, in order to effectuate the purpose of this act, to reestablish the regulation of rents in any such defense-rental area or portion thereof, he may forthwith by regulation or order reestablish maximum rents for housing accommodations therein in accordance with the standards set forth in this act.

"Any regulation or order under this section may be established in such form and manner, may contain such classifications and differentiations, and may provide for such adjustments and reasonable exceptions, as in the judgment of the Housing Expediter are necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this act. Any regulation or order under this section which establishes a maximum rent may provide for a maximum rent below the rent or rents prevailing for the defense-area housing accommodations, at the time of the issuance of such regulation or order.

"(b) Whenever in the judgment of the Housing Expediter such action is necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, he may, by regulation or order, regulate or prohibit speculative or manipulative practices or renting or leasing practices (including practices relating to recovery of the possession) in connection with any defense-area housing accommodations, which in his judgment are equivalent to or are likely to result in rent increases inconsistent with the purposes of this act.

"(c) Regulations, orders, and requirements under this act may contain such provisions as the Housing Expediter deems necessary to prevent the circumvention or evasion thereof.

"(d) The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in established rental practices, except where such action is affirmatively found by the Housing Expediter to be necessary to prevent circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, or requirement under this act.

"(e) The Housing Expediter shall administer the powers, functions, and duties under this act; and for the purpose of exercising such powers, functions, and duties, the Office of Housing Expediter is hereby extended until February 28, 1949.

"(f) During the period beginning on the effective date of this title and ending on the date this title ceases to be in effect, no person shall demand, accept, or receive any rent for the use or occupancy of any housing accommodations greater than the maximum rent in effect on February 29, 1948, established under the authority of this act.

"(g) The Housing Expediter is authorized to issue such regulations and orders as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act and shall by regulation or order make such adjustments in maximum rents as may be necessary to correct inequities or further to carry out the purposes and provisions of this title.

"(h) 1. The Housing Expediter is hereby authorized and directed to create in each defense-rental area, or such portion thereof as he may designate, a local advisory board, each such board to consist of not less than five members who are representative citizens of the area, to be appointed by the Housing Expediter from recommendations made by the respective governors. The local boards may make such recommendations to the Housing Expediter as they deem advisable with respect to the following matters:

"(A) Decontrol of defense-rental area or any portion thereof;

"(B) The adequacy of the general rent level in the area; and

"(C) Operations generally of the local rent office.

"2. The Housing Expediter shall furnish the local boards suitable office space and stenographic assistance and shall make available to such boards any records and other information in the possession of the Housing Expediter with respect to the establishment and maintenance of maximum rents for housing accommodations in the respective defense-rental areas which may be requested by such boards.

"3. Any recommendation of a local board which in the judgment of the Housing Expediter is appropriately substantiated and in accordance with applicable law, shall be approved and appropriate action shall promptly be taken to carry such recommendation into effect."

SEC. 5. Section 205 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 205. (a) The Housing Expediter may, subject to the civil-service laws, appoint such employees as he deems necessary in order to carry out his functions and duties under this act, and shall fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The Housing Expediter may utilize the services of Federal, State, and local agencies and may utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services, as may from time to time be needed. Attorneys appointed under this section may appear for and represent the Housing Expediter in any case in any court. In the appointment, selection, classification, and promotion of officers and employees of the Office of Housing Expediter, no political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration, but all such appointments and promotions shall be given and made on the basis of merit and efficiency.

"(b) The principal office of the Housing Expediter shall be in the District of Columbia, but he or any duly authorized representative may exercise any or all of his powers in any place.

"(c) The Housing Expediter is authorized to make such studies and investigations, to conduct such hearings, and to obtain such information as he deems necessary or proper to assist him in prescribing any regulation or order under this act, or in the administration and enforcement of this act and regulations thereunder.

"(d) The Housing Expediter is further authorized, by regulation or order, to require any person who rents or offers for rent or acts as broker or agent for the rental of any housing accommodations, to furnish any such information under oath or affirmation or otherwise, to make and keep records and other documents, and to make reports, and he may require any such person to permit the inspection and copying of records and other documents, and the inspection of defense-area housing accommodations. The Housing Expediter may administer oaths and affirmations and may, whenever necessary, by subpena require any such person to appear and testify or to appear and produce documents, or both, at any designated place.

"(e) For the purpose of obtaining any information under subsection (c) the Housing Expediter may by subpena require any other person to appear and testify or to appear and produce documents, or both, at any designated place.

"(f) The production of a person's documents at any place other than his place of business shall not be required under this section in any case in which, prior to the return date specified in the subpena issued with respect thereto, such person either has furnished the Housing Expediter with a copy of such documents (certified by such person under oath to be a true and correct copy), or has entered into a stipulation with the Housing Expediter as to the information contained in such documents.

"(g) In case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpena served upon, any person referred to in subsection (e), the district court for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Housing Expediter, shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony or to appear and produce documents, or both; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. The provisions of this subsection shall also apply to any person referred to in subsection (d).

"(h) Witnesses subpenaed under this section shall be paid the same fees and mileage as are paid witnesses in the district courts of the United States.

"(i) No person shall be excused from complying with any requirements under this section because of his privilege against self-incrimination, but the immunity provisions of the Compulsory Testimony Act of February 11, 1893 (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 49, sec. 46) shall apply with respect to any individual who specifically claims such privilege

"(j) The Housing Expediter shall not publish or disclose any information obtained under this act that such Housing Expediter deems confidential or with reference to which a request for confidential treatment is made by the person furnishing such information unless he determines that the withholding thereof is contrary to the public interest.

"(k) Any person subpenaed under this section shall have the right to make a record of his testimony and to be represented by counsel.

"(l) At any time after the issuance of any regulation or order under section 204, any person subject to any provision of such regulation or order, may, in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Housing Expediter, file a protest specifically setting forth objections to any such provision and affidavits or other written evidence in support of such objections. Statements in support of any such regulation or order may be received and incorporated in the transcript of the proceedings at such times and in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Housing Expediter. Within a reasonable time after the filing of any protest under this subsection, but in no event more than 30 days after such filing, the Housing Expediter shall either grant or deny such protest in whole or in part, notice such protest for hearing, or provide an opportunity to present further evidence in connection therewith. In the event that the Housing Expediter denies any such protest in whole or in part, he shall inform the protestant of the grounds upon which such decision is based, and of any economic data and other facts of which the Housing Expediter has taken official notice.

"(m) In the administration of this act the Housing Expediter may take official notice of economic data and other facts, including facts found by him as a result of action taken under subsections (c) to (l) of this section.

"(n) Any proceedings under this section may be limited by the Housing Expediter to the filing of affidavits, or other written evidence, and the filing of briefs.

"(o) Any protest filed under this section shall be granted or denied by the Housing Expediter, or granted in part and the remainder of it denied, within a reasonable time after it is filed. Any protestant who is aggrieved by undue delay on the part of the Housing Expediter in disposing of his protest may petition the Emergency Court of Appeals, created pursuant to this section for relief; and such court shall have jurisdiction by appropriate order to require the Housing Expediter to dispose of such protest within such time as may be fixed by the court. If the Housing Expediter does not act finally within the time fixed by the court, the protest shall be deemed to be denied at the expiration of that period.

"(p) Any person who is aggrieved by the denial or partial denial of his protest may, within 30 days after such denial, file a complaint with the Emergency Court of Appeals, created pursuant to this section, specifying his objections and praying that the regulation or order protested be enjoined or set aside in whole or in part. A copy of such complaint shall forthwith be served on the Housing Expediter, who shall certify and file with such court a transcript of such portions of the proceedings in connection with the protest as are material under the complaint. Such transcript shall include a statement setting forth, so far as practicable, the economic data and other facts of which the Housing Expediter has taken official notice. Upon the filing of such complaint the court shall have exclusive jurisdiction to set aside such regulation or order, in whole or in part, to dismiss the complaint, or to remand the proceeding: *Provided*, That the regulation or order may be modified or rescinded by the Housing Expediter at any time notwithstanding the pendency of such complaint. No objection to such regulation or order, and no evidence in support of any objection thereto, shall be considered by the court, unless such objection shall have been set forth by the complainant in the protest or such evidence shall be contained in the transcript. If application is made to the court by either party for leave to introduce additional evidence which was either offered to the Housing Expediter and not admitted, or which could not reasonably have been offered to the Housing Expediter or included by the Housing Expediter in such proceedings, and the court determines that such evidence should be admitted, the court shall order the evidence to be presented to the Housing Expediter. The Housing Expediter shall promptly receive the same, and such other evidence as he deems necessary or proper, and thereupon he shall certify and file with the court a transcript thereof and any modification made in the regulation or order as a result thereof; except that on request by the Housing Expediter, any such evidence shall be presented directly to the court.

"(q) No such regulation or order shall be enjoined or set aside, in whole or in part, unless the complainant establishes to the satisfaction of the court that the regulation or order is not in accordance with law, or is arbitrary or capricious. The effectiveness of a judgment of the court enjoining or setting aside, in whole or in part, any such regulation or order, shall be postponed until the expiration of 30 days from the entry thereof, except that if a petition for a writ of certiorari is filed with the Supreme Court under subsection (s) within such 30 days, effectiveness of such judgment shall be postponed until an order of the Supreme Court denying such petition becomes final, or until other final disposition of the case by the Supreme Court.

"(r) There is hereby created a court of the United States to be known as the Emergency Court of Appeals, which shall consist of three or more judges to be designated by the Chief Justice of the United States from judges of the United States district courts and circuit courts of appeals. The Chief Justice of the United States shall designate one of such judges as chief judge of the Emergency Court of Appeals, and may, from time to time, designate additional judges for such court and revoke previous designations. The chief judge may, from time to time, divide the court into divisions of three or more members, and any such division may render judgment as the judgment of the court. Two judges shall constitute a quorum of the court and each division thereof. The court shall have the powers of a district court with respect to the jurisdiction conferred on it by this act; except that the court shall not have power to issue any temporary restraining order or interlocutory decree staying or restraining, in whole or in part, the effectiveness of any regulation or order issued under section 204. The court shall exercise its powers and prescribe rules governing its procedure in such manner as to expedite the determination of cases of which it has jurisdiction under this act. The court may fix and establish a table of costs and fees to be approved by the Supreme Court of the United States, but the costs and fees so fixed shall not exceed with respect to any item the costs and fees charged in the Supreme Court of the United States. The court shall have a seal, hold sessions at such places as it may specify, and appoint a clerk and such other employees as it deems necessary or proper.

"(s) Within 30 days after entry of a judgment or order, interlocutory or final, by the Emergency Court of Appeals, a petition for a writ of certiorari may be filed in the Supreme Court of the United States, and thereupon the judgment or order shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court in the same manner as a judgment of a circuit court of appeals, as provided in section 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 28, sec. 347). The Supreme Court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of all causes filed therein pursuant to this subsection. The Emergency Court of Appeals, and the Supreme Court upon review of judgments and orders of the Emergency Court of Appeals, shall have exclusive jurisdiction to determine the validity of any regulation or order issued under section 204, and of any provision of any such regulation or order. Except as provided in this section, no court, Federal, State, or Territorial, shall have jurisdiction or power to consider the validity of any such regulation or order, or to stay, restrain, enjoin, or set aside, in whole or in part, any provision of this act authorizing the issuance of such regulations or orders, or any provision of any such regulation or order, or to restrain or enjoin the enforcement of any such provision.

"(t) (1) Within 30 days after arraignment, or such additional time as the court may allow for good cause shown, in any criminal proceeding, and within 5 days after judgment in any civil or criminal proceeding, brought pursuant to subsections (u) to (y) of this section or section 37 of the Criminal Code, involving alleged violation of any provision of any regulation or order issued under section 204, the defendant may apply to the court in which the proceeding is pending for leave to file in the Emergency Court of Appeals a complaint against the Housing Expediter setting forth objections to the validity of any provision which the defendant is alleged to have violated or conspired to violate. The court in which the proceeding is pending shall grant such leave with respect to any objection which it finds is made in good faith and with respect to which it finds there is reasonable and substantial excuse for the defendant's failure to present such objection in a protest filed in accordance with subsection (L) of this section. Upon the filing of a complaint pursuant to and within 30 days from the granting of such leave, the Emergency Court of Appeals shall have jurisdiction to enjoin or set aside in whole or in part the provision of the regulation or order complained of or to dismiss the complaint. The court may authorize the introduction of evidence, either to the Housing Expediter or directly to the court, in accordance with subsection (p) of this section. The provisions of subsections (q), (r), and (s) of this section shall be applicable with respect to any proceeding instituted in accordance with this subsection.

"(2) In any proceeding brought pursuant to subsection (u) to (y) of this section 37

of the Criminal Code, involving an alleged violation of any provision of any such regulation or order, the court shall stay the proceeding—

"(i) during the period within which a complaint may be filed in the Emergency Court of Appeals pursuant to leave granted under paragraph (1) of this subsection with respect to such provision;

"(ii) during the pendency of any protest properly filed by the defendant under subsection (1) of this section prior to the institution of the proceeding under subsection (u) to (n) of this section or section 37 of the Criminal Code, setting forth objections to validity of such provision which the court finds to have been made in good faith; and

"(iii) during the pendency of any judicial proceeding instituted by the defendant under this section with respect to such protest or instituted by the defendant under paragraph (1) of this subsection with respect to such provision, and until the expiration of the time allowed in this section for the taking of further proceedings with respect thereto.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this paragraph, stays shall be granted thereunder in civil proceedings only after judgment and upon application made within 5 days after judgment. Notwithstanding the provisions of this paragraph, in the case of a proceeding under subsection (u) of this section the court granting a stay under this paragraph shall issue a temporary injunction or restraining order enjoining or restraining, during the period of the stay, violations by the defendant of any provision of the regulation or order involved in the proceeding. If any provision of a regulation or order is determined to be invalid by judgment of the Emergency Court of Appeals which has become effective in accordance with subsection (q) of this section any proceeding pending in any court shall be dismissed, and any judgment in such proceeding vacated, to the extent that such proceeding or judgment is based upon violation of such provision. Except as provided in this subsection, the pendency of any protest under subsection (1) of this section, or judicial proceeding under this section, shall not be grounds for staying any proceeding brought pursuant to subsections (u) to (n) of this section or section 37 of the Criminal Code; nor except as provided in this subsection, shall any retroactive effect be given to any judgment setting aside a provision of a regulation or order issued under section 204.

"(u) Whenever in the judgment of the Housing Expediter any person has engaged or is about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute or will constitute a violation of any provision of section 206 of this act, he may make application to the appropriate court for an order enjoining such acts or practices, or for an order enforcing compliance with such provision, and upon a showing by the Housing Expediter that such person has engaged or is about to engage in any such acts or practices a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order shall be granted without bond.

"(v) Any person who willfully violates any provision of section 206 of this act, and any person who makes any statement or entry false in any material respect in any document or report required to be kept or filed under section 204 of this act or subsections (c) to (i) of this section, shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000, or to imprisonment for not more than 2 years in the case of a violation of section 206 (c) and for not more than 1 year in all other cases, or to both such fine and imprisonment. Whenever the Housing Expediter has reason to believe that any person is liable for punishment under this subsection, he may certify the facts to the Attorney General, who may, in his discretion, cause appropriate proceedings to be brought.

"(w) The district courts shall have jurisdiction of criminal proceedings for violations of section 206 of this act, and, concurrently with State and Territorial courts, of all other proceedings under subsections (u) to (y) of this section. Such criminal proceedings may be brought in any district in which any part of any act or transaction constituting the violation occurred. Such other proceedings may be brought in any district in which any part of any act or transaction constituting the violation occurred, and may also be brought in the district in which the defendant resides or transacts business, and process in such cases may be served in any district wherein the defendant resides or transacts business or wherever the defendant may be found: *Provided, however*, That all suits under subsection (y) of this section shall be brought in the district or county in which the defendant resides or has a place of business, an office, or an agent. Any such court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of any criminal or other proceedings brought before it under this section. No costs shall be assessed against the Housing Expediter or the United States Government in any proceeding under this act.

"(x) No person shall be liable for damages or penalties in any Federal, State, or Territorial court, on any grounds for or in respect of anything done or omitted to be done in good faith pursuant to any provision of this act or any regulation, order or requirement thereunder notwithstanding that subsequently such provision, regulation, order or requirement may be modified, rescinded, or determined to be invalid. In any suit or action wherein a party relies for ground of relief or defense upon this act or any regulation, order, or requirement thereunder, the court having jurisdiction of such suit or action shall certify such fact to the Housing Expeditor. The Housing Expediter may intervene in any such suit or action.

"(y) Any person who demands, accepts, or receives any payment of rent in excess of the maximum rent prescribed under section 204 shall be liable to the person from whom he demands, accepts, or receives such payment, for reasonable attorney's fees and costs as determined by the court, plus liquidated damages in the amount of (1) $50, or (2) three times the amount by which the payment or payments demanded, accepted, or received exceed the maximum rent which could lawfully be demanded, accepted, or received, whichever in either case may be the greater amount: *Provided*, That the amount of such liquidated damages shall be the amount of the overcharge or overcharges if the defendant proves that the violation was neither willful nor the result of failure to take practicable precautions against the occurrence of the violation. Suit to recover such amount may be brought in any Federal, State, or Territorial court of competent jurisdiction within 1 year after the date of such violation: *Provided further*, That if the person from whom such payment is demanded, accepted, or received, either fails to institute an action under this subsection within 30 days from the date of the occurrence of the violation or is not entitled for any reason to bring the action, the Housing Expediter may institute such action on behalf of the United States within such 1-year period. If such action is instituted by the Housing Expediter, the buyer shall thereafter be barred from bringing an action for the same violation or violations."

SEC. 6. Section 206 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 is amended to read as follows:

"PROHIBITIONS

"SEC. 206. (a) It shall be unlawful, regardless of any contract, agreement, lease, or other obligation heretofore or hereafter entered into, for any person to demand, accept, or receive any rent for any defense-area housing accommodations or otherwise to do or omit to do any act, in violation of any regulation or order or agreement under this act, or to offer, solicit, attempt, or agree to do any of the foregoing.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any person to remove or attempt to remove from any defense-area housing accommodations the tenant or occupant thereof or to refuse to renew the lease or agreement for the use of such accommodations, because such tenant or occupant has taken, or proposes to take, action authorized or required by this act or any regulation, order, or requirement thereunder.

"(c) It shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of the Government, or for any adviser or consultant to the Housing Expediter in his official capacity, to disclose, otherwise than in the course of official duty, any information obtained under this act, or to use any such information, for personal benefit.

"(d) Nothing in this act shall be construed to require any person to offer any accommodations for rent."

SEC. 7. Section 209 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 is hereby repealed.

SEC. 8. Section 210 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 210. Section 2 (a) of the Administrative Procedure Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after "Selective Training and Service Act of 1940;" the following: "Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended;"

SEC. 9. Section 211 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 211. (a) The provisions of this title shall be applicable to the several States and to the Territories and possessions of the United States but shall not be applicable to the District of Columbia.

"(b) The provisions of this title shall not apply to housing accommodations located in any transient hotel, motor court, or in any tourist home serving transient guests, exclusively.

SEC. 10. This act shall become effective on the 1st day of March 1948.

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 11. This act may be cited at the Housing and Rent Extension Act of 1948.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM TO FILE INTERIM REPORTS

Mr. BREWSTER. I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution and I request its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution will be received. The clerk will report it for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program be authorized to file additional reports with the Secretary of the Senate following the adjournment of the Senate and that they be printed as parts of Senate Report No. 440.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, what is the reason for the adoption of this resolution? And if it is adopted, when would the committee expect to make a report to the Secretary of the Senate?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, it has been the custom to make what are called interim reports from time to time, and then an annual report. It has been

found to be much more appropriate to have the reports coming in, one a month or one every 2 months, rather than wait for the conclusion. This would permit the issuance of reports and their printing.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to have the resolution go over for the time being. Perhaps the Senator and I will get together. I ask that it go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will go over temporarily.

The resolution (S. Res. 160) was ordered to lie over temporarily.

Subsequently, the resolution (S. Res. 160), submitted by Mr. BREWSTER, was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

TEMPORARY CONTINUATION OF REGULATION OF CONSUMER CREDIT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CAPEHART submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 148) to authorize the temporary continuation of regulation of consumer credit, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That after November 1, 1947, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall not exercise consumer credit controls pursuant to Executive Order Numbered 8843, and no such consumer credit controls shall be exercised after such date except during the time of war beginning after the date of enactment of this joint resolution or any national emergency declared by the President after the date of enactment of this joint resolution."

And the House agree to the same.

That the House recede from its amendment to the title.

HOMER CAPEHART,
RALPH E. FLANDERS,
JOHN W. BRICKER,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
HENRY O. TALLE,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

REPORT OF SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, out of order I ask unanimous consent to report from the Committee on Appropriations House bill 4347, the second supplemental appropriation bill with amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received for the calendar.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL-FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL—AUTHORIZATION TO FILE REPORT

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] in charge of the conference on the War Department civil-functions appropriation bill may be authorized to file a conference report while the Senate is in recess.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

REPORT ON POSTMASTER NOMINATIONS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as chairman of the Civil Service Committee, having charge of post offices, I am pleased to make the following report showing the present status of postmaster nominations:

Number of postmaster nominations received by Senate Civil Service Committee since Jan. 1, 1947	1,285
Withdrawals	116
Nominations to be considered	1,169
Nominations recommended for confirmation	904
Nominations held up for investigation	137
Nominations held by Senators	100

(Of these 100, 20 are also being held by the committee for investigation.)

Nominations received July 24 and not examined	28
Unconfirmed nominations	245

Of 245 unconfirmed nominations, 137 are held for investigation. One hundred nominations held up by Senators of respective States.

Mr. President, I want to say to every Senator upon the floor, if there is a nomination being held up, if the Senator will come to the office of the Committee on Civil Service, the entire file will be turned over to him. It is the position of the Civil Service Committee that every Senator is entitled to see the file on any particular case.

NOMINATION OF HERBERT W. CHRISTENBERRY—SUSPENSION OF THE RULE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that paragraph 6 of rule XXXVIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate relating to proceedings on nominations, be suspended with respect to the nomination of Herbert W. Christenberry to be district judge for the eastern district of Louisiana, now pending in the Committee on the Judiciary. I wish to say that the rule provides that if any nomination is before the Committee on the Judiciary after the Senate recesses it automatically dies after 30 days. The reason for this move on my part is that the subcommittee has not had time to investigate the matter, with no reflection on Mr. Christenberry, and my motion is agreeable to the Committee on the Judiciary and to the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's motion is not in order at the present time.

Mr. WILEY. I ask unanimous consent that the rule may be suspended.

Mr. LUCAS. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, is this going to lead to any controversy?

Mr. WILEY. I do not think it will take a minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that paragraph 6 of rule XXXVIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate be suspended. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

PALESTINE—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MYERS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by me respecting Senate Joint Resolution 149, of which I am a cosponsor.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FRANCIS J. MYERS ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 149

Mr. President, the question of Palestine has been discussed on the floor of the Senate hundreds of times. Again and again various Members of this body have risen to reiterate the sympathy and support of the American people and the Congress of the United States for the aspiration of the Hebrew people to reestablish their nation in Palestine. Again and again we have deplored the tragic plight of the Hebrew people and criticized the British Government for violating its duties and obligations under the League of Nations mandate. Over and over again we have called attention to the responsibility of the mandatory power in Palestine for continuing the tragedy of destitute and desperate millions still confined in German concentration camps, still waiting hopelessly in displaced persons centers, still bereft of property, security, and citizenship in the countries of eastern Europe.

I think that it is time to change this record of futile lamentations and pious hopes. I believe that we must take some positive and constructive action to put an end to the Hebrew tragedy and to the flagrant violation by a government of its obligations under international law.

Permit me to call your attention, Mr. President, to certain simple and incontrovertible facts. There is a treaty between Great Britain and the United States—the Anglo-American Convention of 1924—which was approved and ratified by the United States Senate. This treaty incorporates the text of the mandate assumed by Great Britain in regard to Palestine. It specifically stipulates that the British Government will not make any changes in any provision of this mandate without previous consultation and approval by the United States. Nevertheless, almost from the day that Great Britain signed this treaty it has been guilty of persistent and brazen infractions of the fundamental provisions of the mandate amounting to unilateral denunciation of this treaty.

May I cite some of these infractions?

The mandate instructs the British Government and its Palestine Administration to "encourage close settlement by the Jews on the land, including State lands and waste lands not required for public purposes." One does not facilitate immigration by passing a law prohibiting it; one does not encourage settlement on the land by passing a law prohibiting the purchase of that land.

This international contract assumed by Great Britain and incorporated in the Anglo-American Convention also provides that "the mandatory shall be responsible for placing the country under such political, administrative, and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home." For 25 years the British Colonial Office and the Palestine Administration have, both openly and secretly, maneuvered and connived to create such conditions as would

make the establishment of a Jewish national home impossible.

Article 5 of the mandate states: "The mandatory shall be responsible for seeing that no Palestine territory shall be ceded or leased to, or in any way placed under the control of, the government of any foreign power." At the very time this article was being written Great Britain made arrangements to partition Palestine, placing three-quarters of that country under the rule of the foreign puppet, Emir Abdullah. In January 1946 the last shreds of legality were torn from this provision of the mandate by the action of the British Government in unilaterally establishing Trans-Jordan as an independent kingdom. During the 24 years that Great Britain kept Trans-Jordan apart from the rest of Palestine, meanwhile sustaining it by the revenues from the Palestine treasury (87 percent of which were derived by exorbitant taxation of the Hebrew people) the Palestine administration prohibited Hebrews from settling in Trans-Jordan, from acquiring land there, even from traversing that country without the special permission of the High Commission.

In article 9 of the mandate the British Government is made responsible "for seeing that the judicial system established in Palestine shall assure to foreigners, as well as to natives, a complete guaranty of their rights." With the exception of Hitler's attitude toward treaties as "scraps of paper," I know no more cynical disregard of a solemn contractual obligation than the British violation of this provision. Since the war, all due processes of law and justice have been abrogated in Palestine by the British Government. Military courts have been instituted which have repeatedly meted out cruel and unusual punishments to the Hebrew people, punishments that are in striking contrast to the sentences given to Arabs for the same offenses. For years, thousands of Hebrews have been arrested, imprisoned, and deported to concentration camps in Africa without trial, without even preferment of charges.

Article 15 of the mandate specifically states: "No discrimination of any kind shall be made between the inhabitants of Palestine on the ground of race, religion, or language. No person shall be excluded from Palestine on the sole ground of his religious belief." The legislative violations I have cited above and the thousands of incontrovertible instances of judicial, administrative, and economic discrimination that I can cite prove that British policy deliberately contradicts this provision of the mandate.

If in the face of this overwhelming evidence the United States Government allows these conditions to continue, it will be guilty of dereliction of its rights and responsibilities under the Anglo-American Convention. We must not allow it. We must not permit the British Government, nor any Government, to show such brazen disrespect for a treaty to which the United States is a party. We cannot tolerate such an affront to the American Government and the American people. We cannot condone such oppression of a small and weak nation for whose welfare we have legally and morally assumed responsibility. We cannot shut our eyes to such flouting of international law and of decent respect to the opinions of mankind without destroying the faith of millions of people in justice and decency, without letting loose upon this world an area of international brigandage and oppression like the one which has just cost us a bloody world war.

Mr. President, I have taken the time of the Senate to make this statement because we have recently learned that the death sentence to three young Hebrew patriots, imposed by one of these illegal military courts, has been confirmed by General MacMillan, the commander in chief of the British Army of Occupation in Palestine. This was done in the face of a fervent plea made by the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine for the commutation of these death sentences. It was done within a week of the time when the British commanding general in Italy commuted the death sentences of the three German generals responsible for the brutal massacre of 335 Italians in Rome. I am sure the Senate will agree with me that we cannot permit this gross miscarriage of justice without entering our vigorous protest in the RECORD and communicating it to the British Government unless we are prepared to have in Palestine a repetition of the official murders that blacken the pages of Irish history. The Senators will recall that until an outraged American Government gave expression to its abhorrence and indignation, the British hanged and shot hundreds of Irish patriots. We must not allow that many victims to the Moloch of British oppression in Palestine before we take action.

Mr. President, recently the Secretary of State announced that the policy of the American Government on Palestine has not changed. We know what that policy has been. I urge the Senate to call upon the Secretary of State to implement this policy immediately by insisting, as we have every right to do, that Great Britain live up to its treaty with the United States and reestablish immediately a civilian administration in Palestine which will guarantee the civil liberties of the population and carry out in full the provisions of the mandate. Such is the purpose of the Senate Joint Resolution 149 of which I am a cosponsor.

PURCHASES OF GRAIN FOR EXPORT—STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in the interest of saving time, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD a short statement I am making on a bill recently before the Senate, Senate bill 1586, relating to exports of grain and grain products.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HUGH BUTLER

There is pending at the present time a bill, S. 1586, which provides that the sale to foreign purchasers of grain and grain products for export shall not be performed or conducted by a department or agency of the Government. A number of considerations prompted me to introduce that bill. I am convinced that the sale of grain for export can be handled in an efficient and orderly manner by the grain trade and I wish to eliminate, as quickly as possible, Government interference and competition with private business. It is my belief that no Government agency can enter the market without being an unsettling influence.

It was my hope that Government competition with private business could be eliminated without specific directives from Congress. I recognize that in certain activities the withdrawal of the Government must be a gradual process. I feel that this should be accomplished by the various agencies as expeditiously as conditions confronting them permit. I am happy to report that a spokesman for the Department of Agriculture last week stated, and I quote:

"During the war we have been criticized by some businessmen for the large degree of Government activity in fields once reserved for private business. I assure you that we are as anxious to get out of most of these functions as businessmen are to have us out.

"In the development of export programs for cotton our major emphasis now is to get this business into the hands of private traders. That is not easy with the world's economy so disrupted and much of the foreign buying being done by governments. But we are making progress. Last year about a third of the three-million-odd bales of cotton exported were handled by private concerns in this country. Next year we believe the figure will be much nearer 100 percent."

It appears that the Government some time ago returned the sale of coal for export to the private coal trade. I wish to call the Senate's attention to a report on coal exports released by the President last Saturday. This report was made by Capt. Granville Conway, Coordinator for Emergency Export Programs, who is assigned the task of coordinating all efforts to transport grain and coal to meet urgent needs abroad. In his report Captain Conway states, and I quote:

"A notable aspect of the past year's coal export program has been the general shift from United States Government procurement of export coal to direct purchasing from United States industry by foreign buying agencies. This transition was accomplished gradually during the year with a minimum disruption of the flow of exports.

"Virtually all shipments are now on this direct-purchase basis. United States Government agencies act only to coordinate the planning, scheduling, and movement of supplies to avoid overcrowding in the ports and to assure an equitable division of the supplies available for export among the countries receiving the coal."

In commenting on this report the Honorable John R. Steelman, the assistant to the President, stated, and I quote:

"It is gratifying, therefore, that the United States in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, was able to ship abroad—and to the places where it was most gravely needed—record-breaking amounts of coal, and to do this in spite of production and shipping difficulties, without denying the needs of American consumers and industry. This record was made with a minimum of Government participation and controls, through the cooperative efforts of the industries concerned, working under policies and programs set by the Government."

It is significant that Captain Conway, who has so successfully coordinated transportation, recommended to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary when the bill, now Public Law 188, was being considered that the grain trade could assume the responsibility for the sale of grain for export to foreign purchasers and could exercise it more efficiently than the Government. He is not the only administration spokesman who favored the return of this trade to private firms. C. Tyler Wood, economic advisor to the State Department, advised the subcommittee that heard witnesses on the question of continuing export controls, that he personally saw no reason why grain export should not be the function of private industry.

I believe that the Secretary of Agriculture should follow the recommendations of Captain Conway and Mr. Wood. I hope that before the Congress adjourns we may learn that, as with cotton, a major emphasis in the grain export program will be on the return of the grain exporting business to private trade. The private grain export trade, in a letter sent by R. J. Barnes, the association president, to President Truman on July 21, expressed again its desire and ability to undertake this business and stated in part, and I quote:

"Being interested, as you are, in the level of prices, you must have noticed during the last few weeks the steep advance in prices of grain. In no small measure this has been brought about by the buying of wheat for the export program by Government agencies such as the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the Production and Marketing Administration of the Department of Agriculture. It is true, of course, if the export of wheat was handled by the grain trade and if the export program is to be executed in the same volume, the export grain trade will have to buy and sell to claimant nations the same amount of wheat as is being bought for them by the Department of Agriculture. However,

the Department of Agriculture, for various reasons, is attempting to execute its export program under the great handicaps of operating in the open and in full view, and with the publicity attached thereto of the knowledge of its operations by the general public, which overemphasizes the importance of the purchases made by the Production and Marketing Administration. If the exports were handled by the private grain trade the result would be greatly less disturbing to our general economy, and, incidentally, foreign claimant nations would purchase their grain on a purely competitive basis, which is not now possible by purchasing from Government agencies within the framework of the allocations.

"We know that you are gravely concerned with these matters and that you have charged the Secretary of Commerce as the head of a representative nonpartisan public committee appointed by you, to investigate the effects upon our domestic economy of the exports contemplated.

"We wish to assure you that the grain exporters of the United States are fully capable of handling the exports of wheat to claimant nations, and that this can be done more efficiently and more cheaply by us than it is now being done by the Government. As you state in your message, 'It is imperative that these programs of assistance be conceived and executed so as to be of maximum benefit to such foreign countries, without having an unduly adverse effect upon our domestic economy'.

"This, we assure you, will be accomplished exactly by what we urged be done with the least possible delay, namely, the physical handling of the procuring, shipping and exporting, and all the details attached thereto, by the private grain trade under the system of allocations which is provided for under the extension of the Export Control Act."

There seems abundant evidence that Government agencies are retiring from various kinds of business in the export field, yet the Department of Agriculture is holding tenaciously to the export of grain, a field in which even the administration's own coordinator holds that the private trades could do a better job. Though the Congress, hurried in its last few weeks of considering legislation, extended the export control law unchanged in this respect, the Senate's Judiciary Committee in its report recommended that this business be returned to private trade at the earliest moment. It will be interesting to note, when this body again convenes, how far the Government agencies have progressed toward the return of this business to the private trades, and how they interpret that earliest moment.

HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD two editorials with reference to Hawaiian statehood, one from the Portland Press Herald and one from the Evening Express, both of Portland, Maine. The editorials do not necessarily express my opinion.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald of July 3, 1947]

HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

When the House voted, last Monday, statehood for Hawaii, Maine's Representatives divided: Mr. HALE and Mrs. SMITH voted for the measure; Mr. FELLOWS voted against it. The total vote was 196 to 133. Of the no votes, 77 were by Democrats, and only 56 were by Republicans. There is a hint there that there was some partisanship in the result, the Democrats perhaps fearing that admission of Hawaii as a State would strengthen the Republican majorities in House and Senate; and there were, no doubt, some Republicans who, with no particular affection for Hawaii, felt that two more Senators and two more Representatives would be on their side to strengthen their hold upon legislation and general party control.

There was nothing immediate in the vote. The Senate is believed to be rather lukewarm on the subject of Hawaiian statehood, and it is thought that no action will be taken at this session. The arguments for prompt action do not seem overpowering. The chief ones are that granting of statehood would be fulfillment of promises made long ago to grant it when the islands are ready, and that the islands are, in fact, ready for it now.

But opponents, though in the minority, have a strong case. There are many in the islands who are opposed to statehood, and there are more who rebel a little at the thought of two Japanese Senators and two Japanese Representatives in the Congress, as there might be, inasmuch as the Japanese population comprises the most numerous part of the population. There is some sense in the objection that Hawaii would have one Senator for each 35,000 voters, and in the suggestion that it would be an error to admit an insular possession into statehood.

The House would have none of these arguments, however; it seemed to believe that America, the melting pot, would take care of the polyglot population of the islands; and, of course, there was general agreement that during the war the Hawaiians were firmly loyal. Some day statehood will come. The surprise really is that the present House of Representatives should have believed that the time is now.

[From the Portland (Maine) Evening Express July 5, 1947]

HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

The House has passed and sent to the Senate a bill to admit Hawaii to the Union as the forty-ninth State. If the bill becomes law, Hawaii will be our first off-shore State. It will be a long way off shore, 2,000 miles, no less.

The Hawaiian Islands are the main pivot of our defenses in the Pacific. If the Japanese had wrested them from us—and if they had followed up their attack on Pearl Harbor, they might well have done so—we should certainly have been a much longer time in beating Japan to her knees. Now we have the statement of General MacArthur that Japan cannot possibly make war within the next hundred years, and so cannot make the Hawaiians her outpost, as she tried, however, with might and main to do before the war, holding the Japanese for the Emperor, insisting and successfully insisting on Japanese-language schools for these Japanese Americans.

Many of these Japanese Americans are loyal, we do not doubt that. But, all told, out of the Hawaiian population of 500,000, 180,000 are Japanese, and if the Emperor in that swift assault had captured the islands, who supposes that he would have met with very fierce resistance from that bloc of Empire blood? The Japanese are masters in the art of lip-service; they bow very low indeed when they are forced. But in character they are the most homogeneous race in the world. Situations alter, but they do not. They are like tools in a rack; take down one tool or another, and it will equally serve the Emperor's purpose.

The Japanese in the Hawaiians have reached high subordinate positions, but so long as Hawaii is a territory, they can reach no higher. Give her statehood, and the vote will soon show itself. We are seeing that the Japanese on Nippon, while they can be made to go through the motions of democracy, cannot fathom its secret, but when the Emperor, "the guest" comes into the Diet, they bow low, and the indications of the blood come out.

In the Hawaiians the Japanese are still Japanese. Their voting power is a bloc. They don't vote as Democrats or Republicans; another life would be all too short to din these notions into them. They vote as Japanese, to strengthen their tribal position—even though it may well be that they have given up hopes, in this generation, of throwing up their caps for the Emperor. The Chinese-Hawaiian blend is a good blend; the Japanese-Hawaiian decidedly a bad, surly, and often ugly blend. Its traits are Japanese rather than Hawaiian.

Hawaii is the cross-roads of the world, a mixture of every conceivable dark race, with a few white men thrown in. It is too early yet to know which way that cat will jump. It will be better to wait a generation, long enough for the Japanese language to disappear, and by that time perhaps we may be surer of these new citizens. If you understand a man's words, you are at least that much nearer to estimating his thoughts.

ATTENDANCE OF SENATOR McMAHON AT MEETING OF AMERICAN LEGION AUXILIARY IN NEW HAVEN, CONN.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I wish to have the RECORD show that yesterday when I was announced as being absent on public business I was addressing the Auxiliary of the American Legion at New Haven, Conn.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the announcement will be printed in the RECORD.

TRIBUTE TO PENNSYLVANIA—ADDRESS BY HAMILTON DALTON

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Hamilton Dalton before the Sunbury Rotary Club at Sunbury, Pa., June 5, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISLOYALTY IN GOVERNMENT—EDITORIAL FROM THE HARTFORD DAILY COURANT

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Cure Worse Than Disease," from the Hartford Daily Courant of July 23, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PICK-SLOAN PLAN: A WASTEFUL FAILURE—STATEMENT BY BENTON J. STONG

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "The Pick-Sloan Plan—a Wasteful Failure," by Benton J. Stong, delivered at the Valley Development Conference in Washington, D. C., July 17, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ELECTRICAL INDUSTRY AND MULTIPLE PURPOSE RIVER VALLEY DEVELOPMENT—ADDRESS BY MORRIS L. COOKE

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Electrical Industry and Multiple Purpose River Valley Development," by Morris Llewellyn Cooke, consulting engineer of Philadelphia, at the Valley Development Conference, Washington, D. C., July 18, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

FLOODS IN THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY—EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS STAR-TIMES

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times entitled "Breadbasket to Desert?" which appears in the Appendix.]

FLOODS AND FLOOD CONTROL—STATEMENT OF JEROME C. LOCKE

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding floods and flood control, by Jerome C. Locke, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MARSHALL PLAN—ADDRESS BY SENATOR KILGORE

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the Marshall plan by Senator KILGORE, broadcast over the radio July 20, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ZIONIST MOVEMENT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURRAY

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by him delivered before the Zionist Club at Manhattan Center, New York, July 6, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MALONE

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Senator MALONE at the convention of the National Editorial Association, Fort Worth, Tex., April 12, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMPENSATION OF LETTER CARRIERS—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. UMSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Letter Carriers' Due," from the New York Herald Tribune of July 20, 1947, and an editorial entitled "A Matter of Justice," from the New York Daily Mirror of July 22, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

PALESTINE—ADDRESS BY DR. JAMES G. MACDONALD

[Mr. McGRATH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Dr James G. MacDonald, member of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine, on the occasion of the Jubilee Convention of the Zionist Organization of America, at the Hotel Pennsylvania, New York City, July 4, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

VISIT OF PRESIDENT TRUMAN TO THE SENATE—ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Arthur Krock in the New York Times of July 25, 1947, having to do with the visit of President Truman to the Senate, which appears in the Appendix.]

EVERYBODY'S FOR IT BUT—EDITORIAL FROM THE BISMARCK (N. D.) TRIBUNE

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Everybody's For It But"—published in the Bismarck (N D.) Tribune for July 21, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

GEORGIA WARM SPRINGS FOUNDATION

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD speeches made on the occasion of the presentation to the State of Georgia of properties of the Georgia Warm Springs Foundation, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOREIGN POLICY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR McMAHON

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on foreign policy to be delivered by him on July 27, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

IMMIGRATION POLICY—ARTICLE BY STANLEY HIGH

[Mr. BALDWIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Why We Must Modernize Our Immigration Policy," by Stanley High, published in the Reader's Digest for August 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED—PROCEEDINGS OF PUBLIC FORUM

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the proceedings of the American Federation of Physically Handicapped Public Forum, Washington, D. C., June 19, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ALABAMA ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, GANTT, ALA.

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Maury A. McWilliams, president of the Alabama Electric Cooperative, Inc., dated June 7, 1947, and a telegram from Gordon Persons, president of the Alabama Public Service Commission, dated June 9, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

MONOPOLY—ARTICLE BY A. F. WHITNEY, PRESIDENT, BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Monopoly—Concentration of Monopoly Power in America Now at Its Peak," by A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, published in the Railroad Trainmen of July 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PEOPLE WIN—EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The People Win," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, which appears in the Appendix.]

A CALL TO ACTION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LANGER

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Call to Action," delivered by him at the Roosevelt Hotel, in Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state the parliamentary situation. The question is on agreeing to the request of the Senator from Ohio that the Senate proceed to consider measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, commencing with Order of Business 749.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may I add to that that at the conclusion of the call of the calendar we recur to the unfinished business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, there are five bills on the calendar, all of them very important from the standpoint of the national defense, and perhaps to Army procurement and the procurement for the armed forces generally. Would it be possible to include in the unanimous-consent agreement an agreement that at the end of the call of the calendar these bills could be taken up for consideration tonight?

Mr. TAFT. A parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. I assume that by unanimous consent any Senator can ask to return to a bill appearing earlier on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the first order of business on the calendar.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO MONTGOMERY COUNTY, PA.

The bill (H. R. 3862) to authorize the Federal Works Administration to grant and convey to Montgomery County, Pa., a certain parcel of land, was announced as first in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that I find myself in a very difficult position with regard to this bill. I should like to accommodate the Senator from Pennsylvania, who was very kind to come to me earlier this evening and discuss the matter with me, knowing my position in regard to the principle the bill involves in connection with the Armed Services Committee.

After my conversation with the Senator from Pennsylvania I conferred with some of my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee, and I wish to inform the Senator from Pennsylvania that those with whom I talked feel the way about the bill I feel. We do not see how we can let the bill pass tonight when we have in the Armed Services Committee raised objection to similar bills, and today, through the chairman of the committee, we have presented a resolution which is now pending on the calendar which seeks to work out a policy in regard to this matter.

I merely wanted this statement of explanation in the RECORD so that the Senator from Pennsylvania would understand our position. I must object to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

INCOME TAX LIABILITY OF CERTAIN SERVICEMEN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 479) relating to the income-tax liability of members of the armed forces dying in the service, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment, on page 2, after line 19, to strike out "prevented by the operation of any law or rule of law (other than sec. 3801)" and to insert "prevented (except by the provisions of sec. 3801) by the operation of any law or rule of law."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CREDITS FOR WAR LOSSES

The bill (H. R. 4257) to provide an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3613) to amend secs. 1802 (a), 1802 (b), and 3481 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. At the request of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] I ask that this bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will go over

REPRESENTATION OF VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS BY CERTAIN MILITARY PERSONNEL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3546) to amend section 200 of Public Law 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, June 29, 1936, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. At the present time, Mr. President, under the law a retired member of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps is not eligible to represent a veterans' organization in presenting claims to the Veterans' Administration. The purpose of the bill is to allow veterans to represent such organizations in the presenting of claims to the Veterans' Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RIO GRANDE BRIDGE, TEXAS

The bill (H. R. 2776) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES H. UNDERWOOD

The bill (H. R. 2534) for the relief of James H. Underwood, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANK F. MILES

The bill (H. R. 642) for the relief of Frank F. Miles was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HARRY V. BALL

The bill (H. R. 2432) for the relief of Harry V. Ball was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIE P. GOODWIN ET AL.

The bill (H. R. 1648) for the relief of Willie P. Goodwin, J. M. Thorud, and W. H. Stokley, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. THEODORE A. GEISSMAN

The bill (H. R. 1791) for the relief of Dr. Theodore A. Geissman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SERVICE CREDIT TO POSTAL EMPLOYEES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1082) to credit certain service performed by employees of the postal service who are transferred from one position to another within the service, for purposes of determining eligibility and promotion, which had been reported from the Committee on Civil Service, with an amendment, on page 3, after line 10, to insert two new sections at the end of the bill, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That any employee of the postal service who is in a position for which salary grades are provided in the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, and who transfers or is transferred from such position to any other position in the postal service for which salary grades are provided by such act, shall, for purposes of establishing eligibility for promotion in the position to which he transfers or is transferred, (1) in the case of an employee in a position for which automatic promotions are provided, be credited with all satisfactory service since his last automatic promotion and (2) in the case of an employee in a position for which automatic promotions are not provided, be credited with all satisfactory service, not exceeding 1 year of such service, performed in such position.

SEC. 2. Any such employee shall be eligible for promotion within the salary grades of his new position after completing an amount of service in such position, which when added to the prior service for which credit is provided by the first section of this act, gives such employee sufficient service for promotion in his now position.

SEC. 3. As used in this act, the term "employee" includes postmasters, officers, supervisors, special-delivery messengers in offices of the first class, and all other employees paid from field appropriations of the postal service for whom salary grades are provided in the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945.

SEC 4. This act shall be applicable in determining eligibility for promotion of any employee who has been transferred from one position of the postal service to another prior to the date of enactment of this act and who has not received a promotion in his new position since such transfer, except that no employee shall be promoted because of such application prior to the first day of the first quarter which begins after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 5. Any employee in the postal service whose services are utilized in a dual capacity shall be paid for service rendered in that capacity at the grade and rate of compensation authorized for the position to which he is temporarily assigned, and credit shall be allowed for all previous continuous service as a regular or substitute postal employee.

SEC. 6. The provisions of sections 1, 2, 3, and 4 of this act shall not apply to employees who transfer or are transferred to the position of post-office inspector or to the position of railway postal clerk.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1720) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator please explain this bill?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, this bill is to increase the present authorization for the Federal Housing Commissioner, to insure mortgages under title VI of the National Housing Act by $200,000,000. It also provides $750,000,000, the maximum amount of mortgages insured on permanent houses under the Lanham Act.

Mr. MAYBANK. I think it was the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts who asked the question, and I might say that the Banking and Currency Committee, in the extension of the RFC, yielded to the House on the provisions that eliminated the rediscounting of mortgages through the RFC, and since that time these mortgages have gone to the FHA. If I remember, at the time, it was $1,000,000,000 needed in the appropriations. That was eliminated. This only authorizes, as the distinguished Senator from Delaware said, the increase in the FHA mortgage loans to veterans and to other housing authorities, to enable them to go ahead with the work that previously had stopped. I understand that the House Banking and Currency Committee feels as does the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, of which the Senator from Delaware is a representative here, and introduced the bill. It is almost unanimous.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. KILGORE. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. I should really like to know who is to be benefited by this.

Mr. TAFT. I may say the FHA will run out of money. The FHA is the organization which insures the mortgages on new homes. It is probably the most necessary, valuable, and popular organization among the housing organizations.

The $750,000,000, as I understand, includes mortgages on houses which are now owned by the Government, and which are to be sold, as they should be sold, and this bill is to permit special insurance to veterans who buy those houses from the Government for themselves.

Mr. KILGORE. The previous explanation was very incomplete. I am very glad to get the explanation of the Senator from Ohio, and I withdraw the objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 603 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by (1) striking out "$2,800,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$4,000,000,000" and (2) striking out "$3,800,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$4,200,000,000."

SEC. 2 Title VI of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 610. Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this title, the Administrator is authorized, upon application by the mortgagee, to insure or to make commitments to insure under section 603 or section 608 of this title any mortgage executed in connection with the sale by the Government, or any agency or official thereof, of any housing acquired or constructed under Public Law 849, Seventy-sixth Congress, as amended; Public Law 781, Seventy-sixth Congress as amended; or Public Laws 9, 73, or 353, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended (including any property acquired, held, or constructed in connection with such housing or

to serve the inhabitants thereof), without regard to—

"(1) any limit as to the time when any mortgage may be insured under this title;

"(2) any limit as to the aggregate amount of principal obligations of all mortgages insured under this title, but the aggregate amount of principal obligations of all mortgages insured pursuant to this section shall not exceed $750,000,000;

"(3) any requirement that the obligation be approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction or that the construction be new construction;

"(4) any of the provisions of section 603 (b) (2) or paragraph (B) and (C) of the first sentence of section 608 (b) (3):

Provided, That such mortgage shall (1) otherwise be eligible for insurance under section 603 or section 608, as the case may be, (2) have a maturity not exceeding twenty-five years from the date of insurance, and (3) involve a principal obligation (including such initial service charges, appraisal, inspection, and other fees as the Administrator shall approve) in an amount not exceeding 90 per centum of the appraised value of the mortgage property as determined by the Administrator."

ATTENDANCE OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AT MEETING OF EMPIRE PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) authorizing attendance of Members of Congress at a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This is the same as the House concurrent resolution which has just come over. The clerk will report the House concurrent resolution.

The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution coming over from the House of Representatives.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 110) authorizing attendance of Members of Congress at a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association was read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the House concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was agreed to, as follows:

That the Senate and the House of Representatives hereby accept the invitations tendered by the President of the Legislative Council and the Speaker of the House of Assembly of the Bahamas Government to have four Members of the Senate and four Members of the House of Representatives attend a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association to be held in the Bahamas beginning December 28, 1947. The President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives are authorized to appoint the Members of the Senate and the Members of the House of Representatives, respectively, to attend such meeting, and are further authorized to designate the chairmen of the delegations from each of the Houses. The expenses incurred by the members of the delegations appointed for the purpose of attending such meeting, which shall not exceed $2,000 for each of the delegations, shall be reimbursed to them from the contingent fund of the House of which they are Members, upon submission of vouchers approved by the chairman of the delegation of which they are members.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 152) which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the word "author-, ized", to insert "during the session, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 102 (g) (2) (D) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $30,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, this is to authorize an appropriation of $30,000 for the purpose of bringing down to date the proposed report on Federal and State expenditures. The governors' conference spent a great deal of its time on that subject at the recent meeting. It is a subject that has engaged their interest for quite a while. A subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments was appointed to attend the conference. We were unable to do so, on account of the vote on the tax bill the day we were to be there. The governors' conference has appointed, or will soon appoint, a committee of the governors to meet with representatives of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, at the meeting of the conference of State governors this fall, . The money is for the purpose of bringing down to date a careful study made 4 or 5 years ago for this body, so that we may get an up-to-date opinion when we meet at that time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I want to make just one or two comments. I notice a number of resolutions here authorizing expenditures of money. Day before yesterday the calendar had on it $280,000 worth of resolutions, asking for more money to investigate something or other. It seems to me that we have pretty nearly gone to seed on these investigations. Everybody wants to investigate something, between now and January 3.

Mr. BRICKER. This is not an investigation. This is simply a research, and for the purpose of a report on the investigation or research work that is done by attorneys and by accountants, so we may have it available at the meeting this fall, and have the matter brought down to date for the Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. Is this a new project?

Mr. BRICKER. No; it is not a new project. It is a continuation of a project that has been going on for many years, and bringing down to date the very extensive report which was made for the use of the Congress, I think, some 3 or 4 or 5 years ago.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. This is to carry out a duty which devolves upon the committee by reason of the Legislative Reorganization Act of last year. It states that the Committee on Expenditures in the executive departments shall have the duty of studying intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities. There are many fields in which the Federal Government and the States are now overlapping. Most people think of the field of taxation as a principal example.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not going to object to the consideration of the resolution, Mr. President.

Mr. AIKEN. It is to carry out a duty required by law.

Mr. LUCAS. The Legislative Reorganization Act is being interpreted in a good many ways, bringing an unusual number of investigations and research work, it seems to me. I merely wanted to make my position known with respect to the different resolutions that are on the Calendar, and some of the ones that are up for passage at the present time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 153), which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 20, Eightieth Congress, agreed to January 24, 1947 (creating a special committee to study the problems of American small business enterprises), is hereby continued until the 31st day of October 1948. Such committee is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $50,000 in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for the same purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I inquire how much increase is involved in this proposal?

Mr. WHERRY. Fifty thousand dollars.

Mr. BARKLEY. How much has the committee had up until now?

Mr. WHERRY. They have had approximately $7,000 a month since the beginning of the Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. I know, but in the past?

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator means in past years?

Mr. BARKLEY. The entire history of the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I have not been here during all the period, but the Senator from Montana, who is chairman, has been. I think it would run as high as $200,000 a year, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is that one of the committees whose life was supposed to have been terminated by a resolution a while ago in this session?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. What is the date of the termination?

Mr. WHERRY. The termination was October 31.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nebraska whether this is the Small Business Committee.

Mr. WHERRY. It is.

Mr. MAYBANK. When the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from Nebraska, and I were on the Committee on Audit and Control of the Contingent Expenses of the Senate we appropriated many thousands and thousands and tens of thousands of dollars to that committee to get it on the job.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Under the Legislative Reorganization Act, it was extended 1 year?

Mr. WHERRY. It was extended only until October 31.

Mr. MAYBANK. And this extends it until January?

Mr. WHERRY. It extends it for a period of a year from now. If the Senator will yield now, if there is no objection, I should like to have it passed. I am satisfied this passed the Committee on Rules and Administration, with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] present. The distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] has joined in sponsoring it. I am quite satisfied that if the Senate will agree to the resolution and continue the committee, the Committee on Banking and Currency, or some other committee will take over the work of the Small Business Committee. I am sure the Senate will be satisfied if it continues the Small Business Committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. WHERRY. O, Mr. President, does the Senator from Arkansas object to the resolution extending the committee?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. If there is going to be objection, let me make a further statement. The Small Business Committee now has three subcommittees working. One committee is engaged in investigating the subject of newsprint. Another subcommittee is investigating the subject of steel. Another subcommittee is engaged in investigating the subject of mines and mining. The subcommittees are doing very efficient work. I can describe to the distinguished chairman case after case in which the subcommittee on steel, under the able leadership of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] has accomplished extremely important and useful work.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Let me make a statement in respect to the subcommittee engaged in investigating the subject of steel. I have received many letters from Minnesota during the last few weeks in which the writers have very highly commended the subcommittee on steel because of the amount of sheet metal we have succeeded in having brought into Minnesota by reason of the activity of the subcommittee on steel. I strongly urge the adoption of the resolution providing the extension of the Committee on Small Business.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, we have now arrived at the point at which I said we would arrive when the resolution providing for the Small Business Committee was adopted last January. The resolution continued the Small Business Committee for a year. Another resolution was adopted which continued the War Investigating Committee for a year. I knew when the time came when the life of the committees would expire that it would be urged that they have not had time enough to perform the work they desired to perform; that there would be plenty of business, so the War Investigating Committee and the Small Business Committee should continue in operation.

There was quite a battle in the Senate in the first part of the year over the question whether the Small Business Committee should be continued as a special committee, or whether it should be taken over by a standing committee. The same thing was true with respect to the War Investigating Committee. It is now proposed that the special investigating committee be continued.

The able Senator from Nebraska is now asking that the committee be continued until October 1948. Yet every statement that was made during the debate upon the floor of the Senate last January was to the end that it was only desired to continue the Small Business Committee for 1 year. That was the statement which was made. That was the theory upon which the Small Business Committee was continued. Now the question of further extension is being considered. We had just as well make the committee a regular standing committee, because that is exactly what it is going to be, so far as appropriations are concerned, and so far as continuation of the staff is concerned.

Mr. President, I dislike to object to a measure of this kind, particularly in view of the fact that the able Senator from Nebraska, the majority whip, who has many responsibilities on the Republican side of the aisle, has performed excellent work in connection with the committee. I desire to commend him for the way he has handled himself on the other side of the aisle during this session. Nevertheless, we get back to the principle that is involved under the Reorganization Act. If we are going to continue to pay no attention to the Reorganization Act, as we have done in many instances during the present session of Congress, what we ought to do when we reconvene is to do away with the act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 5 minutes in his own time.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I think it would be only fair for me to say that several important problems have developed in this country.

Mr. LUCAS. It always happens that way.

Mr. MURRAY. I cannot help that. Everyone knows that the newsprint shortage in the United States is one of the most serious shortages confronting us. There is also a serious shortage of steel which is affecting small-business concerns all over the country.

Mr. President, I want to be fair about this matter. The staff of the Small Business Committee is doing an excellent piece of work. The committee has received commendations from business men all over the country for the work it has been doing in connection with the problem of steel shortage and also the problem of newsprint shortage. The committee has worked out a program whereby it is bringing about an apportionment of the newsprint which shall be available, and preventing small newspapers from being closed down. I think the committee is doing an excellent piece of work. I want to be just about the matter.

I have not always gotten along so well with my able friend from Nebraska, but I want to acknowledge that the committee has been doing a good job. It would not be fair for me not to say so.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have been a member of the Small Business Committee for a year and a half. I was one who was not overly enthusiastic about the committee about a year ago or less, but I now find that the reason I was not overly enthusiastic was that I did not understand the fine work the committee had done and was doing under the leadership of the able Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and later under the able leadership of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

I am inclined to believe that some day we will want to make a standing committee out of the Small Business Committee. I feel quite confident about that.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, it is difficult for Senators on this side of the Chamber to hear what the Senator from Indiana is saying.

Mr. CAPEHART. I said I feel quite confident that the time will come when we will want to make a standing committee of the Small Business Committee, because the duties and responsibilities of the Small Business Committee cut across all other committees.

The Small Business Committee is the only committee to which the small businessmen of America can come and secure help. The small businessman has been able to come to that committee and receive help not only during this year, but last year and the year before. I think it would be a great mistake to discontinue the Senate Small Business Committee. I base that upon my experience with the committee over the past year. I have no doubt it will do valuable work hereafter. I think it would be a mistake to discontinue the committee. I think the small businessmen of America would be very much disappointed if we did so.

I believe the committee has done an excellent job in respect to newsprint.

and it is doing a fine job in respect to steel. It is doing a splendid job in connection with many other subjects. I hope the Senator who objected to the resolution will withdraw the objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last January I was one of the two or three Republicans, as I recall, who voted against the extension of the Small Business Committee as a special committee. If I were in exactly the same position again as of that date I would vote exactly the same way, because I felt then, and feel now, that as a matter of policy under the reorganization plan the setting up of special committees violates at least the spirit, and I think the clear intent of that plan. But I said during the argument that was had at the time the matter was under discussion, that if we did continue the committee as a special committee it would have a job to do, and that in all probability there might be a need for some extension of it at the end of the terminal period provided in the then extension resolution.

I want to say as one who, I think, has been working as hard as anyone in the Senate on the whole problem of monopoly and monopolistic control, who has an anti-monopoly bill pending in the Senate, that I have found the Small Business Committee the most effective instrument we have had this year in bringing to light some of the monopolistic practices that are strangling small business in this country.

I think it would be a great mistake to take hasty action here tonight cutting off the Small Business Committee without making any plans for continuation of the type of service which the committee is rendering. Therefore, as one who was against this extension, but as one who has worked with the committee this year, and who knows from that experience, growing out of the great service it has rendered to small business in the West, what it is doing in connection with the newsprint problem and the steel problem, I say that it would be a great mistake for us to cut off the committee without further consideration. Therefore I respectively ask the Senator who objected to the continuation of the committee to withdraw his objection, with the understanding that when we meet in January we shall have an opportunity to resurvey the whole problem and decide whether or not we wish to continue the committee as a special committee or bring it under the jurisdiction of some standing committee.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that I heartily agree with what he has said. I believe that the Small Business Committee should be kept in existence until we meet again in January. The Senator from Nebraska well knows that as a member of the old Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, when the Small Business Committee was first created, I never failed, along with him, to vote the necessary funds. The Senator from Nebraska well knows, as do members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, that there is a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency which is supposed to look into the problems of small business. It has not been able to do so because it has not had the funds. The Small Business Committee has had the funds.

While I may object to its continuation after January, I shall not object to its continuation until January.

Many of us are members of several committees. A year ago at this time I voted for the reorganization bill, and voted to continue the Small Business Committee. My friend from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and I were members of the old Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, which appropriated the money.

Today the Small Business Committee is dealing with the problems of steel and newsprint. In other days it dealt with the question of meat, and many other questions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for half a minute?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not on my 5 minutes.

Mr. President, I have only a few comments to make with respect to the resolution to which I objected.

This great interest in small business seems to recur only when an extension of the life of the committee is involved. Only a few days ago we had before us the question of an appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission. I endeavored to have the amount increased to the budget estimate, but I met with no sympathy whatever from the other side of the aisle. The only purpose of that appropriation was to protect small business by enforcing the Clayton Act; but my efforts met with no response.

This may be a little ancient history, but by way of background let me say that there has been no great interest in small business on the other side of the aisle. In the discussion of exemptions from the excess-profits tax we had a very similar result in trying to obtain some benefits for small business under the tax laws.

Of course, Senators are familiar with the effect of section 102 of the revenue act. It is an invitation to the growth of large business. It has contributed toward bringing about a large number of mergers.

As for the work in connection with steel and newsprint, I happen to be a small businessman, and I have not noticed any great improvement in the situation with respect to either of those commodities. The other day I noticed some comments about the Canadian newsprint industry, which, if it had any effect, had an adverse effect on small business. The experience of newspapers in this country with the Canadian newsprint industry has been very sad. We all know the relationship between the price of newsprint bought directly from Canada and newsprint bought on the black market.

The most recent incident, which to me was absolutely inexcusable, was the treatment received by the bill which I introduced more than a year ago and which was unanimously reported from the old Commerce Committee. It was on the calendar last year. It was completely reviewed, rewritten, and modified to meet the objections of everyone except one man representing the National Association of Manufacturers. It met every other objection. The bill was reported to the Senate by the committee with only one or two dissenting votes. The junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is the only member of the committee that I know of who voted against it. The other day we brought that bill up. It has absolutely no purpose except to benefit small business. It has been recommended by the Department of Commerce, but it received very short shrift in the Senate.

I cannot see any real basis for feeling that there is any sincere interest on the other side of the aisle in small business. I do not propose to vote to extend this committee until there is some better evidence on the other side of the aisle that Republican Senators are really interested in small business. If the resolution proposed to extend the committee only until next January, I think that would be another matter; but it is proposed to extend it for a year or more. I am unable to see that there is any real desire to help small business. Therefore I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to offer an amendment to the bill?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will withhold my objection if it may be passed over until tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator permit me to offer an amendment, in view of what the distinguished Senator said relative to the committee?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Certainly. I withhold my objection.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution cannot be amended unless it is taken up.

Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate resolution 153?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment. At the proper place in the resolution I propose to amend it by making the date April 1, 1948. The reason I do so is that January and February are busy months. However, I guarantee that there will be all the opportunity that any Senator desires to reinvestigate the committee, and if the Senate does not want the committee on April 1, it will be all right with me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the amendment?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I object to further consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard, and the resolution will be passed over.

TERMINATION OF CERTAIN TAX PROVISIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MILLIKIN submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4069) to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 14.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19, and agree to the same.

E. D. MILLIKIN,
ROBERT TAFT,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

HAROLD KNUTSON,
DANIEL A. REED,
ROY O. WOODRUFF,
JERE COOPER,
WILBUR D. MILLS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the report?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the House accepted all the Senate amendments except one, which would have permitted depletion allowances for minerals and mineral salts in connection with potash and thenardite.

Mr. LODGE. What is the effect of the bill now?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The net effect is that approximately 18 amendments of the Senate have been accepted, with the one exception which I have mentioned. The Senator will recall that the bill involved the question of certain exemptions for officer personnel and enlisted men. We allowed a uniform 1-year extension, until the end of next year, to both officers and enlisted men. That is the net effect.

Mr. LODGE. Does the bill lift any existing taxes?

Mr. MILLIKIN. This bill was intended to take a large group of statutes which expired by virtue of the President's proclamation ending hostilities and give them definite expiration dates.

Mr. LODGE. Does it have the effect of removing certain taxes?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It removes the taxes, for example, to the extent of a $1,500 exemption for officers in the military service until the end of the next year. It also completely exempts the pay of military personnel of rank less than that of officer.

Mr. LODGE. But it does not lift excise taxes?

Mr. MILLIKIN. No; it has nothing to do with excise taxes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MILLIKIN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 238) to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "(but only until July 1, 1948, in the case of paper in rolls of less than 15 inches in width)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

E. D. MILLIKIN,
ROBERT TAFT,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

HAROLD KNUTSON,
DANIEL A. REED,
ROY O. WOODRUFF,
JERE COOPER,
WILBUR D. MILLS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The effect of the conference report, Mr. President, is to put on the free list paper which is in rolls of 15 inches or more, on an indefinite basis, and to put on the free list for 1 year, or until July 1, 1948, paper less than 15 inches and not less than 9 inches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there any objection to Calendar No. 766, Senate Resolution 120?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of that resolution?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this resolution appropriates $25,000 for expenses in connection with hearings held by the Committee on the Judiciary. Forty-five thousand dollars was requested for the extreme activities which the committee had to undertake. The Committee on Rules and Administration cut that to $25,000. I might say that $20,000 of that is for the running of the committee. The Committee on the Judiciary has performed about 30 percent of the activities of the Senate, and has expended up to $10,000, which was appropriated for the two sessions, and we have felt that for the coming session we would have to have approximately $20,000 to cover the entire field of activities that have been designated to us under the Reorganization Act. Only $5,000 is set aside for investigation.

Let me say to the Senate that in order to get things accomplished I have had to loan as many as two or three of my own individual force, out of my office, in connection with the tremendous volume of work which had to be done. We have had approximately 70 nominations, over 700 bills, and it has been approximately an 80-hour-a-week proposition for us. In the sum requested there is $5,000 which involves our obligations to investigate penitentiaries and the other activities delegated to us under the Reorganization Act. We shall have to employ at least two more stenographers, unless it is expected that I provide stenographers.

Mr. LUCAS. Why does it require $25,000 for investigations?

Mr. WILEY. The Senator did not understand me. There is only $5,000 involved in the investigation. Under the Reorganization Act it is not so much a question of investigation as it is of checking up on the responsibilities delegated to the committee. It is a responsibility of the committee to check into patent bills. That we have not been able to do. We shall have to hold hearings on the matter. It is well known how expensive hearings are when reporters are employed for the stenographic work. We are supposed to investigate the penitentiaries. Only $5,000 is set aside for that purpose out of the $25,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of Senate Resolution 120?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 120) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee of the Judiciary.

PUBLIC LANDS COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The resolution (S. Res. 148) authorizing the Committee on Public Lands to hold hearings at such times and places as it may deem advisable, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of that resolution?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. BUTLER. It provides for the Committee on Public Lands holding hearings at such times and places as the committee may deem advisable. Statehood bills have been introduced with respect to Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. It is the intention of the committee to send not the entire committee, but a delegation, to those places, in order to get the work of the committee out of the way

before Congress again convenes. I can assure the Senator from Illinois that the Committee on Public Lands is not going out on a "snooping trip" to investigate either Republicans or Democrats. We are trying to do the work of the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. LUCAS. The only point I raise is that it seems rather strange that all of a sudden the committee has to go to Alaska, Puerto Rico, and Hawaii because there are some public lands in those places. I do not know whether that has been the custom in the past, but apparently every one has an investigation fever, and wants to travel all over the country and the world to see something or do something. It may be a worthy enterprise. I am not sure. I am only making inquiry for my own information.

Mr. BUTLER. I can assure the Senator from Illinois that it is an entirely worthy enterprise. Of the 13 members of the committee I think only one wants to go to Alaska.

Mr. LUCAS. I can understand that everyone wants to go to Alaska who has not been there.

Mr. BUTLER. There are only four Members making the trip this summer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MAYBANK. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senate Resolution 148 will be passed over.

STUDY AND INQUIRY INTO TRENDS, NEEDS AND PROBLEMS OF AGRICULTURE.

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 147) authorizing a study of agricultural legislation and of trends, needs, and problems of agriculture.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the resolution. I was not present when the resolution was reported out of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, this does not involve an investigation; it involves a study. I am sure that the distinguished Senator from Illinois, who is a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, fully appreciates the importance of this study. As the Steagall amendment expires within the year 1948 and the Commodity Credit Corporation also expires within that year, it will have to be reincorporated. Because of that, I feel—and I am sure the other members of the committee share that feeling—that there is need to give more thought and study to the entire agricultural program in order that we shall have the type of program that would be intelligent and acceptable to the public in general. That is the purpose of the study.

Mr. LUCAS. How much is involved?

Mr. THYE. Fifteen thousand dollars.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask that the resolution be temporarily passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be temporarily passed over.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a few moments ago when Senate resolution 767 was being discussed, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] objected. I have had a conversation with him, and I think it is the intention of the Senator from South Carolina to withdraw his objection at this time.

Mr. MAYBANK. I withdraw my objection, because I have had a satisfactory explanation from the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I hope that it will be passed over for the moment.

Mr. BUTLER. I can assure the Senator from Illinois that the Committee on Public Lands is doing nothing but the work of the committee.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that. That is the stock argument always given for investigations. I can understand perfectly well how the minority, when questions of this kind were up for discussion, made inquiries similar to those which the Senator from Illinois is making. That is perfectly proper. I would like to know a little more about where the members of the committee are going, why they are going, what they are going to see, and what they are going to bring back with them.

Mr. BUTLER. Ten bills have been introduced, and there are hearings in connection with the Indian tribes, on the recommendation of the Department of the Interior. We have a hearing scheduled for Klamath Falls on August 18. It would be a little embarrassing if the members of the committee had to pay their own expenses on these trips.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure it would be embarrassing if I had to pay my expenses on one of those trips, because I could not do it. I do not know why it is necessary.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I should like to remind the Senator from Illinois that in the previous Congress I have heard him ask, when he was standing where he now stands, for as much as $100,000 at one time, and there was never a peep from the then minority side.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I heard plenty of objections from what was the minority side, when I was chairman of the former Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. It was rather difficult for the Senator from Illinois to have action taken on any measures of this sort when he was chairman of that committee, without having objections made by Senators on the other side of the aisle.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let us see if we can proceed in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being heard, the resolution will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next measure on the calendar.

INVESTIGATION OF THE HOUSING FIELD

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) establishing a joint committee to investigate the entire housing field was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of that measure.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, this is a concurrent resolution sponsored by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the junior Senator from Wisconsin. It has received unanimous approval not only by the Banking and Currency Committee, but also by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A companion measure was passed by the House of Representatives yesterday.

The purpose of the investigation is obvious from the title of the concurrent resolution. It is to conduct an investigation of the housing situation from A to Z, and to recommend at the next session of the Congress legislation to correct the situation, if possible.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that we have consulted with the House leaders on the two subjects of the cost of housing, in particular, and high prices, in particular, the subjects of Senate Concurrent Resolution 25 and Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, Calendars Nos. 769 and 770. I understand that the leaders are prepared to urge the adoption of the concurrent resolutions. They provide for the establishment of joint committees.

These measures certainly cover the two subjects that are of the most interest and, I would say, are the most difficult subjects today before the people.

I think the purpose of Senators on both sides of the aisle who have discussed these matters is well understood. They feel that as to these two particular subjects, we should have a definite report before the Senate when we return.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, let me inquire about Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, Calendar No. 770, the next concurrent resolution on the calendar, which of course is not before the Senate at this time. I understood that the Joint Committee on the Economic Report was considering that very matter, if I correctly recall what the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio said one day.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the resolution has been amended, as the Senator will see, at my request, to show that the Joint Committee on the Economic Report is authorized and directed to make these investigations through two or more subcommittees on which there may be other members from outside the committee. The committee is rather limited in number. If we are going to have hearings in several places, I think we can do so, perhaps, with the amount of money the committee has available, although this matter involves somewhat more extensive hearings than were contemplated. So we have requested an additional $25,000. I do not think the additional $25,000 is absolutely necessary. If it is made available, it will not be used unless it is absolutely necessary.

Mr. LUCAS. I say to the Senator that I think Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, Calendar No. 770, is one of the most important resolutions that has been submitted to the Congress, and I would not object to the expenditure of any amount of money for it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, we have already conducted investigations on prices in Washington, during the past 6 weeks, and we have had people of general standing come in and testify. We have felt that we could do much better with some hearings in September and October in determining the nature of local prices.

Mr. President, what is proposed is not in the nature of a junket. No one would want to travel in connection with these hearings, unless he felt compelled to do so; and any travel that is done in connection with them will be done only because it is a duty.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that. The work of investigation is hard. This investigation is an important one, as I see it. I shall not object to either of these measures. I simply wished to make some inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25), which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendments of the committee.

The amendments were, on page 1, in line 5, after the word "Senate", to strike out the comma and the words "of which at least three shall be," and insert "who are"; in line 7, after the word "currency", to strike out "and at least two shall be members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare"; on page 2, in line 1, after the words "Representatives", to strike out the comma and the words "of which at least three shall be," and insert "who are"; in line 3, after the word "Currency", to strike out "and at least two shall be members of the House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor,"; on page 3, in line 24, after the word "power", to strike out the comma and the words "without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended,"; on page 4, line 3, after the word "experts", to insert "consultants,"; in line 4, after the word "duties" and the comma, to strike out "including consultants who shall receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $35 for each day actually spent by them in the work of the committee, together with their necessary travel and subsistence expenses", and insert, "but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923 as amended, for comparable duties."; on page 5, after line 7, to strike out "Sec. 6. The members of the committee shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the committee, other than expenses in connection with meetings of the committee held in the District of Columbia during such times as the Congress is in session."; in line 14, after "Sec.", to strike out "7", and insert "6"; and in line 15, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$100,000", and insert "$50,000", so as to make the concurrent resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Housing (hereafter referred to as the Committee), and to be composed of seven Members of the Senate who are members of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate and seven Members of the House of Representatives who are members of the House of Representatives Committee on Banking and Currency to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. A vacancy in the membership of the committee shall not affect the powers of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. The committee, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, shall conduct a thorough study and investigation of the entire field of housing, including but not limited to—

(1) the extent of the need for housing in the United States as a whole and in all areas thereof;

(2) the extent, if any, to which shortages in building materials are contributing to the shortage of housing;

(3) the reasons for the existing high costs of building materials and housing and the action which may be taken to reduce such costs;

(4) all factors of whatever kind or nature which contribute to the existing high costs of housing and which prevent the speedy construction of adequate housing to satisfy the needs of the Nation; and the action which may be taken to eliminate such factors;

(5) the extent to which archaic building codes contribute to the existing shortage and excessive cost of housing;

(6) the administration and operation of existing Federal laws relating to slum clearance, insurance of mortgages on housing, home loans, guaranties of veterans' housing loans, construction permits, veterans' preference in the renting and purchase of housing, rent control, and all other matters relating to housing;

(7) the availability of private capital and of Government loans to finance the construction of housing;

(8) the organization and operations of Government agencies concerned with housing; and

(9) such other problems and subjects in the field of housing as the committee deems appropriate.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than March 15, 1948, the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation and such other recommendations as it may deem advisable, and shall make its final report not later than January 2, 1949.

SEC. 4. The committee shall have the power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, consultants, and employees at its deems necessary for the performance of its duties, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties. The committee is further authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of all agencies in the executive branch of the Government and may request the governments of the several States, representatives of business, industry, finance, and labor, and such other persons, agencies, organizations, and instrumentalities as it deems appropriate to attend its hearings and to give and present information, advice, and recommendations.

SEC. 5. The committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings; to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned period of the Eightieth Congress; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take such testimony; to have such printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services in reporting such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by them.

SEC. 6. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of disbursements so made.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair now hands down a companion measure, House Concurrent Resolution 104, to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Housing.

The question is, to strike out all after the enacting clause in the House concurrent resolution, and to insert in lieu thereof the text of the Senate concurrent resolution as amended.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to inquire whether all these investigating committees' resolutions, especially these two, provide for minority representation on the joint committees in an appropriate proportion.

Mr. TAFT. I know that Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, Calendar No. 770, does. The representation is 2 to 1 in each case, with three Members of the House of Representatives and three Members of the Senate on each committee, and in each case there will be two Republicans and one Democrat.

I do not know about Senate Concurrent Resolution 25, Calendar No. 769.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that all these resolutions which came from the Committee on Rules and Administration were the subject of a rather unusual experience in the Senate, in that they were unanimously reported with the complete approval of the minority side.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am glad to know that, and yet I should like to know whether they provide for minority representation.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, that is not provided in these measures. We assume that is implicit, and the usual procedure to be followed. It provides for a 14-member committee, with 7 Members from the House of Representatives and 7 from the Senate. Frankly, we did not think it was necessary to provide that there be 4 of one party and 3 of the other.

Mr. BARKLEY. Usually such resolutions provide for both parties to be represented.

Mr. McCARTHY. If I may interrupt, let me say that I shall be very glad to accept an amendment so providing, if the Senator will offer it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I can give the Senator from Kentucky the assurance that the representation will be 4 and 3 in both the House and the Senate, if the Senator will accept that assurance.

Mr. BARKLEY. With that assurance, I shall not press for the adoption of an amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair can give a better assurance, because that is what the Chair will do in making the appointments.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I thank all the assurers for all their assurances.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, is it the purpose to investigate the shortage of housing and how we can provide or can begin to provide housing for the people of the country?

Mr. TAFT. It covers the entire housing field. The emphasis is on the cost of housing, because the cost of housing is the center of the difficulty.

The particular things which were intended to be investigated were the reasons for the high cost of housing—the high cost of building, the possible combinations between materialmen on costs, possible restrictive labor practices, building codes in different cities—things which apparently have put housing beyond the ability of the ordinary man to purchase housing or even to live in new housing.

That is the main thing, because we have had investigations on the general subject of public housing, a subject which is before the Congress, and which will be definitely before the next Congress, a question of principle, rather than an investigation.

Mr. PEPPER. Why has the Taft-Wagner-Ellender bill, a bill which has been spoken of favorably as offering some hope for more adequate housing for the country, not been put on the "must" list for legislation in this session?

Mr. TAFT. Because the time taken and the difficulty of eliminating the controversies has been so insuperable that it means it will lead to the consumption of unlimited time, and we never had the time, nor could we get assurance from the House that they would be willing to consider it at this session. It may be taken up at the next session.

Mr. PEPPER. Reserving the right to object, I wish to make the observation that I cannot escape the feeling that the Congress is going to be condemned by the people of the country for the little progress, as a matter of fact, almost for the retrogression we have permitted in respect to the furnishing of adequate housing. It is a source of very deep regret to me that we have not done something effective in this Congress which might offer some future hope, if not present encouragement, to the people of the country who have no adequate places in which to live.

If this investigation offers any hope, I am delighted, but I must say that when we have done in the Congress the very things which have run up the price of housing, including taking off the power of the Government to allocate materials for homes, including homes for veterans, instead of commercial construction, when we have taken off controls, practically, over rents, and when we have so long delayed the giving of any subsidy, it looks to me as if everything Congress has done has been in the direction of higher cost for housing, and it is late in the session to begin to repent and to investigate.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin a question. Did I understand the Senator from Illinois to say in answer to the question of the Senator from Kentucky that these resolutions had been passed unanimously in the Rules Committee by Senators from both sides of the aisle? I understood him further to say that division was some 2 to 1, Republican representation against Democratic representation, in all of which I am most interested. I understand this particular resolution was introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin and that the law calls for representation which is equitable and just; that is, a representation of 4 to 3. Am I correct in that?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not sure I understood the question.

Mr. MAYBANK. The committee composition, under the resolution, calls for four Republicans and three Democrats. Am I correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the concurrent resolution to be read a third time.

The concurrent resolution was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senate Concurrent Resolution 25 is indefinitely postponed.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. BRICKER, Mr. CAIN, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. MAYBANK conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next number on the calendar.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS TO HOLD HEARINGS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recur to order of business 757, Senate Resolution 148, authorizing the Committee on Public Lands to hold hearings at such times and places as it may deem advisable.

I wish to state that I consider this resolution very important. The Committee on Public Lands is trying to work out a program for the various Indian reservations throughout the United States. I think it is important that that be done. We have gone along trying to administer Indian affairs without a definite program for all the various Indian reservations. We are trying to work out a definite reclamation program in the West, and I hope the Senator from Illinois will withdraw his objection and that the resolution may be agreed to.

Mr. LUCAS. I withdraw the objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona asks unanimous consent that the Senate recur to Calendar 767, Senate Resolution 148. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 148) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Lands, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, for the purpose of making a study and investigation of any matter referred to such committee, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Eightieth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

INVESTIGATION OF HIGH PRICES

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 19) to establish a joint committee to investigate high prices of consumer goods was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, this resolution reaches the ultimate in ridiculousness. We all know why prices are high. We have high prices because the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] tried to outdo each other in seeing who could scuttle most of the OPA the quickest. So what is the use of investigating unless we investigate the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Nebraska, and why they did it? Of course we are going to have high prices when such things happen.

Mr. President, this business of investigating is getting to be a racket. In fact, it has gone to such lengths that a song has been written about it, whose title is, "Who's Going To Investigate the Man That Investigates the Man That Investigates Me?"

We have committees to investigate everything under the sun. Practically every Senator on the other side of the aisle has a private committee. I have been in the Senate several years and I have never had a committee.

Mr. President, we have a Small Business Committee—they are all small business; we have war investigating committees. What do they investigate? They investigate Howard Hughes' bathing beauties. They can find nothing better than that to investigate, because

that gets in the newspapers through pictures of bathing beauties. We have committees for this and that. Some of them make a Roman holiday out of assassinating the characters of innocent and guilty alike. For instance, some investigating committees said that a gentleman by the name of Bernstein had been in the Army and said he was kicked out. He had to get a general to write him a recommendation and say that he was not kicked out, but he will never be able to prove satisfactorily that he was not kicked out. He was an honorable serviceman.

Dr. Oppenheimer, one of the finest of atomic scientists, who helped perfect the atomic bomb, found his brother accused of being a Communist. This "red" does not rub off very easily these days, so Oppenheimer is contaminated, although his brother denied it. The more one denies the more he is suspected. I found that out, so I do not deny things any more.

There is Dr. Condon, of the Bureau of Standards. I understand the committee said they were going to subpena him to come and testify before them, but they had never even asked him to come and testify. However, they were going to subpena him and make it look as if he would not testify, without his ever having been asked.

Lo and behold, a few days ago we confirmed Secretary Royall the next head man in the War Department. And what do we find out? We find that his brother-in-law, the man who married his half-sister, is Johann Steele, suspected of being a Communist. So Secretary Royall is in some difficulty. He said he did not pay much attention to his brother-in-law, and they wanted to know why he did not, what kind of a man he was that he did not hold his brother-in-law to his bosom and love him.

So, Mr. President, you are damned if you do and damned if you do not. [Laughter.]

I understand that in the State Department, in their loyalty investigation, they asked these two questions, among others:

"Were you in favor of the Taft-Hartley bill?"

"Were you in favor of tax reduction?"

Mr. President, that is a good one. I should like to know what that has to do with anyone's loyalty.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I find there is an omission in this concurrent resolution 770, on page 6, line 2, before the period, where there should be inserted the language "take the action prescribed in section 2 hereof."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection——

Mr. TAYLOR. I object.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator withdraw his objection while I make a brief statement with reference to this bill?

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly. I shall be happy to show that courtesy to the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, this bill, which was originally introduced by me in the form of a resolution, called for a special committee, but in order to avoid the difficulty of running into the problem of creating a new committee and of duplicating another committee, we finally amended the resolution and made this committee a subcommittee of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

I might say, Mr. President, that I hold in my hand a series of petitions which were presented to me by representatives of the following organizations: The American Veterans' Committee, the CIO, the CIO auxiliaries, the National Council of Jewish Women, the League of Women Shoppers, the Committee for Social Action of the Congregational Churches, the National Women's Trade Union League, and the National Association for Colored People, as well as the Americans for Democratic Action. Mr. President, there is no subject in the minds of the people of the United States that is more important than this, and there is no way that the Congress can better get the facts than to have a bipartisan impartial investigation of consumer prices. I ask the Senator from Idaho if he will not withhold his objection, so that this committee can be formed and be put to work.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, Mr. President. I refuse to withhold my objection. I cannot see any justification for this committee whatever. High prices are here. There is nothing that can be done about it. They cannot be rolled back. They came because the OPA was scuttled. The Republicans are responsible. I object. [Laughter.]

Mr. BALDWIN. I will leave the subject with one question: Does the Senator from Idaho want to accept the responsibility for standing in the way of action by this Congress to find out the basis and reason and cause of high prices?

Mr. TAYLOR. No; no. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are responsible for that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point certain remarks I had intended to make at great length, but which I did not make, because I did not want to take the time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR RAYMOND E. BALDWIN RE SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 19

Though I do not believe it necessary to provide any statistical demonstration either of the fact that prices of consumer goods in this country are dangerously high or of the fact that our people are deeply concerned about that grave problem, I would like to call the Senate's attention to the following facts. According to Bureau of Labor statistics, food prices—as of April this year—are 93 percent higher than in January 1941, and one-third higher than a year ago. Clothing prices are 82 percent higher than in 1941 and 20 percent higher than a year ago. Public opinion polls have demonstrated consistently over the past year that our people are more concerned about high prices than about any other single domestic issue.

Unfortunately, these high prices are not limited to luxuries or unessential goods. The necessities of living—bread, meat, clothing, housing—cost more than our people can well afford to pay.

This is no time for political recriminations, nor is it any time to try to place blame. The hour is late and the disturbing facts remain. It is up to us, as a Congress representing the people of this country, to demonstrate our recognition of this condition.

There are those who have said that high wages are the sole cause of the present high prices, though statistics would not seem to bear that out. There are those who have said that the shipment of goods to Europe and Government buying is the sole cause of high prices. Statistics would not seem to bear that out, but, if that is true, let us at least demonstrate to our people the choice they have. There are those who claim natural shortages are causing high prices. There are those who claim that artificial shortages are causing high prices. There are those who claim that exorbitant profits are causing high prices. Whatever the causes, let us find out and inform our people fully.

Beyond all of these reasons, or alleged reasons, for high prices, I believe this country is now suffering from a high-price psychology. Those who sell goods have come to believe, with some justification, that buyers will pay—and can pay—almost any price. We have almost come to accept exorbitantly high prices as a vicious but unchangeable evil. This high-price psychology has a spiraling effect. For the sake of preserving a sound national economy, for the sake of our people who are bearing the heavy burden, we must discourage that kind of thinking.

The proposed resolution directs the Joint Committee on the Economic Report to make a study of high prices at the consumer level. This investigation would serve at least three useful purposes. First, it would demonstrate to our people that we, as a Congress, are not unaware of their serious concern and that we propose to do whatever we can to relieve them of the burden of high prices. Second, such an investigation could be expected to uncover reasons that should lead to action on the part of our people or our Government—if necessary—to bring about a downward trend in prices. Third, such an investigation would serve the policing purpose of bringing down prices, in cases where exorbitant profits might exist, by turning on a spotlight of public information.

This resolution calls for the establishment of two or more subcommittees of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. The subcommittees would be made up of Members of the House and the Senate and of both parties. It is my hope that three or four such subcommittees would operate more or less autonomously in various sections of the country for the purpose of hearing the story of high prices from the people themselves. These subcommittees, I believe, should act as a forum before which our worried people could appear. It should be their purpose to trace down the cost of necessities from their production to the consumer in order to determine fairly and openly what is causing these exorbitant prices. We are, as a body, sufficiently equipped in the field of theoretical economic studies—which have so far produced no solution or relief—and no information on prices intelligible to the housewife trying to meet a household food budget. I envisage this investigation not as a study of statistical tables, but as a study of human relationships, a study in which our peo-

ple can take part in solving a common problem.

In our democracy, we believe in a free enterprise system. We do not want to return to the days of shortages and black markets. It is, therefore, up to us on both sides of the aisle to do all in our power to make this free economy work. I cannot express too strongly, my deep conviction that this Congress must, before its adjournment, make a practical move which will have as its purpose to reduce prices on consumer goods, not from a study of the advanced theory of economics, but from a study of the price of a loaf of bread. It we should adjourn this session of Congress without having demonstrated to our people our concern for their major domestic worry, we would have served them poorly indeed.

This resolution will, in my estimation, help to reduce the price of consumer goods to the point our people can afford to buy them in the quantities they need and in the quantities that makes possible large production and wide employment. I sincerely hope that Senators on both sides of the aisle will join in this common effort to solve a critical domestic worry.

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to revert to Calendar 768, Senate Resolution 147, which was objected to temporarily by the senior Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont asks unanimous consent to revert to Calendar 768, Senate Resolution 147. The Clerk will state the resolution.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 147) authorizing a study of agricultural legislation and of trends, needs, and problems of agriculture.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Illinois advises me that he withdraws his objection.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, have we reached Order No. 772, House bill 1826?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next order on the calendar is 771, House bill 452, when we get to it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Have we reached Order No. 773, House bill 4110?

Mr. AIKEN. No; not as yet.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to ask whether that bill and Senate Resolution 147 are the same. Are they going to overlap?

Mr. AIKEN. We have reverted to Calendar No. 768, Senate Resolution 147.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The resolution proposes to authorize "a study of agricultural legislation and of trends, needs, and problems of agriculture." The one I refer to is a little further down on the calendar. It is House bill 4110, to amend title I of the act entitled "An act to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture." Now, what is the relationship?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I would be very glad to explain that when we get to it. It is designed to correct a mistake which was made last year. The calendar number which I asked to revert was 768, Senate Resolution 147. It was objected to temporarily by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], who has withdrawn his objection. It is proposed to provide a modest sum for the most important purpose, I think, of any of the resolutions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Just one moment, Mr. President. The Senator says "a most modest sum, for a most important objective"?

Mr. AIKEN. Objective, not objection.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It might take more than a most modest sum.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It may take more than that, if the purpose of the Commission is all-important. But does it conflict directly with House bill 4110?

Mr. AIKEN. No. I shall be glad to explain House bill 4110 when we reach it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not want to wait that long, and to pass this over in the meantime. I want to know now. Where is the conflict? Is there an overlapping? That is what I want to know, now.

Mr. AIKEN. No. There is no connection between the resolution and the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, just a moment. The Senator says there is no relationship?

Mr. AIKEN. There is no connection whatever. When we passed the agriculture research bill last year, it contained a proviso in it that 20 percent of the amount authorized must be spent for marketing research. What we meant to say was 20 percent of the amount appropriated, and the bill, in which the Senator is interested, H. R. 4110, seeks to correct that, so that 20 percent of the amount appropriated will be spent for marketing research instead of 20 percent of the amount authorized, because the amount appropriated is considerably less I believe than the amount authorized, and therefore an inordinate amount would be spent for marketing research, unless the correction in the law is made. The purpose is simply to correct a mistake which Congress made last year.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then H. R. 4110 is simply a technical correction of the existing law?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct; that is its purpose.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And what is the purpose of Order No. 768, Senate Resolution 147?

Mr. AIKEN. That is a request for $15,000 for the Senate Agriculture Committee, to use in working out a long-range agricultural program, to take effect when the provisions of the Steagall amendment expires on December 31 next year.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am very glad to have that explanation. I merely wanted to determine, if possible, that we are not duplicating effort.

Mr. AIKEN. We are not.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I object to this Agricultural Committee. Is that what it is?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This is Order No. 768, Senate Resolution 147.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, authorizing a study of the problems of agriculture. What is the use of studying the problems of agriculture, with a Republican Congress? That is what we want to know. What is the matter? What are agriculture's needs? They need REA. Yes, they need REA. What did the Republican Congress do? They cut the appropriations for REA. The farmers need fertilizer, and they are unable to get much of it. They need reclamation programs, so the GI's will be reclaiming farm lands, and those that are on the lands will have more water. Those appropriations have been cut.

One may go down the line with respect to practically everything that agriculture needs—and we all know what it needs—and find that the appropriations have been cut. So why investigate? The answer is plain: What agriculture needs, Mr. President, is a Democratic administration. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator objects, and the resolution is passed over.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Did the Senator object?

Mr. TAYLOR. I had not finished speaking. I have 5 minutes, have I not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's 5 minutes, if he hurries, still remains to him, to the extent of 2 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR. I shall take 5 minutes on the next one.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. TAYLOR. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator objects. The resolution will be passed over.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, since there seems to be a good deal of politics injected into the proceedings at a late hour tonight, it seems to me we would gain time by recessing until tomorrow morning.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator withhold his motion for a moment?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is a small Executive Calendar. Perhaps we can dispose of the nominations on the calendar before we recess.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I would object to taking up the Executive Calendar now.

RECESS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, in view of the lateness of the hour and the certainty that we could not conclude the bills on the calendar for some substantial time, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon today.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes a. m. Saturday, July 26, 1947) the Senate took a recess until 12 o'clock meridian the same day.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 25 (legislative day of July 16), 1947:

APPOINTMENTS IN THE OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Edward Sidley Bres (colonel, Corps of Engineers Reserve), Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Harry Hawkins Vaughan (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery Reserve), Army of the United States.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Andrew Frank McIntyre (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers Reserve), Army of the United States.

Col. Benjamin Franklin Riter, Judge Advocate General's Department Reserve, Army of the United States.

Brig Gen. Herbert Norman Schwarzkopf (lieutenant colonel, Infantry, National Guard of the United States), Army of the United States.

HONORARY RESERVE

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Carlton Spencer Dargusch (lieutenant colonel, Judge Advocate General's Department, National Guard of the United States), Army of the United States.

Col. John Thomas Taylor, Chemical Corps Reserve, Army of the United States.

IN THE NAVY

Midshipman John C. Shannon (Naval Academy) to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy with the rank of ensign, from the 6th day of June 1947, in lieu of appointment as ensign in the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed.

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 6th day of June 1947:

Charles R. Mischke
Charles B. Teal

Jerry W. Bates (Naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Navy, from the 6th day of June 1947, in lieu of assistant paymaster in the Navy with the rank of ensign as previously nominated and confirmed.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be assistant civil engineers in the Navy with the rank of ensign:

Robert C. Doerpinghaus
William E. Nims

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JULY 25, 1947

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art ever drawing us to Thyself with the gentle compulsions of Thy spirit, may this moment of prayer lead us into the fellowship of nobler aspirations and endeavors.

Inspire us with a faith that has larger realizations of divine wisdom and power and wider applications to the problems of these days which are so full of changes, confusions, and conflicts.

May the nations of the earth and the members of the human family be mindful of one another, and in their common remembrance may they bear one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 72. An act to increase the number of authorized aviation stations operated by the Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H. R. 673. An act to repeal certain provisions authorizing the establishing of priorities in transportation by merchant vessels;

H. R. 1238. An act to permit vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and points in the continental United States;

H. R. 1341. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif.;

H. R. 1633. An act to amend section 16 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia";

H. R. 1714. An act to exclude certain interns, student nurses, and other student-employees of hospitals of the Federal Government from the Classification Act and other laws relating to compensation and benefits of Federal employees, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2054. An act to amend the act of April 14, 1930, to provide increased retired pay for certain members of the former Life Saving Service;

H. R. 2109. An act to amend section 1003 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 3043. An act to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3541. An act to define the functions and duties of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3619. An act relating to the sale of the Mission Point Lighthouse Reservation, Grand Traverse County, Mich.;

H. R. 4084. An act to authorize the creation of additional positions in the professional and scientific service in the War and Navy Departments; and

H. R. 4268. An act making supplemental appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 176. An act to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to dental diseases and conditions; to establish the National Institute of Dental Research; and for other purposes;

S. 342. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Reading, Pa.;

S. 722. An act to authorize the issuance of Oregon Trail commemoration 50-cent pieces to the Oregon Trail Monument Association, Idaho Unit, Inc.;

S. 1042. An act to provide for the completion of Mount Rushmore National Memorial and the financing thereof by issuance of a special coin;

S. 1064. Relating to the payment of travel expenses of officers and employees of the Post Office Department and postal service;

S. 1116. To provide a limitation on the construction of family quarters for the Army and Navy, and for other purposes;

S. 1304. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the organization of Minnesota as a Territory of the United States;

S. 1305. An act to amend section 24 of the Federal Power Act so as to provide that the States may apply for reservation of portions of power sites released for entry, location, or selection to the States for highway purposes;

S. 1543. An act to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended;

S. 1614. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the patriotic services of Gen. Maurice Rose and to perpetuate the General Rose Memorial Hospital as a historic shrine;

S. 1648. An act to authorize the expenditure of income from Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for training of Federal prisoners;

S. 1721. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of injuries sustained by G. R. Below, late of Seattle, Wash.; and

S. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 338. An act to amend the Plant Quarantine Act approved August 20, 1912, as amended, by adding thereto a new section.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 859. An act to provide for the exploration, investigation, development, and maintenance of the fishing resources and development of the high-seas fishing industry of the Territories and island possessions of the United States in the tropical and subtropical Pacific Ocean and intervening seas, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 238. Joint resolution to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing joint resolution, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. GEORGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2173. An act to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. COOPER, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of a letter which I have sent to my colleague the gentleman from Nebraska on the accomplishment of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 758) to promote the national security by providing for a National Security Organization, which shall be administered by a Secretary of National Security, and for a Department of the Army, a Department of the Navy, and a Department of the Air Force within the National Security Organization, and for the coordination of the activities of the National Security Organization with other departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 758) to promote the national security by providing for a National Security Organization, which shall be administered by a Secretary of National Security, and for a Department of the Army, a Department of the Navy, and a Department of the Air Force within the National Security Organization, and for the coordination of the activities of the National Security Organization with other departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"SHORT TITLE

"That this Act may be cited as the 'National Security Act of 1947'.

"TABLE OF CONTENTS

"Sec. 2. Declaration of policy.

"TITLE I—COORDINATION FOR NATIONAL SECURITY

"Sec. 101. National Security Council.
"Sec. 102. Central Intelligence Agency.
"Sec. 103. National Security Resources Board.

"TITLE II—THE NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

"Sec. 201. National Military Establishment.
"Sec. 202. Secretary of Defense.
"Sec. 203. Military Assistants to the Secretary.
"Sec. 204. Civilian personnel.
"Sec. 205. Department of the Army.
"Sec. 206. Department of the Navy.
"Sec. 207. Department of the Air Force.
"Sec. 208. United States Air Force.
"Sec 209. Effective date of transfers.
"Sec. 210. War Council.
"Sec. 211. Joint Chiefs of Staff.
"Sec. 212. Joint staff.
"Sec 213. Munitions Board.
"Sec. 214. Research and Development Board.

"TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

"Sec. 301. Compensation of Secretaries.
"Sec. 302. Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries.
"Sec. 303. Advisory committees and personnel.
"Sec. 304. Status of transferred civilian personnel.
"Sec. 305. Saving provisions.
"Sec. 306. Transfer of funds.
"Sec. 307. Authorization for appropriations.
"Sec. 308. Definitions.
"Sec. 309. Separability.
"Sec. 310. Effective date.
"Sec. 311. Succession to the Presidency.

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 2. In enacting this legislation, it is the intent of Congress to provide a comprehensive program for the future security of the United States; to provide for the establishment of integrated policies and procedures for the departments, agencies, and functions of the Government relating to the national security; to provide three military departments for the operation and administration of the Army, the Navy (including naval aviation and the United States Marine Corps), and the Air Force, with their assigned combat and service components; to provide for their authoritative coordination and unified direction under civilian control but not to merge them; to provide for the effective strategic direction of the armed forces and for their operation under unified control and for their integration into an efficient team of land, naval, and air forces.

"TITLE I—COORDINATION FOR NATIONAL SECURITY

"NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

"SEC. 101. (a) There is hereby established a council to be known as the National Security Council (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Council').

"The President of the United States shall preside over meetings of the Council: *Provided*, That in his absence he may designate a member of the Council to preside in his place.

"The function of the Council shall be to advise the President with respect to the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies relating to the national security so as to enable the military services and the other departments and agencies of the Government to cooperate more effectively in matters involving the national security.

"The Council shall be composed of the President; the Secretary of State; the Secretary of Defense, appointed under section 202; the Secretary of the Army, referred to in section 205; the Secretary of the Navy; the Secretary of the Air Force, appointed under section 207; the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, appointed under section 103; and such of the following-named officers as the President may designate from time to time: The Secretaries of the executive departments, the Chairman of the Munitions Board appointed under section 213, and the Chairman of the Research and Development Board appointed under section 214; but no such additional member shall be designated until the advice and consent of the Senate has been given to his appointment to the office the holding of which authorizes his designation as a member of the Council.

"(b) In addition to performing such other functions as the President may direct, for the purpose of more effectively coordinating the policies and functions of the departments and agencies of the Government relating to the national security, it shall, subject to the direction of the President, be the duty of the Council—

"(1) to assess and appraise the objectives, commitments, and risks of the United States in relation to our actual and potential military power, in the interest of national security, for the purpose of making recommendations to the President in connection therewith; and

"(2) to consider policies on matters of common interest to the departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security, and to make recommendations to the President in connection therewith.

"(c) The Council shall have a staff to be headed by a civilian executive secretary who shall be appointed by the President, and who shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 a year. The executive secretary, subject to the direction of the Council, is hereby authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to perform such duties as may be prescribed by the Council in connection with the performance of its functions.

"(d) The Council shall, from time to time, make such recommendations, and such other reports to the President as it deems appropriate or as the President may require.

"CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

"SEC. 102. (a) There is hereby established under the National Security Council a Central Intelligence Agency with a Director of Central Intelligence, who shall be the head thereof. The Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among the commissioned officers of the armed services or from among individuals in civilian life. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $14,000 a year.

"(b) (1) If a commissioned officer of the armed services is appointed as Director then—

"(A) in the performance of his duties as Director, he shall be subject to no supervision, control, restriction, or prohibition (military or otherwise) other than would be operative with respect to him if he were a civilian in no way connected with the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, or the armed services or any component thereof; and

"(B) he shall not possess or exercise any supervision, control, powers, or functions (other than such as he possesses, or is authorized or directed to exercise, as Director), with respect to the armed services or any component thereof, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, or any branch, bureau, unit or division thereof, or with respect to any of the personnel (military or civilian) of any of the foregoing.

"(2) Except as provided in paragraph (1), the appointment to the office of Director of a commissioned officer of the armed services, and his acceptance of and service in such office, shall in no way affect any status, office, rank, or grade he may occupy or hold in the armed services, or any emolument, perquisite, right, privilege, or benefit incident to or arising out of any such status, office, rank, or grade. Any such commissioned officer shall, while serving in the office of Director, receive the military pay and allowances (active or retired, as the case may be) payable to a commissioned officer of his grade and length of service and shall be paid, from any funds available to defray the expenses of the Agency, annual compensation at a rate equal to the amount by which $14,000 exceeds the amount of his annual military pay and allowances.

"(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Director of Central Intelligence may, in his discretion, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Agency whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States, but such termination shall not affect the right of such officer or employee to seek or accept employment in any other department or agency of the Government if declared eligible for such

employment by the United States Civil Service Commission.

"(d) For the purpose of coordinating the intelligence activities of the several Government departments and agencies in the interest of national security, it shall be the duty of the Agency, under the direction of the National Security Council—

"(1) to advise the National Security Council in matters concerning such intelligence activities of the Government departments and agencies as relate to national security;

"(2) to make recommendations to the National Security Council for the coordination of such intelligence activities of the departments and agencies of the Government as relate to the national security;

"(3) to correlate and evaluate intelligence relating to the national security, and provide for the appropriate dissemination of such intelligence within the Government using where appropriate existing agencies and facilities: *Provided*, That the Agency shall have no police, subpena, law-enforcement powers, or internal-security functions: *Provided further*, That the departments and other agencies of the Government shall continue to collect, evaluate, correlate, and disseminate departmental intelligence: *And provided further*, That the Director of Central Intelligence shall be responsible for protecting intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure;

"(4) to perform, for the benefit of the existing intelligence agencies, such additional services of common concern as the National Security Council determines can be more efficiently accomplished centrally;

"(5) to perform such other functions and duties related to intelligence affecting the national security as the National Security Council may from time to time direct.

"(e) To the extent recommended by the National Security Council and approved by the President, such intelligence of the departments and agencies of the Government, except as hereinafter provided, relating to the national security shall be open to the inspection of the Director of Central Intelligence, and such intelligence as relates to the national security and is possessed by such departments and other agencies of the Government, except as hereinafter provided, shall be made available to the Director of Central Intelligence for correlation, evaluation, and dissemination: *Provided, however*, That upon the written request of the Director of Central Intelligence, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall make available to the Director of Central Intelligence such information for correlation, evaluation, and dissemination as may be essential to the national security.

"(f) Effective when the Director first appointed under subsection (a) has taken office—

"(1) the National Intelligence Authority (11 Fed. Reg. 1337, 1339, February 5, 1946) shall cease to exist; and

"(2) the personnel, property, and records of the Central Intelligence Group are transferred to the Central Intelligence Agency, and such Group shall cease to exist. Any unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds available or authorized to be made available for such Group shall be available and shall be authorized to be made available in like manner for expenditure by the Agency.

"NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD

"SEC. 103. (a) There is hereby established a National Security Resources Board (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Board') to be composed of the Chairman of the Board and such heads or representatives of the various executive departments and independent agencies as may from time to time be designated by the President to be members of the Board. The Chairman of the Board shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $14,000 a year.

"(b) The Chairman of the Board, subject to the direction of the President, is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to assist the Board in carrying out its functions.

"(c) It shall be the function of the Board to advise the President concerning the coordination of military, industrial, and civilian mobilization, including—

"(1) policies concerning industrial and civilian mobilization in order to assure the most effective mobilization and maximum utilization of the Nation's manpower in the event of war;

"(2) programs for the effective use in time of war of the Nation's natural and industrial resources for military and civilian needs, for the maintenance and stabilization of the civilian economy in time of war, and for the adjustment of such economy to war needs and conditions;

"(3) policies for unifying, in time of war, the activities of Federal agencies and departments engaged in or concerned with production, procurement, distribution, or transportation of military or civilian supplies, materials, and products;

"(4) the relationship between potential supplies of, and potential requirements for, manpower, resources, and productive facilities in time of war;

"(5) policies for establishing adequate reserves of strategic and critical material, and for the conservation of these reserves;

"(6) the strategic relocation of industries, services, government, and economic activities, the continuous operation of which is essential to the Nation's security.

"(d) In performing its functions, the Board shall utilize to the maximum extent the facilities and resources of the departments and agencies of the Government.

"TITLE II—THE NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

"ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

"SEC. 201. (a) There is hereby established the National Military Establishment, and the Secretary of Defense shall be the head thereof.

"(b) The National Military Establishment shall consist of the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force, together with all other agencies created under title II of this Act.

"SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

"SEC. 202. (a) There shall be a Secretary of Defense, who shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That a person who has within ten years been on active duty as a commissioned officer in a Regular component of the armed services shall not be eligible for appointment as Secretary of Defense. The Secretary of Defense shall be the principal assistant to the President in all matters relating to the national security. Under the direction of the President and subject to the provisions of this Act he shall perform the following duties:

"(1) Establish general policies and programs for the National Military Establishment and for all of the departments and agencies therein;

"(2) Exercise general direction, authority, and control over such departments and agencies;

"(3) Take appropriate steps to eliminate unnecessary duplication or overlapping in the fields of procurement, supply, transportation, storage, health, and research;

"(4) Supervise and coordinate the preparation of the budget estimates of the departments and agencies comprising the National Military Establishment; formulate and determine the budget estimates for submittal to the Bureau of the Budget; and supervise the budget programs of such departments and agencies under the applicable appropriation Act: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force from presenting to the President or to the Director of the Budget, after first so informing the Secretary of Defense, any report or recommendation relating to his department which he may deem necessary: *And provided further*, That the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force shall be administered as individual executive departments by their respective Secretaries and all powers and duties relating to such departments not specifically conferred upon the Secretary of Defense by this Act shall be retained by each of their respective Secretaries.

"(b) The Secretary of Defense shall submit annual written reports to the President and the Congress covering expenditures, work, and accomplishments of the National Military Establishment, together with such recommendations as he shall deem appropriate.

"(c) The Secretary of Defense shall cause a seal of office to be made for the National Military Establishment, of such design as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

"MILITARY ASSISTANTS TO THE SECRETARY

"SEC. 203. Officers of the armed services may be detailed to duty as assistants and personal aides to the Secretary of Defense, but he shall not establish a military staff.

"CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

"SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary of Defense is authorized to appoint from civilian life not to exceed three special assistants to advise and assist him in the performance of his duties. Each such special assistant shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 a year.

"(b) The Secretary of Defense is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such other civilian personnel as may be necessary for the performance of the functions of the National Military Establishment other than those of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

"DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

"SEC. 205. (a) The Department of War shall hereafter be designated the Department of the Army, and the title of the Secretary of War shall be changed to Secretary of the Army. Changes shall be made in the titles of other officers and activities of the Department of the Army as the Secretary of the Army may determine.

"(b) All laws, orders, regulations, and other actions relating to the Department of War or to any officer or activity whose title is changed under this section shall, insofar as they are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, be deemed to relate to the Department of the Army within the National Military Establishment or to such officer or activity designated by his or its new title.

"(c) The term 'Department of the Army' as used in this Act shall be construed to mean the Department of the Army at the seat of government and all field headquarters, forces, reserve components, installations, activities, and functions under the control or supervision of the Department of the Army.

"(d) The Secretary of the Army shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Department of the Army, of such design as the President may approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

"(e) In general the United States Army, within the Department of the Army, shall include land combat and service forces and such aviation and water transport as may

be organic therein. It shall be organized, trained, and equipped primarily for prompt and sustained combat incident to operations on land. It shall be responsible for the preparation of land forces necessary for the effective prosecution of war except as otherwise assigned and, in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of peacetime components of the Army to meet the needs of war.

"DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

"SEC. 206. (a) The term 'Department of the Navy' as used in this Act shall be construed to mean the Department of the Navy at the seat of government; the headquarters, United States Marine Corps; the entire operating forces of the United States Navy, including naval aviation, and of the United States Marine Corps, including the reserve components of such forces; all field activities, headquarters, forces, bases, installations, activities, and functions under the control or supervision of the Department of the Navy; and the United States Coast Guard when operating as a part of the Navy pursuant to law.

"(b) In general the United States Navy, within the Department of the Navy, shall include naval combat and services forces and such aviation as may be organic therein. It shall be organized, trained, and equipped primarily for prompt and sustained combat incident to operations at sea. It shall be responsible for the preparation of naval forces necessary for the effective prosecution of war except as otherwise assigned, and, in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of the peacetime components of the Navy to meet the needs of war

"All naval aviation shall be integrated with the naval service as part thereof within the Department of the Navy. Naval aviation shall consist of combat and service and training forces, and shall include land-based naval aviation, air transport essential for naval operations, all air weapons and air techniques involved in the operations and activities of the United States Navy, and the entire remainder of the aeronautical organization of the United States Navy, together with the personnel necessary therefor.

"The Navy shall be generally responsible for naval reconnaissance, antisubmarine warfare, and protection of shipping.

"The Navy shall develop aircraft, weapons, tactics, technique, organization and equipment of naval combat and service elements; matters of joint concern as to these functions shall be coordinated between the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy.

"(c) The United States Marine Corps, within the Department of the Navy, shall include land combat and service forces and such aviation as may be organic therein. The Marine Corps shall be organized, trained, and equipped to provide fleet marine forces of combined arms, together with supporting air components, for service with the fleet in the seizure or defense of advanced naval bases and for the conduct of such land operations as may be essential to the prosecution of a naval campaign. It shall be the duty of the Marine Corps to develop, in coordination with the Army and the Air Force, those phases of amphibious operations which pertain to the tactics, technique, and equipment employed by landing forces. In addition, the Marine Corps shall provide detachments and organizations for service on armed vessels of the Navy, shall provide security detachments for the protection of naval property at naval stations and bases, and shall perform such other duties as the President may direct: *Provided*, That such additional duties shall not detract from or interfere with the operations for which the Marine Corps is primarily organized. The Marine Corps shall be responsible, in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of peacetime components of the Marine Corps to meet the needs of war.

"DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

"SEC. 207. (a) Within the National Military Establishment there is hereby established an executive department to be known as the Department of the Air Force, and a Secretary of the Air Force, who shall be the head thereof. The Secretary of the Air Force shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"(b) Section 158 of the Revised Statutes is amended to include the Department of the Air Force and the provisions of so much of title IV of the Revised Statutes as now or hereafter amended as is not inconsistent with this Act shall be applicable to the Department of the Air Force.

"(c) The term 'Department of the Air Force' as used in this Act shall be construed to mean the Department of the Air Force at the seat of government and all field headquarters, forces, reserve components, installations, activities, and functions under the control or supervision of the Department of the Air Force.

"(d) There shall be in the Department of the Air Force an Under Secretary of the Air Force and two Assistant Secretaries of the Air Force, who shall be appointed from civilian life by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"(e) The several officers of the Department of the Air Force shall perform such functions as the Secretary of the Air Force may prescribe.

"(f) So much of the functions of the Secretary of the Army and of the Department of the Army, including those of any officer of such Department, as are assigned to or under the control of the Commanding General, Army Air Forces, or as are deemed by the Secretary of Defense to be necessary or desirable for the operations of the Department of the Air Force or the United States Air Force, shall be transferred to and vested in the Secretary of the Air Force and the Department of the Air Force: *Provided*, That the National Guard Bureau shall, in addition to the functions and duties performed by it for the Department of the Army, be charged with similar functions and duties for the Department of the Air Force, and shall be the channel of communication between the Department of the Air Force and the several States on all matters pertaining to the Air National Guard: *And provided further*, That, in order to permit an orderly transfer, the Secretary of Defense may, during the transfer period hereinafter prescribed, direct that the Department of the Army shall continue for appropriate periods to exercise any of such functions, insofar as they relate to the Department of the Air Force, or the United States Air Force or their property and personnel. Such of the property, personnel, and records of the Department of the Army used in the exercise of functions transferred under this subsection as the Secretary of Defense shall determine shall be transferred or assigned to the Department of the Air Force.

"(g) The Secretary of the Air Force shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Department of the Air Force, of such device as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

"UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

"SEC. 208. (a) The United States Air Force is hereby established under the Department of the Air Force. The Army Air Forces, the Air Corps, United States Army, and the General Headquarters Air Force (Air Force Combat Command), shall be transferred to the United States Air Force.

"(b) There shall be a Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of four years from among the officers of general rank who are assigned to or commissioned in the United States Air Force. Under the direction of the Secretary of the Air Force, the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, shall exercise command over the United States Air Force and shall be charged with the duty of carrying into execution all lawful orders and directions which may be transmitted to him. The functions of the Commanding General, General Headquarters Air Force (Air Force Combat Command), and of the Chief of the Air Corps and of the Commanding General, Army Air Forces, shall be transferred to the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force. When such transfer becomes effective, the offices of the Chief of the Air Corps, United States Army, and Assistants to the Chief of the Air Corps, United States Army, provided for by the Act of June 4, 1920, as amended (41 Stat. 768), and Commanding General, General Headquarters Air Force, provided for by section 5 of the Act of June 16, 1936 (49 Stat. 1525), shall cease to exist. While holding office as Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, the incumbent shall hold a grade and receive allowances equivalent to those prescribed by law for the Chief of Staff, United States Army. The Chief of Staff, United States Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force shall take rank among themselves according to their relative dates of appointment as such, and shall each take rank above all other officers on the active list of the Army, Navy, and Air Force: *Provided*, That nothing in this Act shall have the effect of changing the relative rank of the present Chief of Staff, United States Army, and the present Chief of Naval Operations.

"(c) All commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men, commissioned, holding warrants, or enlisted, in the Air Corps, United States Army, or the Army Air Forces, shall be transferred in branch to the United States Air Force. All other commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men, who are commissioned, hold warrants, or are enlisted, in any component of the Army of the United States and who are under the authority or command of the Commanding General, Army Air Forces, shall be continued under the authority or command of the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, and under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Air Force. Personnel whose status is affected by this subsection shall retain their existing commissions, warrants, or enlisted status in existing components of the armed forces unless otherwise altered or terminated in accordance with existing law; and they shall not be deemed to have been appointed to a new or different office or grade, or to have vacated their permanent or temporary appointments in an existing component of the armed forces, solely by virtue of any change in status under this subsection. No such change in status shall alter or prejudice the status of any individual so assigned, so as to deprive him of any right, benefit, or privilege to which he may be entitled under existing law.

"(d) Except as otherwise directed by the Secretary of the Air Force, all property, records, installations, agencies, activities, projects, and civilian personnel under the jurisdiction, control, authority, or command of the Commanding General, Army Air Forces, shall be continued to the same extent under the jurisdiction, control, authority, or command, respectively, of the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, in the Department of the Air Force.

"(e) For a period of two years from the date of enactment of this Act, personnel (both military and civilian), property, records, installations, agencies, activities, and projects may be transferred between the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force by direction of the Secretary of Defense.

"(f) In general the United States Air Force shall include aviation forces both combat and service not otherwise assigned. It shall be organized, trained, and equipped primarily

for prompt and sustained offensive and defensive air operations. The Air Force shall be responsible for the preparation of the air forces necessary for the effective prosecution of war except as otherwise assigned and, in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of the peacetime components of the Air Force to meet the needs of war.

"EFFECTIVE DATE OF TRANSFERS

"SEC. 209. Each transfer, assignment, or change in status under section 207 or section 208 shall take effect upon such date or dates as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

"WAR COUNCIL

"SEC. 210. There shall be within the National Military Establishment a War Council composed of the Secretary of Defense, as Chairman, who shall have power of decision; the Secretary of the Army; the Secretary of the Navy; the Secretary of the Air Force; the Chief of Staff, United States Army; the Chief of Naval Operations; and the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force. The War Council shall advise the Secretary of Defense on matters of broad policy relating to the armed forces, and shall consider and report on such other matters as the Secretary of Defense may direct.

"JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

"SEC. 211. (a) There is hereby established within the National Military Establishment the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which shall consist of the Chief of Staff, United States Army; the Chief of Naval Operations; the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force; and the Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief, if there be one.

"(b) Subject to the authority and direction of the President and the Secretary of Defense, it shall be the duty of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—

"(1) to prepare strategic plans and to provide for the strategic direction of the military forces;

"(2) to prepare joint logistic plans and to assign to the military services logistic responsibilities in accordance with such plans;

"(3) to establish unified commands in strategic areas when such unified commands are in the interest of national security;

"(4) to formulate policies for joint training of the military forces;

"(5) to formulate policies for coordinating the education of members of the military forces;

"(6) to review major material and personnel requirements of the military forces, in accordance with strategic and logistic plans; and

"(7) to provide United States representation on the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

"(c) The Joint Chiefs of Staff shall act as the principal military advisers to the President and the Secretary of Defense and shall perform such other duties as the President and the Secretary of Defense may direct or as may be prescribed by law.

"JOINT STAFF

"SEC. 212. There shall be, under the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a Joint Staff to consist of not to exceed one hundred officers and to be composed of approximately equal numbers of officers from each of the three armed services. The Joint Staff, operating under a Director thereof appointed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, shall perform such duties as may be directed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Director shall be an officer junior in grade to all members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

"MUNITIONS BOARD

"SEC. 213. (a) There is hereby established in the National Military Establishment a Munitions Board (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Board').

"(b) The Board shall be composed of a Chairman, who shall be the head thereof, and an Under Secretary or Assistant Secretary from each of the three military departments, to be designated in each case by the Secretaries of their respective departments. The Chairman shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $14,000 a year.

"(c) It shall be the duty of the Board under the direction of the Secretary of Defense and in support of strategic and logistic plans prepared by the Joint Chiefs of Staff—

"(1) to coordinate the appropriate activities within the National Military Establishment with regard to industrial matters, including the procurement, production, and distribution plans of the departments and agencies comprising the Establishment;

"(2) to plan for the military aspects of industrial mobilization;

"(3) to recommend assignment of procurement responsibilities among the several military services and to plan for standardization of specifications and for the greatest practicable allocation of purchase authority of technical equipment and common use items on the basis of single procurement;

"(4) to prepare estimates of potential production, procurement, and personnel for use in evaluation of the logistic feasibility of strategic operations;

"(5) to determine relative priorities of the various segments of the military procurement programs;

"(6) to supervise such subordinate agencies as are or may be created to consider the subjects falling within the scope of the Board's responsibilities;

"(7) to make recommendations to regroup, combine, or dissolve existing interservice agencies operating in the fields of procurement, production, and distribution in such manner as to promote efficiency and economy;

"(8) to maintain liaison with other departments and agencies for the proper correlation of military requirements with the civilian economy, particularly in regard to the procurement or disposition of strategic and critical material and the maintenance of adequate reserves of such material, and to make recommendations as to policies in connection therewith;

"(9) to assemble and review material and personnel requirements presented by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and those presented by the production, procurement, and distribution agencies assigned to meet military needs, and to make recommendations thereon to the Secretary of Defense; and

"(10) to perform such other duties as the Secretary of Defense may direct.

"(d) When the Chairman of the Board first appointed has taken office, the Joint Army and Navy Munitions Board shall cease to exist and all its records and personnel shall be transferred to the Munitions Board.

"(e) The Secretary of Defense shall provide the Board with such personnel and facilities as the Secretary may determine to be required by the Board for the performance of its functions.

"RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD

"SEC. 214. (a) There is hereby established in the National Military Establishment a Research and Development Board (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Board'). The Board shall be composed of a Chairman, who shall be the head thereof, and two representatives from each of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, to be designated by the Secretaries of their respective Departments. The Chairman shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $14,000 a year. The purpose of the Board shall be to advise the Secretary of Defense as to the status of scientific research relative to the national security, and to assist him in assuring adequate provision for research and development on scientific problems relating to the national security.

"(b) It shall be the duty of the Board, under the direction of the Secretary of Defense—

"(1) to prepare a complete and integrated program of research and development for military purposes;

"(2) to advise with regard to trends in scientific research relating to national security and the measures necessary to assure continued and increasing progress;

"(3) to recommend measures of coordination of research and development among the military departments, and allocation among them of responsibilities for specific programs of joint interest;

"(4) to formulate policy for the National Military Establishment in connection with research and development matters involving agencies outside the National Military Establishment;

"(5) to consider the interaction of research and development and strategy, and to advise the Joint Chiefs of Staff in connection therewith; and

"(6) to perform such other duties as the Secretary of Defense may direct.

"(c) When the Chairman of the Board first appointed has taken office, the Joint Research and Development Board shall cease to exist and all its records and personnel shall be transferred to the Research and Development Board.

"(d) The Secretary of Defense shall provide the Board with such personnel and facilities as the Secretary may determine to be required by the Board for the performance of its functions.

"TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

"COMPENSATION OF SECRETARIES

"SEC. 301. (a) The Secretary of Defense shall receive the compensation prescribed by law for heads of executive departments.

"(b) The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force shall each receive the compensation prescribed by law for heads of executive departments.

"UNDER SECRETARIES AND ASSISTANT SECRETARIES

"SEC. 302. The Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force shall each receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 a year and shall perform such duties as the Secretaries of their respective departments may prescribe.

"ADVISORY COMMITTEES AND PERSONNEL

"SEC. 303. (a) The Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, and the Director of Central Intelligence are authorized to appoint such advisory committees and to employ, consistent with other provisions of this act, such part-time advisory personnel as they may deem necessary in carrying out their respective functions and the functions of agencies under their control. Persons holding other offices or positions under the United States for which they receive compensation while serving as members of such committees shall receive no additional compensation for such service. Other members of such committees and other part-time advisory personnel so employed may serve without compensation or may receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $35 for each day of service, as determined by the appointing authority.

"(b) Service of an individual as a member of any such advisory committee, or in any other part-time capacity for a department or agency hereunder, shall not be considered as service bringing such individual within the provisions of section 109 or 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 18, secs. 198 and 203), or section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, unless the

act of such individual, which by such section is made unlawful when performed by an individual referred to in such section, is with respect to any particular matter which directly involves a department or agency which such person is advising or in which such department or agency is directly interested.

"STATUS OF TRANSFERRED CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

"SEC. 304. All transfers of civilian personnel under this Act shall be without change in classification or compensation, but the head of any department or agency to which such a transfer is made is authorized to make such changes in the titles and designations and prescribe such changes in the duties of such personnel commensurate with their classification as he may deem necessary and appropriate.

"SAVING PROVISIONS

"SEC. 305. (a) All laws, orders, regulations, and other actions applicable with respect to any function, activity, personnel, property, records, or other thing transferred under this Act, or with respect to any officer, department, or agency, from which such transfer is made, shall, except to the extent rescinded, modified, superseded, terminated, or made inapplicable by or under authority of law, have the same effect as if such transfer had not been made; but, after any such transfer, any such law, order, regulation, or other action which vested functions in or otherwise related to any officer, department, or agency from which such transfer was made shall, insofar as applicable with respect to the function, activity, personnel, property, records or other thing transferred and to the extent not inconsistent with other provisions of this Act, be deemed to have vested such function in or relate to the officer, department, or agency to which the transfer was made.

"(b) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the head of any department or agency or other officer of the United States, in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties, shall abate by reason of the taking effect of any transfer or change in title under the provisions of this Act; and, in the case of any such transfer, such suit, action, or other proceeding may be maintained by or against the successor of such head or other officer under the transfer, but only if the court shall allow the same to be maintained on motion or supplemental petition filed within twelve months after such transfer takes effect, showing a necessity for the survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain settlement of the questions involved.

"(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of the second paragraph of section 5 of title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941, the existing organization of the War Department under the provisions of Executive Order Numbered 9082 of February 28, 1942, as modified by Executive Order Numbered 9722 of May 13, 1946, and the existing organization of the Department of the Navy under the provisions of Executive Order Numbered 9635 of September 29, 1945, including the assignment of functions to organizational units within the War and Navy Departments, may, to the extent determined by the Secretary of Defense, continue in force for two years following the date of enactment of this Act except to the extent modified by the provisions of this Act or under the authority of law.

"TRANSFER OF FUNDS

"SEC. 306. All unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, nonappropriated funds, or other funds available or hereafter made available for use by or on behalf of the Army Air Forces or officers thereof, shall be transferred to the Department of the Air Force for use in connection with the exercise of its functions. Such other unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, nonappropriated funds, or other funds available or hereafter made available for use by the Department of War or the Department of the Army in exercise of functions transferred to the Department of the Air Force under this Act, as the Secretary of Defense shall determine, shall be transferred to the Department of the Air Force for use in connection with the exercise of its functions. Unexpended balances transferred under this section may be used for the purposes for which the appropriations, allocations, or other funds were originally made available, or for new expenditures occasioned by the enactment of this Act. The transfers herein authorized may be made with or without warrant action as may be appropriate from time to time from any appropriation covered by this section to any other such appropriation or to such new accounts established on the books of the Treasury as may be determined to be necessary to carry into effect provisions of this Act.

"AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 307. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 308. (a) As used in this Act, the term 'function' includes functions, powers, and duties.

"(b) As used in this Act, the term 'budget program' refers to recommendations as to the apportionment, to the allocation and to the review of allotments of appropriated funds.

"SEPARABILITY

"SEC. 309. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"EFFECTIVE DATE

"SEC. 310. (a) The first sentence of section 202 (a) and sections 1, 2, 307, 308, 309, and 310 shall take effect immediately upon the enactment of this Act.

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (a), the provisions of this Act shall take effect on whichever of the following days is the earlier: The day after the day upon which the Secretary of Defense first appointed takes office, or the sixtieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

"SUCCESSION TO THE PRESIDENCY

"SEC. 311. Paragraph (1) of subsection (d) of section 1 of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President in case of the removal, resignation, death, or inability both of the President and Vice President', approved July 18, 1947, is amended by striking out 'Secretary of War' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Secretary of Defense', and by striking out 'Secretary of the Navy,'."

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
GEORGE H. BENDER,
HENRY J. LATHAM,
JAMES W. WADSWORTH,
CARTER MANASCO,
JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
CHET HOLIFIELD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAN GURNEY,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
WAYNE MORSE,
RAYMOND E. BALDWIN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
HARRY F. BYRD,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 758) to promote the national security by providing for a National Security Organization, which shall be administered by a Secretary of National Security, and for a Department of the Army, a Department of the Navy, and a Department of the Air Force within the National Security Organization, and for the coordination of the activities of the National Security Organization with other departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment to the text of the bill strikes out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommend that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment, and that the House agree to the same.

The bill as agreed to in conference is the same as the House amendment, except for typographical, clerical, and clarifying changes, and the following:

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment provided (sec. 101 (a)) that the National Security Council be composed of the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense (in the Senate bill designated as "Secretary of National Security"), the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. Under the Senate bill the Council was also to be composed of such other members as the President may designate from time to time. Under the bill as agreed to in conference (sec. 101 (a)) the Council, in addition to the members specifically named above, is to be composed of such of the following-named officers as the President may designate from time to time: the Secretaries of the executive departments, the Chairman of the Munitions Board, and the Chairman of the Research and Development Board. No such additional member is to be designated until the advice and consent of the Senate has been given to his appointment to the office the holding of which authorizes his designation as a member of the Council. Thus, for example, the Secretary of Commerce now in office could be designated by the President as a member of the Council, but if in the future a new Secretary of Commerce is appointed the new Secretary could not serve as a member of the Council until the advice and consent of the Senate has been given to his appointment to the office of Secretary of Commerce.

The Senate bill (sec. 101 (c)) provided that the Secretary of Defense be director of the staff of the Council. The House amendment (sec. 101 (c)) provided that the Council have a staff headed by a civilian executive secretary to receive compensation at the rate of $14,000 a year. The bill as agreed to in conference (sec. 101 (c)) is the same as the House amendment except the compensation of the executive secretary is fixed at the rate of $10,000 a year.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

The Senate bill provided that the Director of Central Intelligence be appointed from the armed services or from civilian life. The House amendment provided that the Director of Central Intelligence be appointed from civilian life. The bill as agreed to in conference (sec. 102) provides that the Director shall be appointed from among the commissioned officers of the armed services or from among individuals in civilian life

and adds a new subsection (b) which provides that if a commissioned officer of the armed services is appointed as Director then (1) in the performance of his duties as Director, he is to be subject to no supervision, control, restriction, or prohibition (military or otherwise) other than would be operative with respect to him if he were a civilian in no way connected with the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, or the armed services or any component thereof; and (2) he is not to possess or exercise any supervision, control, powers, or functions (other than such as he possesses, or is authorized or directed to exercise, as Director) with respect to the armed services or any component thereof, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, or any branch, bureau, unit or division thereof, or with respect to any of the personnel (military or civilian) of any of the foregoing. Except as noted in the preceding sentence the appointment to the office of Director of a commissioned officer of the armed services and his acceptance of and service in such office is in no way to affect any status, office, rank, or grade he may occupy or hold in the armed services or any emolument, perquisite, right, privilege, or benefit incident to or arising out of any such status, office, rank, or grade. Also any such commissioned officer, while serving in the office of Director, is to receive the military pay and allowance (active or retired, as the case may be) payable to a commissioned officer of his grade and length of service and is to be paid, from any funds available to defray the expenses of the Central Intelligence Agency, annual compensation at a rate equal to the amount by which $14,000 exceeds the amount of his annual military pay and allowances.

The House amendment (sec. 105 (d)) provided that to the extent recommended by the National Security Council and approved by the President, such intelligence operations of the departments of government as relate to the national security shall be open to the inspection of the Director of Central Intelligence, and such intelligence as relates to national security and is possessed by such departments and other agencies of the Government shall be made available to the Director of Central Intelligence for correlation, evaluation, and dissemination. Section 102 (d) of the bill as agreed to in conference provides that to the extent recommended by the National Security Council and approved by the President, such intelligence of the departments and agencies of the Government, except as hereinafter provided, relating to the national security, shall be open to the inspection of the Director of Central Intelligence, and such intelligence as relates to the national security and is possessed by such departments and other agencies of the Government, except as hereinafter provided, shall be made available to the Director of Central Intelligence for correlation, evaluation, and dissemination; provided, however, that upon the written request of the Director of Central Intelligence, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall make available to the Director of Central Intelligence such information for correlation, evaluation, and dissemination as may be essential to the national security.

PERSONNEL OF NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD

Both the Senate bill (sec. 103 (b)) and the House amendment (sec. 106 (b)) authorized the chairman of the National Security Resources Board to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to assist the Board in carrying out its functions. The Senate bill provided that such authority be subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The House amendment provided that such authority be without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The bill as agreed to in conference (sec. 103 (b)) follows the language of the Senate bill.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Both the Senate bill (sec. 202 (a)) and House amendment (sec. 102 (a)) provided that the new Secretary be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The House amendment contained a proviso (not contained in the Senate bill) providing that a person who has held a commission in a Regular component of the armed services shall not be eligible for appointment as Secretary of Defense. The bill as agreed to in conference (sec. 202 (a)) contains a provision that a person who has within ten years been on active duty as a commissioned officer in a Regular component of the armed services shall not be eligible for appointment as Secretary of Defense.

The Senate bill (sec. 202 (a) (2)) imposed upon the Secretary of Defense the duty to exercise general direction, authority, and control over certain departments and agencies. The House amendment (sec. 102 (a) (2)) added the word "general" before the word "authority" and before the word "control." The words added by the House amendment have been deleted in the bill as agreed to in conference (sec. 202 (a) (2)) as surplusage.

The Senate bill (sec. 202 (a) (3)) imposed upon the Secretary of Defense the duty to formulate and determine the budget estimates for submittal to the Bureau of the Budget. The House amendment contained no such provision. The bill as agreed to in conference (sec. 202 (a) (4)) contains this provision from the Senate bill.

COMPOSITION AND DUTIES OF THE NAVY AND OF NAVAL AVIATION

The House amendment (sec. 203 (b)) contained language relating specifically to the composition and duties of the United States Navy and of Naval Aviation. The Senate bill (sec. 206 (b)) provided that the provisions of this act shall not authorize the alteration or diminution of the existing relative status of Naval Aviation. The first and last paragraphs of section 206 (b) of the bill as agreed to in conference are the same as the first and last paragraphs of section 203 (b) of the House amendment. The second, third, and fourth paragraphs of section 203 (b) of the House amendment are omitted and the following is inserted in lieu thereof:

"All naval aviation shall be integrated with the naval service as part thereof within the Department of the Navy. Naval aviation shall consist of combat and service and training forces, and shall include land-based naval aviation, air transport essential for naval operations, all air weapons and air techniques involved in the operations and activities of the United States Navy, and the entire remainder of the aeronautical organization of the United States Navy, together with the personnel necessary therefor.

"The Navy shall be generally responsible for naval reconnaissance, antisubmarine warfare, and protection of shipping."

COMPOSITION AND DUTIES OF THE MARINE CORPS

The House amendment (sec. 203) contained the following provision:

"(c) The United States Marine Corps, within the Department of the Navy, shall include land combat and service forces and such aviation as may be organic therein. The primary mission of the Marine Corps shall be to provide fleet marine forces of combined arms, together with supporting air components, for service with the fleet in the seizure or defense of advanced naval bases and for the conduct of such land operations as may be essential to the prosecution of a naval campaign. It shall be the duty of the Marine Corps to develop, in coordination with the Army and the Air Force, those phases of amphibious operations which pertain to the tactics, technique, and equipment employed by landing forces. In addition to its primary mission, the Marine Corps shall provide detachments and organizations for service on armed vessels of the Navy, shall provide security detachments for the protection of naval property at naval stations and bases, and shall perform such other duties as the President may direct: *Provided*, That such additional duties shall not detract from or interfere with the performance of the primary mission hereinbefore set forth. The Marine Corps shall be responsible, in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of peacetime components of the Marine Corps to meet the needs of war."

The Senate bill (sec. 206 (b)) provided that the provisions of this act shall not authorize the alteration or diminution of the existing relative status of the Marine Corps (including the Fleet Marine Forces). The bill as agreed to in conference contains the same language (sec. 206 (c)) as that in the House amendment except that (1) the words "The primary mission of the Marine Corps shall be" at the beginning of the second sentence are changed to read "The Marine Corps shall be organized, trained, and equipped"; (2) the words "to its primary mission" at the beginning of the fourth sentence are omitted; and (3) the words "performance of the primary mission hereinbefore set forth" in the proviso at the end of the fourth sentence are omitted and in lieu thereof the words "operations for which the Marine Corps is primarily organized" are inserted.

COMPENSATION OF SECRETARIES

The Senate bill (sec. 302 (b)) provided that the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force shall each receive the compensation prescribed for the Secretary of Defense. The House amendment (sec. 301 (b)) provided that these three Secretaries shall each receive compensation at the rate of $14,500 a year. The bill as agreed to in conference (sec. 301 (b)) provides that these three Secretaries shall each receive the compensation prescribed by law for heads of executive departments.

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
GEORGE H. BENDER,
HENRY J. LATHAM,
JAMES W. WADSWORTH,
CARTER MANASCO,
JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
CHET HOLIFIELD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 1 hour.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously no quorum is present.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 131]

Barden	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Norton
Bell	Harness, Ind.	O'Toole
Bland	Hart	Pfeifer
Bloom	Hartley	Philbin
Buckley	Hays	Phillips, Calif.
Bulwinkle	Hébert	Poulson
Butler	Heffernan	Powell
Cannon	Hendricks	Rabin
Carroll	Herter	Rayfiel
Case, S. Dak.	Jenison	Reed, Ill.
Celler	Jenkins, Pa.	Rooney
Chelf	Johnson, Okla.	Sabath
Clark	Jones, N. C.	Sadowski
Clements	Jones, Wash.	Sarbacher
Cole, Mo.	Kee	Smith, Ohio
Cole, N. Y.	Kefauver	Somers
Cox	Kelley	Stigler
Dawson, Ill.	Kennedy	Taylor
Dawson, Utah	Keogh	Thomason
Dingell	Klein	Tollefson
Domengeaux	Lesinski	Trimble
Durham	Ludlow	Vail
Elsaesser	Lynch	Vinson
Fellows	McCowen	Welch
Fernandez	McDowell	Williams
Fuller	Macy	Wood
Gathings	Marcantonio	Worley
Gifford	Mason	Youngblood
Gore	Meade, Md.	Zimmerman
Gossett	Norrell	
Gregory		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 340 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot entertain that request at this time. Perhaps later in the day the Chair may be able to, but not now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that during the time of adjournment the vacation of Congress, so-called, which is always to the individual Members a period of extra work and overtime, you all will have a pleasant time with the folks at home.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, which is H. R. 4214, under the number S. 758, to my mind, is as important as any that could come before the Congress. There is no question but that we need unification. All admit that in all preparations for national defense or for war there has been inexcusable duplication and waste. War is waste and destruction.

My reluctance to vote for legislation of this kind grows not out of the fact that it is not needed but that for some 25 years certain individuals connected with the Joint Staff have been seeking not only to give the Nation unity in its preparations for defense and for war and greater efficiency, but that some of those pushing it seek to open the door to the establishment of a military dictatorship. Not only does the General Staff want to give us greater efficiency but as indicated by the terms of this bill they want the power to plan our domestic as well as our foreign policy. When you read the bill you will discover that that is the fact. All too often these planners become the ones with authority and carry out their plans as distinguished from the plans of the Congress.

And so there may arise in your minds the question as to why I support it, and I can only repeat what I said in the beginning when this bill was before us for the first time. It is the lesser of two evils. Apparently we are going to pass—I may say it is evident we are going to pass—some legislation on this subject, and may I respectfully submit to you and to your judgment that the bill that your committee brought back, the bill just returned by the conferees to this House, is a great improvement over the original bill, and the best we can get at this time. That is why the conferees bring it back for your consideration.

In this bill you will find provisions that make it necessary that future Congresses will be required, if our liberty is to be preserved, to guard against the planning of the State Department and the military in this country with reference to foreign policies, with reference to domestic economy, with reference to the dissipation of our resources and our production, our industrial plants, because, as we all know, in these days the planning is more than half the battle; and when they bring planned or planning legislation here to Congress—when it relates to foreign policy or domestic policy the Congress has been all too willing, for what reason I know not, to accept, adopt, and carry it out.

Now to touch the provisions of this bill, the points on which your conferees could not carry out your wishes to the extent which they desired. Distinguished gentlemen from the other end of the Capitol had something to say about it. They had quite a lot to say about it.

You will recall that when the House passed on this legislation it amended the bill H. R. 4214, which the committee reported, with reference to the Central Intelligence Agency. The committee had written into the bill a provision that the head of that agency might be a civilian or a man from the armed services. The House amended the bill to provide that he shall be a civilian. During the debate the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] offered an amendment which provided that if a man from the armed services was appointed he should be required to relinquish his rank and his authority in the Army.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, when we went into conference, the conferees for the other body flatly refused to accept that amendment. They had made certain concessions to which your attention will be called later on, but on that one they stood pat. They refused to accept the House amendment to the committee bill so your conferees compromised by accepting the language of the bill, 4214, as reported by your committee to the House, thus discarding the amendment written into the bill by the House which would have required that the head of that agency be a civilian. My own choice, and I think the choice of six of the seven members of the House subcommittee who were conferees, was that the head of that agency should be a civilian, but we could not get it, so we went along with that compromise. It seeks to divorce the head of the agency from the armed services if a man in the service is appointed.

It will be recalled also, if you have read the hearings, that there was a deliberate effort on the part of the Army part of the Joint Staff to reduce the marines to the status of a police force. Your committee, and the House sustained its action, wrote into the bill certain provisions which protect the marines. You may just as well talk about stopping the sunrise or the setting of the sun as to think that the people of this country are going to permit the Congress to vote to get rid of the marines. The marines have fought their way into the hearts of all the people, and the conferees who were opposed to the provisions which protected them could get nowhere. In my humble judgment, this bill protects to the fullest extent the marines, their activities, their role, their missions, their rights to develop the kind of warfare and weapons they think are necessary or of advantage to the country.

There was fear on the part of some who had been in the Navy as to certain omissions in the original bill as sent up by the administration. You will recall that the men who fought as admirals, vice admirals, rear admirals, men who fought in the last war as captains, and officers of lower rank, some of them having had their ships blown out from under them, did not get an opportunity to appear before the committee to express their thoughts and their ideas as to what the legislation should be. You will recall that 4 or 5 days before the hearings were ended, and they were closed in spite of my protest, there were two orders of the Navy, 94 and 95, which prevented the fighting men and officers in the Navy, except as their views were channeled through the Secretary of the Navy from expressing their opinions. That gag was only removed a few days before the hearing ended. It was then impossible to call those witnesses. So there was a justifiable fear on the part of the enlisted men in the Navy and on the part of the officers of the Navy that an attempt was being made to take from them naval aviation.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] offered an amendment in the House, and it was adopted, which in our opinion and apparently in the opinion of the Members of the House protected the Navy by permitting it to continue to have naval aviation.

We had to make some changes in the phraseology of that amendment as written in by the House. But again, in my judgment, there is no change in the basic thought; there is no change in the language that will prevent the Navy from carrying out to the fullest extent its desire to be adequately protected in time of war by naval aviation and to develop before war comes naval aviation.

Those were the three more important points in the legislation as it went to conference. First was the appointment of the head of the Central Intelligence. We had to guard against a gestapo, and we wrote in there a provision which we

think now will do that. Then there was the protection to be given to the marines and there was the protection to be given to naval aviation. We have both in the bill as it comes back from conference. So, on the whole, if we must have a bill—and we must—it is here. We do most humbly and respectfully submit this bill for your consideration and action. My only purpose in calling attention to the dangers the bill carries is this: It opens the door to military dictatorship and renders more burdensome the duty of future Congresses to adequately protect us from government by the armed services. All in all, inasmuch as the Congress is determined to pass a bill, this is the best we can get, and it is if the powers granted are not extended and if the organizations set up by it are content to remain within the written provisions of the bill, not too bad.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am overwhelmed by the continued generosity of my distinguished chairman. My friend the gentleman from Michigan has referred to the Director of Central Intelligence, and I think I might advise the House that that was the last question that we passed upon in conference. The Senate accepted the House provision of the bill as reported out of the House committee.

You will remember when the bill was on the floor we frankly advised the Committee of the Whole at that time that the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments was strongly inclined toward, if not favorable to, a civilian director, but in view of the immediate situation that confronted us we put in the provision that in case a military man, a career officer of the Army or the Navy, was appointed that he would have to occupy what would be, in effect, a civilian position. We tried to protect him so that he would be free from a dual influence. I recognize, if one were to argue or say it did not completely eliminate a dual influence, that I could not challenge that statement. But we did the best we could from a human angle. We felt, since enabling legislation was going to come in later from another standing committee of the House—and we know that; we were advised and saw a copy of the proposed bill—that that question, with the other questions that would arise in connection with this Central Intelligence Agency, should be left to the standing committee, and that our committee should try to meet the immediate problem. The bill as it comes back is substantially the House bill. I think it is a much better bill—and I agree on that with my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]—than any of the bills that were considered by the committees of both branches and an improvement upon the bill that passed the Senate. It is now a bill that probably expresses in the most effective way possible the collective action to a satisfied extent of the membership of the House and the Senate.

This bill is one of the most controversial problems that came up in Congress at the outset of this session, and we have seen it go through the House practically without any opposition. The House is now ready to accept the conference report. I think this is a strong indication of the confidence the House has in the considerations of the House committee and in the bill the House committee reported.

One of the most controversial problems and consequently one of the last to be resolved was the question of providing in legislation a reasonable assurance that the Marine Corps and naval aviation would continue to perform their proper functions in the National Military Establishment after unification. Fears were expressed, and honest fears, that an attempt to describe in detail the composition of forces, and their functions and missions might introduce an inflexibility which would impair the effectiveness of the armed forces.

Your committee recognized these fears, and while they considered it desirable to provide in general terms for the continued functioning of these two elements of the armed services, it was not their intent to create a statutory rigidity which would be a bar to future progress. By the same token, it is not their intent by this act to freeze the organization of the armed forces, or the concept of military operations, since a major purpose of the act is to assure that scientific progress shall be reflected in a progressive and dynamic organization. It is in no way the intent of the committee to tie the hands of the Secretary of Defense in any manner which would prevent the increased economies and the enhanced efficiency which the people of the United States have a right to expect. Further, nothing in this act should be construed as infringing upon the traditional and constitutional authority of the President as Commander in Chief.

The bill permits broad flexibility in administration and in operation in all of its aspects, and should be construed in the future from that angle. Under no conditions, either directly or indirectly, even if we had the power to do so, does it infringe upon or invade the powers of the President, as President or as Commander in Chief. This is clearly the intent of the Congress.

We have now come to the final legislative stage in this very important and far-reaching piece of legislation. It shows what the processes of legislative action under constitutional government are. As we look back through the months we recollect the fears that were expressed, and some properly so, then we recollect the evidence considered in hearings and the fears taken into account. Then the bill went through the legislative processes, and has finally come down to this final legislative stage, and we now find a feeling of abiding satisfaction that the bill represents the best that can be done at this time in connection with legislation along the lines outlined therein.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I concur in what the gentleman has said. As the gentleman knows, I personally think it is a mistake not to require that the Director of Central Intelligence be a civilian, but I am sure that on the whole the bill is in excellent shape and that the majority of the provisions for which the House committee voted and which it believes to be right have been written into the bill. I think the committee is to be congratulated.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman. I think the House can accept the statement of the chairman, in which I concur, that the conferees on the part of the House are able to report back to the House that the substance of the changes made by the House committee are contained in the bill.

It has been a pleasure to me to work with all of the members of the committee on this bill. Every Member approached this problem with an open mind, no matter what party he belongs to. The members of the conference committee, both of the House and of the Senate, did likewise. There were no difficulties at any time. We went into the thing very carefully. It is a bill which through able and courageous administration will produce efficiency and economy in our armed services, and will make stronger our future national security.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a resolution calling for an investigation of the Department of State. Because of my long-time respect and admiration for Gen. George C. Marshall, the Secretary of State, this is indeed a grevious thing to have to do.

However, under circumstances outlined to me in great detail with respect to State Department action—or, I should say, lack of action—on behalf of an American citizen, I think it is apparent that there is no other recourse than to have the matter in question fully investigated. I am confident that every Member of Congress who familiarizes himself with the problem will agree as to the validity of my decision.

The resolution, Mr. Speaker, calls for investigation of the State Department's action with reference to the rights of an American citizen to protection under the provisions of the arbitration treaty between our Nation and the Government of Guatemala. This treaty requires the submission to arbitration of claims of American citizens against the Government of Guatemala. The individual in question—a man by the name of Soto—has been refused such arbitration by the State Department. I can see no valid

reason for it; I am advised that there are reasons therefor, but reasons which will not stand up under investigation.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that this man's claim has been pending since 1929—all of this time in the State Department. It has been twice approved by the Legal Department of the State Department. Moreover, the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate passed a resolution declaring that this American citizen is entitled to arbitration under the treaty in question. The State Department's failure to act has been questioned by myself and Senators WILEY, BUTLER, and JENNER, and, as I have stated before, in effect has been questioned by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Nothing has come of it. It is, I submit, time to act.

Now, let me say here that I do not know Mr. Soto. The results of the matter do not bear upon me personally in any respect, politically or otherwise. I am totally disinterested in the problem from any standpoint other than the obtaining of redress for an American citizen who, from all available facts, is certainly entitled thereto. I further submit that it is the duty of the Congress to exert its power for the protection of the rights of our citizens. And if it appears—as it definitely does—that the legal department of the State Department is so engrossed in other matters that it not only neglects but refuses to maintain and protect the rights of our own citizens, at a time when we are being called upon to assist the plight of foreign nationals, then, I say, Mr. Speaker, that something effective must be done.

For this reason, I have offered a resolution today to require a thoroughgoing investigation of this claim, not only in fairness to this American citizen by the name of Soto, but because of the possibility, if this matter has been grossly mishandled, of similar action having been taken in other instances involving our own citizens. I earnestly request that whichever committee of the House of Representatives receives my resolution will follow the matter to its conclusion. I am personally confident that an investigation is fully warranted. It should get under way with the least possible delay.

(The resolution referred to is as follows:)

Resolved, That the Committee on ———, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation of the action of the Department of State with respect to the claim of George B. Soto, a native-born American citizen, against the Government of Guatemala, amounting to approximately $3,000,000, which has been pending in the Department of State since 1929; to ascertain why the agreement made by Guatemala with the Department of State to arbitrate this claim in 1932 was not carried out by the Department of State; to ascertain why, when the claim was approved as valid and meritorious by the legal department and the counselor of the Department of State in 1938 and 1940, and dispatches sent to Guatemala demanding settlement of the claim in June 1941, such claim should by October 1941 become not valid and not meritorious and be dropped by the Department of State after Guatemala had made two offers of cash payments of the claim, thereby admitting liability under the claim; to ascertain whether or not the dropping of the Soto claim by the Department of State was involved in the securing of the cooperation of Guatemala in the Presidential freezing order issued in July 1941, and before Guatemala was at war with Germany and Japan; to ascertain the liability of the United States Government for the payment of this claim if the claim has been used by the Government for its own purposes, and, if so, to provide for payment of the claim out of Department of State appropriations, if, by the failure of the Department of State to act, the liability has been fixed by the Department of State on the United States Government; to ascertain and determine whether the legal rights of an American citizen under the Pecuniary Claims Convention of Buenos Aires of 1910 to arbitration of the claim can be denied by the Department of State.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) within 120 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution, the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, dispatches, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mrs. BOLTON (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BANTA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MATHEWS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I make another appeal for action by this House on legislation that is urgently needed for the veterans before Congress adjourns. I have urged especially that action be taken before adjournment on pending legislation, already approved by the Senate, to increase subsistence allowances to students under the GI bill. I again earnestly request that the majority leadership give favorable consideration to that.

In the extension of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation recently the authority to purchase GI loan paper was left out over the protest and votes of many of us and I think that experience has shown, and will show, that this was a mistake. I note the Senate has just passed a bill to give such authority to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation again. Legislation is pending in this House to do the same. I earnestly appeal to the majority leadership not to adjourn this Congress until that legislation is also passed.

There are other items of veterans' legislation pending which I do not have time to discuss in the time given me but which I hope the leadership will give consideration to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include therein certain statements and excerpts.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I am advised by the Public Printer that the extension exceeds the amount allowed and will cost $177.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 10 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address recently made by Dr. Thorning, and in another instance to include an article appearing in the American Watch Worker.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted I may address the House for 15 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

RECORD in two instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two different subjects.

Mr. FOLGER and Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article in the Republican News of July 1947.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a paper on reparations.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include letters and a clipping.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Mr. Spyros P. Skouras.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD. It may slightly exceed the cost as prescribed, but I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding that fact I may be granted that permission.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the additional cost, and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the other special orders today, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is unable to entertain such a request at this time.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. Are we not allowed to talk about the Kansas City investigation?

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman can get time he can talk about anything he wants to.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is unable to entertain requests for 1-minute speeches at this time.

MANUFACTURERS OF WAR MATERIALS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a resolution providing for the appointment of a select committee to be composed of five Members of the House to conduct a study and review of the activities of those manufacturers of war materials during World War II who materially contributed to the war effort of the United States and her allies. The committee would also recommend that a suitable form of recognition, comparable to citations awarded to members of the armed services, be awarded to manufacturers for the valuable services they performed to this country and our allies. As a result of investigations conducted by either congressional committeees or private citizens, too many of these loyal citizens who did such a remarkable job in helping us to win this war are now being criticized for political or other reasons. Many innocent people are being accused of having made exorbitant profits or having produced inferior matériel, which is not based on the facts. No one can deny that without the valuable aid given by the majority of manufacturers of war matériel we might not have won the war, or at least it might have been prolonged. Scientists and others who perfected the atomic bomb and manufacturers of ships, tanks, munitions, and other types of war matériel should be commended by some public recognition for the great service they rendered to their country. It is the purpose of my resolution to create a committee which would go into this whole field and report to the Congress giving the names of the outstanding manufacturers who would be commended in some form recommended by the committee.

TEMPORARY CONTINUATION OF CONSUMER CREDIT CONTROLS

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the resolution (S. J. Res. 148) to authorize the temporary continuation of regulation of consumer credit; and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 148) to authorize the temporary continuation of regulation of consumer credit, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the joint resolution and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That after November 1, 1947, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall not exercise consumer credit controls pursuant to Executive Order Numbered 8843, and no such consumer credit controls shall be exercised after such date except during the time of war beginning after the date of enactment of this joint resolution or any national emergency declared by the President after the date of enactment of this joint resolution."

And the House agree to the same.

That the House recede from its amendment to the title.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
HENRY O. TALLE,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HOMER CAPEHART,
RALPH E. FLANDERS,
JOHN BRICKER,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 148) to authorize the temporary continuation of regulation of consumer credit, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate joint resolution authorized the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to continue to exercise consumer credit controls pursuant to Executive Order No. 8843 until December 31, 1947, with the proviso that no such regulations should fix a maximum maturity of installment credit of less than 24 months or require a down payment in excess of 20 percent of the purchase price. It further provided that except during any war beginning after December 31, 1947, or any national emergency proclaimed by the President after such date, no such consumer credit controls should be exercised after such date.

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate joint resolution after the enacting clause and inserted an amendment in the nature of a substitute providing that after the date of enactment of the joint resolution the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall not exercise consumer credit controls pursuant to Executive Order No. 8843 and, except during the time of war beginning after the date of enactment of the joint resolution or any national emergency declared by the President after the date of enactment of the joint resolution, no such consumer credit controls shall be exercised hereafter.

The substitute agreed to in conference provides that after November 1, 1947, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall not exercise consumer credit controls pursuant to Executive Order No. 8843, and that no such consumer credit controls shall be exercised after such date except during the time of war beginning after the date of enactment of this joint resolution or any national emergency declared by the President after the date of enactment of this joint resolution.

The House recedes from its amendment to the title.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
HENRY O. TALLE,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the conferees on the part of the Senate re-

ceded with an amendment, the amendment being that the language of the House bill is accepted in its entirety except that the effective date is November 1, 1947, instead of the date of the enactment of the resolution.

The only difference is that consumer credit controls under the conference agreement will be continued to November 1, 1947, instead of the date of the enactment of the resolution as provided in the House bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous report of the conferees. I think it is a very happy solution of the disagreements existing between the two Houses.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS TO UNITED STATES HOUSING ACT OF 1937

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1361) to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit loans, capital grants, or annual contributions for low-rent-housing and slum-clearance projects where construction costs exceed present cost limitations upon condition that local housing agencies pay the difference between cost limitations and the actual construction costs, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1361) to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit loans, capital grants, or annual contributions for low-rent-housing and slum-clearance projects where construction costs exceed present cost limitations upon condition that local housing agencies pay the difference between cost limitations and the actual construction costs, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 2. The United States or any State or local public agency assisted by Federal funds made available with respect to housing shall continue to have the right to maintain an action or proceeding to recover possession of any housing accommodations (except as provided in the proviso of section 209 (b) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947) operated by it where such action or proceeding is authorized by the statute or regulations under which such accommodations are administered, but no such action or proceeding shall be maintained prior to March 1, 1948, if in the opinion of the administering authority such action or proceeding would result in undue hardship for the occupants of such housing accommodations, or unless in the opinion of such authority other housing facilities are available for such occupants."

And the House agree to the same.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
HENRY O. TALLE,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOE MCCARTHY,
J. WM. FULBRIGHT,
JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1361) to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit loans, capital grants, or annual contributions for low-rent-housing and slum-clearance projects where construction costs exceed present cost limitations upon condition that local housing agencies pay the difference between cost limitations and the actual construction costs, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: The first section of the Senate bill added a new subsection (6) to section 15 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 providing in part that notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (5) or of any other section of such act the Authority is authorized to make capital grants, loans, or annual contributions for low-rent-housing or slum-clearance projects, in the full amount of any sums previously allocated, to any public housing agency, at the request of such agency, upon condition that such agency will pay, or cause to be paid, by the State or political subdivision, the difference between the cost limitations prescribed in subsection (5) and the actual cost of construction per family dwelling unit or per room during the period of building construction. The House amendment modified this provision so as to provide that the amount to be so paid, or caused to be paid, should be such proportion of the total development cost of the project as the amount of the average actual cost per family dwelling unit of the items covered by the applicable cost limitations prescribed in subsection (5) in excess thereof bears to such average actual cost; and a proviso was added to the effect that the amount of any such payment should be excluded from the base on which the maximum amount of any capital grants, loans, or annual contributions authorized by such act are calculated. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 2: This amendment added to the bill a section 2 which inserted at the end of the second sentence of section 2 (1) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 a proviso prohibiting the Federal Public Housing Authority and all officers and employees thereof, during the period from the time of taking effect of the proviso until February 29, 1948, (1) from initiating or maintaining any action or proceeding to recover possession of any housing accommodations administered by such Authority, if such action or proceeding is based upon the fact that the income of the occupants of such housing accommodations exceeds the allowable maximum, and (2) from in any manner requiring any State or local public housing agency to take any action to recover possession of any housing accommodations administered by such agency, if the basis for requiring the State or local public housing agency to take such action is the fact that the income of the occupants of such housing accommodations exceeds the allowable maximum, unless other adequate housing facilities are available for said occupants. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The committee of conference have agreed upon a substitute for the House section which provides that the United States or any State or local public agency assisted by Federal funds made available with respect to housing shall continue to have the right to maintain an action or proceeding to recover possession of any housing accommodations (except as provided in the proviso of sec. 209 (b) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947) operated by it where such action or proceeding is authorized by the statute or regulations under which such accommodations are administered, but no such action or proceeding shall be maintained prior to March 1, 1948, if in the opinion of the administering authority such action or proceeding would result in undue hardship for the occupants of such housing accommodations, or unless in the opinion of such authority other housing facilities are available for such occupants.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
HENRY O. TALLE,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the only matter in controversy before the conferees was the provision in respect to the eviction of tenants in public housing projects. The conference agreed to certain changes which amount to about the same thing as provided in the House bill except that there is some discretion on the part of the Administrator in respect to ousters.

At the present time there are many tenants of the public housing projects who are not eligible as tenants because their income is higher than that allowed by statute. During the war they were not evicting any of these families, of course.

Under the basic law the Administrator is compelled to evict tenants who become ineligible for occupancy because of an increase in income. This amendment is to somewhat soften those practices, but at the same time makes it possible for persons of low income who are intended to be tenants to eventually occupy the projects. For that reason, and notwithstanding the provisions of basic law, we have given the Administrator the authority to evict them unless he finds that there are no facilities for them and unless he finds that undue hardship would result from the ouster. In other words, we authorize the eviction but only when there are facilities to which the people may move.

Mr. Speaker, the report is signed by all the managers on the part of the House and I think it is a very sensible compromise between the Senate and House positions.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, the conference report is an improvement on the

bill as passed by the House and I hope it will be adopted unanimously.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. The discretion then rests with the local Housing Authority, the local administering authority, is that the fact?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; in substance that is correct.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN].

Mr. KEAN. This discretion continues until March 1, 1948, only?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. KEAN. It gives them 6 months.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, it seems this is entirely inconsistent with the whole philosophy of Government housing, which is to clean out slums and to protect and help the low-income group. The result is to ignore the basic philosophy, is it not?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I would not say it ignores the basic philosophy, because the tenants are paying an economic rent. These people of high income are not paying the low rent, they are paying an economic rent, but we have a condition here whereby during the war these people were literally frozen into these projects. We could not move them, because of lack of facilities, and we have not whipped the housing shortage yet. Now, we hope to do so by March 1 of next year, when we hope it will be perfectly safe for all of the high-income people to be moved from these projects to make room for the people of low income. That program will be gradually carried out so that there will not be too much of a shock or inconvenience to the individuals affected. Instead of ousting them all immediately, we provide for their eviction according to a well-defined program between now and March 1.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I will not take the 5 minutes. I think I may in a minute or two suggest what I believe is a very good step in getting some brick laid, so far as housing is concerned. It is furthermore a good step, because it is not a completely Federal controlled project. For the first time now in some of these slum clearing housing projects we are encouraging the municipalities to come in and provide funds, and I am very proud of the fact that the city of Milwaukee has taken the lead in itself providing funds to activate this slum clearance program. I believe a number of other cities that have projects of slum clearance similarly planned will follow suit. It is an excellent example of Federal, municipal, and local cooperation on a slum clearance project, and in that respect I think it is a concrete step forward in getting some housing now when housing is sorely needed in the larger cities.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I agree with the gentleman that it is necessary to clean up some of the slums in the cities. There is no more important place than right here in Washington. Is there anything in this bill that contemplates that it be done immediately before we get these houses built for veterans?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. No; there is nothing there that will interfere with the homes for veterans whatsoever. These are all projects that have been planned. Contracts have been let, and they have not been able to proceed because the law as it now stands does not permit them to go ahead on account of the ceiling fixed by the law. This conference bill permits the municipality to provide that excess amount that is necessary in view of the rising cost to proceed with the project.

Mr. RICH. At the time they think best, or are they to go at this immediately?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. At the time they think best, but of course, they all fill an important immediate need.

Mr. RICH. We grant the need, but they still have a place to live, whereas in the case of the ex-servicemen, they do not have any place, and they want to take care of them first and then go ahead with these slum clearances.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. There is no doubt about that; that the veterans are in great need of a housing program, and everything should be done to provide veteran housing now. This bill demonstrates the use of Federal and municipal help on levels where it should be done, in slum clearance and pertaining to low income groups.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman, in the final analysis, if this so-called housing shortage has not got to be solved by the desire on the part of the people to build homes for themselves?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. That is exactly right, and primarily by the desire and the activity of the people in their respective localities, and this bill points in that direction. It points toward the activity on the part of local communities and engages them where formerly they were not.

Mr. BARDEN. I do not have reference to local home ownership. I want the individual to own the house, and if we will get him to encourage that desire, then we will not be confronted by the kind of emergencies we had up for discussion the other day as the result of the housing outfit not selling these houses to established individuals.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. The gentleman has made an excellent suggestion, because it is the individual who must take the first step ordinarily, to build his own home, because we know of his great anxiety in that regard.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Is it not a fact that we find many veterans in these so-called slum clearance projects, and this measure will provide decent houses for veterans who are unfortunately living in slums today?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. That is exactly true. It will help those veterans likewise. The city of Milwaukee, Wis., has taken the lead in the Nation to activate this slum clearance program that will affect many cities throughout our country. Milwaukee takes this lead in housing as she has in so many other ways, in crime prevention, in safety, in the health and welfare of its citizens. The reason for this is because the people of Milwaukee have a strong spirit of independence of mind, initiative and sense of public responsibility. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROPHY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] and myself have supported this legislation. Officials of the city of Milwaukee like Assistant City Attorney John Decker have worked hard and earnestly to secure its passage. This legislation deserves the support of every Member of this House because it shows a healthy trend toward State and Federal cooperation in the clearance of slums from our urban centers. This is not a fantastic scheme. It is making it possible by the help of the municipalities to start excavating, laying foundation and brick and putting roofs over the heads of people who would otherwise be living in the hovels of urban slums.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOBLICK].

Mr. SCOBLICK. Mr. Speaker, the approval of the proposed amendment to the United States National Housing Act of 1937 is incumbent upon us, for it provides the means for additional housing in this Nation at a time when homes are most needed; when we have funds appropriated that are being tied up because of the increased costs of construction; when we have expended large sums for the beginning of housing projects, which remain dormant; when the solution of these problems can be met with the adoption of this amendment.

I urge the adoption of this amendment and base my decision on a situation of which I am personally informed. There are many housing projects which were sponsored under the United States National Housing Act of 1937 that are incompleted throughout the Nation. In the city of Scranton, Pa., which is located in my district, there was begun before World War II a project known as Valley View Terrace. This project was initiated under the Housing Act of 1937. Over $300,000 of Government funds have been invested in its construction; there remains appropriated and unexpended almost $700,000 of United States funds for its completion.

In the meantime, what was described at the passage of the act as a crisis in housing in the Nation has now increased to larger proportions.

The virtual suspension of repairs and building in home construction for the past 7 years has extended the housing

crisis to a highly acute and almost shameful situation. World War II veterans, who have returned from round the world, anticipating a normal life, with the necessities of life and a few luxuries available to them in this land of ours, have found themselves without independent shelters to set up housekeeping with the wives they left behind, or the sweethearts they came home to and married.

In the instance of Valley View Terrace at Scranton, there is partial construction of a development that will provide, when completed 240 homes. This, of course, will not solve the housing shortage in this area by any means, but it will indeed be of great help and reduce by 240 families, those who are seeking independent shelters.

The United States Government has a huge investment in Valley View Terrace as it has in many other similar projects. It is poor economy to let such invested funds rot on the ground; it is poor government that does not lead the way to relieve discomfort and inconveniences that have resolved upon its men and women who fought in defense of their country.

This amendment will pave the way for the completion of these projects, and without the appropriation of additional United States Government funds.

With building costs having risen higher and beyond original estimates, this amendment provides the respective housing authorities that have been set up for the construction and operation of these projects to take measures to finance any additional costs that have developed because of higher construction costs.

In the instance of Valley View Terrace, I am informed that the Scranton housing authority, once provision is made, is prepared to finance the costs that will accrue above and beyond the appropriated funds.

With authority, vested in them by this amendment, to provide the wherewithal for the completion of Valley View Terrace, I respectfully urge the Members of Congress to pass this amendment and take a long step in the solution of the housing problem in Scranton and throughout the Nation.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, if there are no further requests for time, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 317) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiry to be conducted by the Committee on Agriculture, or subcommittees thereof, as authorized by H. Res. 298, not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for the employment of attorneys, experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "$50,000" and insert "$25,000."

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, may I say that I have about 15 resolutions from the Committee on House Administration. They are all privileged; they are all unanimously reported, I think, and they all explain themselves.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

FASCISM IN ACTION

Mr. PATMAN. I am getting many inquiries about the publication of the booklet on Fascism in Action. May I ask the chairman of the committee if the committee expects to report out the resolution which would permit the printing of 100,000 additional copies for distribution by the Members? Under the present situation each Member will get only one copy. Naturally more requests than that will be received. In order to supply these requests, under the present situation the Members will be compelled to purchase these documents from the Government Printing Office, and I am advised they will cost 40 cents per copy. I am hopeful that the gentleman's committee will report out the resolution to allow a reasonable number, at least, to be printed for distribution by the Members of the House and Senate.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The Subcommittee on Printing took up the gentleman's resolution for the printing of 100,000 copies of Fascism in Action but had no estimate of the cost and took no action on that resolution at this time. The full committee will probably not be in session again during this session.

Mr. PATMAN. I have found out how much it would cost. It would cost $91.50 per thousand if printed when the Government Printing Office supply is printed.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. We have had enough hand-outs to Members of Congress, and we do not want any more books at 40 cents a copy to be given them for nothing. If the Members want more than their allotment, they ought to pay for them.

Mr. LECOMPTE. This resolution will be before the committee at the next session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the committee amendment and the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4002. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. OVERTON, and Mr. RUSSELL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3045. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe the processes and procedures for recording instruments of writing in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CAIN, Mr. FLANDERS, and Mr. MCGRATH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2659. An act to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance, and provide for the medical and scientific treatment of persons found to be alcoholics by the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BUCK, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4069. An act to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. GEORGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 303) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 141, Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $25,000, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, special counsel and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee and signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 259) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the investigations and surveys authorized by House Resolution 211, Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Public Works acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $30,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 331) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations, authorized by House Resolution 295, Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $125,000, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AID

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 332) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expense of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 296, Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Select Committee on Foreign Aid, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $125,000, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, this provides for the expenses of the select committee which was provided for in the resolution adopted by the House 2 days ago.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Is that the resolution known as the Herter resolution?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I think it is known as the Herter resolution.

Mr. SABATH. That will investigate conditions covered by the resolution that we just passed for the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The resolution with reference to the Committee on Foreign Affairs is entirely separate and apart from the so-called Herter resolution.

Mr. SABATH. I do not know whether any evidence has been given before your committees as to whether these two committees will not really overlap.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Their activities will not overlap, I am advised.

One committee is appointed to look into the political conditions in Europe and around the world perhaps, and the other committee will more likely direct its investigations to economic conditions.

Mr. SABATH. Has that committee already been appointed?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I think that the Speaker in his wisdom has not yet appointed that committee, but I am not advised as to that at the moment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the members of the committee have not yet been selected.

Mr. SABATH. I trust that the Speaker in his wisdom will appoint a committee that will not be lopsided and which will give the minority adequate representation. The resolution did not provide for that.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I have supreme confidence in the Speaker that he will see there is a fair distribution of the appointees and that able men and women are selected for that investigation.

Mr. SABATH. This cost $125,000?

Mr. LECOMPTE. And that is considerably less than the committee asked for.

Mr. SABATH. The other resolution called for $125,000.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Considerably less than they asked for.

Mr. SABATH. The three resolutions that we passed before called for $25,000, $30,000, and $50,000.

Mr. LECOMPTE. That is correct.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman has several other resolutions to provide for these committees?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I have.

Mr. SABATH. How much will all of these investigations that are provided for, that you are going to ask appropriations for, amount to? Can the gentleman give the House the figure?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I can give you all the figures. Do you want the figures for the whole session or just today?

Mr. SABATH. If the gentleman has those figures, I think it would be useful to the Members. Otherwise, overstatements and misstatements may be made. So that if we have the actual amounts that have been appropriated, I think it will serve the membership well to explain that it is not over two or three million, as some people have stated. I, myself, thought it would be under a million dollars.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It will be right at a million dollars.

Mr. SABATH. But I believe I was close to the figures even before these resolutions were reported. I think we will appreciate it if the gentleman will give the figures for the cost of all these investigations.

Mr. LECOMPTE. We have authorized investigations to the amount of $632,204.03 up to this morning. There are approximately $400,000 worth of authorizations or approvals in this morning's list of resolutions, which makes it around $1,000,000, but considerably less than the total amount of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. SABATH. But will the gentleman state that it will be over a million dollars?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Just a trifle over a millon dollars, but very little of that money is expended yet.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Is there anything in any of these investigations that will investigate the crookedness of this last election at Kansas City; to find out just exactly what is going on out there? They are trying to block every investigation. I think we ought to have something to let the American people know just how crooked that election was, and the American people deserve to know what it was.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The gentleman can offer a resolution.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. How many resolutions of inquiry emanated from the Committee on Foreign Affairs?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Only one.

Mr. CELLER. Was there one previous to the one the gentleman just spoke of?

Mr. LECOMPTE. No, sir; not for investigation.

Mr. CELLER. I wondered whether or not there are enough members of the Foreign Affairs Committee to conduct all these tours.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Well, one is for a select committee and one is for the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Of course, the Speaker will name the members of the select committee.

Mr. CELLER. Has the gentleman examined the history of the Reorganization Act and its purposes? Was not the Reorganization Act to discourage so many members on junkets, I might call them?

Mr. LECOMPTE. These resolutions have been approved by the House.

Mr. BURLESON. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. BURLESON. Is it not a fact that the committee was very conservative in its consideration of the requests of the various committees in perhaps approving only about 50 percent of those requests?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Only about 50 percent of the requests; the gentleman is correct on that.

Mr. BURLESON. I believe the gentleman will agree that it is hardly the prerogative and responsibility of the

Committee on House Administration to go behind the scenes of various committees and determine whether or not the investigations are necessary.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Emphatically so.

Mr. BURLESON. The Committee on House Administration cannot anticipate all of the actions of the investigating committee.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The House approved the resolution providing for the investigation and then requests come to this committee for the money to cover their expenses. Their request is scrutinized carefully and in many cases cut down 50 percent.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. As a Member of the House who is violently opposed to some of these foreign policies, I believe it is high time the Committee on Foreign Relations informed itself, and I believe this expenditure is one of the wisest that could be granted by the House.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING TARIFF ACT OF 1930

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 238, to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KNUTSON, REED of New York, WOODRUFF, COOPER, and MILLS.

TERMINATING CERTAIN TAX PROVISIONS BEFORE THE END OF WORLD WAR II

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4069) to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. KNUTSON, REED of New York, WOODRUFF, COOPER, and MILLS.

EXTENDING SECOND-CLASS MAIL PRIVILEGES TO CERTAIN STATE AGENCIES

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2857) to extend second-class mailing privileges to bulletins issued by State conservation and fish and game agencies or departments, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. REES, TWYMAN, and LYLE.

PROVIDING FOR EXPENSES OF CONDUCTING STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS AUTHORIZED BY RULE XI (1) (h) INCURRED BY THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 333) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations with respect to publicity and propaganda in the Government departments and agencies authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $10,000 additional, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee and signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR EXPENSES OF CONDUCTING STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS AUTHORIZED BY RULE XI (1) (h) INCURRED BY THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 334) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations with respect to the disposition of surplus property authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $15,000 additional, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE EXPENSES OF CONDUCTING STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 111

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 335) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 111, Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Education and Labor, acting as a whole or by subcommittee not to exceed $25,000 additional, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. This committee had $50,000 before and have expended that $50,000, is that correct?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Forty thousand dollars, not all expended.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Not all expended?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Now we are appropriating for them $25,000 more?

Mr. LECOMPTE. They have extensive investigations in mind and they also have a number of requests for investigation.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. For instance, I understand they are talking about a trip out to Hollywood, is that right?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I think the chairman of the Subcommittee on Accounts, and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Accounts, can justify this expenditure for the gentleman very easily.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think it ought to be justified to the Congress.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. I may say for the benefit of the House that this committee was granted $40,000 of which it has spent about $15,000, leaving about $25,000. We are going to be in recess for at least 5 months. Certain investigations have been asked by the public. The committee has made its plan and in order to follow out the program for the next 5 months and not run out of funds, the Committee on Accounts cut them from an original budget of $75,000 down to an additional $25,000, merely to carry on for the 5 months during adjournment of the Congress.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I want to point out one thing that I think is very significant. As I understand it, this committee is to go out to Hollywood and make an investigation along the same lines and of the same nature another committee of the House made. The Committee on Un-American Activities went out to investigate labor in Hollywood. The Committee on Un-American

Activities did practically the same thing and made investigations along the same line. Some of these investigations, in my opinion, do nothing more nor less than add fuel to the building up of scare headlines in order to develop hysteria against labor in this country.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the House has authorized these investigations. I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS TO RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURES FOR THE DISTRICT COURTS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 264 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That House Document Numbered 46, Eighticth Congress, first session, entitled "Amendments to Rules of Civil Procedure for the District Courts of the United States", and "Report of Proposed Amendments to Rules of Civil Procedure for the District Courts of the United States", prepared by the Advisory Committee on Rules of Civil Procedure, be printed in one volume with an index as a House document; and that five thousand additional copies shall be printed, of which three thousand copies shall be for the use of th House document room and two thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate document room.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the committee amendments and the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 207 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (h) (1), Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments acting as a whole, not to exceed $5,000, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee, signed by the chairman of the said committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out "$5,000" and insert "$1,500."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? May I have 5 minutes?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under the rules of the House, may I yield 5 minutes to a Member without losing control of the time, and yielding the floor?

The SPEAKER. If debate is desired?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Yes. I will not lose control of the bill?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may do that.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Under those circumstances, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, when the Reorganization bill came into effect, among the committees authorized by the law there was the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. That committee was supposed to be the over-all investigating committee. Some of the papers characterized it as the Blue Ribbon Investigating Committee. They said great things would come out of that committee. People had great expectations that that committee would really accomplish something worthwhile. To it the leadership assigned six members of the Rules Committee.

On the 3d day of January, I offered an amendment to the act which would have given every standing committee of the House $10,000, just the same as was granted to the committees of the Senate for general use and expenses. That was voted down, and we were told that our committee on expenditures would be given funds to make whatever investigations were necessary. When other committees asked for money to investigate various matters that I thought fell within the jurisdiction of that committee—and I am sure did rest within the jurisdiction of that committee—we made no objection; we let them go ahead. We were glad to get rid of part of the work, because we knew we would have more than we were able to do. Then there was created a Subcommittee To Investigate Surplus War Property. That committee was given, I think, $50,000. It was a continuation of the old Slaughter committee. The committee has done a remarkably efficient and worth-while job. As I read the report and review the testimony taken, it shows where they have saved, by preventing certain activities, several million dollars. There can be no question but that every cent spent by that committee was justified.

Then we had another subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS], a committee on propaganda that it was charged was illegal. That committee was given the modest sum of $26,000. One reading the reports of that committee is convinced, cannot help but be convinced, that so much of that money as was spent was spent judiciously. That committee did a remarkable job. A great saving will come from the activities of that committee, and it is barely possible that some in the Government service may find themselves behind the prison bars. I most respectfully ask the Members of the House to read the reports of that committee.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I would like to point out to the gentleman and to the House that of the $26,000 given to the committee of which I am chairman, less than $5,000 thus far has been spent in the two investigations we have made.

Mr. HOFFMAN. A most remarkable record; a most remarkable record. And the Members of the House, who know of the investigation and the activities of that committee, are confident that not one cent will be wasted, and that the Government will be saved many, many dollars because of the activities of that committee. Then there was another committee headed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], whose activities have not yet ceased. Every member of that committee has been and is on the job and so are the members of the staff. So, there were three committees. There was another committee which took the place of the old Smith committee investigating extra legal activities. That committee of which I happen to be chairman of the subcommittee was given, I think, $40 000 and, as the record shows, I think it has on hand at this time some $38,000.

That committee did a job on racketeering by so-called unions and union men who had seized and improperly used union organizations. If the Department of Justice does its duty, some racketeers and extortionists will land in Federal penitentiaries.

The committee to investigate the State Department, headed by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] was given $10,000, and only a small portion of that has been expended. That committee has been very cautious in spending the Government's money and to get a dollar's value for a dollar spent.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado, the chairman of that committee.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The subcommittee investigating the State Department has made use of a staff member and the facilities afforded by the committee, and not a penny of that $10,000 has been spent up to this moment. We have been able to do this work without spending any of this money.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman who is chairman of the subcommittee investigating the State Department now advises me that not one cent of the appropriation has been spent, that they have been using the committee staff. The report filed yesterday shows that the committee knows what is needed and has in no way failed to give worthwhile service.

Then we have the committee which investigated the Dock Street strike situa-

tion and that turned up cases showing violations of the law. We have been asking, besieging, begging, the Attorney General's department to prosecute and put behind the bars at least some of those offenders. So far we have gotten nowhere.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield three additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There are many, many requests for investigations coming in which do not fall within the jurisdiction of any of these subcommittees.

I never was a spender nor a waster, nor, so far as I know, is any member of our committee inclined to waste money.

Within the past 15 days there was a conference of Governors held at Salt Lake City, Utah. One of the subjects of the conference was to determine how to get the most out of funds which were appropriated jointly by the municipalities, the States, and the Federal Government to carry on work in which all were interested.

We were told that the Senate was sending a committee out to attend the conference. As chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I was asked to name a committee to attend the sessions of the convention, at which I am advised all but two of the Governors were present. And so a member of the committee and a secretary were sent to the governors' conference.

They returned with a full, complete, and instructive report, and the total expense to the committee was $39.96, plus $42.

The representatives of the committee hitchhiked rides on Government planes both ways. They charged for, and only for, their actual disbursements.

I cite this to show the Members of the House that our committee is not wasting Government funds; that it is performing its duty efficiently and economically. I cite it also as an illustration of what can be done, and done without great expense, if there is a real desire to serve the Federal Government.

A few weeks ago I asked for $5,000 to be granted to the full committee to carry on its investigations, because we did not have one red penny to carry on those investigations called for by individuals and organizations throughout the country on matters which the chairman of that committee thinks ought to be investigated, but which will not fall within the jurisdiction of any of the subcommittees.

Early in the history of these committees I refused to sign vouchers for money spent under the direction of subcommittee chairmen, because I did not and could not know anything about what they were spending it for. I reached the logical conclusion, at least, I thought it was logical, that if a chairman of a standing committee appointed a chairman of a subcommittee, he ought to have confidence enough in the subcommittee chairman to let him spend his money the way he wanted it spent, and to sign vouchers for the money spent.

The other day when I asked for $5,000 for the full committee, what did they do to me? They gave me $1,500.

So if, during the remaining 5 months of the year, the Members of the House or their constituents write me demanding investigations of something that should be investigated, just please remember that the full committee—the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments—the so-called blue-ribbon investigating committee of the House, the committee of the House which has on it six members of the great Rules Committee, has $1,500—count them, $1,500—to spend in conducting investigations.

The committee and its chairman will do their best, their utmost, to give you good service. But it will not get very far on the amount given it.

Please believe me when I say we will endeavor to be as careful of that precious $1,500 as would the most efficient miser. While we are spending it, if we do spend it, we will refrain from looking with envy at those committees traveling abroad, at the spenders of the billions which are to be sent abroad.

In a lighter vein, permit me now to say to you gentlemen of the House that if there are any of you who have not been on a junketing expedition somewhere, or if you have a staff member who has not been on a junketing expedition somewhere, just let me know—and I am extending the same invitation to the Members of the other body, join us and help us avoid wasting any part of the money given us. File your request with me, so that perhaps you can get in and help me during the next 5 months save part of that $1,500 which was so generously given our committee.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from Michigan that his committee has already had for the five subcommittees $196,000, and was permitted today $25,000 more.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. I might say that when the chairman of this committee says he will not be responsible for the vouchers of his subcommittees, he is the only committee chairman in the House that I know of that will not take that responsibility. The subcommittees of that committee have been granted over $190,000. The Committee on House Administration did not feel that any committee should just be given a blank check to do as they pleased with it. We gave them $1,500 so in case a necessity arose and some member of their staff had to take a trip throughout the country some day, they would have enough to pay his carfare.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I think that statement answers the charge of the gentleman from Michigan that this committee has not dealt fairly with the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS ADMINISTRATION OF THE WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4002) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ENGEL of Michigan, CASE of South Dakota, TIBBOTT, SCRIVNER, KERR, MAHON, and NORRELL.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 297) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the investigation and study to be conducted pursuant to House Resolution 293, by the Committee on Ways and Means, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $25,000, including expenditures for the employment of advisers, consultants, investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, may I say that the study of the tax question by the Ways and Means Committee is authorized by the House. The request for this small amount of funds was made jointly, I believe, by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota and the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman and ranking minority member of the great Committee on Ways and Means.

The Committee on House Administration felt that this money would be prudently expended.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to extend my thanks to the chairman of the Committee on House Administration for the many courtesies that he has extended to me and also to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SUNDSTROM], chairman of the subcommittee, who gave me an opportunity to appear before the committee, as well as to the other members of his committee for their graciousness. I appear before the House today with the thought in mind that a certain situation should be called to the attention of all the Members

before they cast their vote on this resolution. I want it understood at the outset that whatever I say should not be interpreted to reflect upon the character or reputation of any individual, but rather, that I am addressing my remarks to the principle involved and to certain practices to which I very seriously object.

I realize that whatever I say here will not prevent this resolution from being adopted or prevent $25,000 being made available to the Committee on Ways and Means for the purpose of defraying certain expenses. But I do think that the membership of the House should be aware of the fact that this resolution is merely an act of charity to bail out the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means for a mistake that he made in ignoring his committee and going out on his own speaking for the committee, yet without the authority of the committee, and appointing a so-called advisory committee made up of representatives of big business, Wall Street lawyers, and bankers, and others.

As I said before, I do not reflect upon their character, because if I were a professional man I, too, would be selling my services as they are doing. But the fact of the matter is that this committee is dominated by men who have appeared before our committee before and have expounded their views. Most of them have testified at the hearings recently held by our committee. So I see no good reason to have this so-called tax advisory committee using $25,000 of the taxpayers' money to defray their expenses. We have their testimony. They have also appeared before the committee in previous years. The truth of the matter is, as I said before, we are simply going to bail out the chairman for having made an error, which he admitted in the committee recently and apologized to the committee at the time he was looking for some money to defray the expenses of this special group.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Does the gentleman mean to say that the committee has evidence that these men have submitted in the past; they have held hearings and you have their views on record now?

Mr. FORAND. The hearings are full of their statements.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. In the old days when we had witnesses come down we paid them $6 a day and transportation. This resolution provides $25,000. Is that correct?

Mr. FORAND. That is correct. And the chairman made a statement to the press that these men would not receive salaries but their expenses would be defrayed.

This group has come to Washington on two occasions, and therefore the expenses for those two trips now stare the committee in the face.

I believe that with the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, the staff of experts on the committee, the staff of the Treasury, which is made available to us by the Secretary of the Treasury, we have all the experts we need, so that the committee itself can write a bill, with the help of its own experts, and without having any outsiders come in and tell us how to do it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] has expired.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 10 minutes?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania 5 minutes now, and if he needs more time I may yield him more time.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of House Resolution 297 is to provide the necessary funds for the activities of an illegitimate and handpicked committee of outsiders appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means without prior consultation with or approval of the Committee on Ways and Means. No other purpose was suggested by the chairman of the committee for offering this resolution. This so-called Special Tax Study Committee was first announced by the chairman in a press release on June 8, 1947.

This Tax Study Committee of lawyers and businessmen, with one representative from organized labor, held its first meeting in Washington in the Ways and Means Committee room in the Capitol on June 12, 1947. At that time Mr. KNUTSON announced that "meetings of the special study group will be called by the chairman at such times and places as he may determine. The members of the special study group will serve without compensation, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in attending meetings of the study group called by the chairman. The expenses so incurred will be paid out of funds appropriated for the purposes mentioned on vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means."

If I understand the foregoing statements of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, they authorize the chairman of the Special Tax Study Committee to call meetings wherever and whenever he may desire, with a blank check for all expenses incurred by the members in attending such meetings, and the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means promised to approve the vouchers for such expenses.

While this Tax Advisory Committee was meeting on June 12 the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] and I took the House floor to call attention to the fact that the Special Tax Study Committee had never even been discussed in a meeting of the Committee on Ways and Means. Indeed it was not until July 15, more than a month later, that the chairman first mentioned his Special Tax Study Committee in a meeting of the Committee on Ways and Means. At that time he announced the introduction of House Resolution 293 and House Resolution 297 and requested authorization from the Committee on Ways and Means to proceed to obtain their enactment.

There are several reasons for my opposition to giving any official status to this outside advisory group:

First. The committee already has the able assistance of the Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, Mr. Colin F. Stam, and his expert staff; the Office of Tax Legislative Counsel and Division of Tax Research of the Treasury Department; the technical and administrative people of the Bureau of Internal Revenue; and the staff of technical advisers recently added to assist the committee in accordance with the Legislative Reorganization Act of last year. No necessity has been shown for any outside tax-study group.

Second. The committee has been holding hearings for nearly 2 months on the subject of a comprehensive revision of the Internal Revenue Code. So every taxpayers' group represented among the membership of this committee has had an opportunity to come in and present their views on tax matters to the committee in open hearings.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. LECOMPTE. How much additional time does the gentleman want?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Three minutes.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from Iowa can yield him my time, too.

Mr. LECOMPTE. That will not be necessary.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for three additional minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Third. A comprehensive revision of the Internal Revenue Code is not a part-time job to be entrusted to professional and business men already heavily loaded with personal responsibilities. It is a matter for continuous and painstaking study and draftsmanship by our tried and trusted tax specialists, including Mr. Beaman of the House legislative counsel.

Fourth. If an advisory committee is to be appointed, it should not be stacked with Members whose views on tax matters are so openly one-sided. Mr. Roswell Magill, the chairman of the special tax-study committee; Mr. John W. Hanes, and Mr. J. Cheever Cowdin, all are known to be spokesmen for big business and special interests in tax matters.

The appointment of the Magill committee was headlined in the New York Journal of Commerce on June 10, 1947, as follows:

Magill appointment underscores trend toward sales taxes.

The Wall Street Journal commented:

The emphasis in Congress is shifting from tax relief to tax-law revision, meaning redistribution of the tax burden.

And further:

Republican ideas are mirrored in the naming of Roswell Magill to head a Ways and Means Committee tax-study group. Mr. Magill, former Under Secretary of the Treasury, has been chairman of the privately financed committee on postwar tax study. He supported GOP plans for a 20-percent tax cut across the board. His tax-study group recommends higher excises, and suggests the possibility of a 5-percent retail sales tax, along with other major revisions in the tax law that would immediately benefit stockholders, families with taxable incomes above the first surtax bracket, and businesses that encounter temporary financial hardships.

In conclusion, the Constitution vests the House of Representatives with exclusive power to originate revenue legislation. The House has delegated jurisdiction over tax measures to the Committee on Ways and Means. The people are entitled to the assurance that only their duly elected representatives, or properly selected professional employees of the Government, shall participate in the drafting of tax legislation. The taxing power so carefully restricted in the Constitution should not surreptitiously be delegated to, or subverted by, small groups representing their own selfish interests.

To bring men down from Wall Street to write the 1948 tax bill is in itself inexcusable. To pay the expenses of these men, some of whom come down in their own private airplane, is extravagant and wasteful, and an activity which an economy-minded House of Representatives ought not to sanction.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I shall not take the 5 minutes allotted me because I realize that the efforts of the opposition have proven a fizzle. I do want to say to the House, however, that the action of the chairman was ratified by a vote of 18 to 4 in the Ways and Means Committee and among those who voted to sustain the chairman was the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], former chairman, and a great chairman, of the Ways and Means Committee.

In appearing against the resolution before the House Administration Committee, the gentleman from Rhode Island started out with the usual balderdash about the Wall Street bankers. When he saw he was not getting anywhere with that attack he tried several other lines. I do not think I am divulging any confidences when I say that every member of the subcommittee voted to report this resolution out.

I have no desire to help the opponents of this resolution attain further political publicity.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I would like to stress this fact: The gentleman and I have been on the Ways and Means Committee for 15 years and this is the first time our committee has asked for a dime out of the Public Treasury.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; that is true. It is also the first time that some of the gentlemen have made the column of a certain columnist, a vehicle for personal aggrandizement. The information that the columnist was furnished by a member of our committee is greatly exaggerated and much of it is unfounded, but it made a pretty good story at that. I have never gone in for peanut stuff; I am too old in my services in the House to indulge in peanut politics now, and so far as I am concerned, the resolution may be acted upon at this time.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think it is important for the Members of this House to know that almost every single Member that has already been appointed to this Tax Study Committee was handpicked by the chairman without even his own Members knowing anything about it, except that he had consulted with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] who gave him the name of one man out of 11 who was put on this committee. So, you know the type of committee that you are voting to legitimatize today.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from Minnesota are in agreement on this.

Like other committees of this House, we have our fair share of publicity seekers and demagogs.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I regret to find myself in disagreement with my two colleagues the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], both of whom I know are able, diligent, and useful members of that committee. The purpose of the committee authorized by this resolution is not to reduce or to raise or to increase or lower taxes. It is a study for revision and a simplification of our present tax laws. That is the work the committee has in hand now, and it has been working on it for some time, and it is work that this special advisory committee was to advise the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to.

Now, this advisory group will not sit in with the Committee on Ways and Means. The Committee on Ways and Means writes tax legislation in executive session, based on such information and facts as it is able to gather, with the help of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and the Treasury staff. Witnesses appear before it.

I do not believe politics should be mixed up with tax matters. I never did believe that, and while I was chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means I will say that the minority members of that committee, with very slight exception, if any, went along with the majority members. We proposed many tax measures during the war. We wrote, perhaps, more tax laws, and proposed heavier taxes, than ever in the history of the country, and we worked along without any division of political lines.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FORAND. I am sure the gentleman will agree that he consulted with every member of the committee. The committee was advised what he planned to do, and that he did nothing without consulting the committee, and for that reason he had the support and he still has the support and the respect of the Members, because he deserves it.

Mr. DOUGHTON. While I am not familiar with all the personnel of this committee, from what I know of them by reputation, they are outstanding in their qualifications to advise the committee with respect to the revision of our tax laws. Dr. Magill was Under Secretary of the Treasury, selected by President Roosevelt, and I suppose approved by Secretary Morgenthau, for a year and 7½ months. He was adviser to our committee. I never heard a suggestion that he was partisan or that he was a Wall Street banker or anything of that kind. We all had confidence in him. He was able, and he was very helpful to us in his work. John Hanes, another member of this advisory committee, who during the Roosevelt administration was appointed I suppose with the approval of Secretary Morgenthau, as Assistant Secretary, and served in that capacity about 4 months, and then when Dr. Magill resigned he was promoted to Under Secretary and served as Under Secretary for a year and 2 months. I have never heard any criticism as far as his being partisan. He was able, he was outstanding. Another member of that committee was the present Governor of Kansas, Frank Carlson, who served as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means for a number of years. He is able, he is nonpartisan as far as a man can be; fair minded in every respect. So far as I know the members of this committee are able and outstanding businessmen. The question of revision of our present tax laws is a job that we have been unable to do for a long time. Due to the press of work of our committee during the war we never had time to get to it. Now the Committee on Ways and Means is going to undertake this study under the direction of its able chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota. He says, and I have no reason to believe otherwise, that the work will be carried on in a nonpartisan way. The minority members will be consulted as well as the majority members. I am hopeful they will make a thorough study to assist the committee in simplifying our present tax laws so the ordinary taxpayer will not have to go to an expert accountant or lawyer and pay a big fee to get his tax returns made out. I think that with the help of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, the staff of the Treasury, and this advisory committee that has been appointed, we can do a good job in revising our present tax laws.

I am sorry that I find myself compelled to disagree with my colleagues. The chairman perhaps was a little premature when he first named the committee, but after his work was approved by the committee, as he has stated, by a vote of 18 to 4, I feel that the resolution should be adopted for the good of our committee and the work that we may be able to do for the Congress.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST].

Mr. WEST. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago the gentleman from Pennsylvania stated that as far as he knew the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means had not consulted with anyone with the possible exception of our minority leader, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]. For the information of the House, may I say

that the chairman came to me when he was considering appointing Wright Mathews, of Texas, and asked me if I knew him. I told him yes, I had the pleasure of knowing him, and I thought he was one of the most capable and one of the most outstanding tax lawyers in the United States. He was Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue, appointed by President Roosevelt's administration, and rendered very efficient service in that position. It is true he is not a Wall Street banker, but I can assure the House that there is not a finer or more capable and honest man in the country than Wright Mathews. He will be an honor to the committee.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEST. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am delighted the gentleman has given the House this information. This is the first intimation I have had that any other person was consulted with the exception of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]. I know the majority members of the committee were not consulted before these selections were made, so the gentleman was getting special attention at the time the chairman of the committee consulted him.

Mr. WEST. You are getting an especially good man on the committee in Wright Mathews.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I agree with the gentleman. I assume Mr. Mathews is a fine expert.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEST. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. May I say that of the committee of 11 that was appointed 6 are Democrats, 1 from Virginia, and my distinguished colleague can testify to his character and ability.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEST. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Lane, of Virginia, was appointed to this committee, as I understand. I have known Mr. Lane practically all of his life. He does not come from my district, but he is a Virginian. Mr. Lane came up the hard way. He worked himself up in the plant of which he now is the head. I think he is well qualified to pass on tax matters. He is a man who may be very helpful in the committee that has been appointed.

I also happen to know two other gentlemen of this committee, one being the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. Hanes. It has also been my privilege to know the former member of the committee who is now Governor of the State of Kansas, Mr. Frank Carlson. I compliment the gentleman on the type of men he has selected for this committee.

Mr. WEST. I join in that commendation.

May I say in conclusion that I think there is no finer character to be found anywhere than Wright Mathews.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMPLOYEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 336), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective July 1, 1947, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, additional compensation per annum, payable monthly, to certain employees of the House, so long as the positions are held by the present incumbents, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

To the disbursing clerk the sum of $1,000 basic.

OFFICE OF THE DOORKEEPER

To the superintendent of the document room the sum of $1,000 basic.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. May I inquire as to the status of House Concurrent Resolution 31 which was favorably reported by the gentleman's committee on April 24?

Mr. LECOMPTE. We have a number of resolutions that we have not been able to get to yet. The gentleman's resolution is among them, and if we can get to it, it will be called up.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I just wanted to be assured that the gentleman is going to call up the resolution sometime. I have spoken to the majority leader, and he seems to be agreeable.

Mr. LECOMPTE. There are a good many resolutions that we have not been able to get to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION—CONTESTED ELECTIONS

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 337) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That notwithstanding any adjournment or recess of the Eightieth Congress, testimony and papers received by the Clerk of the House in any contested-election case shall be transmitted by the Clerk to the Speaker for reference to the Committee on House Administration in the same manner as though such adjournment or recess had not occurred: *Provided*, That any such testimony and papers referred by the Speaker shall be printed as House documents of the next succeeding session of the Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION—CONTESTED-ELECTION CASES

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 338) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That notwithstanding any adjournments or recesses of the first session of the Eightieth Congress, the Committee on House Administration is authorized to continue its investigations in the contested-election cases of Mankin against Davis, Lowe against Davis, and Wilson against Granger. For the purpose of making such investigations the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION—CONTESTED-ELECTION CASES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution resolution (H. Res. 339) to implement the resolution just passed and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the investigations to be conducted pursuant to House Resolution 338, by the Committee on House Administration, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $5,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee, or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARINE CORPS MEMORIAL, GRANT PARK, CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 112 to establish a commission to formulate plans for the erection, in Grant Park, Chicago, Ill., of a Marine Corps memorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established a commission, to be known as the Marine Corps Memorial Commission, and to be composed of three Commissioners to be appointed by the President of the United States. The Commission shall consider and formulate plans for the erection upon a suitable site in Grant Park, in the city of Chicago, Ill., of an appropriate memorial to the members of the United States Marine Corps who have given their lives in the service of their country.

SEC. 2. The Commission may accept from any source, public or private, money or other property for use in carrying out its functions under this joint resolution; and is authorized to cooperate with interested public and private organizations in carrying out such functions.

SEC. 3. Upon the request of the Commission, the heads of the Federal departments or agencies may designate such personnel of their respective departments or agencies, or of the Marine Corps, as the case may be, as may be necessary to assist in carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution.

SEC. 4. Members of the Commission shall serve without compensation except that their actual expenses in connection with the work of the Commission may be paid from any funds available for the purposes of this joint resolution, or acquired by other means herein authorized.

SEC. 5. The members of the Commission shall select one of their number as chairman and another as secretary.

SEC. 6. The Commission shall report its recommendations to Congress at the earliest practicable date.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a manscript entitled "New Zealand Social Security Plan," notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the two-page limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $337.25.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CONTESTED ELECTION—FREDERICK M. ROBERTS AGAINST HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on House Administration, and ordered printed:

JULY 25, 1947.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: On December 4, 1946, Frederick M. Roberts served notice on HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, returned Member from the Fourteenth Congressional District of the State of California, of his purpose to contest the election of the said DOUGLAS and filed a copy of said notice in this office. Now comes the sitting Member, HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, and in a communication filed with me July 24, 1947, moves to dismiss the contest, setting forth the reasons therefor.

For the information of the House, the Clerk deems it proper to state that no testimony on behalf of either party has been filed in his office as required and in the manner prescribed by law, and it would therefore appear that the contest had abated.

The notice of contest of Mr. Roberts and the motion to dismiss of the returned Member, together with a copy of the letter of her attorney, are submitted herewith for the consideration of the appropriate committee.

Respectfully,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Resolution 340.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That House Resolution 36, Eightieth Congress, authorizing the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to continue certain investigations, is hereby amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following: The committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings as it deems necessary.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING PUBLIC LAW 27, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 245, amending Public Law 27, Eightieth Congress.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 2 of Public Law 27, Eightieth Congress, approved March 31, 1947, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. The authority granted by this resolution shall remain in force only until April 1, 1948: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to authorize the Commandant, United States Coast Guard, to grant waivers for the employment of alien seamen except for those who served between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, aboard vessels operated by the War Shipping Administration, the United States Maritime Commission, or the Army Transport Service."

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM L. CUNLIFFE

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of H. R. 4177, for the relief of William L. Cunliffe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 12 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, William L. Cunliffe, of Montreal, Canada, who is of English descent, father of Bruce Ferguson Cunliffe, a citizen of the United States, shall be deemed to have been born in Canada rather than in India, where his parents were residing at the time the said William L. Cunliffe was born.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING IMMIGRATION ACT, 1917

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill S. 1463, an act to amend section 12 of the Immigration Act of 1917.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 12 of the act entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to, and the residence of aliens in, the United States," approved February 5, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 882; U. S. C., title 8, sec. 148), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 12. That upon the arrival of any alien, United States citizen, or national, by water at any port within the United States on the North American Continent from a foreign port or port of Guam, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, or other insular possession of the United States, or at any port of the said insular possessions from any foreign port, from a port in the United States on the North American Continent, or from a port of another insular possession of the United States, it shall be the duty of the master or commanding officer, owners, or consignees of the steamer, sailing, or other vessel, having said alien, United States citizen, or national on board to deliver to the immigration officers at the port of arrival typewritten or printed lists or manifests made at the time and place of embarkation of such alien, United States citizen, or national on board such steamer or vessel, and such lists or manifests shall be in such form and contain such information as the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, with the approval of the Attorney General, shall by regulation prescribe as necessary for the identification of the persons transported and for the enforcement of the immigration laws. That it shall further be the duty of the master or commanding officer of every vessel taking passengers from any port of the United States on the North American Continent to a foreign port or a port of Guam, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, or other insular possession of the United States, or from any port of the said insular possessions to any foreign port, to a port of the United States on the North American Continent, or to a port of another insular possession of the United States to file with the immigration officials before departure a list of all aliens, United States citizens, or nationals, taken on board, said list to be in such form and to contain such information as the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, with the approval of the Attorney General, shall by regulation prescribe as necessary for the identification of the persons transported and for the enforcement of the immigration laws. No master or commanding officer of any such vessel shall be granted clearance papers for his vessel until he has deposited such list or lists with the immigration officials at the port of departure and made oath that they are full and complete as to the information required to be contained therein. Any neglect or omission to comply with the requirements of this section shall be punishable as provided in section 14 of this act: *Provided*, That in the case of vessels making regular trips to ports of the United States the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, with the approval of the Attorney General, may, when expedient, arrange for the delivery of lists of outgoing aliens, United States citizens, or nationals at a later date: *Provided further*, That it shall be the duty of immigration officials to record the following information regarding every resident alien and citizen or national leaving the United States by way of the Canadian or Mexican borders for permanent residence in a foreign country: Name, age, and sex; whether married or single; calling or occupation, whether able to read or write; nationality; country of birth; country of which citizen or subject; race; last permanent residence in the United States; intended future permanent residence; and time and port of last arrival in the

United States; and if a United States citizen, or national, the facts on which claim to that status is based."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING NATIONAL LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940 AS AMENDED

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4160) to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (n) of section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, is amended, effective October 8, 1940, to read as follows:

"SEC. 602. (n) Upon application by the insured and under such regulations as the Administrator may promulgate, payment of premiums on such insurance may be waived during the continuous total disability of the insured, which continues or has continued for 6 or more consecutive months, if such disability commenced (1) subsequent to the date of his application for insurance, (2) while the insurance was in force under premium-paying conditions, and (3) prior to the insured's sixtieth birthday: *Provided*, That upon application made within 1 year after the date of this enactment the Administrator shall grant waiver of any premium becoming due on or after October 8, 1940, and prior to the date of this enactment which may be waived under the foregoing provisions of this subsection: *Provided further*, That the Administrator, upon any application made subsequent to 1 year after the date of this enactment, shall not grant waiver of any premium becoming due more than 1 year prior to the receipt in the Veterans' Administration of application for the same, except as hereinafter provided. Any premiums paid for months during which waiver is effective shall be applied to payment of premiums subsequently becoming due on such insurance unless the insured requests a refund thereof. The Administrator shall provide by regulations for examination or reexamination of an insured claiming benefits under this subsection, and may deny benefits for failure to cooperate. In the event that it is found that an insured is no longer totally disabled, the waiver of premiums shall cease as of the date of such finding and the policy of insurance may be continued by payment of premiums as provided in said policy: *Provided further*, That in any case in which the Administrator finds that the insured's failure to make timely application for waiver of premiums or his failure to submit satisfactory evidence of the existence or continuance of total disability was due to circumstances beyond his control, the Administrator may grant waiver or continuance of waiver or premiums: *Provided further*, That in the event of death of the insured without filing application for waiver, the beneficiary, within 1 year after the death of the insured or of this enactment, whichever be the later, or, if the beneficiary be insane or a minor, within 1 year after removal of such legal disability, may file application for waiver with evidence of the insured's right to waiver under this section. Such application filed by the beneficiary shall have the same effect as if filed by the insured. In any case in which premiums are not waived under this subsection solely because the insured died prior to the continuance of total disability for 6 months, and proof of such facts, satisfactory to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, is filed by the beneficiary with the Veterans' Administration within 1 year after this enactment, or 1 year after the insured's death, whichever is the later date, his insurance shall be deemed to be in force at the date of his death: *And provided further*, That if the beneficiary be insane or a minor, proof of such facts may be filed within 1 year after removal of such legal disability. Premium rates shall be calculated without charge for the cost of the waiver of premiums herein provided and no deduction from benefits otherwise payable shall be made on account thereof."

SEC. 2. Subsection (r) of section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 3, line 6, strike out "or" and insert "of."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALE OF PAXON FIELD, DUVAL COUNTY, FLA.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1532) relating to the sale of Paxon Field, Duval County, Fla.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 or of any other law, the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to sell all that tract or parcel of land described as part of the northwest quarter and the north half southwest quarter section 8, township 2 south, range 26 east, Duval County, Fla., described as follows:

Beginning at an iron stake six hundred and seventy-two feet east of the northwest corner of section 8 and on the north line of said section; thence east one thousand three hundred and twenty-four and seven-tenths feet to an iron; thence south no degrees fifty minutes east three hundred and thirty feet to an iron; thence east six hundred and thirty feet to an iron, set in concrete on the west side of Melson Avenue; thence south no degrees fifty minutes east along west side of said avenue one thousand nine hundred and eighty-five and two-tenths feet to an iron; thence west six hundred and thirty feet to an iron; thence south no degrees fifty minutes east three hundred feet to an iron on the north line of Louisa Street; thence west one thousand three hundred and sixty-one and one-tenth feet to an iron; thence north two thousand six hundred and sixteen and two-tenths feet to place of beginning, containing one hundred and nine and thirty-eight one-hundredths acres, more or less; also

Beginning at an iron, six hundred and seventy-two feet east and two thousand six hundred and seventy-six and two-tenths feet south of the northwest corner of section 8; thence east one thousand nine hundred and ninety-two and two-tenths feet to a concrete monument on the west side of Melson Avenue; thence south zero degrees fifty minutes east along the west side of said avenue one thousand three hundred feet to an iron; thence west one thousand four hundred and eleven and three-tenths feet to an iron; thence north fifty feet to an iron; thence west six hundred feet to an iron; thence north one thousand two hundred and fifty feet to place of beginning, containing fifty-nine and eight-tenths acres, more or less, and being the same land as shown as tracts 1 and 2 on plat recorded in plat book 13, page 82, public records of said county, and containing one hundred and sixty-nine and eighteen one-hundredths acres, more or less; also

Part of south half southeast quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter, section 8, township 2 south, range 26 east, Duval County, Fla., bounded and described as follows: Beginning at a stone monument at the northwest corner of section 8, township 2 south, range 26 east; thence along west line of said section 8, south one degree sixteen minutes east two thousand six hundred and forty-six and four-tenths feet to a point; thence east one thousand nine hundred and seventy-four and three-tenths feet to a point; thence north zero degrees fifty minutes west thirty feet to an iron stake in the north line of Louisa Street for a place of beginning of lands to be described; from said place of beginning run east along the north line of Louisa Street six hundred and thirty feet to an iron stake in the west line of Melson Avenue; thence along the west line of Melson Avenue north zero degrees fifty minutes west three hundred feet to an iron stake; thence west six hundred and thirty feet to an iron stake; thence south zero degrees fifty minutes east three hundred feet to place of beginning.

Recorded in deed book 700, at page 497, of the current public records of Duval County, Fla., containing 180 acres of land, more or less, together with all buildings, structures, and improvements thereon (known as Paxon Field), in the manner and subject to the terms and conditions provided in the act entitled "An act to authorize the sale of Federal buildings," approved August 26, 1935 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 40, sec. 345b).

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider and a similar House bill (H. R. 3988) were laid on the table.

OFFICE OF THE RECORDER OF DEEDS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3045) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe the processes and procedures for recording instruments of writing in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ALLEN of California, McMAHON, and ABERNETHY.

REHABILITATION OF ALCOHOLICS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2659) to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance, and provide for the medical and scientific treatment of persons found to be alcoholics by the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with

Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ALLEN of California, MILLER of Nebraska, and DEANE.

RELIEF OF ACCOUNTABLE OFFICERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1350) to authorize relief of accountable officers of the Government, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the General Accounting Office is authorized, after consideration of the pertinent findings and if in concurrence with the determinations and recommendations of the head of the department or independent establishment concerned, to relieve any disbursing or other accountable officer or agent or former disbursing or other accountable officer or agent of any such department or independent establishment of the Government charged with responsibility on account of physical loss or deficiency for any reason whatsoever of Government funds, vouchers, records, checks, securities, or papers in his charge, if the head of the department or independent establishment determines (1) that such loss or deficiency occurred while such officer or agent was acting in the discharge of his official duties, or that such loss or deficiency occurred by reason of the act or omission of a subordinate of such officer or agent; and (2) that such loss or deficiency occurred without fault or negligence on the part of such officer or agent. This act shall be applicable only to the actual physical loss or deficiency of Government funds, vouchers, records, checks, securities, or papers, and shall not include deficiencies in the accounts of such officers or agents resulting from illegal or erroneous payments.

SEC. 2. The paragraph of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1919, relating to relief of disbursing officers of the Navy (41 Stat. 132; U. S. C., title 31, sec. 105), and the act entitled "An act to authorize relief of disbursing officers of the Army on account of loss or deficiency of Government funds, vouchers, records, or papers in their charge," approved December 13, 1944 (58 Stat. 800; U. S. C., title 31, sec. 95a), is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "for any reason whatsoever."

And on page 2, strike out section 2 and insert:

"SEC. 2. This act shall not operate to repeal the provisions of the paragraph of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1919, relating to relief of disbursing officers of the Navy (41 Stat. 132; U. S. C., title 31, sec. 105), and the act entitled 'An act to authorize relief of disbursing officers of the Army on account of loss or deficiency of Government funds, vouchers, records, or papers in their charge,' approved December 13, 1944 (58 Stat. 800; U. S. C., title 31, sec. 95a)."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Will the gentleman give us a brief explanation of the bill as amended?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I shall be glad to do so.

When this bill was considered by the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, a subcommittee of three members was appointed to make a study and report. This committee consisted of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JENKINS], and myself.

This is a Senate bill. I understand it was introduced at the request of the Treasury Department.

This bill originally authorized relief for the Chief Disbursing Officer of the Treasury Department and others in the Department who were short in their accounts through no fault or negligence of their own. In the Senate it was amended to cover any disbursing officer in any department of the Government, including the Army and the Navy. When our committee took up this bill the Army and Navy objected to being included in this legislation, as both departments now have laws under which their disbursing officers are relieved from financial liability for losses which occur without negligence on their part. The General Accounting Office prefers to have all branches of the Government, including the Army and Navy, covered by one law. The committee decided, that because of the lack of time, no general bill could be agreed upon and considered at this session of Congress. We therefore recommended an amendment eliminating the Army and Navy from the provisions of this measure. The bill specifically provides that the laws relating to the relief of disbursing officers of the Army and Navy shall not be repealed.

At the present time, disbursing officers in other than the Army and Navy departments, can only be relieved of responsibility by the passage of a private bill by Congress, or by the filing of a suit by the officer or agent in the Court of Claims. This bill provides for the granting of administrative relief in these cases, and applies only where the loss or deficiency occurred without fault or negligence on the part of the officer involved. The bill does not cover shortages or deficiencies resulting from illegal or erroneous payments.

This bill will take care of the situation until further time can be had to study this entire question. The Treasury Department is very anxious to have this bill passed at this session. The General Accounting Office has agreed to the bill in its present form. All departments are included except the Army and Navy. I may say to the gentleman from Tennessee it is contemplated that a thorough study will be made of the entire situation in the next few months by the General Accounting Office, in conjunction with the proper Army and Navy officers in the hope a bill can be introduced early in the next session which will be general in character, and which will include all departments, including the Army and Navy. This bill is necessary at this time in order to provide the relief sought by the Treasury Department, as well as other Government agencies, for their disbursing officers and agents who are short in their accounts through no fault or negligence of their own.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNAUTHORIZED USE OF THE OFFICIAL SEAL, EMBLEM, AND NAME OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4186) to prohibit and punish the unauthorized use of the official seal, emblem, and name of the United Nations, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this bill and the necessity for it?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we are the host nation to the United Nations it is important that we protect the use of their seal and name against unauthorized commercial exploitation. By resolution of the United Nations General Assembly the member nations were requested to afford this protection, and as the nation in which the United Nations headquarters is located this is especially applicable to us. The bill protects valid trade-marks or copyrights which have been obtained using the name "United Nations," but does not permit renewals. Other users of the name or insignia before the United Nations Charter came into effect have a year in which to bring themselves into conformity with this bill when enacted into law. Trade-marks using the name have been registered for such things as women's apparel, textiles, and paper stationery. All other commercial exploitation of the emblem, name, or seal of the United Nations, aside from what I have specified, without permission of the Secretary-General of the United Nations is prohibited by this bill.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Will the gentleman tell us what the penalties are as contained in the bill?

Mr. JAVITS. The penalty is as for a misdemeanor against any individual corporation, partnership, and so forth who use the United Nations name, emblem, or seal commercially without permission of the United Nations itself or as permitted by this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "United Nations Official Seal, Emblem, and Name Act, 1947."

SEC. 2. As used in this act—

(a) The term "person" means any individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, public entity, public or private institution, group, or other entity, other than the United Nations.

(b) The term "United Nations" means the international organization established under that name by the Charter of the United Nations; and

(c) The "emblem or the official seal of the United Nations" may be described as follows: "A map of the world representing an azimuthal equidistant projection centered on the North Pole, inscribed in a wreath consisting of crossed conventionalized branches of the olive tree; in gold on a field of smoke-blue with all water areas in white. The projection of the map extends to 60 degrees south latitude, and includes five concentric circles."

SEC. 3. It shall be unlawful, without the authorization of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, for any person to use, whether as a trade-mark, commercial label, or portion thereof, or as an advertisement or insignia for any business or organization or for any trade, commercial, or charitable purpose, within the jurisdiction of the United States of America, the name or the abbreviation thereof through the use of its initial letters, the emblem, or the official seal of the United Nations, or any simulation thereof: *Provided*, That any person who, or whose assignor, actually used the name or the abbreviation thereof through the use of its initial letters, the emblem, or the official seal of the United Nations, or any simulation thereof may continue such use for the same purpose for a period not to exceed 1 year from the date of enactment of this act or for the period remaining, on the date of the enactment of this act, under a valid and subsisting trade-mark or copyright, which, however, shall not be subject to renewal: *Provided further*, That no such use shall be made with the fraudulent purpose of inducing the belief that it is sponsored by or in any way officially connected with the United Nations.

SEC. 4. Any person who willfully violates or attempts to violate any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be liable to a fine not exceeding $500 or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 1 year, or both, for each and every offense.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "political entity."

Page 1, line 8, after the word "group", insert "the United States, including any State of the United States, any political subdivision of such government, and any legal successor, representative, agency, or agency of the foregoing."

Page 3, line 2, after the word "thereof", insert "before October 24, 1945."

Page 3, line 12, strike out "person" and insert "individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, public or private institution, groups, and any legal successor, representative, agent or agency of the foregoing."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2173) to amend section 7 of the act entiled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the Government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ALLEN of California, MILLER of Nebraska, and DEANE.

UNIFORM SYSTEM OF BANKRUPTCY THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4326) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know what the bill is.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this bill merely extends until March 1, 1948, the right of a farmer debtor to file a petition in bankruptcy under the Frazier-Lemke Act.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I believe the Subcommittee on Bankruptcy in Railroad Reorganization has also favorably reported a bill to study and to revise the Frazier-Lemke Act. This merely extends the operation of the act until March when we will have an opportunity of revising and rewriting basic legislation; is that correct?

Mr. REED of Illinois. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 75 (c) (U. S. C., title 11, sec. 203) of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, be and is amended to read as follows:

"(c) At any time prior to March 1, 1948, a petition may be filed by any farmer in the district court of the district in which he resides, stating that such farmer is insolvent or unable to meet his debts as they mature and that it is desirable to effect a composition or an extension of time to pay his debts. The petition or answer of the farmer shall be accompanied by his schedules. If any such petition is filed, an order of adjudication shall not be entered except as provided hereinafter in this section."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HENDRICKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

GETTYSBURG NATIONAL PARK, PA.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3645) relating to the exchange of certain private and Federal properties within Gettysburg National Military Park, Pa., and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what the bill does?

Mr. GROSS. There has been some disagreement there. The local cemetery, privately owned, adjoins the national cemetery, and it is simply straightening the line. The Department of the Interior recommends that this be done; the Bureau of the Budget also advises it. The Park Service will get 4 acres of land for which they will give an acre and a quarter to the local cemetery. It is like straightening a fence line between the two cemeteries.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of consolidating Federal holdings of land within Gettysburg National Military Park, Pa., the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to accept, on behalf of the United States, approximately 4 acres of non-Federal land within the park boundaries, such land to be conveyed to the United States without cost by the Evergreen Cemetery Association, of Gettysburg. Upon acceptance of title thereto by the United States, such property shall be subject to all laws and regulations applicable to the park. In exchange for the conveyance to the United States of the aforesaid property, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey to the Evergreen Cemetery Association approximately 1¼ acres of federally owned land within the park, such property constituting a right-of-way through the Evergreen Cemetery property: *Provided*, That the aforesaid exchange shall be consummated only upon condition that the Secretary is satisfied that such exchange is in the public interest and that the properties to be exchanged are of approximately equal value.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR ALASKA

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 174, an act to amend section 26, title I, chapter 1, of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for

Alaska, and for other purposes," with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, line 15, strike out all after "section." down to and including line 20 and insert "Any rights or privileges acquired hereunder with respect to mining operations in land, title to which is transferred to a future State upon its admission to the Union and which is situated within its boundaries, shall be terminable by such State, and the said mining operations shall be subject to the laws of such State."

Page 3, after line 20, insert:

"SEC. 2. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to affect or impair any valid claims, rights, or privileges, including possessory claims under the first proviso of section 8 of the act of May 17, 1884 (23 Stat. 26), arising under any other provision of law."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA HEDWIG FERESZ

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 1650) for the relief of Maria Hedwig Feresz.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this bill?

Mr. CLASON. This bill came out of the Committee on the Judiciary, and after investigation by the Department of Justice it was disclosed that this woman had been in this country since 1939. They said the record showed that she was worthy of remaining in this country. She asks for permission to remain.

Mr. KEFAUVER. As I recall, it was with unanimous consent from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CLASON. I understood that it was.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien Maria Hedwig Feresz, of Hadley, Mass., a Polish national who entered the United States in 1939 for a temporary stay, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of January 1, 1939.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after the period, insert: "Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Polish quota for the first year that the same Polish quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 14 OF VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT OF JUNE 27, 1944

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1494) to amend section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 37).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, this bill is identical with House bill 966 that passed the House on June 19. It is an amendment to the Veterans' Preference Act. The Senate has passed its own bill. In order for this measure to become law it is necessary that either one or the other be adopted. That is the reason I am calling it to the attention of the House today.

Mr. RICH. Has your full committee considered it?

Mr. REES. It has the unanimous approval of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. RICH. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first proviso of section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 387) is hereby amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That such preference eligible shall have the right to make a personal appearance, or an appearance through a designated representative, in accordance with such reasonable rules and regulations as may be issued by the Civil Service Commission; after investigation and consideration of the evidence submitted, the Civil Service Commission shall submit its findings and recommendations to the proper administrative officer and shall send copies of the same to the appellant or to his designated representative, and it shall be mandatory for such administrative officer to take such corrective action as the Commission finally recommends."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three newspaper articles.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle.

CHEROKEE INDIAN RESERVATION, N. C.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 794) to authorize the sale of a small tract of land on the Cherokee Indian Reservation, N. C.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. D'EWART. This bill, which has been cleared by the majority leader and the minority leader, proposes to lease 2 acres on the Cherokee Indian Reservation to the Methodist Church for the purpose of building a church on that reservation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That with the consent of the authorized tribal authorities of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to issue a license to the Methodist Church to use from two to four acres of tribal land on the Cherokee Indian Reservation, N. C., for so long a time as such land may be used for church purposes, including the construction of a church building and a parsonage. The license shall be issued by the Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative upon such terms and conditions as may be mutually agreeable to the parties, and may be revoked only if and when the land ceases to be used for the purposes for which said license is issued.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WEED KILLER

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Resolution 276.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas use of the preparation known as "2,4-D" has been widely recommended as an economical method of killing weeds; and

Whereas, on the basis of such recommendations, rice farmers have applied 2,4-D to their fields; and

Whereas it has been demonstrated that the 2,4-D dust has caused extensive damage to cotton crops located at considerable distances from the fields which were so dusted; and

Whereas there are reports that such dust has also damaged potatoes, soybeans, and other crops; and

Whereas the damage and possible complete destruction of such cotton and other crops will constitute a severe loss to the Nation

and an incalculable blow to the individual farmers concerned: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby requested—

(1) to use the facilities of the Department of Agriculture and the radio, press, and various farm groups and organizations to make known to the Nation at once the fact that 2,4-D can be used only with extreme caution:

(2) to make an immediate investigation to determine (a) what crops are harmed by 2,4-D and (b) how far 2,4-D dust will carry and have harmful effects when distributed by airplane and when distributed by ground equipment;

(3) to make a study to determine whether existing supplies of 2,4-D can be mixed with other chemicals in a preparation which will not be harmful to cotton and to other economically valuable plants; and

(4) to make known to the Nation the results of the investigation conducted pursuant to paragraph (2) and of the study conducted pursuant to paragraph (3).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the resolution?

Mr. HOPE. This resolution was reported unanimously by the Committee on Agriculture. It requests the Secretary of Agriculture to take immediate steps to prevent further damage to crops as a result of the use of the weed killer known as 2,4-D, which is a very potent weed killer, one of the new chemicals. It is being used quite extensively in the rice fields in the South.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is this the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE]?

Mr. HOPE. Yes. It was introduced by him as the result of the immense damage in the cotton fields of Louisiana and Texas which is reported to be occasioned by the use of this chemical.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4068) to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to construct a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this includes the amendment adopted by the committee?

Mr. DONDERO. It does.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what is going to be the cost of the construction of this building?

Mr. DONDERO. The cost of the building will be $22,850,000, but no appropriation is asked for prior to 1950.

Mr. RICH. The idea is to permit the Federal Works Administrator to proceed with the preparation of plans and specifications so that they may be ready in 1950?

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct. I may say to the gentleman that $7,000,000 has already been appropriated, and the excavation has been made for the basement. That is to prepare the plans so as to be ready for the construction of the building in 1950.

Mr. LECOMPTE. This is an authorization?

Mr. DONDERO. That is right.

Mr. RICH. The construction of this building will release a lot of buildings that are now being occupied in the District by this agency? All the divisions of the General Accounting Office will then be housed in the two buildings?

Mr. DONDERO. In one building. The General Accounting Office is now housed in 21 buildings in the District.

Mr. RICH. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in lieu of completing the construction of the building authorized by the First Supplemental Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1941 (54 Stat. 1036), for the use and occupancy of the General Accounting Office, the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized to construct upon square 518 in the District of Columbia a building for the use and occupancy of the General Accounting Office under a limit cost of $22,850,000, exclusive of funds heretofore obligated or expended for the account of the building hereby superseded: *Provided*, That to the extent practicable, the excavations and construction work heretofore performed upon said site for the building hereby superseded may be utilized for the building herein authorized: *Provided further*, That all powers granted the Federal Works Administrator with respect to the building for the General Accounting Office in the District of Columbia by said First Supplemental Civil Functions Appropropriation Act, 1941, are hereby continued and may be exercised for the purpose of this act within the limits herein fixed.

SEC. 2. The balances of any funds heretofore appropriated under authority of said First Supplemental Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1941, for the building superseded by the building herein authorized which are unexpended and unobligated on the date of approval of this act, are hereby made available for the purpose of, and shall be chargeable against the authorization contained in this act; and the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for the construction of the building herein authorized within the full limit of cost as established pursuant to section 1 hereof, notwithstanding the fact that appropriations for the full amount of such cost may not have been made.

SEC. 3. No appropriation of funds, in addition to those continued available by section 2 of this act, shall be made for expenditure during any fiscal year prior to 1950: *Provided*, That for expenditure during the fiscal year 1950 and thereafter, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act within the limit of cost of $22,850,000 herein fixed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 22, after "authorized", strike out "within the full limit of cost as established pursuant to section 1 hereof, notwithstanding the fact that appropriations for the full amount of such cost may not have been made" and insert "as funds are appropriated or contract authorization are provided therefor."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERADICATION OF WATER POLLUTION IN NEW ENGLAND STATES

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1418) granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to control and reduction of pollution in the waters of the New England States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman give us some explanation of the bill?

Mr. DONDERO. This bill authorizes the New England States to enter into a compact for the purpose of solving their own steam-pollution problems. I think the Congress of the United States should encourage this kind of legislation.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this bill gives congressional consent to an interstate compact relating to the control and eradication of the pollution of the streams and waters of the New England States which was entered into under authority of Public Resolution 104, Seventy-fourth Congress. It was introduced by Senator Baldwin and other New England Senators, and many of the New England Members of the House also have introduced a similar bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON This bill has a favorable report from the department and it was unanimously reported out of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the status of the general bill, the Barkley or Mundt stream-pollution bill?

Mr. DONDERO. Hearings have been held, I will say to the gentleman, on such legislation, but the committee has not reported a bill. I believe that will be done when Congress convenes for the next session.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent and approval of Congress is hereby given to an interstate compact relating to the control and reduction of pollution of the streams and waters of the New England States negotiated and entered into or to be entered into under authority of Public Resolution 104, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved June 8, 1936, and now ratified by the States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island, which compact reads as follows:

"NEW ENGLAND INTERSTATE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL COMPACT

"Whereas the growth of population and the development of the territory of the New England States has resulted in serious pollution of certain interstate streams, ponds, and lakes, and of tidal waters ebbing and flowing past the boundaries of two or more States; and

"Whereas such pollution constitutes a menace to the health, welfare, and economic prosperity of the people living in such area; and

"Whereas the abatement of existing pollution and the control of future pollution in the interstate waters of the New England area are of prime importance to the people and can best be accomplished through the cooperation of the New England States in the establishment of an interstate agency to work with the States in the field of pollution abatement;

"Now, therefore, the States of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont do agree and are bound as follows:

"ARTICLE I

"It is agreed between the signatory States that the provisions of this compact shall apply to streams, ponds, and lakes which are contiguous to two or more signatory States or which flow through two or more signatory States or which have a tributary contiguous to two or more signatory States or flowing through two or more signatory States, and also shall apply to tidal waters ebbing and flowing past the boundaries of two States.

"ARTICLE II

"There is hereby created the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission (hereinafter referred to as the commission) which shall be a body corporate and politic, having the powers, duties, and jurisdiction herein enumerated and such other and additional powers as shall be conferred upon it by the act or acts of a signatory State concurred in by the others.

"ARTICLE III

"The commission shall consist of five commissioners from each signatory State, each of whom shall be a resident voter of the State from which he is appointed. The commissioners shall be chosen in the manner and for the terms provided by law of the State from which they shall be appointed. For each State there shall be on the commission a member representing the State health department, a member representing the State water pollution control board (if such exists), and, except where a State in its enabling legislation decides that the best interests of the State will be otherwise served, a member representing municipal interests, a member representing industrial interests, and a member representing an agency acting for fisheries or conservation.

"ARTICLE IV

"The commission shall annually elect from its members a chairman and vice chairman and shall appoint and at its pleasure remove or discharge such officers. It may appoint and employ a secretary who shall be a professional engineer versed in water pollution and may employ such stenographic or clerical employees as shall be necessary, and at its pleasure remove or discharge such employees. It shall adopt a seal and suitable bylaws and shall promulgate rules and regulations for its management and control. It may maintain an office for the transaction of its business and may meet at any time or place within the signatory States. Meetings shall be held at least twice each year. A majority of the members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, but no action of the commission imposing any obligation on any signatory State or on any municipal agency or subdivision thereof or on any person, firm, or corporation therein shall be binding unless a majority of the members from such signatory State shall have voted in favor thereof. Where meetings are planned to discuss matters relevant to problems of water pollution control affecting only certain of the signatory States, the commission may vote to authorize special meetings of the commissioners of the States especially concerned. The commission shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements and shall make an annual report to the governor and the legislature of each signatory State setting forth in detail the operations and transactions conducted by it pursuant to this compact, and shall make recommendations for any legislative action deemed by it advisable, including amendments to the statutes of the signatory States which may be necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of this compact. The commission shall not incur any obligations for salaries, office, administrative, traveling, or other expenses prior to the allotment of funds by the signatory States adequate to meet the same; nor shall the commission pledge the credit of any of the signatory States. Each signatory State reserves the right to provide hereafter by law for the examination and audit of the accounts of the commission. The commission shall appoint a treasurer who may be a member of the commission, and disbursements by the commission shall be valid only when authorized by the commission and when vouchers therefor have been signed by the secretary and countersigned by the treasurer. The secretary shall be custodian of the records of the commission with authority to attest to and certify such records or copies thereof.

"ARTICLE V

"It is recognized, owing to such variable factors as location, size, character, and flow and the many varied uses of the waters subject to the terms of this compact, that no single standard of sewage and waste treatment and no single standard of quality of receiving waters is practical and that the degree of treatment of sewage and industrial wastes should take into account the classification of the receiving waters according to present and proposed highest use, such as for drinking water supply, industrial and agricultural uses, bathing and other recreational purposes, maintenance and propagation of fish life, shellfish culture, navigation, and disposal of wastes.

"The commission shall establish reasonable physical, chemical, and bacteriological standards of water quality satisfactory for various classifications of use. It is agreed that each of the signatory States through appropriate agencies will prepare a classification of its interstate waters in entirety or by portions according to present and proposed highest use and for this purpose technical experts employed by State departments of health and State water pollution control agencies are authorized to confer on questions relating to classification of interstate waters affecting two or more States. Each signatory State agrees to submit its classification of its interstate waters to the commission for approval. It is agreed that after such approval all signatory States through their appropriate State health departments and water pollution control agencies will work to establish programs of treatment of sewage and industrial wastes which will meet standards established by the commission for classified waters. The commission may from time to time make such changes in definitions of classifications and in standards as may be required by changed conditions or as may be necessary for uniformity.

"ARTICLE VI

"Each of the signatory states pledges to provide for the abatement of existing pollution and for the control of future pollution of interstate inland and tidal waters as described in article I, and to pu and maintain the waters thereof in a satisfactory condition consistent with the highest classified use of each body of water.

"ARTICLE VII

"Nothing in this compact shall be construed to repeal or prevent the enactment of any legislation or prevent the enforcement of any requirement by any signatory State imposing any additional condition or restriction to further lessen the pollution of waters within its jurisdiction. Nothing herein contained shall affect or abate any action now pending brought by any governmental board or body created by or existing under any of the signatory States.

"ARTICLE VIII

"The signatory States agree to appropriate for the salaries, office, administrative, travel, and other expenses such sum or sums as shall be recommended by the commission. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts obligates itself only to the extent of $6,500 in any one year, the State of Connecticut only to the extent of $3,000 in any one year the State of Rhode Island only to the extent of $1,500 in any one year, and the States of New Hampshire, Maine, and Vermont each only to the extent of $1,000 in any one year.

"ARTICLE IX

"Should any part of this compact be held to be contrary to the constitution of any signatory State or of the United States, all other parts thereof shall continue to be in full force and effect.

"ARTICLE X

"The commission is authorized to discuss with appropriate State agencies in New York State questions of pollution of waters which flow into the New England area from New York State or vice versa and to further the establishment of agreements on pollution abatement to promote the interests of the New York and New England areas.

"Whenever the commission by majority vote of the members of each signatory State shall have given its approval and the State of New York shall have taken the necessary action to do so, the State of Nev York shall be a party to this compact for the purpose of controlling and abating the pollution of waterways common to New York and the New England States signatory to this compact but excluding the waters under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Sanitation Commission (New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut).

"ARTICLE XI

"This compact shall become effective immediately upon the adoption of the compact by any two contiguous States of New England but only insofar as applies to those States and upon approval by Federal law. Thereafter upon ratification by other contiguous States it shall also become effective as to those States."

SEC. 2. Without further submission of the compact, the consent of Congress is given to the States of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont, and to the State of New York pursuant to article X of the compact, to enter into the

compact as a signatory State and party thereto.

SEC. 3. Nothing contained in this act or in the compact herein approved shall be construed as impairing or affecting the sovereignty of the United States or any of its rights or jurisdiction in and over the area or waters which are the subject of the compact.

SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

QUIETING TITLE TO CERTAIN LAND IN PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY, MD.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4115) to quiet title and possession with respect to certain land in the town of Cheverly, Prince Georges County, Md.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what does this bill do?

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman, may I say this bill simply quiets title to a small parcel of land that was deeded to the United States by someone recently. The United States has no use for it. The report shows that the bill was reported unanimously by our committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States hereby releases the quitclaims to Walter N. Campbell and Zenobia Campbell, husband and wife, all the right, title, and interest, if any, of the United States of America in and to certain land in the town of Cheverly, Prince Georges County, Md., more particularly described in a deed which purported to convey such land to the United States of America as follows: The southerly 12 1/10 feet front, extended by the same width, the full length thereof lot No. 1431, and the northerly 46 feet front, extended by the same width, the full length thereof of lot No. 1432 all in block 63 of section 9 of the subdivision known as Cheverly, according to the official plot and survey thereof of record among the land records of said county; such deed being executed on December 28, 1942, by the said Walter N. Campbell and Zenobia Campbell, and recorded in the land records of such county in liber No. 694 beginning at folio 48.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DELAWARE RIVER JOINT TOLL BRIDGE COMMISSION

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4140) granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to permit the State of New Jersey and the State of Pennsylvania to enter into an agreement for the building of a toll bridge across the Delaware River. It was unanimously reported out by our committee, the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. KEFAUVER. This is a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. DONDERO. It was unanimously reported by our committee.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. This is merely an extension of the authority that the Joint Bridge Commission now has?

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Under the Reorganization Act, are not these bills supposed to be handled administratively, without having to come before the Congress?

Mr. DONDERO. This is a compact between two States.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGON. The gentleman's motion is to adopt this bill with a committee amendment?

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the compact or agreement set forth below, and to each and every term and provision thereof: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to affect, impair, or diminish any right, power, or jurisdiction of the United States or of any court, department, board, bureau, officer, or official of the United States, over or in regard to any navigable waters, or any commerce between the States or with foreign countries, or any bridge, railroad, highway, pier, wharf, or other facility or improvement, or any other person, matter, or thing, forming the subject matter of the aforesaid compact or agreement or otherwise affected by the terms thereof.

"SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA AND THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

"AMENDING THE AGREEMENT ENTITLED 'AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA AND THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY CREATING THE DELAWARE RIVER JOINT TOLL BRIDGE COMMISSION AS A BODY CORPORATE AND POLITIC AND DEFINING ITS POWERS AND DUTIES', BY EXTENDING THE JURISDICTION, POWERS, AND DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION AND DEFINING SUCH ADDITIONAL JURISDICTION, POWERS, AND DUTIES

"Whereas, the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission (hereinafter referred to as the 'commission') was created by a compact or agreement entitled 'Agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey creating the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission as a body corporate and politic and defining its powers and duties,' executed on behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by its Governor on the 19th day of December, 1934, pursuant to an act of its general assembly approved the 25th day of June, 1931 (pamphlet laws, 1352), as last amended by an act of said general assembly approved the 18th day of May, 1933 (pamphlet laws, 827), and executed on behalf of the State of New Jersey by its Governor on the 18th day of December, 1934, pursuant to an act of its Senate and general assembly approved June 11, 1934 (ch. 215, laws of 1934; R. S. (1937) 32:8-1), to which compact or agreement the consent of the Congress of the United States was given by section 9 of an act of the Congress approved August 30, 1935 (Public No. 411, 74th Cong., 49 Stat. 1051, 1058), and under the provisions of which compact or agreement the commission was authorized to administer, maintain and operate certain bridges over the Delaware River and now maintains and operates the same as joint State-owned free bridges; and

"Whereas because of the great increase in traffic and loads over said bridges since their construction, many of said bridges are now inadequate or unsafe, and it will be necessary to rehabilitate or replace some or all of said bridges with new bridges at the same or different locations in order to provide safe, adequate and convenient facilities for traffic crossing the Delaware River; and

"Whereas it is necessary that the commission have power to issue and sell its bridge revenue bonds, for rehabilitating or replacing existing bridges with new bridges at the same or different locations, for acquiring or constructing additional bridges, and for refunding any bridge revenue bonds of the commission, and that the commission also have power to fix, charge and collect tolls, rates, rents and other charges for the use of any such new bridge or bridges; now therefore,

"The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey do hereby solemnly covenant and agree, each with the other, as follows:

"(1) Article IX of the agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey creating the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission as a body corporate and politic and defining its powers and duties, which was executed on behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by its Governor on the 19th day of December, 1934, and was executed on behalf of the State of New Jersey by its Governor on the 18th day of December, 1934, be and the same is hereby amended to read as follows:

"ARTICLE IX

"The commission shall make annual reports to the Governors and Legislatures of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey, setting forth in detail its operations and transactions, and may make such additional reports, from time to time, to the governors and legislatures as it may deem advisable.

"(2) Article X of said agreement be and the same is hereby amended to read as follows:

"ARTICLE X

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this agreement the commission shall have the following powers:

"(a) The commission may acquire, construct, rehabilitate, improve, maintain, repair, and operate bridges for vehicular or pedestrian traffic across the Delaware River between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey at any locations north of the boundary line between Mercer County and Burlington County in the State of New Jersey as extended across the Dela-

ware River to the Pennsylvania shore of said river.

"(b) The commission may replace any one or more existing bridges across the Delaware River between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey north of said line with one or more new bridges at such locations as the Commission may determine to be adequate and convenient for the traffic to be served thereby.

"(c) The commission may acquire by purchase or by the exercise of the power of eminent domain any existing ferry or bridge the acquisition of which the commission may determine to be necessary or advisable in connection with the construction of a new bridge, the cost of such acquisition to be deemed to be a part of the cost of such construction.

"(d) The commission may enter upon, use, occupy, enlarge, construct, and improve any street, road, or highway located within the limits of any municipality and deemed by the commission to be necessary in connection with the acquisition, construction, improvement, maintenance, or operation of any bridge owned or operated by the commission or of any bridge approaches, bridge plazas, or approach highways to any such bridge, subject, however, to the consent of the governing body of such municipality and to such reasonable police regulations as may be established by such governing body.

"(e) The commission may demolish and remove any bridge now operated by it when such bridge has been or is being replaced by a new bridge at the same or a different location which in the determination of the commission will serve substantially the same traffic as that served by such existing bridge, and the commission may sell or otherwise dispose of any ferry or other property of the commission deemed by it to be no longer useful or needed for the purposes of the commission.

"(f) The commission may acquire for the purposes of this article any real property which it shall find necessary or convenient to acquire for public use in the manner provided by article III of this agreement or, in the alternative, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in the same manner and with the same right of entry as the highway department of the Commonwealth may acquire lands by condemnation for highway purposes and in the State of New Jersey in the same manner and with the same right of entry as the highway department of the State may acquire lands by condemnation for highway purposes.

"(g) The commission may make and enforce such rules and regulations with respect to the use of any bridge operated by it as it shall deem proper and reasonable, including regulations limiting the loads permitted on any such bridge and closing to traffic any such bridge deemed by the commission to be unsafe.

"(h) The commission may provide, from time to time, for the issuance of its bridge revenue bonds for any one or more of the following purposes: (1) providing funds for the acquisition, construction, rehabilitation or improvement of any one or more bridges the acquisition, construction, rehabilitation or improvement of which is herein authorized; (2) providing funds for the construction or improvement of approach facilities deemed by the commission to be necessary or desirable in connection with the acquisition, construction, maintenance or operation of any bridge owned or operated by the commission, including but without limitation bridge approaches, entrance plazas, overpasses, underpasses and approach highways; and (3) refunding any bridge revenue bonds or bridge revenue refunding bonds of the commission. The bridge or bridges (including any approach facilities) on account of which a single issue of bonds shall be issued as herein authorized shall constitute a single project for financing purposes.

"(i) The commission may fix, charge, and collect tolls, rates, rents, and other charges for the use of any bridge or bridges constituting a single project, such tolls to be so fixed and adjusted, subject to any applicable Federal law, as to provide funds at least sufficient (1) to pay the cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating such bridge or bridges, including the administrative expenses of the commission chargeable thereto, (2) to pay the bridge revenue bonds or the bridge revenue refunding bonds issued on account of such project and the interest on such bonds, and (3) to provide reserves for such purposes; provided, however, that no tolls shall be charged or collected for the use of any bridge now operated by the commission as a free bridge but only for the use of bridges constructed or acquired by the commission under the provisions of this compact or agreement. Subject to any applicable Federal law, the commission may pledge such tolls, rates, rents and other revenues or any part thereof for such purposes. The commission may establish separate schedules of tolls, rates, and charges for use of any bridge on which tolls may be established hereunder by residents of areas adjacent to or served directly by such bridge under such conditions and on such terms as it shall determine to be proper and reasonable, including tolls, rates, and charges for unlimited use of any such bridge.

"No member of the commission shall be subject to any personal liability or accountability by reason of any act or omission of the commission.

"In witness whereof, this 3d day of July 1947, Alfred E. Driscoll has affixed his signature hereto as Governor of the State of New Jersey and caused the great seal of the State to be attached thereto.

"ALFRED E. DRISCOLL,
[SEAL] "*Governor, State of New Jersey.*

"And, on this 8th day of July 1947, James H. Duff has affixed his signature hereto as Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and caused the great seal of the Commonwealth to be attached thereto.

"JAS. H. DUFF,
"*Governor, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.*"
[GREAT SEAL]

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 6, after "thereof", insert "*And provided further*, That after the costs of the bridges in a single project have been amortized, such bridges shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SURPLUS WAR DEPARTMENT-OWNED MILITARY REAL PROPERTY FOR NATIONAL CEMETERIES

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 272) to provide for the utilization of surplus War Department-owned military real property as national cemeteries, when feasible.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what the bill does?

Mr. WELCH. The bill provides for the utilization of surplus War Department-owned military real property as national cemeteries. Under the amendment which will be offered, it limits the expansion of two military cemeteries, one at Fort Rosecrans, Calif., and the other at Jefferson Barracks, Mo.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I say these are national cemeteries which are now in existence. Adjacent to those cemeteries there is acreage owned by the Government, and it is purely an expansion matter. There are no new cemeteries. It is just an expansion of two old cemeteries. It is without the acquisition of any property. The property is now owned by the Government.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Is this thing limited to these two cemeteries?

Mr. FLETCHER. It is limited to these two cemeteries.

Mr. RANKIN. That crazy order issued by the War Department recently forbidding race segregation in national cemeteries has virtually closed those cemeteries to the white boys of the South. If you want to make this an individual proposition, all right, but I do not want any such measure as this covering the whole country.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I say I have four telegrams here. They have bodies there and there are no graves to put them in. It is an emergency situation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Will the gentleman tell us how much money is involved?

Mr. WELCH. There are no funds involved.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. What is the acreage involved in these cemeteries?

Mr. WELCH. I do not recall the acreage in the Jefferson Barracks. Fort Rosecrans, Calif., has 34 acres.

Mr. BUCK. What is the acreage at Jefferson Barracks?

Mr. WELCH. I do not remember the exact acreage.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. I spoke to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER], in whose district the Jefferson Barracks is located, and he said they would probably want about 50 acres. They have a large acreage, but they would need only about 50 acres in addition to the present national cemetery.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. What I am trying to find out is what is in the amendment that is going to be proposed.

Mr. WELCH. If the gentleman will withhold his right to object until the amendment is read, I am sure he will approve the bill as amended.

Mr. RANKIN. It will have to be rather convincing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to reserve my objection until I can find out what is in the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi reserves the right to object.

Without objection, the Clerk will read the amendment for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WELCH:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "utilize", insert the words "and expand existing facilities."

Page 1, line 9, after the word "practicable", insert "through the use of."

Page 2, line 5, after the word "to", strike out the words "establish thereon" and insert the words "expand existing."

And on page 2, line 7, after the word "maintenance", strike out "of such cemeteries" and insert the word "thereof."

Page 2, line 7, after the word "cemetery", strike out the word "established" and insert the words "as expanded."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentlemen from California, either one or both of them, if this applies to the entire country?

Mr. WELCH. No; it is confined to two cemeteries.

Mr. RANKIN. Where is it limited to two?

Mr. WELCH. It is limited to two under the amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. That is what I want to find out, if it is limited to two cemeteries; and if so, which two.

The War Department, as I said, has issued a crazy order which has virtually closed national cemeteries to the white boys of the Southern States, and probably a great many other States. I am not going to let this measure pass if it is to be Nation-wide in its scope.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests to the gentleman from California that he withdraw his request.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the War Department letter made a part of the RECORD.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, that ought to be put in the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests to the gentleman that the bill be withdrawn until these differences are ironed out.

Mr. RANKIN. Let him write it into the bill.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

IMPLEMENTING PATENT PROVISIONS OF PEACE TREATIES WITH ITALY, BULGARIA, HUNGARY, AND RUMANIA

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4070) to carry into effect certain parts relating to patents of the treaties of peace with Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania, ratified by the Senate on June 5, 1947, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. LEWIS. Yes. This came out of the Committee on the Judiciary. It simply extends the provisions of the Boykin Act of last year to Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I believe the State Department has requested the passage of this bill.

Mr. LEWIS. The State Department and the Patent Office.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property of 1883, as amended, is considered as reestablished and in full force and effect between the United States and Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania from the date of this act and the nationals of the latter countries may hereafter apply for and obtain patents in the United States for their inventions and enjoy the rights and privileges thereof as provided in article 2 of said convention: *Provided, however*, That patents shall not be applied for or obtained, or if obtained, shall not be valid, for inventions relating to war materials as specified in article 6 of annex XV A of the Treaty of Peace with Italy, article 6 of annex IV of the Treaty of Peace with Bulgaria, article 6 of annex IV A of the Treaty of Peace with Hungary, and article 6 of annex IV A of the Treaty of Peace with Rumania.

SEC. 2. The rights of priority and the times for the taking of any action specified in sections 1 and 3 of Public Law 690, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 8, 1946, which had not expired on December 8, 1941, or which commenced after such date, shall be and are hereby extended until February 29, 1948, in favor of nationals of Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania, subject to the conditions and limitations specified in sections 1, 3, 4, and 10 of said Public Law 690.

SEC. 3. Nationals of Germany and Japan may hereafter apply for and obtain patents in the United States for their inventions in accordance with the patent laws and enjoy the rights and privileges thereof: *Provided, however*, That patents obtained for such inventions shall be subject to any conditions and limitations with respect to duration, revocation, utilization, assignment, and licensing which may be imposed by Congress, or by the President, patents may not be applied for or obtained, or if obtained, shall not be valid, for any invention made, or upon which an application was filed by any such national, before January 1, 1946, in Germany or Japan or in the territory of any other of the Axis Powers or in any territory occupied by the Axis forces.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 3, after the word "inventions", insert the words "heretofore made."

Page 2, line 17, after the figures "690", insert "*Provided, however*, That nothing in this Act shall affect any act which has been or shall be done by virtue of special measures taken under legislative, executive, administrative, or military authority of the United States during World War II."

Page 3, line 4, after the word "President", insert "in accordance with the provisions of any peace treaty hereafter entered into with Germany or Japan: *And provided further,*".

Page 3, line 6, after the word "That," insert "except for patents based on applications filed in the United States Patent Office prior to the date of enactment of this Act,".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. McCOWEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject Federal Aid for Education and include a statement.

Mr. DAWSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GOFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio statement.

AMENDMENT TO ARMED FORCES LEAVE ACT OF 1946

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3501) to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, approved August 9, 1946 (Public Law 704, 79th Cong., 2d sess., 60 Stat. 963), and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 3, line 18, strike out "excluding" and insert "and."

Page 3, line 19, after "discharge", insert "including for enlisted persons the allowances as provided for such enlisted persons in subsection (a) of this section."

Page 5, strike out all after line 17 over to and including line 12 on page 6.

Page 6, line 13, strike out "4" and insert "3."

Page 6, line 23, strike out "5" and insert "4."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPLORATION, INVESTIGATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND MAINTENANCE OF FISHING RESOURCES

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 859) to provide for the exploration, investigation, development, and maintenance of the fishing resources and development of the high seas fishing industry of the Territories and island possessions of the United States in the tropical and subtropical Pacific Ocean and intervening seas, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 3, line 15, after "Hawaii", insert ": *Provided further*, That there are authorized to be transferred to the Fish and Wildlife Service not to exceed three surplus vessels suitable for conversion and use in oceanographic and bilological research and exploratory fishing, by any disposal agency of the Government without reimbursement or transfer of funds."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIDELITY TRUST CO., OF BALTIMORE, MD.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 892) for the payment of claims of the Fidelity Trust Co., of Baltimore, Md., and others, covered by findings of fact made by the United States Court of Claims, dated June 5, 1944, and contained in Senate Document No. 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, and its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what amount is involved and does the full committee from which this comes approve of it?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. This bill has been passed by the official objectors. There was some misunderstanding with reference to it the other day and I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. RICH. Has the committee in charge approved it?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes, and the official objectors have also approved it.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman's word is good, but where are you going to get the money?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Internal Revenue be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to receive, consider, and allow without interest the claims as hereinafter set forth for the refund of bankers' special taxes paid under the War Revenue Act of June 13, 1898, and under the Emergency Revenue Act of October 22, 1914, and later held to have been erroneously and illegally collected by the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the *Fidelity and Deposit Company* v. *United States* (259 U. S. 296) and the *United States* v. *Fidelity and Deposit Company* (266 U. S. 587), which claims are covered by the findings of fact made on June 5, 1944, by the United States Court of Claims and reported at pages 13, 14, and 15 of Senate Document No. 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, as follows:

17767. Fidelity Trust Co., of Baltimore, Md., $2,116.86.

17768. Maryland Trust Co., successors to Continental Trust Co., Baltimore, Md., $3,223.30.

17769. Baltimore Trust Corp., liquidating agent of Baltimore Trust Co., Baltimore, Md., $3,409.34.

17770. Safe Deposit & Trust Co. of Baltimore, Baltimore, Md., $66.

17771. Union Trust Co. of Maryland, Baltimore, Md., $867.67.

17772. Citizens National Trust & Savings Bank of Los Angeles, successors to Citizens Trust & Savings Co., Los Angeles, Calif., $1,108.92.

17773. Wells Fargo Bank & Union Trust Co., successors to Union Trust Co. of San Francisco, San Francisco, Calif., $1,074.90.

17774. International Trust Co., Denver, Colo., $993.50.

17775. Phoenix State Bank & Trust Co., successors to State Bank, Hartford, Conn., $397.42.

17776. Stamford Trust Co., Stamford, Conn., $636.17.

17778. Citizens Bank & Trust Co., Tampa, Fla., $323.50.

17779. Harris Trust & Savings Bank, Chicago, Ill., $4,219.80.

17780. Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, successors to Continenal & Commercial Trust & Savings Bank, Chicago, Ill., $5,179.17.

17781. Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, successors to Hibernian Banking Association, Chicago, Ill., $2,170.

17782. Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, successors to Illinois Trust & Savings Bank, Chicago, Ill., $9,512.

17783. Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, successors to Illinois Trust & Savings Bank, Chicago, Ill., $10,706.23.

17784. Peoples Trust & Saving Co., Fort Wayne, Ind., $155.04.

17785. Security Trust Co., Indianapolis, Ind., $153.34.

17786. First National Bank & Trust Co., successors to Phoenix & Third Trust Co., Lexington, Ky., $104.

17787. State Bank & Trust Co., Richmond, Ky., $154.50.

17789. Franklin County Trust Co., Greenfield, Mass., $75.99.

17790. Security Trust Co., Lynn, Mass., $148.26.

17791. Berkshire Trust Co., formerly Berkshire Loan & Trust Co., Pittsfield, Mass., $117.99.

17792. Springfield Safe Deposit & Trust Co., Springfield, Mass., $170.67.

17793. Detroit Trust Co., successors to Security Trust Co., Detroit, Mich., $1,392.50.

17794. Union Guardian Trust Co., successors to Union Trust Co., Detroit, Mich., $440.50.

17795. Mercantile Commerce Bank & Trust Co., formerly Mercantile Trust Co., St. Louis, Mo., $197.49.

17796. Mercantile Commerce Bank & Trust Co., formerly Mercantile Trust Co., St. Louis, Mo., $9,283.50.

17797. Mississippi Valley Trust Co., St. Louis, Mo., $8,223.84.

17799. Hudson Trust Co., Union City, N. J., $2,036.25.

17800. Paterson Savings Institution, Paterson, N. J., $2,438.

17802. Morristown Trust Co., Morristown, N. J., $2,737.45.

17803. Cumberland National Bank of Bridgeton, successors to the Cumberland Trust Co., of Bridgeton, Bridgeton, N. J., $100.46.

17804. Brooklyn Trust Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., $1,525.

17805. Kings County Trust Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., $2,864.57.

17806. National City Bank of New York, successors to Peoples Trust Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., $570.50.

17807. Marine Trust Co. of Buffalo, successors to Buffalo Trust Co., Buffalo, N. Y., $101.

17808. Marine Trust Co. of Buffalo, successors to Bankers Trust Co., Buffalo, N. Y., $878.51.

17809. Chemical Bank & Trust Co., successors to United States Mortgage & Trust Co., New York City, N. Y., $3,845.50.

17810. Title Guarantee & Trust Co. of New York City, N. Y., successors to Manufacturers Trust Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., $3,798.

17811. Bank of New York, successors to Bank of New York & Trust Co., successors to New York Life Insurance & Trust Co., New York City, N. Y., $16,502.52.

17812. Bank of New York, successors to Bank of New York & Trust Co., successors to New York Life Insurance & Trust Co., New York City, N. Y., $7,300.

17813. Lawyers Trust Co., successors to Central Realty Bond & Trust Co., New York City, N. Y., $1,078.75.

17814. United States Trust Co. of New York, New York City, N. Y., $15,706.50.

17816. First Trust & Deposit Co., successors to Trust & Deposit Co. of Onondaga, Syracuse, N. Y., $1,555.17.

17817. First Trust & Deposit Co., successors to City Bank Trust Co., successors to Central City Trust Co., Syracuse, N. Y., $132.11.

17818. First Trust & Deposit Co., successors to City Bank Trust Co., successors to Central City Trust Co., Syracuse, N. Y., $433.67.

17819. City Savings Bank & Trust Co., Alliance, Ohio, $226.32.

17820. Fifth Third Union Trust Co., successors to Union Savings Bank & Trust Co., Cincinnati, Ohio, $1,836.33.

17821. Central National Bank, successors to Central United National Bank, successors to the United Banking & Trust Co., Cleveland, Ohio, $0.00.

17822. Central National Bank, successors to Central United National Bank, successors to the United Banking & Trust Co., Cleveland, Ohio, $1,297.99.

17823. Union Trust Co., successors to the Broadway Savings & Trust Co., Cleveland, Ohio, $734.01.

17824. Union Trust Co., successors to the State Banking & Trust Co., Cleveland, Ohio, $565.67.

17825. Toledo Trust Co., formerly Toledo Savings Bank & Trust Co., Toledo, Ohio, $622.67.

17826. Easton Trust Co., Easton, Pa., $502.67.

17827. Central Trust Co., Harrisburg, Pa., $210.01.

17828. Harrisburg Trust Co., Harrisburg, Pa., $545.50.

17829. Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Co., successors to Logan Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa., $1,706.81.

17830. Germantown Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa., $459.33.

17831. Girard Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa., $10,859.33.

17832. Liberty Title & Trust Co., successors to German American Title & Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa., $1,147.03.

17833. Liberty Title & Trust Co., successors to German American Title & Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa., $1,794.

17834. United Security Trust Co., formerly United Security Life Insurance & Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa., $0.00.

17835. United Security Trust Co., formerly United Security Life Insurance & Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa., $8,136.61.

17836. Integrity Trust Co., successors to the West Philadelphia Title & Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa., $932.33.

17837. Fidelity Trust Co., formerly Fidelity Title & Trust Co., Pittsburgh, Pa., $1,932.94.

17838. Miners' National Bank of Wilkes-Barre, successors to Wyoming Valley Trust Co., Wilkes-Barre, Pa., $805.16.

17839. First National Bank, successors to Sunbury Trust & Safe Deposit Co., Sunbury, Pa., $416.66.

17840. Wakefield Trust Co., Wakefield, R. I., $669.

17841. Zion's Saving Bank & Trust Co., Salt Lake City, Utah, $712.

17843. Lynchburg Trust & Savings Bank, Lynchburg, Va., $162.90.

17844. Spokane & Eastern Trust Co., Spokane, Wash., $426.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the claims allowed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue pursuant to the preceding section of this act: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 20 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and any such payment

shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UTILIZATION OF SURPLUS WAR DEPARTMENT-OWNED MILITARY REAL PROPERTY AS NATIONAL CEMETERIES

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 272) to provide for the utilization of surplus War Department-owned military real property as national cemeteries, when feasible.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will withdraw my reservation of objection with the understanding that the amendments to be offered will apply to those two cemeteries only.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That when the Secretary of War determines that there is need for an additional cemetery or cemeteries for the burial of members of the armed forces of the United States dying in the service or former members whose last discharge therefrom was honorable and certain other persons as provided for by existing law (24 U. S. C. 281), he is authorized to utilize, when practicable, federally owned lands under the jurisdiction of the War Department for military purposes and not needed for such purposes for the establishment thereon of a national cemetery or cemeteries.

SEC. 2. Upon the selection by the Secretary of War of such land, as provided in section 1 hereof, the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to establish thereon national cemeteries and to provide for the care and maintenance of such cemeteries. No national cemetery established pursuant to this act shall have an area in excess of 640 acres.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of War is authorized to prescribe such regulations as he may deem necessary for the administration of this act.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry into effect the purposes of this act.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WELCH:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "utilize", insert "and expand existing facilities at Fort Rosecrans, Calif., and Jefferson Barracks, Mo., and on page 1, line 9, after the word "practicable", insert "through the use of."

On page 2, line 5, after the word "to", strike out the words "establish thereon" and insert the words "expand existing" and on page 2, line 7, after the word "maintenance", strike out the words "of such cemeteries" and insert the word "thereof."

On page 2, line 7, after the word "cemetery", strike out word "established" and insert words "as expanded."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard on the amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I think I should explain to the House the reason for my attitude on this measure.

The War Department recently issued an order forbidding race segregation in our national cemeteries.

That simply means the closing of the national cemeteries to the white boys of the Southern States and a large portion of the rest of the country. The white boys of the South will hereafter be buried in the local cemeteries.

For that reason I am not willing to have this program expanded throughout the entire country. I agreed to withdraw my objection with the understanding that the gentleman from California would offer this amendment limiting it to the western cemeteries.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend at this point in the RECORD four telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLETCHER. The telegrams referred to are as follows:

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *July 22, 1947.*

Hon. CHARLES K. FLETCHER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Report just received. All grave space for veterans' purposes at national cemetery, Fort Rosecrans, has been used. Urgently request expedite action allocation additional ground for graves. Notwithstanding reallocation of overseas war dead need is immediate as veterans of San Diego County are dying now.

B. G. HAMBLIN,
Executive Secretary,
San Diego County Council of Veterans.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *July 22, 1947.*

Hon. CHARLES K. FLETCHER,
Congressman:

No more graves in Rosecrans. Bodies waiting burial in private cemeteries. Immediate action requested.

WALTER J. PARKER.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *July 23, 1947.*

Hon. CHARLES K. FLETCHER,
House of Representatives:

Rosecrans cemetery situation critical. Urge passage your bill this session.

SAN DIEGO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *July 22, 1947.*

Hon. CHARLES K. FLETCHER,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Fort Rosecrans National Cemetery closed today. San Diego situation critical. Veterans awaiting burial. Request immediate action on development of additional acreage.

R. J. COSGRIFF,
Service Officer, Chapter No. 2,
Disabled American Veterans.

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 3394, "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide for the evacuation and return of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States,' approved May 16, 1946, in order to provide for the shipment of the remains of World War II dead to the homeland of the deceased or of next of kin, to provide for the disposition of group and mass burials, to provide for the burial of unknown American World War II dead in United States military cemeteries to be established overseas, to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire land overseas and to establish United States military cemeteries thereon, and for other purposes," do pass with the following Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 17, after "War", insert ", except as expressly reserved to the American Battle Monuments Commission by section 9 of this act."

Page 5, after line 16, insert:

"SEC. 9. The American Battle Monuments Commission shall be solely responsible for the permanent design and construction of the cemeteries to be established in foreign countries under section 5 of this act and of all buildings, plantings, headstones, and other permanent improvements incidental thereto. The Secretary of War is authorized to undertake such temporary construction as will be necessary for the accomplishment of this act and to maintain such cemeteries in a suitable condition until such time as the functions of administration thereof shall pass to the American Battle Monuments Commission in accordance with section 12 of Public Law 456, Seventy-ninth Congress, or any other law."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY AND OF THE NAVY

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 3215, an act to revise the Medical Department of the Army and the Medical Department of the Navy, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 11, after "Section", insert "the Sanitary Engineering Section."

Page 4, line 1, strike out all after "Surgeon" down to and including "promotion" in line 8 and insert "General, and each person appointed and commissioned an officer of the Medical Service Corps who at the time of appointment holds a degree of doctor of philosophy or comparable degree recognized by the Surgeon General in a science allied

to medicine may, subject to regulations as prescribed by the Secretary of War, be credited at the time of appointment with an amount of service equal to 3 years."

Page 11, strike out all after line 17 over to and including line 11 on page 12 and insert:

"'Hereafter the authorized strength of the Hospital Corps of the Navy shall equal 3½ percent of the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy and Marine Corps. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized, in his discretion, to establish such grades and ratings in the Hospital Corps as he may deem necessary in the proper administration of such corps: *Provided*, That enlisted men of other ratings in the Navy and in the Marine Corps shall be eligible for transfer to the Hospital Corps, and men of that corps to other ratings in the Navy and the Marine Corps.'"

Page 12, strike out all after line 13 down to and including line 17 and insert "The Secretary of the Navy may hereafter appoint as many warrant officers in the Hospital Corps, as may be deemed necessary, from the rating of chief petty officer or petty officer, first class, in the Hospital Corps: *Provided*, That no person shall be appointed."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maine?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have a brief explanation of this measure?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3215 passed the House unanimously some time ago. It went over to the Senate and was amended only for the purpose of bringing it in conformity with the provisions of the promotion bill recently acted upon.

In its consideration of H. R. 3215, the Senate Armed Services Committee adopted three amendments, one of which was proposed by the Army and the other two by the Navy.

The sole purpose of the Army amendment is to bring the provisions of H. R. 3215 into conformity with the provisions of the promotion bill, H. R. 3830.

The Navy amendments go to title III of the bill and are made for the purpose of bringing the language of this bill into conformity with the present policy of the Bureau of Naval Personnel in determining the appropriate names to be applied to members in the Hospital Corps. The Bureau of Naval Personnel desires administrative flexibility in this regard and there appears to be no reason why the request should not be granted.

Another amendment approved by the Senate would add a "Sanitary Engineer Section". There is no objection to this. In fact testimony at the hearings indicated that other sections would be added as needed under the authority of this bill. In connection with the Senate committee amendment, I would like to include correspondence in explanation.

H. R. 3215, "To revise the Medical Department of the Army and the Medical Department of the Navy, and for other purposes" is now on its way to the President for his signature.

The Navy Department writes me that the words "pharmacists" or "pharmacists' mates" will not be used in describing the titles of the grades and ratings in the Hospital Corps of the Navy.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., July 12, 1947.

Hon. MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. SMITH: Enclosed for your information is a copy of a letter which I have transmitted to Mr. George H. Frates, the Washington representative of the National Association of Retail Druggists, assuring him that the Navy Department will not continue to describe members of the Hospital Corps of the Navy as "pharmacists" or "pharmacists' mates" should the bill H. R. 3215 be enacted in the form in which it was reported to the Senate.

The Navy Department requested the Senate Committee on Armed Services to amend title III of the bill for reasons which do not go to the substance of the measure but for reasons which have only to do with its practical administration. These reasons are:

(a) There is a possibility of having no legal authority for membership in the Hospital Corps at all during the interim necessary to shift from one nomenclature to another.

(b) The most appropriate new names to be applied to the members of the Hospital Corps have not been determined.

(c) The names of other ratings in the Navy are not frozen by statute. Administrative flexibility in fixing such names is desirable. Had there been such flexibility in the case of pharmacists' mates, a change in the law would not be necessary at this time. The Secretary of the Navy could have made the change by administrative action.

Very respectfully,

IRA H. NUNN,
Legislative Counsel.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., July 12, 1947.

Mr. GEORGE H. FRATES,
National Association of Retail Druggists,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FRATES: This letter is to confirm our telephone conversation of yesterday during which I assured you that, if and when the bill H. R. 3215, "To revise the Medical Department of the Army and the Medical Department of the Navy, and for other purposes" becomes law in the form in which it has been reported to the Senate, the Navy Department will not employ the words "pharmacist" or "pharmacists' mates" in describing the titles of the grades and ratings in the Hospital Corps of the Navy. The Navy Department will, on the other hand, abandon the use of those terms for the purpose for which they are now employed as soon as practicable after any act of the Congress becomes law which alters the provisions of the act of August 29, 1916, as amended, so as to permit other phraseology to be used in designating the grades and ratings of the Hospital Corps of the Navy.

You will note that an amendment to title III of the bill, H. R. 3215, which was adopted by the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate at the request of the Navy Department will, if enacted, amend the act of August 29, 1916, as amended, so as to authorize the Secretary of the Navy "to establish such grades and ratings in the Hospital Corps as he may deem necessary," thus providing adequate authority to abandon the present restrictive phraseology.

I am aware of the interest of the Honorable MARGARET CHASE SMITH and of the Honorable CARL T. DURHAM, both Members of the House of Representatives, in this matter and am sending a copy of this letter to each in order that they may be advised of the intentions of the Navy Department.

Sincerely yours,

IRA H. NUNN,
Captain, USN,
Legislative Counsel.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maine?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE TO STATE OF DELAWARE OF A PORTION OF PEA PATCH ISLAND

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1480) authorizing the conveyance to the State of Delaware of a portion of Pea Patch Island.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the State of Delaware all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to Pea Patch Island, situated in the Delaware River, near Delaware City, Del., except that portion of the island lying northeastwardly of a straight line just northeastwardly from the northeast outside wall of the Fort Delaware moat and 80 feet northeastwardly at right angles from triangulation station "Torpedo" from a point in the southeasterly high-water line to a point in the northwesterly high-water line of the island, reserving to the United States a perpetual easement to construct and operate on the east fire-control station of the fort parapet a navigational light and fog signal with necessary appurtenances, and a perpetual easement to construct and maintain a submarine cable from the water on the southeasterly side of the island to the light and fog-signal apparatus.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1326) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 508 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Commencing with crops planted for harvest in 1948, for the purpose of determining the most practical plan, terms, and conditions of insurance for agricultural commodities, if sufficient actuarial data are available, as determined by the Board, to insure, or to reinsure insurers of, producers of such agricultural commodities under any plan or plans of insurance determined by the Board to be adapted to any such commodity. Such insurance shall be against loss of the insured commodity while in the field due to unavoidable causes, including drought, flood, hail, wind, frost, winterkill, lightning, fire, excessive rain, snow, wildlife, hurricane, tornado, insect infestation, plant disease, and such other unavoidable causes as may be determined by the Board. Any insurance offered against loss in yield shall not cover in excess of 75 percent of the recorded or appraised average yield of the commodity on the insured farm for a representative period subject to such adjustments as the Board may prescribe to the end that the average yields

fixed for farms in the same area, which are subject to the same conditions, may be fair and just: *Provided*, That, if 75 percent of the average yield represents generally more protection than the investment in the crop in any area, taking into consideration recognized farming practices, the Board shall reduce such maximum percentage so as more nearly to reflect the investment in the crop in such area. Insurance provided under this subsection shall not cover losses due to the neglect or malfeasance of the producer, or to the failure of the producer to reseed to the same crop in areas and under circumstances where it is customary to so reseed, or to the failure of the producer to follow established good farming practices. In 1948 insurance shall be limited to not more than seven crops (including wheat, cotton, flax, corn, and tobacco) and to not more than three additional crops in each year thereafter. Insurance provided for any agricultural commodity, except wheat, cotton, flax, corn, and tobacco, shall be limited to producers in not to exceed 20 counties. Insurance for wheat, corn, and cotton shall be limited to producers in not to exceed 50 counties, and for flax and tobacco to producers in not to exceed 25 counties, for each such commodity. Counties selected by the Board shall be representative of the several areas where the agricultural commodity insured is normally produced. Insurance shall not be provided in any county unless written applications therefor are filed covering at least 200 farms or one-third of the farms normally producing the agricultural commodity; nor shall insurance of any agricultural commodity be provided in any county in which the Board determines that the income from such commodity constitutes an unimportant part of the total agricultural income of the county. The Board may limit or refuse insurance in any county or area, or on any farm, on the basis of the insurance risk involved. The Corporation shall report annually to the Congress the results of its operations as to each commodity insured."

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 508 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That such premiums may be established on the basis of the parity or comparable price for the commodity as determined and published by the Secretary of Agriculture, or on the basis of an average market price designated by the Board."

SEC. 3. Subsection (c) of section 508 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by striking out in the first sentence "however," and inserting in lieu thereof "That indemnities may be determined on the same price basis as premiums are determined for the crop with respect to which such indemnities are paid: *Provided further*,".

SEC. 4. Section 502 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 502. It is the purpose of this title to promote the national welfare by improving the economic stability of agriculture through a sound system of crop insurance and providing the means for the research and experience helpful in devising and establishing such insurance."

SEC. 5. Nothing in this act shall be construed to affect the validity of any insurance contract entered into prior to the enactment of this act insofar as such contract covers the 1947 crop year. Any such contract which purports to cover a crop in the 1948 or any subsequent crop year in any county in which insurance on such crop will be discontinued pursuant to this act is hereby terminated at the end of the 1947 crop year.

SEC. 6. Subsection (d) of section 507 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end of the subsection and inserting a comma and the following: "except that employees or agencies responsible for administering this act in each county shall be selected and designated by the Corporation and shall be responsible directly to the Corporation without the intervention of any intermediate office or agency."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to amend the Crop Insurance Act and to reduce the program to an experimental basis. My time is limited and I do not care to go into an extended discussion of the present crop-insurance program and the manner in which it has functioned. There has been much criticism of it, it has been badly administered, and there are certain features of the act which I think have made it impossible for it to function as a business proposition. I think everyone who has studied the matter, however, will agree that it is very important to the farmers of this country to give them crop insurance if a system of that kind can be worked out on a business basis. The farmer today is the only businessman who has no opportunity to carry insurance on his business operations.

The committee in reporting the present bill has not only reduced the scope of the coverage by providing that it shall be applicable only to certain crops and to a small number of counties on an experimental basis, but it has also amended the law in a number of particulars in such a way as to make Government crop insurance a businesslike proposition.

I think that if I were to name the principal thing which has made crop insurance a failure in the past I would say it was that the law we had before did not eliminate the moral risk. You cannot have any kind of an insurance program and have it operate successfully if it is more profitable to have a loss than it is not to have a loss. The way the crop-insurance program was set up and the way it has been administered in the past it was on many occasions more profitable to have a loss. That accounts, in my opinion, very largely for the failure of the present program. In this bill we have gotten away from that situation by providing that at no time shall a man's right to insurance exceed his investment in the crop. That does away, I think, with one of the principal causes of the difficulties that we have had in the past in connection with crop insurance.

In addition to that, we have changed the provision of the act which states the purpose so as to put it upon a more businesslike basis. In the original Crop Insurance Act, the language read as follows:

It is the purpose of this title to promote the national welfare by alleviating the economic distress caused by crop failure due to drought and other causes by maintaining the purchasing power of farmers and by providing for staple supplies of agricultural commodities for domestic consumption and the orderly flow thereof in interstate commerce.

That was interpreted and perhaps fairly interpreted by those administering the crop-insurance program as constituting a sort of relief program. That is the way it has been administered during most of the time that it has been in effect. The committee has substituted for that statement of purpose the following language:

It is the purpose of this title to promote the national welfare by improving the economic stability of agriculture through a sound system of crop insurance and providing the means for the research and experience helpful in devising and establishing such insurance.

If I had more time I could point out to you many ways in which the bill has been amended so as to provide for a businesslike administration of this program.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. What crops does this bill cover?

Mr. HOPE. This bill will cover to begin with, wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, and flax.

Mr. CHELF. Has not your experience been that tobacco has carried its own weight?

Mr. HOPE. Tobacco has been in the experimental program. It has carried its own weight, as the gentleman says. In fact, all the experimental programs that have been tried have not resulted over-all in any losses.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Will the gentleman say what year this covers?

Mr. HOPE. It will go into effect for the crop year 1948.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. RICH. What do you mean that every one of these crops have carried themselves without loss?

Mr. HOPE. I meant that the premiums collected were sufficient to pay the losses.

Mr. RICH. And carry on the business and keep the capital stock?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 18 minutes, and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to report to the House very briefly today on the progress of the special committee on publicity and propaganda in the executive agencies, of which I have the honor to be chairman.

Our work has been moving along for 3 months. We have published two interim reports on particular phases of Government propaganda activities—one on the operations of the Public Health Service and the Social Security Board in

behalf of socialized medicine in the United States; the other on the activities of the War Department in advocacy of universal military training. I present today only a summary of our work to date, and to acquaint the Members with some of our plans, as now outlined, for the investigations which are to be pressed during the recess.

Over a period of years there has been evident to the Members of this body a growing and sometimes disturbing tendency in the executive branch, to discount or discredit the Members and the legislative actions of the Congress of the United States. It has long been felt by some of us that this unwholesome development was not spontaneous with the people themselves, but grew out of an ever-increasing tendency on the part of the Federal agencies, with their tentacles reaching into practically every county and hamlet, to misuse the funds which have been appropriated to them, to propagandize the people to bring pressure upon Congress for the passage of specialized legislation to perpetuate jobs and ideologies.

Mr. Speaker, I have called attention of the House before, that during the New Deal there was built up in the Federal agencies the highest-priced publicity staff in the world. I said recently it was estimated this Federal publicity organization cost the taxpayers $75,000,000 a year. Today, I want to tell you, on the basis of investigations by the Subcommittee on Publicity and Propaganda, that $75,000,000 will not approximate the amount being spent for publicity and propaganda by the Federal Government. No one can tell how high the figure goes. No one can tell—for the simple reason that practically every person on the Federal pay roll seems to consider himself an authorized lobbyist—authorized to lobby on Government time—that means the taxpayer's money—for the particular project in which he is interested.

Some of the Federal employees who have been identified in their use of Government time and materials and the Government franking privilege to influence legislation, have indicated surprise that anyone would think they were doing anything wrong. In fact, some of them seemed to conceive it their job to stir up the people with their one-sided propaganda activities, to mislead the people in an effort to get their projects approved by Congress.

One of the most insidious aspects of this type of activity is that when these people go out or write out, propagandizing the people, they presume to speak as Federal officials with the authority of the Federal Government back of them.

Here is the Federal Government speaking against the Federal Congress, or rather—and here is where the propaganda machine is very clever indeed—against an individual or individuals in Congress.

For too many years now the Federal agencies have been led to regard Congress as a rubber stamp to do their every bidding; as a whipping boy to be pounced upon by its publicists and its organized propaganda campaigns, whenever Congress elects to exercise its appointed legislative functions.

Mr. Speaker, that sort of activity must stop.

Because of obvious and flagrant abuses the House of Representatives on May 1 established the Subcommittee on Publicity and Propaganda to investigate such activities on the part of the Federal agencies and their employees.

Although this committee has a very small staff and has been operating only a very short time, it has revealed some shocking things. And preliminary investigations already under way indicate even more shocking disclosures to come.

A major exposure of this committee was the activities of several Federal agencies in attempting to bring pressure upon Congress for the approval of socialized medicine.

The committee found that employees of six agencies arranged a series of so-called health workshop meetings, at which the Federal employees posed as Federal consultants to give the delegates factual information on health questions which might arise at the meetings. Actually, the evidence revealed, the sole purpose of the Federal employees in arranging and attending these meetings was to influence the delegates in favor of socialized medicine.

The manner in which the War Department has been attempting to sell universal military training to the people of this country has also come under consideration by the committee. The committee found that civilians were employed by the Secretary of War for the primary purpose of selling important groups on compulsory military training. In testimony before the committee the Assistant Secretary of War, Howard C. Peterson, testified that the purpose of employing these civilians was "to sell the program to the public, with the hope that the public will sell it to the Congress."

Your subcommittee has received a number of complaints with respect to the activities of county AAA committeemen in propagandizing against reductions in appropriations for the Department of Agriculture.

In Nebraska, for example, the campaign appears to have been organized and conducted from the State headquarters level, where a form letter was drafted in a meeting of key officials as "suggested material" for the county committeemen. This suggested material was then carried to the county men by the farmer field men in the State.

Evidence at hand indicates the result was a flood of the most brazen propaganda to farm cooperators throughout the State.

After detailing the cuts, a typical letter states:

> If this action is sustained by the Senate when they vote on this measure in the near future, it will mean that you as well as all other farmers owning or operating land cannot be paid the full amount of money appearing on the farm plan you may have signed in which you indicated practices to be performed during 1947.
>
> The price-support program will, of course, be curtailed if money for that purpose is not made available, as well as the much-needed soil-erosion control, weed eradication, and farm drainage, the need of which the recent heavy rains have reminded us all very vividly.
>
> The recent congressional action not only affects the immediate status of agriculture, but may eventually result in economic disaster of agriculture and the Nation in the years ahead.

I want to repeat that. Just listen to this, Mr. Speaker—listen to what these people on the Federal pay roll, using Government time and materials, and using the Government frank to send out their propaganda—listen to what they have to say about the attempt of your Appropriations Committee to shave a little money from the Department of Agriculture. I quote again:

> The recent congressional action not only affects the immediate status of agriculture but may eventually result in economic disaster of agriculture and the Nation in the years ahead.

Does anyone wonder if Congress has slipped in the estimation of the public when the public receives such statements as that from Federal officials, going out under the Government frank under the guise of official Government business.

But that isn't all. That is by no means all. In fact, it gets worse as it goes on. Listen to this, and I continue to quote:

> If price stabilization is denied farmers and no provision is made to protect the land against the damages caused by the elements, history will repeat itself and economic disaster can be the only final result to farmers, business, and labor. Big capitalists and speculators who have inside and advance information may profit by depressions.

Gentlemen, I assure you neither this body nor the Department of Agriculture has heard the last of that. I have told you some of the things our preliminary investigation has revealed. We do not intend to drop it there.

In addition to these investigations, others are under way which I will not mention at this time but which you will hear more about from time to time as our work moves on.

However, I do want to say that our entire committee staff has been instructed to keep a close watch on the propaganda of the State Department in favor of the so-called Marshall plan for the rehabilitation of Europe. We have been advised on good authority that the Department has a well-organized plan to "sell" the Marshall plan to the people during the congressional recess. It is the conception of the State Department at this moment that both the Congress and the public must be educated to a fuller appreciation of what is involved in the Marshall plan. We all agree, of course, that the people are entitled to full knowledge of the Government's foreign policy. But we insist nevertheless that it is not the duty of the Department of State, nor any other executive agency, to tell the people what they ought to think on these grave matters. That's the essential difference between government publicity and Government propaganda. Enlightenment is a proper function; compelling propaganda, such as uses the devices of radio and motion pictures, leaflets, bulletins, pamphlets, and such, is not only disapproved by the conscience of representative government but is positively unlawful.

It has become apparent to your committee that Government propaganda is designed, in most instances, to make the

individual believe he is thinking for himself. In reality, Government propaganda distorts facts, with such authority that the person becomes prejudiced or biased in the direction which the Government propagandists wish to lead national thinking. It is the authority and the supposed objectivity of Government which leads people to accept, without question, the words released by Government officials and agencies. Propaganda in its crudest form appeals to emotion only. Government propaganda is frequently only slanted. but accomplishes the same result. An individual might be wary and critical of material coming from a special interest group. He knows such groups have an ax to grind, but he will consider as gospel truth, if the Government says the identical thing, because he thinks Government officials are impartial.

I have told this body before that in 1 week we measured the total output of the Federal publicity bureaus. The volume of material made about 800 columns of newsprint—more than might have been printed in the average daily paper in 1 week if nothing had been allowed for advertising, cartoons, and editorials.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to have a representative form of government with the Congress making the laws, this sort of thing must be stopped. Otherwise, the Congress will become in truth a rubber stamp to carry out the whims and vagaries of the undercover propagandists in the Federal agencies.

I for one do not propose to see that happen. Your committee does not propose to see that happen. And I pledge you here and now that the Committee on Publicity and Propaganda will continue its efforts to expose this sort of thing wherever it exists, regardless of the agencies or personalities involved.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Who was the author of the communication the gentleman has just quoted from?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I have not the letter with me. I have it in my office.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman stated it was a Government official.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. If that is true, the letter indicates that there might be a violation of existing law. My recollection is we have a law which makes it unlawful for a Government official or for a person on the Government pay roll to use the services and the time of the Government in propaganda activities.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Yes. That is section 201, title XVIII, of the Criminal Code.

Mr. COOLEY. I am wondering if the gentleman may not be mistaken and if that might not have originated with some farm organization.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. No. That originated in the agricultural office in the State of Nebraska. The committee sent an investigator out there who personally investigated and brought back the facts.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman has made reefrence to certain letters that were sent around the State of Nebraska. In all fairness it should be said that no doubt there were some farmers and AAA field men who were drawn into something they did not realize was unlawful. I believe I know where those things originated. The Democratic State chairman sent out a telegram to each county containing information that was inaccurate and suggested that they start a propaganda campaign.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, we are presently considering a bill to carry on Federal crop insurance on an experimental basis. Speaking wholly for myself, I should like to liquidate the program. I am not unmindful of the fact, however, it would be impossible to secure conclusive action in both sides on such a program at this time; consequently I trust that the present bill will be passed and that it can be enacted into law because it will be the only limitation we have on the crop-insurance program.

Now, in this season of the year when baseball is at its zenith you often hear men accost each other and ask "What is the score?" You will be interested in the score on crop insurance as it was disclosed to my subcommittee after extensive hearings. I divided it into two parts, the first part which began with the enactment of so-called crop insurance in June 1938, the second period beginning in 1944.

In the first period we had 5 full crop years when wheat was insured. We had 2 full years of insurance on the cotton crop. The loss on wheat was $26,312,000; the loss on cotton was $11,562,000. The administrative expense for that period was $23,000,000. So, from the first period from 1938 to 1944 the score on crop insurance was a loss to the Federal Treasury, including administrative expenses, of $66,000,000.

At that time crop insurance was liquidated partly through a modest effort of my own and then was restored in the Senate, so we started once more. We started then on wheat and cotton and in an experimental way on tobacco, flax, and corn. On the latter crops we insured some 16 counties. Here is the score for period No. 2. We make a modest profit of $6,000,000 on wheat. We took a loss of $57,000,000 on cotton. Most of that came in one single crop year because the farmers had outguessed the Crop Insurance Corporation. The administrative expense for that period was $9,000,000. The loss, therefore, was a net $60,000,000; $66,000,000 plus $60,000,000 means a loss of $126,000,000. It reminds me of the echoes that come back from the discussion on crop insurance on this floor in 1938 when it was said, "Let us try it out; let us make this venture; we are sure that a capital stock of $100,000,000 will be sufficient to carry out all of the experimental stage and put it on good grounds." I have lived in my young life to see the day when the entire corporate stock of the crop-insurance program has been liquidated, and in addition thereto there has been an expenditure of $48,000,000 for administrative expenses.

Now, there are some oddities that have developed. For instance, in five States last year the expense of writing the business exceeded all of the premiums that we got. The field expense ranged from $4.79 to ¢20.78 per contract. No insurance company in the world could stay in business on that basis. I give you a typical example.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the State of Georgia the premiums were $200 000 plus and the expenses of doing business were $157,000. We cannot get crop insurance liquidated now, so I suggest to you that at least we adopt a limitation on the program, and the bill before you will place it on an experimental basis, namely, about 20 counties, for most of these crops.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand, the appropriation bill contained a continuity for the experimental program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The appropriation bill contained language setting a limitation similar to that carried in the Aiken bill in the Senate.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If this bill does not become law, will the experimental program continue or will it be stopped?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; the program will continue, but on a larger scale than is contemplated in the existing bill, and that is the reason I hope that the present bill will be enacted.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. It would seem that any ordinary business concern would do its experimental work first, and thereafter enlarge. We are doing it backward.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will say to my good friend from Pennsylvania that the affairs of government are not always ordinary.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York, Mr. Rooney.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the action taken earlier this week by the conferees on the Interior Department appropriation bill—which is now at the White House—is a signal victory for the

people of the Southwest insofar as the item for Southwestern Power Administration is concerned. The unanimous decision of the conferees guarantees that Norfork and Denison dams will be tied together as they should by a transmission line, and insures the construction of a substation to be built at Waleetka, Okla., at a cost of $500,000. Thus the people's dams will remain the properties of the people—not the properties of the private utilities and their powerful lobby.

The unexpended funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1947 are continued available during the fiscal year 1948 and whether work has been physically started before June 30, 1947, or not, are made available for the construction of necessary interconnecting facilities incident to and connected with the construction of the Denison-Norfork transmission line. Thus the competent administrator of Southwestern Power Administration, Douglas Wright, has sufficient moneys to carry on his commendable work for the people of the Southwest in the fiscal year 1948 and to cause electricity to be brought to many more of the farms of that portion of our great country.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I have tried to follow this crop-insurance program for the last 3 or 4 years. You heard the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that up until 1943 we squandered $66,280,000 on this program. At that time we had given them only $30,000,000 of capital stock. Then they asked for an appropriation for $40,000,000 more. At that time, because of the record they had made, I objected very strenuously to granting any more money to this organization. I not only fought that bill when it was on the floor of the House, but after the bill was passed I made up my mind that I would try my best as a Member of Congress to follow it through, and if possible make it successful, and stop the waste of Government funds. I wrote a letter to Marvin Jones, who was then War Food Administrator, and gave him my ideas on how that ought to be operated, and suggested he keep his eye on this organization. He replied that if it later did not prove out more satisfactorily than it had in the beginning, he would do his utmost to see that it was discontinued.

I then wrote a letter to Mr. Wright, who was then chairman of this corporation, and asked him the names of the people whom he would propose to operate it and their responsibility and experience in business. Mr. Wright gave me a reply, and also came to my office several times and discussed the Federal crop-insurance program with me. At that time he said he was having some men come from Chicago to try to assist them in making this plan work. That was in 1944.

Since that time they have lost every dollar that has been put into this program, every dollar of the capital stock, which amounted to $100,000,000. They spent over $50,000,000 in administration of the program. They made a profit of $8,000,000 on wheat and they lost that. All the premiums they received during the time crop insurance was in effect, and I do not know how many millions of dollars that was, have been lost. It continually lost, lost, lost. It is one of the most colossal instances of poor legislation and poor business I have ever known or had ever experienced. So I came to the conclusion that I would do everything I could to see that the Federal crop insurance was put out of business. I have not had any success in putting it out of business, because the Committee on Agriculture now comes in with this bill to carry insurance for crops on as an experiment. As was said a while ago, we are experimenting at the wrong end of this organization. It should have had its experimentation way back in 1939. But you are not through with this yet. It will be a great loss, I feel sure, as long as you go.

I asked the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture whether, if this experiment did not prove out successfully in 2 years, he would use his influence to close it up. He and other members of the Committee on Agriculture said if they could not make a successful venture out of it in 2 years it ought to be closed up. I hope they are going to carry that out.

This situation has been dreadfully bad. To think that we had a man in there for 3 or 4 years who squandered all this money. I went to see the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Anderson, just recently. I asked him where Mr. Wright was. He said, "He is not here now. There is somebody else who is going to have charge of this Federal crop insurance program." So I tried to find out where Mr. Wright was and I had quite a time locating him. I thought there was something wrong, so I sent for Mr. Wright. I located him down here in Alexandria. Finally, I got him in the office. I found out, but I did not find out from him, that Mr. Anderson showed him the gate and told him to get out. Well, Mr. Anderson did a good thing when he showed Mr. Wright the gate because anybody who could see a corporation run for this length of time and the great losses, ought to get the gate. Crop insurance as administered was inefficient, poor judgment, poor management, and it was not insurance but dishonest business as operated.

I hope you will vote for this resolution as bad as it is. We will have to take it and think it is a good thing just because it will stop the business as previously operated and certainly this bill will not be as bad as previously conducted. I shall vote for this improvement but if I could vote to eliminate the Federal Crop Insurance program altogether I would do so.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield the time I have to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that there is anything I can add to the discussion of this legislation. Of course, I have followed it for the last 8 years. I do want to point out that there seems to be one crop that this insurance particularly applies to, and that crop is tobacco. A tobacco crop is just a little bit different from any other crop because of the fact that a man usually has only a very small acreage. His whole yearly earnings are wrapped up in half an acre, an acre, or a few acres of tobacco.

Following the reports through the years and with all the bad records that we have had here today, those statements do not apply to tobacco.

As to the others, that is water under the dam. There is no use rehashing that. We know it has been maladministered. I think everyone admits that. It is regrettable that this crop-insurance program, though started as a program ended up in the class of a racket. But I do think from the standpoint of tobacco, if we did not go any further than that, we should carry this on for at least another year or two to see if we cannot set up some yardstick so far as the tobacco insurance for tobacco is concerned.

This legislation under consideration today, if carefully administered, will determine whether national crop insurance should be a permanent policy or whether it should be discontinued once and for all.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he desires to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL.]

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3465 is not new legislation. It is restrictive or a limitation on the present law as it is now written.

DIFFICULTIES WITH FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE

Contributing to the difficulties of this first Federal experiment in crop insurance was the background against which the legislation was enacted. The Nation had just passed through the disastrous drought years. Farmers in many parts of the country were reeling under the impact of the double blows of economic and natural disaster. They desperately needed assistance. The decision to undertake the writing of crop insurance on a Nation-wide scale, instead of on a limited experimental basis such as the course of prudence would have dictated, must be regarded as partially an effort to bring relief to farmers who were in critical need of it. As such, it served its purpose—and probably did so as equitably and at as little cost to the Federal Treasury as any other method would have done. But such a purpose was not conducive to the development of an actuarially sound system of insurance.

Inherent also in that crop insurance effort was the defect of its conception as part of the ever-normal granary. The commodities received as premium payments or purchased in the hedging operation, it was believed, would add to the supplies in the granary and contribute to the stabilization of agricultural prices—this apparently without realizing fully the cost of administering and storing such supplies and the effect the accumulated surpluses themselves would have in overriding and depressing the

very market they were designed to support.

Against this background Federal crop insurance got under way with the wheat crop of 1939; and for five successive years the indemnities paid exceeded the premiums collected, despite the fact that some of the years were excellent wheat-crop years for the country as a whole. In 1942 insurance was offered on cotton, pursuant to an amendment to the act, and for 2 years losses were sustained on cotton insurance, despite two good cotton crops.

By 1943 agriculture was well into the era of high wartime prices, emergency relief measures were no longer necessary, and crop insurance was terminated with the 1943 crop. The losses on wheat had total $26,312,000; on cotton, $11,480,000, plus an administrative expenditure of $28,488,000.

THE REINSTATED PROGRAM

There was still, however, the almost universal feeling that farmers are entitled to the stability resulting from insurance of their crops against losses from causes beyond their control, if such insurance could be developed on a sound basis—and that the brief period of semi-insurance, semi-relief activity from 1939 to 1943 had not given the program a fair trial. Accordingly, the decision to abandon the effort to develop crop insurance was reconsidered, and in December 1944 Congress reinstated the program. Some refinements and adjustments were made, in the light of the previous experience; but, on the whole, the scope of the wheat and cotton programs were not changed, and flax was added as a commodity on which general insurance was to be offered. Corn and tobacco were included but limited to 20 representative counties for each community. The results of this second phase of operations is shown in the following table:

Crop insurance—gain or loss from insurance operation, crop years 1945 and 1946

	1945	1946 [1]
Wheat	+$828,552.73	+$55,446,736.71
Cotton	−15,245,022.30	−41,020,044.02
Flax	+574,191.57	−566,240.25
Corn:		
Yield	−284,991.86	−6,149.00
Investment	+21,801.29	+47,599.24
Tobacco	+148,949.02	+508,700.00

[1] Estimated.

NOTE.—Plus (+) indicates gain; minus (−) indicates loss.

With the exception of cotton, the results in terms of gain or loss during the past 2 years have not been too unsatisfactory. The losses on cotton, however, are not such as can be countenanced in a sound insurance program, and there is no present assurance that a similar situation will not develop with regard to wheat if the current cycle of exceptionally favorable wheat years should suddenly end. To put it briefly, the committee believes that the present crop-insurance program is, on the whole, neither sound insurance nor profitable experimentation.

DEVELOPMENT A LONG-TIME PROJECT

The committee believes it should be recognized that the development of a sound crop-insurance program covering even the major agricultural commodities on a Nation-wide basis is a long-time project that may well take years in its accomplishment. It has taken many years, the experience and intelligence of many individuals, and the investment and loss of millions of dollars to develop other forms of casualty insurance to the sound position they now occupy. In the course of that development, hundreds of insurance companies were formed and went bankrupt, hundreds of types of insurance were tried and found wanting, and millions of individual investors and policy holders ventured and lost their own money in the trial and error experiments which eventually contributed to the welfare of the Nation as a whole. In crop insurance, at least, those who could least afford it—the policyholders who thought they had purchased protection—have not been required to foot the whole bill for the national experiment.

If crop insurance is to succeed in the United States, it must fulfill two basic requirements: First, it must be sound from a business standpoint—capable of "paying its own way" and operating without loss to the Government; second, it must offer farmers a type of insurance they want and are willing and able to pay for.

FARMERS ENTITLED TO EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM

The committee believes that it is possible eventually to write crop insurance that will meet both these basic qualifications. It does not believe that this can be accomplished overnight nor that it is reasonable to expect that a half-dozen crop seasons of experience will achieve for crop insurance what it took other forms of commodity insurance many years of trial and error to develop. The committee is convinced, however, that the best interests of farmers themselves will be most truly served if the Public Treasury is protected against excessive loss, by curtailment of the insurance program during its development period to the smallest scale consistent with effective experimentation, and expanding it later only when experience has indicated that a sound insurance plan has been worked out.

The committee has, therefore, prepared this bill, H. R. 3465, placing the crop-insurance program on a strictly experimental basis and providing the Crop Insurance Corporation with the latitude of operation and the authority which it believes to be necessary to the carrying out of a truly experimental program. The details of the proposed program are explained in the analysis of the bill.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that much can be gained by trying to place responsibility for the losses on crop insurance in the past. I think an investigation would disclose that there are many different sources to blame.

I do want to express the hope that some way can be found to bring some degree of security to those people who provide the food and fiber to feed and clothe the Nation. I have said before and I would like to repeat now that it seems to me the people who work in the field, who work in the sun and produce the food to feed the remainder of the Nation are entitled to that same degree of security and protection as is now enjoyed by the people who eat that food. Is that not fundamental?

I hope that some way can be found out of this experiment whereby we can bring to the people on the farms some protection against the hazards they must bear today. I think that the pending bill will greatly improve the program.

I would like to refer briefly to some of the measures provided in this bill which should save the Government the enormous losses which have been mentioned here.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield briefly.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to make this observation. The gentleman from Georgia now addressing us, as well as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, have both been energetic in taking every step for the welfare of the people who live and work on our farms.

Mr. PACE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. In regard to cotton insurance, does that extend to all varieties of cotton, long fiber as well as short?

Mr. PACE. It extends to all varieties and in all areas. When the experimental program is put into operation, the purpose will be to select a county here and a county there which, when selected, will be completely representative of the production of cotton throughout the Nation.

I would like to state some of the changes which are being made and which I think will prevent future losses.

This bill limits the farmer's recovery under his policy to not exceeding his investment. So no more can there be the possibility of a producer abandoning his crop and trying to make a profit on his insurance.

Secondly, it eliminates insurance in any county where there are not at least 200 farms, or one-third of the farmers under the program. This should eliminate a great deal of expense.

Third, and very important, for the first time we give the Board the right to refuse to write farmers on the basis of risk. Heretofore the Corporation was required to insure a crop regardless of the reputation, the background, or the moral risk of the farmer. The Corporation states that this has contributed in good measure to its losses.

Fourth, and I think this is equally important, this bill gives the Corporation the right to hire and fire and direct its own employees. I know many of you will be surprised to learn that up to this time the Corporation did the insuring but another agency of the Department of Agriculture provided all of the employees to administer the program out in the field. The consequence has been to have a business organization trying to put the program on a business basis but with no authority to select its employees.

Lastly, and also important, heretofore and hereafter all premiums may be paid in the commodity; that is, if you insure a wheat crop, you can pay your premium in wheat. But to save itself from heavy

losses due to changes in price the Corporation has been required to buy an amount of wheat equal to the premiums and keep it in storage. This has been very expensive. Under this bill the Corporation is authorized to establish premiums on the basis of the parity or comparable price for the commodity insured, or on the basis of an average market price, and then to determine indemnities on the same price basis as the premiums are determined. This should result in great savings and greatly improve the program.

I ask your approval of this bill, and I sincerely hope that through these experimental programs we can find sound means and methods of soon setting up a Nation-wide, all-commodity insurance program for the protection of our agricultural producers.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I wish that this bill had been brought before the House under a rule which would enable more time for debate. This matter is an important one. The farmers of America are interested in Federal Crop Insurance. The bill contains necessary amendments to the Federal Crop Insurance Act. I think these amendments will revitalize the program and will enable a greater number of farmers of America to participate in this Federal crop insurance program.

For many years, almost every member of the economic family of the Nation, has been able to insure against accidental loss of the commodity he deals with, except the farmer. The idea of protecting the farmer against accidental loss or destruction of his products is a sound one. The law with these amendments will, I believe, be put on a sound basis. Insurance generally is comparatively new, but it has been fully applied to the protection of every commodity except the crops grown by farmers. Many years ago, efforts were made to provide crop insurance but the first real effort came in the act of February 1938. However, the program has been carried out on a hit and miss basis and it has never had the backing from Congress it deserves.

This bill undertakes to place the act on a sound basis which will eventually pay its own way without loss to the Government and it proposes to offer farmers a type of insurance which they want and which they are willing to pay for. I think the Committee on Agriculture has done a splendid service to the farmers of the Nation in reporting this measure and I hope that it may be passed through both Houses of Congress during this session.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its amendment and request a conference with the Senate and that the Chair appoint conferees.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HOPE, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, HILL, FLANNAGAN, and COOLEY.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today following the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today following the special orders heretofore granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TIBBOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio broadcast.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

MARINE BAND AUTHORIZED TO ATTEND THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION AT NEW YORK AND THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES IN CLEVELAND, OHIO

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4247) to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the national convention of the American Legion to be held in New York, N. Y., August 28 to 31, 1947.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 1633) to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the national convention of the American Legion to be held in New York, N. Y., August 28 to 31, 1947, and the national convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, September 4 to 9, 1947, may be substituted for the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to permit the band of the United States Marine Corps to attend and perform in the parade of the American Legion to be held in New York, N. Y., on August 30, 1947, and to attend and perform in the parade of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in Cleveland, Ohio, on a date between September 4 to 9, 1947, to be selected by the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of defraying the expenses of such band in attending and performing in such parades, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sufficient sum to cover the cost of transportation and pullman accommodations for the leaders and members of the Marine Band, and allowance not to exceed $6 per day each for additional traveling and living expenses while on duty, such allowances to be in addition to the pay and allowance to which they would be entitled while serving their permanent station.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider and a similar House bill (H. R. 4247) were laid on the table.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION: CANCELLATION OF CAPITAL STOCK AND REFUND OF MONEYS RECEIVED FOR SUCH STOCK

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1070) to provide for the cancellation of the capital stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the refund of moneys received for such stock and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is directed to retire its capital stock by paying the amount received therefor (whether received from the Secretary of the Treasury or the Federal Reserve banks) to the Secretary of the Treasury as hereinafter provided, to be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. As soon as practicable after the enactment of this act, the Corporation shall pay to the Secretary so much of its capital and surplus as is in excess of $1,000,000,000. The balance of the amount to be paid to the Secretary shall be paid in units of $10,000,000 except that the last unit to be paid may be less than $10,000,000. Each unit shall be paid as soon as it may be paid without reducing the capital and surplus of the Corporation below $1,000,000,000. As each payment is made a corresponding amount of the capital stock of the Corporation shall be retired and canceled and the receipt or certificate therefor shall be surrendered or endorsed to show such cancellation. The stock subscribed by the various Federal Reserve banks shall be retired and canceled, pro rata, before the stock subscribed by the Secretary is retired and canceled.

SEC. 2. Section 12B (d) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 264 (d)), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. Section 12B (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 264 (b)), is amended by striking out "$10,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$15,000."

SEC. 4. Section 12B (c) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 264 (c)), is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The Corporation is authorized to borrow from the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to loan to the Corporation on such terms as may be fixed by the Corporation and the Secretary, such funds as in the judgment of the Board of Directors of the Corporation are from time to time required for insurance purposes, not exceeding in the aggregate $3,000,000,000. For such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds of the sale of any securities hereafter issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, are extended to include such loans. Any such loan shall be used by the Corporation solely in carrying out its functions with respect to such insurance. All loans and repayments under this section shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States."

SEC. 5. Subsections (b) and (c) of section 5c of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, secs. 606a (b) and (c)), are hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 20, strike out "$12,500" and insert "$15,000."

Page 3, line 7, after the figures "$3,000,000" insert "outstanding at any one time: *Provided*, That the rate of interest to be charged in connection with any loan made pursuant to this paragraph shall not be less than the current average rate on outstanding marketable and nonmarketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the making of such loan."

Page 3, strike out lines 23 and 24, and on page 4, strike out all of lines 1 and 2.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGIONAL DISBURSING OFFICERS, TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 907) to provide for the orderly transaction of the public business in the event of the death, resignation, or separation from office of regional disbursing officers of the Treasury Department.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the orderly transaction of the public business in the event of the death or of the resignation or separation from office of the Chief Disbursing Officer," approved December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1086; U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, title 5, sec. 249b), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That in case of the death or of the resignation or separation from office of the Chief Disbursing Officer or any regional disbursing officer of the Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department, the accounts of such Chief Disbursing Officer or regional disbursing officer may be continued and payments made in his name by an Assistant Chief Disbursing Officer designated by the Secretary of the Treasury or by an assistant regional disbursing officer designated by the Secretary of the Treasury or designated by an official of the Treasury Department authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury to make such designated, for a period of time not to extend beyond the last day of the second month following the month in which such death, resignation, or separation shall occur. Such accounts and payments shall be allowed, audited, and settled in the General Accounting Office, and the checks signed in the name of the former Chief Disbursing Officer or regional disbursing officer shall be honored by the Treasurer of the United States, in the same manner as if the former Chief Disbursing Officer or regional disbursing officer had continued in office. The former Chief Disbursing Officer or regional disbursing officer, his estate, or the surety on his official bond, shall not be subject to any legal liability or penalty for the official acts and defaults of the Assistant Chief Disbursing Officer or assistant regional disbursing officer acting in the name or in the place of the former Chief Disbursing Officer or regional disbursing officer under this act, but the Assistant Chief Disbursing Officer or the assistant regional disbursing officer, and his surety, shall be responsible therefor under his bond. The bond of the Acting Chief Disbursing Officer or acting regional disbursing officer shall be an amount at least equal to the minimum amount of the bond required of the Chief Disbursing Officer or the regional disbursing officer, respectively. The Secretary of the Treasury may, from time to time, require the Assistant Chief Disbursing Officer, or the assistant regional disbursing officer, to renew and increase his bond to the United States."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 9, strike out the word "designated" and insert the word "designation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INSTITUTE OF INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4168) to provide for the reincorporation of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there be, as of the date of enactment of this act, created as an agency of the United States of America a body corporate with the name of "The Institute of Inter-American Affairs" (in this act called the "Institute").

SEC. 2. The purposes of this corporation are to further the general welfare of, and to strengthen friendship and understanding among, the peoples of the American Republics through collaboration with other governments and governmental agencies of the American Republics in planning, initiating, assisting, financing, administering, and executing technical programs and projects, especially in the fields of public health, sanitation, agriculture, and education.

SEC. 3. The Institute, as a corporation—

(a) Shall have succession for a period of 5 years unless sooner dissolved by an act of Congress.

(b) May adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed.

(c) May make and perform contracts with any individual, corporation, or other body of persons however designated, whether within or without the United States of America, and with any government or governmental agency, domestic or foreign.

(d) Shall determine and prescribe the manner in which its obligations shall be incurred and its expenses allowed and paid.

(e) May, as necessary for the transaction of the business of the Institute, employ officers, employees, agents, and attorneys in accordance with the provisions of the civil service and classification laws, except that the Institute may, without regard to the civil service and classification laws, employ, and fix the compensation of, officers, employees, agents, and attorneys of the Institute employed for service outside the continental limits of the United States: *Provided*, That the salary of any person thus employed shall not exceed the maximum salary established by the classification laws, and that the Institute may require bonds of any employee and pay the premiums of such bonds: *Provided further*, That no person who is a citizen of the United States not presently employed by the Institute of Inter-American affairs or the Inter-American Educational Foundation, Inc., shall be employed under authority of this paragraph (e) until such person has been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation: *Provided further*, That no person not a citizen of the United States shall be employed under authority of this paragraph (e) for service in any Amerian Republic of which such person is not a citizen except with the specific approval of the Government of the American Republic concerned.

(f) May acquire by purchase, devise, bequest, or gift, or otherwise, lease, hold, and improve such real and personal property as it finds to be necessary to its purposes, whether within or without the United States, and in any manner dispose of all such real and personal property held by it and use as general funds all receipts arising from the disposition of such property.

(g) Shall be entitled to the use of the United States mails in the same manner and on the same conditions as the executive departments of the Government.

(h) May, with the consent of any board, corporation, commission, independent establishment, or executive department of the Government, including any field service thereof, avail itself of the use of information, services, facilities, officers, and employees thereof in carrying out the provisions of this act.

(i) May accept money, funds property, and services of every kind by gift, devise or bequest, or grant, or otherwise, and make advances and grants to any individual, corporation, or other body of persons, whether within or without the United States of America, or to any government or governmental agency, domestic or foreign, when deemed advisable by the Institute in furtherance of its purposes.

(j) May sue and be sued, complain, and defend, in its corporate name in any court of competent jurisdiction.

(k) Shall have such other powers as may be necessary and incident to carrying out its powers and duties under this act.

SEC. 4. Upon termination of the corporate life of the Institute all of its functions shall be liquidated and, thereafter, unless otherwise provided by Congress, the assets shall be transferred to the United States Treasury as the property of the United States.

SEC. 5. (a) The management of the Institute shall be vested in a board of directors (hereinafter referred to as the "Board") of not less than five in number, each of whom shall be appointed by the Secretary of State from among the officials and employees of the Department of State and, in the discretion of the Secretary of State and with the consent of the chiefs of other departments or agencies respectively concerned from among the officials and employees of other United States Government departments and agen-

cies: *Provided*, That no person shall be appointed as a director under authority of this paragraph (a) until such person has been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(b) The Secretary of State shall designate one director as Chairman of the Board.

(c) The directors shall hold office at the pleasure of the Secretary of State.

(d) The directors shall receive no additional compensation for their services as directors but may be allowed actual necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as directors.

(e) The Board shall direct the exercise of all the powers of the Institute.

(f) The Board may prescribe, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which the business of the Institute may be conducted and in which the powers granted to it by law may be exercised and enjoyed: *Provided*, That a majority of the Board shall be required as a quorum.

(g) In furtherance and not in limitation of the powers conferred upon it, the Board may appoint such committees for the carrying out of the work of the Institute as the Board finds to be for the best interests of the Institute, each committee to consist of two or more of the directors, which committees, together with officers and agents duly authorized by the Board and to the extent provided by the Board, shall have and may exercise the powers of the Board in the management of the business and affairs of the Institute.

SEC. 6. The Institute shall be a nonprofit corporation and shall have no capital stock. No part of its revenue, earnings, or other income or property shall inure to the benefit of its directors, officers, and employees and such revenue, earnings, or other income, or property shall be used for the carrying out of the corporate purposes herein set forth. No director, officer, or employee of the corporation shall in any manner directly or indirectly participate in the deliberation upon or the determination of any question affecting his personal interests or the interests of any corporation, partnership, or organization in which he is directly or indirectly interested.

SEC. 7. When approved by the Institute, in furtherance of its purposes, the officers and employees of the Institute may accept and hold offices or positions to which no compensation is attached with governments or governmental agencies of the other American Republics.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of State shall have authority to detail employees of the Department of State to the Institute under such circumstances and upon such conditions as he may determine: *Provided*, That any such employee so detailed shall not lose any privileges, rights, or seniority as an employee of the Government by virtue of such detail.

SEC. 9. The principal office of the Institute shall be located in the District of Columbia, but there may be established agencies, branch offices, or other offices in any place or places within the United States or the other American Republics in any of which locations the Institute may carry on all or any of its operations and business under bylaws or rules and regulations.

SEC. 10. The Institute, including its franchise and income, shall be exempt from taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, or any Territory, dependency, or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority.

SEC. 11. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved. If any clause, sentence, paragraph, or part of this act shall for any reason be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of this act, but shall be confined in its operations to the clause, sentence, paragraph, or part thereof directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment shall have been rendered.

SEC. 12. The Institute of Inter-American Affairs and the Inter-American Educational Foundation, Inc., two Government corporations caused to be created under the laws of the State of Delaware on March 31, 1942, and September 25, 1943, respectively, by the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, shall, within 10 days following the enactment of this act, transfer to the corporation created by this act all necessary personnel, the assets, funds, and property—real, personal, and mixed—and all debts, liabilities, obligations, and duties, and all right, privileges, and powers subject to all restrictions, disabilities, and duties of the two said corporations, and the corporation created by this act, shall accept full title to and ownership of all the assets, funds, and property—real, personal, and mixed—and all debts, liabilities, obligations, and duties, and all rights, privileges, and powers subject to the said restrictions, disabilities, and duties of the two said corporations and all such debts, liabilities, obligations, and duties of the two said corporations shall henceforth attach to the corporation created by this act and may be enforced against it to the same extent as if said debts, liabilities, obligations, and duties had been incurred or contracted by the corporation created by this act: *Provided*, That all citizens of the United States presently employed by the Institute of Inter-American Affairs or the Inter-American Educational Foundation, Inc., and transferred under authority of this section 12 to the corporation created by this act shall be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation within 6 months following the date of enactment of this act: *Provided further*, That no person not a citizen of the United States presently employed by the Institute of Inter-American Affairs or the Inter-American Educational Foundation, Inc., for service in an American Republic of which such person is not a citizen, and transferred under authority of this section 12, shall be retained in such service for a period exceeding three months from the date of enactment of this act except with the specific approval of the government of the American Republic concerned.

SEC. 13. The Institute shall be subject to the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act (Public Law 248, 79th Cong.).

SEC. 14. There are authorized to be appropriated, at a rate not to exceed $5,000,000 annually, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this act.

This act may be cited as the "Institute of Inter-American Affairs Act."

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman what his understanding is as to the intent on the part of the State Department for these Inter-American corporations? When this bill came up on the Consent Calendar the other day I requested another Member to ask that it be passed over, which was done.

In the Appropriations Committee it is our general understanding that these activities are to be liquidated as of June 30, 1948, which leads me to believe there is little reason for the extension of these corporations. The gentleman's bill attempts to give them 5 years new life. He has agreed to 3 years instead of 5. But I would like it to be explicitly understood that there is not to be any initiation of new contracts, programs, involving commitment of this Government beyond the present commitments on the part of the United States.

Mr. JONKMAN. The gentleman means beyond June 30, 1948?

Mr. PLOESER. I have not any objection to the period of liquidation or even an additional supervisory period. But this attempt amounts to committing us to new programs. All of these programs have an expiration date prior to June 30, 1948.

Mr. JONKMAN. This is a Government-owned corporation incorporated under the laws of the State of Delaware. In December 1945, the Government passed the Government Corporation Decontrol Act which provided that after June 30, 1948 all of these corporations incorporated under State law should cease to operate as agencies of the United States. That is the statute that is affecting the Institute of Inter-American Affairs. It is not the action of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. PLOESER. Of course, that is not the question. The question is, do they intend to institute any new programs beyond those which they are now completing?

Mr. JONKMAN. My understanding is that they do not intend to institute any programs after 1948. There may be minor ones within the period through 1948.

Mr. PLOESER. They testified before us that these programs are expiring and a liquidation period as far as financial assistance beyond 1948 is concerned is not needed, that in the main it may take some time into the fiscal year 1949 to wipe out all of the commitments we have as of the present day. This looks like a chance for the camel to get its nose under the tent and make new commitments for additional programs.

Mr. JONKMAN. Some of these programs take 2, 3, 4, or 5 years. There are some that are not completed and will not be completed perhaps by June 30, 1948.

Mr. PLOESER. It is not the gentleman's intention that they initiate any new programs?

Mr. JONKMAN. It is my understanding they will not.

Mr. PLOESER. That is the gentleman's intention. The gentleman's intention and my intention is that they shall not.

Mr. JONKMAN. That is my understanding.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONKMAN: Page 2, line 5, after the word "of", strike out "five" and insert "three."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYING CERTAIN LANDS IN BOISE, IDAHO

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1505) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Boise, Idaho, to the Boise Chamber of Commerce.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what kind of land is this?

Mr. GOFF. It is some lots that the Chamber of Commerce of Boise conveyed to the Department of Agriculture for the purpose of building an office for the Forest Service. The lots were not used for that purpose. The building was not constructed, and now this bill seeks to reconvey the lots to the Boise Chamber of Commerce. They were conveyed to the Federal Government for the sum of $1. The bill has passed the Senate.

Mr. RICH. Will the chamber of commerce give the $1 back?

Mr. GOFF. Yes. It provides that they shall pay the same price as the Government paid for it.

Mr. RICH. I withdraw my reservation, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the Boise Chamber of Commerce, Boise, Idaho, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to lots one to nine, inclusive, in block two of Riverside Park addition to Boise City, Ada County, Idaho.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL PERMANENT MAJOR GENERALS

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3993) to authorize the appointment of certain additional permanent major generals and brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized to appoint as permanent major generals of the line of the Regular Army the following officers of the Regular Army serving in the temporary grade of major general in the Army of the United States: Edward P. King, Jr.; William F. Sharp; George F. Moore; George M. Parker, Jr.; and Albert M. Jones.

SEC. 2. The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized to appoint as permanent brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army the following officers of the Regular Army serving in the temporary grade of brigadier general in the Army of the United States: Clifford Bluemel, James R. N. Weaver, Maxon S. Lough, William E. Brougher, Joseph P. Vachon, Charles C. Drake, Bradford G. Chynoweth, Clinton A. Pierce, Arnold J. Funk, Lewis C. Beebe, and Kearie L. Berry.

SEC. 3. The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized to appoint Luther R. Stevens, an officer of the Philippine Constabulary, serving as a temporary brigadier general in the Philippine Army, as a permanent brigadier general of the line of the Regular Army.

SEC. 4. Effective as of the date of his relief from active duty, Carl H. Seals, a retired officer of the Regular Army serving on active duty as a temporary brigadier general in the Army of the United States, shall be advanced on the retired list of the Regular Army to the grade of brigadier general, and shall receive the retired pay provided by law for officers retired in that grade.

SEC. 5. Any persons appointed pursuant to the provisions of section 1, 2, or 3 of this act shall be additional general officers of the line of the Regular Army in the grades to which so appointed and shall not be counted for the purposes of provisions of law establishing the authorized number of general officers of the line of the Regular Army. Nothing in this act shall be deemed permanently to increase the authorized number of general officers of the line of the Regular Army or to authorize the appointment in the grade of general officer of the line of any successor to any such person.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. D'EWART: On page 2, line 9, strike out the word "and" after the first comma, and before the period, insert the words "and William P. Morse."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERRING JURISDICTION UPON THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 609) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claims arising out of the deaths of Normal Ray Pedron and Carl Franklin Morris.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claims against the United States arising out of the deaths of Normal Ray Pedron and Carl Franklin Morris, late of Hope, Ark., who were killed April 15, 1944, at Hope, Ark., by the explosion of a 37-millimeter shell of the type used by the United States Army.

SEC. 2. In the determination of such claims the United States shall be held liable for damages and for any acts committed by any of its officers or employees, to the same extent as if the United States were a private person.

SEC. 3. Suit upon such claims may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claims, and appeals from and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph "twentieth" of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRIET TOWNSEND BOTTOMLEY

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 2389, an act for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. JENNINGS, SPRINGER, and KEAN.

A. E. McCARTNEY ET AL.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 629) entitled "An act for the relief of A. E. McCartney and O. A. Foster; P. W. Woodyard and J. R. Mahon; B. E. Truitt, T. L. Truitt, and W. B. Lacy; G. W. Cox, J. M. Cox, and F. T. Cox; W. W. Cox and Dr. J. W. Cox; Robert Cathcart and Claude Cathcart," do pass with the following Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 4, after "$3,688.69", insert "the sum of $930.75 to Joseph Natali, Stanolind Oil & Gas Co., and Farmers' Land & Canal Co., and the sum of $1,004.06 to J. E. Fournier, Stanolind Oil & Gas Co., and Farmers' Land & Canal Co."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill for the relief of A. E. McCartney and others."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3678) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3678) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 36.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 26, 27, 28, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,388,266,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$21,469,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In

lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,549,755,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,170,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$154,032,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$83,299,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$699,646,960"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$374,055,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$82,474,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$829,272,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$430,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$69,534,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$129,386,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$191,353,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$320,739,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$245,532,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$19,890,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$134,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$67,828,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$43,039,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 11, 16, 19, 21, 24, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, and 92.

ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
HARVE TIBBOTT,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
W. F. NORRELL,
Managers on the Part of the House

CHAN GURNEY,
WAYLAND BROOKS,
CLYDE M. REED,
STYLES BRIDGES,
ELMER THOMAS,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3678) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $2,388,286,700 for "Pay of the Army" instead of $2,348,438,179 as proposed by the House and $2,423,813,129 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $21,469,000 for "Finance service, Finance Department," instead of $20,160,650 as proposed by the House and $22,806,563, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Corrects total for the "Finance Service, Army."

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $7,170,500 for "Welfare of enlisted men, Quartermaster Corps," instead of $6,777,141 as proposed by the House and $7,610,619 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $78,559,860 for "Regular supplies of the Army" as proposed by the Senate instead of $70,059,860 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $154,032,900 for "Clothing and equipage" instead of $153,834,336 as proposed by the House and $154,330,688 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $83,299,300 for "Incidental expenses of the Army" instead of $78,530,058 as proposed by the House and $88,430,042 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8: Corrects total for the "Quartermaster Service, Army."

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $374,055,100 for "Transportation service, Army," instead of $347,577,227 as proposed by the House and $392,633,443 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $82,474,900 for "Signal Service, Army," instead of $79,128,895 as proposed by the House and $85,475,501 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $829,272,100 for the "Air Corps, Army," instead of $773,332,508 as proposed by the House and $858,443,591 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13: Authorizes contract authorization of $430,000,000 for "Air Corps, Army," instead of $280,000,000 as proposed by the House and $497,490,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $69,534,000 for the "Medical and Hospital Department" instead of $69,153,267 as proposed by the House and $70,049,458 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $129,386,000 for "Engineer Service, Army," instead of $114,512,405 as proposed by the House and $145,456,441 as proposed by the Senate. The $10,800,000 recommended by the Senate for requirements due to the new policy of treating as liberated nations certain countries heretofore treated as occupied is not included in the approved amount. This action by the conferees is not intended to prevent a request for a deficiency for this purpose later in the year upon proper justifications.

Amendment No. 16: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $191,353,000 for "Barracks and quarters, Army," instead of $184,702,101 as proposed by the House and $197,896,261 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Corrects a total for "Engineer Service, Army."

Amendment No. 19: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $245,532,800 for "Ordnance Service and Supplies, Army," instead of $244,381,771 as proposed by the House and $247,024,041 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $19,890,300 for "Chemical Service, Army," instead of $19,240,936 as proposed by the House and $20,487,813 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $134,000,000 for the "National Guard" instead of $110,000,000 as proposed by the House and $136,535,176 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates $67,828,900 for the "Organized Reserves" instead of $54,975,816 as proposed by the House and $80,681,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates $25,025,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $24,840,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 27: Increases the limitation on "Clerical services" to $92,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $60,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates $303,500 for the "Promotion of rifle practice," as proposed by the Senate instead of $281,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 29: Adjusts the funds to be transferred by the Secretary of War for employment of additional personnel at the

seat of government and elsewhere to $43,039,100.

Amendments Nos. 30 to 35, inclusive: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 36: Eliminates the provision proposed by the Senate authorizing the transfer of not to exceed 5 percent between appropriations.

TITLE II—SURPLUS APPROPRIATION RESCISSIONS

Amendments Nos. 37 to 92, inclusive: Reported in disagreement.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

Amendment No. 11, pertaining to contract authorization for the "Signal Service of the Army." The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment limiting such authorization to $5,000,000 instead of $11,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16, pertaining to contract authorization "Engineer Service, Army." The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment limiting such authorization to $2,000,000 instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19. Eliminates the House language pertaining to the sale of scrap or salvage material under "Ordnance Service and Supplies, Army," and substitutes therefor clarifying language as follows:

"*Provided*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, not more than $25,000,000 of the amounts received by the War Department during the fiscal year 1948 as proceeds from the sale of scrap or salvage material shall be available for expenses of transportation, demilitarization, and other preparation for sale or salvage of military supplies, equipment, and matériel: *Provided further*, That a report of receipts and disbursements under this limitation shall be made quarterly to the Appropriations Committees of the Congress;"

The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 21, pertaining to contract authorization "Ordnance Service and Supplies, Army." The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment limiting such authorization to $2,000,000 instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24, pertaining to contract authorization for the National Guard. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment limiting such authorization to $15,000,000 instead of $25,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 30 to 35, inclusive, under "General provisions," clarifying House language pertaining to the application of personnel ceilings governing personnel employed by other agencies but performing work for the War Department. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

TITLE II—SURPLUS APPROPRIATION RESCISSIONS

Amendments Nos. 37 to 92, inclusive, provide for the rescission of certain appropriations made for the fiscal year 1940 through 1946 in the revised amount of $1,438,966,500. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
HARVE TIBBOTT,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
W. F. NORRELL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3678) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this is the War Department military appropriation bill. The original budget estimate was $5,716,791,500. The House reduced this $435,809,000, or to $5,280,000,000. The Senate restored $335,636,376, or all of the House cut but $100,000,000. In the conference the House receded on $201,000,000 and the Senate on $134,000,000, leaving the bill $234,261,000 below the budget estimate.

The bill as it left the House had $280,000,000 in contract authorizations. The Senate increased these contract authorizations to $543,490,000. The conference reduced it to $454,000,000 or a reduction of $89,490,000. There was a supplemental estimate for airplanes on this contract authorization of $103,000,000. The Senate added $34,000,000 new money because of the increased cost of gasoline. This is over and above the budget. The conference agreed to $24,000,000, or $10,000,000 below the amount put in by the Senate.

As to increases for various other items, the National Guard was increased $26,535,000, the Organized Reserves $25,000,000, the ROTC $25,000,000. The total increase on these last items by the Senate was $52,942,000, that is, over and above the budget estimate, and the conference agreed to $37,900,000, a reduction of approximately $15,000,000. There were other items, the conversion of vessels, and so forth, on which the Senate added $20,856,000, and we restored $8,000,000 finally. In other words, the new money added by the Senate was $108,000,000, and the conferees restored $73,000,000, or a reduction of $35,000,000.

When the bill went to the Senate it contained a reduction of 74,806 civilian employees. The Senate restored 35,204 of the 74,806. The conferees reduced this number and agreed to put back 16,435 employees, leaving a net reduction in the number of employees of 58,371, instead of 74,806.

The House took out $184,086,216 for the civilian employees, and the Senate restored $86,803,000. The conferees agreed on a restoration of a net sum of $41,200,000, leaving a net savings on civilian employees of approximately $143,000,000.

Of the officers, that is, not including nurses or warrant officers, the House provided in the original bill for a total number of 132,500. The House reduced this by 17,500, leaving 115,000. The Senate restored 10,000. The conferees agreed on a restoration of 5,000, leaving the Army with 120,000 officers, making a reduction of 12,500.

There was a reduction of 2,600 warrant officers. The Senate restored all of them, and we finally agreed to a reduction of about 650 at a saving of $2,500,000.

I think that covers the picture pretty well.

I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, the chairman has made a very comprehensive statement and I am in full accord with him. The members of the conference committee of the House and Senate did a good job, and I think we have a bill that the House will be satisfied with.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], a member of the committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I think the significance of the conference report can be realized by a brief reference to four features in what was done.

Those four features would be: One, what we did with respect to civilian employees of the War Department; two, what we did with respect to officers; three, what we did with respect to the Air Force; and, four, what we did with respect to the National Guard.

First. With respect to civilian employees, in the bill that the House passed the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the War Department made reductions ranging from 5 percent to 25 percent in the number of civilian employees requested by the various branches of the War Department. The Senate restored those reductions in many instances 100 percent and in some instances not that much. The conference agreement on the civilian employees so far as the zone of the interior is concerned was to allow 50 percent of the Senate restoration. With respect to civilian employees overseas, the House bill originally made a straight reduction of 10 percent. The Senate restored the full 10 percent of that reduction. The conference agreement retained 60 percent of that 10-percent reduction originally voted by the House. In many of the zones overseas foreign nationals are available. This action refers to nationals of the United States who are civilian employees.

Mr. DURHAM. Can the gentleman give us the final figures on the Air Forces?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I will be glad to do that as item three.

Second, with respect to officers, when the bill passed the House we made a reduction of about $96,000,000 in the officers, both commissioned and warrant officers. The Senate restored $55,000,000 for commissioned officers and $10,000,000 for warrant officers. The conference agreement restores $35,000,000, of which $27,500,000 is for commissioned officers and $7,500,000 for warrant officers. This means a saving of $60,000,000 from the original budget estimate and the conferees believe ample officer strength is provided, especially keeping in mind the fact that we have a great pool of well-trained experienced Reserve officers at this time.

It should also be borne in mind that during our deliberations on the bill, the War Department brought before us a

revised table of organization which reduced money requirements. The committee was not satisfied in our hearings with the showing of the War Department on officer distribution. They had 20,000 majors as against 6,000 first lieutenants and 4,000 second lieutenants, and 6,000 colonels. Obviously, that was wholly out of balance. In the revised table they brought before us they reduced the ratios of colonels and majors and made an increase in the lower grades.

Now, third, with respect to the Air Force and its planes. Members of the House will recall that when the bill left the House we provided $400,000,000 in cash for the procurement of airplanes and $280,000,000 contract authorization. Both of those items were stepped up by the other body.

One reason was that the cost of airplanes had gone up from the time the estimates were originally prepared. As I recall the figures, the Senate added $4,000,000 in cash for procurement of airplane spare parts and raised the contract authorizations from $280,000,000 to $497,000,000. The conferees agreed upon the cash and $430,000,000 in contract authorizations for the procurement of airplanes and things that go with them.

The total cash money for the Air Forces, as provided by the conference agreement, is $829,000,000, as compared with $773,000,000 proposed by the House and $858,000,000 proposed by the Senate. I have used round figures. Much of the increase in cash is to cover increased costs of gasoline.

Fourth, with respect to the National Guard. When the bill passed the House we did not cut the budget estimates for the National Guard. We gave the War Department every dollar that was requested for the National Guard. We were happy to find in our conference with the other body that the opinion of the Members of the Senate was in accord with the feeling of the Members of the House on the importance of the National Guard. They gave them not merely the budget estimate, but they gave them a considerable increase over the request of the budget. The final action on the National Guard gives them $24,000,000 more than the House figure. There was a general feeling by the conferees on both sides that in the present world situation it is important that the National Guard be kept in a position where the Reserve officers in the Guard will get the training they should have to keep them up to date, and to make them available should an emergency ever arise.

These four features I have mentioned may help Members to interpret the action taken on this important part of the national economy.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. How many planes are provided for in the appropriation?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In our discussions in the conference we did not deal in numbers of airplanes but in terms of millions of pounds of aircraft. The fact that we did not make the authorization in numbers of planes is because discretion is left with the War Department as to the types of planes they will procure.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Will the gentleman tell me briefly about the constituted Reserve officers?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the gentleman have in mind the Organized Reserves as distinguished from the National Guard?

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The conference agreement on the Organized Reserves appropriates $67,828,900 for the Organized Reserves as compared with $54,975,000 proposed by the House, and $80,661,000 proposed by the Senate.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 11: Page 23, line 13, insert "and in addition to this appropriation the Secretary may, prior to July 1, 1948, enter into contracts in an amount not in excess of $11,000,000."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wish to say just one word further to what I have said previously. This was a conference that it was anticipated would be a very difficult conference. I want to express my personal appreciation for the leadership of the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the committee, and for the work of the other conferees. I felt that we went into a difficult conference, but we found that working on it for the last couple of days we were able to reach a complete agreement. I believe that saves time for the House and really speaks for the unity of opinion when we are dealing with questions of national defense.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11 and agree to the same with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the amount named in said amendment, insert the following: "$5,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 16: Page 29, line 1, insert ", and in addition to this appropriation the Secretary may, prior to July 1, 1948, enter into contracts in an amount not in excess of $5,000,000."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I think the gentleman did probably as much as anybody could with the Senate in this bill. The gentleman simply does not think there is a possible chance of holding the bill down, but that we have got to make these increases as indicated in the amendments.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. These amendments which we are now considering are practically all technical amendments. They are small amendments. The large items of consideration were, of course, personnel, the officers, the Air Force, and the guard.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and agree with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the amount named in said amendment, insert the following: "$2,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 19: Page 31, line 15, after the word "Office", strike out the balance of line 15 and all of lines 16 to 23 inclusive, and the word "Congress" in line 24, and insert ": *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, not more than $25,000,000 of the amounts received by the War Department during the fiscal year 1948 as proceeds from the sale of scrap or salvage material shall be available for expenses of transportation, demilitarization, and other preparation for sale or salvage of military supplies, equipment, and materiel: *Provided further*, That a report of receipts and disbursements under this limitation shall be made quarterly to the Appropriation Committees of the Congress."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 19 and concur in the amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 21: Page 32, line 8, insert ", and in addition to this appropriation the Secretary may, prior to July 1, 1948, enter into contracts in an amount not in excess of $5,000,000."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 21 and agree to the same with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the amount named in said amendment, insert the following: "$2,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 24: On page 37, line 14, insert "and in addition to this appropriation the Secretary may, prior to July 1, 1948, enter into contracts in an amount not in excess of $25,000,000."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the

Senate No. 24 and agree to the same with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the amount named in said amendment, insert the following: "$15,000,000."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, may I inform the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] that these amendments we are discussing are actual reductions. The prior amendment reduced the amount from $5,000,000 to $2,000,000 and this amendment reduces the amount from $25,000,000 to $15,000,000.

Mr. RICH. I want to congratulate the committee. The thing that makes me boil is the fact that the Senate holds out for these great amounts. They have been known over in that end of the Capitol to increase the appropriation bills of the House, notwithstanding the fact that our Appropriation Committee does everything it can to hold them down.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. May I inform the gentleman from Pennsylvania, after having been on this committee 11 years and considering a large number of appropriation bills, that there is much I would like to say along the line the gentleman from Pennsylvania has just spoken of but which the rules of the House forbid me saying.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments Nos. 30 to 35, inclusive, be considered en bloc because they all pertain to the personnel ceiling.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 30: Page 58, line 10, insert "with respect to War Department personnel."

Senate amendment No. 31: Page 58, line 11, strike out "Ordnance" and insert "War."

Senate amendment No. 32: Page 58, line 14, strike out "Department" and insert "Department or."

Senate amendment No. 33: Page 58, line 15, after the word "agencies", insert "if such personnel is charged to a ceiling determination for another agency under 607 (g) (1) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended."

Senate amendment No. 34: Page 58, line 18, strike out "other civilian components" and insert "Organized Reserves."

Senate amendment No. 35: Page 58, line 19, strike out "nor shall said section 14 of the act of May 24, 1946, apply with respect."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan moves that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider Senate amendments 37 to 92, inclusive, en bloc. These are the rescission amendments. The House rescinded in all $1,100,000,000 in the 1942 to 1946 appropriations. The Senate increased this amount of rescissions by these amendments to $1,438,956,500.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Senate amendment No. 37: Page 58, line 2, strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$5,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 38: Page 58, after line 2, insert:

"Expediting production of equipment and supplies for national defense, 1940 46, $20,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 39: Page 58, line 5, strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$3,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 40: Page 58, line 7, strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$3,300,000."

Senate amendment No. 41: Page 58, after line 7, insert:

"Army War College: Army War College, 1942–46, $2,500."

Senate amendment No. 42: Page 58, after line 7, insert:

"Adjutant General's Department: Command and General Staff School, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., 1942–46, $7,000."

Senate amendment No. 43: Page 58, line 9, strike out "$203,000,000" and insert "$279,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 44: Page 58, line 11, strike out "$125,000,000" and insert "$154,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 45: Page 58, line 12, strike out "$75,000,000" and insert "$121,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 46: Page 58, line 13, after "$3,000,000" insert: "; and (4) claims of military and civilian personnel of the War Department, $1,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 47: Page 58, lines 15 and 16, strike out "$160,000,000" and insert "$190,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 48: Page 58, line 18, strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$4,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 49: Page 58, lines 18 and 19, strike out "$35,000,000" and insert "$42,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 50: Page 58, lines 19 and 20, strike out "$55,000,000" and insert "$59,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 51: Page 58, line 20, strike out "$25,000,000" and insert "$27,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 52: Page 58, line 21, strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$8,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 53: Page 58, line 22, strike out "$40,000,000" and insert "$50,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 54: Page 58, lines 24 and 25, strike out "$90,000,000" and insert "$165,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 55: Page 59, lines 2 and 3, strike out "$190,000,000" and insert "$220,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 56: Page 59, line 6, strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$6,500,000."

Senate amendment No. 57: Page 59, line 8, strike out "$40,000,000" and insert "$120,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 58: Page 59, line 10, strike out "$30,000,000" and insert "$86,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 59: Page 59, line 10, after "$30,000,000;" insert "(2) Military posts, $13,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 60: Page 59, line 11, strike out "(2)" and insert "(3)."

Senate amendment No. 61: Page 59, line 11, strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$21,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 62: Page 59, line 14, strike out "$362,000,000" and insert "$363,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 63: Page 59, line 17, strike out "$15,000,000" and insert "$30,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 64: Page 59, after line 17, insert:

"Special service schools: Special service schools, Army, 1942–46, $2,000, and subappropriations under this head are hereby decreased as follows: (1) Infantry School, $300; (2) Cavalry activities, $200; (3) Field Artillery activities, $750; and (4) Coast Artillery activities, $750."

Senate amendment No. 65: Page 59, after line 17, insert:

"Armored force: Instruction in armored force activities, 1942–46, $55,000."

Senate amendment No. 66: Page 59, line 19, strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$2,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 67: Page 59, after line 19, insert:

"United States Military Academy."

Senate amendment No. 68: Page 59, after line 19, insert:

"Pay of Military Academy, 1942–46, $35,000."

Senate amendment No. 69: Page 59, after line 19, insert:

"Maintenance and operation, United States Military Academy, 1942–46, $550,000."

Senate amendment No. 70: Page 59, after line 19, insert:

"National Guard: National Guard, 1942–46, $3,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 71: Page 59, line 21, strike out "$25,000,000" and insert "$28,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 72: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Inter-Americar relations, War Department: Inter-American relations, War Department, 1943–46, $125,000."

Senate amendment No. 73: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, War Department."

Senate amendment No. 74: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of Secretary of War, 1942–46, $1,874."

Senate amendment No. 75: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of Chief of Staff, 1942–46, $19,176."

Senate amendment No. 76: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Adjutant General's Office, 1942–46, $29,321."

Senate amendment No. 77: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of Chief of Cavalry, 1942–46, $7,021."

Senate amendment No. 78: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of the Inspector General, 1942–46, $49."

Senate amendment No. 79: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of the Judge Advocate General, 1942–46, $3,342."

Senate amendment No. 80: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of Chief of Field Artillery, 1942–46, $2,358."

Senate amendment No. 81: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of the Chief of Finance, 1942–46, $11,667."

Senate amendment No. 82: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of Chief of Infantry, 1942–46, $7,508."

Senate amendment No. 83: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of the Quartermaster General, 1942–46, $20,176."

Senate amendment No. 84: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of the Chief Signal Officer, 1942–46, $4,987."

Senate amendment No. 85: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of Commanding General, Army Air Forces, 1942–46, $1,877."

Senate amendment No. 86: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of Chief of Engineers, 1942–46, $40,857."

Senate amendment No. 87: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of Chief of Ordnance, 1942–46, $24,553."

Senate amendment No. 88: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of Chief of Chaplains, 1942–46, $3."

Senate amendment No. 89: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, National Guard Bureau, 1942–46, $3,615."

Senate amendment No. 90: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of Chief of Coast Artillery, 1942–46, $11,613."

Senate amendment No. 91: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Office of the Secretary: Contingent expenses, War Department, 1942–46, $200,000."

Senate amendment No. 92: Page 59, line 22, strike out "$1,100,000,000" and insert "$1,438,966,500."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Blair Moody.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Illinois State Journal.

RELATING TO SAFETY IN BITUMINOUS COAL AND LIGNITE MINES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. J. Res. 130) relating to safety in bituminous-coal and lignite mines of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That whenever the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Mines or his duly authorized representative, shall, upon investigation or inspection of any coal mine, pursuant to the act of May 7, 1941 (55 Stat. 177), find that the safety standards, set forth in the Federal Mine Safety Code for Bituminous Coal and Lignite Mines of the United States, adopted pursuant to an agreement dated May 29, 1946, between the Secretary of the Interior, acting as Coal Mines Administrator, and the United Mine Workers of America, as published in 11 Federal Register 9017 (title 32, CFR., pt. 804, secs. 304.1–304.15), with respect to ventilation, rock-dusting, storage and use of explosives, roof and rib support, the use of water or water with a wetting agent or other means of dust control where mining operations raise an excessive amount of dust, and prevention of fires in the underground workings of the mines, are not being observed, he shall forthwith notify the owned and the operator of such mine and the State agency charged with the enforcement of safety measures in such mine of his findings and recommendations thereon, and request such owner, operator, and State agency severally to report to the Director of the Bureau of Mines the action taken with respect to said recommendations.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Mines, shall, each 3 months, commencing September 1, 1947, report to the Congress of the United States with respect to the conditions of all bituminous coal and lignite mines investigated or inspected during the period, all recommendations and notices to the State agencies, and action taken by such mine owners, operators, and State agencies with respect to his findings and recommendations.

(b) The record of such inspections, findings, recommendations, notices, and reports, with respect thereto, shall be made available for public inspection as soon as practicable.

SEC. 3. (a) "Owner" includes a lessee and any person in possession or custody of a mine.

(b) "Operator" includes any agent, manager, superintendent, cooperative, or other person having control or supervision of a mine, directly or indirectly.

SEC. 4. This act shall remain in effect for a period of 1 year from the date this act is approved.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, this legislation will establish a code for health and safety in the coal mines. Under the resolution, enforcement of safety measures is left to the State agencies which are given the benefit of findings and recommendations resulting from Federal investigations and inspections, as are the owners and operators of the mines. The owners, operators, and State agencies are to report back to the Director of the Bureau of Mines the action taken with respect to these findings. The Secretary of the Interior is in turn required to report to Congress every 3 months with respect to the conditions of all mines investigated and inspected during the period; all recommendations and notices to State agencies, and action taken by the mine owners, operators, and State agencies with respect to his findings and recommendations. These records are to be made available for public inspection as soon as practicable.

The Labor Committee is of the opinion that those portions of the safety code which dealt with operating conditions, which experience shows have been the most prolific causes of mining disasters, should be immediately subjected to the closest scrutiny of the United States Bureau of Mines. The committee felt that the adoption of safety standards with respect to ventilation, rock dusting, storage and use of explosives, roof and rib support, the use of water or other means of dust control where mining operations raise an excessive amount of dust, and prevention of fires, all within underground workings of mines, would go far toward effectively preventing further disasters such as occurred at Centralia, Ill.

At present the Bureau of Mines has 132 Federal mine inspectors. This legislation will need an additional 100 mine inspectors and 50 safety engineers.

Statistics from the Federal Bureau of Mines show that in the last 35 years there have been 66,140 men killed, an average of 1,889 a year, in addition to 2,135 permanently disabled. If 80 percent of these 66,140 men were married and each left a widow and three children, there would be 211,649 widows and orphans and 2,135 incapacitated men living with families of 5—and the breadwinner totally disabled.

The resolution contains no additional enforcement or penalties but leaves such matters entirely within the province of the States. The act limits itself to remain in effect for 1 year from date it was approved. Thus, Congress places squarely upon the States the burden of making the mines safe and keeping them safe for the protection of men underground until Congress has had an opportunity to study the problem thoroughly, and makes it clear that if the States do not guard the safety of the miners, the Congress will act further.

If the States neglect to enforce the code for health and safety in the coal mines then it will be the duty of Congress to put more "teeth" in the Federal Mine Inspection Act. Coal mines operating in violation of safety regulations should be closed for the protection of the miners. We should give the Federal mine inspectors the power to close down unsafe mines until pronounced safe by Federal authority.

SAFETY IN THE MINES

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the piping voice of opposition to mine safety is again drowned by the throaty roar of the explosion coming out of the Old Bend coal mine in West Frankfort, Ill., where yesterday 28 men were reported dead.

Last spring Bob Howe, national representative of UMW, and Bill German, representing coal operators, took several of us Congressmen down into the coal mines underground. I wish every Member of this House that has opposition to this coal mine safety bill would go underground and see the conditions under which coal miners work. Their objections to a strong safety code would quickly vanish if they would stand underground when the face of the coal is being blasted and the earth would shake under their feet.

Coal mining is basic to American industry. We must keep our mines running in good order. The demands of a destroyed Europe and a hungry world rely to a great extent on American coal. The heavy machinery introduced into American mines during the past years has greatly stepped up our production. It has also increased the hazards.

I am not satisfied with this bill because it does not go far enough. Any violations of a safety code should make it possible for the Government to close down unsafe mines. We cannot rely on all the States for proper enforcement. Some States have good mine laws and good enforcement, and some States have not. All American mines should be safe. While this bill does not go far enough, I shall nevertheless support it because it is a step in the right direction. It puts forth the Federal safety code as a norm for all mines to follow. Just let me give you an example of a few of the things involved. Some operators are

delinquent in keeping sufficient rock-dusting and wetting in the mines to remove the danger of explosion from coal dust. Rock-dusting, as you may know, neutralizes coal dust. Machines to disseminate the rock dust should always be in proper order and should spread the rock dust close to the face of the coal. Some operators do not have sufficient rock dust in the coal mines so that the coal dust becomes dangerous. And again, take the subject of ventilation. As coal is mined methane gas is released from the face. Proper ventilation of pure air should at all times be kept close to the face. Some operators do not close the break-throughs between the avenues in which the mining is carried on and consequently the fresh air is short-circuited. Again, old works in the mines must be properly sealed off. Another frequent violation is that operators do not have permissible machinery. Electrical sparks frequently fly from the electrical-control boxes of the machinery. These should be properly covered to prevent ignition of coal dust or methane gas. In other cases the roof is not properly shored up so as to prevent roof falls, a frequent cause of accidents. These and many more are feature dangers that must be guarded against by constant vigilance in the mines.

A strong safety code should be enforced throughout all the mines in the United States. Otherwise the young men will not come to work in the mines. They will go to other fields. The average age of a miner today is over 50 years. This indicates that young, prospective coal miners are becoming wary of entering the mines. It would be a tragedy if the American coal mines do not have proper safety enforcements. I plead with you, therefore, to pass this bill. We should pass any further legislation that is necessary to guarantee, so far as is humanly possible, the safety of human lives of men who mine the black gold.

There are no coal mines in my district, but I know that the industries in my district depend, like all other American industries, upon the soundness of the coal-mining industry. Let us, by the passage of this legislation, show that we are deeply concerned over the safety of the lives of these American citizens that go underground for their daily work.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon mine No. 8 of the Old Ben Coal Corp. was racked by an explosion. This mine is situated just beyond the city limits of West Frankfort, Ill., a large mining town in my district. Latest reports show that 28 men have died in this disaster. Sixteen bodies have been removed and 12 others are still in the gas-filled pits. More than 200 men were working at the time of the explosion.

Mr. Speaker, I am a coal miner. I think I know as well as any man in this Chamber what is happening in West Frankfort this morning and what were the thoughts of those who were trapped inside the fire yesterday, able to communicate with the outside world but with nothing to do but wait for death. Many of these men were my friends. I pledged myself when I came to Congress that I would do everything in my power to make coal mining a safer occupation.

Today we are to vote on Senate Joint Resolution 130, a mine safety measure offered by my good friend GERALD LANDIS. This resolution will make the inspection record of every mine available to the Congress and I, for one, will scrutinize closely the inspection record of every mine that blows up in the future.

I know, as does the honorable gentleman from Indiana, that, contrary to statements of selfish interests, you can have increased safety and full coal production at the same time. More than 50 percent of the accidents in coal mining are caused by falls of roof and rib. In the old hand-loading days of mining a man working by himself or with a buddy could hear the warning cracking and popping of the top coal in time to leave a dangerous place. With the modern system of mining the clank of machinery and rush of motors leave all this to chance.

The Congress of the United States cannot legislate against individual accidents, the results of carelessness or acts of God. But we can legislate against this killing of men by the hundreds in gas or dust explosions. Any coal miner knows that you cannot have a gas explosion if there is no gas present in the mine. Any coal miner knows that there is no necessity for the presence of gas if you have proper, regulated ventilation and a sufficient volume of air to dilute the gas and render it harmless. Any coal miner knows that there is no necessity for a coal-dust explosion if the coal dust is not allowed to accumulate in dangerous quantities. If you must have coal dust, it can be rendered harmless if diluted with rock dust in sufficient quantity.

The presence of gas or coal dust in dangerous quantity is not the result of individual carelessness or an act of God. It is the result of an unwillingness on the part of management to provide the proper means to remove these dangerous elements from the mine. In this highly competitive industry the man who is willing to do what is right and safe must be governed by what his competitor is willing to do or be placed at a disadvantage in the coal market. In too many cases employers are too willing to take a chance on safety so that they may undersell their competitor and make a few more dollars.

The day is not far away when the mining industry of this Nation is going to miss the efforts of the thousands of miners killed in our coal mines. The average age of the coal miner of today is over 50 years. As these older men are killed in mine accidents or die of their service-connected disabilities, who is going to move the coal of this Nation? Not the younger generation, for they are staying away from the pits in great numbers. Do you think the widows of these 28 men are going to allow their children to follow in their fathers' footsteps? They will not. Not even if you double the present rate of wages.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared now or any time to support legislation that will make the coal mines a safer place in which to work. To me these disasters are inexcusable. I am not worried about the cry of State's rights, or duplication of effort, or double policing of the industry. I know our present efforts are not adequate, and if the Congress of the United States can pass one law that will stop this needless loss of life in part or in full, I am in favor of it. It is my sincere hope that, with increased safety as a goal, the next session of Congress will enact legislation which will for all time put an end to these tragic experiences prevalent in the coal-mining industry.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? If not, the question is on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

HON. ROBERT F. JONES

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a communication, which I ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

JULY 25, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I wish to inform you that on July 24, 1947, I transmitted to the Honorable Thomas J. Herbert, Governor of Ohio, my resignation as Representative in Congress of the United States from the Fourth District of Ohio effective at midnight September 2, 1947.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT F. JONES,
Member of Congress.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes, and that I may yield portions of that time if I so desire.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of personal loss that I contemplate the resignation of my very good friend, ROBERT F. JONES. When he came to Congress he was one of the youngest Members, and although he has been in Congress now nearly 8½ years he is still the youngest man in the Ohio delegation. I am sure the Ohio delegation, both Republicans and Democrats, wish him well in his new position. While his leaving will be a loss to the district which he has so ably represented and to the State of Ohio, it will be a much greater loss to the Nation. His outstanding work as a member of the Committee on Appropriations was distinctively Nation-wide in its scope. Anyone who saw him perform in his handling of the Interior Department Appropriation bill on this floor some few weeks ago surely realized that his work was distinctively Nation-wide. I have heard many Members say that by his masterful handling of that bill he proved that he is a master parliamentarian. His work on the Committee of Appropriations for the last few years has made him a national figure. And it has won for him the admiration of all the members of this great committee, whether Republicans or Democrats.

It is of his personal qualifications, though, that I comment with the most pleasure. He is a most wholesome and personable young man. I know of no young man who has developed faster, and

more deservedly, during my time in Congress. We all know that some men are more useful than others, but no one can long maintain a high place with his colleagues unless he has real merit. "BOB" JONES has many fine qualities of heart and mind that have earned for him the respect of all his colleagues. His keen mind and good judgment have established him as a man of great ability. His kind and courteous disposition has made for him many warm persona. friends. His courage and honesty have won for him the respect of all who know him. When he leaves this House he will have the respect of all who know him. Those who know him best respect him most.

Here he is today with nearly 9 years of service in the greatest legislative body in the world behind him, yet he has before him the best years of his life. I predict for him great success in the position to which the President of the United States has appointed him. He was appointed because he had a good record which could not be successfully assailed.

He comes from a fine family. Today, his mother, his wife, and his fine children are in the gallery, and they are justly proud of him. Of him I can say, with the poet Owen Meredith:

In the midnoon of manhood, with plenty to do,
And every incentive for doing it, too.
With the duties of life just sufficiently pressing
For prayer, and of joys more than most men for blessing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, my district, the Fifth District of Ohio, adjoins BOB JONES' district. The beautiful little city of Delphos is divided between the two districts right in the center of the town.

I came to Congress at the same time BOB JONES did. The affection I have for him is the affection I have for my own son. I can only say to you it is only gilding the lily to pay tribute to BOB JONES. He was a marked man in school, he was a marked man in college, and he was a marked man in the service of his county and the service of his State. Happy is the State and fortunate is the Nation that has a public servant such as ROBERT F. JONES.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. As a member of the Interior Department Appropriations Committee, may I say that the Democrats have the very highest regard and admiration for BOB JONES. He has made not only a competent but an honest chairman and member of that committee. I hate to see him leave Congress, and I concur in what the gentleman has said.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I have watched wonderful men leave these halls, such as Lindsay Warren and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], as well as various other Members to serve in other branches of Government. The Nation never had a greater public servant than ROBERT JONES. The President has chosen wisely and well.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to subscribe to the fine things that have been said about BOB JONES' service in the House of Representatives. His has been an outstanding record and an inspiration to every Member of Congress. He has been a great public servant, and I predict further distinguished service for him in his new work.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay my respects to the gentleman from Ohio, BOB JONES. I think without doubt he is one of the finest, clean-cut gentlemen that I have ever known in all my life. I have been associated with him here for several years and when I was on the Committee on Appropriations I did not know anyone who worked harder to try to do a good job. He is honest; he is honorable; he worked hard and is interested in doing what he thinks is best for his country. He succeeded here in the House. He succeeded back home. He will succeed as a member of the Federal Communications Commission. I wish BOB JONES and his family Godspeed and I am sure that he will make a success and do a grand job for the United States in the job that the President has appointed him to. It is a great loss to the Congress of the United States for him to go from our midst.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to let this opportunity pass without saying a word about the service of BOB JONES and the type and character of man I think he is.

I do not think there have been better men to serve in the House of Representatives than BOB JONES. I shall miss him very much personally, and I know that the House will miss his splendid ability and his great efficiency. He is going to a place where he can, and I think will, be of great service. He is going to a Commission which I think will not be hurt by the infusion of some BOB JONES blood.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman, the majority leader [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it has been a great pleasure and a real privilege to have served in this body with BOB JONES, of Ohio. I consider him one of our outstanding Members—a man of unquestioned integrity and honesty. He has shown but one purpose, and that is to do the right as he sees the right in the interest of all the people of this great country.

As chairman of the Interior Department Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, he had a most difficult assignment. In his handling of that bill he showed a detailed knowledge of every single item in it. He always supported his arguments with facts.

The services of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] will be missed. His appointment to the Federal Communications Commission by the President is a well-deserved recognition of BOB JONES' ability. I predict that he will serve with distinction on that body, as he has served with distinction as a Member of Congress. He takes with him our affectionate regards and best wishes for his continued success.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, BOB JONES came here as an able young lawyer. As a result of the most diligent effort in committee and on the floor, and tremendous study, day and night, he became one of the ablest parliamentarians we had on the floor, and one of the most effective committee members and one of those who was best able to handle a bill and put it across on the floor.

I am sure that in the work he is tackling in the Federal Communications Commission he will make a record which will stand out just as his record has stood out here.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

Mr. BREHM. Bobbie knows that my family and I love him. There is really no need to elaborate on that statement. However I would like to offer a toast which Rip Van Winkle made popular in fiction years ago. It is one which has always appealed to me: "Here's to your health and your family's good health and may you all live long and prosper."

My family and I wish that for BOBBIE JONES and his family.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, as one who came here with BOB JONES as a freshman in 1939, in the Seventy-sixth Congress, I feel a pang that he is leaving the ranks of those of us who came here with the spirit of '76. But BOB JONES has made an especial mark for himself with his rugged integrity, his keen intellect, and his unflagging industry, his great courage. While we regret to see him leave here, I predict he will make a great mark in public service, in the important and arduous task that he takes up under this Presidential appointment. We all can bid him Godspeed and good luck.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I have watched BOB JONES perform, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, at close range. I have seen him develop into one of the most effective chairmen I have ever seen perform on this floor. The way he handles his bills is absolutely superb. It is a fine thing that America can have such men as BOB JONES to serve in Congress. I know him, and I know his family, and I know what kind of an American he is and they are, and I wish him continued success in his new field of endeavor.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it would take a far better master of language to pay adequate tribute to BOB JONES than I. But if we were to enumerate all those

qualities that make a good legislator, BOB JONES has every one of them. I would not omit one. Hard work, intelligence, fairness, honesty, integrity, thoroughness, and so on down the line. In addition to that, he is a great guy and a great citizen. We wish him well in his new activity.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Communications Commission will be the gainer and this House will be the loser when my good friend and long-time associate, ROBERT F. JONES of Ohio, leaves these halls to assume his new responsibilities as a member of the FCC.

My own emotions at this time are difficult to put into words. Never has there been an occasion in the history of these United States when the wisdom, the courage, the perseverence, the understanding, and the integrity of BOB JONES was more needed in Congress. Since he took his seat in the Seventy-sixth Congress, this country has fought and won a Second World War, our national debt has soared to astronomical figures. We are being called upon to feed, clothe, house, and administer medical aid to the whole world. We are faced with the necessity of combatting dictatorships in peace as we have faced totalitarianism in war. The vigorous thinking of the new Members of this House cries out for the leavening influence of experienced Members of longer service.

The gentleman from Ohio is a living example of the value of experience. He has ably served his constituents of the Fourth Congressional District of Ohio. His incisive mind has been of inestimable value in the deliberations of the subcommittee on State, Commerce, Justice, and the Judiciary, in which capacity I have long been associated with him. His wide knowledge and his quick grasp of involved situations have made him one of the most efficient chairmen of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior Department who have ever acted to save the taxpayers' dollars. Not only has he served the people of his district and the people of his State, he has also served the people of every congressional district in every State in the Union. He has fought, without regard for his own health, that our Constitution might be preserved and that every American citizen might have more abundant life, free from the undue burden of governmental expenses.

Yes, I regret to see my old friend go. However, my regret is cushioned by the awareness that his chosen field of service is one of vital importance. I am confident that as a member of FCC Mr. JONES will have a signal opportunity to continue his statesmanlike career. Communications are the life lines of this Nation. It is indeed encouraging to know that the policies of the FCC will bear the imprint of Mr. JONES' courageous thinking for many years to come. No one of us who have had the truly great inspiration of working with him can gainsay the fact that the FCC is richer by a man who is a daily practitioner of Christian Americanism.

If the choice were ours, we would have you stay with us. But yours is the choice and you have chosen your post of duty. But when you go, the heartfelt good wishes and prayers of those who know your worth go with you, ROBERT JONES of Ohio—statesman, legislator, and patriot.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would not let this opportunity pass without adding my words of affection, admiration, and respect for our colleague, BOB JONES, who is going to leave us for a post on the Federal Communications Commission. There is not much new that can be added save to say that Congress is losing one of its most able Members, and in the well-chosen words of our minority leader, the Federal Communications Commission will receive a most valued member.

I, too, came to Congress along with BOB JONES, and during these 9 years that we have served together I have learned so well to know those sterling qualities of BOB JONES that have endeared him to all of us who have served here.

We wish him well and Godspeed in his new assignment.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the legislative committee that has jurisdiction over legislation affecting the Federal Communications Commission I am somewhat familiar with the responsibilities that face a member of that commission. Having observed the diligence and the intelligence with which BOB JONES has pursued his career in the House of Representatives, I feel certain that he will add strength to that important independent commission of our Government.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR].

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, as a Member from Ohio, I want to concur in every statement that has been made relative not only to my colleague but to my friend, BOB JONES.

You as Members of Congress will miss a fine Congressman. The district he has so ably represented in the past will miss a great Representative, and we of the Ohio delegation will certainly lose a fine colleague.

I am sure I speak the voice of his district, his friends, and I know of this Congress when I say to you: Bob, we wish you well and the best of luck.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE].

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, there was a group of almost a hundred new Members in the Seventy-sixth Congress, including the Honorable ROBERT JONES, of Lima, Ohio. I have observed my colleagues who came with me to the Seventy-sixth Congress from that time down to the end of this first session of the Eightieth Congress. I think no man in that group has performed better service, has developed into a better judge of governmental affairs and governmental problems or has thrown himself more wholeheartedly into the problems of the Congress than has ROBERT JONES.

Power to him in his new environment.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, while I am not a Methodist I wish to voice a profound "amen" to every word that has been said in these encomiums of BOB JONES. I never had the privilege of working in committee with him, but I want to add these words, that I know to be true from public and private contact with him here, and they have not been said as yet: We love him for the enemies he has made in the discharge of his duty. We love him for the sweetness of his disposition, for his million-dollar smile, and for the poise he has manifested on all occasions in this House. We love him. That is the summarizing of the whole tribute.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the closing hours of Congress prevent us from properly extolling the virtues of this great American from Ohio, BOB JONES. We have observed him as a great Member of the House. We confidently believe Bob will be one of the greatest additions to the Federal Communications in the history of that illustrious body.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY].

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], the dean of the Ohio delegation quoted from Owen Meredith, who said—

> At life's midnoon
> With plenty to do,
> And plenty of incentive
> For doing it too—

There was indeed an incentive for the appointment of BOB JONES. The citizenry of our Commonwealth have always said "We hear people, but who is sincere?"

BOB JONES is sincere.

As a county prosecutor he never was a fixer. As a Congressman he never tried to "just please." He was a man who always asked, "What is right?"—then he did it. He never asked "Who wants it?"

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL].

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, BOB JONES came to the Seventy-sixth Congress as a new Member at the same time I did. Since then he has been one of my closest and best friends. I liked and admired him from the first. Through the years that feeling has steadily grown. I have always respected his sincerity, his integrity, and particularly his ability. I have never seen or heard anyone handle an appropriation bill on the floor of the House of Representatives with more judgment, clarity, finesse, and ability than that exercised by ROBERT F. JONES, of Ohio. His departure from our midst is a real loss to the Congress and the people. I am glad his services will be continued in

Government. BOB, here's wishing you happiness and success in your new career.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I have also known BOB JONES since the Seventy-sixth Congress. It was my privilege to serve with him on the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee that handled the Department of Interior appropriation bill. I can vouch for all the fine things that have been said about BOB JONES.

While we are always happy to see our friends progress in life, we are reluctant to lose their association, and one of the happy thoughts I have in extending my congratulations to a Member who will not be in this House at the next session is the fact that he will remain in Washington, where he will continue his outstanding service to his country, and where we can have the benefit of his counsel, and the pleasure of his association.

The President's nomination of ROBERT F. JONES to the Federal Communications Commission and his subsequent confirmation by the Senate has met with spontaneous approval in and out of Congress, and I can well understand this, since having the privilege and pleasure of taking my seat in the Seventy-sixth Congress at the same time as my colleague, who was so wisely chosen by his constituents in the Fourth Congressional District of the great State of Ohio.

From county prosecuting attorney in Ohio to five terms in Congress, and then elevation to the Federal Communications Commission by Presidential appointment and unanimous approval by the United States Senate is an outstanding accomplishment for a young man who has just passed his fortieth birthday. And I am certain that the record will show that this young man did not stop there—in the parlance of the day, he is destined to go places.

BOB JONES has the wisdom, judgment, aggressiveness, and will to get things done, and done in the right way. This I have intimately observed during my association with him on the Appropriations Committee, of which I had the privilege to become a member this year, and the good fortune to serve on the Interior subcommittee of which Bob was our capable, keen-minded, and hard-working chairman.

A real American, a capable and conscientious public servant, and a man among men, BOB JONES is the type of citizen of which our country can well feel proud. He is the representative type that has helped to make this country great, and whose services could not be used to better advantage than by having him continue in the service of our Federal Government.

Congratulations, BOB JONES. May the days ahead be filled with greater success than you have already earned, and which you so well deserve. You will always be in our thoughts, and I know I express the sentiments of every Member here when I say, come back and visit with us often.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks with reference to the Honorable ROBERT F. JONES at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot allow this occasion to pass without paying respect to the accomplishments of ROBERT JONES, our colleague from Ohio. I wish to congratulate him upon being selected as a member of the important board of the Federal Communications Commission. BOB JONES has served faithfully in Congress. He is a man of courage, great ability, and splendid background. I am sorry that we must lose him in Congress but I know that he will serve the Nation well in his new capacity. I wish him good fortune and a long life of continued service to his country.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to say a few words in commendation of BOB JONES. Bob and I entered the House together in 1939 and he has proven himself to be one of the most able Members of this body. May I join in seconding all of the good things which have been said here today about a very good man, who will make his mark in his new work on the Federal Communications Commission. If ever a man was worthy of such a position, ROBERT JONES of Ohio is that man.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, "That fellow, BOB JONES—I sure wish he was on our team!"

That statement came from Mr. Charles E. Cone, of Ephrata, Wash., and the official Columbia Basin Commission of the State of Washington. It came after the first passage through the House of the Interior Appropriations bill.

It was an outright compliment from one who believes in sound western development. It was a compliment from a man who did not agree with the cuts which had been made in the President's budget for western development in general and the Columbia Basin project in particular. It was a compliment to the legislative craftsmanship of the Honorable ROBERT JONES, of Ohio.

That we violently disagree with the achievements in cutting down on many items in the Interior Appropriations bill is primarily by reason of a difference of geographical viewpoint. We in the West, of course, have no objection to the outlay of Federal funds in the East for the purposes of flood control on torrential streams. We rejoice at the improvement of harbors and navigable waterways, even though in many instances these outlays are not repaid, excepting in the security they give to those whose industry results in tax payments.

Our western development will and, of course, should be repayable to the maximum amount and by the standard of eastern development, reimbursable twice, both in project funds and in the impetus to tax-paying industry which they will develop.

All of us admire a legislative craftsman and BOB JONES in his handling of the Interior Appropriations bill, even though we in the West do not agree, proved himself to be one of great ability.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] himself.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, of course I am very grateful for the kind words that have been said about me here this afternoon. I choose, however, to consider them as impersonal and that they represent an ideal to which you Members of the House, with whom I have served, would like to see a colleague of yours adhere. I deeply appreciate the confidence of the people of the Fourth District of Ohio who have elected and reelected me to serve them for nearly a decade as a Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress is nearly the last bulwark of liberty and the last deliberative body in the world. We must not forget, and I know the Members here are always conscious of the fact, that we still are free men and that so long as freemen exist there is always a strong and great legislative body.

I go to the position to which I have been appointed by the President of the United States with a background of the traditions of this House of Representatives. I go as a recent Member of a great legislative body, close to the people; a legislative body that cherishes and defends freedom. We may differ at times over the way we arrive at the solution of our problem, but we discus them, we debate, decide and when the majority speaks, we all abide by that decision. That is what distinguishes us from nearly every country in the world. Today the world is on fire and police governments are the rule rather than the exception.

The nearly 10 years I have spent here I know will assist me greatly in the duties I shall take up on September 3. To have the point of view of men and women who are trying to preserve liberty and freedom is a distinguished background and will be of great assistance in serving on the Federal Communications Commission which has so much to do with freedom of speech and freedom of communications throughout the United States, in fact throughout the world.

Again I thank you, I thank you sincerely. I appreciate immensely the many fine kindnesses you have shown me in the 8½ years I have served as a Member of this body. It has been my privilege in that time to serve under the greatest Speakers that the House of Representatives has ever had. It has been my pleasure to serve with men and women of sterling character. I am grateful, indeed, to have been a Member of this, the last great outpost of liberty in the world.

I shall miss you all, of course. Our relationship may never be the same again because, after all, I am leaving the House of Representatives to become a "bureaucrat." I do not expect any quarter from any one in this House in that capacity, because I gave no quarter as a member of the Appropriations Committee to any

of the bureaucrats. I hope sincerely, though, that when I do come back you can give to me the same clean bill of health you have given me as I leave you today.

TRIBUTE TO HON. ROBERT F. JONES AND HON. LEO F. RAYFIEL

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, offer full praise to BOB JONES and say to him, "Hail and farewell."

There is another Member of our body who is marked out for distinction, and that is my distinguished friend, our gallant colleague from Brooklyn, N. Y., LEO RAYFIEL, who has been designated as United States judge for the eastern district of New York. His appointment has recently been confirmed by the Senate. Leo, I am sure, will make a good judge, because he was always a good lawyer and a good Congressman. Good Congressmen make good judges. They make the laws, and thereby have the greatest equipment to interpret the laws. I would say about Leo that we love him for the many friends that he has made. He is a benign sort of fellow, generous, fair-minded, studious, of considerable erudition and modesty. I am sure that when he is a judge he will put human rights above property rights. I am sure that he is going to be fair and just to litigants and tolerant to the lawyers. Some judges are very intolerant. The story I will tell you could not be made applicable to Judge RAYFIEL. One of the present members of the Supreme Court was hearing a case argued, and the present Secretary of War, General Royall, was the attorney for the defense, and one of the judges was particularly intolerant and he kept closely questioning General Royall. General Royall tried his best to answer, but it was only with the greatest difficulty that he could answer all those vexatious and unnecessary questions that this judge directed to him, until finally asked another question, the general said, "If I, Judge, would answer that question, it would indeed be like the blind leading the blind." I am sure Judge RAYFIEL will be courteous and considerate and fair and most tolerant to litigants while a judge. He has marked out a splendid career in the House. He will hew out an even more glorious career as a judge of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York.

DECLARATION OF RECESS DURING REMAINDER OF THE WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the remainder of the week the Speaker may declare a recess at any time subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CONFERRING OF MEMBERSHIP ON SPEAKER MARTIN IN AMVETS

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call the attention of the Members of the House to a meeting that is to be held in the Committee on Ways and Means room in the Old House Office Building this evening at 8 o'clock, at which time our honorable and distinguished Speaker the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] will be given an honorary membership in the new House of Representatives Post, No. 19, of AMVETS. All Members are cordially invited to attend the meeting. The principal speaker of the evening will be the distinguished minority leader, Mr. SAM RAYBURN. I hope that all the Members will take notice of this and come out and do proper honor to our distinguished Speaker.

The AMVETS have been given a charter by the Eightieth Congress. It is one of the fine, vigorous, and patriotic veterans organizations of World War II. Mr. MARTIN's honorary membership will add dignity to the ranks of the American Veterans of World War II, whose ranks now contain many distinguished citizens throughout the Nation. The AMVETS are doing a fine job in all posts of the Nation for veterans of World War II. The future of this organization gives every promise of becoming one of the great and beneficial veteran's organizations which will inspire and keep alive our love and patriotic zeal for the United States of America.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SNYDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

AMENDMENT OF PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1020) to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended, with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 101 (b) of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by inserting after the word "employees," the following: "who shall be entitled to accumulate annual leave to the maximum of 90 work days exclusive of the time actually and necessarily occupied in going to and from the continental United States and such time as may be necessarily occupied in awaiting sailing or flight,".

SEC. 2. Subsection (c) of section 101 of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting after the words "Commonwealth of the Philippines" the following: "(or the Republic of the Philippines)".

SEC. 3. Subsection (a) of section 106 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 106. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the amount of $400,000,000 for the purpose of paying compensation to the extent authorized in this title and of such sum, not to exceed $8,400,000 shall be available to pay the expenses of the Commission. All moneys heretofore or hereinafter appropriated under authority of this title shall remain available until April 30, 1951."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. The bill that has just been read is not the same number as the bill containing these provisions that was objected to last Monday on the Consent Calendar. Is it in order to consider a Senate bill under these conditions?

The SPEAKER. Under suspension of the rules either a House or a Senate bill may be considered.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there is any need to take much time on this bill inasmuch as it was explained last Monday when the Consent Calendar was called. Only one person objected to it then, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] and he will explain his reasons shortly.

The bill, as originally introduced and passed by the Senate, consisted of three amendments to the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1947, which we passed last year. First, it allows employees of the War Damage Commission who go to the Philippines to carry on during the next 4 years the work of examining and settling claims to accumulate up to 90 days annual leave, which merely gives the same privilege which Government employees in this country ordinarily enjoy.

The second amendment recognizes the fact that the Commonwealth of the Philippines, which existed when this act was passed, is now the Republic of the Philippines, and the language of the law is changed accordingly.

The third amendment is the one about which there is some disagreement. In the Rehabilitation Act authorizing $400,000,000 to be used in payment of legitimate war-damage claims in the Philippines, 1 percent or $4,000,000 was provided for the administrative expenses of the Commission. At that time the question was raised in the Committee on Insular Affairs, where the bill was handled, as to whether that would be enough. They asked for $4,000,000 because that seemed like a great deal of money so we let it go at that. Now they come back and present the load of work that is before them, and it is obvious that they cannot, with that amount of money, examine with adequate care all the million-and-a-quarter claims that it appears will come in. They have 4 years in which to examine more than a million claims. That is at the rate of 250,000 claims a year, which means that almost 1,000 claims have to be settled each work day. This requires, on the estimate basis of one person handling two claims a day,

500 employees just to adjudicate the claims, to say nothing of secretarial and other help.

The question is, Do we want to increase from 1 to 2.1 the percentage of the $400,000,000 to be authorized for the Commission's administrative expenses so that it can carefully examine these claims and eliminate fraudulent or unworthy claims; or do we want just to send these men out with $400,000,000 and a checkbook to pass out the American taxpayers' money without proper protection?

We all know the zeal and diligence of the gentleman from Pennsylvania in his efforts to economize. I myself think that in this case he is following a policy which is the opposite of economy, because this bill does not in the least increase the total amount of money appropriated. It only decides whether the Commission is to have a large enough share for administrative expenses so that it can reasonably be expected to spend it wisely, instead of wasting much of it. If it does not have enough money to build up an adequate staff, it simply cannot spend it wisely.

This bill comes out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs with unanimous approval. It was given to the Committee on Foreign Affairs only because the Committee on Insular Affairs, where this legislation was originally developed, no longer exists.

I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] for yielding to me. I merely wish to say something about the membership of the Commission under discussion. Mr. Frank Waring, Chairman of the Commission is a man of great ability. He has the respect and confidence of many Members of this House. He has appeared before the Subcommittee on Appropriations and I wish to state that he made a fine impression on the membership of the committee with his testimony regarding Philippine needs and requirements. Members of the committee believe Chairman Waring is a man of exceptional ability and that in the administration of these funds he is not forgetting the interests of the American taxpayer. Another member of the Commission is well-known to the membership of this House. He is the Honorable Francisco Delgado, who represented the Philippine Commonwealth Government in this body. He was then the Resident Commissioner from the Philippines. Mr. Delgado and his beautiful and capable wife will not be forgotten by scores of Members because of their delightful personalities and their daily efforts to bind stronger the friendships between the peoples of the Philippine Islands and those of the United States of America. Mr. Delgado recently completed a long journey throughout the northern provinces of the Philippine Islands. He was kind enough to send me a copy of the report which he made following this journey. The report indicates a most careful investigation of damage and claims. I have not heard the testimony on this particular bill but I felt Members should know something about at least two members of the commission with whom so many of you are acquainted. I have confidence in Chairman Waring and feel that he will continue making unbiased reports on his administration to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask the gentleman two or three questions? The $400,000,000 is an obligation of the United States, is it not?

Mr. JUDD. That is correct. The Congress assumed it last year.

Mr. CRAWFORD. There is no reasonable discussion that can be raised on that matter at all. Is there any reason for us to assume that the Filipinos will get back on their feet industrially and otherwise until they have a substantial amount of these claims paid, with their homes destroyed and their industries thrown out of balance in every way that can be imagined and with their principal cities destroyed? It is a very difficult problem. I have been through the islands since the war and I have seen the damage there. I know something about Philippine industry as I have studied it closely for many years.

It seems to me the best way we can possibly save money to the American taxpayers is to let these claims be administered expeditiously and in a businesslike manner. I know that we could not take a group to the Philippines and handle this $400,000,000 bill on the basis of 1 or 2 percent of the total amount. There is no insurance company that could handle it on that basis. I think the gentleman's committee is very wise in providing for this additional use of funds for administration, so that these claims can be settled and this work expedited and the Filipino people gotten back on their feet so that they can produce for themselves. I am very much in favor of the gentleman's proposal.

Mr. JUDD. I thank the gentleman. I should have stated earlier that this bill was originally introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL] who was formerly chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs and by the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], the present chairman of the Committee on Public Lands.

We have the Senate bill before us today instead of their bills only because it is more convenient, the Senate having already passed the bill.

I now yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE].

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. May I ask if these claims are the claims of people other than citizens of the United States or people from the United States who had investments there and the Filipinos themselves or do these claims include any of the Japanese nationals?

Mr. JUDD. Citizens of the United States as well as of the Philippines can put in claims if they use the money for rebuilding or reopening the business or home or mine or factory which was damaged. Japanese nationals are not eligible. One reason why it will cost more to adjudicate these claims than would ordinarily be the case is because each claim has to be examined to determine whether the person who puts in the claim is an American or Philippine citizen or of certain other categories; second, whether he was a collaborator with the Japanese during the occupation; third, whether he was the actual owner of the property because the homes and papers of thousands were destroyed, the courthouses were destroyed including deeds and public records. Then the proper value of the property has to be determined. This commission cannot operate like an insurance company which pays on the basis of the face value of a policy where there is no question as to ownership or value, and so forth. Furthermore the property to be appraised may be in any one of 10,000 islands. So the task is enormous.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Is it assumed that the liabilities are all those of the United States—are all just claims that can be established to be paid?

Mr. JUDD. No. If the total of all claims determined valid exceeds the $400,000,000 authorized, the payments will be reduced proportionately. It is provided further that if any reparations or indemnity in money or bullion is recovered from the Japanese, it shall be applied to this fund. If $100,000,000 should come back, our obligation would be reduced correspondingly.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. I think that Members who are not members of the committee are entitled to that information.

Mr. JUDD. Certainly. I shall be glad to answer any other questions.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I wanted to corroborate the gentleman's statement to the effect that when the committee considered this bill last year the question of the percentage allowance for administration of the act was considered, and all of us thought that the percentage set in the bill was insufficient. However, those who were supporting the measure felt that they could get along with that amount of money. Naturally, we did not give them more than they asked for. However, we all recognized, or at least we all doubted their ability to get along with that small percentage. I simply wanted to verify what the gentleman said.

Mr. JUDD. I thank the gentleman. I now yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL], who is one of the authors of the resolution.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I have been very familiar with this bill from its inception. It arose in the Insular Affairs Committee last year, of which committee I was chairman at that time. At the time the bill was passed a number of the members of the committee who had had some observation of insurance companies in settling claims felt that 1 percent was entirely too small to make any businesslike or economical handling of these

claims. To begin with, the islands are 10,000 miles away, and a great many people are going to have to be transported to the Philippines to do the job of properly examining and settling these claims. When you get down there, there are 10,000 of those islands. There will have to be a great deal of traveling back and forth, because you cannot intelligently settle a small claim except on the ground where the claim arose. Here is a man who claims his shack was burned. You have to find out whether it was actually burned and whether he actually owned it or not. Here is a man who has a carabao that was destroyed by the Japanese. You have to find out whether he actually owned a carabao. Unless you have adequate personnel to go down there and handle these things in the proper way it will cost this country perhaps one to two hundred million dollars in losses by maladministration. I think if we deny the Commission enough funds to adequately provide for personnel to go down there and intelligently handle this job it will be penny-wise and pound-foolish.

This bill does not require the appropriation of any more money. This money for administrative purposes will be taken out of the $400,000,000 which the Congress has already provided. It is just a question as to whether or not we handle it in a businesslike way, send intelligent people down there to go into these claims, and deny those that are groundless and deny those that are excessive and pay those that are just. Quite a number of you gentlemen have had some experience in handling the liquidation of claims for insurance companies and liability companies. You have represented liability companies as lawyers. If you have, you know there is not a liability company in America, with all their skill, who can begin to settle claims right here on the ground for 1 percent. It takes 6 or 8 percent for the average liability company. You gentlemen who have had experience along that line well know that.

So the passage of this bill means that this $400,000,000 that the taxpayers of America are digging up to settle these claims and bring about the rehabilitation of the Philippines simply means whether you are going to go into it in a businesslike way and allow the personnel in charge to have enough money to go into the matter, or whether you just put somebody on a stump out there and distribute the money without any rhyme or reason.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, certain committee amendments were added to this bill largely through the commendable efforts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON]. These amendments, as I am sure he will explain, provided essentially the same restrictions with respect to loyalty of American personnel on the Commission and screening by the FBI as we have put into other legislation. Also provisions for preventing, if possible, use of Filipino personnel or payments to persons who are Communists.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me a little time?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, our committee has taken up a recommendation for legislation that was sent to the Speaker and referred by him to our committee, to assist persons in the Philippine Islands. I am wondering just how that would affect legislation that is before our Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. JUDD. I am sorry; I do not know just what the gentlewoman refers to.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We have had very many requests for appropriations but I am not going to be against this bill——

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. There are two or three propositions dealing with the people in the Philippines. This bill deals only with war damage which we propose to pay. It goes back to the very inception of the fact that the Philippine Government was a part of this country, you might say, when the war broke out. We had not given them their independence. We went in there and drove the Japs out and did a lot of destruction ourselves with our own guns, our own bombs. This is a liability of the United States.

In addition to that the Philippine Republic is certainly going to need an enormous amount of assistance from the United States if it is to stand on its own feet as a republic. We know that. I am sure the gentlewoman from Massachusetts will find and that her committee will find that the $400,000,000 of war damage does in no way clean up the Philippine bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry but I cannot yield further.

I wish to state that I would like very much to send a group of members from my committee to study the whole Philippine question out there insofar as compensation for the disabled is concerned; but I was told it was late to bring up anything of that sort. It seems to me this is a foreign-affairs Congress. I say it is not fair to send so much to foreign countries that we have nothing left for our own. Anyway, we have spent so much in foreign countries and will spend much more, and our Committee on Veterans' Affairs has not as yet been able to secure any more money in order to send the members of our committee through the country inspecting the Veterans' Administration hospitals, the Veterans' Administration regional offices and branch offices for which inspection there is such great need. Millions and millions of dollars have been sent to foreign countries. It is time we took care of our disabled. Mr. Speaker, this Congress is really a foreign-affairs Congress. During the war our soldiers came first; in peace foreign countries come first and other nondisabled in the United States. It is not just, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota reserves 5 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, as the first session of the Eightieth Congress draws to a close, many questions have been asked regarding enactment of further legislation of direct benefit to the war veterans.

While I cannot at this time say definitely as to what further legislation may be acted upon during this first session and what may be acted upon when we reconvene for the second session in January, I would like to point out a few pertinent facts.

Last January 6, President Truman in his message to the Congress on the State of the Union, referred to additional veterans' legislation as follows:

> Exclusive of mustering-out payments and terminal-leave pay, the program for veterans of all wars is costing over $7,000,000,000 a year—one-fifth of our total Federal budget. This is the most far-reaching and complete veterans' program ever conceived by any nation.
>
> Except for minor adjustments, I believe that our program of benefits for veterans is now complete. In the long run, the success of the program will not be measured by the number of veterans obtaining financial aid or by the number of dollars we spend. History will judge us not by the money we spend, but by the further contribution we enable our veterans to make to their country. In considering any additional legislation, that must be our criterion.

That statement can leave no question about the opposition of President Truman to additional veterans' legislation of any consequence.

Further than this the House of Representatives' Committee on Veterans' Legislation has had reports from Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Director of the Veterans' Administration, against scores of the measures now pending in the House of Representatives.

In addition, he reports that the bills cannot be considered to be in accord with the program of the President's Budget Bureau. That simply means that the President is against these bills.

For example, on July 18, General Bradley wrote to the committee regarding H. R. 3584, a bill to provide increased subsistence allowance to veterans pursuing certain courses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes.

General Bradley furnished the committee a report on the estimated cost of such legislation under date of June 3, 1947. In his letter of July 18, 1947, General Bradley said:

> The Veterans' Administration has been advised by the Director, Bureau of the Budget, that there is no objection to the presentation of such report to the committee and that this bill could not be considered to be in accord with the program of the President.

In view of this expressed opposition of the President, it certainly would be fair to assume that he would likely veto any such bill that the Congress might send to him.

However, notwithstanding the opposition of President Truman to the enactment of additional veterans' legislation, as expressed in his message on the State of the Union, the House of Representatives and the Congress have passed many meritorious acts for the benefit of war veterans.

I call attention to the following favorable actions of the House of Representatives and the Congress:

From Veterans' Affairs Committee:

H. R. 3961, increasing the rates of pension payable to Spanish-American and Civil War Veterans. Passed House June 30, 1947. Passed Senate July 19, 1947.

H. R. 3889, establishing the presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases. Passed House July 21, 1947.

H. R. 1353, Public Law 5, to repeal time limit for reinstatement of national service life insurance.

H. R. 1327, Public Law 34, to provide for renewal for a fifth 5-year period, 5-year level premium term insurance plan for World War I veterans.

House Joint Resolution 196, Senate Joint Resolution 115, Public Law 91, providing for the continuation of offices of Veterans' Administration in the Phillippines.

H. R. 2368, Public Law 115, increasing the revolving fund from $1,500,000 to $3,000,000 for the purpose of making loans to veterans of World War II undertaking vocational training.

House Concurrent Resolution 54, provide for use of Schick General Hospital, Clinton, Iowa. Passed House July 23, 1947.

H. R. 2181, amending veterans regulations pertaining to institutional on-farm training for veterans. Passed House May 12, 1947.

H. R. 3739, providing for Veterans' Administration facility at Clarksburg, W. Va. Passed House July 17, 1947. Passed Senate July 23, 1947.

From Judiciary Committee:

H. R. 1888, Public Law 216, to incorporate AMVETS. Passed House April 9, 1947. Passed Senate July 16, 1947.

H. R. 3398, Public Law 126, extending time for bringing alien fiancées to the United States.

H. R. 3149, Public Law 213, expedite admission to United States of alien spouses and minor children of veterans. Passed House June 16, 1947. Passed Senate July 16, 1947.

Numerous private bills authorizing admission to the United States of veterans' alien wives barred by existing law.

From Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

H. R. 1426, extending veterans' preference benefits to widowed mothers of exservicemen. Passed House July 21, 1947.

H. R. 739, providing for protection of veterans and career-service employees in connection with reduction of forces in Federal service. Passed House July 21, 1947.

H. R. 966, to amend section 14 Veterans' Preference Act. Passed House June 19, 1947.

H. R. 1389, to amend section 2 Veterans' Preference Act. Passed House June 19, 1947.

S. 1180, issuance of Gold Star Mother commemorative stamps. Passed House July 21, 1947.

From Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 1380, veteran death gratuities. Passed House June 16, 1947.

H. R. 3394, to provide for return of World War II dead. Passed House June 16, 1947. Passed Senate, amended, July 23, 1947.

H. R. 1544, providing Gold Star lapel buttons to widows, parents, and next of kin of veterans who lost their lives. Passed House July 21, 1947.

H. R. 4017, cashing of terminal-leave bonds. Passed House July 7, 1947. Passed Senate July 19, 1947.

H. R. 2314, expedites lump-sum payments under Naval Aviation Cadet Act to survivors of deceased officers. Passed House June 16, 1947. Passed Senate July 16, 1947.

From Committee on Public Lands:

H. R. 4059, providing for homesteading in Alaska for veterans. Passed House July 21, 1947.

From Committee on Banking and Currency:

H. R. 2780—S. 854, Public Law 85, emergency veterans' housing—$35,500,000 authorization.

H. R. 3203, Public Law 129, provides among other things priorities for veterans and families in connection with housing material.

H. R. 3492, war housing disposal—permanent buildings—provides for veteran priority and financing of purchase under National Housing Act. Passed House June 18, 1947.

H. R. 3448, amends Federal Home Loan Bank Act to permit banks to accept 25-year mortgages, which is the maturity period of many veteran home loans. Passed House June 2, 1947. Passed Senate July 23, 1947.

From the Appropriations Committee:

H. R. 4031, Public Law 161, providing for expenditures after July 1, 1947, for amputees.

From Ways and Means Committee:

H. R. 479, provides for refund of income taxes paid for year in which serviceman died while in service. Passed House July 22, 1947.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman read from the President's message, then he began reading a list of great acts this Congress had passed in the interest of the veterans. May I ask the gentleman if the President has vetoed any of those bills?

Mr. HALLECK. No; he has not.

Mr. RAYBURN. In all probability if the House under its present leadership would follow the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], and pass some more good laws with reference to the veterans, in all probability the President would not veto those?

Mr. HALLECK. I might say to the minority leader, as I have said in my statement, the opposition of the President is expressed through the Bureau of the Budget, and it has been expressed to most of these measures. Now, then, in connection with the cashing of the terminal-leave-pay bonds, as I pointed out in the debate on that measure, the officials from the Treasury Department testified and appeared in opposition. That measure is now at the White House. I could not undertake to say whether the President will veto that measure or not.

Mr. RAYBURN. The thing about it is that the representatives of the Treasury and the administration in all probability appeared before the committee in opposition to some form of payment, but did they appear in opposition to the bill as it passed the House? Does the gentleman's memory go back and can he say definitely that that is the fact?

Mr. HALLECK. I can say with all reasonable assurance that that is the fact. With respect to the cashing of the terminal-leave bonds there was at one time a substitute proposal suggested which would have simply made them negotiable. My information is that the Treasury appeared against the cashing of the bonds, which was the manner in which the legislation was finally passed.

Mr. RAYBURN. It goes without saying, however, that the President has not vetoed any of these measures that the gentleman says this Congress has passed in the interest of the veteran.

Mr. HALLECK. That is right.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot recognize the gentlewoman. The time is entirely in the hands of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I do not have the time right now; I am sorry.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

REENACT PRICE CONTROL ACT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I was indeed gratified to hear the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] call attention to legislation in the interest of the veterans, all of which was recommended and urged and advocated by the President and nearly unanimously voted by the Democratic Members.

But, unfortunately, such was not the case as to the high cost of living which the President repeatedly has urged be reduced. About that you gentlemen have absolutely failed to do anything. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a joint resolution today, fully appreciating, I want you to know, that no action will be taken in these closing days of the session, but I am introducing it for the purpose and in the hope that those responsible for the high cost of living may finally yield to the appeals of the President and do something to bring about a reduction in the high cost of living, and at the same time to give

you gentlemen a chance and an opportunity, when you go home, to explain to the people why no action has been taken to reduce the high cost of living, when that action lies in your power.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks the text of the resolution I am now introducing and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Resolution to reestablish effective price and rent control

Whereas notwithstanding the assurances given last year by industrial leaders, manufacturers and building contractors that if price controls were removed and if they were free of what they then termed "unnecessary controls and restrictions affecting free enterprise" that the then-existing high prices would not only be held in check but would be gradually lowered and home construction would increase; and

Whereas since the Office of Price Administration was abolished the prices of all foods and commodities have continuously risen during the past year and the cost of living today is at the highest point in history in the United States; and

Whereas with the end of rent control the cost of living will rise more sharply; and

Whereas despite the report of the Mid-year Economic Report of the President, and the appeal of President Truman to manufacturers, businessmen, and builders to reduce prices, prices have continued to rise; and

Whereas people of low and even medium incomes are obliged to deny themselves of actual necessities of life and are deprived of proper housing accommodations; and

Whereas many economists fear that the continuous increase in prices is certain to create inflation and will eventually force employees to demand higher wages to the endangerment of the peaceful conditions now existing between industry and labor; and

Whereas the stoppage of the dangerous increase in the cost of living can only be accomplished by reestablishing price and rent control: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby vested with all the powers which were conferred on the Price Administrator by the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as such act was approved on January 30, 1942. Such powers shall be subject to the same limitations and safeguards as were contained in such act as it was approved on such date, with the exception that the powers vested in the President by this act shall terminate on December 31, 1948.

SEC. 2. The President is authorized to establish in the executive branch of the Government such an agency or such agencies as he deems necessary to accomplish the objective of effective price and rent control and home construction. The President is further authorized to delegate to any such agency or agencies or to any other department or agency any or all of the powers vested in him by the first section of this act.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, these avaricious business and industrial czars who are plunging this country toward uncontrolled inflation and risking the soundness of our economy have proved that they have no intention of heeding the President's plea for reducing prices.

COST OF LIVING INDEX STANDS AT 190 PERCENT

On the other hand, prices continue to go up, and this morning the cost of living index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics stands above 190 percent of the 1935–39 average.

This means that the cost of living has doubled in less than 8 years.

Most of that increase has occurred since OPA was murdered on the floor of this House 13 months ago.

Price control was repealed in the face of my warnings.

It was repealed in the face of the President's warnings and of his veto message on the first bill presented him.

So now, Mr. Speaker, I think that the only thing we can do is to reinstate price control.

It is too late to keep prices from rising; but it is not too late to keep them from going higher.

There is still time to prevent the absolute prostration of such an inflation panic as has created chaos and anarchy in China.

There is still time to save private enterprise from its own folly and suicide.

These big industries, the cartels, and the monopolies and the trust and combines, with their enormous and smooth-running lobbies, are continuing to roll up huge profits, enormous reserves, and surpluses, and they are sitting on top of the world.

But the world is made up of consumers, and the weight of those unconscionable profiteers is crushing the people.

ONE 1939 DOLLAR BUYS TWO 1947 DOLLARS

It takes two 1947 dollars to buy what one 1939 dollar bought.

At the rate we are going it will not be long before it will take three 1947 dollars to buy what $1 would get in 1939.

Now is the time to prevent that wild and uncontrolled inflation which is bound to result if the inflationary panic ever gets started.

Now is the time to put on the brakes. Now is the time to reenact the price-control laws.

So, as I stated, I have today filed a joint resolution which empowers the President to exercise any or all of the powers we gave to President Roosevelt in 1942 under the Price Control Act. We have faith and trust in President Truman, and we know that he will use those powers with great discretion.

I know that many of you here on this floor are serving your first term. You do not and cannot remember the recurrent debates on wartime controls.

But I know, too, that all of you can remember what took place when the President declared the existence of a state of emergency and the Nazi war machine began to be heard clear across the ocean.

HOW INFLATION BEGINS

War plants went to work on defense orders. The Army and Navy were enlarged. Everybody was at work, and money was flowing freely. People with money naturally want to spend it, and pretty soon we were beginning to see real shortages in the stores. Then other controls were imposed, and we converted to all-out war. People could spend their money only for food and clothing.

We had to have price controls and rationing to make sure that everybody got his just share. Even so, you remember that timid housewives filled their closets with sugar and canned goods and soap.

The same thing can happen in peace.

Once the panic of fear gets started, it is too late to stop it. When people begin to take their money out of the banks and to demand silver instead of paper, when they begin to buy diamonds instead of bonds, or to hide the money in the mattress, and when they begin to buy huge stocks of all scarce items—canned goods, sugar, and other things that will keep—you know the palsy of fear is settling over the land.

We dare not wait, Mr. Speaker.

Now is the time to act.

We cannot depend on "private enterprise."

THE LITTLE MAN IS SQUEEZED

I am not criticizing legitimate business. I have been in business all my life. I like to make a profit as well as you or anybody else.

But today the big interests are not making a legitimate and reasonable profit. They are making exorbitant profits, and the little man is being squeezed.

The people who are being hurt by these soaring prices are the workers, the housewives, the farmers, the small-salaried white-collar workers, the annuitants and insurance beneficiaries with small fixed income, the small retailers, the patriotic people who bought Government bonds and held onto them, the taxpayers.

The big boys are getting theirs. As the GI's used to say, they never had it so good.

But while they are getting theirs on a constantly rising market, they are hurting the best interests of our country. They are sacrificing our future economic security and stability to immediate and inordinate profits.

More than once, when I have observed the big companies flouting the law and getting black-market prices for lumber and meat and building materials through side payments and tie-in sales and other such devices for evading the law, if not breaking it, I have urged the Department of Justice to proceed against them under the antitrust laws or any other applicable statutes, and I am glad to say that it was possible to break up some of those profiteering rackets, but unfortunately not very many.

ACTION IS NECESSARY

I also demanded action against the packers who have so brazenly defied the Nation, and who went on strike to keep the country meatless until price ceilings were removed. Over a year ago I introduced a resolution calling for an investigation of the American Meat Institute and of the packing industry. Repeatedly I brought to the attention of the House proof that the packers' warehouses were bulging with meat and meat products, and that their own feeding pens, in close proximity to their slaughterhouses, were filled with beef stock and hogs.

When the ceilings were removed this meat flowed onto the retail market in a high-priced stampede at double the cost to the consumer.

Everything jumped in price—vegetables, canned goods, shortening, fresh fruit, bread.

They are still going up. We dare not wait any longer.

The President's appeals have been ignored by big business, as have the warnings of the President's economic advisers and of many of the outstanding economists of private industry.

As I told you, I have no hope of action on this resolution prior to adjournment. I do have hope that it will make our businessmen pause and think and give heed to the President's repeated requests and warnings. If they do not, then at the special session if one is called, or in the early days of the next session, I shall demand action—and what is more important to you on the left, the people will demand action.

Mr. Speaker, while I have the floor I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made on the floor yesterday, and at the same time ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in three instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the other day we took care of the Japanese who were interned by us on the west coast by authorizing the Attorney General to entertain suits for damages in the amount of $2,500. We are now entertaining the claims of the Filipinos pursuant to the $400,000,000 which we advanced to them. The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce several weeks ago reported out the bill H. R. 4044, which will do the thing we are really interested in, namely, taking care of our own people who were internees in Santo Tomas and elsewhere, and making provision for those who suffered the Death March of Bataan. I hope and trust that before this session ends, after we have taken care of everybody else in the world, we will stand up and take care of our own people when that bill is brought to the floor of the House.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, you have before you this afternoon a bill which is designed to do more than the bill you passed a year ago to help take care of the Filipinos. You have given the Filipinos $400,000,000 to take care of the things that happened over there during the war, and to pay for the damages that were suffered. As was said a moment ago, if an American had his house destroyed in the last war, unless he had war-damage insurance he would have gotten nothing for it, but you are going over to the Philippines and offer to settle all the claims there, and pay everybody, as nearly as you can, out of the amount we have authorized to be appropriated, $400,000,000.

This bill comes from the Committee on Foreign Affairs. That committee has recommended that we pay to foreign countries millions and millions and millions of dollars. You are not through. That committee is going to bring in many more bills asking you to pay hundreds of millions and hundreds of millions more to foreign countries. Where are you going to get the money? I have asked that thousands of times in this House, and you have not been able to answer.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. In the bill I referred to a moment ago, H. R. 4044, we cover into the Treasury of the United States $250,000,000 to $275,000,000 of German and Japanese vested assets in the United States.

Mr. RICH. We ought to get that money. That is the only thing we are going to get from Germany for fighting the last war. We are not after anything; we would just like a little justice. I should like to have a little justice for the American people. You have passed this bill for $400,000,000. Last year you gave the War Damage Commission $4,000,000 to go over there and settle these claims. If anybody here thinks $4,000,000 is not a lot of money, then I do not know anything about finance. I think $4,000,000 is a lot of money in any man's language, especially the language of the United States of America, but the way we have been talking in the last 5 or 6 years it is only a pea in a pod.

Before they get started they come in here and want to boost this sum to $8,400,000. They have not even got started. The bureaucrats, the rascals, have been asking us for money for the last 6 or 8 or 10 years and you have been giving it to them like drunken sailors. You have been passing out money as if it did not mean anything. Remember that the taxpayers of this country have to pay the bill. They want $4,000,000 to go over there and start these claims. The claims will not be in here for 2 or 3 months. Then if they go over there and try to aggregate the claims for the different amounts, that will take them 3 or 4 months. Why not wait until next year before you pass this legislation, and see just the number of claims you are going to have and how difficult it will be to adjudicate the claims. You can do it more intelligently. You can do it more wisely and you can do it to the best advantage of the taxpayers of America, and you will not be asked by the Committee on Foreign Affairs to increase the amount from $400,000,000 to about a billion dollars or $1,500,000,000. If you want more time I think you can get a little more time to do it after you have spent 5 years on it, and you can do it in a wise and judicious manner.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. DORN. Would not the gentleman be more correct if, in speaking of money being sent to Europe, he said billions of dollars instead of millions of dollars?

Mr. RICH. Well, I want to talk in a language that I think most of the Members of Congress understand. They have been talking in the billions so long that I am not very sure whether they know what they are talking about.

Think of this organization, this bureaucratic bunch that is starting over there. They want to double the amount or take two or three times the amount. You do not need them to go there. I will tell you that a lot of them would never go there and settle claims if I were running this Government. They ought to be sent some place else and given a job because I question whether any of them know what it is all about. You could get some Filipinos who are educated and who have been educated in the American schools and who live in the Philippines and who could do it for one-fourth or one-fifth of what it is going to cost us to do it.

Members of Congress, do you believe that we should build up this great organization here to go over and settle these claims now? That is the only reason I am trying to fight this bill. We are going to have a roll-call vote on this bill, and I do not want the majority leader to come over to find out how you are going to vote once you get a quorum here, and you might as well know that right now. I want to know how many fellows want to handle this in the right, the wise, the sensible, and judicious way or whether we are going to give these bureaucrats all they want. They had $4,000,000,000, and they only spent a couple of hundred thousand dollars. Now, they want to double the money. Do you not think it is time for us to stop that? Let us stop them here, and let us do a good job.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I am always glad to stand alongside my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] in the interest of economy.

We on the Committee on Foreign Affairs were asked for $16,000,000 for administrative expenses for the Philippine War Damage Commission. I know that as one of BOB RICH's younger and newer members of the Pennsylvania delegation I was fighting for economy and, in fact, waged a battle to get this reduced from $16,000,000 to $8,400,000.

The reason was that the Navy went over there and handled their war damage claims, but the Navy's administration expenses were 1.8 percent instead of the 4 percent this Commission claimed to be necessary. There were certain items that the peacetime Philippine War Damage Commission felt they would have in their budget that the Navy did not. Both the chairman [Mr. WARING] and I separately estimated that amount at seven-tenths of 1 percent. So on that basis of computing administration expenses the amount would run between $8,000,000 and $10,000,000.

I oppose loose spending and therefore I do not think it would be unjust to say that an analogy to insurance claims is entirely out of order here, as these claims handled by large adjustment agencies are not comparable in the least.

If I understood the former chairman of the Interior Affairs Committee correctly, he said it might cost $100,000,000 in the Philippines. If that is what he meant to say, that would be a gross waste of money. I do not think the expense of

this Commission during the 1948 fiscal year should run more than $2,000,000.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I just want to correct the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. BELL. I did not say it would cost $100,000,000 to administer this matter. What I said was that if you did not give them a reasonable amount to administer it intelligently, we would probably lose $100,000,000.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman.

Now, may I explain the finances of the Commission for a minute? At the present time the Commission has a $4,000,000 authorization for administration expense to take them through until 1951. They have spent during the fiscal year 1947, $800,000 of it. They have just been appropriated this year, by conference on appropriations, $2,000,000. So that they have spent to date $2,800,000 out of the $4,000,000. The Foreign Affairs Committee is asking you to give them a final figure of $8,400,000 over this 4-year period to 1951.

The other body passed this bill in 5 minutes, and they gave them $16,000,000, all that this Philippine War Damage Commission asked for. Then, when the Chairman of the Commission was cross-examined in our Foreign Affairs Committee, he admitted they had $2,000,000 that they did not have budgeted. They wanted that as a cushion. So that the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House has cut this bill $7,600,000 so far, and we are watching the purse strings.

May I finish by pointing out some committee amendments that I have put in. The first amendment is to prevent the paying of any of this money in damage claims to anybody in the Philippines who is a member of the Communist Party or advancing those particular ideas that do not accord with the democratic system. That is only fair.

The other amendment is to scan the Board itself to see that everybody on it is checked by the FBI before January 1, 1948, so that we know we have loyal citizens on this Commission.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I, too, as a member of the committee, was interested in achieving economies, and I think the gentleman from Minnesota was also interested in economy. I think there were quite a few members of the committee interested in economy.

Mr. FULTON. May I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] our chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], especially for being interested in economy. The membership of the Foreign Affairs Committee unanimously agreed on the reduced figure for administration expenses after extensive hearings.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, to get back to the bill under consideration, I want to remind the House that this bill does not appropriate or authorize a single additional dollar. It provides that out of the $400,000,000 already authorized for rehabilitation work in the Philippines by legislation passed last year, there shall be an increase from 1 percent to 2.1 percent for administrative expenses, that is, from $4,000,000 to $8,400,000, so that the Commission can do the best possible job in making sure that all claims are properly settled and the money well spent.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this horrible picture that we have heard so much about, Duel in the Sun, is being imposed on the people of Washington again. I desire to extend my remarks in the RECORD to show just what it means.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include some correspondence between myself and our colleague from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] on the accomplishments of the Un-American Activities Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a report which I have written for the magazine The Republican.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1946, AS AMENDED

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BISHOP].

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make a report to the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the membership on their generosity which made possible the raising of a large amount of money for the Metropolitan Boys Club of Washington.

First I wish to thank the membership, especially those who participated in playing the baseball game on July 12. Next I wish to report on how we carried out the mandate served by our gracious Speaker and our majority leader on us Republicans to win the ball game, which we did successfully by a score of 16 to 13.

We are grateful for the sportsmanship shown by our colleagues on the Democratic side. I am sure that when our colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PRICE] challenged us to the game he wanted to win it and that he kept his promise of endeavoring to do everything possible to make a great showing for the House in this joint effort to raise money for the Boys Club.

I wish to thank Chief Justice Vinson of the United States Supreme Court for participating with us and tossing out the first ball.

I wish also to compliment our colleague the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN] who did such a fine job umpiring for us; our colleague from New York [Mr. KEARNEY] for his efforts on the publicity end; the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL], finance, and the gentleman from Wisconsin who handled concessions, the gentleman from California, "Dr." POULSON, who added much to the entertainment of the afternoon, and the gentleman from Indiana, Congressman GILLIE, who so ably administered to the physical needs of the players.

Mr. Speaker, for the interest of the membership I insert at this point a list of the Members who participated in the ball game:

REPUBLICAN TEAM LINE-UP, CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL GAME, JULY 12

CASE, South Dakota, left field.
JACKSON, California, third base.
DAVIS, Wisconsin, shortstop.
FLETCHER, California, right field.
HOWELL, Illinois, first base.
BISHOP, Illinois, second base.
STRATTON, Illinois, center field.
BROPHY, Wisconsin, catcher.
CORBETT, Pennsylvania, pitcher.
BOGGS, Delaware, pitcher.
WILSON, Indiana, pitcher.
HILL, Colorado, pitcher.
BUTLER, New York, pitcher.
MUNDT, South Dakota, pitcher.
Utility: HORAN, Washington; HAGEN, Minnesota; MACKINNON, Minnesota; LANDIS, Indiana; KEARNS, Pennsylvania; LOVE, West Virginia; SCOBLICK, Pennsylvania.
STOCKMAN, Oregon, umpire; MARTIN, Massachusetts, coach; HALLECK, Indiana, coach; SPRINGER, Indiana, coach; PLOESER, Missouri; KEARNEY, New York, publicity; KUNKEL, Pennsylvania, treasurer; BYRNES, Wisconsin, concessions; ARENDS, Illinois, whip.
Score, Democrats, 13; Republicans, 16.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleague from Illinois in thanking those who participated in this ball game to make it a success. I appreciate their efforts very much.

I, too, insert in the RECORD at this point the names of Members who participated on my side:

DEMOCRATIC MEMBERS PARTICIPATING IN BASEBALL GAME FOR BENEFIT OF METROPOLITAN POLICE BOYS' CLUB OF WASHINGTON, JULY 12, 1947

1. ABERNETHY, THOMAS G., Mississippi.
2. ALBERT, CARL, Oklahoma.
3. BATTLE, LAURIE C., Alabama.
4. BRYSON, JOSEPH R., South Carolina.
5. CAMP, A. SIDNEY, Georgia.
6. COOLEY, HAROLD D., North Carolina.
7. DURHAM, CARL T., North Carolina.
8. EVINS, JOE L., Tennessee.
9. FOGARTY, JOHN E., Rhode Island.
10. GARY, J. VAUGHAN, Virginia.
11. GORE, ALBERT, Tennessee.
12. GOSSETT, ED, Texas.
13. GRANT, GEORGE M., Alabama.
14. HUBER, WALTER B., Ohio.
15. JACKSON, HENRY M., Washington.
16. JONES, ROBERT E., JR., Alabama.
17. KEFAUVER, ESTES, Tennessee.
18. PRICE, EMORY H., Florida.
19. PRIEST, J. PERCY, Tennessee.

20. RICHARDS, JAMES P., South Carolina.
21. RIVERS, L. MENDEL, South Carolina.
22. SMATHERS, GEORGE A., Florida.
23. STIGLER, WILLIAM G., Oklahoma.
24. WHEELER, W. M. (DON), Georgia.
25. WHITTEN, JAMIE L., Mississippi.
26. WORLEY, EUGENE, Texas.
27. LANHAM, HENDERSON, Georgia.
28. HARDY, PORTER, JR., Virginia.
The page boys.

I would like to give special mention to Fishbait Miller for the fine job he did in helping with the line-up and in various other ways.

I thank all the Members for the effort they put forth for the Boys' Club of Washington. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] will tell us in a minute just how much money was raised.

Mr. COOLEY. How about the umpire?

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Yes; a word of thanks to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] who represented us so ably on the field as umpire as he had the difference on the field.

Also I wish to thank the gentleman from Alabama, GEORGE GRANT, who looked after the sale of refreshments on the Democratic side. Also the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER] who was the champion peanut salesman. We are grateful to them all.

I think it should be observed at this point in regard to the score which the gentleman from Illinois mentioned which was 16 to 13, but if the rain had not knocked the Democrats out of their last bat it would have been a different story.

Mr. WORLEY. I am sure everyone understands that the score would have been different had we had our last bat.

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Naturally the score would have been entirely different. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. It seemed to me that sometime during the game somebody knocked a home run.

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Yes. We will not say anything about who was playing center field at the time. You have all heard of "Wrong Way" Corrigan.

Mr. KNUTSON. That home run was an optical illusion.

Mr. ARENDS. Without making it a matter of record, can the gentleman tell us whether or not the ball was ever recovered?

Mr. PRICE of Florida. The ball was found after about 10 or 15 minutes. Of course, Mr. COOLEY made the slight mistake of running toward second base when he should have run for the bleachers.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to let this opportunity pass without thanking the authorities in charge for so freely giving us the use of the Eastern High School facilities to do a little practicing and also for the valuable assistance given to us by Coach Geigon. He helped us very much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania very briefly that he may make his financial report.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, the net total profit to date is $2,927.03. I just collected $10 since the festivities started. The cash sales were $3,197. That consisted of money paid in for tickets by Members plus $188 which came from the Touchdown Club of Washington, headed by Mr. Robert C. Simmons. This organization participated in the ticket sales to that extent. All of us appreciate their fine cooperation greatly.

The sales at the stadium gate were $329. The net profits from concessions were $119.25, the total receipts being $3,645.25.

We also did a good job for the United States Treasury because the tax on tickets amounted to $596.02. This was by far the largest item of expense.

All the other expenses were very small. The Washington stadium, under the direction of Clark Griffith, not only let us have the stadium free, but also supplied a great many facilities, including the ticket sellers at the windows and numerous other small items which saved a great deal of money and enabled the net profit to be much higher than it otherwise would have been.

It may be we will take in some more money between now and adjournment because on each of the last few days I have received checks from Members who had forgotten to send them in. If any of you have overlooked the letter we will be glad to have you mail your checks this afternoon. They will be added to the check that is being sent to the Metropolitan Boys Club. With the tremendous rush of business on the floor and in committee during the past weeks, inevitably a percentage would overlook this payment.

The complete statement of receipts and expenses is as follows:

Statement of receipts and expenses, congressional baseball game, Griffith Stadium, July 12, 1947

RECEIPTS

Tickets:		
Cash sales		$3,197.00
Griffith Stadium sales		329.00
Total		3,426.00
Profit—concessions at Griffith Stadium		119.25
Total receipts		3,645.25

EXPENSES

Tax on tickets		$596.02
Mimeographing and envelopes		2.80
Printing, 25,000 tickets		61.50
Griffith Stadium expense:		
Scoreboard	$2.00	
Maids	8.00	
Soda, clubhouse	8.40	
3 dozen baseballs, at $16.50 a dozen	49.50	
		67.90
Total expenses		728.22
Profit		2,917.03

Statement prepared July 25, 1947.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUNKEL. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the Democrats lost but the Republicans were the last to bat. Next year there will be other controversies and conflicts coming on and the Democrats would like to challenge the Republicans to a real game in 1948.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-seven Members are present, a quorum.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4269. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BALL, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. TYDINGS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4269) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, ENGEL of Michigan, STEFAN, CASE of South Dakota, KEEFE, CANNON, KERR, and MAHON.

AMENDING TARIFF ACT OF 1930

Mr. KNUTSON submitted the following conference report and statement on the resolution (H. J. Res. 238) to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 238) to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted

by the Senate amendment insert the following: "(but only until July 1, 1948, in the case of paper in rolls of less than 15 inches in width)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

HAROLD KNUTSON,
DANIEL A. REED,
ROY O. WOODRUFF,
JERE COOPER,
WILBUR D. MILLS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

E. D. MILLIKIN,
ROBERT TAFT,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res 238) to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Existing law (par. 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930) admits free of duty "standard newsprint paper". The House joint resolution amended this paragraph so as to provide that paper which is in rolls not less than 15 inches in width shall be deemed to be standard newsprint insofar as width of rolls is concerned. Senate amendment No. 1 limits the application of the amendment made by the House to the period ending June 30, 1948; and Senate amendment No. 2, changes the width of the permissible rolls from 15 to 9 inches.

The House recedes on amendment No. 2, and recedes on amendment No. 1, with an amendment the effect of which is to make the 15-inch width permissible as permanent law, but to make the 9-inch width permissible only until July 1, 1948.

HAROLD KNUTSON,
DANIEL A. REED,
ROY O. WOODRUFF,
JERE COOPER,
WILBUR D. MILLS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the Resolution 238, to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TERMINATION OF WARTIME TAX PROVISIONS

Mr. KNUTSON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4069) to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II.

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4069) to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 14.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19, and agree to the same.

HAROLD KNUTSON,
DANIEL A. REED,
ROY O. WOODRUFF,
JERE COOPER,
WILBUR D. MILLS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

E. D. MILLIKIN,
ROBERT TAFT,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4069) to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: The House bill provided that for the purposes of the proviso of section 511 (h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, the present war shall be considered as having terminated on the fifteenth day after the date of the enactment of the bill. The Senate amendment provides that for such purposes the present war shall be considered as having terminated on March 31, 1948. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 2: The House bill amended section 22 (b) (13) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to terminate on December 31, 1947, the income-tax exclusion of $1,500 of service pay now allowed to commissioned officers or commissioned warrant officers serving in the armed forces of the United States and to citizens or residents of the United States serving in the armed forces of any of the other United Nations. The Senate amendment provides that such income-tax exclusion shall not terminate until December 31, 1948. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 3: The House bill amended section 22 (b) (13) of the code so as to terminate on December 31, 1947, the income-tax exclusion of all service pay allowed under existing law to personnel serving in the armed forces of the United States below the grade of commissioned officer (or commissioned warrant officer). The Senate amendment provides that such income-tax exclusion shall not terminate until December 31, 1948. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 4 and 5: The House bill amended section 22 (d) (6) (A) of the code which makes special provisions, in the case of taxpayers using the last-in first-out method for income-tax reporting, for replacement of inventories depleted by involuntary liquidation because of circumstances related to the war. Section 8 of the House bill provided that the relief under section 22 (d) (6) (A) of the code is allowable if the involuntary liquidation occurred in a taxable year beginning prior to August 1, 1947 (instead of prior to the termination of the war), and the replacement occurred in a taxable year ending prior to August 1, 1950 (instead of not more than three years after the termination of the war). Amendment No. 4 substitutes for the date August 1, 1947, the date January 1, 1948; and amendment No. 5 substitutes for the date August 1, 1950, the date January 1, 1951. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 6: The House bill amended section 1621 (a) of the code by striking out paragraph (1) thereof which excludes from the definition of wages, and hence from withholding of income tax at source, remuneration for services performed as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States. The House bill provided that the amendment striking out paragraph (1) should be applicable with respect to wages paid on or after January 1, 1948. The Senate amendment provides that such amendment shall be applicable with respect to wages paid on or after January 1, 1949. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 7: This is a clerical amendment and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 8: This is a clerical amendment and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 9: This is a clerical amendment and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 10: This amendment provides for percentage depletion at the rate of 15 percent in the case of bauxite for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1946. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 11: This amendment provides for percentage depletion at the rate of 15 percent in the case of pyrophyllite for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1946. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 12: This amendment provides for percentage depletion at the rate of 15 percent in the case of phosphate rock for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1946. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 13: This amendment provides for percentage depletion at the rate of 15 percent in the case of trona for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1946. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 14: This amendment provides, with respect to percentage depletion, that "In the case of potash and thenardite, whether extracted from a mine or from a brine or other deposit, there shall be included in gross and net income from the property the income from other minerals or mineral salts extracted therefrom." The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 15: This is a technical amendment and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 16: This is a technical amendment and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 17: This is a technical amendment and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 18: This is a technical amendment and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 19: The Senate amendment adds a section 16 to the bill, for which there is no corresponding provision in the bill as passed by the House. Section 23 (q) (2) of the code provides that contributions or gifts (for religious, charitable, educational, etc., purposes) made by a corporation to an unincorporated association (trust, chest, fund, or foundation) are not deductible if made within a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1946 (the date of cessation of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President) unless such contributions or gifts are to be used within the United States or any of its possessions. The Senate amendment adding section 16 to the bill amends section 23 (q) (2) so that the requirement that such gifts or contributions must be used within the United States or any of its possessions is applicable only to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1948, instead of December 31, 1946, as provided under existing law. The House recedes.

HAROLD KNUTSON,
DANIEL A. REED,
ROY O. WOODRUFF,
JERE COOPER,
WILBUR D. MILLS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4069) to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. COOPER (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous conference report signed by all of the conferees. I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the chairman of our committee make an explanation to the House of the action of the conferees. I think it is important enough to do that.

Mr. KNUTSON. I understood we finally disposed of the matter. I think the gentleman has reference to the $1,500 exemption for servicemen, is that correct?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. We accepted the Senate amendment.

Mr. EBERHARTER. As I understand, as the measure left the House, the exemptions that the armed services personnel held since 1943 were removed. It was provided in the 1943 act that no enlisted man would be charged an individual income tax on any pay received, and the armed services personnel and commissioned class were entitled to a $1,500 exemption. As it left the House, this exemption was removed; is that correct?

Mr. KNUTSON. Not as far as the enlisted personnel was concerned. It only was removed from the officer personnel. The Senate restored the officer personnel, and that amendment was accepted in conference.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I believe the chairman will agree with me that the position taken by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania was the position adopted by the Senate on this bill, and that provision was agreed to in conference.

Mr. KNUTSON. The will of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania prevailed.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I just thought it would be interesting to the House to know that the armed services personnel will still have the same exemptions as they have been enjoying for the past four or five years.

Mr. KNUTSON. They will continue to enjoy a favored status over all other citizens.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That exemption will continue through 1948?

Mr. KNUTSON. To 1949.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a summary of the history of the Committee on Ways and Means during this session of the Congress.

FILING OF CONFERENCE REPORTS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bills H. R. 2659 and 2173 may have until midnight tonight to file conference reports on those bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill H. R. 3045 may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

RETURNS OF ITALIAN PROPERTY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 138) to provide for returns of Italian property in the United States, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas article 79 of the Treaty of Peace with Italy, signed at Paris on February 10, 1947, grants to the Allied and Associated Powers the right to seize and retain "all property rights and interests which on the coming into force of the present treaty are within its territory and belong to Italy or to Italian nationals, and to apply such property or the proceeds thereof to such purposes as it may desire, within the limits of its claims and those of its nationals against Italy or Italian nationals, including debts, other than claims fully satisfied under other articles of the present treaty" and further provides that "All Italian property, or the proceeds thereof, in excess of the amount of such claims, shall be returned"; and

Whereas pursuant to article 79 of the treaty of peace, negotiations have been entered into between the Governments of the United States and of Italy looking toward an agreement under which, upon the return of property, formerly Italian, in the United States, Italy will place at the disposal of the United States funds to be used in meeting certain claims of nationals of the United States; and

Whereas for the purpose of carrying out such agreement, it is desirable to authorize in accordance with the procedures provided for in section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, return to Italy or citizens or subjects of Italy, or corporations or associations organized under the laws of Italy, of property vested in or transferred to the United States or its agencies; and

Whereas for the purpose of aiding the revival of the Italian economy and establishing it on a self-sustaining basis, it is desirable that there be returned or transferred to Italy those Italian vessels acquired by the United States after December 7, 1941, for use in the war effort and now owned by the United States and vessels of a total tonnage approximately equal to the tonnage of those Italian vessels seized by the United States after September 1, 1939, and lost while being employed in the United States war effort: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President, or such officer or agency as he may designate, is hereby authorized to return, in accordance with the procedures provided for in section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, any property or interest, or the net proceeds thereof, which has been, since December 18, 1941, vested in or transferred to any officer or agency of the United States pursuant to the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and which immediately prior to such vesting or transfer was the property or interest of Italy or a citizen or subject of Italy, or a corporation or association organized under the laws of Italy.

SEC. 2. Section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"(2) that such owner, and legal representative or successor in interest, if any, are not—

"(A) the Government of Germany, Japan, Bulgaria, Hungary, or Rumania; or

"(B) a corporation or association organized under the laws of such nation: *Provided*, That any property or interest or proceeds which, but for the provisions of this subdivision (B), might be returned under this section to any such corporation or association, may be returned to the owner or owners of all the stock of such corporation or of all the proprietary and beneficial interest in such association, if their ownership of such stock or proprietary and beneficial interest existed immediately prior to vesting in or transfer to the Alien Property Custodian and continuously thereafter to the date of such return (without regard to purported divestments or limitations of such ownership by any government referred to in subdivision (A) hereof) and if such ownership was by one or more citizens of the United States or by one or more corporations organized under the laws of the United States or any State, Territory, or possession thereof, or the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That such owner or owners shall succeed to those obligations limited in aggregate amount to the value of such property or interest or proceeds, which are lawfully assertible against the corporation or association by persons not ineligible to receive a return under this section; or

"(C) an individual voluntarily resident at any time since December 7, 1941, within the territory of such nation, other than a citizen of the United States or a diplomatic or consular officer of Italy or of any nation with which the United States has not at any time since December 7, 1941, been at war: *Provided*, That an individual who, while in the territory of a nation with which the United States has at any time since December 7, 1941, been at war, was deprived of life or substantially deprived of liberty pursuant to any law, degree, or regulation of such nation discriminating against political, racial, or religious groups, shall not be deemed to have voluntarily resided in such territory; or

"(D) an individual who was at any time after December 7, 1941, a citizen or subject of Germany, Japan, Bulgaria, Hungary, or Rumania, and who on or after December 7,

1941, and prior to the date of the enactment of this section, was present (other than in the service of the United States) in the territory of such nation or in any territory occupied by the military or naval forces thereof or engaged in any business in any such territory: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the provisions of this subdivision (D) return may be made to an individual who, as a consequence of any law, decree, or regulation of the nation of which he was then a citizen or subject, discriminating against political, racial, or religious groups, has at no time between December 7, 1941, and the time when such law, decree, or regulation was abrogated, enjoyed full rights of citizenship under the law of such nation; or

"(E) a foreign corporation or association which at any time after December 7, 1941, was controlled or 50 percent or more of the stock of which was owned by any person or persons ineligible to receive a return under subdivisions (A), (B), (C), or (D) hereof: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the provisions of this subdivision (e), return may be made to a corporation or association so controlled or owned, if such corporation or association was organized under the laws of a nation any of whose territory was occupied by the military or naval forces of any nation with which the United States has at any time since December 7, 1941, been at war, and if such control or ownership arose after March 1, 1938, as an incident to such occupation and was terminated prior to the enactment of this section; and"

SEC. 3. The first sentence of section 33 of the Trading With the Enemy Act (40 Stat. 411), as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC 33. No return may be made pursuant to section 9 (a) or 32 (a) unless notice of claim for return has been filed within 2 years from the seizure or vesting in the Alien Property Custodian, as the case may be, of the property or interest in respect of which the claim is made or by August 8, 1948, or in the cases of claims pursuant to section 32 (a) by Italy, citizens or subjects of Italy, or corporations or associations organized under the laws of Italy, by July 31, 1949, whichever is later."

SEC. 4. The President is authorized upon such terms as he deems necessary (a) to transfer to the Government of Italy all vessels which were under Italian registry and flag on September 1, 1939, and were thereafter acquired by the United States and are now owned by the United States; and (b) with respect to any vessel under Italian registry and flag on September 1, 1939, and subsequently seized in United States ports and thereafter lost while being employed in the United States war effort, to transfer to the Government of Italy surplus merchant vessels of the United States of a total tonnage approximately equal to the total tonnage of the Italian vessels lost: *Provided*, That no monetary compensation shall be paid either for the use by the United States or its agencies of former Italian vessels so acquired or seized or for the return or transfer of such vessels or substitute vessels.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. RICH. I demand a second, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. RICH. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, this legislation requires no appropriation at all. It is a significant step toward the rehabilitation of a country which is undergoing grave difficulties, the repercussions of which are of vital concern to this country. We must do all that we can to bolster this Nation and help her to remain a bastion of liberty rather than an outpost of communism.

This is not only a matter of our own national self-interest, it is in the interest of world peace. Moreover, it is in line with the policy we adopted following the surrender of Fascist Italy on September 8, 1943, when we granted Italy cobelligerent status and guaranteed the essential nationhood of that country. This legislation will help to relieve the burden imposed by the Italian treaty recently ratified.

The headlong rapidity of events in Europe, the withdrawal of the Russian Government from participation in the Paris Conference, the large-scale attacks on war-ravaged and destitute Greece, and other disturbing manifestations of Soviet expansionism, make it urgent that we do all that we can to give assistance to Italy at this critical time. It is known that there are strong, violent elements in the Communist Party in Italy and they have ample means for fomenting serious disturbances which might well result in the capture by armed force of the Italian Government.

Accordingly, the passage of this resolution is urgent, aside from the material aid it will bring to Italy. It is important also as a further gesture of our determination to resist the antifreedom imperialism which has its headquarters in Moscow.

In addition, this legislation has been recommended most eloquently by our distinguished Secretary of State, who regards it as a very important and vital matter in the conduct of the foreign policy of our country.

Now I should like to say a few words with respect to the safeguarding of the rights and claims of American citizens who may have been injured or whose property may have been damaged as a result of the war with Italy. As you may know, since the Paris Peace Conference it has been the policy of this Government to effectuate as soon as possible the return to Italy of Italian properties in the United States which can be retained under the provisions of article 79 of the Treaty of Peace with Italy. As a matter of fact, the reparations demanded of Italy during the Paris Peace Conference were some $22,000,000,000, and we were accused of wanting to keep Italian property in the United States in order to obtain reparations from Italy. Accordingly, in order to obtain this reduction, first from $22,000,000,000 to $750,000,000, and finally down to $360,000,000, we said at Paris that we would not regard Italian property in this country as a reparations payment to us. The burden of reparations on Italy is a burden which inevitably falls to some extent on us, and, therefore, this was a very wise thing to have done. The national interest was served in this reduction of reparations payments.

In view of the fact that our Government has generously waived its claims under section 79 of the treaty it is appropriate to inquire if the claims of American nationals are adequately protected.

First, let us consider the claims of American nationals with respect to properties in Italy which may have been confiscated or damaged by wartime action. These claims are safeguarded by article 78 of the Peace Treaty which provides, first, that all property rights and interests of American citizens in Italy must be restored to their owners free of all encumbrances and charges, and, second, that the Italian Government is responsible for such restoration in good order or for compensation in Italian lira to the extent of two-thirds of the sum necessary to repair the damage. With respect to this category of claims, the Italian Government has confirmed these obligations by an exchange of letters and, of course, there is an agreement covering this matter which will be signed very soon and the substance of which has already been agreed to.

Then, there are claims of American civilians for personal injuries, and maltreatment of prisoners of war in Italy. As to this no claims have been received. The agreement which is being negotiated provides for $5,000,000 to cover all claims. The indications are that this sum will be more than twice the amount necessary to cover the claims. More than 2 years have elapsed sinve VE-day and the amount of claims already received after due publicity in the Federal Register indicates that $5,000,000 will be ample to cover the claims of American nationals.

With respect to claims of American oil companies in Italy whose factories and plants in Italy have been seriously damaged, further agreements have been made so that they will be satisfied.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

I understand that United States oil companies have had their property restored, is that right?

Mr. LODGE. I am interested to have this information.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is my understanding.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. It is my understanding that the oil companies have had their property returned to them.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Returned to them.

Mr. HARRIS. It is my understanding that it was their own property that was returned to them and they have their own property back that was taken from them.

Mr. LODGE. I am glad to have that contribution.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is the information I have, that the property has been returned to the oil companies.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the gentleman.

Aside from this question of claims, there is this vital matter with respect to the ships which are to be transferred under this act. The tonnage lost is estimated to be approximately 140,000 tons. To this tonnage should be added 60,000 to 70,000 tons, representing ships previously confiscated and still afloat, which will be returned to Italy by this legisla-

tion. In this category are included five Italian ships confiscated by Latin-American countries, which were purchased by the United States, which served their purpose and which are now idle.

With respect to the Liberty ships to be transferred, it should be noted that there are some 400 or 500 Liberty ships which are now laid up and which have an estimated scrap value of $10,000 to $50,000 per ship. Each of those ships would require from $50,000 to $200,000 in the way of repairs, in order to put them in satisfactory operating order. But it is contemplated that those ships will be transferred to Italy on an "as is—where is" basis. Those ships will be selected by the President of the United States in consulation with the maritime commission. In this way it is hoped that only the better available ships will be transferred.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I would like to ask my colleague, regarding the transfer of the Liberty ships to Italy, if the Maritime Commission has approved the transfer of those ships. The reason I ask that question is that I know certain other countries are anxious to obtain Liberty ships and I understand, whether I am informed correctly or not, there is trouble in getting the maritime commission to authorize the transfer to other countries.

Mr. LODGE. I am informed by the State Department that that matter has been taken care of. In fact, this entire matter has been cleared with the Alien Property Custodian, as well as the Treasury Department.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. Would the gentleman tell the House whether Italy, under the peace treaty, is obligated to make reparation payments to other countries?

Mr. LODGE. Under the peace treaty Italy is obligated to make reparation payments to other countries, but those payments are made in the following fashion——

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE] has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. LODGE. Russia, for instance, will ship in raw materials to Italy, and Italian labor will transform those raw materials into finished products, which will be shipped out to Russia. It involves no expenditure of raw materials on the part of Italy.

Mr. BUCK. Then, conceivably, some of this fund can go to other countries?

Mr. LODGE. This fund cannot go to Germany, Bulgaria, Hungary, or Rumania, if those countries are successors in ownership. There are provisions in the bill which cover that entire situation. With respect to reparations, the situation is as I have described.

There are between 15 and 18 Liberty ships involved in this transfer. We have eight additional ships in our possession which we are going to transfer. There are, as I have said, also five ships which we purchased from Brazil and Venezuela.

It should be pointed out that at the end of the war the Italian merchant marine was left with one-tenth of its prewar tonnage. That is to say, 300,000 tons instead of 3,000,000 tons, and many of those losses were sustained during the period of cobelligerency with the United Nations. Furthermore, a number of Italian ships were operated by the Allied forces during this period, thereby causing the Italian Government considerable sacrifice in connection with their operations.

Examples of these are the ships *Vulcania* and *Saturnia* which were used as hospital ships. It is estimated that the Italian economy on the basis of the present exchange situation will make a net currency profit of $15,000,000 per annum if these ships are transferred to her; and if not it will cost them $21,000,000 per annum. Accordingly, a net gain of $36,000,000 is involved.

We recently passed a bill which gave Italy $130,000,000 in relief We know how costly it is to transport that relief overseas. We know that the great difficulty in Italy is lack of foreign exchange. This will put Italy in a position where she can gain some much needed foreign exchange.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope that this legislation will receive favorable action at this time. I regard it as of the utmost importance.

The question as to whether the return of Italian vested property to the former Italian owners will jeopardize American claimants has been one which I have gone into thoroughly. It is possible to break down American claimants into three major categories: First, Americans who have claims against Italy because of damage to the property in Italy or Italian control of these Americans either as a result of war activities or arising out of the controls imposed by the Italian Government during its period of belligerency against us; second, claims of Americans directly against the property which is to be returned or claims which they may have against the Italian owners of the property to be returned; and, third, special claims of Americans against Italy arising out of the war and which are not otherwise satisfied under the terms of the treaty of peace which has been ratified by the Senate.

A thorough examination of this Government's policy with respect to these three categories of claims reveals that the present legislation will not jeopardize the claimants' position or the means which they may have to satisfy their claims. I have considered it necessary to go into these questions with the appropriate Government agencies—State, Justice, Treasury—in order that I could be certain that by taking this action we will not be injuring the rights of our nationals. I am firmly convinced that the results of my investigations fully substantiate the conclusion that the enactment of this legislation will not prejudice the rights or claims of those Americans.

With respect to the first type of claims, article 78 of the Treaty of Peace with Italy requires the Italian Government to restore all property rights and interests held by nationals of the United States to such nationals. It further requires that the property shall be returned to complete good order, or if that is not possible, that compensation shall be paid for that part of the property which cannot be returned in complete good order. Using this provision as a basis, the Department of State, in conjunction with other interested agencies, is currently negotiating an agreement with the Italian Government which further insures that the property of American nationals will be returned in good order, or in the event that the property has been so damaged that that is not possible, compensation will be paid. In this connection difficult cases which have arisen over the past 2 years with respect to the return of property in Italy of American nationals in Italy, have been reviewed and full agreement has been reached satisfactory not only to our Government but to the nationals concerned which will make possible the immediate return of such property and the immediate payment of compensation, if such is required. In other words, the American national who owns property in Italy will, in the immediate future, either receive that property back in complete good order and free of all encumbrances which may have been placed upon it while it was under the control of the Italian Government, or in the event that the property cannot be restored to complete good order, he will immediately in the future receive compensation. The fact that the American nationals who have interests in Italy falling into this category are fully satisfied with the terms of the agreement that is being worked out, is sufficient answer to any doubts that may be raised that we are jeopardizing the rights of those Americans by returning Italian vested property.

The second category of claims deals with the claims of American nationals which lie directly against the property which is to be returned or claims against the Italian owners of the property to be returned. The present legislation in and of itself assures that the claims of these American nationals will not be prejudiced. This is necessarily so because the present legislation in every detail uses the same procedures for returning to Italy and Italian nationals their vested properties as this Congress has already deemed satisfactory for the return to other nations and their nationals. This means, therefore, that before vested property can be returned to the Italian owners the Office of Alien Property of the Department of Justice must publish notice in the Federal Register that such property is being returned and must give notice to the claimants that they may pursue their usual legal remedies by attachment or otherwise against that property in order that they may be assured that their claim or claims which are deemed legitimate by our courts will be satisfied. Therefore, these American nationals are in no different position than they would have been if the Italian property had never been vested, with one exception. That exception is that had the property never been vested they might

never have had the opportunity of knowing that the property was in this country, and therefore might never have had the opportunity to attach the property. However, they are now giving formal notice as required by the Congress that the property is in this country and that in the near future it is to be returned to the Italian owners. Therefore, section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended by this legislation, if anything, puts these claimants in a better position, since they have a more adequate opportunity of pursuing their claims against the Italian owners. Under these circumstances there certainly can be no question that the enactment of the present legislation would jeopardize the claims of American nationals falling into this category.

The third category of the claims which may be held by American nationals deals with the special meritorious claims arising out of the war and not otherwise covered by the treaty of peace. With respect to this category, we are talking primarily of the small number of claims for injuries to American civilians in Italy arising out of the war or claims for maltreatment of Americans while prisoners of war of the Italian armed forces. I say "small number" for clear and obvious reasons: First. The Italian authorities never pursued, as did Germany and Japan, a policy of maltreating our American prisoners of war. It is well-known that the Italian armed forces to the fullest extent possible followed the rules of international law with respect to the treatment of their prisoners of war; it is very well-known that they never stooped to the inhumane policy of the Germans of maltreating prisoners of war. That this is so is borne out by the fact that no claims have been filed for such maltreatment. The same applies with respect to American civilians who may have been injured or killed in Italy during the war. During the war the Italians allowed American civilians to pursue their usual course of life in Italy. Those who were under suspicion or against whom there was evidence of working for the Americans against Italy were, in accordance with the usual rules of international law and in the same manner as this Government acted, interned by the Italian Government. The treatment they received, however, as internees was consistent and in accordance with the principles of international law. Moreover, these cases were few in number. Therefore, the type of claim that might arise in this category would be the claim of an American who may have been injured by actual warfare in Italy. In view of the fact that the number of Americans in Italy during the war were few and in view of the fact that to date no claim has been filed in this category, it is clear that we need not fear any large number of such claims.

I wish to stress this last point. Considerable publicity was given in the United States to the negotiations at the Paris Peace Conference. The United States press was full of reports that we were in fact determining at the Paris conference what should be done with respect to claims against Italy. Similarly, such publicity was given to the deliberations of the Senate over the ratification of the Italian Treaty of Peace. Once again the United States press carried full reports concerning the terms of the treaty: the fact that the treaty laid down the rules for satisfying the claims of Americans against Italy. Considerable publicity was given—and is still being given—to the fact that there is now in the United States an economic and financial mission which is negotiating with our Government an executive agreement to settle issues which remain outstanding under the terms of the Treaty of Peace with Italy. The press of the United States has carried numerous reports on these negotiations, but despite all this publicity, I am informed that no large number of claims of any important monetary value have been filed with our Government. We can easily compare this experience with the experience we have had in other cases. When the Yugoslav Government sent a delegation to the United States to work out an agreement on similar questions, a large and considerable number of Americans notified their Government of claims they held against Yugoslavia. The American is quick to realize the possibility of satisfying his claims and making his claims known to the Government. This, therefore, means that in order to satisfy such claims, which are in the category of claims not settled by the treaty of peace, only a very small amount of money is required. On the basis of this evidence, I would be willing to say that anywhere from one to $3,000,000 would be adequate. However, in order to make assurance doubly sure, our Government is requiring in these current negotiations with the Italians the payment by Italy to the United States in the immediate future, of $5,000,000 in American currency which is to be utilized for the satisfaction of these special claims. Under these circumstances there can be no doubt that this amount is more than adequate, and this is a lump sum payment and the entire amount is made available to us. This procedure affords clear advantages to the American national who, if he has such a claim, does not, as is the usual rule under mixed claims commissions and the like, have to satisfy both the foreign government and this Government as to the merits of his claim. He need only deal with this Government and need only present his evidence to this Government, and upon its being satisfied that his claim is a meritorious claim, the money is ready and available for payment to him. The Government of Italy has nothing to say about it. Therefore, I believe it is clear that the enactment of this resolution will not in any way jeopardize the possibilities of the American national who holds such claims against Italy in obtaining satisfaction; on the contrary, under the executive agreement now being worked out, his ability to effect satisfaction of that type of claim will be enhanced. At this point I should like to point out that although this agreement has not been formally signed, the Italian Government has already given its approval to it. The signature is only a matter of typing up the final documents.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Summarizing, therefore, the effect of this legislation upon all the possible claims that American nationals might have against Italy or the Italian owners of property in this country, we can say the following:

First. Under the terms of the Treaty of Peace and under the terms of the agreement which has been worked between the two Governments, the American national who owns property in Italy is being dealt with in a manner which is fully satisfactory to his Government and to him.

Second. The American national who holds a claim against Italian property in this country is being given a better opportunity than he would otherwise have of obtaining satisfaction of that claim upon his proving in the usual manner in the courts that his claim is a meritorious one; and

Third. The American national who has a special claim against Italy arising out of the war is being assured that there will be money available for the payment of that claim and that it can be handled in an expeditious manner without any reference to the foreign government.

I should like to point out one basic reason why I think it is essential that the House pass this resolution now. When the United States delegation went to the Paris Peace Conference, they had two basic policies with respect to the question of reparations against Italy. The first was that the reparations should not be onerous or burdensome—that Italy could not possibly meet such claims. In other words, it was the intention of this Government that Italy, rather than remaining a country which could not possibly continue on a self-sufficient basis, should be restored to an economic vitality which would assure not only a democratic government in Italy, not only the absence of the need of aid from the United States, but also an Italy which would be able to contribute in a positive manner to world peace.

The second basic policy of this Government was that the reparation formula should not be one which would require this Government to give aid to Italy in order that it could pay off its reparation claims to other countries.

In the very beginning our negotiators had to face the following facts: Twenty-two billion dollars worth of reparation claims were filed against Italy by other governments. Clearly and obviously such a huge amount could not under any circumstances be paid out by Italy. By continuous argument and by constantly pressing forward in the most convincing manner possible the arguments against such a large reparations claim being approved by the conference, this Government was able, as the conference was drawing to a close, to reduce that $22,000,000,000 worth of claims to $760,000,000 worth. However, this, too, was considered an unreasonable amount to charge against Italy. It was clear that if this amount was approved by the Paris peace negotiators, Italy would have no possibility of establishing a satisfactory economic and political future for itself. Our negotiators therefore made it very clear to the other governments that we

were not going to ask for any reparations against Italy. When we were accused of the intention of using Italian assets in the United States as a means of satisfying in a concealed way our reparation claims against Italy, we pressed forward with all vigor by stating our clear-cut intention of returning by far the greater portion of these assets. We made it very clear that while we were knocking down the reparation claims of other countries and while we were holding forth our position of not seeking reparations against Italy, we did not intend in any way or under any guise to use Italian assets in this country to meet our own claims. By making these arguments we were able, therefore, to reduce the amount of reparation claims against Italy as it now stands in the treaty of peace, to $360,000,000. We started with $22,000,000,000 and we have succeeded in ending up with $360,000,000; but we did this only by assuring the other governments that we were not going to obtain reparations from Italy and that we would return the greater part of the Italian assets in this country to Italy.

Were this House now to take a policy different from that which proved so successful to the Paris Peace Conference negotiators, the consequences will be disastrous. I believe it would be a grave mistake for us to jeopardize this settlement by acting inconsistently with the strongly and publicly stated policies of our Government.

Further than that our failure to pass this legislation will have a lamentable psychological and political effect on the Italian people. It is vital that Italy remain on the right side of the iron curtain.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.].

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I am confining myself largely to the question of the ships involved. A letter from the Under Secretary refers to two categories. There are really, as I see it, three categories of ships. The first relates to eight ships which have been seized by this country and which we undertook to return to the Government of Italy. Second, 5 ships which have been purchased by this Government from Brazil and Venezuela and which we undertook to return to Italy; and, third, 18 vessels seized prior to December 7, 1941, subsequently requisitioned by the United States for use in the war effort and thereafter lost.

What we are doing in the second category, as I have it, is this; we are taking five ships that were taken by Brazil and Venezuela which were of Italian registry. We bought those five ships from Brazil and Venezuela. We paid cash for them. We now propose to give those same five ships back to Italy.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION. Will the gentleman tell us what we paid for those ships?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I am not sure that I have the entire amount here that we paid for them.

The valuation of the 18 ships in the third category is also, I am sorry to say, not available; but the official cost of building a Liberty ship was about $1,728,000. We undertook to replace the Italian ships which have been lost with Liberty ships at a million and three-quarters.

But I want to speak in particular about those five ships we bought from Brazil and Venezuela. We bought those ships. We gave Brazil and Venezuela cash. Now we plan to give the ships back to Italy; and I think the House should know that Brazil and Venezuela have also given the cash back to Italy. So the Italian Government will be in receipt of both the ships and the cash, and the American Government will be in receipt of nothing whatsoever. That seems to me to be somewhat too generous to Italy in view of the fact that while we are returning the larger part of Italian assets in the United States to Italy we are not clearly protecting our American citizens from any claims which they may have to the Italian assets because while we are reserving $5,000,000 to take care of American citizens there is no evidence before us as to how much the claims of American citizens will be or whether that will be adequate.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. As I understand, the plan is to give the Italian Government Liberty ships now controlled by the Maritime Commission.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. That is my understanding.

Mr. BONNER. Can the gentleman show us under what authority this can be done? Under what system or arrangement can we take ships from the Maritime Commission and give them to the Italian Government when we already have legislation authorizing the Maritime Commission to sell these ships?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. You cannot do it unless this joint resolution is adopted.

Mr. BONNER. Does it amend the Ships Sales Act as passed by this House?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. It has the effect of that. It amends the Trading with the Enemy Act of 1917. It does not precisely state that it amends the Ships Sales Act, but that certainly would be the effect of it, in my opinion. The concern I have is whether or not we are being too anxious to take care of the Italian Government before we take care of the claims of American citizens of Italian or other origin who have claims.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, according to the testimony given before the Deficiency Committee just a few days ago by the Maritime Commission, we were told they will have approximately 7,200 ships to be disposed of, some of which are Liberty ships and LST's. They also indicated it is going to cost more money to take care of the repairs, reconditioning, guarding, and so forth of these ships than we will get for them through ultimate sale. I have the information, questioning the officials of the Maritime Commission, that an LST boat cost more than a Liberty ship. I was told that a Liberty ship cost approximately $1,500,000 and that the junk value would be approximately $75,000, that an LST cost originally $1,700,000 and the junk value, they estimate, may be $75,000, perhaps less.

I would like to ask the chairman of the committee where they get the information that the junk value of these Liberty ships is $10,000, what condition these ships are in, and so forth?

Of course, the price depends upon the condition of the ship.

Mr. HINSHAW. The information obtained by the committee is from a letter written by the Under Secretary of State, Robert H. Lovett, dated July 19, 1947, in which he says:

> With respect to the Liberty ships the official figures which have been released concerning the estimated cost of building a Liberty ship are: Estimated prewar cost, $1,278,000; estimated wartime cost, $1,728,590.

Mr. STEFAN. There is not very much difference between the original cost figures I gave and the figures the gentleman gives me. The testimony in our committee, however, does not jibe with the figures and information we are now getting.

Mr. HINSHAW. I will quote that if the gentleman will give me the opportunity:

> We are also advised that the scrap value of Liberty ships is as low as $10,000 each, while the maximum scrap of any Liberty ship does not exceed $50,000.

That is where the information of the committee came from.

Mr. STEFAN. There is apparent difference of information between the Department of State and the Maritime Commission. The departments should get together on facts so Congress can get some reliable information.

Mr. HINSHAW. I do not know that.

Mr. STEFAN. Now, I want to ask another question. A young man who told me that he is an American citizen claims he has a large claim which may be affected by this bill. He mentioned a large amount and stated he would be very happy to take one or two of those Liberty ships for this claim. Can the gentleman give me some explanation of that? I do not know the details, but I want to help American citizens. I have no sympathy for our former enemies. The death of our soldiers in Italy is too fresh in my mind. I cannot forget that Italy fought against us. So I want to know now, before this bill is passed, whether or not American citizens are being protected.

Mr. HINSHAW. American citizens certainly are being protected. They have the right, which they always had, to file their claims against the Italian Government and they are protected pursuant to a memorandum of agreement.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman believe that this particular American citizen will be protected under this bill?

Mr. HINSHAW. I do.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. With reference to whether or not the American citizen is protected, I want to read a paragraph from a letter that the Department of Justice wrote me July 23. It says:

> Information concerning the identity of the persons believed to have been the former owners of the larger items of Italian property now held by the Office of Alien Property has already been sent you. It is estimated by the Office of Alien Property that approximately 45 percent of the property which will be returnable if Senate Joint Resolution 138 is adopted was formerly owned by corporations and approximately 55 percent by individuals and partnerships.

Also I quote the pertinent part of a State Department letter, written July 24:

> There is no information on file in the Department of State * * * of an American national having claims against Italy arising out of personal injury * * * or maltreatment while prisoners of war in cases of members of our armed forces.

Mr. STEFAN. All I want to know is whether or not American citizens are protected. Does the gentleman believe they are?

Mr. BECKWORTH. No claims, says the State Department, have been filed by any American citizens. They have no record of any whatsoever.

Mr. STEFAN. This legislation is being rushed through too quickly. More accurate information should be given to the Congress before this is enacted into law.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Further, in relation to the question of the protection of American citizens, this letter is from the Department of State, dated July 24. It says:

> At the present time there is no information on file in the Department of State or to its knowledge in any Government agency of an American national having claims against Italy arising out of personal injury in the case of civilians or maltreatment while prisoners of war in cases of members of our armed forces.

In answer to a question along this line which I asked one of the witnesses from the State Department he said that he knew of no instances where American citizens have filed claims. He further said that no information has been given out by the State Department to the effect that if American citizens filed claims there would be a way by which they could recover.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I dislike to take the time of the House on a question such as we have here, but I took an oath of office to support the Constitution of the United States, and when I came here to Congress I made up my mind that I was going to try to do the best I knew how to try to operate the Government for the benefit of the American people.

We were dragged into a war that we did not want to get into. We have been in two of them in the last 20 years, and we never should have been in either one of them. But, now, since we have gotten into this last one, we have gotten to the point, as I see it, where we think we should be the guardian angels of every nation in the world, and I do not believe that we ever intended to be that and I do not believe that we can ever be that. We have got a great job to look after our own country. Some people think that after you get into a war and you win the war that you have got to do everything that we are trying to do with the money of the people of America, who are keeping their noses down to the grindstone at almost every turn, to help out with solving the problems of all the world. I do not think that that is our business and I, for one, am not going to assume that responsibility. I think if our State Department can help these countries in certain ways, that we ought to try to do it—work with them—be good friends. But, when it comes to a time that we are going to drag America down, and all the American institutions with it, then I want to tell you that it is time to get up here and fight, and that is just what I am trying to do today. I am fighting to save America from going into bankruptcy.

We got these vessels from Italy. We brought them over here or used them over there. Venezuela and Brazil took the ships belonging to Italy that were in their harbors. After we got started in the war, Uncle Sam, the great benefactor, went down to Venezuela and Brazil and bought the ships and paid cash for them. Then we brought them up here. Now we are giving them back to Italy. We are giving back to Italy all the vessels we took from her, and we paid Venezuela and Brazil for those ships. Venezuela and Brazil gave the money that they got for the ships back to Italy. Now we are offering to pay Italy again for all the ships we sunk during the war, either in cash or by giving them ships of our own to make up the difference. If you do that, if your constituents want you to do that, all right, but wait until you get back home and you will find out whether some of them will not do a lot of kicking about what you are doing down here. If they kick to me that they want me to do that, they will have to send somebody else down here, because I am going to protect the American people, who do not want this thing of trying to destroy the American way of life, the American freedom we have enjoyed, and the American standard of living. It is about time we wake up, or else we will not have anything to wake up to. The first thing you know you will give everything you have away, and you will have nothing to think about but what the radicals of this country will do to you after you tear down the good, sound-thinking American people of this country.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think the gentleman should know that what is actually involved here is property that belongs to Italian nationals which was taken over by the Alien Property Custodian and which we are now returning to them. This is the result of a side agreement entered into between Secretary Byrnes and the representatives of the Italian Government at the time they were negotiating the treaty between Italy and the United States and our Allies. Italy received such an unjust treaty that the least we can do now is to keep our word, our commitment that was made in the name of the people of the United States, and return to the Italians their own property.

Mr. RICH. Yes, we might have to agree to the commitments that are already made, but we have to get some men that are for America, we have to have some men pretty soon that will give consideration to the welfare of the United States. We have had too many people in official position in the last four or five years who want to hand everything over to some other country. We still have a lot of them. The quicker we get rid of them the better, and get some men in there that will look after the interest and the welfare of America before it is too late.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. The gentleman from New York made the statement that Italy is the victim of an unjust treaty. I should like to have the gentleman from Pennsylvania ask the gentleman from New York who is responsible for that unjust treaty with Italy.

Mr. RICH. Why does not the gentleman ask him? I will give him time.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. While I ordinarily go along 100 percent with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, yet I think he will wish to correct his remarks when he undertakes to say that this country was dragged into this war.

Mr. RICH. We were dragged into it, when we had Pearl Harbor and they went over there and tried to destroy it. We got started in it there. But we had a President of the United States that said, "I promise you mothers again and again and again, I will keep you out of war." That same President did everything under the sun to get us into that war, and he did that before we had Pearl Harbor, too. The gentleman knows it.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I may know that, which I deny, but——

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman mean to say that was not the case?

Mr. PLUMLEY. I absolutely do.

Mr. RICH. Then I do not yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. BONNER. It is my understanding in this proposed bill you are going to give the Italian Government 20 ships from the laid-up fleet after we provided in the ship sale bill to sell these ships to

American owners and foreign owners. We had a binding understanding that only that price would be taken for the ships and we assured American operators that no other ships would go on the seas in international trade other than at the price written in the ship sale bill. So if this passes we are breaking faith with these American operators who have come in and bought the ships as well as with the foreign operators because this is competition that they are not expecting. It is unfair competition besides so far as the ships sale bill is concerned which is the law of the land.

Mr. RICH. Then, if we enact this legislation, we are breaking faith with some of our American people. So that we find out we are getting so mixed up as time goes on that you get in a whirl and you do not know where you are going and you do not know what commitments have been made.

My time has expired and that is too bad, because we probably could discuss this for hours and I think it ought to be discussed for hours.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I want to answer the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] who wants to know from me who is responsible for the unjust treaty that the Italian people received. I answer him very simply—the Big Four will have to share that responsibility. But that is neither here nor there. Italy is going through a terrible period of economic hardship. What we are doing here is not giving Italy any of our money at all. We are simply returning to the Italian nationals property that was taken over by the Enemy Alien Property Custodian. We are also giving Italy a few ships, replacing those ships which we took from Italy which have been destroyed or are now obsolete. We are replacing them with our Liberty ships. This bill carries out a commitment that Secretary Byrnes made to the representatives of the Italian Government at the time the treaty with Italy was being negotiated.

We are being asked here today to keep our word with the people of Italy, a word that was given by our then Secretary of State to Italy when he was dealing with the representatives of the Italian Government. The least we can do is to keep this promise to Italy after having broken so many that had been made to her.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I trust that this afternoon the Members of this House will vote to suspend the rules and pass the pending resolution (S. J. Res. 138) to provide for returns of Italian property in the United States. Adoption of this resolution before the close of this session is urged by the Department of State in the interest of strengthening our foreign policy. It merely carries out the commitments made in our behalf by Secretary of State Byrnes. Simple justice requires its immediate passage. As stated in the following telegram addressed to me by Luigi Antonini, president of the Italian-American Labor Council, which I shall read, "It will have a tremendous helpful effect on the cause of democracy in Italy." The Senate has already recognized this and favorably considered Senate Joint Resolution 138. It merely authorizes the transfer or return to Italy by the United States of certain ships which have been in lay-up for a considerable time, and provides means for the return to the Italian Government and its nationals of those Italian properties now held by the Office of Alien Property. This legislation will strengthen the Italian economy and aid not only our national interest but the interest of world peace. It implements American foreign policy. I am sure that this vitally important resolution will receive your sympathetic consideration. I respectfully urge its immediate adoption.

The telegram I referred to reads as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 24, 1947.*

Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY,
House Office Building:

The Italian-American Labor Council urges you to use your influence and your vote in favor of the bill already approved by the Senate and defined as the "draft joint resolution to provide for return of Italian property in the United States and for other purposes." Our organization is confident that the above bill will be passed by the House of Representatives before its adjournment as it will have a tremendous helpful effect on the cause of democracy in Italy.

LUIGI ANTONINI, *President.*

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE].

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, this is a simple question: Are we going to live up to the commitment that we made in the treaty of peace with Italy? Are we going to stick to our word? It is true that we have bought these ships from Brazil and that they were seized from the Italian nationals—that is true. But I say to you gentlemen that when General Marshall, the Secretary of State, comes and says, "This is needed in order that peace and quiet may be restored on the face of the earth," I am going to stand by him, and I feel that every Member of the House, regardless of what my friend from Pennsylvania may say, agrees with me absolutely on that question.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I think this is good legislation and hope it will be enacted.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, in 3 minutes it will be difficult to emphasize, to the extent it should be, the importance of this legislation. I shall try, however, to do so by emphasizing, first, the thought which was just expressed by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE], and the same thought which was likewise expressed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

This whole question resolves itself into whether or not we are willing upon our part, as a nation, to make good the promises that were made by our American representatives in negotiating the Italian peace treaty. I think everyone is aware of the difficult situation that confronts our representatives in bringing that treaty to a conclusion. We were faced with situations that required them, as evidence of good faith upon our part, to promise to do the things that are provided for in this bill.

I am not going to peer into every nook and corner to see whether this or that or the other should have been done. I have confidence in the patriotism and Americanism of those who represented us in those crucial days. I believe they did everything humanly possible to bring into being a treaty that would be fair to all concerned. As far as I am concerned, I am going to vote for the passage of this bill, and, thereby uphold their hands and make good the promises they made in the name of our country.

I get tired of hearing individuals rise on this floor and remind Members that they have taken an oath of office. We are all aware of it. I am certain each of us is just as sincerely trying to carry out his and her oath and their obligation to our country as some of those who so frequently impress upon the House that they are trying to do so and leaving an inference that those who vote differently are not doing so. I am also of the opinion that if some of those who have criticized this bill as lacking in due regard for the rights of our nationals had spent as much time in studying it as they have in talking about it, I am certain they would have come to a different conclusion than they have with respect to it.

Do not think for a moment that our nationals have been overlooked. This bill takes care of our nationals. A sufficient amount of Italian property is retained or subject to lien to adequately protect and satisfy all possible claims.

In the second place most of these ships are no good to us nor of any use to us other than as scrap. Go down to the James River, go up to the Hudson, go to the other places where these ships have been pulled up and taken out of service, and you will see what I am saying is absolutely the truth. It is not taking money out of the pockets of our nationals. It is not taking money out of the pockets of Uncle Sam. But it is fulfilling an obligation that our American representatives made when the Italian treaty was negotiated. The promises our representatives made at that time helped greatly in achieving a treaty that gave some measure of help and security to the Italian Government in stabilizing its economic structure.

Senator VANDENBERG made a statement to the Senate when this bill was under consideration in that body. He explained the difficulties under which he and his colleagues labored in an effort to effect a peace treaty. It was absolutely necessary that a treaty be concluded at that time. It was a crucial situation they faced. The promise, which this bill embodies, undoubtedly was a determining factor in fixing the terms of peace set forth in the treaty. When Senator VANDENBERG had finished his statement, the Senate immediately passed the bill unanimously. I hope the House will do likewise.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] has expired.

All time has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, is it possible to gain 1 minute by unanimous consent to read a part of the regulations?

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot entertain such a request. Under the rules, 20 minutes is allowed on each side.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the pending resolution a draft memorandum of understanding between Italy and the United States is in process of preparation for signature. Appended to that draft is annex I from which I quote as follows:

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF ITALY REGARDING ITALIAN ASSETS IN THE UNITED STATES AND CERTAIN CLAIMS OF UNITED STATES NATIONALS

ANNEX I

The United States intends to effect returns, pursuant to article I, paragraph 1 (a) of this memorandum of understanding, by appropriate legislation permitting returns of vested property to Italy and subjects or citizens of Italy and corporations or associations organized under the laws of Italy upon the terms and conditions generally applicable to return of such property to others eligible for return pursuant to section 32 of the Trading with the Enemy Act, as amended.

It is understood that while the United States will seek to eliminate Italian nationality as a disqualification from eligibility for return pursuant to section 32 (a) of the Trading with the Enemy Act.

(a) The United States does not intend to assume any obligation to make returns to any of the following:

(1) the Italian Fascist Party, any organization closely affiliated therewith (other than the Italian Government) or any person who was a member of such party or organization at any time after September 8, 1943; or

(2) Any person, firm or organization convicted of violation of any of the statutes set forth in section 34 (a) of the Trading with the Enemy Act, as amended; or

(3) Any person, firm or organization convicted of war crimes or having collaborated with any enemy country after September 8, 1943; or

(4) Any person, firm or organization indicted or officially charged with war crimes or with having collaborated with an enemy country after September 8, 1943, until such person, firm or organization has been officially acquitted or cleared of such indictment or charge; or

(5) A corporation or association organized under the laws of any country other than Italy or Trieste; or

(6) Any individual who was at any time after December 7, 1941, a citizen or subject of a nation other than Italy with which the United States has at any time since December 7, 1941, been at war; or

(7) Any individual voluntarily resident at any time since December 7, 1941, within the territory of any nation other than Italy with which the United States has at any time since December 7, 1941, been at war;

(b) Ultimate disposition of property falling under the terms of section (a), paragraphs (1)-(7) above is reserved for future decision by the Government of the United States, after consultation between the governments of Italy and the United States;

(c) The United States does not intend to make returns in any case in which it deems that return would be contrary to its interests in respect of national security or antitrust or fiscal policy; and

(d) The United States does not intend to assume any obligation to make returns of any property which was used pursuant to an arrangement to cloak or to conceal any property or interest within the United States of any person ineligible to receive a return under section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading with the Enemy Act.

It is further understood that in the case of any literary, artistic or industrial property to be returned, the property shall remain subject to all licenses and agreements for licenses which were granted or entered into by the United States with respect to it and which were in effect immediately prior to return; and any rights of the United States to revoke any such license or agreement for licenses shall not be included within the return.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to call special attention to paragraph (a) (1) above and to the fact that on September 8, 1943, the Fascist Party of Italy was disbanded by decree. Hence there is little meaning to that language.

I believe it to be the intention of our committee, of which I have the honor of being the ranking majority member, that neither Nazis nor Fascists should obtain return of any of their property that had been vested in the United States by any agency of our Government. We are perfectly willing to have the vested property of non-Fascists returned to them, pursuant to this resolution.

It is therefore urged that this language I have referred to in annex I (a) (1) be revised to eliminate all possibility of return of vested assets to any Italian who participated in the affairs of the Fascist Party prior to September 8, 1943, as well as subsequently. It was the Fascist Party in control of the Italian Government that with the Nazis engulfed the world, including ourselves, in war and destruction. We are no more concerned with ex-Fascists of Italy than with the happily departed Duce himself.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this legislation to implement the agreement of our Secretary of State with Italy. The treaty of peace with Italy was a hard treaty. This will soften the burden and help the Italian people who were our cobelligerents in the past war to get back on their feet. We are doing this by recognizing the rights we accorded them when we accepted the Italians as cobelligerents in the war against the Nazis.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I intend to support this resolution when it comes to a vote. I believe it falls within our foreign policy to aid in the reconstruction of postwar nonmonarchist Italy. It is in line with our insistence that those we help shall do all that is possible to help themselves. We will be furnishing the Italian people with precious means for self-help if we pass this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New Jersey to suspend the rules and pass the resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 139.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended, and the resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RENT CONTROL ACT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1590) to amend the District of Columbia rent-control law so as to provide that schools and universities may recover possession of housing accommodations in certain cases.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) of section 5 of the act entitled "An act to regulate rents in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 2, 1941, as amended, is amended by (1) striking out the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the word "or," and (2) adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(6) The landlord, being a recognized school or an accredited nonprofit university, has a bona fide need for the premises for educational, research, administrative, or dormitory use."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks with respect to agricultural research in Alaska.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO CONSIDER CONFERENCE REPORTS WITHOUT PRINTING IN RECORD

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the balance of the week to consider conference reports as they are submitted, notwithstanding the fact that they have not been printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the persistently gloomy world picture has so engrossed itself upon the American people

and the Congress that we sometimes overlook important steps of progress on the road to peace. Yet we are told that every cloud must have its silver lining, and recently I have observed two events which have given me great encouragement. One of these events received considerable publicity but the the other, of equal importance in my opinion, has received little or no attention in the press.

The first item was the phenomenal reception to the first public offering of the securities of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development last week. The World Bank is designed as a long-term lending agency for rebuilding factories, harbors, railroads, and the like destroyed during the war. On the basis of resources and guaranties of all member countries, its founders hoped from the beginning to tap various sources of investment and to give reconstruction and development credits to governments and government-sponsored borrowers. But not until last week was it known how great or how small might be the confidence of private investors in this new adjunct of the United Nations. According to the New York Times of July 17, 1947, the bank recently announced that it was preparing two issues of its securities aggregating $250,000,000. These issues were cleared by the Security and Exchange Commission at 3:30 Monday afternoon, July 14. Subscription books were opened at the beginning of business on Tuesday, July 15, and by noon officials of the bank announced that the offering had been heavily oversubscribed. This display of confidence in the world bank must have been gratifying to former Assistant Secretary of War, John J. McCloy, now president of the bank, and to his staff. I am sure that all Americans who are interested in the maintenance of a sound and healthy economy of private capitalism view with satisfaction the coordination of effort in financing the capital needs of devastated sections of the world. As the New York Times editorial observed:

> No such emphatic demonstration as this could have taken place in the absence of public confidence in the bank and what it essentially symbolizes—the determination and ability of the world ultimately to work its way back to vigorous economic and political health.

Of perhaps equal importance, Mr. Speaker, was the decision last week of the Republican membership of the Committee on Ways and Means not to issue a contemplated critical report of the reciprocal trade program of the United States, and the efforts of the United States and 17 other countries at Geneva to lay the foundation for an International Trade Organization. The reciprocal trade policies, formulated by the Congress under the sound guidance of that eminent statesman, Hon. Cordell Hull, of Tennessee, is the best antidote to the poisonous economic warfare that already looms on the continent of Europe. The International Trade Organization is an effort on a broad scale to deal with the problem of reducing public and private barriers to trade and of eliminating trade discriminations.

Some questions have been raised about the relationship, if any, between the ITO and the Marshall plan for economic rehabilitation of Europe. In a press conference on July 2, 1947, Under Secretary of State, William L. Clayton, made a very simple explanation of the interdependence of these two proposals. Mr. Clayton said:

> The object of General Marshall's suggestions is the prompt rehabilitation of the European economy, through Europe's joint efforts, assisted by the United States.
>
> The object of ITO is to bring about agreement among nations covering their international economic relationships, in order to assist them to maintain a stable economy once it has been rehabilitated.
>
> The Marshall plan makes the ITO negotiations more important than ever because without a sound permanent program of reciprocal multilateral trade, no temporary emergency program could possibly have any permanent worth-while result.

As I view the problem, the Marshall plan involves the cooperation of the United States with the 16 countries now meeting at Paris in determining the capital needs for the reconstruction of the European economy and the available resources for such capital. These capital requirements may be provided jointly by the World Bank, appropriations by the United States Congress, and sources within the stricken countries. The Marshall plan will provide the machinery and the engines to get the factories, mines, and railroads of industrial Europe humming once again. But to revive the productive capacity of these European nations will be of little avail if, in self-defense, each nation feels compelled to maintain quotas and exchange restrictions which preclude the flow of world commerce.

In many respects our planning for the long-range development of world trade and the abolition of artificial barriers to commerce has received greater immediate attention than the pressing problem of starting the wheels of industry.

In his Harvard speech, Secretary Marshall emphasized how grave is the danger of a complete break-down in the modern system of the division of labor upon which the exchange of products is based. He pointed out that in vast areas in Europe town and city industries are not producing adequate goods to exchange with the food-producing farmer. Since the farmer cannot find the goods for sale which he desires to purchase, he feeds more grain to stock and provides his family with a more ample supply of food, although he may have insufficient clothing and other necessities of civilization.

The Paris Conference is the answer to General Marshall's suggestion that the European countries draft a program designed to place Europe on its feet economically. There has been some suggestion that the venture is too costly for the United States to undertake. It has been said that our resources are inadequate for the task, but just as we could neither avert nor win World War II by thinking about its cost, neither can we avoid the responsibility nor the adverse efforts to our own country and our own way of living by placing a dollar and cents limitation upon the economic recovery of western European civilization.

So the Marshall plan and the ITO are integral parts of the over-all plan for the restoration of world economic stability. The capital advanced by the United States or by the World Bank cannot be repaid unless an agency like the ITO establishes rules for international trade. We sometimes lose sight of the importance to freedom of enterprise in this country in having a pattern of international trade in which the major decisions are reached by private buyers and sellers in active competition, rather than by governments. Those who fear the power which may be vested in the proposed International Trade Organization should not fail to consider the alternative of quotas, exchange restrictions, and domination of trade through international monopolies and cartels.

One of the outstanding achievements of the current session of the Congress has been the bipartisan support of our foreign economic policy, as well as of our foreign policy in general.

Prior to the departure of Under Secretary of State Clayton for Geneva for the reciprocal trade and ITO negotiations, the President issued an Executive order establishing certain definite trade-agreements procedures. One of these provisions requires the inclusion of an escape clause in all trade agreements hereafter negotiated. The President's order was the result of conversations between Under Secretaries of State Acheson and Clayton and Members of another body. In his statement announcing the issuance of his Executive order, the President said that these Members agreed that we should go forward with the Geneva negotiations. Nevertheless, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means called extensive hearings to investigate the operation of the reciprocal trade program, including the proposed International Trade Organization. When the hearings ended after several weeks it was considered not unlikely that the majority would prepare a public report which might prove embarrassing to the leadership of the United States at Geneva. The decision of the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means not to issue such a report, as I said at the beginning, has received little consideration by the press. I have taken this opportunity, therefore, to express my congratulations for this demonstration on the part of the House of the same fine bipartisan support of our foreign economic policy that had already been demonstrated on the part of the leadership of the Senate.

The reciprocal trade program has the overwhelming support of the American people. Public-opinion polls show that from 75 to 80 percent of the public favor the extension of this important pillar of our foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks at this point an article from Modern Industry of April 15, 1947, and another item from Modern Industry of June 15, 1947, which magazine conducted the most recent public poll on this question.

[From Modern Industry of April 15, 1947]

SHOULD THE RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM BE CONTINUED?

"YES," SAYS C. A. RICHARDS, DIRECTOR, EXPORT DIVISION, INTERCHEMICAL CORP., NEW YORK

(In the export business for over 50 years, Richards is president of the Philippine-American Chamber of Commerce, and served as

consultant to United States Government during the war.)

Because—

1. Our exports to countries with whom we have reciprocal agreements rose 63 percent as against 32 percent to others. Imports from countries with agreements rose 22 percent, compared with 12½ percent from others.

2. So far no American industry has suffered under the agreements—escape clauses are rarely invoked.

3. We can compete successfully with foreign products, despite our higher labor costs, because of our greater manufacturing know-how.

4. The real deterrent to foreign trade is quota systems, not tariffs.

I am not a free trader, but am for freedom of trade. I believe that the reciprocal trade program should be continued because of what it has already done to help our export trade, which is my first interest.

The necessity for the program initiated by Secretary of State Hull in 1933 was largely caused by the passage in 1930 of the Hawley-Smoot tariff. It raised many rates of duty to a point where our importation of certain commodities became very difficult, if not impossible.

In retaliation, many countries immediately raised tariff, exchange, and other barriers against imports from this country.

The first reciprocal trade agreement law empowered the President to reduce these 1930 tariff rates by a maximum of 50 percent. The Doughton bill, passed in 1945, gave the President the power to reduce the rates in effect on January 1, 1945, by 50 percent. Since passage of the Doughton bill, no tariffs have been reduced, although there are some reductions contemplated at the meetings of the 18 nations to be held in Geneva this month.

No United States industry of any size has been seriously interfered with by reductions made in the 1930 rates to date. We should view this whole program, not from the viewpoint of what harm it could do, but what harm it has done and what benefits have accrued from it. I have asked men in a position to know, who have been opposed to its continuance, what important industries have been harmed, and have been unable to find any.

Furthermore, since the first agreement was made there have been some complaints made to the Government regarding concessions, and these have been divided into two groups: one, unimportant complaints frequently arising from misunderstandings of the agreements; and the second, those that might be termed formal complaints.

As a result, supplementary agreements have been concluded with Canada and Switzerland. The concession granted on handkerchiefs in the trade agreement with Switzerland was ended, and an informal agreement was reached to restrict the importation of watches and parts. In January of this year the State Department announced a proposed termination of the concession on linen fire hose, granted in the trade agreement with Canada.

Program is flexible

These facts have been provided by the Committee for Reciprocity Information. They fairly conclusively show that, to date, operation of the reciprocal trade program has proved that, where necessary to the protection of our own industry, conditions can be altered.

Furthermore, in the trade agreement signed with Mexico on December 23, 1942, there is an escape clause. In the recent Executive order of the President, it is officially stated that a clause to the same effect will be incorporated in all future trade agreements. Since the signing of the agreement with Mexico over 4 years ago, no complaints have been filed with the committee under this clause.

Few changes to date

Space is lacking to recite the many changes which the Government might have made in our tariff structure but did not. Yet one or two might be cited to emphasize the care with which the program has been handled to date:

Take the case of yarn spun of rayon. In the Tariff Act of 1930, paragraph 1303, this duty is stipulated at 12½ cents a pound, plus an ad valorem duty of 45 percent and 50 percent, depending on whether singles or plied. Despite the power given the President over all these years, this rate has not been changed. If the Doughton bill's provisions are used, the most it can be reduced is to 6¼ cents a pound, plus 22½ percent and 25 percent, respectively.

Don't overlook the fact that the power, under the Doughton bill, to reduce tariffs by 50 percent is not from the original 1930 rate, but from the January 1, 1945, rate.

Therefore, if the tariff has not been reduced on any article, the most the President can do is to reduce it 50 percent from the 1930 rate. If it has already been reduced the full 50 percent permitted by the original bill, that rate may be reduced another 50 percent, which will make the total reduction 75 percent.

Another instance: Paragraph 1108 in the 1930 tariff covers woven woolens weighing not more than 4 ounces a square yard. Under the 1930 tariff the rate was 50 cents a pound, plus 50 percent ad valorem, 55 percent ad valorem, and 60 percent ad valorem, depending upon the value of the fabric. The President has not changed the specific duty, but he has reduced the ad valorem to a flat 37½ percent.

Nub—it fosters trade

On the other hand, the fact should be emphasized, as was set forth in Mr. Clayton's letter of January 16 to Senator HUGH BUTLER, that between 1934–35 and 1938–39 our exports to countries with which we had trade agreements increased 63 percent, as against 32 percent with countries with whom we did not have trade agreements. In the same period our imports from those with whom we had trade agreements increased 22 percent, against 12½ percent from the others.

No fact brings out more emphatically the advantages which have accrued to us from this reciprocal trade program.

Another often-quoted argument against the program is the contention that if we lower tariffs, we necessarily must lower our own standards of living. I cannot find any proof of this alleged effect. Standards of living in this country are the highest in the world. And yet, for over 50 years I have been in the export business and seen exports grow. Why?

Because we lead the world in producing certain articles better and cheaper than they could be produced by the countries from which we import them.

United States is more efficient

For example, the production per man of coal in England is less than 2 tons a day. In this country it is about 50 tons a day. Surely, with this increased production we can afford to pay our miners higher wages than the miners in England receive.

In 1938, the last prewar year, we imported about $23,000,000 worth of cotton manufactures and semimanufactures, on which a duty averaging 44.9 percent, equivalent to $12,586,000, was imposed.

In 1944 the British Government sent a mission here headed by Sir Frank Platt, British cotton controller. This mission investigated our entire textile industry. On its return a report was made from which I should like to quote one sentence:

"British P. M. H. [production per man per hour] (calculated on the basis of total output and total labor force) is less than the American by about 18 to 49 percent in spinning, by 80 to 85 percent in winding, by 70 to 89 percent in beaming, and by 56 to 67 percent in weaving."

Revise, but keep the law

It is my hope that when the program comes up again in 1948 that the Congress will extend the existing law, making any administrative changes which may seem desirable beyond those covered by the President's recent Executive order, so long as they do not make the program unworkable.

I have never found any opponent who had facts to justify opposition to the continuance of the program. But they had fear—fear that the power given the executive branch of the Government might harm some United States industry. This fear has no justification based on the facts known to date.

Tariff isn't the only bar

One other very important point is too frequently overlooked in considering this program: That a serious deterrent to international trade today lies, not only in the amount of the tariff collected by any country, including ourselves, on the importation of the product, but in some of the semivisible handicaps to freedom of international trade which have been cropping up during the war and since VJ-day.

For example, there is the recent Argentine announcement of three exchange rates—which is in effect an increase in tariff on certain items of 13 percent and on other items of 32 percent. There is also the quota system used by some countries, which is far more injurious to international trade than the tariff. Quotas set the maximum of a commodity that may be imported from a country, whereas the commodity may be free or dutiable. Under a tariff, even though high, persons may import if they wish to pay the price. But under the quota system imports are definitely limited.

The quota system is not new but it is growing; and it is one of the evils which our representatives at Geneva intend to bring into the open and endeavor to eliminate to the maximum extent.

Repeatedly it has been said that even in this country our tariff is not as big a deterrent to imports as the Treasury Department decisions, made under the tariff. Active steps are now being taken to put our own house in order.

NO, SAYS HAROLD J. WALTER, PRESIDENT, UXBRIDGE WORSTED CO., INC., UXBRIDGE, MASS.

Because—

1. Lower tariffs would harm many United States industries and kill, among others, the textile industry which can't compete against foreign labor.

2. Our national defense would be jeopardized if we face another crisis with a weakened textile industry to supply our armed forces.

3. Mass unemployment here would wreak havoc on the world economy, whereas several million unemployed in such low-pay countries as France, England, Germany, India, China, etc., would have little effect on the world.

4. America can help the world only if her industries remain prosperous.

Lowering tariffs, we are told, promises a panacea for all of the world's ills; for bringing prosperity to impoverished countries, for creating good will and understanding between this country and others; for leading the way toward continuing world peace; for increasing the already astronomical United States income of $175,000,000,000 yearly.

Can tariff be all these things—do all these things? Are not several of these arguments irreconcilable?

Before a decision, we must decide first what a tariff is, not only by definition but also in terms of what it means to workers, to the manufacturer of textiles, the manufacturer of automobiles or typewriters or razor blades, to the politician, and to the Department of State.

A tariff is a tax placed on foreign goods at entry into this country. This tax is designed for two purposes: (1) To provide revenue for the Government; and (2) to protect American manufacturers from a flood of foreign goods which, cheaply produced in countries with lower living standards than ours, can undersell our products in domestic markets.

What does the average worker know about tariffs? Not much.

If he thinks at all about tariffs, he thinks of them in terms of his favorite radio commentator or the particular slant which his newspaper gives him. For the most part, however, the worker has little or no idea what a tariff is, what it is designed to do, or what the present arguments for further reductions under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act are about. He knows little or nothing of how tariffs affect his job, his industry.

Using the same definition, how does the American textile manufacturer feel about the tariff?

He feels that the tariff has been a bulwark against foreign rivals which could have in the past, and will in the future if further reductions are made, put him out of business.

His reasons are simple and easily understood:

Labor is the dominant cost factor in textile manufacturing. There are still few, if any, true mechanical operations or manpower short cuts. Expanding operations or larger volume does not decrease unit labor cost as in many industries.

Labor costs in textiles now rank with some of the highest. The figures show a rise of 112 percent in 6 years. Yet even before these advances, textile labor costs were several times greater in the United States than in England, many times greater than those in Japan. Now, the disparity is even wider.

The average rate for textile work in the United States is now $1.20 an hour. In England, it is 35 cents an hour. On the Continent and in India and Japan, it is considerably less than the English figure. Even allowing for the greater efficiencies of American labor and machinery, it is impossible to overcome this wide separation.

Leaders of the textile industry believe the present tariff must be maintained if there is to be a textile industry in the United States.

Do the manufacturers of automobiles, or typewriters, or razor blades see the same things when they look at the tariff? No.

These industries, and others, have become highly mechanical. Labor costs per unit have come down and down through the use of automatic machinery. They do not have to worry about cheap foreign labor because labor to them represents such a low cost on a unit basis.

In addition, United States technical advances have far outstripped those in most foreign countries. As a result, labor costs are about the same, despite the higher wages in this country, because more actual labor must be used abroad to produce the same article.

Whose ox is gored?

Tariffs are not needed to protect these industries. And since they have no fear that other countries will undersell them in the United States, they are in favor of reducing or removing tariffs on all goods, for instance, on textiles. A flood of textiles would build foreign exchange in this country for the purchase of machine goods. Textile production in England and France is rapidly recovering from the war and offers an immediate opportunity for exports.

Naturally United States machine industries oppose tariffs as hindrances to their expanding export business.

The politician, in far too many instances, views the tariff issue in terms of sectional advantage. Frequently it becomes a bargaining issue: "I'll vote for your tariff if you vote for my pork barrel."

The Department of State follows closely the line of the highly mechanized industries. Tariffs become barriers to expanding world trade. Reduction of tariffs, they say, enhances our position as the leading nation of the world.

Fact outweighs prejudice

Tariffs, the State Department and others would have us believe, only protect production inefficiencies. This is not a valid argument in the textile industry for a very simple reason, a reason which has been overlooked completely by proponents of tariff reduction because of ignorance, prejudice, or both.

Textiles, except where man-made fibers, such as rayon, nylon, are concerned, involve the processing of wool and cotton. No one has been able to raise sheep so that the hair on each is the same weight, length, and strength as that on the sheep next to it. Cotton, too, varies greatly from field to field, from season to season, and boll to boll.

Textiles deal with a product which is as variable as New England weather. It cannot be controlled as it is possible to manipulate the texture, hardness, or particular quality wanted in steel.

Textile plants are efficient

The charge of inefficiency cannot stand when knowledge is brought into the picture.

Here then, are the questions:

Is the textile manufacturer wrong to fight for his survival?

Is the automobile manufacturer right to fight to enlarge his industry, his export trade, at the expense of textiles?

Is the politician right in expressing himself in terms of prosperity for his own constituency, the rest of the country be damned?

Is the Department of State right in concerning itself with the unemployed of the world when the death of the textile and other industries is at stake with the consequent unemployment or displacement of millions of our own workers?

What are the answers?

Loss: $24,000,000,000

Ten million unemployed workers at $1.20 an hour in the United States means a reduction in the national income of $24,000,000,000. This does not take into consideration the additional losses because of decreased buying power, or lost taxes. These same 10,000,000 unemployed in England at 35 cents an hour reduce that country's income by only $7,000,000,000. In Japan, India, or China, the loss in income would be a mere two to three billion dollars or less.

Would it not mean more to the United States, and to the world, to keep those 10,000,000 people working right here than it would be to have 10,000,000 persons employed somewhere else in the world?

Two million unemployed in England, four million in France, Germany, and Poland, and four more million in India, China, and Japan, would have little effect on world economy.

But in the United States, 10,000,000 unemployed could spell depression and economic chaos in the world. Certainly these countries might have more foreign exchange to purchase goods here, but there is no assurance it would be all spent here; and even if it were, it would be but a drop in the bucket as compared to the $24,000,000,000 lost.

Would you care to decree the death of the seventh largest employer of labor in the United States, the textile industry, holding out only the wild-eyed promise that ultimately those thousands of persons now employed in that industry—who would be unemployed by its demise—would be absorbed into the remaining plants?

Would crush small towns

It is a great industry made up of small units. Many of these are responsible for the welfare of the villages in which they are situated. All together, they form a vital part of our national economy.

The textile industry depends on the tariff for its very life, and will continue to do so until technical advances reduce unit labor costs to compete with cheap foreign labor.

I use the textile industry as an example, because it is the one with which I am familiar. But many more industries ride in our boat. They need tariff protection, too.

Under present conditions, with tariffs at their present levels, England can ship cloth into our domestic markets and undersell American manufacturers. What good can accrue from a further lowering of the tariff?

Shield in time of war

Imagine the United States facing another crisis as it did in 1941 with a weak or negligible textile industry dependent on foreign sources for the uses of textiles in wartime.

The retention of strong armed forces is urged and draws little disagreement from informed sources. Yet many would nullify the effectiveness of those forces by weakening one of the principal sources of its supply.

America can help the world only if America can remain prosperous. Weakening certain industries to expand others is certainly not the way to keep America prosperous.

[From Modern Industry of July 15, 1947]

LANDSLIDE VOTE FOR RECIPROCAL TRADE

By a thumping majority of 81 to 19 percent, readers of Modern Industry from coast to coast voted "Yes" to the April 15 Debate in Print: Should the reciprocal trade-agreements program be continued?

C. A. Richards, director, export division, Interchemical Corp., New York, upheld the affirmative in that debate. He argued that no United States industry has suffered under the agreements; and that we can compete with foreign products, despite our higher labor costs, because of our greater manufacturing know-how.

Harold J. Walter, president, Uxbridge Worsted Co., Inc., Uxbridge, Mass., for the negative, maintained that lower tariffs would cripple many United States industries and kill the textile industry. We can help the world only if our industries remain sound.

Typical comments from voters agreeing with the "yes" side:

"By exporting, our manufacturers can maintain high production. But we cannot export unless we import in proportion." * * * "Extension of world trade is best assurance of peace."

"No" side: "Reciprocity in these agreements benefits other countries only." * * * "We have too high a standard of living to trade with other countries under a low tariff."

The area-by-area vote:

	"Yes" percent
New England	69.6
Mid-Atlantic	84.5
North Central	85.5
South	75.0
Midwest	75.4
Mountain and Pacific coast	78.8

	"No" percent
New England	30.4
Mid-Atlantic	15.5
North Central	14.5
South	25.0
Midwest	24.6
Mountain and Pacific coast	21.2

Congressmen and key Washington officials have already received these results.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the tremendous importance of the reciprocal trade

program to the establishment of an international trade organization and the ultimate success of the Marshall plan for the rehabilitation of Europe, not to mention the overwhelming support manifested by the American public, I trust that the Committee on Ways and Means will early in the next session report out a bill providing for the extension of the reciprocal trade authority of the President without restrictive amendments.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LESINSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article written by Mr. Lyons in the Polish Review of July 10, 1947.

AMENDMENT OF PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1946, AS AMENDED

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1020) to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended, insist on the amendment of the House and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. VORYS, JUDD, FULTON, MANSFIELD, and ROGERS of Florida.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the gentleman from Minnesota a question.

The SPEAKER. The time for the reservation of objections is past. The Chair had put the request, and it was agreed to.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. May I ask the gentleman from Minnesota a question with reference to the bill?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may do so by unanimous consent.

Mr. RICH. Then I ask unanimous consent to do so.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to go along in the regular way. I object to the consent request coming at this time.

STAMP COMMEMORATIVE OF THE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE POULTRY INDUSTRY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 246, to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the poultry industry in the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to prepare for issuance, during 1948, a special series of 3-cent postage stamps, of such design as he shall prescribe, in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the poultry industry in the United States.

Mr. SADLAK. As an outstanding branch of agriculture and figuring prominently in our everyday life the poultry industry proudly points to 100 years of service.

The oldest poultry show in the world got its start in Boston, Mass., and January 20 to 24, 1948, inclusive, is set aside for the Boston Poultry Show, marking a century of poultry progress. This exposition will cover every branch of the industry including breeding, processing, marketing of poultry, and great exhibits of live birds from every State in the Union. The entire Mechanics Building, covering a solid city block, has been engaged for the event. I understand that national organizations connected with the poultry industry have already scheduled their official annual meetings to coincide with this occasion.

And so we are approaching the centennial of the first organized effort in behalf of the poultry business which has developed to such a degree that it ranks second only, in money value, to the dairy industry.

A most interesting comment on this resolution appeared in the Baltimore Sun on Thursday morning, July 24, 1947, written by the Associated Press from Washington, as follows:

PROPOSED STAMP WOULD GIVE CHICKENS MUCH TO CACKLE ABOUT

WASHINGTON, JULY 23.—The 1,000,000,000 chickens in the country soon may have something they really can cackle and crow about.

For Representative SADLAK, Republican, of Connecticut, has just introduced into Congress a resolution calling for a special stamp in the chickens' honor.

SADLAK did this at the request of Paul Ives, editor of Cackle and Crow magazine, published at New Haven, Conn. Ives naturally is quite excited because exactly 100 years ago this Nation had its first poultry show.

Want to talk about progress? Want to talk about tremendous achievements? Well, then, talk about chickens.

LAND OF OPPORTUNITY

"Like many other immigrants," says the Department of Agriculture in a tribute to its feathered friends, "the modern chicken has found the United States a land of opportunity."

And indeed it has. Few chickens ever think much about it now, but their ancestors came from the jungles—from New Guinea, Java, and Malaya.

They were taken to Europe, and from there to the American colonies.

SOME FEATHERY FACTS

And now for some feathery facts:

Farmers get $3,000,000,000 from their chicken crop each year.

Like a mattress tester, a hen can get ahead by laying down on the job. But she once figured that 86 eggs were a year's work. The average now has been boosted to 113, and in good flocks smart clucks do twice that well.

A gizzard has nothing to do with a chicken's digestion. A rooster had one removed, felt fine, lived four more years.

An eating chicken soon may be built to specifications. A national grocery company decided it wanted an ideal chicken, and offered a reward for same.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution would authorize and direct the Postmaster General to issue, during 1948, a special series of 3-cent postage stamps, of such design as he shall prescribe, in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the poultry industry in the United States.

In the opinion of the committee, wherein there was unanimous approval, this industry, which has made such rapid progress and which constitutes such an important segment of our economic life, merits this recognition.

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words in favor of House Joint Resolution 246, submitted by my colleague, ANTONI N. SADLAK, calling for the issuance of a special stamp by the Post Office Department in commemoration of the one hundredth birthday anniversary of the poultry business in the United States. A hundred years ago the oldest poultry show in the world started in Boston and there the interest in poultry was born which has grown throughout the years and developed this gigantic industry. It produced nearly $3,000,000,000 during 1946 in the United States. Among all farm interests it is exceeded only by the great dairy interest. In Connecticut it heads the list of all industries by a wide margin. As an old poultryman myself, and a life long friend of Paul Ives, editor of Cackle and Crow, one of the leading poultry papers in the United States, who is also chairman of the show committee for the one hundredth Boston poultry show, I wholeheartedly support this legislation.

The joint resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUING SUPPORT FOR WOOL

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Rules Committee I call up House Resolution 315, providing for the consideration of the bill (S. 1498) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1498) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois and yield myself such time as I may use.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of S. 1498, which is a bill to support the price of wool until December 31, 1948.

This is an open rule providing for 1 hour of general debate.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think any extended explanation of this bill is necessary. We have had wool legislation before us previously this year. A similar bill passed the House on May 23. It was vetoed by the President on June 26. On the same day the Senate passed this bill before us today.

The first bill contained a provision which was objectionable to the President. I think the President should have signed the first bill. However, if we are going to continue the price-support program for wool we must pass this bill. I do not like it as well as the first bill, but we have no alternative.

The purpose of this bill is to direct the Commodity Credit Corporation to continue the wool price-support program that expired on April 15, 1947. Since that date the Government has not supported the price of wool. I understand some of the finer grades of wool have been selling at good prices and there has been a ready market for the same. However, the cheaper grades of wool have not been moving and there will be no market for these types of wool until this legislation is passed.

The bill also provides that the Commodity Credit Corporation may sell the wool purchased in previous years and now on hand. It is estimated there are about 460,000,000 pounds of this wool. Up to now this wool could not be sold in competition with foreign wool for the reason that the Commodity Credit Corporation was not permitted to sell below the parity price. Since this price was above the prices quoted on foreign wool there was no opportunity to dispose of the same. This bill removes all restrictions, and this wool can now be sold.

If the bill previously passed by the Congress had become a law this wool could have been sold without any loss to the Government. That bill provided for quotas and import fees on foreign wool in the discretion of the President. In that manner we could have sold this large stock pile of wool and sustained no loss. This bill contains no such provision. I hope we can dispose of this wool with little loss, but we could have avoided any loss whatever if the President had signed the bill passed by this House 2 months ago.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. I take this opportunity to go on record at this point as being utterly opposed to this legislation or legislation of a similar character.

Mr. CHENOWETH. May I say to my good friend from New Jersey that the time is here when we must pay a little more attention to some of our domestic industries in this country. Otherwise, we will become entirely dependent upon foreign nations for our supply of strategic raw materials, whether it be wool or some other commodity. Surely we learned the value of domestic industries during the war when foreign imports of many items were stopped.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I say apropos of the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey that if the wool industry does not get this help he might as well kiss the American wool industry good-by.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. Speaker, I am for this bill. It has passed the Senate and I hope it will be passed by the House without amendment so that it can be sent direct to the White House. I urge the adoption of the rule and the passage of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, after the rule is adopted there will be general debate, but no vote will be taken on the bill this evening. I am not going to deviate from my policy of not opposing a rule on a bill that has been reported after consideration by a legislative committee. I feel, however, this is another bill which will add additional costs and burdens upon the American consumer and the American people.

I fully appreciate the position of the wool growers in the West. In fact, as I have often said before, I am deeply interested in their welfare. So, of course, are the manipulators who make fortunes by manipulating the wool supplies, and who are interested in this bill because it calls for Government support of wool prices—in fact, it has been estimated that this bill will tax the American people from $100,000,000 to $200,000,000 annually for the benefit of those who buy and sell wool, though it will do little enough for the herders and the shearers and the workers.

ANOTHER SUBSIDY

It is another disguised subsidy to the wool growers to guarantee them continued high profits and benefits. It is an unending source of amazement to me to see how these industrialists and their highly paid lobbies can get anything they want from this Republican Congress, always at the expense of the consumers, the workers, and the taxpayers. Since the infamous political coalition of the Seventy-ninth Congress was formed, and now with an overwhelming Republican majority in both Houses of Congress, there is not even any effective opposition or criticism of this lobbyists' steam roller.

The only redeeming feature of this bill, as I view it, is that it will permit the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell any or all of the 460,000,000 pounds of wool owned now by the Government, which may help to clothe the world, and which the British wool combine through various tricks and artifices has been able to tie up, notwithstanding that we produce only about one-third of the wool we use each year.

THE WAR IS OVER NOW

This was done with the knowing connivance of American manufacturers and traders, and again shows how selfish our own industrialists and merchants can be, and how they retard the progress of our country and go against the welfare and interest of the consumers by maintaining outrageously high prices without any justification.

I concede that during the war Congress passed a wool subsidy act to insure the production of a sufficient quantity of wool to meet our domestic and military needs and even provided that prices should be frozen for 2 years after the war.

But the war is over and has been for 2 years. We have kept faith with the wool producers. They and the manufacturers have been the beneficiaries of the Government bounty to the disadvantage of the people.

What I say about wool applies equally to all other commodities. I wonder how long the American people will continue to be bled.

I fully appreciate that many of the Members who favor this legislation are my personal friends, for whom I have a high regard; but when we are acting on legislation which affects all the people we should not permit personal friendships to affect or corrupt our judgments. We must take into consideration the needs and wishes of the people.

The President vetoed the first wool bill because of its bad effect on the economy; but so far as I am concerned I cannot see that this bill offers any improvement in its protection to consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, when the iniquitous loyalty bill was rigged for passage by the superpatriots and witch hunters of the House who are not satisfied with the thoroughness of the regulations promulgated by Executive order to root out disloyal Communists and parlor pinks, I shuddered at the thought of the humiliation of the countless thousands of faithful and devoted Government employees, loyal to their job and more so to their beloved country, who will be forced to go through third-degree examinations in order to retain their jobs. The distinguished, able, and trustworthy columnist, Lowell Mellett, known for fairness, liberality, and searching scrutiny, treats the recent and unwarranted action of the House so comprehensively and honestly that I felt I could do no better than to avail myself of his eloquence by reading into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his comments published in the Washington Star of Tuesday, July 22. His opinion and expressions coincide with my views and sentiments.

ON THE OTHER HAND—CONGRESS MAY DO THE UNFORGIVABLE IN SEEKING TO ENFORCE LOYALTY BY LAW

(By Lowell Mellett)

In an attempt to do the impossible, Congress may do the unforgivable. The House already has done its worst—but lack of time is likely to prevent the Senate from following suit immediately.

The House seeks to enforce loyalty by law. The Members who voted to do this will tell

you this is not quite true, that all they seek to do is to make sure that no disloyal persons shall have employment in the Government.

To this end all persons about to be employed, as well as the hundreds of thousands already employed, would be given searching examinations as to their loyalty. The business would start with the Civil Service Commission looking over its own files and fingerprints and then proceeding to the records of the FBI, the Army and Navy, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, local law enforcement agencies and any other sources that might occur to anybody.

If somewhere along the line something "derogatory" should be turned up—such as somebody making serious but unsupported charges against the man or woman under consideration—the name would be certified to the FBI for a full-fledged investigation. The result of this investigation would be presented to a Federal Loyalty Board, created by the act. This board would decide whether the employee or candidate for a job was loyal. If not found loyal, he would be fired or not hired.

DEFENSE HOBBLED

The Board would make its decision on evidence—but the accused person would not see or hear the evidence. He could have counsel, but the counsel could not confront his accusers, subpena witnesses or cross-examine any witness.

The man or woman found guilty of "disloyalty" through this utterly unfair and un-American process would be branded for life. He would find it difficult, if not impossible, to obtain other employment. The man or woman found "loyal" would, in many instances, be in no better situation. The very fact that he or she had been subjected to suspicion and dragged through such proceedings would leave its stigma, a smear that would stick.

That is the unforgivable thing the House is willing to do. And, as said, it is also attempting the impossible.

Loyalty is a state of mind and heart. It is a matter of the spirit. The same is true of disloyalty. Overt disloyalty or treason is a crime and punishable as such. Like every other country, we have plenty of law for that. But only the Japanese, in the heydey of their military men, could conceive of "thought police" as a means of reaching the impure mind. Only the Japanese—until the present strange hysteria hit the House.

It is to be hoped that this hysteria will subside before Congress comes back in January. If it doesn't get better, it may get worse. We may find Federal employees compelled to take new and fearsome oaths, written in their own blood, as a requisite for serving Uncle Sam.

TO HARM INNOCENT

Yet, loyalty will remain a matter of spirit, with no man able to say who does and who does not possess it. You may feel that any man who volunteered in the last war and offered his life in defense of his country had loyalty beyond questioning. But it won't be beyond questioning if he applies for a Government job.

You may have other odd ideas about loyalty. You may think the Members of the House owe a certain amount of loyalty to these same veterans—owe them some loyal assistance or protection in the matter of housing, for example. Many Members, however, including some who voted for this loyalty bill, have a different notion on that subject. Their loyalty has gone instead to the real estate interests.

Loyalty is, indeed, a thing difficult to get at. The House is attempting to get at it in the worst possible way. And, in the process, it is certain to do grievous harm to many innocent persons.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, there are several things that have happened since this matter was debated by the House some months ago. In the first place the previous bill that passed the House was vetoed by the President. In the second place, the market for wool and particularly fine wool, has strengthened very materially, so that the sales of the finer wools in this country that have been made during the period of the past few months have averaged in price from 5 to 9 cents above the support price provided for in this bill. The poorer grade wool, however, is not moving effectively, largely for the reason that the mills have not known whether or not under some such legislation as this the Commodity Credit Corporation will be disposing of its surplus stocks of inferior grade wools at a price which would very much affect the general market.

I realize that the hour is very late, and I am only taking this very brief time now to put into the RECORD an amendment which I shall offer to this bill when it comes up for amendment, which I understand will not be tonight but tomorrow That amendment is a very simple one. Instead of fixing the support price at a definite figure which could not change regardless of what happens to other commodities or to our economy in general, I am going to move that the words "at the price it supported wool in 1946" be stricken out and that in lieu thereof there be substituted "at a price not less than 90 percent of parity."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Is that not the same language that the gentleman offered when the original wool bill was before the House?

Mr. HERTER. No; it is not the same amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. What is the difference?

Mr. HERTER. The amendment I offered before was at 90 percent of parity. It could not have been fixed higher than that. I am offering tomorrow "at not less than 90 percent of parity" so that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation can fix it at a higher price if they see fit. That is the formula that has applied to agricultural products. The gentleman's own Committee on Agriculture reported a bill this week dealing with milk prices in which exactly the same formula applies, and it still allows the Commodity Credit Corporation to fix the price higher than 90 percent of parity if it thinks such a price is justified. It is like the Steagall amendment. It is exactly like every other commodity.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the fact that back on March 11, 1946, President Truman addressed a letter to Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY in regard to the wool situation, and I would like to read that letter, if I may:

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: On January 5, 1946, you sent me a memorandum on wool in accordance with a suggestion I had made to you at a conference on the subject. In your memorandum you suggested that I request the interested agencies of the Government to confer and to prepare a wool program. Such a program has now been prepared and is attached. It represents the considered views of the administration on the best methods for solving a serious and difficult problem.

Your committee will, of course, be able to call on the interested agencies for any desired assistance in your further studies of the wool situation or in drafting appropriate legislation.

I trust that the Congress will find that this proposed wool program constitutes a sound and adequate basis for constructive legislation.

In closing I wish to express my agreement with you that cooperation between the Executive and the Congress is essential to the establishment of an effective wool program.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

In the attached statement the administration and the agencies' interest recognize the fact that parity on wool is not fair and this is the language pertinent to parity as it affects wool.

1. The parity price of wool be revised or established at the so-called comparable level so that wool parity prices will be on a level equivalent to parity prices for other farm products.

In other words, for some reason the administration and the agencies affected consider 90 percent of parity for wool producers as inadequate protection to the wool growers of the country.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Of course, if we had adopted the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, we would never have had this controversy at all. What the gentleman says is the meat of the whole controversy.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, this is mighty poor legislation. It is nothing but a subsidy bill. It also puts the Government into business to buy all the wool in the country from now on until December 31, 1948. It pays the highest price for wool that we paid in 27 years, and guarantees it with money we will have to take out of the Treasury. We now have 400,000,000 pounds of wool in the stock pile, and the Commodity Credit Corporation is supposed to sell it.

They have to sell it before December 31, 1948, and take any loss that might come to the Treasury. If you are going to pass legislation like this it seems to

me we are on the wrong track. Another thing, it gives permission for the President and the State Department to reduce the tariff which is now on scoured wools of 34 cents a pound. If the farmers of this country cannot get along on the price they have now, what are they going to do when you reduce the tariff? It is poor legislation. You ought not to vote for it at all.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thought I heard the gentleman mention something about the tariff. How does the gentleman feel about reducing the tariff on woolen textiles?

Mr. RICH. I do not want to reduce it on anything. If you reduce the tariff on any commodity in this country, whereby you wreck the woolen manufacturers, the farmers, the sheep growers, and the labor of this country, I am against it. I have always been against it and I always will be against it. The Republican Party has always been for a high tariff, and it has made this country the greatest country on earth. Do you think I am going to stand for something of that kind? Not on your tintype. I am not built that way.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my remarks and include a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, possible abuses of retirement privileges by officer personnel are bringing serious criticisms upon the War and Navy Departments of our Government. In the War Department in the period May 1, 1945, to December 31, 1946, I find that 1,283 Regular Army officers were retired for physical disability. For all other reasons only 408 were retired during this period. That means three out of four were found physically disabled by examining boards.

In the Navy, during the period May 1, 1945, to May 1, 1947, I am advised that 2,864 were retired for physical disability, and only 732 for all other reasons. Here the ratio of retirements for physical disability is nearly 4 to 1.

Since these appear to be disturbing figures, I have secured from official Government sources figures for comparison on the number of physically disabled persons in civilian life. Having noted that the greater number of retirements for physical disability are in the grades of general officer or colonel in the Army, and that a large number of Navy physical disability retirements are in proportionate grades, I assume that we may safely consider only ages 35 to 64.

And here is what we find in civilian life: Two percent of the males in ages 35 to 44 are physically disabled, 3.7 percent of those in ages 45 to 54, 6.4 percent in ages 55 to 59, and 12.1 percent in ages 60 to 64. Yet in the services the percentages of those retired for physical disability runs 75 percent or more among the men retired in the camparable colonel-general age brackets. And the fact has been brought out that many high-ranking officers who retired from the services as physically disabled went immediately into industry at very lucrative salaries.

Now what can be the reason for this condition? How has the percentage of physically disabled reached such alarming heights among officer personnel? Who makes up the retiring boards, and on what basis do they judge physical-disability standards?

It is true that personnel retired for physical disabilities draw in some instances higher retirement pay than they would draw for length-of-service retirement. And it is true that physical disability retirement pay is not subject to income tax. It is likewise true that retirement pay for length of service is in only a very few cases higher than disability-retirement pay. But these should not be deciding factors.

I make no accusations at this time. I simply call attention to the facts, for I find them disturbing. I think this matter should receive serious thought from the membership of the Congress during the period prior to our reconvening in January. A request has been made by the House Committee on Armed Services, partly at my suggestion, that the services provide us with full and accurate information on this subject during that period, and that careful attention be given to correcting abuses if abuses exist.

In the belief that it may prove interesting, I file herein a table of retirements by officers of the Regular Army. I regret that I have not been furnished a similar table for naval officer personnel.

Retirements of Regular Army commissioned officers, May 1, 1945, to Dec. 31, 1946

Grade	Physical disability	Other retirements (age or service)	Wholly retired [1]	Total
General of the Army	1			1
General		1		1
Lieutenant general	8	3		11
Major general	136	28		164
Brigadier general	160	47		207
Colonel	831	287		1,118
Lieutenant colonel	91	38	1	130
Major	31	3	1	35
Captain	16	1		17
First lieutenant	9			9
Second lieutenant			1	1
Total	1,283	408	3	1,691

[1] Do not receive retired pay.

On Jan 1, 1947, 5,701 commissioned officers of the Regular Army received retired pay.

NOTE.—Non-Regular officers are not placed on the Regular Army retired list. They are certified to the Veterans' Administration for retirement. From Dec. 31, 1941, through Dec. 28, 1946, 26,056 were so certified. May 7, 1945, through Jan. 3, 1947, 18,525 were so certified.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Has the gentleman obtained similar information with regard to the retirement for disability of Reserve officers, in comparison with retirement for disability of Regular officers?

Mr. SIKES. I do have some information on that but I do not have as complete information on it as I do for the Regular officers. I find that the percentage of Reserve officers who have been retired for physical disability is very small in comparison with the over-all number, and that of the number of Reserve officers who are examined for physical disability by examining boards only about one-third or less are retired. By comparison it is my understanding that nearly all of the Regular Army officers who are examined for physical disability by examining boards are retired for physical disability.

Mr. COOLEY. Is not that a rather strange situation?

Mr. SIKES. I find it so.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I am speaking with regard to the wool bill. Hold your hats, taxpayers, you are about to be taken for another ride.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1498) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1498, with Mr. JENKINS of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has been thoroughly discussed on previous occasions, and I am not going to take very much time at this late hour of the day for a general discussion of the subject.

I am taking these few minutes to call attention to the fact that the bill which is now before us is identical with the bill which passed both Houses and was vetoed by the President except for the fact that section 4 which provided for the imposition of import fees and quotas under the provisions of section 32 of the AAA Act has been eliminated.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman referred to section 4 which was stricken out of the bill. Is it not a fact that the authority conferred under section 4 was a discretionary power in the hands of the President as to whether or not he wanted to impose import fees or a quota?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; it was the same provision which has been applicable at one time or another to something like 40 different agricultural commodities. It vested in the President power and authority to make investigations and determine whether or not support-price programs on agricultural commodities were being interfered with by reason of imports. The provision as to wool simply put it on the same basis as other agricultural commodities which come under the provision of section 22.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. A good many of the newspapers and editorial writers have said that legislation provided for an increase in the duty on wool, and I would like to have the gentleman make it plain that it did no such thing and there was no increase authorized in the duty on wool in that bill.

Mr. HOPE. I am glad the gentleman asked that question because he is absolutely right in his statement that the bill in itself did not provide for any increase in duties. I might say that in all the time that I have been a Member of Congress I cannot recall any bill which was so persistently misrepresented in the press, especially in editorial columns, as the wool bill which passed the House and was vetoed by the President. I am not blaming the press so much for that misrepresentation as I blame the State Department for passing out information which constituted misrepresentation as to the character and purpose of the legislation. But I do not want to spend any more time going into that particular phase of the matter.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The bill reported by the House certainly authorized the President to increase the tariff to the extent of 50 percent, did it not?

Mr. HOPE. It gave the President the authority that he now has as to a number of other commodities, to either impose a quota or an import fee which would be in effect an increase in the tariff under certain conditions, if certain findings were made and he decided to use his discretion and found it was necessary to do that in order to prevent the support-price program from being interfered with.

Mr. COOLEY. My recollection is that my distinguished colleague very studiously refrained from confessing that the President was ever to exercise his discretion in that certain situation to which the gentleman has referred. Some of the Members said it was a discretionary matter with the President. I took the position at that time, and I still think I was correct in saying that it was not discretionary with the President if the findings justified and indicated the necessity for an increased duty.

Mr. HOPE. Of course, it was necessary for the President to make a determination based upon the findings of fact. That determination was based upon whether or not he concluded that the imports were interfering with the support-price program. That was a matter that necessarily must have been left to his discretion.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right, and that is the only discretion he had to exercise. Now, after having asked the Tariff Commission to make an investigation and then report back to him, if they indicated that the imports were interfering with the domestic program he had no alternative other than to impose it at that time.

Mr. HOPE. No. It was still up to the President, in the exercise of his discretion and judgment, to determine whether or not, based upon the information furnished by the Tariff Commission, imports were interfering with the support-price program.

Mr. COOLEY. But he had to make his determination based upon the findings of fact, and if the findings of fact indicated no other alternative, he had to make it?

Mr. HOPE. Yes, but he had to make the determination. It was not automatic.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In the first place, it was discretionary on the part of the President to ask the Tariff Commission to make the investigation.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree that is the only discretion he had.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Afterward he had to concur in the findings of the Tariff Commission, and if he did not find that the facts submitted by the Tariff Commission were in accordance with his views, it was discretionary with him whether or not he wanted to exercise his power.

Mr. COOLEY. It would not have been a question of being in accord with his views, but in accord with the facts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. It seems to me also that under section 4 the President could only impose such fees as would bring the price of foreign wool up to the price wool is supported under the wool program. Is that not true?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; that is correct.

Now, I do not want to get into any further discussion of the provisions of the other bill, because that is water over the dam. The President vetoed the bill. The Congress did not override the veto. While I think the other method of approaching the problem was preferable, we were not successful in solving it that way, and we are now coming here with what I think is the second best way of affording a price-support program for wool.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. HERTER. I am wondering whether the gentleman can advise me whether he would accept an amendment. Instead of 90 percent of parity it could be fixed at a higher price, if the Secretary of Agriculture or the Commodity Credit Corporation so desired.

Mr. HOPE. No. I do not believe I would be in a position to accept that amendment.

It has already been brought to the attention of the committee that the parity price on wool does not at this time reflect a fair relationship as between wool and other farm commodities or a fair relationship with the cost of production, and for that reason among others, I do not believe that I could consistently agree to the amendment suggested.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. HERTER. Is it not true that the Commodity Credit Corporation today is supporting certain commodities at higher than 90 percent of parity? For instance, cotton is being supported at 92½ percent and some commodities at a higher price because of the necessity of stimulating production. Would not the gentleman be willing to look to the same people who have discretion in all Steagall commodities to determine what is the proper price above 90 percent of parity to make the same determination in the case of wool?

Mr. HOPE. The support price of wool which we are asking in this bill is the same support price that has prevailed since 1943. Practically all other prices are now far higher than they were in 1943. I do not believe that it is out of the way to urge that the 1943 price should be continued. I realize that the gentleman's amendment does not necessarily reduce the rate at which the price would be supported, but it would give authority to support the price at a lower rate, which I do not believe would be desirable at this time.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The only thing "comparable price" means is that wool would then be given the same treatment that other agricultural commodities enjoy under the parity formula of the Steagall amendment.

Mr. HOPE. Yes; as a matter of fact we are not stabilizing the price of wool at the comparable price. There are some other commodities in the same situation as wool where the Department of Agriculture has determined a comparable price and use that for stabilization purposes. But that is not true of wool. If that provision were in the bill it would result in a price 4 or 5 cents higher than the price now contained in the bill.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is right.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. The bill now before us is the Senate bill and has passed the Senate.

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

Mr. JENNINGS. Should it be amended it would then go to conference and in this jam we are in there would be very little probability of its becoming law at all.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman has raised a very good point and one to which we

must give consideration in this late stage of the session, because unless the bill can be passed in its present form it certainly is very doubtful as to whether it can become law at this session.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three additional minutes.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. The gentleman will remember, of course, that the original O'Mahoney bill regarding which the gentleman from North Carolina read a letter from the President to Senator O'MAHONEY, contains the very thing we are talking about here, a comparable price. We were trying to change the formula that put wool on a parity with other commodities. Is not that true?

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

Mr. GRANGER. And as to the comparable price some of the members of our committee did not want to go along with it. This is the compromise. This is the only thing that has ever been found which would meet the issue. We might just as well not pass this bill if we accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts because that is the reason the bill was introduced in the first place.

Mr. HOPE. Yes; I agree with the gentleman. I appreciate the contribution he has made by calling attention to that fact.

Just briefly in conclusion I wish to bring the attention of the committee to the fact that the situation has changed somewhat as to wool prices in recent weeks.

There has been a stiffening of the price as far as the better grades are concerned, as stated by the gentleman from Massachusetts. That is fortunate in that those grades have been selling higher than the support price would have been and there has been that much more wool on the open market. We want all of the wool to go to the market place that can possibly go there. The Commodity Credit Corporation has been able to sell some of its stocks of wool because the better grades have gone above the parity price. That is all to the good, and we are glad that is the situation because it means that in the end this operation is not going to be as costly to the Government as it would be otherwise. It means that the loss of the Commodity Credit Corporation is going to be less but it does not in any way lessen the need for this legislation because we do not know what the market may be or where it may go between now and December 31, 1948, at which time this program will end. The Army, so I am told, wants to take some of the stock pile of the Commodity Credit Corporation and, of course, that will help in the liquidation and will cut down the loss that will be sustained on account of this liquidation. So I think those who have been fearful of the cost that might accrue under this legislation can vote for this bill with the assurance that a change in conditions has reduced the probable cost considerably.

I hope that the committee will approve the bill without amendment and that we can send it to the President in the form in which it was passed by the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, this whole matter has been debated on the floor formerly and I think every Member is acquainted with the provisions of the present bill. It has been passed by the Senate. There is no question in the world, in the event we give favorable consideration to the bill, but what the President will approve the legislation. It is absolutely necessary to protect the wool industry in America. There is no other way around. I do not think the membership of this House wants to put the great wool industry out of business.

Mr. Chairman, if we do not get this legislation we are not going to get any legislation at all. It is up to us to make that determination here and now. The committee is in possession of all the facts in connection with the whole situation; therefore I do not see any necessity for prolonging the discussion. We are only attempting to give the wool grower the same treatment that the producers of other agricultural commodities received under what is known as the Steagall amendment, a fair price. A parity price to the wool growers under the parity formula is not a fair price. That is the reason this legislation changes the parity formula with respect to wool. It is just simply doing justice to the wool growers of America.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I favor this measure and I favor it for the benefit of the wool growers of the entire Nation and particularly of my own State. Its enactment will be in simple justice to them. But there is another group dependent upon us in this matter of the price of wool.

I would like to say this: in addition to the white men there are in my State about 60,000 Navajo Indians and others who are nomadic, living upon their sheep, and the price of wool means everything in their economy. They are hard pressed now and up against the limit of subsistence. So, I am thinking in behalf of the 60,000 Navajo and Hopi Indians who produce wool and depend upon it for their very living. It is even better to give them a fair price than to furnish them charity. They prefer it rather than charity.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Some of the statements which have been made during the debate on this matter might indicate or tend to indicate that this support program was not needed. As the gentleman has pointed out, we are faced with a situation that we either take this bill or no bill at all. Now, if we have no bill at all, its natural result might be that the market for wool at present levels might go to pieces.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. And I think it would go to pieces.

Mr. COOLEY. Because we have a tremendous surplus hanging over the market at the present time.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. And I think it will take this legislation to give the wool growers of America reasonable protection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, your Committee on Veterans' Affairs has worked diligently and I want to report to the House that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has reported five bills we believe should pass, the President and his Budget Bureau notwithstanding. But to date the veterans' legislation Congress has passed has amounted to very little, because the insurance time-extension bill simply gives the veterans a chance to apply for insurance. It is a commercial matter. The veterans pay for it. It should not be called a benefit, in fact. The House has one very important bill—the Patterson bill—which would give service presumption to chronic and tropical diseases.

This bill has passed the other body. I want to bring to the attention of the House again that if we do not pass the Senate bill which is now on the Speaker's desk, which gives the blind, the double arm amputees, and the double leg amputees automobiles, we are depriving the men, the most seriously wounded, of transportation that they can use in securing jobs. There are only 12,000 affected. They are the last ones of the group that are always classed together for rating purposes. The cost would not be great and would cover a period of 3 years. I know no Member wants to go back to his district and face a blind boy, when a boy with a leg off or a boy with both legs off can get an automobile, and say, "You cannot. The Congress did not choose to give you a car; it was not willing to do it." The bill was discriminatory last year. This rectifies that.

We passed other legislation out of our committee, Mr. Speaker, that is vitally needed. I do not know how the Members can go back and I do not know how I can go back and tell the veterans of various organizations where I have been asked to speak in the hospitals and say, "No, the Congress has passed millions and millions of dollars for relief to foreign countries and never counted the cost, but we are not passing legislation for the veterans because of the cost."

The Congress cashed the terminal-leave-pay bonds for the able-bodied, but did nothing additional for the disabled.

Mr. Speaker, there is other much-needed legislation already passed by the other body which is on the Speaker's desk, legislation which your committee on veterans' legislation passed first but which has not been acted upon by the House. The other body passed the on-the-job training bill, the subsistence-allowance bill, the bill for increased allowances for disabled taking vocational training, the amputee-car bill and the institutional farm-training bill which the House already has passed.

I believe the leadership will bring up those bills for action tomorrow. I still have faith. I do not believe that faith will be betrayed.

Six months, when the House will reconvene, will be too late for the men and women in school and in training.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object to this request, but I want to serve notice at this time that I shall object to any other requests to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the statement made by the very able gentlewoman from Massachusetts. I am in full accord with her that there has not been very important legislation concerning veterans passed by this body, and we would be sorely remiss in our duties to the veterans if we did not fully enact legislation that has been recently passed by the Senate.

Yesterday afternoon I called the attention of this body to a bill, S. 1394, which was passed by the Senate unanimously and now is languishing in a committee in this body. I was much surprised today when the majority leader issued his statement to this body in which he quoted from the President's speech of last January 6. The majority leader said:

> That statement can leave no question about the opposition of President Truman to additional veterans' legislation of any consequence.

I say that is not true. The President has yet to veto any bill concerning veterans' legislation which has been passed by this Congress. I am confident that he will not veto the type of veterans' legislation having senatorial approval. If the legislation the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has spoken to you about, including S. 1394, passes this body there will be no Presidential veto. Of that I am confident. If we adopt and approve these bills which the Senate has passed unanimously, there will be no Presidential veto.

Let me tell you what I suspect is the real motive behind the majority leader's remarks. For some unknown reason the Republican leadership of this body is attempting to avoid the consequences of bottling up veterans' legislation. It is common knowledge that they will not permit S. 1394 and other measures recently passed by the Senate to come before this body for action. Now there is great demand for this legislation. Disabled war veterans need the assistance provided by some of these bills, and particularly in S. 1394 thousands upon thousands of veterans have been pressing for an increase in their subsistence allowance in order to meet the continued rise in the cost of living.

The majority leader, in the prepared speech before this body today, has expressed deep concern over the possibility of a Presidential veto of additional veterans' legislation. I cannot understand, at this late date, his solicitude about a Presidential veto. Certainly such concern was not manifest with regard to other important measures which have been passed through this body under the guiding hand of the Republican leadership. I refer now to the Taft-Hartley bill and to the tax bills. I suggest to the majority leader that the proper way to place the onus on the executive branch of the Government is to give it an opportunity to perform its function. Bring these important veteran bills before this Congress. Let us perform our legislative function under the Constitution and then let the record clearly show whether or not the President will veto these extremely important measures. The responsibility for the passage of these measures is directly that of the majority party and its leadership. No searching and grasping from disconnected portions of the President's speech of last January can relieve the majority leadership of this body from its responsibility.

Again, I agree with the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that this is a part of the unfinished business of this Congress and in good conscience we cannot face our veterans at home unless we act now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That (a) the Commodity Credit Corporation shall continue, until December 31, 1948, to support a price to producers of wool in the continental United States and Territories at the price it supported wool in 1946.
>
> (b) Notwithstanding any other provisions hereof, the Commodity Credit Corporation may adjust support prices for individual grades and qualities of wool for the purpose of bringing about a fair and equitable relationship in the support prices for the various grades and qualities of wool; and may make discounts from support prices for off-quality, inferior-grade, or poorly prepared wool.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JENKINS of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1498) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Governor Thurmond, of South Carolina, at the governors' conference in Salt Lake City.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FLETCHER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special order heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE—LAWRENCE MICHAEL AGAINST HOWARD W. SMITH

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 25, 1947.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The motion to dismiss of the contestee in the contested-election case of Lawrence Michael against HOWARD W. SMITH for a seat in the House of Representatives from the Eighth Congressional District of the State of Virginia, filed in this office July 25, 1947, is transmitted herewith for reference to the appropriate committee.

Yours respectfully,
JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

AMENDING NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H. R. 4395 to amend the National Housing Act to increase insurance on FHA title VI loans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

NO. 1 FAILURE OF THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS—SUBSERVIENCE TO THE REAL-ESTATE LOBBY

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, in March of 1946 the Chicago Daily News printed a dispatch from Washington which gladdened the hearts of the members of one of the most powerful lobbies operating at present in this country. The headline said, "How lobby helped weaken housing bill."

The story read in part:

The housing bill passed the House this week with the guts cut out of it—and it was a luncheon club that did the gutting.

Sitting around a luncheon table, Washington secretaries of construction trade associations decided they didn't like the idea of price ceilings on old houses or subsidies to stimulate building-material production.

So they went to work, and soon every Member of the House was getting telegrams from lumber dealers, contractors, real-estate firms, builders, and architects in his district.

Then the story quotes Herbert U. Nelson, executive vice president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, as follows:

"We've got a gang in power who think solely of the consumer and usually in terms of 'protecting' him," said Nelson.

He was referring to the Democratic administration, which was launching an aggressive emergency housing program in the early months of 1946.

From the warped viewpoint of the real-estate lobby, protecting the consumer is a bad thing. They schemed cleverly to end this protection, but could not overcome the Democratic administration backed up by the Democratic Congress.

That was in 1946, prior to November 6.

Sure the Democratic Party wants to protect the consumer, and we were proud of it.

But the Republican Party came into control of Congress in the fluke elections of '46 and the real-estate lobby has literally "gone to town."

Six weeks before the session opened the president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards told members to wait for the new Congress on the Capitol steps with a proposal for a cushioned decontrol of rents.

Cushioned decontrol of rents is a nice way of saying "Let us get rid of the protection that keeps the consumer from being at the mercy of greedy landlords."

Under the pretext of extending rent control, a bill was finally passed which I termed "a monstrosity." It was in committee when I first saw this strange creature known as the Housing and Rent Act of 1947—H. R. 3203.

Actually, this bill killed the existing emergency program to get housing for veterans. It was supposed to remove all the restrictions on commercial building. Restrictions that had been put in to give builders of living places for veterans a chance to compete against money-heavy commercial and industrial builders for scarce building materials.

The real-estate profiteers and speculators are doing very well under the existing housing shortage, and profits are much higher in commercial construction than in home building, so big business did not like the provisions that held it back to let home building go ahead faster.

The real-estate lobby cracked its whip and the Republican majority in Congress jumped through the hoop.

The result: Congress enacted a hodgepodge and a monstrosity known as the Housing and Rent Control Act of 1947.

Of course, the nastiest thing about this bill was the cruel joker provision which gave landlords the right to extract a 15-percent rent increase from helpless tenants. It gave tenants the choice of going for the 15-percent jump now or really getting blackjacked later on. In effect, it has been misnamed a "voluntary agreement."

Many helpless tenants really know what it means by now.

This bill was delayed in the other body until late in the session and then sent to the White House as part of a carefully laid political scheme.

If the President did not sign this phony bill, which gives a little protection to the consumer, the Republicans said brazenly they would pass no rent control law.

So the question was whether it was better to protect the consumer at least to the extent of some curb on landlords' greed or whether to have no law and put all tenants completely at the mercy of property owners at once.

Of course, neither choice was a good one. But the President decided wisely that a little protection for the consumer was better than none, so he signed the bill after issuing a blistering statement castigating the real-estate lobby and pointing out the evils of this bill.

I said this was part of a well-planned political scheme. It was. The Republicans deliberately held off the choice of a bad bill or no rent control bill at all until too late in the session for a better law to be pushed through before the old one expired.

Like the wolf in Little Red Riding Hood, the real-estate lobby said that nobody needed to be afraid of them because landlords wouldn't take unfair advantage of the privileges they were given under this bill.

Well, hotel rooms rented on a monthly basis were freed from rent control under this bill. Hotel operators around the country promptly dropped the mask of being grandma and stood revealed as the ravenous wolf.

Rates were increased as high as 200 percent. Even flophouse rates soared upward in an inflationary spiral. It was plain that the same thing would have happened to other tenants without the meager protection they receive under this bill.

This breaking of its promise is typical of the performance of the real-estate lobby.

Last year the real-estate lobby said in canned news releases that elimination of price controls would speed construction of homes and lower the cost of homes.

So price controls were removed. Prices of homes soared skyward. The veteran making $40 or $50 a week had a fine selection of homes—jerry-built crackerboxes—that he could buy for from eight, or nine, or ten thousand dollars.

That was the lower costs that the real-estate lobby promised. But the real-estate lobby is not much interested in the people who do not have seven or eight thousand dollars lying around in loose cash.

The real-estate lobby's promise to solve the housing problem if government controls were removed stands today as a cruel mockery to the homeless veteran—as cruel as its repeated statements that there is no housing shortage.

Yes, the real-estate lobby actually makes that argument. They say there is no housing shortage. They say it is just overconsumption of existing space. Look what we are doing now? Have you seen the figures for June 1947?

The real-estate lobby has a simple solution to this so-called overconsumption of existing space. They would just raise rents so that families would have to move into smaller quarters and then all the folks with plenty of dough would then have nice places to live in.

Of course, it might be a little uncomfortable for a veteran and his wife and baby to have to live in one room instead of two or three, but the real-estate lobby does not worry about that—any more than they worry about being trapped in untrue promises of reducing building costs and meeting the needs of veterans.

In Mein Kampf, Adolf Hitler gave his theory of propaganda. It was to pick a big lie and keep repeating it. If you repeated it long enough, Hitler believed, you would get the people to believe it.

Apparently Hitler's theory has not gone unnoticed in this country, or has it?

Recently in headlines, the weekly publication of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, Mr. Herbert U. Nelson, the lobbying gentleman we mentioned earlier, wrote as follows:

The realtor who sells homes in our country can certainly offer the best buy in the world today and in all history.

This unbelievable brazenness shows how little the real-estate lobby cares for the homeless veteran and how much it cares for the blood money that can be extorted during the present housing shortage from homeless veterans desperate for a place to live.

What a favor the pious talking real-estate lobbyists offer the veteran in "the best buy in the world today and in all history." The homeless veteran can buy a crackerbox worth $3,500 at most for only 8 or 9 or 10 thousand dollars or he can do without a decent place to live.

This is directly the result of the real-estate lobby's spectacular success in winning from the Republican Congress the

ending of the Democratic administration's housing program.

Small wonder that President Truman asked Congress to investigate this slick outfit. Small wonder that the Senator from Ohio, the Republican Party whipcracker in the other body, said that he would like to investigate the lobby. Brother, could we give it a whitewashing—and how.

In fact this lobby is so powerful that it continues to block passage of a housing bill of which the Senator from Ohio is one of the coauthors. This lobby is so slick and so brazen that one of its spokesmen said that because the Senator from Ohio had the temerity to cosponsor a bill to help build homes at decent prices and to help tear down the festering slums that bring such juicy rental returns, the lobby would block the Senator's Presidential ambitions for espousing such socialistic legislation.

Imagine a lobby that is able to be even more reactionary than the Senator from Ohio, who is now disclaiming having any part in writing the famous labor bill of 1947.

The Senator from Ohio would like to investigate the real-estate lobby—he says—but actually he knows that such an investigation would reveal the utter subservience of the Republican Congress to this lobby, so you may be sure that nothing will be done to expose this high-pressure group of vote swayers. A Democratic Senator introduced a resolution for the probe, but the Senator from Ohio did not give it the green light and so nothing happened. This was another victory for the real-estate lobby. Actually the record of the lobby's victories in this Congress is astounding.

Let us run down the complete list of what has been done to sabotage veterans' hopes for a home and to take a little more from you and me to fatten the pocketbooks of the landlords and rich contractors.

Here is a brief story of the sell-out of homeless veterans:

The so-called voluntary 15-percent rent increase hit millions of persons and added fire under the inflation boiler the Republicans are stoking so busily in their program of high prices and low wages. This unfair boost hits veterans and nonveterans alike, but the Republicans are more concerned with helping the rich get richer and the poor to the poorhouse.

The real-estate lobby won meat-ax cuts in appropriations for housing agencies and Federal aid to local low-cost housing programs. Veto by appropriation is what you call this, Mr. Majority Leader. I might say to the genial gentleman from Indiana, the majority leader, who so very frequently refers to the use of the Presidential veto, that your party has used a very effective and devious strategem—"Veto by appropriation."

The real-estate lobby won removal of the controls on nonhousing construction, giving the green light to builders of virtually everything but homes to go in and outbid home builders for scarce materials.

The real-estate lobby won approval by the House of the joker bill which calls for sale of 166,000 units of Government-owned housing for cash only. Real-estate profiteers have the ready cash, homeless veterans do not. Fortunately at present it is bottled up in the other body.

The real-estate lobby prevented passage of the Taft-Wagner-Ellender bill to get housing in the price range of those who need it most.

And one outstanding thing that they did do in the other body was to approve the President's reorganization plan on housing and home financing. Where there is life there is hope.

A spokesman for the real-estate lobby has testified openly that the place for poor people to live is in the poorhouse. With the help of the Republican majority in Congress they will wind up by having even moderately well-to-do people living in miserable, inadequate housing.

The Republican majority in Congress and the real-estate lobby have not even bothered to try to hide their callous indifference to the welfare of the general public.

If homeless veterans and the millions of others who are not properly housed today do not go to the polls and vote for the Democratic program of decent housing for all, in 1948, we will continue to see the real-estate lobby rule Congress.

I, for one, do not believe that the veterans who defeated the powerful armies of Germany and Japan are going to let the real-estate lobby win this war.

The lobby has nothing but dollars on its side. The veterans have a weapon as strong as the bullets they used in the war—their ballot. Ballots can win the housing war.

Let us win it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE RECORD OF THE REPUBLICAN CONGRESS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Eightieth Congress, first session, draws to a close. In the next few months the people of our Nation will have an opportunity to evaluate the accomplishments and lack of accomplishments of the past 6 months of Republican rule. The record has been written. The sins of commission and omission are clearly set forth. The people will be the final judge. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] said on April 15, during debate, "The Republican Party now has the responsibility for preparing and bringing legislation to this floor for action."

Now let us see what they have done and what they have left undone. Their sins of commission and omission are equally damnable.

HIGH PRICES

First, let us look at the high cost of living. The Republican leadership for over 2 years have been fighting all attempts at inflation control. They wrecked OPA last year with the promise that the law of supply and demand would bring prices down in a few months. Has the price of living come down? No. The cost of living is 17 percent higher today than it was in June 1946. This pleases the speculators and the profit hogs, but it does not please the people. And the Republicans have done nothing about the constantly rising cost of living.

TAXES

Now let us talk about taxes. With great fanfare, the Republican leadership has twice forced through the House a tax-reduction bill which gives a larger percentage of net take-home pay to the high-income individual than it does to the wage earner. Do not let them fool you with their phony percentages. The tax-cut bill was for the greedy and not for the needy.

At a time when our national debt was over $259,000,000,000, all thought is given to inflationary tax cuts, instead of the sound fiscal policy of paying our debts. The greedy with swollen incomes yell for the cut. But the President vetoed a cut at this time for the benefit of the people.

MINIMUM WAGES

Now let us look at minimum-wage legislation. The Republican leadership has been holding hearings on the minimum-wage bill. But I understand no action will be taken by this session of Congress.

They do not favor raising the 40-cent minimum wage to 60 cents per hour, which means raising wages from a paltry $3.20 a day to a subsistence wage of $4.80.

Some of the big low-wage industries do not want a $4.80 per day minimum wage for their employees, and they have flashed a red light to their Republican friends in the Eightieth Congress, and, of course, they have obeyed.

This pleases the low-wage-paying industrialist, but the people do not like it.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Now let us look at labor legislation. Yes; they have been successful in passing the Taft-Hartley bill, an omnibus antilabor bill which the Republican leadership promised would solve all industrial disputes.

Only a few days after this became the law of the land over the President's veto this law failed in its first big test. The coal miners struck. A half-million workers not only struck but they refused to sign a new contract binding them to the terms of the Taft-Hartley bill.

If the Taft-Hartley bill was what its sponsors claimed it was, why did not the coal operators use it against John L. Lewis? There are only two answers. The law is either unworkable, and unconstitutional, or there was employer appeasement for political purposes. Mr. TAFT says the law does one thing, and Mr. HARTLEY says the law does the opposite.

It will take years of court trials to determine what this hodge-podge of ill-considered legislation will do.

One thing we know: It will not bring industrial peace to America.

RENT CONTROL

Have you had your rent raised lately? Well the Republican leadership wrecked rent controls with the Wolcott bill, and millions of American citizens are faced with rent increases, which are not limited

to 15 percent which they tried to make the people believe.

On hotels, motor courts, and new construction, all rent controls have been removed. The rent gougers are having a holiday. This pleases the landlords' lobby but it does not please the people.

HOUSING

Are you a veteran, and do you need a house to live in?

The Republican leadership wrecked housing control in the Eightieth Congress by choking off appropriations for control and allocation agencies and removing price controls on building supplies.

Prices skyrocketed and essential residential building for the medium-income-bracket civilian and veteran is not available.

This may please the real-estate lobby, but it does not please the returned veteran or the civilian who wants to buy a home at a reasonable price.

FLOOD CONTROL AND RECLAMATION

What about the conservation of our national natural resources?

Do you live in the Missouri Valley, where the floods are costing hundreds of millions of dollars in damage?

The Republican leadership has drastically cut flood control, soil conservation, and western reclamation projects appropriations.

They say this is economy. And the wealthy taxpayers agree; but the people in the flooded Missouri Valley think it is tragic.

And the people of the West, hungry for land, water, and hydroelectric power, are desperate.

Yet the wealthy taxpayers are pleased; but the real wealth, the rich topsoil of America, is swept down the muddy Missouri Valley River to the sea.

They made a few paltry cuts in the taxes, but they cost the people millions by these cuts. The people do not like it.

SUMMARY STATEMENT

In conclusion, the Eightieth Congress should not adjourn on July 26. The Republican leadership should keep Congress in session until they have passed legislation to solve the vital national problems that are affecting the lives of every citizen.

The people need housing. They want inflation stopped.

They want protection against monopoly.

They desperately need flood control.

They need extension of social security into fields of avocation not covered at present.

The aged need a Federal old-age pension. The people need Federal aid for education. The people want world-wide peace. And Congress should busy itself with national problems and stand ready to implement international agreements. The duties and obligations of the Eightieth Congress will not be fulfilled if they adjourn July 26.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

ADMINISTRATION OF PALESTINE

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, only a few days ago a joint resolution was introduced in both Houses of Congress directing the Secretary of State to request His Britannic Majesty's Government immediately to abolish the emergency regulations at present governing the administration of Palestine and to reestablish a civilian administration and civil liberties to the people of Palestine.

I am referring, Mr. Speaker, to House Resolution 237 and Senate Joint Resolution 149. These resolutions stress the fact that the entire regime in Palestine and the present system of administering the country are illegal and that a de facto state of war exists in that country. It emphasizes the conditions prevailing there, which converted Palestine into a police state the like of which could not be found anywhere in the western world, and the sufferings and hardships imposed on the population under a most brutal totalitarian regime and a rule of ruthless tyranny.

The occasion for that resolution was the confirmation of death sentences pronounced on the three Hebrew patriots, Jacob Weiss, Mayer Nakar, and Absalom Habib, for alleged participation in the liberation of prisoners from the prison of Acre on May 4, 1947, in which no British lives were lost and in which some 250 political prisoners, both Hebrew and Arab, were liberated.

These death sentences passed by a so-called military court, whose legality could not be reasonably established by any stretch of interpretation of international law, have been confirmed by Lt. Gen. G. H. R. MacMillan, commander of the British forces, on July 8, in complete disregard of the plea of the United Nations Special Committee as well as the plea of numerous public bodies inside and out of Palestine. This attitude of the British administration in Palestine, shocking as it is, is even more appalling when one takes into consideration the fact that three death sentences against Nazi generals in Italy, found guilty of the wanton murder of some 350 innocent Italian men, women, and children, have been commuted by another British commanding officer, thus presenting to the world the utterly distorted conception of clemency applied to avowed criminals, on one hand, and cruel and undue punishment applied against sincere idealists and patriots fighting for the liberation of their country and their people, on the other hand. Mr. Speaker, it is only natural that such an attitude on the part of the government of one of our principal allies in the last World War—a government with whom the Government of the United States has maintained over a period of decades the most friendly relations, a government to whom we recently extended very substantial economic help, a government which is continually calling on our people for assistance in the solution of its problems and difficulties—should have provoked in this country, and particularly among the elected representatives of the American people, a wave of shocked indignation and anger. For the American people and its representatives are not prone easily to forget that we have recently concluded a victorious war against fascism and nazism in the defense of the very principles of democracy and freedom menaced by the totalitarian states.

The American people and its elected representatives cannot and will not forget that millions of American boys have taken up arms and waged many battles in which hundreds of thousands of them have given their lives so that all men might be free and no people, big or small, be oppressed any longer. For the American people and its elected representatives are fully aware that freedom is one and indivisible all over the world and that an attack on the freedom of any people on this earth is an attack on our own freedom, which we cherish and defend with all our might. The American people and its elected representatives cannot and will not forget that the totalitarian powers whom we defeated also began their attacks on freedom by attacking the Hebrew people, by choosing this peaceful and unarmed people as a test case in order to ascertain how the civilized world would react to an attack on them. We cannot and will not forget, having succeeded in their drive against the Hebrew people, the Nazis established their technique of attacking other peoples one at a time until the time came when they felt strong enough to attack the whole world, including our United States. We must always keep in mind that whenever an attack against democracy is being planned, the Hebrew people are the first victim but they are never the last. Other peoples follow and finally a conflict engulfing the whole civilized world becomes inevitable. We are determined that this shall not happen again and that is why it is our duty to stop aggression against a peace-loving people who have suffered enough—I should rather say too much—before it is too late.

Mr. Speaker, only a few days ago words were spoken in the Senate of the United States with dignity and firmness reminiscent of the days of our Declaration of Independence, when the representatives of our people rose to the heights of historical greatness which established our Nation as a guide to all peoples of this world on the path of great achievements for true democracy and freedom and equal opportunity for all. When these words were spoken in the Congress of the United States, no one dared to think that the British Government's reply to these noble sentiments of the representatives of the American people would be another act of cruelty and inhumane brutality against the remnants of the Hebrew people. It is utterly unfortunate that even the most pessimistic among us have misjudged the depth to which the present government of Britain has sunk in its fall from the days of Dunkerque to this day. It is most discouraging to know that the same British Navy which so gallantly fought against tremendous odds in the last war is being used now to commit acts of piracy on the high seas against unarmed vessels on a mercy mission of repatriating to their homeland those remnants of the Hebrew people

who by some miracle escaped the crematoria and the gas chambers to which the Nazis had committed them.

On July 18, 1947, the steamship *Exodus*, carrying some 4,500 Hebrew repatriates to their homeland, was attacked on the high seas some 17 miles outside of Palestinian territorial waters by a swarm of British destroyers, which rammed her, attacked her passengers with tear bombs and small arms fire, and put a boarding party on her main deck. Three persons aboard were killed and over a hundred sustained serious injury. One of the dead was an American crewman, the ship's first mate, William Bernstein, age 24, of Los Angeles. Bernstein leaves a widow and one child.

The battered mercy ship was towed into the port of Haifa, where the repatriates were transferred to British prison ships, and they are now being taken to a French port whence they will be sent back to concentration camps in which most of them have spent up to 8 years, including 3 years after their so-called liberation.

Mr. Speaker, I hardly need to add any remarks to this story drawn from dispatches by American press agencies. The inhuman cruelty of this action of the British Government speaks for itself. But it would hardly be fitting for us to condemn the British Government unless we are prepared to act ourselves in order to come to the rescue of those unfortunate human beings tossed around on the high seas as if they were the scum of the earth.

Let us not forget for one moment that we have not only a moral obligation toward these people, that we would be guilty of forfeiting our Christian principles by standing idly by while they are being driven to despair and maybe even annihilation. Let us not forget for one moment that these are the very people who were one of our most gallant allies in the recent war. Mr. President, permit me to cite from my personal experience. I had the good fortune to be assigned to fight in the last war on one sector of the European underground. I have seen those people fighting almost with their bare fists against the most highly mechanized armies of Nazi Germany. I have seen them risking their lives every minute of the day.

I have seen them holding in check entire divisions of the mighty Wehrmacht while they were only a handful of meagerly armed but determined fighters who believed in the precepts of our own great Jefferson that resistance to tyranny is obedience to God. They have found the courage and the endurance which it took to resist the Nazi invader in their own faith in the principles of freedom and in their faith in us, their allies. They were sincerely convinced that we meant every word of what we said when we declared we were fighting that war for a new democratic order, for the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter. Those people have every right to expect us to fulfill the promises that we so generously made to them. They have every right to ask of us that we liberate them in fact and not make a mockery of the term liberation by leaving them for three full years after liberation day behind barbed wires in the very same concentration camps in which millions of them were annihilated. We would be guilty of complicity in one of the most hideous crimes against humanity if we let them down in this hour of their need; if we permitted them to be thrown around from one port to another instead of stretching out a helping hand to put an end to their wanderings and untold sufferings.

Mr. Speaker, we have assumed moral and legal responsibility for the fate of these people. We signed in 1924 a treaty with Great Britain taking a full share of responsibility for the fulfillment of the mandate over Palestine and for the establishment of a home for those very same unfortunates who are now being denied it.

At this very moment it cannot be fully ascertained whether these victims of Nazi brutality and callous breaches of solemn promises by the western democracies will be forced back into France. I would not take it upon myself to criticize or to pass any judgment on the action of the French Government in this difficult situation. The French Government may feel that whichever way it acts it will be open to some criticism. If it refuses to admit them some people may say that the French Government is thus prolonging the agony of these unfortunate wanderers. If it does admit them, some may say that the French Government is thus becoming an accomplice to the British Government in driving these sufferers back into the concentration camps in which they have already been kept much too long. For my part, I have too high respect for the noble traditions of the great French Republic to doubt even for one moment that whatever action the French Government may take it will be motivated by its concern for the welfare of the 4,500 human beings and not by considerations of political expediency. I am even more inclined to express this belief because of the most praiseworthy record of the Government of France in its unremitting efforts and continuous endeavors to help the Hebrew repatriates in every possible way, despite innumerable difficulties of a political or other nature which they encountered in this field.

But I definitely refuse to believe even for one moment that the French Government would permit itself to be duped by ill-placed considerations of pseudo humanity. These people have undergone untold hardships with one purpose in mind: To leave Europe, the huge graveyard of their kin, and to start a new life in the Holy Land. To force them back into Europe would be cruel and inhuman. I am confident that the great Republic of France will not commit such a disgraceful act.

It would be a very sad day for me and for every decent American when we would have to compare the attitude and actions of the Government of France with the attitude and actions of our own Government and reluctantly come to the conclusion that the comparison was not in favor of our own American Government. It would be a sad day indeed for every decent American when we would have to come to the conclusion that our Government has made numerous declarations of sympathy and compassion, that it did not spare noble phrases and brilliant formulas but, alas, did not lift a finger in order to undertake real action.

Another representation to the British Government by our President would expose once more our country and its highest elected officer to the unpalatable treatment which he incurred on the occasion of numerous previous representations to the British Government on the Palestine matter, which were either ignored or rebuked in a manner incompatible with the dignity of his high office and the respect due to it. It would be futile to expect any results from such a representation after the unsavory experience which we have had with the British Government to this date.

On May 12, 1947, I was one of the 15 Representatives and Senators, Republican and Democratic, who wrote to the President urging that he implement the repatriation program of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, by lending trucks and ships to the displaced Hebrews and facilitating their return to Palestine before another winter sets in. We received word from the State Department that the consideration of this program must wait for the United Nations Special Committee report and that no action can be taken pending the current investigation. Whether or not this argument has sufficient validity is a matter into which I will not enter now, aware as I am of the limited time of my colleagues. But there is one thing about which one cannot have any doubts and this is that regardless of pending inquiries and determination of long-range policies for Palestine or the formulation of the future status and administration of that country, it is our indisputable duty to act and to come to the rescue of the 4,500 Hebrews in this immediate emergency. We cannot wait any longer while human beings are being kicked around from port to port, some of them being shot, some being drowned, and some perhaps disappearing through suicide. Our President has a duty to act and act now. President Truman must extend the protection of the United States to these people. We must at once recognize their full legal right to repatriate themselves to Palestine, a right which our President has so convincingly expressed on several occasions, and we must without further delay assist them in returning to their homeland—Palestine.

I am certain that any step taken by President Truman to guarantee the safety of these Hebrews under the United States flag in returning to Palestine will meet with the most enthusiastic response both in the United States and among decent people the world over. I know of no course other than this one which would be morally justified and legally right under international law.

The 4,500 have been victims of a criminal assault in which some of them lost their lives, others sustained injury, and the rest fortunately survived. We cannot, without losing all claim to decency, let them be the victims of repeated assaults under the pretext that they have to wait for redress from the United Nations. There is no conception in Anglo-Saxon law or international law which imposes on the survivors of a criminal assault the repetition of that same assault while the court is in session.

There is no law in any part of the world which would permit a criminal to repeat his crime while he is being tried for it. We cannot afford to become accomplices to such a repetition and that is exactly what we would be if we do not take action to save the victim from the hands of the criminal.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] is recognized for 10 minutes.

CAN WE AFFORD TO FOLLOW HERBERT HOOVER'S ADVICE AGAIN?

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, in February 1947 Mr. Herbert Hoover was asked by President Truman to go to Germany for the purpose of making a study of her economic problems. It was the second time after the defeat of nazism that Mr. Hoover was asked, as an expert on relief, to give the American people the benefits of his long experience and knowledge.

The American people were entitled to expect from the former President of the United States impartial, fair, and disinterested advice as to what should be done about Germany and her place in the postwar European economy.

I believe the American people will have many reasons to be sadly disappointed with the report Mr. Hoover submitted to them. For the report disregards American interests and security, and is neither impartial nor fair, nor does it attempt to make a decent analysis of the true German economy as it really was in 1936—the year Mr. Hoover wants us to use as a guidepost for the future. Since Mr. Hoover selected 1936, and since in his report he calls all the measures intended to control the German economy fallacies, it behooves us to point out a few of his own fallacies.

It is beginning to be more and more apparent that we never learn anything. We do not learn from history; we do not learn from experience; and it is sad to say that we often cannot learn from our so-called national leaders.

From history we should have learned that there can be no security from German aggression until Germany is made a peaceful nation and without power to wage war. The Versailles Treaty should have taught us that Germany's aggression has an economic foundation. This fact was not recognized after World War I, and all our efforts were concentrated on controlling Germany's military aspirations. In 1919, the Allies imposed some prohibition on the production of military goods; they imposed limitations on the size of the army and navy, but they forgot to impose the only restrictions that count—the restrictions over Germany's industrial production and, in general, over her national economy.

But if we forgot the most essential controls, the Germans did not. Anxious to learn their lesson in order to make good the mistakes that led them to defeat in World War I, they proceeded to study the causes of their debacle. As early as 1923, the Germans had already developed their economic general staff. British Gen. J. H. Morgan of the Allied Disarmament Commission watched them in the middle twenties preparing for World War II. He reported his findings but nobody wanted to study them. From him, as well as from other sources, we learned that the Germans promoted the latest technique, knowledge, and research of synthetic and other methods of production in order to give the new Germany the industrial potential she needed to conquer Europe. Nor did the Germans overlook anything in order to procure the working capital needed for the expansion of their industrial plants. Germany was badly in need of money. This she obtained when the western powers were only too eager to get rid of their postwar savings. Indeed, they almost begged Germany to accept their investments. The reason advanced to the people was that Germany needed the foreign money in order to enable her to pay her reparations.

When Germany claimed that she could not pay reparations unless she was allowed to sell abroad her increased industrial products, Germany's neighbors fell into this trap and thus were economically weakened.

When German industrialists complained of too much competition from her neighbors—that is when Germany began flooding Europe with her increased industrial output—her neighbors complied with Germany's wishes by entering into cartel agreements which enabled Germany to manipulate Europe's foreign trade. The result of these cartel activities was that Germany's war potential was built up. Still, nobody complained about it. Nor did anybody complain when it was found out that Germany used deliberate ruses in order to entice her erstwhile enemies. Germany's foreign cartel partners said nothing about these ruses even when they discovered them. Even now the people hardly realize what these ruses meant. In the case of steel, for instance, in order to induce her erstwhile enemies, France and Belgium, into joining them in forming the international steel cartel, the Germans deliberately asked for a smaller quota of steel than Germany could easily produce. Immediately after the establishment of the cartel, the Germans proceeded to manufacture much more than their quota, paid the stipulated fines, but succeeded thus in becoming the dominating partner of the cartels. Thanks to this deception, the Germans soon succeeded in controlling Europe's entire steel and coal production. By virtue of these agreements, not only did Germany obtain the power over the economic life of Europe, but by exploiting to the limits many cartel devices, she was in a position to obtain direct access to military developments abroad. And thanks to the cartel system also, Germany was able to maintain an intelligence service which the best spy system could not procure for her.

GERMANY'S INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION

The industrial development so auspiciously begun under the Republic was perfected under the Nazis. The foreign-trade manipulations for the purpose of giving Germany power to wage war and for the specific aim of weakening her neighbors and prospective victims reached tremendous proportions in the thirties. Her industrial potential reached a new high; she became the most powerful industrial nation in Europe prior to World War II. Some of the basic plants built or enlarged in the twenties, thanks to the farsightedness of the German industrial leaders and the general staff and thanks to the huge loans granted by the democratic nations, were found to be small in the thirties.

As the crescendo of industrial production mounted, the Germans suddenly discovered that the coal mines were not sufficiently mechanized to meet the labor shortages. They began to realize that the demands for coal-tar derivatives had been underestimated; as a result more ovens and distillation plants were built. As the growing importance of her aerial warfare became apparent, the Germans realized that the aluminum production as originally planned was too small. Germany's aluminum production was pushed to the extreme and became second to none.

The development of Germany's industries could not be arrested in the thirties. Each unanticipated expansion of one industry put new burdens on other industries on which it was based. Thus a large aluminum output called for more electric power, and the new electric power in turn called for a greater coal output. This was also the case with magnesium, when that metal was found to be of strategic importance.

Indeed, the thirties were unsurpassed insofar as they pertain to the expansion of Germany's industries. For instance, the development of synthetic oil was deliberately held down in the twenties because of its high costs. In 1935, oil production reached 300,000,000 tons, and by 1939 it was 1,500,000,000 tons.

When we speak about Germany's development of her industrial production, we mean in the first place, Germany's heavy industry, and by heavy industry we mean her war potential, her ships, her transports, her arms, her ammunitions, her tanks, and the metals necessary to expand the industrial capacity to produce and to service them. In order to accomplish the program the original German planners had in mind, it was necessary to build a powerful iron and steel industry. The iron and steel industry is essentially the best yardstick to measure a nation's ability to wage a successful war. This can best be illustrated by

casting a glance at the increase in production of pig iron. Between 1933–38, Germany's pig iron production was increased 350 percent, while ingot steel output tripled during the same time.

An increase of such magnitude requires capital. The best way to illustrate what Germany did in the thirties is to show where her money was spent. Official records available show that between 1933–36 Germany spent most of her income on the development of her capital goods or heavy industry. In 3 years after Hitler seized power, Germany's new investment in heavy industry was increased almost 500 percent while it increased only 200 percent in the consumer goods industry. Thus, in 1933 the amount of new investments in heavy industry was 309,000,000 marks and in 1936 it was 1,593,000,000 marks. In the consumer goods division the increase during the same year was from two hundred and forty-eight to four hundred and ninety-one million marks.

These figures are extremely important and must always be kept in mind in discussing Germany's economy as it was known in the thirties. These figures clearly show that German economy before the war was deliberately planned to give Germany the mastery over Europe—war or no war.

The following economic realities indicate the magnitude of Germany's prewar conquest.

In 1936, with less than 10 percent of the area and 20 percent of the population of Europe, Germany accounted for one-half and in some cases much more than one-half of the total European production of heavy industries that furnished her war potential—coal, pig iron, steel, nitrogen compound, machine tools, and machinery. In other categories such as cement, sulfuric acid, electric energy, cotton and wool yarn, and paper, more than one-third of the European production was concentrated in Germany.

Already in 1936 it was clear that no European power was in a position to withstand Germany's economic pressure. The regular trade practices of Europe were upset by Germany's machinations and dumping. No nation could oppose Germany's ruthless trade practices. In the fields of heavy machinery, machine tool industries, and aluminum, Europe became subservient and dependent upon Germany for supplies. The total result was that Europe's trade and commerce were not in a position to prosper.

WHAT MR. HOOVER SHOULD KNOW

Such, in brief, was the picture of Europe's economics in 1936. Historical data pertaining to Germany's ulterior motives are available. Brig. Gen. J. H. Morgan described Germany's ulterior motives as far back as the twenties in his recent book, Assize of Arms.

All European businessmen and financiers have, at one time or other, had to suffer from Germany's methods of trading. American businessmen who had dealings with Germany and Europe in the middle thirties are only too well acquainted with Germany's practices.

The American chemical industry knows from sad experience how eager the German chemical industry—and especially the infamous I. G. Farben—were to allow the development of the chemical industry in the United States prior to and subsequent to World War I. The European victims of Germany in World War II know full well what Germany's economic domination meant to them between 1939–45.

One would naturally have assumed that Mr. Herbert Hoover, although fate was kind enough to bring him into this world in the United States, thus sparing him the indignity of living under German domination, would have also learned the fundamentals of European economics, even as any fair-minded economist or historian.

Mr. Hoover was spared the horrors of living in a Nazi hell during World War II, but he has visited Europe many times. He has just returned from a special mission to Germany and has written a report to the President in which he states that he has exhaustively examined Germany's heavy industry and plants. On the basis of his analysis, Mr. Hoover claims that Germany should be allowed the full development of her heavy industries, and he chose 1936 to illustrate what Germany could do for Europe.

I do not know what titles Mr. Hoover has to show that he is an expert on German economics. If he is entitled to give all sorts of advices to the American people, the most elementary ethics would require that he tell the American people the most elementary facts about Germany—namely, that the German economy was a war economy. This was not expecting too much, since the people are entitled to know the significance of Mr. Hoover's recommendations in terms of our security and the peace of the world. Mr. Hoover should have shown the American people what Germany's economic domination of Europe in 1936 meant to the world at large in terms of blood, sweat, and tears and also what it would mean in the future if Germany were to be allowed to go back to 1936.

GERMANY'S WAR POTENTIAL

One was entitled to expect Mr. Hoover, who only a few months ago personally inspected the existing German plants—some slightly damaged but mostly intact and ready to dominate and enslave Europe again—to tell the American people that Germany is only militarily defeated, but that her economy is only temporarily at a standstill. After all, he knows and can reveal that the base of German aggression—the base which it built up over the last 25 years and which enabled her to nearly conquer the world—is virtually untouched. To take the case of machine tools, Mr. Hoover, as an outstanding engineer, surely was best qualified to tell the people that before the war Germany, with a population only one-half as large as that of the United States and with an economy not as highly mechanized as that of the United States, had a machine-tool, machinery, and machine-building capacity larger than that of the United States. Since Mr. Hoover studied German industry in 1947, did he not see for himself that Germany, after losing the war, still possesses over 4,000,000 tons of undamaged machine tools? Why did he not tell the American people that the existing German machine-tool industry is decidedly a menace to the peace of the world?

Apparently, Mr. Hoover is not perturbed about the tremendous machine-tool industry. Not only does he not mention its existence, not only does he not make any comparisons between German's available machine tools of 1936 and that of 1947, but he has nothing to say about making use of these machine tools as reparations. On the contrary, he makes the flat recommendation that no installations be removed for reparations. Since Mr. Hoover has certainly heard of the pathetic demands of the Inter-Allied Reparations Agency at Brussels, he apparently is satisfied that the 18 nations clamoring for machine tools are not entitled to any consideration.

Mr. Hoover speaks of 1936 as the year which enabled Germany to supply the world with the necessary products, but he does not tell of the tremendous increase of Germany's steel capacity between 1933–36. We believe the American people are entitled to get a concise analysis from Mr. Hoover dealing not only with the steel industry but with other phases of Germany's future ability to wage war as well. Mr. Hoover, therefore, should have dwelled on the present-day industrial capacity, technological and scientific organization, economic assets owned outside Germany and the nature of German's highly integrated economy which makes Germany today still a potential threat to the safety of the world.

Mr. Hoover is rightly concerned about Germany's ability to make a living. But speaking about Germany's ability to export, Mr. Hoover sees only two alternatives: either Germany exports the products of the light industry or the heavy industry. Mr. Hoover dismisses light industry because the products of the light industry would compete with those of Britain in which case Britain's economic situation would further deteriorate, and this in turn would call for an additional loan from us. Consequently, Mr. Hoover is in favor of Germany's exporting the products of her heavy industry.

AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

Mr. Hoover does not attempt to show the economic consequences involved in his recommendations to make Germany's heavy industries work for Europe. Does Mr. Hoover not know that sheet steel, strip steel, rolled steel, railroad equipment, machines, dynamos, can be produced in Belgium, France, Czechoslovakia, Britain, and so forth? If it is true that Germany's light industry can be a menace to Europe, as Mr. Hoover fears, the menace of Germany's heavy industry can be infinitely greater. For it is obvious that the non-German heavy industries will be penalized in order to allow the German heavy industry to work full blast. A stagnant heavy industry in Western Europe will retard the development of Germany's victims. Their entire economy will be affected, unemployment will increase and their

currency will deteriorate still further. In order to stave off hunger and political bankruptcy, these nations will turn for additional loans to the United States, thus nullifying Mr. Hoover's efforts to alleviate the harassed taxpayer.

Mr. Hoover's logic is difficult to follow, indeed. The European nations have suffered because before the war their economy was allowed to be dominated by Germany. They have suffered from the domination of German heavy industry; they bled, fought, and finally were freed from the German nightmare with the promise they will have "freedom from fear." Surely the Allies did not mean that after the war the victims of Germany would be asked to submit their entire economic life to the will of the very same leaders of the German heavy industry. True, Mr. Hoover himself did not promise Europe "freedom from fear," but it is difficult to see how his humanitarianism can allow him to make such an uncharitable recommendation. And what makes this recommendation more ominous in his answer to the all-important problem of control over the German war potential, with the simple statement: "And twoscore of intelligent men could see that there is no arms production and that no industry is manufacturing or storing material for evil purposes."

Mr. Hoover refuses to learn anything from history, from economics, and from the deeds of the German heavy industry. A most casual glance at Germany's economic activities of the thirties could easily convince him that it was not only the arms and ammunitions the Germans stored that paralyzed Germany's victims, but German machine shops, steel capacity, and, above all, German domination of her neighbor's machines, technique, and economy.

HOOVER IGNORES THE COAL PROBLEM

Mr. Hoover was sent to Germany as an expert on economics, yet he does not mention coal as a commodity which Germany has in abundance and which she can produce and export in considerable quantities. Mr. Hoover, after all, as an engineer knows that before the war Germany used to export tremendous quantities of coal and coke to Europe. Since Mr. Hoover chose 1936 as a yardstick, it is only fair to point out that that year over 50 percent of Europe's metallurgical coke orginated in Germany. Therefore, Mr. Hoover surely must know that Germany, in those days, had enough coke to smelt the metal for its own war machine and had enough left over to supply a large proportion of the fuel needed to operate Europe's furnaces. When the German war machine needed more coke, this was provided without difficulty, as can be seen from the tremendous increase in production of metallurgical coke between 1933 and 1938. German statistics show that in 1933 Germany produced 21,200,000 tons of coke, whereas in 1938, her production had more than doubled and amounted to 43,500,000 tons.

Surely Mr. Hoover, in his exhaustive studies of Germany's economics, is aware of the fact that in order to prepare her war machine, Germany used tremendous quantities of coal in her steel, power-generating industries and as a basis for production of heavy chemicals, synthetic oil, plastics, and so forth.

Mr. Hoover also knows that coke-oven byproducts were extensively used in the German coal-tar-dye industry, explosives, plastics, poison gases, and so forth.

Moreover, Mr. Hoover knows that Germany's peacetime economy cannot possibly consume the tremendous prewar coal production. For instance, during World War II, synthetic oil and synthetic rubber based on domestic Geman coal, effectively replaced imports of rubber and oil. In many instances, coal served as a raw material for ersatz products and became of increasing importance in the German industrial self-sufficiency. Obviously, a peaceful Germany would not need to consume her coal for purposes of making these synthetics.

Does Mr. Hoover realize what he is asking the American people to underwrite when he says:

> The Anglo-American zones should abandon the destruction of plants, the transfer of plants for reparations, and the level-of-industry concept and start every plant—the heavy as well as the light.

NAZIS STILL IN CHARGE

Perhaps Mr. Hoover, when he made his exhaustive study of Germany's heavy industries, did not have the time to see how useful the Germans have been to Europe, when they got the power. At any rate, Mr. Hoover knows that the German Bizonal Economic Committee was given authority over economic matters January 1, 1947. In the Ruhr the Germans have had their way for quite a while now. They have been running the plants, controlling and supervising the coal production, and for all practical purposes, have been doing as they pleased. Some of the most important German industrialists with the worst Nazi records have been placed again in charge of their plants and mines. The notorious Nazi, H. Dinkelbach, is again the head of the whole steel industry; the Hitler supporter, Poensgen, is again head of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke; the Zangens Rasch, Abs, Hugenbergs, Vits, and other high Nazi profiteers are again in charge of their businesses. But Europe has not been getting the products of the Ruhr. Mr. Raymond Daniell was in Germany at the time Mr. Hoover was studying very hard. Describing the general bad faith of the Germans as he saw it, he had this to say, March 30, in the New York Times:

> In this atmosphere it is only natural that blackmail, bribery, and chicanery of various sorts have become weapons of patriotic resistance. There is no open sabotage, but thefts of coal on a large scale, black-market dealings in the produce of the Ruhr factories and holding back farm produce—all are on the increase. The Germans are still using coal and factory products of the Ruhr to soften the peace.

Would Mr. Hoover be kind enough to explain how he would supervise the activities of Messrs. Zangen, Dinkelbach, Hugenberg, and so forth, and what methods does he envisage to see to it that the Germans do supply the coal and other raw materials to their former victims and neighbors? The implication of the recommendation Mr. Hoover advocates is that Germany should be granted full use of her coal for the production of her prewar steel and power industries, heavy chemicals, synthetic oil, plastics, and so forth.

One would have expected Mr. Hoover to inform the American people that, in the past, Germany's domination of the European economy was based on Germany's hard coal. By the same token, one would have expected Mr. Hoover to enlighten the people by telling them that over 80 percent of Germany's hard coal production is concentrated in the western area of Germany now under the control of the British and French authorities. The coal production figures for these regions at the end of World War II are as follows:

	Percent
Ruhr	69.2
Aachen	4.2
Saar	7.2

COAL AND THE AMERICAN TAXPAYER

Mr. Hoover knows full well that in 1933, Germany produced only about 109,000,000 tons of hard coal. He also knows that in 1938, under the stimulus of Hitler's 4-year war plan, production of hard coal rose to about 185,000,000 tons.

When Mr. Hoover advocates the full exploitation of every heavy and light German plant, he also advocates Germany's use of all the coal produced in Germany. If this policy is implemented, it would mean thwarting the recovery of Europe. Or, translated into American terms, the longer Germany postpones the delivery of coal to Europe, the less able will Europe be to recover and the more money the American taxpayer will have to spend in order to sustain Europe.

Mr. Hoover, as a close student of European politics, also knows that when he speaks of German heavy industry, he means the Ruhr and Rhine. Further, having studied Germany as he said he did, he knows that Germany's war potential is located in the Ruhr and Rhine. This, notwithstanding, in his lengthy report to the President, he does not have one single word to say about the control, either political or economic, of the Ruhr and Rhine and, indeed, he expressly stipulates that "German industry must be operated by Germans themselves if she is to serve all nations equally."

Since Mr. Hoover does not mention it, presumably he does not want to impose any controls over the Ruhr and Rhine. However, as an expert economist, he knows that Germany has dominated the European economy by cartelizing the heavy industry which, in the first place, meant the steel and coal industries of the Ruhr and Rhine.

HOW GERMANY DOMINATED EUROPE

How did the German heavy industry always use its power? Again I take up the year 1936 which Mr. Hoover takes as a yardstick. The greatest service he can render the American people and humanity at large, is to tell what Germany did in those days. When Germany wanted to enslave the economy of a neighbor, she withheld steel and coal from him and this placed Germany in a

position to dominate her neighbor's politics, thinking, economy, and, indeed, her entire life. When Mr. Hoover asks for the complete development of Germany's heavy industries and when he insists that these industries be left exclusively in German hands, he places the entire European economy in jeopardy again, because the net effect of his recommendation is going to be that the German cartels will continue to dominate Europe and to prepare for World War III. For Mr. Hoover's information, the international steel cartel dominated by Germany's heavy industry is still functioning in Luxemburg.

None of the above-mentioned facts were explained by Mr. Hoover in his report of March 24 to President Truman. What is more, when Mr. Hoover deliberately glossed over the paramount importance of Germany's exports of coal to Europe, he withheld the most important fact the people must know, namely, that coal is deliberately being withheld from Europe in order to lead America to believe that the only possible recovery for Europe lies in Germany's development of her own heavy industry.

Mr. Hoover has this to say about Europe's recovery:

> If Germany's heavy industry is allowed to function she has an ability to export and would become an asset to Europe's recovery.

It is rather significant that Mr. Hoover forgot the most important element essential to Europe's recovery—export of coal from Germany.

Had Mr. Hoover shown the slightest deference to the economic realities of Europe, he would have pointed out that although Germany in 1936 succeeded in becoming the most important economic power in Europe, she still found enough coal and coke to supply her neighbors with the following quantities:

	Tons
France	10,078,000
Belgium and Luxemburg	9,929,000
Italy	8,143,000
Netherlands	7,566,000

Czechoslovakia, Sweden, Denmark, Greece, and other countries were also able to obtain their share of coal from Germany.

WHY NOT COAL FOR FOOD?

Germany's average prewar yearly export of hard coal was about 30,000,000 tons of coal. At present, Europe's recovery requires 100,000,000 tons a year. Allowing for the present state of the rolling stock and other difficulties, it is only fair to assume that in the near future Germany could export 50,000,000 tons of hard coal to Europe.

At the prevailing prices, an export of 50,000,000 tons of coal to Europe can provide Germany with $1,000,000,000 revenue which would enable her to import the necessary foodstuffs and would thus materially help the American and British taxpayers.

This, Mr. Hoover did not mention. Nor did he mention the fact that for the past year every effort is being made by the British authorities to retain the maximum coal for the use of the German industries. Or, to quote General Erskine, in November 1946 Deputy Military Governor of the British zone, "The necessity for stimulating moribund German industries through the utilization within western Germany of hard coal mined there, led to the decision."—To stop the export of coal to Germany's victims.

Mr. Hoover does not explain nor even mention General Erskine's unilateral decision to punish the industries of France, Belgium, Holland, and Luxemburg. And yet in his capacity as an economist, humanitarian, and statesman, he knows full well that unless France obtains about 20,000,000 tons of coal she cannot rebuild her own industry and that the inevitable consequences will be that she will have to fall back upon new American help. Not only does Mr. Hoover not say anything about these economic consequences, but he does not even mention the Saar. But even assuming that France obtains the coal supply from the Saar, she cannot fully exploit her iron ore deposits in Lorraine. If France cannot use her iron ore from Lorraine and cannot obtain the coal from the Ruhr, she will have to send her ore to the German Ruhr—exactly as was the case in the thirties. This means that although Germany lost the military war for the second time during this century, she won her industrial war.

IF GERMANY WINS

And what will be the consequences of Germany's winning her industrial war? Mr. Hoover's aversion to communism need not be stressed here. Nor for that matter need we stress ours. It is essential, however, to exploit further the political consequences of Mr. Hoover's recommendations to rebuild Germany's heavy industry.

The Communist parties in France and Italy, forgetting for a moment those of the smaller western nations, are very powerful and have shown a remarkable ability to exploit the faulty thinking of some western European and American statesmen. They have succeeded so far in becoming powerful because they know how to exploit the trials and tribulations of the peoples of their respective countries. The longer plants are idle because of the lack of supplies from Germany, the greater the misery and want, and the more Frenchmen and Italians can be converted to communism.

It is clear, therefore, that Mr. Hoover does not seem to be worried about the plight of the industries in western Europe, nor about the workers who may be pushed farther left, which Mr. Hoover certainly cannot be said to desire. Since coal will have to be found somehow, it could come from Upper Silesia. The question is, How much? One of the important economic factors leading to the scuttling of the Versailles Treaty was the competition between Upper Silesia and British coal. The British antiquated coal industry, after World War I, found it very difficult to compete with the coal coming from the more modernized Upper Silesian coal mines. In those days, the Poles were able to sell their coal at lower rates to France and Italy, despite the long sea journey and the long haul from Katowice to Gdynia. That is one of the reasons why, during the period between the two wars, neither the Polish Government nor its coal were popular with the British politicians.

Things have changed greatly since those times. Today, and until the British economic crisis is over, Britain would presumably not mind seeing Polish coal in western Europe. It would take Poland some time before she is able to husband her rolling stock and overcome the transportation difficulties generally prevailing in Europe. It will also take her time to increase her coal output to meet some of the heavier demands. Then, too, the deliveries will most certainly be subject to the prevailing political conditions. The political times being what they are, coal has become one of the most important "political" raw materials of the postwar world. This being the case, both the east and the west can play the same game. So long as the Hoover philosophy prevails and coal is withheld from western Europe in order to rebuild Germany again, Poland and eastern Europe can afford to wait and bide their time. This new economic and political power play can easily be based upon coal—Polish coal—even as the Anglo-American economic play is based upon the oil in the Middle East.

Western Europe lost heavily when the Germans were allowed to dominate the European economy in the thirties. It is bankrupt now because of it. And we also know that one does not cure a poisoned patient by giving him the same dose of arsenic. Nor does one cure the patient by giving him a substitute, but equally man-killing, arsenic.

Common sense suggests that so long as the policies of Mr. Hoover and those of like mind in the United States and Britain continue to be implemented, the industrial future and the democratic institutions of the nations which have been on our side in the recently concluded struggle are in jeopardy.

If communism has been able to recruit so many new supporters in western Europe, it was not only due to the fact that unemployed workers cannot be satisfied with Mr. Hoover's rugged individualism, but also because they cannot understand why they should be freezing and starving, so that the empires of Stinnes, Krupp, and Thyssen may be rebuilt.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I wish to present a very timely article written by Dr. Jean Pajus that appeared in the magazine To Prevent World War III. Dr. Jean Pajus is a former adviser to FEA in Washington, and to the Division of Cartels and External Assets in Berlin.

GERMANY—TWO YEARS LATER

(By Jean Pajus)

Germany surrendered on May 8, 1945. She capitulated because she was utterly bankrupt—militarily, physically and morally. No nation in modern times has succumbed in greater universal condemnation than Germany and no end of hostilities engendered so much hope in the hearts of men.

To many people, Germany was no longer a problem. Although they were more concerned with the dramatic sweep of events

than with the realities of life, these observers were ready to agree that certain measures were necessary to assure the final and definitive peace for the world. In general, most people were in favor of some measures against a possible revival of a bellicose Germany.

Two years ago, after 5 years of war, the peoples of the world were aware that peace must be built upon a firm foundation, that security from German aggression cannot be maintained without education, good will, and with the proper economic and industrial safeguards. They have had ample opportunities to see how Germany prepared her war by marshaling her economic power and how she succeeded in controlling occupied Europe not with bayonets alone, but with economic controls. One may also add that these thoughts were not the product of hatred or revenge, nor was it the product of the school of hard or soft peace; the people's desires were for a peace rooted in common sense.

WHAT WE EXPECTED

Specifically, the peoples wanted to see a new Germany, a Germany free of the traditional German authoritarian, militaristic, and ultra-nationalistic ideals which, in the past, have proved the bane of existence for Europe and the world. The world was tired of fighting and tired of the perennial Germany which knew only how to incarnate the pernicious spirit of evil. The peoples of the world may not have a great sense of history, but they knew what Germany had done to them.

The peoples of the world sincerely believed that the Allies, having suffered horribly for 5 years, had finally learned their lesson. The world was entitled to expect the victors to teach the vanquished how to live by showing them their own sincerity and good faith and, above all, introduce into Germany democratic economic and political principles needed to make a new start.

The Allies were entitled to demand reconstruction of the devastated territories, and they expected that the German economy would be placed at the service of Europe. They were also entitled to obtain reparations, restitution of stolen goods, and reconstruction of their devastated plants.

The peoples of the world wanted and were entitled to be given permanent safeguards against German renewed aggression. This meant not only nominal disarmament of the German military forces or destruction of a few military installations, but permanent Allied control of Germany's industrial war potential.

The peoples of the world wanted and were entitled to obtain guarantees that the German economy, equipped as it has always been to wage war, would henceforth contribute her share to the peaceful development of Europe; that she would never again be permitted to disturb the regular commercial practices by resorting to the use of dishonest devices in the field of commerce and industry, as in the past.

The peoples of the world were given assurances during the war that their wishes would be met. Solemn pacts were entered into. There was Yalta, there was Potsdam, and there were innumerable pledges by all the allied statesmen at Moscow, at London, and at Paris.

No time in history has witnessed a greater failure and bankruptcy of pledges and hopes than the past 2 years. The failure is the more tragic, because the peoples of the world have never been told the extent of the violations of the pledges; thus they are not in a position to assess the damage done to their future security. What is more, the people still do not realize that they have been told deliberate falsehoods usually cloaked under cover of mutual recriminations thrown by the erstwhile Allies against each other.

Two years after our victory, the world is witnessing the most unusual spectacle: Defeated Germany is enjoying the enviable position of being able to choose between two blocs. Germany, who cannot even be asked anything officially, is in a position to make her weight felt. Despite her plight, she is coveted and courted as no other nation. Germany knows it and she can again impose her conditions.

The new Germany has not materialized. The masses of the German people are today, less than ever, amenable to accept the principles of a democratic society. The German people at large, feel no responsibility for their crimes, nor do they feel responsible for the destruction of Germany itself.

Justice Jackson put his finger on the spot when he said in April 1947, "No people has a stronger will to survive and dominate than have the Germans. And Hitler's dual policy of multiplying the Germans and biologically weakening or exterminating their rivals will reach its consummation in a generation." This was the conclusion Justice Jackson reached after listening to the evidence presented at the trial of the war criminals at Nuremberg.

Gen. Lucius D. Clay has not seen any change of heart on the part of the German people. "The military government," he said, "cannot in full conscience restore the self-responsibility of government to the German people, who have not shown that they are willing to denazify their public life."

Meanwhile, we are losing ground day by day. The prewar traditional autocratic forces we had hoped to eliminate are inching back into positions of power and profit. So long as these traditional German forces are not eliminated, it is impossible to speak of a spiritual regeneration of the German people.

The forces that led the world to disaster are again in charge of business and political administration. The real democratic elements of the German people are rather small and they were never given a chance. They are dismayed because they were not invited to make their contribution to the rebuilding of the new Germany and they stand aghast when they see the results of the so-called democratization of Germany's public life. Having watched the activities of the Nazis in power, they are appalled when they discover that the German denazification courts were only able to find that Baden had 2 percent, Hessen 9 percent, and Bavaria 8 percent of unworthy officials.

These democratic elements in Germany were told by Justice Jackson last year, that there were 2,000,000 active criminals in German organizations. Moreover, they knew that in 1933 there were 17,000,000 Nazi votes.

GERMANY'S MIND TODAY

Germany cannot make her spiritual revolution so long as the traditional enemies of democracy are allowed to continue their work. These enemies of Germany's spiritual revolution were cleared by the German denazification courts because they were able to convince the judges that at one time they were regular church-goers, or showed courage during air raids, or were able to show that they have lost members of their families during air raids, or that they have lost property during the war, or have extended protection to persecuted minorities.

Nobody in his right mind will want to question charity nor deny fair play to the Germans, but the results obtained by the Germans in their efforts to undergo a spiritual change, clearly show that the Germans themselves have not made an attempt to recast their thinking and attitude toward those who led the world to disaster.

Yet one hesitates to condemn too severely the Germans for their failures of the past 2 years. The outside world always knew that the Germans never had the proper leadership nor training in democracy. That is why the world expected the Allies to show them how democracy works. The Allies have failed. The sort of lessons we have shown the Germans in democracy the past 2 years can be gathered from our experiences in Bavaria. When it was pointed out to our political adviser, Dr. Walter Dorn, that in Bavaria 62 to 80 percent of the verdicts of the German spruchkammer, or denazification courts, were erroneous and that this was openly admitted by the Bavarian President Minister himself, Dr. Dorn replied: "Be careful. He is an old-line reactionary and a strong nationalist. If you offend him, he might resign."

The question is how can we expect the Germans to learn democracy if we appoint reactionary and nationalist politicians, and if we refuse to teach them what we mean by democracy?

Can we blame the Germans for their shortcomings, when the spectacle they see is not very edifying—to say the least. The Germans see tremendous power enjoyed and exercised by German magnates, industrialists, bankers, and spoliators of occupied territories, high officials who have contributed their share to the seizure of power by Hitler, and by others who helped to bring about World War II. The Germans find key positions, held by administrators in towns, districts, laender and on the bi-zonal level—men who now claim to be servants of liberty, but who, in reality, owe their positions to the prominent roles they played under Hitler. The same phenomenon can be observed in all four zones. In the Russian zone, leading Nazis suddenly become members of the Socialist Unity Party and collaborate with the Communists. In the western zone the Germans see millions of Nazis suddenly denazified without trial or benefit of hearing, as was the case last Christmas.

OUR ADMINISTRATION

Two years after Germany's defeat, we are forced to admit that the real tragedy of our occupation of Germany lies in the psychological attitude of the military government or rather in the lack of the proper psychological attitude toward Germany. We have shown so far misunderstanding, ignorance and lack of good faith, which in the long run is bound to cost us the victory. We have placed our dearly won victory in unsteady hands, we have selected officials without qualifications, some intellectually dishonest or incapable, others who are indifferent, still others who are realists, and what is more tragic, we have appointed officials who for years had strong economic and other ties with the real rulers of Germany.

What the allied administrators are doing in Germany is carefully noted by the average German. Their association with the former German leaders does not escape him and the common man cannot help but wonder—weren't the former leaders indicted along with the 22 war criminals at Nuremberg? Seeing his former leaders in the company of high Allied officials, the average German is led to believe that Nuremberg could not have meant what it said.

The average German, after listening for months to the testimony of Schacht and Von Papen, could no longer claim that he was not informed of the crimes committed by his erstwhile economic and financial masters. He was convinced that Schacht and Von Papen could never escape. What did he think when he heard the verdict from the highest Allied tribunal that Schacht and Von Papen were not guilty? Accustomed as he was to cynicism in Nazi high places, he could not help but reason that the Allies can show cynicism of their own. He naturally arrived at the conclusion that these two leaders of the Nazi regime had friends in high

places among the Allies who did not want to convict the real criminals of Germany—the bankers and industrialists. The same German could not help but think that the real masters of prewar Germany were right, because deep down in his own heart he knew that at Nuremberg only the accomplices of Germany's crimes were convicted and that the real culprits were deliberately allowed to escape into the international never-never of intrigue and politics. Moreover, the average German learned that the real spirit of prewar Germany was left intact because at Nuremberg only the crude and indecent side of Germany's nature—the Nazi side—was punished by the highest Allied tribunal.

ORGY OF NATIONALISM

The repercussions of the Allied failures have made themselves fully felt in many manifestations of a new truculent nationalism. This nationalism encompasses the whole political life of Germany. Everyone is a nationalist now. Even the Communists are enraged nationalists and they are fighting for the prewar integrity of the German territory; they are violently opposed to any cession of territory to Germany's neighbors. They are fighting against France's demands for the coal resources of the Saar. The Socialists, under the leadership of Kurt Schumacher, who was properly coached and trained in Britain, speak the nationalist language used by the Socialists after World War I; in their chauvinistic anti-Polish outbursts they are more virulent than the worst Junkers in their "Drang nach Osten" days. The Christian Socialists, carefully nurtured by American politicians, have inherited the mantle of Von Papen and Breuning and speak for the center party. The Liberal Democrats—a strange name for such a party—have organized a strong movement which provides the real hide-out for all the Nazis and reactionaries. Their solicitude for the German refugees knows no bounds and their defense of the prewar German territories provides them with the real drug the German masses are willing to absorb.

This nationalistic orgy is a direct result of the policies pursued by the Allies and by their representatives in Germany. The average German is now convinced that his own prewar forces were right after all, since the occupying authorities themselves are practicing fraternization extensively and are continually pushing the autocratic and conservative forces to the forefront—politically and economically. The tragedy becomes appalling and hopeless when the British go so far as to order the German authorities to reinstate to former prominent positions outstanding leaders in industry found guilty of high crimes against humanity.

One wonders how the British will try from now on to educate the new Germany when they ordered the reinstatement of Dr. Wolf Witzleben, Johann Benkert, Bruno Pohlmann, all very high officials of the notorious Siemens Electrical Co., of Germany—the biggest trust in the field which for years has been dominating the electrical industry in Europe.

The Siemens Co. and the above-mentioned officials have been proven guilty of the following crimes: slave labor, atrocities against foreign workers in concentration camps, soliciting and obtaining the exclusive monopoly of operating the electrical equipment and instruments at Auschwitz and Buchenwald.

It was thanks to the tremendous power wielded by the Siemens Co. in Nazi Germany, and the excellent technical ability of their directors, that the best methods of exterminating 10,000 human beings every 24 hours were installed in the concentration camps. The German courts went through the evidence submitted and carefully sifted the affidavits supporting the evidence. The German people were duly told about the Witzleben, Benkert, Pohlmann roles in these atrocities and they were also told that there was no place in the new Germany for these officials. The verdict of the German courts was reversed by the British authorities and the German people were told that these three officials must be returned to power in the new Germany. This was the answer given the German workers who struck in protest against this iniquitous Allied verdict—the symbol of the new Germany.

THE NEW ANGLO-GERMAN FRIENDSHIP

Symbolic also, for both, the Allied world and the new Germany, was the report emanating from Germany at the same time that the General Electric Ltd. of London was negotiating for the purchase of a sizable block of shares of the Siemens Co., at the very same time the United States authorities were insisting on decartelizing the giant electrical trust. The meaning of these events is bound to make the proper impression on the average German; henceforth, he will know that there is a community of interest between big corporations of Germany and Britain, and that atrocities can be quickly forgotten and forgiven provided a satisfactory financial arrangement can be made between British and German interests.

While it is difficult enough to explain the doings of the military government to the Germans, it is well-nigh impossible to gage the consternation of the allied world which expected a new concept of justice to be applied to Germany.

During the final phase of the war, the democratic forces in Britain were given to understand by the Churchill Government that their sufferings were not in vain. The British people were told that justice would be meted out to the German criminals. A few months later, after the Germans surrendered, the labor government was swept into power and this time the British people breathed easier for they were sure that the people's government, not having any economic or financial tie-ups with the prewar German forces, would certainly see to it that the forces of evil would be eliminated from Germany. As good Britons they expected British justice to be set up as a model for the Germans themselves. The peoples of the world may not know too much about the relations between General Electric Ltd., and Siemens and its gas-chamber experts, but they do know that the tremendous war potential accumulated by the great German combines, must be destroyed. They have heard enough of the Goering, Werke, Bosch, I. G. Farben and others to know that peace will never be secure unless the war equipment built up by the German heavy industry is destroyed. Two years after Germany surrendered, the people are being told that in the British zone the most heavily industrialized of all—only 7 percent of the tank, aircraft, artillery, and other factories termed dangerous by the allied experts, have been dismantled. This is not what the people of Britain had hoped for. Nor did they expect that after 2 years of waiting, 18 nations, victims of German aggression, would receive only 6 factories from the western zone as reparations out of 1,557 plants earmarked for removal.

Nor, for that matter, will the people of Britain understand—if they are ever told about it—why Britain is keeping intact steel plants in Germany with a staggering total capacity of over 18,000,000 tons, whereas Britain's total capacity is in the neighborhood of 15,000,000 tons per year, and Germany's pre-Hitler domestic needs amounts only to 4,000,000 tons.

DEMONOPOLIZING GERMANY?

For almost 2 years now the British Labor Government has been telling the world that the British people did not like the German monopolists any more than the rest of the world. Yet, in occupied Germany, each time the British authorities were asked by the American authorities when they would finally agree to implement article XII of the Potsdam Agreement calling for the elimination of excessive economic power from Germany, the reply invariably was that Britain is all in favor of a socialized economy and against private monopolies. As proof of their intentions, the British officials would invariably advance the record of nationalization of vital segments of their own economy in Britain. Moreover, the British authorities would extol the greatness of their plans to place the natural resources of Germany at the service of the people rather than leave them to the industrial magnates who led Germany to disaster. For 2 years, the British have been calling their plan socialization rather than nationalization. The purpose, they claimed, was to eliminate the power of the German industrialists. These good intentions have never been kept. Nor were any of the broad concepts dealing with the economic controls of Germany ever kept in the British zone. The answer is not difficult to find: Britain never really wanted to socialize the German industry. This attitude is common to both the conservatives and labor parties, because neither is anxious to forego the dividends from British investments in the Ruhr. This is also the major reason for the British hostility to the idea of internationalizing the Ruhr and other economic safeguards against renewed German aggression.

Instead of decentralizing the economy of the Ruhr, the British have tended more and more to concentrate the economic power there. Nowhere else is the British attitude better shown than in the flat refusal to do away with the past abuses perpetrated by the German industries and their activities in international cartels. The formula calling for the elimination of the abuses was simplicity itself and had the added attraction of not requiring an elaborate international machinery to enforce it. The formula merely stated that Germany must not be allowed to become a party to international cartel agreements. This, the British Government has flatly refused to accept. This refusal alone indicates the faith one can attach to the British policy of socialization of the German industry. Another characteristic of the British intention is their refusal to prohibit monopolistic practices in Germany.

After 2 years of Allied efforts to eliminate the greatest source of economic abuse known, the British have finally accepted the principle of decartelization, and have submitted a tentative list of cartels to be eventually decentralized. But the acceptance of the principle was accompanied with a whole string of stipulations, one of them being that the whole slate be subject to final approval by the zone commander. They further stipulated that the commander of the British zone must have final authority in determining the suitability of each particular German company and the method to be used in decartelizing the company. In other words, the problem of decentralizing the German industry will be left to the discretion of the British commander. Parenthetically, how bright the chances of decartelizing the German industry in the British zone are, can be gaged from the fact that the present commander, Gen. Sir Brian Robertson, has consistently opposed a law that would effectively break up German cartels in the British zone in accordance with the Potsdam Agreement. Other high officials are either connected with British cartels or are in sympathy with their aims.

VEREINIGTE STAHLWERKE EXCEPTED

The list submitted by the British to the American zone is the following:

Krupp, Goering, Flick, Haniel, Mannesmann, Klockner, Wolf, Ballestrem, Dagussa, Siemens & Halske, Ver. Industrie Unternehmungen, Ver. Elektriche Begwerks A. G., Eisleben, Chr. Dierig, Phrix, Feldmuhle Papier, Aschaffenburg, Carl Zeiss, Deutche Continental Gas Ges., Gunther Quandt.

For a start, the list is not too bad, but the irony of the situation is that the biggest steel combine in Europe and the second largest in the world, the Vereinigte Stahlwerke, is not even mentioned as a possible candidate for decentralization.

Is the omission of this steel combine purely accidental? One is inclined to believe that there must be a reason for this omission, since on September 4, 1946, the authorities of the British zone were asked to explain why Alfred Hugenberg, a former member of the Hitler cabinet, chairman of the board of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke, one of the most important industrialists and war profiteers who had contributed tremendously to the Nazi Party fund at the time when Hitler was desperate for money, one of the men who contributed tremendously to Hitler's coming to power, was not removed from the managing board of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke. The official British reply was "it takes a vote of the shareholders in the company to remove him as board chairman."

In plain language, the British refusal to remove one of the most important Nazis from the biggest steel combines means that:

(a) While the German state is dead, the Vereinigte Stahlwerke is still vested with sovereign power and can do no wrong, nor can it be punished for past crimes.

(b) The power of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke supersedes that of the Allied military government, which is specifically empowered to remove any German obstructing its administration.

(c) The denazification laws do not apply to the Vereinigte Stahlwerke.

Something must have happened during the month of December 1946 which would seem to indicate the greater weight which Hugenberg carries in the new Germany. That month, German trade-unions from the four zones met for the first time at Hanover, and overwhelmingly called upon the military government to apply the denazification laws in all Germany, especially in her heavy industry, and for elimination of the German monopolies. Instead of seriously considering these just demands, the United States authorities, for their part, saw fit to encourage the revival of the German National Industrial Aid Society—a trade-union movement which was heavily financed and sponsored by Alfred Hugenberg during the Republic. The new German trade unions are wondering why the legitimate demands of the trade-unions have not met with any success.

They have learned that ever since the times of Bismarck, and even before, the leaders of the German industry have followed the practice of associating themselves with powerful industrial organizations. These industrial associations have exerted tremendous influences on German economic and political policies regardless of the composition of the government in power. These industrial associations were behind the expansionist drives of the Kaiser as they were behind the Republic which has never made any attempt to interfere with the power of the heavy industries. Indeed, the economic history of the Weimar Republic is one of gigantic expansion of the biggest German trusts and monopolies. A casual glance at the origin of Vereinigte Stahlwerke and the I. G. Farben will be more than enlightening—it will provide a tragic drama.

The Nazis allowed the industrial associations to prosper because they were heavily indebted to them for their financial support. To compensate these industrialists, the Nazis made membership in their associations compulsory, changed their former names and introduced the principle of leadership into the operation of their associations. In most instances, however, the same men who had been elected representatives of industry prior to 1933 became the appointed leaders after Hitler's coming to power. Until '41, the top organizations in the most vital industry—coal—was the Wirtschaft Gruppe Bergbau. In the steel industry the top organizations had an official status, but the Reich Minister of Economics and other government agencies made use of them and their elaborate provincial organizations in putting into effect many of the economic controls required by the rearmament program and later by the war. In turn, these industrial organizations exerted great influence on the policy-making officials of the Nazi Government as to the nature of these controls and as to every step taken which affected their respective industries. In most instances, the leaders of the industry were high members of the Nazi party and especially appointed to implement the Nazi policies.

In 1941 a central top cartel was founded for every industry in Germany, largely through the efforts of Friedrich Flick, now being tried at Nuremberg. The first top cartel was in the coal industry. This top cartel acquired the absolute mastery of all other coal syndicates and many functions formerly exercised by the German Ministry of Economics were transferred to the top coal cartel. Although Flick and four of his closest associates are in custody, his other associates are still in charge of the coal cartel which is responsible for production of coal for the rehabilitation of Europe.

Flick, to be sure, is a very important criminal, and fortunately for us and unfortunately for him, he was caught, after Germany surrendered, in the United States zone. No such fate, however, befell his friends who happened to be at the moment in the British zone. Collectively, the industrial associations of which Flick was a member, did more harm to the world than Flick did. Yet most of the leaders of these associations and all the companies they controlled have so far escaped the Allied laws affecting the new Germany.

THE SMALLER CIRCLE AT WORK

Way back in 1940, even before the collapse of France, a group of these industrial associations, called the "Smaller Circle" or "Siebener Club" (Club of Seven Members)—used to meet regularly for the purpose of elaborating the expansionist plans for the Nazi government. The plans elaborated by this group later became the law in occupied Europe. The members of the Smaller Circle use to meet before the war too, but in those days they used to shape policies affecting the German secret rearmament plans, procurement of raw materials, war mobilization, etc., which were ultimately executed by public and semipublic agencies such as the coal cartel, the iron cartel, etc. This secret group of seven industrial associations consisted of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke, Flick, Krupp, Mannesmann, Hoesch, Klockner, Gutchoffnungshutte. What has happened to the seven? After 2 years of the most heartbreaking labor and cajoling and begging, the British have finally consented to place five of them on the prospective list of cartels to be decentralized on the terms as mentioned above. It is worthy of note that neither the Vereinigte Stahlwerke nor Hoesch steel concerns are mentioned. The individuals representing these concerns so far have fared very well. Wilhelm Zangen, chief manager and brains of the Mannesmann trust is safely protected in the British zone and was mentioned as one of the chief advisers in the reconstruction plans for the German heavy industry. Its chief deputy, Harold Rasch, was pushed by him to become the brains behind the Bi-Zonal Committee. It is only recently that he was succeeded by a so-called socialist, Victor Agartz. It is also worthy of note that both Zangen and Rasch have distinguished themselves as looters of occupied Europe. (See Prevent World War III, issue No. 19, p. 9, the Mannesmann combine.).

ERNST POENSGEN'S ROLE

Alfred Hugenberg of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke has already been discussed. There is one member of the Smaller Circle who deserves our special attention. He is Ernst Poensgen, almost totally unknown in the United States but in reality the most important man in the German heavy industry. His sphere of activity was entirely, unlike that of his colleague Hugenberg, in the international economic field. He was the brains behind the International Steel Cartel of Luxemburg which he organized in 1926, and which gave Germany the power of life and death over Europe's coal and steel. In 1932, immediately after Hitler's coming to power, Poensgen, together with Fritz Thyssen, pledged the entire German heavy industry in support of the Nazi regime. He was the brains behind the German top steel cartel and worked very closely with Flick, plotting the course of looting to be followed after France's defeat. In July 1940, after France's downfall, Poensgen called a meeting of the Smaller Circle and informed them that he personally was entrusted by General of the SS, Otto Steinbrink—at that time gauleiter for the iron and steel industries in France—to draw up a plan of distribution of iron and steel plants in France and Luxemburg, among the members of the Smaller Circle.

The records reveal that Flick was a little jealous of Poensgen's power and wanted to make sure that he, Flick, would get his proper share of the loot. Poensgen duly reassured Flick by telling him that "I will not pass on any project before discussing it with you."

Poensgen, it seems, had some redeeming features, because at one time he did propose that the original French owners be left with 25 percent of the shares of the companies to be looted. Flick, however, was decidedly opposed to the idea and tried to convince the Smaller Circle that the French owners deserved nothing. Perhaps this redeeming feature of Poensgen's would account for the following: Flick is now being tried in Nuremberg while Ernst Poensgen was especially recalled in 1946 from his retirement in Kietzbuhl, Austria, in order to rebuild the power of the German industry because of his excellent contacts with the British cartels. He has been placed again as chairman of the Association of Iron and Steel Trade Manufacturers in the British zone. It is worthy of note that during the war after Flick had established his model top coal cartel, Poensgen was entrusted by the Nazi Party with the mission of establishing the top steel cartel—the Iron Producing Industry, May 29, 1942. Since Poensgen is again the head of the new German steel association, only one small change occurred since 1942 and a very minute one at that—in the title of the new German industrial association. And in order to make absolutely certain that there was no mistake, Poensgen was placed in charge of running again the Vereinigte Stahlwerke, at the end of 1946.

DINKELBACH—THE BRITISH TRUSTEE

Another person who deserves attention is Heinrich Dinkelbach, also of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke. Dinkelbach is a prominent Nazi and has been the financial genius of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke for years. He was Hitler's organizer of the German heavy industry for war. After the downfall of the Nazi regime, Dinkelbach not only escaped denazification, but succeeded in freeing from prison all but 4 of the 31 arrested top Nazi officials of the VS. Parenthetically, there were over 500 top Vereinigte Stahlwerke officials members of the Nazi Party, SS, SA and other Nazi organizations. Dinkelbach was placed, a few months ago, as the head of the iron and steel industry in the British zone and given the former Stahlhaus at Dusseldorf as the new headquarters for the German steel industry. In keeping with the latest modern trends, the Stahlhaus was baptized North Cumberland House—which decidedly symbolizes the real meaning of the British socialization plans. Dinkelbach has been holding meetings with his friends of the steel industry and is now actively engaged setting up the new North German iron and steel control. Also in keeping with the latest trends, Dinkelbach was given to understand by the British that the German stockholders of the steel and iron companies will not lose anything in the reorganization and that he, Dinkelbach, is slated to act as their trustee. These glad tidings were reported at the meeting of the members of the German iron and steel industry, January 17, 1947, by Dinkelbach himself.

Could this be the reason for Britain's inability to remove Hugenberg as the chairman of Vereinigte Stahlwerke?

We must conclude that not much has changed in Germany, except that the British monopolies have succeeded in acquiring through proxies shares of the Ruhr companies. As a result, the prices of Ruhr industrial shares have risen sharply. As a result also, Britain has become the coal dictator of Europe because she controls three-fourths of the coal consumed by Europe before the war.

It took the democratic world 2 years to learn why, way back at the height of World War II, Britain insisted that she alone can understand the Germans and why Britain wanted to carry on its understanding of the Germans by getting the control over Germany's Ruhr.

To be sure, the present Prime Minister of Britain, Clement Attlee, was not in power then, but a few months ago, he was kind enough to provide us with the proper interpretation of the real meaning of Britain's control of the Ruhr. In a speech delivered November 9, 1946, at the Lord Mayor of London's annual dinner, the Labor Prime Minister had this to say regarding the two facets of Germany's problem: "We cannot have a cesspool of cheap, underfed and exploited labor in the middle of Europe, which may bring down our whole standard of life unless we act with great care. Secondly, in doing this, we must preserve our security and that of our Allies. The German industries must never again be allowed to become an arsenal to be used by a new Germany to attack her neighbors or to promote another war, and it is the fine balance that has to be so carefully worked out and the right controls established."

The real meaning of Britain's carefully elaborated plans and new controls over Germany have been unfolding for the past 2 years. We regret to see these plans of the British Government bear the label of the great Labor Party. We would have understood these plans if they had been presented to us as coming directly from the group of bankers and investors who defeated the peace 25 years ago and who placed so much faith in the revival of the German industry as to invest heavily in Germany.

Apparently, not much has changed since then. The same group of pro-German bankers and investors are still making the British policy toward Germany, although the Labor Party has been in power for 2 years. This group of investors still believes that the best people in Germany are the industrialists and bankers; hence, they prefer dealing directly with them. Hence too, they are opposed to placing the resources of the Ruhr—the real German war arsenal—in the hands of an international authority. And since the United States policy doesn't seem to favor the internationalization of the Ruhr either, it is only fair to conclude that we are gambling again with peace and security.

RESOLUTION TO INVESTIGATE REAL-ESTATE LOBBY

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] is recognized.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to call the attention of the Members to the fact that I have today introduced a resolution that would set up a committee to investigate the most vicious, most brazen lobby which has ever operated in Washington, namely, the real-estate lobby.

I would like to know, as a Member of this House, just what part they played in wrecking the rent-control bill. I would like to know what part they played in helping to block the over-all, comprehensive housing program that we should have passed.

A resolution was passed the other day to investigate housing. That is the biggest laugh of the year.

What we need is not to investigate whether or not people need housing—the people know that, Mr. Speaker—but to investigate why we have not made it possible for them to obtain housing.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include an editorial on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

(The editorial referred to follows:)

[From the Washington Daily News of Monday, July 21, 1947]

REAL ESTATE LOBBY SCORES GRAND SLAM

(By Ned Brooks)

The real estate lobby's series of successes in Congress has soothed the sting of President Truman's rebuke to it.

A check-up showed today that the "interests" recently denounced by Mr. Truman have scored a grand slam with the Republican-led legislators. They have won all major objectives in the current session.

Top victories of the lobby include passage of the voluntary 15-percent increase, the scrapping of most remaining controls on home building and other construction, the pigeonholing of all measures for public housing and rejection of administration plans for a central housing agency.

In reluctantly signing the rent control bill, Mr. Truman suggested an investigation of the real estate lobby, asserting it was "intolerable" that the interests were blocking action on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner general housing bill. He added that "nothing could be more subversive of representative government" than the lobby's "ruthless disregard of the public welfare."

"ON THE CAPITOL STEPS"

Six weeks before the session began, Boyd Bernard, then president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, told members to "wait for the new Congress on the Capitol steps with a proposal for a cushioned decontrol of rents."

On May 12, after the House had passed the bill opening the way for rent increases and repealing most of the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act, the association notified members:

"We won the first round of rents through the passage of the Wolcott bill. This embodies substantially the program we wanted."

At the same time the association was soliciting its membership for $5 contributions to conduct "legislative and research work" here in Washington. Officials ridiculed statements that it had a $10,000,000 fund available for putting over its program, saying its goal of voluntary subscription was only $59,000.

The Wolcott bill as finally approved carried the 15-percent rent boost for voluntary leases running through 1948, repealed Federal protections against evictions, and freed all new housing from rent ceilings.

It lifted all restraints on nonhousing construction except for amusement and recreational projects and repealed provisions of the Veterans' Housing Act on price limitation, premium payments on scarce materials, channeling of raw materials, and restrictions against "luxury" homes.

All these actions had been urged by the National Association Home Builders at its Chicago convention last February, when Representative JESSE P. WOLCOTT, Republican, of Michigan, author of the combined rent-housing bill, was the principal speaker. Representative WOLCOTT announced at that time he would sponsor the measure.

The law retains veterans' preferences on new homes and keeps the liberalized system of Federal Housing Administration insurance, both of which were favored by the lobby.

Allied with the Home Builders Association and Real Estate Boards in the other campaign for decontrol and other legislation have been the Building Products Institute, National Foundation of Home and Property Owners, Mortgage Bankers Association of America, United States Chamber of Commerce, United States Savings and Loan League, National Apartment Owners Association, Retail Lumber Dealers Association.

MINOR SET-BACK

One minor set-back was Congress' refusal to continue authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to act as a secondary market for loans partly guaranteed by the Government under the GI bill of rights. The Home Builders Association protested the action and a move has started in the Senate to restore the powers.

Under constant fire from the real-estate organizations, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill has progressed only as far as approval by the Senate Banking Committee. It is doubtful if the measure will reach a Senate vote this year, and its rejection by the House is conceded. Chief target of the lobby is the provision for Government subsidies to 500,000 homes for low-income families.

A House petition started by Representative HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS (Democrat, California) has failed to produce the signatures necessary to force a vote on the TEW bill.

The House for the second time has rejected a reorganization plan of President Truman calling for a cover-all branch to be known as the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The Senate Banking Committee approved the plan by a one-vote margin, but rejection by the Senate is being predicted. Designed to group all agencies dealing with housing under a

single head the plan has been fought actively by the real-estate groups.

The same groups are supporting a bill by Senator JOHN W. BRICKER (Republican, Ohio) to reestablish the Federal Housing Agency and Federal Home Loan Bank Administration as independent units. Both agencies are among those now grouped under the National Housing Agency, which the lobby wants abolished.

FPHA UNDER FIRE

Real-estate spokesmen have appeared in support of a bill by Senators HARRY P. CAIN (Republican, Washington) and RICHARD B. RUSSELL (Democrat, Georgia) to abolish NHA and one of its subsidiaries, Federal Public Housing Authority.

FPHA, which handles public housing built before the war, has been under fire from many sides. Its administrative budget was chopped $5,000,000 in Congress, and funds available for low-rent subsidies was cut by a like amount. Since the agency might handle any new public-housing program, the real-estate lobby wants it put out of business.

Congress recently cut $14,500,000 from the $50,000,000 requested for FPHA's completion of temporary homes for rental to veterans. The Home Builders' Association had opposed the program, saying the units converted from wartime barracks were only shacks.

The Cain-Russell bill proposes to transfer the disposal of surplus war housing from FPHA to the Federal Works Agency. The House has passed a bill by Representative WOLCOTT accomplishing this result. The measure would require that housing worth about $750,000,000 be sold for cash by the end of 1948, a provision which opponents say would limit sales to real-estate interests with plenty of ready capital or borrowing power.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 176. An act to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to dental diseases and conditions; to establish the National Institute of Dental Research; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1064. An act relating to the payment of travel expenses of officers and employees of the Post Office Department and postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1042. An act to provide for the completion of Mount Rushmore National Memorial and the financing thereof by issuance of a special coin; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1116. An act to provide a limitation on the construction of family quarters for the Army and Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1304. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one-hundredth anniversary of the organization of Minnesota as a Territory of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1305. An act to amend section 24 of the Federal Power Act so as to provide that the States may apply for reservation of portions of power sites released for entry, location, or selection to the States for highway purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1543. An act to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1614. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the patriotic services of Gen. Maurice Rose and to perpetuate the General Rose Memorial Hospital as a historic shrine; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1648. An act to authorize the expenditure of income from Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for training of Federal prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1721. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of injuries sustained by G. R. Below, late of Seattle, Wash.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 72. An act to increase the number of authorized aviation stations operated by the Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H. R. 185. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Catholic Society of Alaska for use as a mission;

H. R. 197. An act to transfer part of block 14 and the school building thereon of Petersburg town site, Alaska, used for school purposes, to the town of Petersburg, Alaska;

H. R. 341. An act for the relief of the estate of Reuben Malkin;

H. R. 348. An act for the relief of Dr. Alma Richards and Mrs. Mary Block;

H. R. 405. An act for the relief of Thomas M. Farley, Mrs. Susie Farley, Mrs. Helen Moss, the legal guardian of Donna Louise Farley, and the legal guardian of Melvin Moss;

H. R. 406. An act for the relief of Walter R. and Kathryn Marshall;

H. R. 434. An act for the relief of Lewis H. Rich;

H. R. 640. An act for the relief of Harley Shores;

H. R. 673. An act to repeal certain provisions authorizing the establishing of priorities in transportation by merchant vessels;

H. R. 704. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Jane Sherman and W. D. Sherman;

H. R. 821. An act for the relief of Charles W. Taylor, Jr.;

H. R. 893. An act for the relief of Myron R. Leard;

H. R. 914. An act for the relief of George Corenevsky;

H. R. 1091. An act for the relief of Mrs. Georgia Lanser;

H. R. 1238. An act to permit vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and points in the continental United States;

H. R. 1341. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif.;

H. R. 1379. An act to establish the United States Naval Postgratuate School, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1497. An act for the relief of the estate of George W. Coombs;

H. R. 1535. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Ralph Stanfield, a minor;

H. R. 1565. An act to codify and enact into positive law, title I of the United States Code, entitled "General Provisions";

H. R. 1566. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 4 of the United States Code, entitled "Flag and Seal, Seat of Government, and the States";

H. R. 1567. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 6 of the United States Code, entitled "Official and Penal Bonds";

H. R. 1633. An act to amend section 16 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia";

H. R. 1652. An act to provide for the naturalization of certain United States Army personnel—Yugoslav fliers;

H. R. 1714. An act to exclude certain interns, student nurses, and other student-employees of hospitals of the Federal Government from the Classification Act and other laws relating to compensation and benefits of Federal employees, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1737. An act for the relief of Owen R. Brewster;

H. R. 1995. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the return of the amount of deductions from the compensation of any employee who is separated from the service or transferred to a position not within the purview of such act before completing 10 years of service;

H. R. 2005. An act to amend the act of April 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 881, entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of the segregated coal and asphalt deposits of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indian Nations, in Oklahoma, and for an extension of time within which purchasers of such deposits may complete payments";

H. R. 2054. An act to amend the act of April 14, 1930, to provide increased retired pay for certain members of the former Life Saving Service;

H. R. 2083. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 17 of the United States Code, entitled "Copyrights";

H. R. 2084. An act to codify and enact into positive law, title 9 of the United States Code, entitled "Arbitration";

H. R. 2109. An act to amend section 1003 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 2390. An act for the relief of Elmer A. Norris;

H. R. 2434. An act for the relief of Ruth A. Hairston;

H. R. 2471. An act to provide for periodical reimbursement of the general fund of the District of Columbia for certain expenditures made for the compensation, uniforms, equipment, and other expenses of the United States Park Police force;

H. R. 2507. An act for the relief of the firm of Barrett & Hilp;

H. R. 2511. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim two acres of land near Muirkirk, Md., to the Queens Chapel Methodist Church;

H. R. 2550. An act for the relief of Mack Gene Odom, a minor;

H. R. 2607. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of George Wesley Hobbs, a minor;

H. R. 2693. An act for the relief of public utility district No. 1, of Cowlitz County, Wash.;

H. R. 2800. An act to amend section 5 of Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3022. An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, gas, and sulfur on lands acquired by the United States;

H. R. 3043. An act to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3055. An act to permit the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War to supply utilities and related services to welfare activities, and persons whose businesses or residences are in the immediate vicinity of naval or military activities and require utilities or related services not otherwise obtainable locally, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3075. An act to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the classification of employees of the postal service, so as to provide proper recompense in the form of compensatory time for overtime performed by supervisors;

H. R. 3127. An act to provide for the loan or gift of obsolete ordnance to State homes for former members of the armed forces;

H. R. 3131. An act to extend for 3 months the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended;

H. R. 3334. An act granting the consent of Congress to Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Susquehanna River;

H. R. 3361. An act for the relief of J. Rutledge Alford;

H. R. 3376. An act to ratify and confirm act 10 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1947, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945;

H. R. 3444. An act to amend section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 3448. An act to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3495. An act for the relief of Andrew C. Extrom and Harry C. Pearson;

H. R. 3541. An act to define the functions and duties of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3619. An act relating to the sale of the Mission Point Lighthouse Reservation, Grand Traverse County, Mich.;

H. R. 3738. An act to amend Public Law 88, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved June 23, 1945;

H. R. 3739. An act to authorize the Veterans' Administration to acquire certain land as a site for the proposed Veterans' Administration facility at Clarksburg, W. Va., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3818. An act to amend the Federal Insurance Contributions Act with respect to rates of tax on employers and employees, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3852. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia," approved August 7, 1946;

H. R. 3997. An act to exclude certain vendors of newspapers or magazines from certain provisions of the Social Security Act and Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 4043. An act to change the order of priority for payment out of the German special deposit account, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4079. An act to amend the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), as amended June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1976);

H. R. 4084. An act to authorize the creation of additional positions in the professional and scientific service in the War and Navy Departments;

H. R. 4254. An act providing for the disposition of farm labor camps to public or semipublic agencies or nonprofit associations of farmers.

H. R. 4268. An act making supplemental appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 250. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of Robert V. Fleming as a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 338. An act to amend the Plant Quarantine Act approved August 20, 1912, as amended, by adding a new proviso to section 1.

JOINT RESOLUTION AND BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution and bills of the House of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 250. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of Robert V. Fleming as a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution;

H. R. 185. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Catholic Society of Alaska for use as a mission;

H. R. 197. An act to transfer part of block 14 and the school building thereon of Petersburg townsite, Alaska, used for school purposes, to the town of Petersburg, Alaska;

H. R. 341. An act for the relief of the estate of Reuben Malkin;

H. R. 348. An act for the relief of Dr. Alma Richards and Mrs. Mary Block;

H. R. 405. An act for the relief of Thomas M. Farley, Mrs. Susie Farley, Mrs. Helen Moss, the legal guardian of Donna Louise Farley, and the legal guardian of Melvin Moss;

H. R. 406. An act for the relief of Walter R. and Kathryn Marshall;

H. R. 434. An act for the relief of Lewis H. Rich;

H. R. 640. An act for the relief of Harley Shores;

H. R. 704. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Jane Sherman and W. D. Sherman;

H. R. 821. An act for the relief of Charles W. Taylor, Jr.;

H. R. 893. An act for the relief of Myron R. Leard;

H. R. 914. An act for the relief of George Corenevsky;

H. R. 1091. An act for the relief of Mrs. Georgia Lauser;

H. R. 1379. An act to establish the United States Naval Postgraduate School, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1497. An act for the relief of the estate of George W. Coombs;

H. R. 1535. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Ralph Stanfield, a minor;

H. R. 1652. An act to provide for the naturalization of certain United States Army personnel—Yugoslav fliers;

H. R. 1737. An act for the relief of Owen R. Brewster;

H. R. 1995. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the return of the amount of deductions from the compensation of any employee who is separated from the service or transferred to a position not within the purview of such act before completing 10 years of service;

H. R. 2005. An act to amend the act of April 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 88), entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of the segregated coal and asphalt deposits of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indian Nations, in Oklahoma, and for an extension of time within which purchasers of such deposits may complete payments";

H. R. 2390. An act for the relief of Elmer A. Norris;

H. R. 2434. An act for the relief of Ruth A. Hairston;

H. R. 2471. An act to provide for periodical reimbursement of the general fund of the District of Columbia for certain expenditures made for the compensation, uniforms, equipment, and other expenses of the United States Park Police force;

H. R. 2507. An act for the relief of the firm of Barrett & Hilp;

H. R. 2511. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim 2 acres of land near Muirkirk, Md., to the Queens Chapel Methodist Church;

H. R. 2550. An act for the relief of Mack Gene Odom, a minor;

H. R. 2607. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of George Wesley Hobbs, a minor;

H. R. 2693. An act for the relief of public utility district No. 1, of Cowlitz County, Wash.;

H. R. 2800. An act to amend section 5 of Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3055. An act to permit the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War to supply utilities and related services to welfare activities, and persons whose businesses or residences are in the immediate vicinity of naval or military activities and require utilities or related services not otherwise obtainable locally, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3075. An act to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the classification of employees of the postal service, so as to provide proper recompense in the form of compensatory time for overtime performed by supervisors;

H. R. 3123. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3127. An act to provide for the loan or gift of obsolete ordnance to State homes for former members of the armed forces;

H. R. 3131. An act to extend for 3 months the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended;

H. R. 3243. An act for the relief of Roman Toporow;

H. R. 3334. An act granting the consent of Congress to Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Susquehanna River;

H. R. 3361. An act for the relief of J. Rutledge Alford;

H. R. 3376. An act to ratify and confirm Act 10 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1947, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945;

H. R. 3444. An act to amend section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 3448. An act to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3495. An act for the relief of Andrew C. Extrom and Harry C. Pearson;

H. R. 3738. An act to amend Public Law 88, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved June 23, 1945;

H. R. 3739. An act to authorize the Veterans' Administration to acquire certain land as a site for the proposed Veterans' Administration facility at Clarksburg, W. Va., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3852. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia," approved August 7, 1946;

H. R. 3997. An act to exclude certain vendors of newspapers or magazines from certain provisions of the Social Security Act and Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 4043. An act to change the order of priority for payment out of the German special deposit account, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4079. An act to amend the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), as amended June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1976); and

H. R. 4254. An act providing for the disposition of farm labor camps to public or semipublic agencies or nonprofit associations of farmers.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, July 26, 1947, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

978. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated Janu-

ary 2, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the intracoastal waterway from the Mississippi River at New Orleans, La., to Corpus Christi, Tex. (alternate connection with the Mississippi River in the vicinity of Algiers, La.), requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on October 30, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

979. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 27, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Mississippi River at Maiden Rock, Wis., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

980. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 16, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Cox (Coxes) Creek, tributary of Stony Creek, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

981. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting report of proposed transfer of equipment to the Ex-Navy-Army Personnel Boating Club; to the Committee on Armed Services.

982. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting request for withdrawal of the case of Adeline Chagnon Shapiro from those 74 cases involving suspension of deportation referred to in letter of July 1, 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

983. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the national interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

984. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 23, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Clear Fork of the Mohican River, in Richland County, Ohio, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

985. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 20, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Pinconning River, Mich., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

986. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 13, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Dunlap Creek and tributaries, Pennsylvania, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

987. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 27, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Bunganuc Creek, Maquoit (Maquoite) Bay, Maine, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

988. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 20, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of report on flood control on the Missouri River at Bismarck, N. Dak., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on May 2, 1939; to the Committee on Public Works.

989. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 13, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of channel to Hog Island, Hingham Bay, Mass., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

990. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report presented to the Secretary of the Interior by the Bureau of Reclamation of this Department on July 21, 1947, on the Coachella Valley division, All-American Canal system, Boulder Canyon project, California (H. Doc. No. 415); to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed.

991. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, relative to the contest of election of Helen Gahagan Douglas (H. Doc. No. 416); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

992. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting an audit of the various Government corporations supervised by the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 417); to the Committtee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 317. Resolution providing expenses for the conducting of studies, investigations, and inquiry to be conducted by the Committee on Agriculture pursuant to House Resolution 298; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1077).

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 303. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 141; without amendment (Rept. No. 1078).

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 259. Resolution providing expenses for conducting the investigations and surveys authorized by House Resolution 211 of the Eightieth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1079).

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 331. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 295; without amendment (Rept. No. 1080).

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 332. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 296; without amendment (Rept. No. 1081).

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 333. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; without amendment (Rept. No. 1082).

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 334. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; without amendment (Rept. No. 1083).

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 335. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 111; without amendment (Rept. No. 1084).

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 264. Resolution providing for the printing as a House document "Amendments to Rules of Civil Procedure for the District Courts of the United States," and "Report of Proposed Amendments to Rules of Civil Procedure for the District Courts of the United States"; with amendments (Rept. No. 1085).

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 207. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (1); with an amendment (Rept. No. 1086).

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 297. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 293; without amendment (Rept. No. 1087).

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 336. Resolution providing additional compensation for certain employees of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 1088).

Mr. GAMBLE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 339. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations authorized by House Resolution 338; without amendment (Rept. No. 1089).

Mr. BISHOP: Committee on House Administration. Senate Joint Resolution 112. Joint resolution to establish a commission to formulate plans for the erection, in Grant Park, Chicago, Ill., of a Marine Corps memorial; without amendment (Rept. No. 1090).

Mr. LOVE: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 4236. A bill to amend the Civil Service Act to remove certain discrimination with respect to the appointment of persons having any physical handicap to positions in the classified civil service; without amendment (Rept. No. 1092). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Senate Joint Resolution 144. Joint resolution authorizing the President to bring into effect an agreement between the United States and the United Nations for the purpose of establishing the permanent headquarters of the United Nations in the United States and authorizing the taking of measures necessary to facilitate compliance with the provisions of such agreement, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1093). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of California: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 612. A bill to authorize the construction of a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, at or in the vicinity of Boston, Mass.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1094). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3930. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended, in relation to extensions made pursuant to wage earners' plans under chapter XIII of such act; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1096). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. VURSELL: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 1324. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to make such act applicable to the officers and employees of the National Library for the Blind; without amendment (Rept. No. 1098). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 221. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers; with amendments (Rept.

No. 1100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PLOESER: Select Committee on Small Business. Interim report pursuant to House Resolution 18, Eightieth Congress, first session, directing an investigation of domestic shortages of critical nonferrous metals (Rept. No. 1101). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PLOESER: Select Committee on Small Business. Report pursuant to H. R. 18, on Federal barge lines (Rept. No. 1102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 4395. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1105). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 4385. A bill to authorize the President of the United States of America to direct the United States Maritime Commission to charter certain vessels to persons not citizens of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 4386. A bill to authorize the Army engineers to investigate and determine the feasibility of dredging the Colorado River from the Gulf of California to the Imperial Dam, and of constructing such necessary locks and other facilities for the purpose of creating an inland harbor for national-defense purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 4387. A bill to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts, to effectuate collective-bargaining agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana (by request):

H. R. 4388. A bill to amend section 2883 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 4389. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to relieve the Legislative Reference Service of the preparation of data in certain cases; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 4390. A bill to amend the Social Security Act by providing for a national system of unemployment and temporary disability insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 4391. A bill to provide for a per capita payment from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 4392. A bill to provide for a per capita payment from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 4393. A bill to provide for the distribution, promotion, separation, and retirement of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 4394. A bill to empower the Secretary of the Interior to grant rights-of-way for various purposes across lands of individual Indians or Indian tribes, communities, bands, or nations; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 4395. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 4396. A bill to limit the pool elevation and the size of dikes for the Garrison (N. Dak.) Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4397. A bill to equalize the retirement benefits payable to Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. J. Res. 252. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to a quorum in either House of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. J. Res. 253. Joint resolution to reestablish effective price and rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. Con. Res. 112. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the reparations owed by Finland to the Soviet Union should be satisfied out of funds the Soviet Union owes to the United States under the Lend-Lease Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. Con. Res. 113. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the proceedings held in commemoration of the centennial of the telegraph, May 24, 1944, provided by House Concurrent Resolution 72, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. Con. Res. 114. Concurrent resolution authorizing international cooperation to raise social-security protection standards for seamen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 115. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress of the United States with respect to admission in the United States of nationals of the Soviet Union and the admission into the Soviet Union of nationals of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. Res. 341. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the real-estate lobby and other pressure groups; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 342. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 341; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. Res. 343. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to have printed additional copies of hearings held before a special subcommittee relative to the agricultural and economic problems of the Cotton Belt; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the office of the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 4398. A bill for the relief of Harvey M. Lifset, formerly a major in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 4399. A bill for the relief of James C. Smith, Charles A. Marlin, Andrew J. Perlik, and Albert N. James; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 4400. A bill for the relief of Ben Grunstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 4401. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Johanna Doelman and two sons Johannes and Fransiscus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY (by request):

H. R. 4402. A bill for the relief of Louis Esposito, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWE:

H. R. 4403. A bill for the relief of Ladislao Vaida, Elena Vaida, and Stefano Vaida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

765. By Mr. MILLER of Maryland: Resolution of Twenty-ninth Division Association, Veterans of World Wars I and II, recommending the passage by the Congress of the United States of a National Security Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

766. Also, resolution of Twenty-ninth Division Association, Veterans of World Wars I and II, recommending the enactment by the Congress of the United States of an Inter-American Military Cooperation Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

767. Also, resolution of approving and recommending the adoption by the Congress of the United States of legislation to provide for the universal military training of young men of the Nation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

768. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. W. Waring, secretary, Townsend Club No. 1, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

769. Also, petition of A. M. Keller, Tampa, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

770. Also, petition of Jose Norat Rodriguez, Ponce, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to disapproval of the bill for an elective governor; to the Committee on Public Lands.

771. Also, petition of Paul Drew, Pittsburgh, Pa., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request to amend the armed forces unification bill; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS

Pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, the following reports were received by the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
July 17, 1947.

In compliance with section 134 (b) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, I am submitting the following report on the personnel employed by the Committee on Agriculture, covering the period of January 3, 1947, through June 30, 1947.

CLERICAL

Name	Position	Gross salary	Date of employment
George L. Reid, Jr.	Clerk	$9,129.12	Jan. 14 to June 30, 1947.
Katherine Wheeler	Assistant clerk	5,392.20	Feb. 1 to June 30, 1947.
Mae Toole	Stenographer	3,805.80	Feb. 4 to June 30, 1947.
Geraldine W. Eaker	do	3,212.74	Feb. 1 to June 10, 1947.
Mary Elizabeth Laxton	do	3,323.10	May 1 to June 30, 1947.
Lorraine Adamson	do	3,047.22	June 23 to June 30, 1947.

PROFESSIONAL STAFF

Joseph C. Parker	Attorney	$9,129.12	Jan. 14 to June 30, 1947.
John J. Heimburger	Research specialist	8,536.56	Jan. 16 to June 30, 1947.
Hugh H. Soper	do	7,022.30	Apr. 7 to June 30, 1947.

Funds appropriated: None.

Very sincerely yours,

CLIFFORD R. HOPE.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
July 24, 1947.

There is submitted herewith a report showing the name, title, and total salary paid to the members of the staff of the Committee on Appropriations as required under the provisions of section 134b of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, for the period beginning January 3, 1947, and ending June 30, 1947.

Committee employee report submitted in compliance with sec. 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended by the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1948, for the period Jan. 3, 1947, to June 30, 1947

Name of employee	Title	Dates of employment	Gross annual salary	Gross paid in period	Total gross paid in period
John C. Pugh	Clerk	Jan. 3 to 31	$10,000.00	$777.79	$4,111.11
Do	Clerk emeritus	Feb. 1 to May 31	10,000.00	3,333.32	
George Y. Harvey	Assistant clerk	Jan. 3 to 31	10,000.00	777.79	4,944.44
Do	Clerk	Feb. 1 to June 30	10,000.00	4,166.65	
Kenneth Sprankle	Assistant clerk	Jan. 17 to 31	8,997.45	349.89	4,516.54
Do	do	Feb. 1 to June 30	10,000.00	4,166.65	
William A. Duvall	Second assistant clerk	Jan. 3 to 31	8,997.45	689.80	4,438.70
Do	do	Feb. 1 to June 30	8,997.45	3,748.90	
Arthur Orr	Assistant clerk	Jan. 3 to June 30	8,997.45	4,438.70	4,438.70
Jack K. McFall	do	Jan. 3 to Feb. 18	8,997.45	1,139.57	1,139.57
Corbal D. Orescan	do	Jan. 3 to 16	8,339.10	324.29	4,423.08
Do	do	Jan. 17 to June 30	8,997.45	4,098.79	
Robert E. Lambert	do	Jan. 3 to 16	8,339.10	324.29	4,423.08
Do	do	Jan. 17 to June 30	8,997.45	4,098.79	
Robert P. Williams	do	Jan. 3 to 16	7,022.40	273.09	4,071.98
Do	do	Jan. 17 to June 30	8,339.10	3,798.89	
Paul M. Wilson	do	Feb. 9 to June 30	8,339.10	3,289.27	3,289.27
Claude Hobbs, Jr.	do	Feb. 11 to June 30	5,668.08	2,204.24	2,204.24
Bert J. Skinnard	Clerk-stenographer	Jan. 3 to 16	4,288.68	166.77	2,497.54
Do	do	Jan. 17 to June 30	5,116.32	2,330.77	
Lawrence C. Miller	do	Jan. 3 to 16	3,461.04	134.59	2,088.31
Do	do	Jan. 17 to June 30	4,288.68	1,953.72	
Earl C. Silsby	do	Feb. 16 to June 30	2,633.40	987.52	987.52
John D. Cook	do	Feb. 19 to June 30	2,633.40	965.58	965.58
William J. Strachan	Page	Jan. 17 to May 31	2,218.24	993.02	993.02
Robert M. Lewis	Messenger-file clerk	Jan. 3 to June 30	2,881.69	1,424.84	1,424.84
Richard J. Denney	Clerk-stenographer, substitute	Jan. 10 to June 30	3,461.04	1,643.99	1,643.99
E. S. Plumley	do	Jan. 7 to Apr. 30	3,461.04	1,095.99	1,095.99
F. B. Plumley	do	May 1 to June 30	3,461.04	576.84	576.84
Dorothy Davis	do	Jan. 8 to June 30	3,461.04	1,663.21	1,663.21
Jessemine N. Bennett	do	Jan. 7 to Apr. 30	3,461.04	1,095.79	1,095.79
Eleanor L. Fox	do	Feb. 1 to June 30	3,461.04	1,442.10	1,442.10
Lawrence A. DiCenzo	do	Feb. 2 to June 30	3,461.04	1,432.47	1,432.47
Marjorie H. VanRiper	do	Mar. 1 to June 30	3,461.04	1,153.68	1,153.68
Veronica Strozak	do	May 15 to June 30	3,461.04	442.23	442.23
Helen H. Kayser	do	Jan. 7 to 31	3,461.04	230.73	807.57
Do	do	Mar. 1 to Apr. 30	3,461.04	576.84	

Summary: Available at gross rates, $73,990.89; total gross paid including increased pay authorized by the Federal Employees Pay Acts of 1945 and 1946, $62,311.39.

Special investigating committee under Appropriations Committee

REGULAR EMPLOYEES

Name of employee	Title	Dates of employment	Gross annual salary	Gross paid in period	Total gross paid in period
Robert E. Lee	Chief investigator	Jan. 3 to 31	$8,602.44	$669.06	$4,417.96
Do	do	Feb. 1 to June 30	8,997.36	3,748.90	
James J. Kerr	Investigator	do	7,022.40	2,926.00	2,926.00
Harris H. Huston	do	Feb. 13 to June 30	7,022.40	2,691.92	2,691.92
Harry S. Barger	do	Feb. 1 to June 30	7,022.40	2,926.00	2,926.00
Jay B. Howe	do	Feb. 14 to June 30	7,022.40	2,672.42	2,672.42
Enid Morrison	Legal clerk	Feb. 17 to June 30	4,288.68	1,506.33	1,506.33
Jean E. Morrow	Clerk-stenographer	Feb. 1 to June 30	2,909.28	1,212.20	1,212.20
Mildred E. Emerson	do	Mar. 10 to June 30	2,633.40	796.96	796.96

PER DIEM EMPLOYEES

Gilbert H. Clee	Investigator	Feb. 14 to Apr. 2	[1] $15		$1,002.55
John M. Dunnick	do	Feb. 24 to Mar. 20	[1] 15		629.09
Thomas J. Graves	do	Feb. 25, to Mar. 15	[1] 15		398.42
Arthur E. Hald	do	Feb. 17 to Apr. 21	[1] 15		1,338.05
Thomas J. Quinn	do	Feb. 17 to Mar. 31	[1] 15		897.70
Homer E. Scace	do	Feb. 18 to May 16	[1] 15		1,709.37
Wilfred H. Sigerson	do	Feb. 24 to June 30	[1] 25		3,472.20
U. Howard Friend	do	Mar. 17 to May 3	[1] 15		1,004.60
Claude S. Holloway	do	Mar. 17 to May 9	[1] 15		794.80
Ronald M. Ketcham	do	Mar. 13 to Apr. 17	[1] 15		752.43
A. Rea Long	do	Mar. 3 to May 23	[1] 15		1,715.75
William H. Courtney	do	Mar. 13 to 23	[1] 15		230.66
Lewis C. Dorweiler	do	Mar. 3 to May 5	[1] 15		1,342.06
George A. Hewitt	do	Mar. 25 to May 9	[1] 15		449.35
J. William Hope	do	Mar. 3 to May 3	[1] 15		671.02
Edward A. Krake	do	Mar. 3 to Apr. 17	[1] 15		650.06
E. B. Nutt	do	Mar. 27 to Apr. 30	[1] 15		743.94
Jacob S. Siedman	do	Mar. 18 to May 5	[1] 15		314.55

[1] Per day base (while actually employed).

Special investigating committee under Appropriations Committee—Continued

PER DIEM EMPLOYEES—continued

Name of employee	Title	Dates of employment	Gross annual salary	Gross paid in period	Total gross paid in period
L. H. Sanderman	Investigator	Mar. 25 to Apr. 30	[1] $15		$775.88
Charles H. Towns	do	Mar. 18 to May 3	[1] 15		335.52
Clarence L. Turner	do	Mar. 1 to May 14	[1] 15		650.04
Carman G. Blough	do	Mar. 5 to May 3	[1] 15		482.30
C. Oliver Wellington	do	Mar. 18 to Apr. 3	[1] 15		146.76
G. W. Blair	do	Mar. 18 to Apr. 11	[1] 15		356.47
Elmer C. Upton	do	Mar. 1 to 19	[1] 15		419.68
W. B. Correll	do	Apr. 24 to June 6	[1] 15		918.60
Robert D. Hammer	do	Apr. 2 to 30	[1] 15		608.10
William J. McGlone	do	Apr. 18 to May 21	[1] 15		712.80
Arthur B. Roberts	do	May 1 to June 11	[1] 15		870.23
Virginia S. Kup	Stenographer	May	[2] 5.55		160.71
Mary K. Scott	do	May 1 to 12	[2] 5.55		90.97
Janet S. Parrish	do	May 1 to 15	[2] 5.55		121.22

[1] Per day base (while actually employed).

Summary on special investigating committee

Appropriation for 80th Cong	$76,204.03
Expended for salaries	44,098.20
Expended for travel and expenses	6,196.45
Total expenditure	50,294.65
Balance unexpended June 20, 1947	25,909.38

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN TABER, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,

July 19, 1947.

Pursuant to the provisions of section 134 (b) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended, herewith is reported the name, profession, basic and gross salary of each person employed by the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, during the period January 3-June 30, 1947:

Name	Profession	Per annum basic salary	Gross salary from Jan. 3 to June 30, inclusive
Robert H. Harper	Chief Clerk	$6,500	$3,954.93
John Russell Blandford	Professional staff	5,800	3,238.10
Clinton B. D. Brown	do	5,800	3,160.07
Bryce N. Harlow	do	5,800	3,238.10
Robert W. Smart	do	5,800	3,238.10
Townsend Hoopes	Assistant clerk	4,300	2,821.30
Agnes H. Johnston	Stenographer	2,500	1,660.50
Berniece Kalinowski	do	2,400	1,480.55
Rosemary Curry	do	2,400	1,406.98
James A. Deakins	Assistant clerk	2,000	614.18

No funds having been made available to this committee during the period January 3-June 30, 1947, no such funds have been expended.

Sincerely,

W. G. ANDREWS, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,

June 30, 1947.

In compliance with section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, there is herewith reported the names, official capacity, and basic salary of the members of the staff of the Banking and Currency Committee:

Clerical staff:

William J. Hallahan, clerk	$4,500
Elsie L. Gould, deputy clerk	3,800
Margaret Park, assistant clerk	2,100

Professional staff:

Orman S. Fink, staff director	5,550

Respectfully yours,

JESSE P. WOLCOTT, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,

July 18, 1947.

As required by Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, I am submitting the pay rolls for the District of Columbia Committee of the House of Representatives for the first quarter. This covers the expenditures of the committee since there are no special appropriations.

January 1947:

William N. McLeod, Jr.	$449.35
Mary C. Harrell	233.24
Gladys E. Quick	219.45

February 1947:

Mabel G. Haller	$694.92
William N. McLeod, Jr. (clerk to the minority)	585.20
Ruth Pingley	357.39

March 1947:

Mabel G. Haller	694.92
William N. McLeod, Jr. (clerk to the minority)	585.20
Ruth Pingley	357.39
Parker Jackson (2 months' appointment)	833.33
Harriett G. Mossburg (temporary)	154.91

As required by Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, I am submitting the pay rolls for the District of Columbia Committee for the second quarter. This covers the expenditures of the committee since there were no special appropriations until House Resolution 195 became law.

April 1947:

Mabel G. Haller, executive secretary	$694.92
William N. McLeod, Jr., minority clerk	585.20
Ruth Pingley, committee stenographer	357.39
Harriett G. Mossburg, typist (temporary)	154.91
Parker Jackson,[1] tax specialist	833.33
Ann Elizabeth Coker,[1] stenographer for tax specialist	129.30

May 1947:

Mabel G. Haller, executive secretary	694.92
William N. McLeod, Jr., minority clerk	585.20
Ruth Pingley, committee stenographer	$357.39
Harriett G. Mossburg, typist (temporary)	154.91
Parker Jackson,[1] tax specialist	833.33
Ann Elizabeth Coker,[1] stenographer for tax specialist	242.44
Clarence Pierce,[2] specialist, home-rule study	592.72

June 1947:

Mabel G. Haller, executive secretary	694.92
William N. McLeod, Jr., minority clerk	585.20
Ruth Pingley, committee stenographer	357.39
Harriett G. Mossburg, typist (temporary)	154.91
Parker Jackson,[1] tax specialist	833.33
Samuel J. Fusco,[1] statistical tax clerk (temporary)	242.44
Ann Elizabeth Coker,[2] stenographer, home-rule study	242.44
Clarence Pierce,[2] specialist, home-rule study	683.95

[1] Charged to Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee.

[2] Charged to Home Rule and Reorganization Subcommittee; transferred to voucher pay roll.

Sincerely,

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,

July 22, 1947.

Complying with section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, I am submitting herewith the names and salaries of the employees of the Committee on Education and Labor, together with the funds expended under our special appropriation. The employees are:

W. Manly Sheppard, Chief Clerk	$10,000.00
Irving G. McCann, chief counsel, (professional staff)	10,000.00
P. Albert Reiman, assistant clerk (professional staff)	10,000.00
Frank S. McArthur, investigator (professional staff)	10,000.00
Bingham W. Mathias, minority clerk (professional staff)	10,000.00
Jennie Ward Carter, clerk-stenographer	4,867.92
Mary Pauline Smith, clerk-stenographer	4,867.92
Mary Ellen Gilbert, clerk-stenographer	4,867.92
Myrtle S. Locher, clerk-stenographer	4,867.92
Frances A. Los, clerk-stenographer (minority)	4,867.92

Special employees pursuant to H. Res. 111:

Henry A. Bates, investigator	$8,500.00
Agnes Ainilian, clerk-stenographer	4,867.92

Pursuant to House Resolution 111, the House appropriated $40,000 for a special investigation of racketeering in labor unions. As of June 30, $10,808.96 had been spent. Under this resolution three special subcommittees have been appointed, but they have no additional personnel and have not expended any funds other than those recorded herein.

Trusting this is the information you desire, I am

Very sincerely yours,

FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr.,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

(January through June 30, 1947)

	Base pay
Carl E. Hoffman, professional	$6,000
William A. Young, professional	5,000
Francis T. O'Donnell, professional	5,000
Annabell Zue, chief clerk	4,000
Martha Crawley, clerk	3,500
Betty Henderson, clerk	2,600
Delores Fel'Dotto, clerk	2,700
Carl H. Monsees (May 7 through July 12), clerical	7,000
Mildred Calhoun (2 weeks, professional)	7,300
Hazel Huffman (investigator)	4,620

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Chairman.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXTRA LEGAL ACTIVITIES IN DEPARTMENTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Total appropriations, $40,000.

(Expenses—April to July 1, 1947)

Carl E. Hoffman, expenses	$22.08
Francis O'Donnell:	
Expenses	38.57
Do	35.85
W. J. Bryan Dorn, expenses	78.92
Martha Crawley, expenses	41.64
Shorthand Service Bureau, reporting	381.15
Carl E. Hoffman:	
Transportation and expenses	18.00
Expenses	18.87
Do	30.05
Do	93.70
George B. Murphy, expenses	79.14
Francis T. O'Donnell, expenses	23.90
Samuel C. Travis, expenses	66.20
Annabell Zue, postage	20.00
Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., services	24.10
Electronic Engineering Co., Inc., rental	60.00
Alderson Reporting Co., reporting	150.90
Hazel Huffman, expenses	188.23
Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co	7.05
Do	16.60
Helen M. Balog, research and stenographic	40.00
Total	1,434.95

Total remaining, $38,565.05.

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Chairman.

SURPLUS PROPERTY SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS,
July 22, 1947.

The Surplus Property Subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, created pursuant to House Resolution 100, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each staff member employed by it during the period from January 3 to June 30, 1947, together with the funds appropriated to and expended by it:

Margaret B. Campbell (resigned June 22), stenographer, gross annual salary	$2,633.40
Edmond J. Donohue, Jr., associate counsel, gross annual salary	6,522.05
Edward E. Fine, Jr. (from Apr. 1), investigator, gross annual salary	2,467.87
Herbert S. French (Apr. 14 through June 16), special counsel, gross salary per day	27.77
Anna-Marie Hogin, stenographer, gross annual salary	3,626.56
Blanche M. LeMan (from June 16), gross annual salary	3,461.04
Joseph C. Lewis, associate counsel, gross annual salary	5,881.88
George V. McDavitt (from Mar. 3), investigator, gross annual salary	5,881.88
Winifred A. Meyerson (resigned June 30), stenographer, gross annual salary	3,116.19
Paul F. Morrison (from Mar. 24), investigator, gross annual salary	5,392.20
George L. Quinn, Jr., associate counsel, gross annual salary	6,522.05
Kathryn E. Smith, chief clerk, gross annual salary	4,219.71
Elmer B. Solomon (from Mar. 12), consultant, gross salary per day	24.92
Charles G. Tomerlin (from Mar. 17), consultant, gross salary per day	27.77
Hugh D. Wise, Jr. (resigned June 30), general counsel, gross annual salary	9,919.10

Funds appropriated, $50,000.
Funds expended, $36,929.81.

Sincerely yours,

ROSS RIZLEY,
Chairman, Surplus Property Subcommittee.

EXPENDITURES OF PROCUREMENT AND BUILDINGS SUBCOMMITTEE

(May 1–Aug. 1, 1947)

Staff as of Aug. 1, 1947:	
Coleman Rosenberger, counsel, May 1–July 31, 1947, at $4,250 per annum gross	$6,012.93
Fritzie P. Manuel, investigator, May 1–July 31, 1947, at $4,250 per annum gross	6,012.93
Clara D. Terry, clerk, May 1–July 31, 1947, at $3,540 per annum gross	5,033.55
Kathleen H. Hart, stenographer, May 19–July 31, 1947, at $2,090 per annum gross	3,033.42
Previous staff members:	
Chet E. Sinclair, staff director, May 3–June 16, 1947, at $5,800 per annum gross	8,075.76
Robert L. Zimler, investigator, June 9–July 31, 1947, at $4,250 per annum gross	6,012.93
Regina H. McLean, stenographer, May 12–24, 1947, at $2,090 per annum gross	3,033.42
Expenses:	
Stenographically reporting hearings, June 3 and 4, 1947	130.00
Supplies, stationery room, May 5–27	53.45
Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., June 19–25	13.63

Balance, June 30, 1947, $35,338.94.

GEORGE H. BENDER, *Chairman.*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLICITY AND PROPAGANDA OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS [1]

June 30, 1947

Salaries:		
May:		
Frank T Bow, general counsel		$803.55
Oscar Lewis Hume, investigator		150.32
Pansy G. Haines, clerk		180.61
June:		
Frank T. Bow, general counsel		803.55
Oscar Lewis Hume, investigator		501.07
Pansy G. Haines, clerk		225.57
Stationery room:		
May: According to statement (which agrees with the records)		41.86
June: According to my records, $33.25; but the stationery room had an item for mimeograph ink, purchased by Barbara Yeaple, $1, which makes a total of		34.25
Pansy G. Haines, May:		
Calendars purchased in the Senate stationery room, as the House stationery room had none and said they would not have any for the year 1947		3.74
3 registered letters		.60
O. L. Hume, investigator:		
June 4, 1947, cash payment for photostating of St. Paul, Minn., newspapers, in connection with the St. Paul Workshop meeting		1.10
June, Atlantic City, 2 days, at $6		12.00
Frank T. Bow, general counsel, June:		
Atlantic City, 2 days, at $6; transportation (use of automobile), 170 miles at $0.05 a mile, round trip, $17; taxi fare, $3		26.00
Petty cash		10.00
Gwen Rhys: Stenographic services rendered, June 25		10.00
Lawrence Sullivan: research		150.00
Sound Studios, Inc., Washington, D. C., June 16		10.50
E. F. Engebretson: June 18, witness at hearing		181.23
Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co, statement		16.44
Alderson Reporting Co.: Following information received over the telephone, by P. G. H., July 22, 1947, no statements having been received at H. O. B., room 535, subcommittee address. The company bookkeeper reports that one statement (for May 28) was sent to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, included with a charge for work done for the latter committee:		
Hearing, May 28	$99.00	
Hearing, June 18	84.90	
Hearing, June 20	51.60	
Hearing, June 16	41.70	
		277.20
Total		3,439.59

H. Res. 197 authorizes an expenditure of $26,000.00

June 30, 1947: Amount spent to date, or being processed [1]..... $3,439.59

Balance..... 22,560.41

[1] The items herein set forth have been expended or are being processed for payment.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
July 21, 1947.

In accordance with your letter of July 15, I wish to advise that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has neither received nor disbursed any funds during the period January 1 through June 30, 1947.

The present committee personnel is as follows:

William Y. Elliott, staff director. Services provided by Library of Congress.

	Salary per annum
Boyd Crawford, administrative officer	$10,000.00
George Pettee, professional staff member	10,000.00
Charles Burton Marshall, professional staff member	10,000.00
John Easton, professional staff member	10,000.00
June Nigh, clerical staff member	4,288.68
Winifred Osborne, clerical staff member	5,016.32
Doris Leone, clerical staff member	4,288.68
Mabel Henderson, clerical staff member	3,047.22

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. EATON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
July 1, 1947.

In accordance with section 134 (b), rule XII, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, the following information is submitted with reference to the name, profession, and total salary of each member of the staff of the Committee on House Administration as of June 30, 1947:

1. Marjorie Savage, clerk; basic salary, $4,500; gross salary, $6,357.78.

2. Frank Specht, assistant clerk and clerk to Subcommittee on Accounts; basic salary, $4,300; gross salary, $6,081.90.

3. Jack Watson, assistant clerk and clerk to Subcommittee on Enrolled Bills, Library, Disposition of Executive Papers and Memorials, basic salary, $4,300; gross salary, $6,081.90.

4. Irene Gilchrist, assistant clerk and clerk to Subcommittee on Elections; basic salary, $2,500; gross salary, $3,598.98.

5. Gladys Riggs, assistant clerk and clerk to Subcommittee on Printing; basic salary, $2,500; gross salary, $3,598.98.

6. Maureen Sandiford, assistant clerk and stenographer; basic salary, $2,500; gross salary, $3,598.98.

7. Dennis A. Lyons, counsel to Subcommittee on Elections; basic salary, $5,000; gross salary, $7,022.40.

Sincerely yours,

K. M. LECOMPTE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
July 17, 1947.

In response to your letter of July 15, I have the following to submit under the provisions of section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946:

CLERICAL STAFF

Name	Title	Base salary	Total salary
Elton J. Layton	Clerk	$7,500	$10,000.00
(Mrs.) Marjorie A. Biddle	Assistant clerk	3,000	4,288.68
Royice Reno	do	3,000	4,288.68
(Mrs.) Margaret H. Smith-Burns	Assistant clerk-stenographer	2,820	4,040.38
(Miss) Georgia G. Glasmann	do	2,820	4,040.38
Roy P. Wilkinson	Assistant clerk	2,000	2,909.28

PROFESSIONAL STAFF

Arlin E. Stockburger	Aviation and engineering consultant	$8,000	$10,000.00
Andrew Stevenson	Expert	8,000	10,000.00
Kurt Borchardt	Professional assistant	5,800	8,075.26
Dr. John H. Frederick	Consultant	5,200	7,285.58

The above information covering the period ending June 30, 1947, is identical with that submitted in my memorandum to you of April 24.

Under House Resolution 163, appropriating $25,000 for the transportation survey, the following personnel was appointed: (Miss) Pauline E. Mickelsen, clerk-stenographer; base salary, $2,820; total salary, $4,040.38.

Also the additional following amounts have been expended from that appropriation:

On a trip the members made to California in connection with the committee's investigation of safety in air navigation:

April 12, 1947, the Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles	$744.36
Reimbursement to clerk of the committee for expenditures from April 7 to 12, inclusive	265.77
To the landing aids experimental station, Arcata, Calif	64.54

On a trip the members made June 10 to 12, inclusive, to New York in connection with aviation accidents:

Reimbursement to Congressman Leonard W. Hall	$29.31
Hotel Lexington, New York City	123.91
Reimbursement to A. E. Stockburger, member of professional staff	20.50

I trust the above information is what you desire.

With kind personal regards, I am

Very truly yours,

CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
July 15, 1947.

Pursuant to direction contained in section 134 (b) of the Reorganization Act of 1946, I submit herewith a list of the employees on the clerical and professional staffs of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, as of July 15, 1947, together with the gross compensation of each employee:

CLERICAL STAFF

Name	Title	Yearly salary
C. Murray Bernhardt	Chief clerk	$8,997.17
Velma Smedley	Assistant chief clerk	8,339.10
Walter M. Besterman	Clerk-stenographer	4,978.38
Eileen R. Browne	do	4,080.12
Harriet R. Booker	do	4,080.12
Frances Christy	do	3,736.92

PROFESSIONAL STAFF

Walter R. Lee	Assistant specialist	$7,022.40

JULY 25, 1947.

On July 15, 1947, I rendered you a report pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Reorganization Act of 1946. I wish to supplement this report by adding the following item of expenditure:

Moneys expended from January 1–July 26, 1947, from a special appropriation for preparation of new edition of United States Code, $49,459.54.

Sincerely yours,

EARL C. MICHENER, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Personnel of period January 3 to June 30, 1947

Name of employee	Title	Period of service	Annual rate, base salary	Annual rate, gross salary
Marvin J. Coles	Counsel, professional staff	Jan. 14 to June 30	$7,440	$10,000.00
Guy H. LaBounty	Investigator, professional staff	Feb. 1 to June 30	7,440	10,000.00
Elizabeth B. Bedell	Chief clerk, clerical staff	do	4,000	5,668.08
Kathryn H. Cole	Clerk, clerical staff	do	3,300	4,702.50
Mae H. Stewart	Assistant clerk, clerical staff	do	2,400	3,401.04
Marion S. Jensen	Clerk, clerical staff	May 1 to June 30	3,600	5,116.32

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries investigating funds

Amount authorized by H. Res. 87, Feb. 21, 1947	$50,000.00
Amount expended January 3 to June 30, 1947	2,203.03
Balance June 30, 1947	47,796.97

ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE,
July 18, 1947.

In accordance with the provisions of Public Law 601, I give you below a report covering funds expended by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee for the period beginning January 3, 1947, and ending June 30, 1947.

	Salary, annual base	Monthly gross	Gross—first quarter			Gross—second quarter		
			January	February	March	April	May	June
George M. Moore, chief counsel	$7,260	$833.17	.....	$416.58	$833.17	$833.17	$833.17	$833.17
Frederick C. Belen, counsel	6,000	694.92	.....	640.06	640.06	694.92	694.92	694.92
Lucy K. Daley, assistant clerk	2,800	334.40	.....	278.67	334.40	334.40	334.40	334.40
Elayne Morelle, stenographer	2,500	266.91	.....	230.91	266.91	266.91	266.91	266.91
Dorothy Francisco, stenographer	2,400	288.42	.....	.....	67.29	288.42	288.42	288.42
Margaret Barnes, stenographer	2,100	253.93	.....	.....	226.28	242.44	242.44	253.93

Funds expended under House Resolution 177

Subcommittee investigation trip to Atlanta, Ga., June 24 to June 29 (inclusive)—two Congressmen, one counsel:

Travel	$92.25
Hotel and incidentals $179.77 less $5.29	174.48

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE M. MOORE,
Chief Counsel.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS,
July 23, 1947.

Replying to your letters of July 15 and July 18, and in accordance with the statutes referred to by you, the following is a list of the names, professions, and total salaries per annum of the staff members of the Committee on Public Lands, for the period ending June 30, 1947:

Ernest A. Grant, clerk	$7,022.40
Claude E Ragan, assistant clerk	5,392.20
Nancy J. Arnold, assistant clerk	5,392.20
E Forrest Reeve, assistant clerk	5,392.20

No money has yet been expended from the sum appropriated under House Resolution 94.

This information is as of June 30, 1947, and it will be noted that no professional staff members were employed as of that date.

Very sincerely yours,

RICHARD J. WELCH,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
July 17, 1947.

In compliance with the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the following is a listing of the name, profession, and total salary of each staff member employed by the Committee on Public Works:

Joseph H. McGann, Sr., professional staff member	$8,013.06
Robert F. McConnell, majority clerk	5,943.90
Joseph H. McGann, Jr., minority clerk	4,288.68
Mrs. Vera Watts, stenographer-clerk	4,978.38
Elaine H. Jackson, stenographer-clerk	4,978.38
Violet V. Schumacher, stenographer-clerk	4,978.38

Very sincerely yours,

GEORGE A. DONDERO, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
July 17, 1947.

In compliance with instructions contained in section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, I am submitting herewith the report required:

Name and title:	*Total salary*
Snader, Lyle O., clerk	$10,000.00
Montgomery, Donald O., assistant clerk	5,943.96
Shaw, Humphrey Scott, minority clerk	5,419.78
Wright, Jane E., stenographer-assistant clerk	4,219.71

With kindest personal regards, and all good wishes for your continued success, I remain,

Sincerely,

LEO E. ALLEN, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
July 21, 1947.

In compliance with the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the following is a listing of the name, profession, and total gross salary of each staff member employed by the committee from January 22, 1947, and ending on June 30, 1947.

PROFESSIONAL

Robert E. Stripling, chief investigator	$4,416.64
Benjamin Mandel, director of research	2,779.68
Louis J. Russell, investigator	3,450.45
Donald T. Appell, investigator	2,428.56
	13,075.33

CLERICAL

John W. Carrington, minority clerk	$2,985.22
Anne D. Turner, file chief	2,804.99
Rosella A. Purdy, clerk-stenographer	1,894.16
Juliette P. Joray, clerk-stenographer	1,894.16
Margaret S. Kerwan, clerk-stenographer	1,894.16
Gladys A. Slack, clerk-stenographer	1,763.10
	13,235.79

In order to cover the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by clause (1) (Q) of rule eleven incurred by the committee, House Resolution 77 for $50,000 was approved January 30, 1947, and House Resolution 152 for $50,000 on April 2, 1947. Of the $100,000 appropriated, $15,512.69 has been expended, leaving a balance of $84,487.31.

Very truly yours,

J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
July 17, 1947.

In accordance with your letter dated July 15, I am furnishing the following data concerning the personnel employed by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives:

Name and title:	*Gross salary*
Karl Standish, chief clerk	$10,000.00
Bessie N. Kenyon, assistant chief clerk	6,357.78
Lucile J. Porter, clerk	4,288.68
Frances Montanye, clerk	4,288.68
Harriet Oliver, clerk	4,288.68
George Turner, clerk	3,736.92
Casey M. Jones, professional aide	10,000.00
Victor C. Cole, professional aide	$10,000.00
Ida Rowan, professional aide	8,339.10

Status of fund authorized under House Resolution 120, passed March 6, 1947, and House Resolution 136, passed April 2, 1947:

Amount authorized	$25,000.00
Expended through June 30 (no salaries)	1,102.35
Balance	23,897.65

Very truly yours,

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
July 21, 1947.

Pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended by the Legislative Appropriation Act of 1947, I wish to report the name, profession, and total annual salary of each person employed by the Committee on Ways and Means for the period beginning January 3 and ending June 30, 1947, as follows:

CLERICAL STAFF

	Total annual salary
James A. Tawney, lawyer	$3,997.45
T. J. Polski (Schnitz), assistant clerk	7,022.45
Don E. Larson, stenographer and accountant	3,928.00
Gladys L. Kullberg, stenographer	3,792.09
Susan Taylor, stenographer	3,792.09
Margie Halsey, stenographer	3,185.16
Sam Hardy, messenger	2,222.00
Hughlon Green, messenger	2,222.00
Harry Parker, retired messenger	2,372.00

PROFESSIONAL STAFF

Lynn B. Stratton, tax adviser	$10,000.00
Serge Benson, lawyer-economist	8,997.45
Charles W. Davis, lawyer	8,339.10

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD KNUTSON.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NEWSPRINT AND PAPER SUPPLY,
July 21, 1947.

In compliance with the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the following is a listing of the name, profession, and total salary of each staff member employed by the Select Committee on Newsprint and Paper Supply:

Total appropriation (H. R. 59)	$25,000
Total expenditures as of June 30, 1947	3,173
Balance as of June 30, 1947	21,827

Alyce E. Warren, clerk, base salary, $2,100; gross salary, $3,047.22.

Sidney Freidberg, counsel; contract fee basis, not to exceed $3,000 per annum.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE J. BROWN,
Chairman, Select Committee on Newsprint and Paper Supply.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS,
July 19, 1947.

In compliance with section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the following accounting of funds is submitted for the period March 24, 1947, through June 30, 1947:

	Salary
M. W. Rowell, executive director	$2,694.43
Allen W. Maddren, assistant director	2,250.00
J. G. Crost, investigator	1,887.27
Leo Cullinane, investigator-research	1,587.34
Willis J. Ballinger, economic adviser	824.85
Grace F. Purdy, clerk	1,229.89
Arvilla Benson, stenographer	761.79
Gladys Flanagan, stenographer	761.79
Dorothy E. Henry, stenographer	461.90
Willie E. Foristel, stenographer	709.85
C. J. Reynolds, Jr., messenger	555.48
David C. Macdonald, special counsel	25.00
Total	13,749.59
OTHER EXPENDITURES	
Transportation, members and staff	$1,617.93
Travel expenses, members and staff	1,359.43
Reporting service	1,325.24
Telephone	176.08
Telegraph	55.70
Newspapers and periodicals	52.90
Committee library	56.00
Stationery and supplies	184.60
Miscellaneous (stamps, petty cash, etc.)	44.74
Total	4,872.62
Grand total expended	18,622.21
Appropriation (H. Res. 18, 80th Cong.)	60,000.00
Total expenditures Mar. 24, 1947, through June 30, 1947	18,622.21
Balance unexpended	41,377.79

Respectfully,

WALTER C. PLOESER.

SENATE

SATURDAY, JULY 26, 1947

(Legislative day of Wednesday, July 16, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Albert Joseph McCartney, D. D., minister emeritus, Covenant-First Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the alpha and omega, the beginning and the ending of our days, we now submit for Thy divine approval the work that has been accomplished in this session. Bless what we have done aright, pardon and overrule what we may have done amiss.

Grant now unto Thy servants home mercies and journeying mercies and a well-earned rest. Let Thy blessing be upon every Member of this body and all who minister to its comfort and efficiency—upon the officers and secretarial staff; upon the reporters who take down every word, for there is not a word in our tongue but lo they record it altogether; upon the doorkeepers, and the page boys who run to and fro at our beck and call; upon the members of the press, and the great cloud of witnesses who crowd the galleries from every quarter of the country.

Now lettest Thou Thy servants depart in peace. The Lord bless you, and keep you; the Lord make His face to shine upon you, and be gracious unto you; the Lord lift up His countenance upon you, and give you peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, July 25, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MRS. MARTHA TRUMAN

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, an hour or two ago the President of the United States left Washington for his home in Missouri to be at the bedside of his aged mother, who, as we all know, has been ill for several months. Word has just come that she has passed away. The President was unable to reach her bedside before the end came.

I am sure that I speak for all Senators and for all the people of the country when I say that we deeply mourn the loss of the President's mother and sympathize with him in his bereavement.

It is a rare thing for any American to live to be 94 years of age. It is a rarer thing for any American mother to live to see her son become President of the United States.

The President's mother was one of the finest characters in the history of the United States, one of the finest mothers, one of the most typical mothers it has ever been my good fortune to know anything about. She was plain, simple, honest, sympathetic, and deeply devoted to her family and her country. She lived to a riper old age than that referred to in the Bible—threescore years and ten—by some 24 years. She was totally unspoiled by the honors which came to her distinguished son, as he himself has been totally unspoiled by those honors. We all, I am sure, feel deeply the President's loss. We feel deeply the loss of so typical an American mother and American woman as was Mrs. Martha Truman. I express, in a prayerful mood, the hope that the end came peacefully, that her memory will always remain verdant among all who knew her or came under her influence, and that her example of simple Americanism, of Christian virtues, may be emulated by all of us who appreciate the value of American life.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am not sure that there is any precedent for my suggestion, but, in response to the words of the minority leader, I should like to suggest that as the Senate's expression of sympathy the Senate send to the President a floral piece, if that suggestion meets with the approval of the Members of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think that is a very happy suggestion, and I join in the suggestion that a suitable floral piece be sent to Independence, Mo., representing the sympathy of Members of the United States Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

On July 25, 1947:

S. 254. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Glenna J. Howrey;

S. 1262. An act to provide a central authority for standardizing geographic names for the purpose of eliminating duplication in standardizing such names among the Federal departments, and for other purposes;

S. 1497. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of cottonseed and cottonseed products, and for other purposes," approved August 7, 1916; and

S. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution to terminate certain emergency and war powers.

On July 26, 1947:

S. 323. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to allow credits to and relieve certain disbursing and certifying officers of the War and Navy Departments in the settlement of certain accounts;

S. 512. An act to extend provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to the Virgin Islands; and

S. 753. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to defer the collection of certain irrigation construction charges against lands under the Flathead Indian irrigation project.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 272. An act to provide for the utilization of surplus War Department-owned real property as national cemeteries, when feasible; and

S. 1070. An act to provide for the cancellation of the capital stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the refund of moneys received for such stock, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34 to the bill (H. R. 3756) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PLOESER, Mr. JENSEN, Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma, Mr. COUDERT, Mr. MAHON, Mr. WHITTEN, and Mr. GORE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1650. An act for the relief of Maria Hedwig Feresz;

H. R. 2029. An act to provide for the free importation of synthetic-rubber scrap;

H. R. 2993. An act to authorize the appointment of certain additional permanent major generals and brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4068. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to construct a building

for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4070. An act to carry into effect certain parts relating to patents of the treaties of peace with Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania, ratified by the Senate on June 5, 1947, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4115. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain land in the town of Cheverly, Prince Georges County, Md.;

H. R. 4160. An act to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended;

H. R. 4168. An act to provide for the reincorporation of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4177. An act for the relief of William L. Curliffe;

H. R. 4186. An act to prohibit and punish the unauthorized use of the official seal, emblem, and name of the United Nations, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 246. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the poultry industry in the United States.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the bill (S. 758) to promote the national security by providing for a Secretary of Defense; for a National Military Establishment; for a Department of the Army, a Department of the Navy, and a Department of the Air Force; and for the coordination of the activities of the National Military Establishment with other departments of the Government concerned with the national security, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

RATIFICATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TERM OF OFFICE OF PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a certified copy of a joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Missouri ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the term of the office of the President, which was ordered to lie on the table.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Suspension of Deportation of Aliens—Withdrawal of Name

A letter from the Attorney General, withdrawing the name of Juan Hernandez Ayala from a report relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted by him to the Senate on June 15, 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Functions and Activities of the Department of Commerce

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Functions and Activities of the Weather Bureau

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide basic authority for certain functions and activities of the Weather Bureau, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Audit Report of Corporations of the Farm Credit Administration

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Corporations of the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Report of National Academy of Sciences

A letter from the President of the National Academy of Sciences, transmitting the annual report of the National Academy of Sciences for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Safe United States Flag International Air Transportation System

A letter from the executive secretary of the Air Coordinating Committee, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to encourage the development of a safe United States flag international air transportation system properly adapted to the present and future needs of foreign commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense, and to meet certain of the obligations incumbent upon the United States by virtue of its membership in the International Civil Aviation Organization, by providing for the transfer, establishment, operation, administration, and maintenance of airport and airway property located outside the continental United States, for the training of foreign nationals in aviation activities, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by Local No. 76, UAW-CIO, Oakland, Calif., favoring the enactment of antilynching legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the international executive board of the UAW-CIO, Chicago, Ill., and Local No. 76, UAW-CIO, Oakland, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation providing a permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. LANGER, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation six lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

James V. Forrestal, of New York, to be Secretary of Defense.

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Civil Service:

Sundry postmasters.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 1742. A bill for the relief of John Frederick Firth-Hand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. AIKEN):

S. 1743. A bill to amend the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, and the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, so that after June 30, 1947, employment by production credit associations and national farm loan associations will be covered by the old-age and survivors insurance benefit provisions of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 1744. A bill to amend the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1948; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 1745. A bill for the relief of George Anthony Yaholkovsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. CAIN introduced Senate bill 1746, to repeal the provisions of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 imposing an income tax on individuals, estates, and trusts, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 1747. A bill to authorize credit in certain accounts of United States property and disbursing officers under the War Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BUCK (by request):

S. 1748. A bill to vest the Commissioners of the District of Columbia with the control and jurisdiction of the District of Columbia Armory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1749. A bill for the relief of all persons detained as enemy aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH:

S. 1750. A bill to amend section 9 (b) of the Hatch Act so as to authorize the Civil Service Commission to reconsider cases in which officers or employees have been removed under such section; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 1751 (by request). A bill to extend the time for construction of the port, port facilities, and access roads in Monrovia, Liberia, under the agreement dated December 31, 1943; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1752. A bill for the relief of Anton Dekom, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 1753. A bill to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on tobacco; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHITE (by request):

S. 1754. A bill to provide for the distribution, promotion, separation, and retirement of commissioned officers of the Coast

and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 1755. A bill to improve the calendar by making it perpetual, by equalizing the quarters of the year, and fixing holidays; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INCOME AND FRANCHISE TAX ACT

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to repeal the provisions of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 imposing an income tax on individuals, estates, and trusts, and I request that a statement by me in connection with the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Washington will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1746) to repeal the provisions of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 imposing an income tax on individuals, estates, and trusts, introduced by Mr. CAIN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The statement presented by Mr. CAIN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAIN

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, some several weeks ago the Congress passed the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947. Because the act has been signed by the President it is now law in the District.

The Income-Tax Act, Mr. President, relieved Federal employees who live in the District of Columbia from any District income-tax liability. Approximately 225,000 Federal employees reside in the District.

The bill which I have just sent to the desk for proper reference would repeal the provisions of the Income Tax Act of 1947 which impose income taxes on individuals, other than Federal employees, who are domiciled or live within the District of Columbia. Should this bill become the law no individual citizen of the District of Columbia would be charged with any income tax liability after December 31, 1947.

The justification for this bill, Mr. President, is simple justice. There can be no possible justification for exempting groups of citizens from their responsibility to a community in which they live. If it is proper for some citizens to contribute to the needs of their community by paying an income tax it is proper that all citizens should pay their proportionate share of the local tax burden. This is not possible under the District Income Tax Act of 1947. This act is constructed on the premise that some should pay for local services which are given free of charge to others. In the District of Columbia about 60 percent of the citizens will share an income-tax load which provides essential community requirements. About 40 percent of the citizens, merely because they are Federal employees, will benefit from services for which they pay nothing. This situation, Mr. President, is unreasonable because it is unfair, discriminatory, unduly burdensome, vicious and perhaps unconstitutional.

The bill I have introduced presumes to recognize an acknowledged injustice. If all taxpayers are not going to pay their fair share of an income tax in our Federal city then no individual citizen should be required or expected to pay an income tax. The repeal measure in question is based on this latter premise.

If the income tax repeal bill is passed the District of Columbia will suffer an anticipated annual revenue loss of some $5,000,000. Those Senators who consider the proposal ought to be aware of this fact. They must know that what they may take away from one source they must provide from another. What I hope they recognize above all else is the inequality and inequity of the income-tax situation, which presently prevails in the District of Columbia. When this sorry state is fully realized and understood it will then be possible to establish a tax base which demands an equality of sacrifice. In no other way can simple justice prevail.

UNIVERSAL DISARMAMENT AND CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. CHAVEZ) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress endorses:

(1) a proposal whenever made by any government for an agreement for:

(a) carrying out President Truman's message to Congress of October 4, 1945, for "the renunciation of the use and development of the atomic bomb" and the unanimous declaration of the United Nations for measures that will "ensure the use of atomic energy for only peaceful purposes."

(b) such universal national atomic and all other disarmament by all States and such strong international inspection and other forces as will prevent any country from seizing atomic plants within its borders or elsewhere and preparing atomic war and as will prevent any other forcible aggression against any country.

(c) the disarmament to be reduced to needed internal police except for agreed occupation and other special forces; to be effected simultaneously in all countries; to be maintained by forces controlled by a body acting by simple majority vote; to be enforced by punishment only of guilty individuals or Government violators and not of innocent people.

(2) Friendly consideration by our Government of loans to the armed countries who join in and execute such agreement. The amount of the loans, their payments in installments as their conditions are progressively complied with and their other terms to be as approved by Congress or its authorizations to the President.

Pending such disarmament agreement the United States and other states may maintain all armaments except as they are progressively decreased according to the terms of such agreement.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 1650. An act for the relief of Maria Hedwig Feresz; and

H. R. 4177. An act for the relief of William L. Cunliffe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2029. An act to provide for the free importation of synthetic-rubber scrap; and

H. R. 4160. An act to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 2993. An act to authorize the appointment of certain additional permanent major generals and brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4186. An act to prohibit and punish the unauthorized use of the official seal, emblem, and name of the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H. R. 4068. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to construct a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4115. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain land in the town of Cheverly, Prince Georges County, Md.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. J. Res. 246. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the poultry industry in the United States; to the Committee on Civil Service.

REGIONAL DISBURSING OFFICERS—TREASURY DEPARTMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 907) to provide for the orderly transaction of the public business in the event of the death, resignation, or separation from office of regional disbursing officers of the Treasury Department, which was, on page 2, line 9, to strike out "designated" and insert "designation."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the amendment corrects the spelling of a word. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

CANCELLATION OF CAPITAL STOCK OF FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1070) to provide for the cancellation of the capital stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the refund of moneys received for such stock, and for other purposes, which were, on page 2, line 19, to strike out "$12,500" and insert "$15,000"; on page 3, line 5, after "000,000", insert "outstanding at any one time: *Provided*, That the rate of interest to be charged in connection with any loan made pursuant to this paragraph shall not be less than the current average rate on outstanding marketable and nonmarketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the making of such loan"; and on page 3, to strike out lines 16 to 19, inclusive.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

RESTRICTIONS ON IMPORTATIONS OF GARBAGE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees be discharged from further consideration of House bill 597, having to do with restrictions on importations of garbage. I understand the House is willing to accept the Senate amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

ALLEGED KANSAS CITY VOTE FRAUDS—INSTRUCTIONS FROM ATTORNEY GENERAL TO FBI

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, on July 19, in a pleasant colloquy in which I had the honor of engaging with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] the opinion was expressed by the Senator from Kentucky that the instructions given by the Attorney General to the FBI in connection with the investigation of the Kansas City vote frauds were not restricted. I should like to insert in the body of the RECORD the instructions from the Attorney General to the Director of the Bureau of Investigation, dated October 11, 1946, headed, oddly enough, "Unknown Subjects; Kansas City, Mo., Primary Election, October 6, 1946, Election Laws."

I ask unanimous consent that the instructions be inserted in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the instructions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS CITY VOTE FRAUDS—INSTRUCTIONS FROM ATTORNEY GENERAL TO FBI

OCTOBER 11, 1946.

(Director, Bureau of Investigation; the Attorney General; unknown subjects; Kansas City, Mo.; primary election, October 6, 1946, elections laws)

Reference is made to Assistant Attorney General Caudle's memorandum of October 2, 1946, in the above-captioned matter. As indicated in that memorandum, United States Attorney Wear at Kansas City, Mo., on September 25, 1946, forwarded to this Department investigating reports of the Kansas City Star, indicating election irregularities during the August 6 primary in the following four precincts of the Fifth Congressional District: fourteenth ward, first precinct; nineteenth ward, second precinct; tenth ward, first precinct; first ward, twenty-fifth precinct.

These reports were submitted to the United States Attorney by the Kansas City board of election commissioners who requested that he take steps to initiate an investigation of alleged violations of Federal law in the contest in the Fifth Congressional District. Since that time Mr. Wear has forwarded clippings of articles from the Kansas City Star reporting these same and additional irregularities in the above-mentioned district. Mr. Wear has informed us that the Star investigation is continuing and the irregularities have been uncovered in some 26 precincts in addition to the four on which he submitted material.

A study of the material at hand indicates possible violations of sections 51 and 52, title 18, United States Code. It is accordingly requested that a preliminary investigation be undertaken along the lines indicated below. While many of the irregularities charged amount at most to violations of State law, such as assistance by election officials to voters in marking ballots without filling out necessary oaths of assistance; improper selection of election officers; improper methods of tallying and counting ballots in the absence of a showing of actual miscounting, nevertheless reports of the investigators indicate that persons (1) are officially listed as having voted while claiming they did not vote, or (2) are officially listed as not having voted while claiming they did vote, or (3) appeared at the polling place and found that their names had already been voted. These latter irregularities indicate violations of section 51, for if the charges can be substantiated they would amount to a conspiracy to deny to qualified voters their federally secured rights to vote for a candidate for Federal office; to have that vote counted as cast; and to have all legitimate ballots honestly and accurately counted, free of dilution by false or fictitious ballots. Possible violations of section 52, title 18, United States Code are indicated if election officials, acting under color of law in officiating at a primary election which is an integral part of the State's electoral process, either alone or with others perpetrated denials of the rights mentioned above.

It is, therefore, requested that the following persons be interviewed and such information elicited from them as will determine (1) the identity of qualified voters who were deprived of the right to vote for a Federal candidate and (2) the identity of persons with their official position, if any, who stuffed ballot boxes with false or fictitious ballots or failed to count ballots for Federal candidates honestly or accurately; together with all circumstances surrounding the violations: 1. Ludwick Graves, Richard C. Jansen, William Davis, Joseph R. Stewart, members of the board of election commissioners, Jackson County Courthouse, Kansas City, Mo.; 2. Ira B. McCarty and John P. Swift, reporters for the Kansas City Star who have written articles on the above described matters, and such other of the Star employees as participated in the Star investigation.

Please give this investigation your special attention and submit reports to me as promptly as possible. Please conduct your investigation in cooperation with the United States attorney at Kansas City, Mo., and furnish him copies of your reports.

EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced a bill to extend the present terminal date of rent control beyond February 29, 1948. I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the RECORD a statement I issued in connection with that bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FRANCIS J. MYERS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, UPON INTRODUCING BILL TO EXTEND RENT CONTROL FOR A YEAR BEYOND FEBRUARY 29, 1948, AND TO AMEND DECONTROL PROVISIONS OF PRESENT ACT

In submitting this bill to extend rent control for a year beyond its present terminal date of February 29, 1948, I recognize, first and foremost, that some of the damage done to effective rent control by the Wolcott act now in effect is irreparable. The experience we had with OPA last year when Congress decontrolled many items, including meat, and then gave authority for their recontrol, proved how difficult it is to restore controls once they are abandoned under selfish pressures.

In the case of rents, however, it is still possible now and will be possible even a few months from now to restore some of the controls which were removed by the Housing and Rent Control Act enacted last June, at the very last moment, without any significant dislocation or hardship.

My bill is based on the assumption that the present housing shortage will not be substantially alleviated by next March 1, when present controls are to expire. In addition to extending those present controls for other year, it also represents an attempt to correct some of the worst features of the present act as they were rammed through Congress on the very eve of the scheduled expiration of the previous law, and sent to the White House on a take-it-or-leave-it basis giving the President the choice of a bad Rent Control Act or no rent control at all beginning July 1 last.

Since many tenants will have signed voluntary 15 percent rent increase leases under this act for fear of being evicted or made subject to terrifically higher increases next March, this bill recognizes the validity of all such leases in existence as of January 1, 1948, since there is little if anything which could be done about the situation now. I should like, however, to see enough Members of Congress announce publicly in the near future their intention to support a continuation of rent control after next March 1 that tenants who are not convinced of the justification of a 15 percent rent increase in their cases can feel secure in not signing such leases. At present, they feel, in many cases, that there is a loaded gun pointed at their heads and the gun is labeled "No rent control at all after March 1."

My bill would:

1. Bring back under rent control in all defense rental areas all housing accommodations subject to regulation under the act which expired last June 30 except hotels (for transients), tourist houses (for transients), and motor courts.

2. Recontrol new construction, which was decontrolled under the Wolcott Act, but would instruct the Housing Expediter to make "due allowance for appropriate adjustments" in setting rents for new construction on the fact that the builder or owner may have proceeded to build on the assumption that these dwellings would not be subject to rent control and that his construction costs may have been higher than they otherwise would have been.

3. Recontrol units converted after February 1, 1947, on the same basis as new construction units.

4. Restore to the Housing Expediter authority in those cases he deems it necessary to recontrol areas which have already been decontrolled, and to put under rent control any areas which have never had rent control but which, in his judgment, should be placed under rent control. Both of these powers were removed by the Wolcott Act.

5. Continue the rent advisory boards established under the Wolcott Act, including their authority to recommend decontrol by areas, to recommend over-all rent increases by areas, and to make recommendations on general operational practices and regulations in their areas, but it would remove the present authority of these boards to consider individual rent adjustment cases and to make recommendations to local rent officials on these individual cases. The Housing Expediter, of course, would retain his present authority to accept or reject the recommendations of these advisory boards.

6. Restore all enforcement provisions of the act which expired last June 30, including criminal sanctions and the right of the Housing Expediter to sue for triple damages in cases of rent overcharges. The present law omits these features.

7. Restore to the Expediter power he no longer has to issue regulations concerning evictions, including the reestablishment of a required waiting period before eviction occurs. The present law leaves eviction matters subject only to State law.

8. Reestablish the exclusive jurisdiction procedure over orders and regulations of the Housing Expediter on rent matters in the Emergency Court of Appeals. Under present law enacted last June 30, orders and regulations of the Housing Expediter on rent matters can be attacked in any State or Federal court following exhaustion of appeal machinery through administrative channels.

9. Continue powers which the Housing Expediter now has to issue regulations covering hardship cases as well as to order general rent increases by areas or nationally where he finds them necessary to fair and equitable administration of rent control.

I feel it is too bad that the Congress would not agree last month to a rent control extension act which would merely continue existing regulations. There was ample provision in the previous law for landlords suffering hardship to obtain rent increases, and thousands of them received such increases. Now

that the damage has been done by enactment of a bad bill, the best we can do now is repair the damage wherever it is possible to do so while assuring a continuation of controls, even if they are relaxed as they have been. This bill seeks to accomplish those purposes.

WILDER DAM ON CONNECTICUT RIVER

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement relating to Senate Joint Resolution 155, which I introduced yesterday.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, yesterday I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 155, which would rescind an order of the Federal Power Commission authorizing the Bellows Falls Hydroelectric Corp. to redevelop the Wilder Dam on the Connecticut River near the towns of Hartford, Vt., and Lebanon, N. H.

I should like to comment briefly as to why I introduced this resolution.

I have placed this matter before the Congress, Mr. President, because the Congress is the only authority which can overrule the Federal Power Commission in granting the Bellows Falls Hydroelectric Corp. the right to reconstruct and raise this dam.

In effect, I am appealing to the Congress to stay the hand of this utility corporation in its attempt to flood, and take out of agricultural production, thousands of acres of the richest meadowland in Vermont and New Hampshire.

In fact, I venture to say that the land to which I refer is some of the richest land in the entire United States.

The people of Vermont and New Hampshire, particularly those who are residents of the immediate area to be affected, are overwhelmingly opposed to the building of this dam.

Public sentiment in my State of Vermont is overwhelmingly opposed to this project, which would result in raising the elevation of the water at the dam to 385 feet above sea level, approximately 16 feet above the level at the present old dam.

An official committee created by the Vermont Legislature of 1944 and consisting of the director of the State planning board, the chairman of the State conservation board, and the present commissioner of agriculture, made a strong report against it.

The position of the people of Vermont and New Hampshire, who are against this project, has been stated at public hearings held by the Federal Power Commission and interested State bodies.

It has been shown conclusively that the construction of the proposed dam would result in irreparable damage to the agricultural and economic interests of the Connecticut River Valley.

In the face of this evidence, Mr. President, I am gravely concerned over the fact that the Federal Power Commission has granted this order.

In deciding in favor of the power company, and against the hardworking farmers of the affected area, I submit that the Commission has failed to give due consideration to the testimony and to the effect of this dam upon the agricultural economy of the area.

Mr. President, we are faced here with the question of deciding whether we shall yield to the desire of the power companies to destroy a great farming area for what they themselves admit are small profits, or whether we shall consider first the welfare of the rank and file citizens of the New England States.

I submit that we, here in this body, stand as the last line of defense of the people against the steam-roller tactics of the power interests.

I have had the utmost respect for the Federal Power Commission.

I regret to say that the Commission, in granting the authority to develop this dam, has approached this question primarily from the standpoint of the power interests rather than from the viewpoint of the general welfare of the people involved.

I submit, Mr. President, that however broad the wording of the Federal Power Act may be or whatever latitude may be implied in the interpretation of that act, the Federal Power Commission is treading on dangerous ground if it ignores entirely the interests of the people immediately affected by this project.

We cannot maintain our democratic institutions; we cannot maintain respect for the law, if we do not carry out the law in such a way as to maintain a merited faith in equal justice for all and to protect the common welfare of the people.

To present more clearly the factual picture of this case, I call attention to the evidence which was presented at hearings by the Federal Power Commission and the New Hampshire Water Control Commission in the Fall of 1944 and the Fall of 1946.

At those hearings, it was contended by the Bellows Falls Hydroelectric Corp., that only 1,147 acres of land would be flooded.

It was claimed also that of this total, only about 334 acres of tillable meadow land would be removed from normal agricultural use.

Testimony of agricultural authorities and Vermont State officials show that approximately 2,800 acres of fertile farm land would be rendered unproductive in Vermont alone and that a somewhat less acreage in New Hampshire would likewise be ruined for agricultural purposes by raising the water at the dam to a 385-foot elevation.

This refers not only to acreage that would be flooded but includes also acreage that would be made useless for agricultural purposes because of seepage, rise of the water table, and other harmful effects upon land that is "water logged" but not flooded.

Mr. President, we all know that we as a Nation have made serious inroads upon our soil. We have been prodigal in our waste of this life-sustaining resource.

To flagrantly sacrifice this valuable meadowland not only will disrupt the agricultural economy of the people living in the area but it will make serious inroads upon the productive capacity of New England.

At a time when we are drawing so heavily upon our resources in an effort to relieve the suffering peoples of the world and in view of the prospective future need for soil and its products, it would be extremely shortsighted, to say the least, for us to permit this fertile land to be permanently ruined for agricultural purposes.

As badly as we need power in New England, the time may come when we may need food nationally more than we need the small amount of electricity which can be developed at this site.

There is no justification for needlessly sacrificing this fertile land in order to get power when other sources of power are available, sources which would produce power more cheaply and would not necessitate the sacrificing of any valuable farm land.

Mr. President, I call attention now to a comparison between the value of the power which would be generated by this new dam and the value of the agricultural output of the land it is proposed to destroy.

According to power-company estimates at the hearings, the Bellows Falls Hydroelectric Corp. would receive annual benefits or profits amounting to $29,230 from the sale of electricity. Weighed against this benefit for power would be the loss of income to milk producers alone of more than $700,000 a year.

Moreover, it was shown by a witness for the largest milk distributor in Boston that the loss of revenue for merely handling the milk would amount to more than $36,000 a year, or about $7,000 more than the benefits from the sale of power.

Furthermore, the power company testified at the hearings that the annual output of the development would be 117,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually while the annual cost of this production would be $1,210,000.

This would make the cost of production over 1 cent per kilowatt-hour or much more than the cost of producing power at tidewater from steam.

Thus, from a purely dollars and cents viewpoint, this dam is not a feasible project.

There is one extremely disturbing fact to consider in connection with this project.

I refer specifically to the failure of the power company to make a comprehensive study of the effects of this proposed dam upon the agricultural economy of the Connecticut River Valley.

Power company witnesses at the hearings in 1944 and 1946 admitted that they had not made such a study.

They were concerned only with their own profits rather than the welfare of all New England.

Yet in the absence of such a comprehensive study, and in the face of clear-cut, specific testimony by farmers and farmers' representatives and the chairman of the committee created by the Vermont Legislature as to the harmful and devastating effect of this project upon the agriculture of the area, the Federal Power Commission granted the power company authority to proceed with the erection of the dam and the destruction of a large section of the Connecticut Valley.

This action by the Commission was neither justified nor warranted in the light of existing evidence.

Over and above the considerations which I have mentioned, Mr. President, there is one other factor to consider, namely, the building of this dam will not in any way relieve the hazard of floods.

It will, in fact, create an additional hazard by eliminating the natural storage basin which now serves the upper reaches of the river.

I am not opposed to the development of water power.

We need to do more than we have done in the past in the development of our water resources. We are in desperate need of low-cost power.

But when it comes to choosing between the development of power by the utilities for an annual profit of $29,000 and protecting the livelihood and welfare of hundreds of farmers producing nearly a million dollars worth of food a year, I do not hesitate to take the part of the farm people who are being ruthlessly deprived of their land.

I appeal to my colleagues here in the Senate to join with me in this stand. We represent the last ray of hope to the citizens involved.

Unless we act favorably on this resolution which I have introduced today, the cold hand of that legal entity—the utility corporation—will strangle the economic life of the farm people of the Connecticut River Valley.

The issue is clear-cut: It is the power company versus the people.

If the utility interests succeed in this instance in devastating several thousand acres of rich Connecticut Valley farm land for $29,000 annual profit, they will then seek to do the same in many other places.

It is not Vermont and New Hampshire alone that are concerned in this case. It is every locality in America which offers the power companies a chance to enhance their profits by riding roughshod over the rights of others.

I urge the Congress to intervene in behalf of the American people.

AN UN-AMERICAN IRON CURTAIN—ADDRESS BY SENATOR KEM

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "An Un-American Iron Curtain,"

delivered by him on July 25, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEMOCRATIC FOLLY—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Democratic Folly," published in the New York Herald Tribune July 26, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NEW DAY AND A NEW WAY—ADDRESS BY DR. FRANK N. D. BUCHMAN

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the New Day and a New Way, by Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman, delivered at Caux, Switzerland, on July 17, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

RAILROAD REORGANIZATION—STATEMENTS BY HENRY W. HARRISON

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD statements by Henry W. Harrison, chairman of the special stockholders' committee, National Conference of Railroad Investors, relating to railroad reorganization, which appear in the Appendix.]

MR. TRUMAN'S HOMESICKNESS—EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA BULLETIN

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Truman's Homesickness," published in the Philadelphia Bulletin of July 25, which appears in the Appendix.]

RESTORATION OF POWERS OF THE STATES—ARTICLE BY HON. JULIAN P. ALEXANDER

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "States of the Union: Time To Start Restoring Their Powers," written by Hon. Julian P. Alexander, a member of the Supreme Court of Mississippi, and published in the American Bar Association Journal for January 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Forty-ninth State," from the Dayton (Ohio) News of July 6, 1947; an editorial entitled "Hawaii's Good Americans," from the Pasadena (Calif.) Star-News of July 1, 1947; an editorial entitled "A New Star for Old Glory?", from the New York Herald Tribune of July 4, 1947; an editorial entitled "Case for Hawaii," from the Dallas (Tex.) News of July 3, 1947; and an editorial entitled "Hawaiian Statehood Bill," from the St. Louis Globe Democrat of July 3, 1947, which appear in the Appendix.]

IMPORTANCE OF INDEPENDENT TESTING, RESEARCH, AND INSPECTION LABORATORIES—STATEMENT BY AMERICAN COUNCIL OF COMMERCIAL LABORATORIES

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the American Council of Commercial Laboratories, dated April 15, 1947, dealing with the importance of independent testing, research, and inspection laboratories, which appears in the Appendix.]

PEACETIME MILITARY TRAINING—GALLUP POLL

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Gallup poll dated July 25, 1947, on the subject of peacetime military training, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM—EXCERPTS FROM REPORTS

[Mr. MALONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from reports of State school-lunch chairmen of State congresses of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, and other data indicating need for the program and increased Federal grants, which appear in the Appendix.]

BACKGROUND AND WORK OF SENATOR MALONE—ARTICLE FROM ENGINEERING NEWS-RECORD

[Mr. ECTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from an article in the Engineering News-Record of January 2, 1947, on the background and work of Senator MALONE, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, a statement prepared by him, which appears in the Appendix.]

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the work of the Eightieth Congress, which appears in the Appendix.]

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1948

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 820, House bill 4347, which is the last appropriation bill. It is most important that it be disposed of at once in order that it may go to conference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. RUSSELL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I wish to understand just what the bill is.

Mr. BALL. It is the second supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator from Minnesota tell us how much is carried in the bill?

Mr. BALL. The total is about $100,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will ask the Senator from Ohio if he will not withhold his unanimous-consent request until I can have an opportunity to examine the bill.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Donnell	Ives
Baldwin	Downey	Jenner
Ball	Dworshak	Johnson, Colo.
Barkley	Eastland	Johnston, S. C.
Brewster	Ecton	Kem
Bricker	Ellender	Kilgore
Bridges	Ferguson	Knowland
Brooks	Flanders	Langer
Buck	Fulbright	Lodge
Bushfield	George	Lucas
Butler	Green	McCarran
Byrd	Gurney	McCarthy
Cain	Hatch	McClellan
Capehart	Hawkes	McFarland
Capper	Hayden	McGrath
Chavez	Hickenlooper	McKellar
Connally	Hill	McMahon
Cooper	Hoey	Magnuson
Cordon	Holland	Malone
Martin	Reed	Thomas, Utah
Maybank	Revercomb	Thye
Millikin	Robertson, Va.	Tydings
Moore	Robertson, Wyo.	Umstead
Morse	Russell	Vandenberg
Murray	Saltonstall	Watkins
Myers	Smith	Wherry
O'Conor	Sparkman	White
O'Daniel	Stewart	Wiley
O'Mahoney	Taft	Williams
Overton	Taylor	Young
Pepper	Thomas, Okla.	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. Does the Senator from Ohio renew his unanimous-consent request?

Mr. TAFT. No; I withdraw the request and ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning at the point where we stopped last night, and proceed until the calendar is completed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator's request include a return to other bills on the calendar?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. I want the Senate to be in the same status, so far as the calendar is concerned, that it was in when we recessed last night.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to inquire of the able Senator from Ohio what his plans are today, so far as he can now foresee, about an executive session, a matter we discussed yesterday.

Mr. TAFT. We hope to have an executive session. It depends somewhat on the calendar. There are two or three bills. After that I think we can go to the Executive Calendar.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator then feels certain we shall have an executive session?

Mr. TAFT. We shall reach the Executive Calendar before we adjourn; I can give the Senator that assurance.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, does the plan contemplate that the call of the Legislative Calendar will be resumed where we left off last night, and that it will be finished?

Mr. TAFT. That will be done, and then if any Senator wants to ask for reconsideration, or for unanimous consent, to revert to some bill, it will be open to him to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INTERIM REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I would like to ask for immediate consideration of a resolution authorizing a

report by the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, during the recess. The Senator from Kentucky wished to ask me a question about it.

Mr. BARKLEY. May we have the resolution read?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

Mr. BREWSTER. The resolution simply provides——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Where is the resolution?

Mr. BREWSTER. Unfortunately, the resolution was adopted yesterday without the knowledge of either the Senator from Kentucky or myself.

Mr. BARKLEY. I might add, and without the knowledge of any other Senator. It was not done publicly in the Senate. It was adopted somewhere yesterday, without my knowing about it, and I wanted to make an inquiry about it from the Senator from Maine. I have no objection to the resolution, but I do not quite understand how a resolution came to be adopted by the Senate without its being reported to the Senate and somebody knowing about it. But I understand that the resolution authorized the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program to make interim reports during the recess of the Senate. I want to inquire of the Senator from Maine, who is chairman of the committee, whether in making these interim reports they are to be cleared through the minority members of the committee, so that the reports will not be made in the same way in which the resolution seems to have been adopted.

Mr. BREWSTER. I can assure the Senator from Kentucky that the unvarying practice of the committee and of its former distinguished chairman, the present President, Mr. Truman, when a Senator, and of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], when he was chairman, will be followed by those now in control of the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is interested in the statement of the Senator from Kentucky that certain action was taken surreptitiously and not in due course. The Chair would like to know what is involved?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is a resolution offered by the Senator from Maine authorizing the committee to make interim reports. The Senator submitted it to me sometime yesterday, and I asked him to let me know when it was to be brought forward, so I could ask the question that I am now asking. We both learned this morning that it was adopted yesterday in a way that I do not understand. I do not know that there is anything surreptitious intentionally about it, but it probably is a matter of routine; somebody considered that there was no objection to it and that it would be adopted. But I do not think that is a good practice in the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator will be good enough to pursue his inquiry, the Chair would like to be definitely advised as to what happened.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I think I may add that after the colloquy between the Senator from Kentucky and myself, I think the Senator from Kentucky indicated to the clerk at the desk that it was a matter to which he had no objection. I do not think he indicated he wanted to ask any questions about it, and I think that fully explains what happened. I am sure there is no occasion for reflection on anyone concerned.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, yesterday, at some time, somebody brought to me here at my desk the resolution and asked me if I had any objection to it. I stated I did not have. I stated I would not object to it, but that did not indicate that I gave my consent for its private adoption without being reported to the Senate and without having the opportunity to ask the Senator from Maine the questions which I have now asked.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is solely interested, as the Senator from Kentucky can understand, that this resolution got through in some surreptitious or backdoor fashion. The Chair is not presiding over that sort of procedure, if he knows it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think there was anything that carries the connotation of surreptitiousness, in the ordinary sense of the word. I think it probably was——

Mr. BREWSTER. Inadvertent.

Mr. BARKLEY. An inadvertence on the part of the clerks, or somebody at the desk, who assumed from my statement that I would have no objection to the resolution, that that meant that I consented to its adoption. But, even under those circumstances, any resolution adopted here should be reported to the Senate.

REINCORPORATION OF THE INSTITUTE OF INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill (H. R. 4168) coming over from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H. R. 4168) to provide for reincorporation of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The House bill is identical with Senate bill 1678, which was recently passed. Two bills crossed each other. The only change in the House bill over the Senate bill is to change the period of incorporation from 5 years to 3 years.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order entered a few moments ago, the calendar will not be called.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Senate Resolution 153, Calendar 765, and I yield to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] to make a statement.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I objected to the resolution last evening. After considering the resolution, and in view of my high regard for the able Senator from Nebraska, I wish to withdraw my objection to the consideration and adoption of Senate Resolution 153. The understanding is that the amendment which was offered last evening by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], would limit the period of extension to April 1, 1948.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska for the present consideration of Senate Resolution 153.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 20, Eightieth Congress, agreed to January 24, 1947 (creating a special committee to study the problems of American small business enterprises), is hereby continued until the 31st day of October 1948. Such committee is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $50,000 in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for the same purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. An amendment was offered in page 1, line 5, to change the date from the 31st day of October 1948 to April 1, 1948. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in connection with the resolution respecting the Small Business Committee, I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a memorandum on the subject of newsprint. I make the request for two reasons. One is that yesterday the Senate passed the sugar bill, carrying in it section 202 (e), to which I objected, and which I think is a direct slap at our good neighbor, Cuba, and is to be regretted. The memorandum which I ask to have printed as a part of my remarks concerns a criticism which has been made by various persons in this country, particularly certain American publishers, regarding the newsprint situation. I offer the memorandum as an explanation of the treatment we have received during the last several years from the Canadian newsprint industry. The Canadians, as well as the Cubans, have been very fair in the treatment of this country. I think they are both very important questions, and I do not think that much of the criticism by people in this country has been warranted. This memorandum will, I believe, throw some light upon the problem.

I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME POINTS ABOUT THE CANADIAN NEWSPRINT SITUATION IN RESPONSE TO CRITICISM BY AN AMERICAN PUBLISHER

The criticism expressed by an American publisher was mainly to the effect that present Canadian newsprint prices in the United States are likely to bring development of newsprint production in Alaska with consequences detrimental to the Ca-

nadian industry. The publisher said he believed that "the difference between $75 to $80 paper and $90 to $100 paper is the straw that will break the camel's back." Referring to possibilities in Alaska the publisher said:

"It should be kept in mind that expenditures being made in Alaska by the Armed Services are not limited to strictly military and naval installations. A basic objective is to increase the population of Alaska by many thousands so a Government-subsidized newsprint industry there could fit into the picture very easily and its value to the newspapers of the United States would guarantee widespread support for such expenditures in the face of the trend against subsidizing private industry."

Some points in response are given in the numbered paragraphs below:

1. The present price of Canadian newsprint, delivered at New York, is $90 a ton. Some large Canadian sellers have stated that they will make no increase in this price and it is, therefore, improbable that other Canadian sellers will want to place their customers at any material disadvantage by raising their prices in this period. Newsprint buyers thus seem to have assurance of a firm price for the 9 months of April 1 to December 31, 1947. This condition of price stability applies to no other major commodity in the United States nor does it apply to any other principal items of publishers' costs.

2. Assuming no further increase in 1947, as above, the price of Canadian newsprint through 1947 will average $88.50 a ton. This is only $4.50 a ton, or about 5 percent, above the $84 level authorized by OPA in October 1946.

3. Taking United States commodity prices in 1932 as a base of 100, the newsprint price index at $90 a ton is 186; at the assumed 1947 average of $88.50 a ton, the index is 183. The general index of United States commodity prices, issued by the United States Department of Labor, averaged 231 in March. The newsprint price index is thus still lagging about 45 points below the general index of United States commodity prices.

4. At $90 a ton, newsprint is also still lagging below the relative price levels of other pulp and paper products. As has been the case for some years past, newsprint continues to be the least profitable and attractive of any of the main pulp and paper products. This is illustrated by the following figures obtained from International Paper Co.: In 1946 newsprint manufactured by Canadian International Paper Co. represented 26 percent of the total tonnage output of the International Paper Co. group but only about 18 percent of its gross revenue and less than 7 percent of its net profit. Incidentally, these figures also demonstrated how meaningless and misleading it is for people to quote the profits of pulp and paper companies as representing newsprint profits. Newsprint, in many cases, is a minor part of a pulp and paper company's earnings and a still smaller part of its profits.

5. The above comparisons of newsprint price index versus general United States commodity price index, and of newsprint versus other pulp and paper products, help to explain the flight from newsprint which has become so clearly apparent among United States pulp and paper manufacturers in recent years. During the past 10 years United States manufacturers of pulp and paper have more than doubled their total output (from 10,000,000 to over 20,000,000 tons a year) but, in sharp contrast, they have reduced their newsprint output by several hundred thousand tons a year. The flight from newsprint is continuing. There are now only two major newsprint producers left in the United States, Great Northern in the East and Crown-Zellerbach in the West. The latter will further reduce its newsprint output, and divert to more profitable products in 1947–48.

6. At $90 a ton, the manufacture of newsprint is evidently still not sufficiently profitable to stop diversion to other products in the United States, let alone attract investment capital for the construction of new mills on any ordinary commercial basis. Current and prospective costs of new mill construction (assuming wood and hydropower to be available) would require prices substantially above $90 a ton to attract investment capital. The only North American projects for new newsprint mills presently in sight are in Alaska and in the southern part of the United States. All such projects are on the basis of obtaining United States Government assistance or what is, in effect, a subsidy from public funds. Such projects are obviously impelled by motives other than commercial profit and, if they are to proceed at all, they will proceed regardless of whether the market price for newsprint is above or below its present $90 level.

7. There is, therefore, no action open to a Canadian newsprint producer by which the above subsidy projects would be influenced one way or the other. Price decreases, even if practicable, would be likely to encourage, rather than discourage, projects of this type because lower prices would tend to reduce present output and this would add to the pressure for Alaskan or southern developments under Government aid.

8. With Canadian newsprint at its present level of $90 a ton for New York delivery, newsprint consumers in United States and Canada are paying by far the lowest prices in the world. In England the price for domestic newsprint, fixed by the British Government, is equivalent to $116 a short ton and Canadian newsprint is selling in England at $109 a short ton. In Australia the current Canadian price (largely due to shipping costs) is equivalent to $130 a short ton. European newsprint is selling in South American countries as high as $190 and more a short ton. In contrast to the $90 which they pay to Canadian manufacturers, United States publishers today are openly paying $200 and more a ton for extra newsprint from other sources.

9. United States customers of Canadian newsprint mills are not only paying the lowest prices in the world but are obtaining and using a lavish supply. In the five prewar years of 1935-39 Canadian newsprint deliveries to the United States averaged 2,286,000 tons a year. In 1946 the figure was 3,355,000 tons. This was an increase of more than 1,000,000 tons, or 47 percent, over prewar; it was also an increase of more than 800,000 tons, or 32 percent, over the 1945 figure. In the first 4 months of 1947 Canadian deliveries to the United States were at the rate of over 3,500,000 tons a year. This is an increase of 1,214,000 tons, or 53 percent, over the prewar average. It exceeds 1945 by over 950,000 tons, or 38 percent. It tops the previous all-time high of 1946 by nearly 150,000 tons.

10. Canadian newsprint mills in 1946 and 1947 to date have set new all-time records of production and newsprint consumption in the United States has also reached new peaks. Consumption in March and April of 1947, for example, was about 14 percent above the same months of 1946 and nearly 33 percent over the March-April prewar average. There can be no doubt that improved prices have been an important stimulus to this record supply despite the fact that, as already noted, current Canadian prices are still the lowest newsprint prices in the world, are still well below the comparative levels of other pulp and paper products, and far below the general level of United States commodity prices.

11. Some people, genuinely concerned in the Canadian newsprint industry, seem to fear that present price trends and their consequences may constitute a parallel to the developments following World War I when high prices led to excessive expansion of the Canadian industry and a subsequent price collapse followed by years of disruption and bankruptcy. The present situation, however, affords no such parallel and justifies no such fears from the Canadian standpoint. Two factors are completely different; one is the price trend itself; the other is the possibility of expansion. These are amplified in paragraphs 12 and 13 below.

12. The newsprint price trend of War II has been quite different from the trend of War I as may be seen from the figures of comparable years in each period, shown in the following table. The prices shown are the average yearly prices for delivery at New York; the index figures are based on the prices in the first year of each war taken as 100.

World War I	Price	Index
1914	$42.30	100
1915	42.00	99
1916	51.78	122
1917	63.78	150
1918	64.30	151
1919	80.15	189
1920	112.60	265
1921	111.45	262
1922	75.00	176
1923	81.80	192
1924	80.80	190

World War II	Price	Index
1939	$50.00	100
1940	50.00	100
1941	50.00	100
1942	50.00	100
1943	54.66	109
1944	58.00	116
1945	60.25	121
1946	72.25	145
1947	[1] 88.50	177

[1] Assumed average for 1947; at $90 the index is 180.

It will be seen at once that, in the World War II period, there has been no sharp and violent rise comparable to the figures of the World War I period. In the fourth year of World War II, for example, the index remained at 100 against 150 in 1917, the comparable year of World War I. Against the sharp index peaks of 265 and 262 in 1920 and 1921 the index figures for the comparable years of 1945 and 1946 were only 121 and 145. The index figure of 177 (or 180) in 1947 is still substantially below the index figures which prevailed throughout the 6 years of 1919–24, with the single exception of 1922. In the existing 1947 price level, and in the trend which has preceded it, there is nothing to attract speculative capital for new mill expansion as there was in the World War I period. Proof of this has already been indicated in some of the points mentioned in paragraphs 4, 5, and 6 above.

13. The other major difference, mentioned at the end of paragraph 11, is in the relative possibilities of expansion. The difference is notable. At the end of World War I the Canadian industry had a total capacity of less than 800,000 tons a year (total Canadian production in 1918 was less than 750,000 tons) and there were immense forest areas, as well as hydropower resources, awaiting development which provincial governments naturally were eager to encourage. Today the Canadian industry has an annual capacity of 4,349,700 tons (over five times its World War I figure) and there are few, if any, forest and power sites suitable for new mill construction, or feasible for new mill development at present costs and prices. The most economical and effective expansion of newsprint capacity today is in the form of improving existing mills. In the Canadian industry this is currently taking place to the extent of many millions of dollars but it should be obvious to anyone that this cannot be expected to proceed without maintenance of an

encouraging newsprint price level. It should also be noted, both by Canadians and by consumers who rely on Canadian supply, that there can be no adequate protection and conservation of Canadian forest resources unless there are market prices sufficient to keep the industry in a healthy operating condition.

14. From a Canadian standpoint, therefore, there appears to be nothing in the present newsprint price situation to cause concern. There would be ground for concern if Canadian newsprint sellers were repeating the error of the World War I period by charging prices which would promote reckless capacity expansion, but this is clearly not the case. As already pointed out, the only prospects of new mill developments are United States Government subsidy projects in which profit is not the impelling motive and in which price is not the deciding factor. Instead of ground for Canadian anxiety there is, on the contrary, reason for Canadian satisfaction in the evidence that Canadian sellers are following a restrained course but are at least, for the first time in many years, beginning to derive respectable profits from newsprint operations and from the use of public forest resources thus involved.

15. This should give satisfaction to Canadians in general because newsprint is the largest single item of Canada's export trade, and, except gold, the largest single source of United States dollars which have again become a factor of paramount importance in Canada's national economy. As far as investors are concerned, it is significant that payment of dividends by Canadian newsprint mills is still so unusual as to excite comment. The two largest wholly Canadian newsprint producers are Consolidated Paper and Abitibi, both of which have substantial earnings from products other than newsprint. Consolidated paid the first dividend in its history last year; its shareholders have received a total of $1.50 a share in 15 years. Abitibi emerged from 14 years of receivership only last year and has not yet paid a dividend on its common shares. International Paper's figures have already been mentioned in paragraph 4 above but they are worth repeating: newsprint in 1946 constituted 26 percent of International's tonnage output, but only about 18 percent of its gross revenue and less than 7 percent of its net profit. As Montreal Financial Times recently commented: "Few, if any, industrial groups on the stock markets can show as meager a record of average dividend return over the past 20 years as that of the newsprint industry."

16. Canadian newsprint manufacturers for many years have been criticized in Canada for using up public-forest resources with no commensurate return. It would be strange indeed to find now, among Canadians, some form of economic psychosis expressed in a sense of guilt or apology about their largest industry's good fortune in at last reaching a position where profits can be made. There is Canadian satisfaction, rather than misgiving, when profits can be obtained from trade in minerals, wheat, or any other export commodity. The same satisfaction should apply to newsprint improvement within the limits of safety and prudence here described.

17. The newspaper business, as well as the newsprint industry, would be better off if newsprint were more widely recognized as an ordinary commodity (like wheat, sugar, coal, steel) rather than mistaken as something belonging to freedom of the press. Most magazine publishers, for example, deal with their questions of paper supply in an ordinary business way, they do not become outraged nor begin to imagine plots against the state when paper companies manage to make money. Some newspaper publishers, however, seem to be under a delusion that the newsprint industry is a sort of public utility to be operated for their exclusive benefit. They seem to think that they have a divine right to unlimited paper supply at cost, or at less than cost, and that any departure from this condition is a violation of sacred rights.

18. This delusory thinking was just as apparent some years ago, when newsprint was selling at $40 a ton, as it is today. It was expressed at that time in continued efforts to keep newsprint prices from rising above bankruptcy levels. It is reflected today in publisher agitation for Government funds to develop new supply in Alaska and the South, following the same old pattern of unlimited paper supply at cost or less. If investors and manufacturers are no longer willing to subsidize the press in this way, then the Government must take public funds to do it. It is the type of thinking that sees the newspaper business only in terms of mass circulation and unrestricted space.

19. To publishers who think in this fashion it does not seem to occur that their conception may be unsound and that, for their own protection and continuance, it might be a good idea to begin adapting their operations to some limitations of forest resources and to maintaining a healthy paper industry. British publishers have learned the lesson of limited supply in an extreme form through the past 8 years and their profits have improved rather than diminished.

20. The delusion described above seems to have led some publishers into a paradoxical position in which they complain about newsprint price increases, but at the same time call for expansion of newsprint capacity and seem to think that Canadians are acting badly by not finding more forests and building more mills. This is, indeed, an example of wanting to have one's cake and eat it, too.

21. If newspaper publishers want low newsprint prices, they must be prepared to expect diminished production. The flight from newsprint by United States mills makes this painfully clear. If increasing supply is their main desire, then publishers must be prepared to pay prices which will stimulate production and maintain a healthy manufacturing industry unless, of course, they can succeed in getting the United States Government to use public funds to subsidize undertakings in Alaska and the South which no investors would touch as commercial ventures. Whether a Government-subsidized paper supply would prove consistent with freedom of the press is a question for publishers to ponder upon. In any event it is clear that newsprint consumers cannot have both low prices and expansion of commercial supply. One objective contradicts the other.

MARKETING AGREEMENTS AND ORDERS—AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks that the spirit of the unanimous-consent order requires the call of the calendar before we undertake to return to other bills on the calendar. Therefore, the Chair will not entertain motions to return to previous bills until the remainder of the calendar has been called.

The clerk will call the next bill on the calendar.

The bill (H. R. 452) to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act relating to marketing agreements and orders, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1826) making it a petty offense to enter any national forest land while it is closed to the public, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, does that bill make it a petty offense to enter a national forest land while it is closed to the public?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands it does.

Mr. CORDON. Over, please.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

DEVELOPMENT OF COOPERATIVE AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION WORK

The bill (H. R. 4110) to amend title I of the act entitled "An act to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work and the more complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges," approved June 29, 1935 (the Bankhead-Jones Act), was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. May we have an explanation of that bill?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, when the agricultural research bill was passed last year it read that 20 percent of the amount authorized should be spent for marketing research. What was meant was 20 percent of the amount appropriated. The bill corrects that error. Otherwise, if 20 percent of the amount authorized should be spent for that purpose, all the money appropriated would have to be spent for marketing research.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4110) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend title I of the act entitled 'An act to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work and the more complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges,' approved June 29, 1935 (the Bankhead-Jones Act)."

AMENDMENT OF PEANUT MARKETING QUOTA PROVISION OF THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT, 1938

The bill (H. R. 4124) to amend the peanut marketing quota provision of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to make more effective the quota system in respect to the peanut industry by imposing more severe penalties for the violation of the quota. I have no disposition to object to the bill. On the contrary, I realize how extremely important for the American economy, and especially to my section of the country and to my State, the peanut industry is. But I wanted to take advantage of this opportunity to say that I voted against the bill in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on the principle that I think the time has arrived for us to find some way to dispose of, at a fair price, the agricultural commodities of this country, without limiting the acreage of the farmers. I think the farmers are not in sympathy with the curtailment of their acreage. They feel

that it imposes an unfair limitation upon their freedom of enterprise and action, and now, at a time when the world is hungry for our agricultural products, it seems to me that with a proper agricultural policy we could find some way to allow the bounty of American agricultural production to flow to the needs of this country and of the world, so that the farmers could be assured a fair price for what they grow, and not be limited in the production which they may have on their own farms.

I realize that under present circumstances, the bill is going to bring about a serious curtailment in the peanut acreage, if it becomes effective, as it must. But if the Senator from Minnesota does get his committee, as I hope he will, to investigate agriculture, I hope he will devote a part of his fine energy and effort to finding some way by which we can find a market that will be fair to the producer, but at the same time will not mean that he will have to limit the number of acres of his own land which he may devote to the production of agricultural commodities.

I do not object to the bill, but I wanted to make that observation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the bill is not passed it will cost the Government $100,000,000, plus the $200,000,000 quota. During the war the penalty for raising an excessive amount of peanuts was reduced in order to encourage greater production. Now with the Steagall amendment in effect, the Government is bound to support the price of peanuts. An inordinately large acreage of peanuts is being planted, and in order to discourage the planting of many times as many peanuts as we can consume, we must restore the penalties which were in effect before the war.

I agree with what the Senator from Florida has said, but I also maintain that if this piece of legislation is not enacted, it will probably cost the United States Treasury $100,000,000 next year.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, may the bill be passed over until I have had a chance to discuss it with Senators?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, if the Senator from Connecticut will withhold his objection, I should like to explain this bill to him. During the war the Department of Agriculture urged the peanut growers to increase production. They increased their production from 2,000,000 to 3,000,000 acres. It was a valuable contribution to the war effort, because the bulk of the peanuts were processed into oil to meet an acute shortage of fats. We now find that we have more peanuts than there is a market for peanuts and for peanut oil. The parity price on peanuts for processing purposes is about $200 a ton, and the producers do not want to pay more than $100 a ton.

Peanuts are a basic farm crop, entitled to limited parity support, but the Department of Agriculture has said that unless the farmers will vote this year to curtail production it will not support the full program for peanuts, which will mean a ruinous price for all peanuts, both edible peanuts and oil peanuts.

All the bill does is to put peanuts on a par with other basic farm commodities, in that if the farmers themselves vote to impose acreage control, it will then be made effective for peanuts, as it is for other controlled crops, and a 50-percent penalty will be provided for violation of the quota. The bill will have no effect whatever unless the farmers themselves vote this fall for acreage control.

I fully share the view of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] that we would like to see a free and unregimented agricultural program; but we know, for example, that this year we have 1,400,000,000 bushels of winter and spring wheat, against a normal domestic market of 800,000,000 bushels; and if we were not now exporting, through loans and gifts, about 500,000,000 bushels of wheat, we would have such a glut of wheat on the domestic market that it not only would force the Government to greater outlays of money to support the crop at 90 percent of parity, but would eventually wreck every wheat-growing State in the Union.

We have this problem in connection with peanuts. It is not that we want a 5-cent bag of peanuts to sell for 10 cents. The bill would not affect the cost of living. That is probably what the Senator from Connecticut has in mind. The only purpose is to give the farmers themselves an opportunity to bring their production in line with the visible market, if they so elect. According to the best-informed opinion it will save them money if they do it, and it will save the Government a great deal of money in its support program, especially if we continue that program beyond 1948.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Virginia has expired.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I am intensely interested in the subject of high prices. It seems to me that when any effort is made, either by private monopoly or Government monopoly, to limit production of any article which the American people eat or use, it tends to increase its price.

However, I am persuaded by the arguments of the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. They are more familiar with the problem than am I, and I am perfectly willing to withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4124) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELATIONS WITH ITALY, BULGARIA, HUNGARY, AND RUMANIA WITH RESPECT TO PATENTS

The bill (S. 1707) to carry into effect certain parts relating to patents of the treaties of peace with Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania, ratified by the Senate on June 5, 1947, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property of 1883, as amended, is considered as reestablished and in full force and effect between the United States and Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania from the date of this act and the nationals of the latter countries may hereafter apply for and obtain patents in the United States for their inventions and enjoy the rights and privileges thereof as provided in article 2 of said convention: *Provided, however*, That patents shall not be applied for or obtained, or if obtained, shall not be valid, for inventions heretofore made relating to war material as specified in article 6 of annex XV A of the Treaty of Peace with Italy, article 6 of annex IV of the Treaty of Peace with Bulgaria, article 6 of annex IV A of the Treaty of Peace with Hungary, and article 6 of annex IV A of the Treaty of Peace with Rumania.

SEC. 2. The rights of priority and the times for the taking of any action specified in sections 1 and 3 of Public Law 690, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 8, 1946, which had not expired on December 8, 1941, or which commenced after such date, shall be and are hereby extended until February 29, 1948, in favor of nationals of Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania, subject to the conditions and limitations specified in sections 1, 3, 4, and 10 of said Public Law 690: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this act shall affect any act which has been or shall be done by virtue of special measures taken under legislative, executive, administrative, or military authority of the United States during World War II.

SEC. 3. Nationals of Germany and Japan may hereafter apply for and obtain patents in the United States for their inventions in accordance with the patent laws and enjoy the rights and privileges thereof: *Provided, however*, That patents obtained for such inventions shall be subject to any conditions and limitations with respect to duration, revocation, utilization, assignment, and licensing which may be imposed by Congress, or by the President in accordance with the provisions of any peace treaty hereafter entered into with Germany or Japan: *And provided further*, That, except for patents based on applications filed in the United States Patent Office prior to the date of enactment of this act, patents may not be applied for or obtained, or if obtained, shall not be valid, for any invention made, or upon which an application was filed by any such national, before January 1, 1946, in Germany or Japan or in the territory of any other of the Axis Powers or in any territory occupied by the Axis forces.

Mr. CONNALLY subsequently said: Mr. President, what happened to Calendar No. 775, Senate bill 1707?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill was passed.

Mr. CONNALLY. May I inquire of the Senator from Wisconsin what is the purpose of the bill?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Patent Office feels that it is essential that legislation of some sort be enacted to resume patent relationships with countries with which treaties already have been signed. Legislation fixing the rights of erstwhile enemy countries is now desirable.

Section 1 of the bill declares that the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property is considered to be in full force and effect between the United States and Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Roumania from the date

of the enactment of the bill, and the nationals of those countries may hereafter apply for and obtain patents in the United States and enjoy the rights and privileges thereof, as provided in article 2 of the convention.

Article 2 of the convention provides that the nationals of each of the countries which adhere thereto are entitled, in all the other countries, to the same rights with respect to patent matters as the country grants to its own nationals. In other words, article 2 requires equal treatment of foreigners by countries which adhere to the convention.

I may say to the distinguished Senator that the State Department, the Commissioner of Patents, and several others were represented before the committee. All the bill does is to attempt to place in operation again the relations which we enjoyed with other countries before the war. Especially now that treaties have been made with the countries mentioned in the bill it was considered wise, in order to protect American patent rights, that this particular bill be passed.

Mr. CONNALLY. Did the State Department and the Commissioner of Patents approve the bill?

Mr. WILEY. Oh, yes. It is their bill.

G. F. ALLEN

The bill (H. R. 2811) for the relief of G. F. Allen, former chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

O. DEAN SETTLES AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 1736) for the relief of O. Dean Settles and others was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT subsequently said:

Mr. President, what happened to Calendar No. 777, House bill 1736?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill was passed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to have an explanation of the bill. Does it carry a monetary grant, and how much?

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, the bill involves payment of damages for loss of several lives and the property of an entire farm, together with crops which had been harvested, as the result of negligent operation of an aircraft in the State of Kansas. I am unable to state the exact amount of money involved.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thought it was the practice to print in the calendar the amount of money involved. That is ordinarily done, but no amount is stated with respect to this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This is a combined claims bill. The Senator is correct in stating that the calendar usually carries the total amount.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know how much is involved.

Mr. McGRATH. The bill will show how much.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the bill involves claims of about $27,000. A United States Army pilot flying a plane came down too low—about 35 feet above the earth. The plane hit a house, killed a man and child, burned up the house and barn and agricultural equipment, and severely, almost fatally, burned two women. The War Department does not question the amount.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This is a very substantial amount.

Mr. REED. It is a very substantial amount.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It seems to me that these amounts ought to be stated on the calendar, especially when a large amount is involved.

Mr. REED. I am not responsible for the amount not being on the calendar. Let me say to the Senator from Arkansas that when a man kills a man and child, and almost fatally burns two women, burns up a house and barn and agricultural equipment, the amount of damages is bound to be large.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did the War Department approve this claim?

Mr. REED. The War Department does not disapprove it. The War Department says that this boy was flying outside his field. He was more than 75 miles from his base. He was doing some stunts in the locality from which he came. Certainly when the Government of the United States puts a man in charge of an airplane which burns up a house, kills two persons, and does a great deal of damage, if any damages are to be paid at all, a substantial sum will be involved.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I probably shall not object, but I should like to examine the bill. May it be passed over temporarily?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator object?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not object. I should like to have the bill passed over temporarily until I can examine it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the vote by which the bill was passed is reconsidered, and the bill is passed over temporarily.

Mr. REED subsequently said: Mr. President, may we return to Calendar No. 777, House bill 1736? The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and I have discussed the matter, and I understand that the Senator from Arkansas withdraws his objection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have no objection, except to say that the amount involved is $38,000, and it is not stated on the calendar. I think such amounts should be stated on the calendar. The calendar would indicate that no money was involved.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. I think the Senate is lucky to get any sort of a calendar under the circumstances under which we have been working recently.

Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 1736?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1736) for the relief of O. Dean Settles and others was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE J. HINER

The bill (H. R. 3845) for the relief of George J. Hiner was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZATION TO PART-TIME REFEREES IN BANKRUPTCY TO ACT AS AGENTS OR ATTORNEYS

The bill (H. R. 1810) to amend the Criminal Code and certain other legislation to permit part-time referees in bankruptcy to act as agents or attorneys for claimants against the United States was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MARIE SALAMONE

The bill (H. R. 1085) for the relief of Mrs. Marie Salamone was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ARCHER C. GUNTER

The bill (H. R. 1316) for the relief of Archer C. Gunter was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRED O. DONOHUE

The bill (H. R. 618) for the relief of Fred O. Donohue was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. ROBERTA FLAKE CLAYTON

The bill (S. 641) for the relief of Mrs. Roberta Flake Clayton was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed, for the purpose of paying amounts owing as arrears of pay and unearned premiums on national service life insurance in the case of James William Clayton, late a machinist's mate, third class, United States Navy, to consider Mrs. Roberta Flake Clayton, of Mesa, Ariz., the adoptive mother of the said James William Clayton, a legal heir within the meaning of the act entitled "An act to permit settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and of deceased commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, without administration of estates," approved February 25, 1946 (Public Law 306, 79th Cong.), and the payment to the said Mrs. Roberta Flake Clayton of an amount not to exceed $2,849.74, shall be in full satisfaction of the obligation of the United States to pay the same.

MERCHANTS MOTOR FREIGHT

The bill (S. 1235) for the relief of Merchants Motor Freight was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Merchants Motor Freight, Inc., of St. Paul, Minn., the sum of $728.98, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States (1) for reimbursement of amounts which it was required to expend for repairs to its open-top trailer as a result of damage to such trailer which occurred on June 30, 1943, when it undertook, at the insistence of a United States Navy officer acting in his official capacity, to transport certain heavy machinery for a war contractor, after it had protested that such machinery was too heavy for such trailer; (2) for reimbursement of expenses incurred in effecting the removal of such machinery from its trailer to another carrier; and (3) for compensation for the loss of use of such trailer: *Provided*, That no part of the amount ap-

propriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

EXTENSION OF JURISDICTION OF UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The bill (S. 1696) to amend the act of August 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 784), so as to extend the jurisdiction of the United States District Court, Territory of Hawaii, over Canton and Enderbury Islands, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of the act entitled "An act to extend the jurisdiction of the United States District Court, Territory of Hawaii, over the Midway Islands, Wake Island, Johnston Island, Sand Island, Kingman Reef, Kure Island, Baker Island, Howland Island, and Jarvis Island, and for other purposes", approved August 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 784, 48 U. S. C. sec. 642a), is hereby amended to read: "The jurisdiction of the United States District Court, Territory of Hawaii, is hereby extended to all civil and criminal cases arising on or within the Midway Islands, Wake Island, Johnston Island, Sand Island, Kingman Reef, Kure Island, Baker Island, Howland Island, Jarvis Island, and, having regard to the special status of Canton and Enderbury Islands pursuant to an agreement of April 6, 1939, between the Governments of the United States and of the United Kingdom to set up a regime for their use in common, the said jurisdiction is also extended to all civil and criminal cases arising on or within Canton Island and Enderbury Island: *Provided*, That such extension to Canton and Enderbury Islands shall in no way be construed to be prejudicial to the claims of the United Kingdom to said islands in accordance with the agreement.

SEC. 2. The title of the said act approved August 13, 1940, is amended to read: "An act to extend the jurisdiction of the United States District Court, Territory of Hawaii, over the Midway Islands, Wake Island, Johnston Island, Sand Island, Kingman Reef, Kure Island, Baker Island, Howland Island, Jarvis Island, Canton Island, and Enderbury Island, and for other purposes."

RELOCATION OF McMILLAN FOUNTAIN

The resolution (S. J. Res. 110) to provide for the relocation of the McMillan Fountain was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the McMillan Fountain, heretofore located in McMillan Park at First and Douglas Streets NW., shall be relocated on grounds owned by the United States, in Potomac Park, District of Columbia, at a location to be chosen by the Secretary of the Interior, with the approval of the National Commission of Fine Arts.

TRANSFER OF FARM ISLAND TO THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

The bill (H. R. 3874) to authorize the city of Pierre, S. Dak., to trapsfer Farm Island to the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COMPACT BETWEEN PENNSYLVANIA AND NEW JERSEY

The bill (S. 1602) granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Calendar No. 807, House bill 4140, is, as the Chair understands, identical with Senate bill 1602. Is there objection to the substitution of the House bill and its present consideration?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4140) granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 1602 will be indefinitely postponed.

OHIO RIVER BRIDGE AT OR NEAR SHAWNEETOWN, ILL.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1529) to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Shawneetown, Ill., which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with an amendment, on page 2, line 10, to strike out "1946" and to insert "1947."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the proviso to the first section of the act entitled "An act to revive, reenact, and amend the act entitled 'An act authorizing the county of Gallatin, State of Illinois, its successors, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near the city of Shawneetown, Gallatin County, Ill., to a point opposite thereto in the county of Union, State of Kentucky,' approved July 18, 1939," approved June 26, 1946, the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River, at or near Shawneetown, Ill., authorized to be built by the county of Gallatin, State of Illinois, by an act of Congress approved July 18, 1939, which act was extended by an act of Congress approved July 2, 1940, and was revived, reenacted, and amended by an act of Congress approved June 26, 1946, are hereby extended 1 and 3 years, respectively, from June 26, 1947.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

SEC. 3. This act shall be effective from June 26, 1947.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4111) authorizing the construction of flood-control works on the Little Sioux River and its tributaries in Iowa was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

MODOC NATIONAL FOREST, CALIF.

The bill (H. R. 3395) to add certain lands to the Modoc National Forest, Calif., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

The bill (H. R. 4127) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, before the bill goes over, I wonder if I may make an inquiry of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. It is the so-called civil-service retirement bill which has been reported by the Committee on Civil Service. I wonder if the Senator from Ohio will tell the Senate whether it is the purpose of the majority, as it has organized its program, to have this bill on a motion to take it up.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, we have neither placed it on or off the list. It is a bill which I am afraid will excite considerable debate. I cannot give the Senator any assurance as to whether we shall reach it today. It certainly should be dealt with at some time.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to serve notice on the Republican leadership that if this bill is not taken up and voted on before the Senate adjourns I intend to place the responsibility squarely upon the Republican leadership of the Senate. Time and time again, Mr. President, the matter has been brought to the attention of the Republican leadership; and yet when the Republican policy committee met on this bill, I, as chairman of the Committee on Civil Service, was not invited to attend. My advice was never sought. The committee reported the bill by a vote of 12 to 1. Today I want to say to every Federal employee that if the Republican leadership does not permit a vote on this bill I shall advise them to vote the Democratic ticket at the next election. We are entitled to a vote on this bill. We begged for it and asked for it; and as chairman of the committee I want to fix the responsibility squarely where it belongs, Mr. President, and I do not want any mistake about that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico has spoken once on the matter. Under the rules he is not entitled to speak again.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that Calendar No. 792, House bill 4127, is a very important bill, affecting approximately 2,000,000 Federal workers. The chairman of the Committee on Civil Service a few moments ago spoke of the number of votes in committee for the bill. In the committee there was only one vote against it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not fair to say, in view of the remarks made by the Senator from North Dakota, the Republican members of the committee, with one exception, voted to report out this bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I shall answer that question by saying that

the statement is absolutely true. All the Democrats in the committee voted for it, and all the Republicans, with one exception, voted for it. I do not care to draw lines here and say that it is a Democratic bill or that it is a Republican bill. All the members of the committee except one voted to report the bill, feeling that something should be done to relieve the situation in regard to the payments to retired civil-service workers. In 1942 when we increased the amount to be paid in by the civil-service workers from 3½ percent to 5 percent, they at that time received practically nothing for the additional amount they were paying into the fund, and they should now, after the war is over, receive greater benefits than they are receiving at the present time. We feel that they can receive such benefits out of the fund, without costing the Government any additional amount. The bill will cost the workers 1 percent more, as it increases their contribution from 5 percent to 6 percent; but it will pay to the retired workers annuities sufficient at least to keep them alive. The increase will not be large, but sufficient to keep them alive in the face of the advancing cost of living.

So we urge that both Democrats and Republicans vote to pass this bill in order to do justice to the civil-service workers of the United States. I shall not say to the Members on this side of the aisle that I will support the Republican Party if this bill is not passed today. Coming from South Carolina, never would I vote the Republican ticket, regardless of how Senators may vote, but I was glad to hear a Republican Senator say that he would advocate the election of a Democratic Congress if this bill should not be passed. I hope that the Senator will continue to make such statements. If this bill is not passed I hope that the retired civil-service employees will know that it is not the Senators on the Democratic side who are holding it up. We are ready to vote now. I believe we would on this side vote almost unanimously for the bill. So I hope the Republican policy committee will decide to make it a "must" bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I favor House bill 4127 and shall vote for it when it comes before the Senate. However, I want to say that I am not a member of the steering committee of the Republican Party, but I am opposed to the Republican chairman of a committee, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] rising in his place and trying to bulldoze and dictate to the Republican Party. The Senator from North Dakota made the statement that he was going to advise people to vote the Democratic ticket if the bill is not passed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I refuse to yield. The Senator said he was going to advise people to vote Democratic. My observation has been that the Senator from North Dakota is more of a Democrat than he is a Republican. My recommendation is that he go over and sit with the Democrats and run on their ticket and become a member of the Democratic Party. As one Republican, I am sick and tired of seeing Republicans run on the Republican ticket, accept favors at the hands of the Republican Party, accept chairmanships at the hands of the Republican Party, and then rise on the floor of the Senate, desert their party, and advise people to vote the Democratic ticket. I have no objection to voters voting the Democratic ticket. I admire a good Democrat or a good Republican. But I do not like to see Members of our party rise on the floor of the Senate and try to bulldoze the Republican Party into doing this, that, or the other thing.

I simply want the American people to know where I stand. I want the Senator from North Dakota to know where I stand; I want the Republican Party to know where I stand, and I want the Democratic Party to know where I stand.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to state that the failure to give consideration to the retirement bill is not the fault of the Republican Party. I have never approached the policy committee in any effort to block the bill and I am not asking now that the bill be withheld from consideration as regular business here today.

I desire, however, to call attention to the fact that for over 3 months this retirement bill has been on the Senate Calendar, and on two different occasions I have challenged the accuracy of the committee report. On both those occasions I have challenged the chairman of the committee, the sponsor of the bill, to stand on the floor of the Senate and defend his bill. However, at no time has he ever answered any of my arguments. At no time during this 3-months' period has he ever made a motion to bring up the bill for consideration. During this time there have been many chances to do so. There have been occasions when the Senate has taken a recess for 2 or 3 days because there was no business before it.

The reason why this retirement bill has not been brought before the Senate is that the committee report is inaccurate and the Senator from North Dakota knows he cannot defend his report. There are many inaccuracies and misrepresentations in it. Again I challenge the Senator from North Dakota, as the sponsor of the bill, to bring the bill before the Senate for consideration. So far, his only effort to have this bill passed has been on calendar call, when debate is limited to 5 minutes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill goes over. The Senator from North Dakota has spoken once. Under the rule, he will have to wait until other business is transacted before he can speak again.

The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS PROCUREMENT ACT OF 1947

The bill (H. R. 4010) to authorize the Treasury Department and the United States Government Printing Office to furnish or to procure and furnish administrative materials, supplies, and equipment to public international organizations on a reimbursable basis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. BEULAH HART

The bill (H. R. 1730) for the relief of Mrs. Beulah Hart was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GRAFF, WASHBOURNE & DUNN

The bill (H. R. 1534) for the relief of Graff, Washbourne & Dunn was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time and passed.

COMMEMORATIVE STAMPS, CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF HENDERSON AND LUELLING

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1564) to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the centennial anniversary of the movement of Henderson and Seth Luelling to the Oregon country, which had been reported from the Committee on Civil Service with an amendment, on page 1, in line 7, after the word "movement", to strike out "of" and insert "to", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to prepare for issuance, on as early a date as practicable during the calendar year 1947, a special series of 3-cent postage stamps, of such design as he shall prescribe, in commemoration of the centennial anniversary of the movement to the Oregon country of Henderson and Seth Luelling, the founders of horticulture west of the Rocky Mountains, and of the epic removal by Henderson Luelling of living nursery of fruit grafts in an ox wagon from Salem, Iowa, to Milwaukie, Oreg., which became the foundation of the great fruit farms and industry of the West.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LAGUNA BAND OF MISSION INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA

The bill (H. R. 3064) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to the surviving members of the Laguna Band of Mission Indians of California was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. What action was taken on Calendar No. 796, Senate bill 1564?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That bill was passed.

The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

LOANS TO OSAGE INDIANS WHO SERVED IN WORLD WAR II

The bill (H. R. 3325) to enable Osage Indians who served in World War II to obtain loans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DANIEL BROKEN LEG

The bill (H. R. 3696), authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Daniel Broken Leg was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PER CAPITA PAYMENT TO FORT BERTHOLD INDIANS

The bill (S. 1133) providing for the per capita payment of certain moneys appropriated in settlement of certain claims of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in North Dakota was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may we have a slight explanation of the bill, as to its cost?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Illinois request a slight explanation?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; I ask for a slight explanation, lasting not more than 3 or 4 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, after long years of litigation the Fort Berthold Indians secured a judgment against the United States for certain claims. The Seventy-ninth Congress appropriated $400,000 to take care of that judgment. That money now lies to the credit of these Indians in the United States Treasury, and it is drawing 4 percent interest.

Under this bill the Indians will be given $150 apiece, or a total of $300,000. The money belongs to them. I see no reason why it should not be distributed according to the rules of their tribal council.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to know what the exact cost will be.

Mr. YOUNG. It will be $300,000, and there still will remain in the Treasury, to their credit, $100,000.

Mr. LUCAS. Is the $300,000 included in the President's budget that was sent to Congress in January?

Mr. YOUNG. The bill does not cost anything, inasmuch as the money now lies in the Treasury to the credit of these Indians and requires no budget estimate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in order to clear the RECORD, I ask the Senator from North Dakota if it is not a fact that the Treasury has this money, which belongs to the Indians, and that all the bill provides for is that their money shall be distributed to them to this extent.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, that is correct. I should like to add that the Fort Berthold Indians have always been on the side of the United States, going back to 1804 or 1805, when they housed, fed, and otherwise took care of the Lewis and Clark Expedition. This expedition would have failed had it not been for the kindly deeds of these Indians. Both by their kindly deeds and the furnishing of a guide to help them on their way through the dangerous territory lying between there and the Pacific coast.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands, with an amendment, on page 1, in line 7, after the words "North Dakota", to strike out "per capita" and insert "$150 per capita, cut of", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That within 60 days from the date of enactment of this act the Secretary of the Interior shall withdraw from the Treasury, and pay to the enrolled members of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in North Dakota, $150 per capita, out of the balance of the principal and interest of the amount appropriated in settlement of certain claims of such Indians pursuant to the last paragraph preceding the heading "Miscellaneous Indian Tribal Funds," in the first section of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1947, remaining after the fees and expenses authorized by such paragraph to be paid from such appropriation shall have been paid or provided for. The money paid to such members under this act shall not be subject to any lien or claim of any nature against any of such members.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to say that this is a very worthy bill. As my colleague has said, this matter has been in the course of disposal since 1866. This is a typical example of how long it takes before Indians get justice in this country—in this case, nearly 100 years before they could get this money, after they were entitled to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill has been passed, anyway.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1698) to define the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, when this bill was introduced, it was understood that all the departments were in favor of it and that all of them had been consulted. Later it appeared that the Department of Justice had some questions about the bill. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

INVESTIGATION OF HIGH PRICES OF CONSUMER GOODS—NOTICE OF REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I should like to give notice now that I intend to call up, at the end of the calendar, Calendar No. 770, Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, establishing a joint committee to investigate high prices of consumer goods. The consideration of the resolution was objected to last night. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], who interposed the objection, is not now on the floor. I have not seen him this morning. This is an extremely important measure, and it should receive the attention of the Senate. It was unanimously reported by both committees by which it was considered, both the Banking and Currency Committee and the Committee on Rules and Administration. I wish that some of my Democratic colleagues on the other side of the aisle would notify the Senator from Idaho that I intend to call up this measure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will be recognized in due course.

The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

FORT SUMNER IRRIGATION DISTRICT, NEW MEXICO

The bill (H. R. 3834) to authorize a project for the rehabilitation of certain works of the Fort Sumner irrigation district in New Mexico, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CONNALLY. Over.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the sponsor of this bill and the Senator who reported it is not in the Chamber. I think it proper that the bill be laid aside until my colleague is present to explain the bill.

Inasmuch as I was glad to agree to have favorable action taken on a bill affecting Texas, so I am sure the Senator from Texas will approve a bill affecting my State.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am willing to have the bill temporarily passed over. I will say that there is a bill providing for temporary relief, and I have no objection to that. But this bill will take a great deal of time and investigation, and I cannot consistently withdraw the objection. I am not hostile to the interests of New Mexico; but the bill which has already been passed, which is of a temporary character, at least, authorizes the expenditure of $60,000 to take care of the existing work on a reimbursable basis.

I have no objection to that, and that will meet the emergency conditions. In connection with the next session of the Congress, beginning in January, we can take up this permanent bill, and I shall not impede it or delay it in anywise.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have always had the greatest respect for the Senator from Texas, and I shall continue to entertain it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I want the Senator from Texas strictly to understand, however, that from now on, if capriciousness is going to prevent action, I shall be just as capricious as anyone else. I have always tried to be fair and to cooperate. In the Committee on Appropriations I have gone out of my way in order to get funds for Texas which the Members of Congress from Texas could not get, but when there is a bill which affects the Senator from New Mexico, reported by the Committee on Public Lands of the Senate, the Senator from Texas objects. That is a little beyond my understanding, I say with all deference and respect for the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I did not know that this bill was a measure for the relief of the Senator from New Mexico. I did not know it was a personal matter. I have the utmost respect and regard for the Senator from New Mexico. However, this matter relates to a stream which originates in New Mexico and flows down into Texas. Both States are interested in the water of the stream. I do not want to be unfair.

I did not object to the other bill which allowed the Reclamation Service to make repairs on existing works in New Mexico

to the extent of $60,000, on a reimbursable basis. But I am under pressure; the people of Texas are sending telegrams urging me to insist on my objection to the bill we are now discussing. They have had no opportunity to come here and be heard, and I appeal to the Senator from New Mexico not to entertain his retaliatory attitude. I am not going to object to something merely because it is in New Mexico. I want to pass on measures on their merits, and I hope the Senator will not think I am making my objection on some other ground. I have aided New Mexico many times on the floor of the Senate, and I expect to continue to do so, regardless of whether the Senator from New Mexico entertains the hostile feeling he has now expressed. I shall not let anything like that interfere with my doing justice in all these matters. But my constituents are entitled to a hearing, they are entitled to an opportunity to present their views regarding this bill, and that is all I am asking.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not a fact that the constituents of the Senator from Texas, to whom he refers, came before the Committee on Public Lands and made their showing?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know; that may be.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Texas was before the committee with reference to this bill, and entered his statements as to how he felt with reference to the bill.

May I ask the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] if it is not a fact that the Committee on Public Lands had hearings on the bill?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, we had an extended committee meeting on the bill, and, with the Senator's permission, I should like to read a very short statement in connection with it.

Mr. CONNALLY. From whom?

Mr. BUTLER. From the committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. The committee has made a report?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from New Mexico on the bill has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I regret very much that the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is not present to make a statement in regard to the bill, which he reported. In his absence I should like to say that House bill 3834 authorizes the rehabilitation of the Fort Sumner irrigation district of New Mexico, originally a privately constructed project, by the Bureau of Reclamation, in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws. There is an urgent necessity that action be taken at the present session of Congress.

The irrigation works of this district were constructed nearly 40 years ago through the private resources of the pioneer farmers who settled the area. From time to time the works have suffered damage from the floods of the Pecos River. Today an acute emergency exists because of the fact that the dam has broken, and has been repaired with an earthen fill. The next big flood will no doubt cause the dam to go out completely, leaving the farmers without water.

Mr. President, that is the statement I should like to call to the attention of the Senator from Texas. Any funds spent at this place will be repaid in full by the residents of the district in accordance with existing law. Moreover, holders of the general obligation bonds of the district must agree to the refinancing plans on a basis satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior before rehabilitation is begun. I suggest that it would be wise for the Senate to pass the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill goes over, under objection.

Mr. HATCH subsequently said: Mr. President, I had been called out of the Chamber when House bill 3834 was reached. I shall not take the time of the Senate now to discuss this particular matter, because objection has been made, but I do wish to say that there is another bill which was agreed to by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] relating to the same matter, which would take care of the situation temporarily, provided the House agrees to the Senate bill which has passed the Senate, and is in the House today.

I wish to say to the Senator from Texas that I shall keep track of the other bill, and sometime later in the day, if it appears that the bill can be passed, I might then ask the Senate to recur to the bill, and perhaps we could get this one passed. But for the time being I think the matter might well stand in its present status.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION PROGRAM

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, yesterday the so-called Mundt bill, H. R. 3342, was under discussion and in order not to prolong the debate as to whether it be made the pending business, I offered Senate Concurrent Resolution 29 which provided for a special commission to investigate the Voice of America program and report back to the Senate on or before February 1, 1948. At the same time H. R. 3342 was left on the Senate Calendar. An understanding was reached by unanimous consent, that at the close of yesterday's calendar my Resolution 29 would be taken up.

Today's printed calendar does not show my resolution and leaves me in doubt as to my position.

I am advised that there are other measures on today's printed calendar which come ahead of my resolution. I am also reasonably certain that upon the close of the consideration of the printed calendar other Members of the Senate will ask to recur to certain numbers, and I want to be assured of the place of Senate Concurrent Resolution 29, so that it can be considered as soon as possible, because the House is now waiting to ascertain whether we will adopt it, since it must be passed by the House. I would appreciate it if I could call it up at once, but I shall not insist, because there are other measures which come ahead of it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's measure bears Calendar No. 824, and it will be reached in about 10 minutes, if we can have a little action and less talk in the Senate.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Chair.

STATE TUBERCULOSIS SANATORIUM AT GALEN, MONT.

The bill (H. R. 2793) authorizing an appropriation for the construction, extension, and improvement of a State tuberculosis sanatorium at Galen, Mont., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ST. LAWRENCE BRIDGE COMMISSION

The bill (H. R. 3332) creating the St. Lawrence Bridge Commission was announced as next in order.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, does this relate to the St. Lawrence waterway?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; it is a measure merely to grant to the State of New York and to the Dominion of Canada permission to build an international bridge.

Mr. BYRD. I have no objection.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the bill has the approval of the State of New York.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF CANAL ZONE CODE

The bill (H. R. 1260) to amend section 107 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALE OF LAND BY NAVY TO ANTHONY P. MILLER, INC.

The bill (S. 1551) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell to Anthony P. Miller, Inc., a parcel of improved land adjacent to the Anchorage housing project at Middletown, R. I., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to sell to Anthony P. Miller, Inc., for not less than its fair market value and on such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, an unimproved parcel of land adjacent to the Anchorage housing project at Middletown, R. I., containing 20 acres more or less.

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE

The resolution (S. Res. 156) increasing the limit of expenditure by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eightieth Congress, $25,000 in addition to the amount and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

Mr. LODGE subsequently said: Mr. President, what action was taken as to Calendar No. 808, Senate Resolution 156?

Mr. TAFT. It was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. When?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Calendar No. 808, Senate Resolution 156, is a resolution which has already been agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. May I inquire when that was done?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It was just agreed to. What is the inquiry by the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. LODGE. I should like to have the Senate reconsider the action on Senate Resolution 156, because I should like to direct a question to members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce regarding it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair calls the request for reconsideration of Senate Resolution 156 to the attention of the Senator from Nebraska, inasmuch as he reported it.

Mr. LODGE. I see the Senator from Indiana present, as well as the Senator from Maine, and I should like to invite their attention for 1 minute to the importance, when they undertake the investigation, of looking into the apparent breach of faith on the part of the Swiss Government regarding the American jeweled-watch industry. I have gone into this matter very carefully, and it is not a tariff matter, it is not a matter for the Finance Committee. In my judgment, it is a matter for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

I find the American jeweled-watch industry ordered certain watch machinery, and made deposits toward payment of the machinery, which were accepted by the Swiss people. This was just before the war. Now the Swiss watch-machinery cartel, Machor, has stepped in and demanded that the machinery will not be delivered unless the American watch manufacturers agree to limit production to their prewar level. Of course, such an agreement on the part of American manufacturers would be wholly illegal under the Sherman antitrust laws and under no circumstances could be agreed to by any American industry.

On behalf of representatives of the American Watch Workers Union, one of our oldest and most respected labor organizations, and their able president, Walter W. Cenerazzo, I furnished the Under Secretary of State, William Clayton, with a list of the ordered machinery which was being held up by the Swiss watch-machinery cartel and received his assurance that the matter would be carefully looked into when he returned to Geneva last May. However, no further action has been reported and I certainly would like to have the assurance of the Senator from Maine that this is a matter which will receive aggressive congressional attention this summer in the course of the investigation to which he refers.

I do not wish to delay the Senate in a recitation of the many important implications of such action on the part of the Swiss. Already they have in effect repudiated their agreements as to the export quotas into this country of their watches. This competition is, without any exaggeration at all, giving the coup de grace—the body blow—to American jeweled-watch manufacture. Add to that the Swiss refusal to deliver machinery which has been partially paid for and which they are under contractual obligations to deliver, and we have a very serious situation indeed. I will only remind the Senator that during the war, all our American watch manufacturers—and they are all too few as it is—suspended the making of watches in favor of making precision instruments for our armed forces. If we permit the Swiss to close down our watch-making plants—and that is more than just a possibility—we shall lose all the expert technical know-how that went into the making of these instruments and will permit a very damaging blow to be struck at our national security.

That is why I think this is vitally important and why I hope to have the Senator's assurance that the matter will be most carefully investigated this summer.

Mr. President, I am in favor of good relations with other countries, and I am in favor of reciprocity. I am in favor of foreign trade, but I am not in favor of people going back on their word.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I can assure the Senator from Massachusetts the matter to which he directs attention will invite the most serious consideration of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and there are aspects of it also which involve finance. It happens that the Senator from New Jersey and myself are also members of that committee, so that it will be fairly reported to both committees before the opening of the next session.

Mr. LODGE. I am very happy to have that assurance, and I withdraw my objection.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I agree with everything the Senator from Maine has said. I think the explanation or suggestion by the Senator from Massachusetts is very excellent. I should like to ask, when the machinery was purchased, was there any stipulation that there should be only a certain number of Swiss watches?

Mr. LODGE. I do not know of any.

Mr. HAWKES. I think that is something we should find out, because otherwise the Swiss cartel would simply be doing what I should call welching on the contract.

Mr. LODGE. That is true.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution has been agreed to.

TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF READING, PA.

The joint resolution (H. J. 218) providing for the representative of the Government and people of the United States in the observance of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Reading, Pa., was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MRS. EDNA MARY JAKIMOWICZ

The bill (S. 1431) for the relief of Mrs. Edna Mary Jakimowicz was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of the tenth category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136 (e)), Edna Mary Jakimowicz, the wife of a citizen of the United States who served honorably in the armed forces of the United States during World War II, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence under the act approved December 28, 1945 (Public Law 271, 79th Cong.), if she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

ATHLETIC AND SPORTS PROGRAMS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1302) to aid the associations, groups, organizations, and institutions encouraging participation of the youth of the country in athletic and sports programs by making surplus athletic equipment available to such associations, groups, organizations, and institutions, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a), notwithstanding the provisions of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, the War Assets Administrator is authorized to dispose of, without charge except for transportation and delivery, to States, their political subdivisions and instrumentalities; to public and governmental institutions; to nonprofit or tax-supported educational institutions and organizations; to charitable and eleemosynary institutions and organizations; to nonprofit associations, groups, institutions, and organizations designated to promote, support, sponsor, or encourage the participation of the youth of the country in athletics, sports, and games any surplus personal property which is suitable for use in athletics, sports, or games by the youth of the country.

(b) To aid in making surplus athletic equipment available to the youth of the country through associations, groups, organizations, and institutions sponsoring or promoting the participation of youth in athletics, sports, and games, any Government agency having a surplus of personal property which would be suitable for the purposes of this act shall declare such surplus to the War Assets Administrator who shall have authority to dispose of same in accordance with the provisions of this act.

(c) Any surplus property suitable for use by the youth of the country in athletics, sports, and games, or any property owned by any agency of the Government hereafter declared surplus which may be so used, shall not be disposed of in any manner other than as provided in this act unless the Administrator has given sufficient notice of such property available for disposal as herein provided and no request for such property has been received.

SEC. 2. (a) Any property so transferred shall be without restriction and without charge to the transferee except for disassembling, transporting, and delivering such property. The United States shall incur no obligation or liability in connection with the disassembling, transporting, or delivery of any property disposed of pursuant to this act.

(b) The War Assets Administrator is hereby authorized to prescribe, amend, and rescind such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

(c) The War Assets Administrator is hereby authorized to determine the qualifications of the transferees under the provisions of this act and his decision shall be final.

(d) The War Assets Administrator is hereby authorized to effect transfers under the provisions of this act without regard to priority as between the transferees under this act or any other law, any law to the contrary notwithstanding.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ACCEPTANCE OF DECORATIONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4308) to amend section 1 of the act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662), as amended, relating to the acceptance of decorations, orders, medals, and emblems by officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations, neutral nations, or other American Republics.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Virginia, who reported the bill, whether it authorizes the acceptance of medals and decorations and honors conferred by other countries upon American officers.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, it only changes the law in one particular. Under the act of June 20, 1942, authority was given, under the Constitution, to permit the acceptance of decorations by any member of the armed forces, within 1 year after the close of a war. Then the question arose whether one who had been a member of the armed forces, but had concluded his service and taken a position of profit or trust under the United States would be permitted to accept a decoration. The bill simply extended the law to provide that if he first served in the armed forces and later obtained a position of profit or trust under the Government of the United States, he could receive the decoration.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, he could receive the same decorations that he might have been permitted to receive had he remained in the service?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the only change is to clarify the law.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

KITCHEN RAILWAY CARS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1632) to authorize the transfer of certain troop kitchen railway cars to the War Department and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments, on page 1, line 8, after the word "Department," to insert "and the Navy Department"; on the same page, line 10, after the word "War", to insert "or the Secretary of the Navy"; on page 2, line 3, after the word "military", to insert "or naval"; and on the same page, in line 4, after the word "War", to insert the words "and Navy", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or the War Assets Administration if the property herein described has been declared surplus, is hereby authorized to transfer all its right, title, and interest, without charge or reimbursement, in and to not to exceed 150 troop kitchen railway cars to the War Department and the Navy Department, regardless of present location, upon certification by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy made within 6 months after the enactment hereof that such transfer of such cars is necessary for the maintenance of an adequate Military or Naval Establishment, such cars to be selected by representatives of the War and Navy Departments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. GURNEY subsequently said: Mr. President, when Senate bill 1632, Calendar 813, was passed, the title was not amended. It should have been amended. I ask unanimous consent to amend the title so as to include the Navy as well as the Army. The amendment in the body of the bill included the Navy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the title will be amended so as to include the Navy.

IMPERIAL PALACE, DRAMATIC ORDER KNIGHTS OF KHORASSAN

The bill (S. 468) to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Imperial Palace, Dramatic Order Knights of Khorassan," to increase the amount of property which the corporation may hold from $100,000 to $5,000,000, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I inquire what act the bill would amend, and what is the Imperial Palace, Dramatic Order Knights of Khorassan? Is that a branch of the Knights of Pythias?

Mr. WILEY. That is correct. All the bill does is to authorize the particular order to increase its holdings in real estate. When incorporated some 25 years ago the order was authorized to own real estate only up to $100,000 in value. The bill would change that provision.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 468) to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Imperial Palace, Dramatic Order Knights of Khorassan," to increase the amount of property which the corporation may hold from $100,000 to $5,000,000, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Imperial Palace, Dramatic Order Knights of Khorassan," approved February 25, 1909 (35 Stat. 646), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. That the said corporation shall have power to take and hold real and personal estate not exceeding in value $5,000,000, which shall not be divided among the members of the corporation, but shall descend to their successors for the promotion of the fraternal and benevolent purposes of said corporation."

JESSIE THOMPKINS

The bill (H. R. 890) for the relief of Jessie Thompkins was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL TORT CLAIMS ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3690) to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 2, line 21, after the word "damages", to insert "measured by the pecuniary injuries resulting from such death to the persons, respectively, for whose benefit the action was brought."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 3, after the numerals "1946", to insert "and, notwithstanding the provisions of section 420 of the Federal Tort Claims Act, no claim which accrued on or after January 1, 1945, and prior to the date of enactment of this act on account of death caused by the negligent or wrongful act or omission of any employee of the Government shall be barred by reason of such provisions if (a) the law of the place where such act or omission occurred provides, or has been construed to provide, only for damages punitive in nature, and (b) suit on such claim is instituted pursuant to part 3 of the Federal Tort Claims Act not later than August 2, 1948."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PROCLAMATION OF FEBRUARY 1 AS NATIONAL FREEDOM DAY—BILL PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 37) requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERTON. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. OVERTON. I withhold my objection. My objection is I have not read the bill. My objection, however, is that we have enough national holidays in the United States under Federal law and under State legislation. I believe we do not need any more. Another objection is that I think the Fourth of July is recognized as "freedom day" in the United States of America, just like Christmas ought to represent religious freedom, so the Fourth of July represents political freedom. I do not know what we need another holiday to be proclaimed as "freedom day."

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I believe that if there is any event in the United States history which United States Senators would agree should be honored by being observed by naming a day on which to observe the event, it is the Emancipation Proclamation. I should not think any Senator would object to the designation of a day to observe that event. I wish to point out to the Senator that National Freedom Day has been observed in Philadelphia for some years, and participated in by the 48 States.

Freedom Day was sponsored by Maj. R. R. Wright, a distinguished citizen of Philadelphia, a former slave who died just a few short days ago at the age of 94. He was a very reputable citizen, held in the highest regard by, I would say, all the people of Pennsylvania. He had earned for himself the esteem and the admiration of all who knew him. At the time of his death he was a bank president, I believe the only Negro bank north of the Mason and Dixon's line. For some years the city of Philadelphia and the State of Pennsylvania have issued proclamations calling upon our people to observe this day, and the Governors of the 48 States have sent representatives to the brilliant ceremony which has been participated in by over 20,000 people in my city on February 1 of each year. It occurred to me that in view of these facts and since the passage of this resolution would be a fitting memorial to my distinguished fellow citizen, the late Maj. R. R. Wright, the Senator might withdraw his objection.

Mr. OVERTON. During the month of February we have Abraham Lincoln Day, and George Washington Day, and then there is groundhog day, too. February is the shortest month of the year, containing 28 days. I must ask that the joint resolution go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

ACTIVITIES OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT IN FLORIDA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Thursday, July 24, the senior Senator from Nevada addressed the Senate at some length regarding an investigation which is, and has been for some time, in progress by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. In the course of his address the senior Senator from Nevada inserted in the RECORD a proposed report on the matter which he, as chairman of the subcommittee, had prepared. As the senior Senator from Nevada stated in his remarks, "Not one member of the subcommittee, aside from myself, has seen fit to take the position which this proposed report advocates."

In view of the fact that the matter under investigation is still pending in the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and in view of the fact that it is contemplated that extensive further hearings will be necessary before the conclusion of the investigation, I direct the attention of the Senate to the fact that after the preparation and submission of the proposed report by the senior Senator from Nevada to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, a memorandum was prepared, at my direction, in which very definite issue was taken, not only with reference to the conclusions in the proposed report by the senior Senator from Nevada, but also with reference to certain facts developed thus far in the hearings which several members of the subcommittee felt were at variance with the facts as recited in such proposed report. Without at this time attempting to anticipate the final judgment of the subcommittee or the Committee on the Judiciary, I think that it is only fair and proper, in view of the action of the senior Senator from Nevada, that the memorandum to which I have previously alluded be at this time inserted in the RECORD, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the memorandum which I now hold in my hand, relating to a proposed report, being the proposed report of the senior Senator from Nevada, be inserted in the RECORD. I call attention of the Senate to the fact that the proposed report of the senior Senator from Nevada was inserted in the RECORD last Thursday by unanimous consent, and I feel that I have a right to expect that the document which I am now submitting shall likewise be inserted without objection. I ask that the memorandum be printed following my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM RELATING TO A PROPOSED REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY PURSUANT TO SENATE RESOLUTION 35, SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS, AND SENATE RESOLUTION 90, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

I. INTRODUCTION

The resolution under which the investigation of the subcommittee was conducted, Senate Resolution 35, Seventy-ninth Congress (subsequently extended by S. Res. 90, 80th Cong.), authorized and directed a full and complete study and investigation of the activities of the Securities and Exchange Commission and Post Office Department, or any representative thereof, with a view of determining whether "(a) the activities of said agencies, through their representatives, are crippling, hampering, or rendering ineffective the Municipal Bankruptcy Act, as amended, heretofore enacted by Congress; and (b) whether or not the activities of said agencies, through their representatives, are unfairly resulting in undermining the credit of the taxing units of the State of Florida."

The major thesis of the proposed report is to the effect that representatives of the Post Office Department, representatives of the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Du Pont interests in Florida, and certain Florida officials collaborated to drive out of Florida certain investment interests, hereinafter referred to as the Crummer Co., and that their efforts crippled, hampered, and rendered ineffective the Municipal Bankruptcy Act and unfairly resulted in undermining the credit of the taxing units of the State of Florida. The minor theses of the proposed report deal primarily with matters of animus and activities incident to the major thesis.

The major thesis involves:

1. An investigation conducted by the Florida House of Representatives with reference to Florida bond refundings, which investigation ultimately centered on the activities of the Crummer Co.

2. An investigation of the activities of the Crummer Co. by the Post Office Department.

3. An investigation of the activities of the Crummer Co. by the Securities and Exchange Commission. The investigation by the Post Office Department and the Securities and Exchange Commission resulted in two indictments being returned against the Crummer Co. in Kansas.

4. The refusal of the Florida State Securities Commission to issue a license to the Crummer Co. Successful mandamus action was maintained by the Crummer Co. to secure a license.

5. The refusal by the Florida State Securities Commission to issue to the Crummer Co. a renewal license. Successful mandamus action was maintained by Crummer Co. to secure such renewal license.

6. An investigation of the bond-refunding situation and condition by the Florida State Senate which investigation resulted in a report which concluded in effect that the investigations by the Federal agencies were causing suspicion to be cast upon certain refunding programs and were thereby undermining the credit of certain localities in Florida.

The Department of Justice, after reviewing the files and report in the Federal investigation, on July 7, 1944, authorized the United States attorney in Kansas to institute criminal proceedings against the Crummer Co. Evidence was presented to a grand jury which on August 3, 1944, returned two true bills charging R. E. Crummer & Co. and certain of its officers and agents with violation of the fraud provisions of the Securities Act of 1933 and with using the mails to defraud customers.

After the court sustained a demurrer to one of the indictments, the United States attorney appealed to the circuit court of appeals which reversed the district court. Certiorari was denied by the United States Supreme Court. Thereafter, on June 10, 1946, both indictments were dismissed at the instance of the Department of Justice, over the objections of the SEC. With reference to the dismissal, the record discloses the following testimony of an Assistant Attorney General (R. 875):

"As far as the Department of Justice was concerned, it was just a case there that was being handled out in the field, and it was not until Mr. Fly, as I understand it, who was their lawyer, came to the Department and complained that he had not had a fair deal, that we really thought of going into the case."

(Mr. Fly is James Lawrence Fly, formerly Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission.)

II. THE PRINTED RECORD IN THE CASE DOES NOT DISCLOSE A LACK OF PROBABLE CAUSE FOR THE INVESTIGATIONS OR THE INDICTMENTS OF THE CRUMMER CO.

1. In 1940 the Supreme Court of the United States made the following pronouncement with reference to a refunding plan worked out by the Crummer Co.

"The fiscal-agency contract provided that Crummer was to be compensated for its services and reimbursed for its expenses by assessing charges against the participating bondholders. * * *

"Crummer solicited assents to the plan. Approximately 69 percent of the bondholders accepted. But for the claims held by the Crummer interests, and voted in favor of the plan, the requisite two-thirds statutory vote, however, would not have been obtained. Some of these claims had been purchased prior to the fiscal agency contract, some later. The average price was apparently about 50 cents on the dollar. The The inference seems clear that some of them were acquired in order to facilitate consummation of the composition by placing them in friendly hands. But the record does not show whether or not Crummer disclosed to the bondholders when their assents were solicited that it was a creditor as well as the city's fiscal agent, the extent of the claims held by it and its affiliate, the circumstances surrounding their acquisition, and its intent to vote those claims in favor of the plan. No such disclosure was made in the plan. * * *

"The order of confirmation must be set aside. It cannot be said that the plan does not discriminate unfairly in favor of any creditor, that the acceptances were in good faith, that the requisite two-thirds vote of approval had been obtained.

"Crummer had at least three financial stakes in this composition: (1) the fee to be

collected from the bondholders; (2) its speculative position in such of the interest accruals as it might acquire from the bondholders at a third of their face amount; (3) the profit which might accrue to it or its affiliate, as a result of the refunding, on bonds acquired at default prices." (*American Ins. Co.* v. *Avon Park* (311 U. S. 138, 1 cc. 141, 194(.)

2. In January 1942 the United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida made the following pronouncement with reference to certain refunding activities of the Crummer Company (see record, p. 723):

"That the action of the fiscal agent, R. E. Crummer & Co., or both, in instigating or promoting suits against this county, with the consent of the county, under the facts found herein, was in violation of the law of Florida.

"Neither the county nor R. E. Crummer & Co. has made a full disclosure as required by law to this Court of the profits that will accrue to R. E. Crummer & Co. or the refunding agency from the refunding operations.

"That the general conclusions of the Master are adopted and the findings of fact are sustained by the facts in his report."

The findings of fact of the Master included the following:

"Prior to the institution of these proceedings, the county commissioners of Bay County with the advice and cooperation of the so-called Agency and the officials of R. E. Crummer & Co., while the refunding agreement was solely voluntary, successfully defeated efforts of nonparticipating creditors to compel the county to pay the sums owing them, and at the same time by agreement induced the State board of administration to consent to the issuance of writs of mandamus issued in the name of employees of R. E. Crummer & Co., who had no interest in them. These writs of mandamus purported to order payment of existing obligations at 5 percent and 6 percent per annum of the county at face value, but were actually obtained to carry out an agreement between the county and the so-called agency for the transfer of the money held by the county, by the board of administration, to a bank in Chicago, Ill., the money so collected to be distributed solely among participating bondholders at 3 percent per annum, and thus prevented other creditors of the county who would not accept the proposed voluntary settlement from collecting the sums due to them, although they were entitled to be paid therefrom."

3. The record contains a letter from Tom C. Clark, Assistant Attorney General, with reference to the report of the Securities and Exchange Commission on the activities of the Crummer Co., which activities were the basis for the indictments. This letter reads in part as follows (see record, p. 780):

"I am of the opinion that the contents of said report show definite violations of these statutes, and, accordingly, you are authorized to present the two cases contained in said report to a grand jury of your district.'

4. The record contains testimony to the effect that the Crummer Company represented both the bondholders and the counties and drew a fee from each. (See record, pp. 109, 194.)

5. The record contains testimony to the effect that the Crummer Co. caused to be instituted numerous mandamus actions to compel payment on defaulted bonds, thereby forcing its refunding arrangements to be consummated. (See record, pp. 30, 32, 33, 140.)

6. The record contains testimony concerning improper favoritism to the Crummer Co.:

"R. E. Crummer & Co. always turned out to be the successful bidder and in payment this firm was allowed to substitute old Sarasota County refunding bonds, which it already owned, in lieu of cash for the new refunding bonds. Also in several instances the county invited public tenders under onerous terms and conditions that could be met evidently only by R. E. Crummer & Co. Immediately after these awards the terms were modified and materially eased." (See record, p. 415.)

7. Testimony is contained in the record concerning certain alleged misrepresentations by the Crummer company:

"And my purpose in making those inquiries was to find, if I could, what representations R. E. Crummer & Co. had made, as to whether these new bonds were to be sold at only 4 percent, or carry two sets of certificates, and I found from that correspondence that in every instance, that they were represented to be 4 percent bonds only; said nothing about excess coupons which were to be withheld and collected for the benefit of four municipalities (R. 131).

"Crummer represented to the unsuspecting owners of the outstanding callable not due bonds that the respective counties had called them legally and to send them in to such and such a place for payment. Whereas he took them up himself, turned them in to the counties for new bonds worth materially more than par * * *" (R. 636).

III. ANIMUS AND ACTIVITIES INCIDENT TO THE MAJOR THESIS

The proposed report states (p. 8):

"Cooperation between representatives of the Securities and Exchange Commission and of the Post Office Department, in the carrying out of their inquisition, was extremely close. They received full and effective cooperation from various representatives of the Du Pont interests. Their activities were closely intertwined once they jointly began to move. The Securities and Exchange Commission supplied the lawyer and vested him with subpoena power. The Post Office Department supplied the factotum who functioned as the entree to the United States attorneys in at least three States. Both sets of agents apparently depended upon the Du Pont interests to furnish information, documents, legal briefs, etc., in working up the cases.

"An assumption that the common objective motivating all this cooperative activity was simply an impartial investigation, aimed at unearthing the facts, does not appear to fit the circumstances. On the other hand, an assumption that the common objective was to discredit R. E. Crummer and to eliminate his companies as a factor in the field of municipal finance provides a complete explanation for all that was done."

Examples of testimony from the record in the case relating to the foregoing and similar questions of animus and activities, inconsistent with the major thesis, follows:

DU PONT INTERESTS

1. Mr. Edward Ball, head of the Florida Du Pont interests, testified that he did not have any desire to see the Crummer Co. eliminated from Florida (R. 667); that he did not take any action to put Mr. Crummer out of business (R. 667); that his knowledge of a complaint with the Post Office Department against the Crummer organization was merely from reading it in the press (R. 651); that his only communications with the post-office authorities, which he could recall, was when Inspector Mansfield (the post office inspector) called on him once or possibly twice inquiring if he had any information (R. 644); that he probably learned of the complaint of Mr. Main (of the Du Pont interests) subsequently (R. 646); that he, as he recalled, did not oppose the Board of Administration Act in the form in which it was finally adopted (R. 727); that neither the Florida National Group of banks or the Du Pont estate has ever, as far as he knew, taken a position on any pending legislation (R. 661). With reference to the investigation by the Florida House of Representatives, Mr. Ball testified as follows:

"I never met with that committee, and they never called me as a witness, and they never asked for any records of any kind" (R. 674).

2. Mr. Giles J. Patterson, an attorney who represented the du Pont interests, testified that he had told Inspector Mansfield (the post officer inspector) that he "was not interested in prosecuting Mr. Crummer in any way, shape, or form" (R. 575); that Mr. Mansfield definitely did not ask him for any information or advice in connection with two criminal cases against Mr. Crummer (R. 577); that he had nothing to do with any indictments directly or indirectly (R. 577).

3. Mr. Walter P. Fuller, investigator for the Florida House of Representatives investigating committee, in answer to the question as to what part Mr. Giles Patterson (Du Pont attorney) played in the activity of the committee, replied as follows:

"Well, I consulted him, I imagine, a half dozen times. He was not very sympathetic to our activities at all" (R. 601).

Mr. Fuller further testified as follows (R. 608):

"Mr. Patterson was not very keen about this investigation. Mr. Patterson took the position with me that he did not want to be in a position of persecuting Mr. Crummer, and that he was not going to do anything that pointed in that direction. He said, 'If I wanted to, there was plenty I could do,' but he was not going to let his personal feelings get involved, and Mr. Patterson wasn't particularly enthusiastic to see either me or Mr. Mansfield, in my opinion."

4. Inspector Mansfield (the post-office inspector) was asked this question: "Did it become apparent to you at all, during your investigation, that one of the concerns was probably behind this investigation?" His answer was "No" (R. 79). He further testified that he did not receive any help from any lawyer not connected with the Government (R. 484); that the information which he obtained from representatives of the Du Pont interests "was information which I sought from them and which they were able to furnish" (R. 501).

THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

1. Inspector Mansfield (the post-office inspector) was asked this question: "From the very time you started out, and until you wound up on this case, you were looking for a conviction of the Crummer people, weren't you?" His answer was: "No, sir." (R. 92.) He further testified that he was looking for the development of all of the facts (R. 92); that he was not influenced in his views by Mr. Fuller (the investigator for the Florida House of Representatives) "without having support from my own investigations, which convinced me that the things were true" (R. 63); that he tried in all fairness and honesty, in going over the entire field, to determine whether there had or had not been a violation (R. 64); that he did not interview Mr. Crummer because the SEC had done so at different times and had provided him with information about their previous interviews with Mr. Crummer (R. 65, 80).

2. Letters sent out by Inspector Mansfield seeking information from bondholders concerning their relations with the Crummer Co. included this or substantially similar language:

"This letter should not be regarded as reflecting upon the character or reliability of the person or concern mentioned, and should be treated as confidential" (R. 69).

THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

A letter in the record (R. 752, et seq.) from James J. Caffrey, Chairman of the Securities

and Exchange Commission, contains, among other things, the following:

"As stated above, the Commission's investigation was not predicated upon any complaint made by or on behalf of a private individual. The investigation had its genesis in the broker-dealer inspection reports of the Atlanta and Chicago regional offices of the Commission which reflected the results of a routine inspection of the books and records of R. E. Crummer & Co. which was registered with the Commission as a broker-dealer under section 15 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. Previous to that time the Post Office Department had notified us that they were conducting an investigation of the Crummer Co.

"The broker-dealer inspection reports prepared by the Commission's staff contained information which, if true, tended to show that Brown-Crummer Investment Co. and R. E. Crummer & Co. had violated section 15 (c) (1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and section 17 (a) of the Securities Act of 1933, both of which provisions prohibit fraud in securities transactions.

"There were no complainants who urged action in this case.

"Representatives of the Commission discussed the nature of the investigation with the subjects under investigation and with their attorney, and that they notified the company's officers of the issuance of the Commission's order for investigation and the nature of the charges.

"So far as we can determine, R. E. Crummer & Co. has at no time requested a hearing before the Commission or any member thereof with regard to the subject matter of our investigation. It is clear that officers of the company were advised by Mr. Hart, of our Chicago regional office, that they would be heard at any time they wished.

"The Commission categorically denies that it 'singled out' the Crummer organization for investigation. As we have emphasized throughout this letter, as well as in our past correspondence, the broker-dealer inspection reports of our Atlanta and Chicago regional offices disclosed information procured primarily from R. E. Crummer & Co.'s own files which, if true, tended to establish fraud on the customers of the Crummer organization.

"In closing I wish to touch briefly upon certain matters pertaining to the nature of the investigation being conducted under Senate Resolution 35. As we understand it, that investigation is being conducted in order to determine whether the activities of this Commission and the Post Office Department, or any representatives or agents thereof, are (a) 'crippling, hampering, or rendering ineffective' the Municipal Bankruptcy Act, and (b) whether such activities are unfairly resulting in the undermining of the credit of the taxing units of the State of Florida. In order that you will have the complete picture before you, I wish to point to certain facts which seem clearly to indicate that our investigation did not adversely affect the credit of such taxing units in Florida. The Citrus County bonds sold at substantially above par during the entire period of the investigation and subsequent court proceedings. Panama City bonds also were sold at above par during that period. As you know, our investigation was confined substantially to alleged fraud by the Crummer companies in connection with transactions in bonds of these two issues—which constitute only a very small percentage of Florida bond issues. It is plain that our investigation had no adverse effect on the credit of Florida taxing units.

"I also wish to emphasize that there was no interference with the administration or operation of the Municipal Bankruptcy Act on the part of this Commission or of any of its representatives. To the best of our knowledge, no plan of composition under the Municipal Bankruptcy Act was considered in connection with the Citrus County bonds. In any event, our investigation was directed solely toward proof of fraud in securities transactions. That the securities involved happened to be municipal bonds was wholly fortuitous and incidental. Our investigation was authorized and in our judgment requisite to the performance of the Commission's duty under the terms of the laws which we administer.

FLORIDA HOUSE INVESTIGATION

With reference to the investigation by the Florida House of Representatives, Walter P. Fuller, the investigator, with reference to certain questions, testified as follows (R. 596):

"Question. What was your understanding of the purpose of the investigation undertaken by the committee of which you became investigator?

"Answer. The purpose was to investigate as many of the bond refundings that had taken place in Florida, as we could, for the purpose of preparing legislation to submit to the 1943 session of the legislature.

"Question. You had no other purpose?

"Answer. That's what we were appointed for.

"Question. You were to investigate generally all municipal bond refundings? You wouldn't confine it to the refundings the Crummer Co. had?

"Answer. Of course not.

"Question. Did you in fact confine yourself to the refundings in which the Crummer Co. had taken part?

"Answer. No.

"Question. Did you devote the larger share of your activities to refundings in which the Crummer Co. had taken part?

"Answer. Yes; because he made the major portion of refundings in Florida. I would like to add there that when the purpose of the committee was announced, a great many people throughout the State wrote Mr. Clement making complaints and asking investigations, and we originally made our investigations where there seemed to be the most complaints."

FLORIDA STATE SECURITIES COMMISSION

Mr. J. M. Lee, State comptroller of Florida and a member of the State securities commission, with reference to the activities of the State securities commission testified in part as follows (R. 193):

"Now, frankly, I acted on investigations, and facts that I had as comptroller and as a member of the board of administration, and that I obtained from applications and from qualifications of the other companies. Now, no individual, no Post Office Department, nor no Securities Commission influenced me one way or the other in that matter. My mind was made up as I have already stated, that because of the fact that there was a Crummer Co. now authorized to do business and now has outstanding contracts uncompleted, an' because of those applying at that time are members of the personnel of the organization that is qualified, I just couldn't see any reason why they should have two, and therefore, for those reasons I voted against granting them two.

"Question. You were not then, as you have said, you were not swayed by any protests or complaints that may have come in?

"Answer. No, sir. My mind was made up on those facts, and the further fact that I was convinced that the new company had, without regard for the commission, proceeded in the capacity of a new company prior to its being qualified."

IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

From the foregoing it is submitted that:

1. The printed record in the case does not disclose a lack of probable cause for the investigations or the indictments of the Crummer Co.

2. There is substantial testimony in the record inconsistent with the major thesis of the proposed report, with questions of animus and certain alleged improper activities.

ALEXANDER WILEY.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4347) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HILL (and other Senators). Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

REFUNDS FROM UNEMPLOYMENT TRUST FUND

The bill (H. R. 3632) to extend the time within which applications may be made to the Railroad Retirement Board for certain refunds from the Unemployment Trust Fund was announced as next in order.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. TAFT. Congress passed a bill several years ago in which it was provided that in States where the railroad employees paid money into the State unemployment fund as well as the railroad retirement fund, that money be refunded. That applied to only 11 States. All this bill does is to provide that they have another year in which to file claims for receiving those refunds in the 11 States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADMITTANCE OF CERTAIN PERSONS TO ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

The bill (H. R. 3870) to authorize certain expenditures from the appropriation of St. Elizabeths Hospital, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN WAR-INCURRED SCHOOL ENROLLMENTS

The bill (H. R. 3682) to extend the period for providing assistance for certain war-incurred school enrollments was announced as next in order.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the title of the bill is not the same as the title which appears on the calendar.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the title on the calendar is incorrect. The bill is not an act to authorize the Federal Works Administration to grant and convey to Montgomery County, Pa., a certain parcel of land, but is an act to extend the period for providing assistance for certain war-incurred school enrollments. Under the Lanham Act the Federal Government has paid the expense of operating certain schools and paid a part of the expense in districts where there was a large amount of war housing and a great number of houses were built. In a number of those districts the Government has not sold that housing yet. Consequently, there are no taxes paid on all that housing, and yet there are many children in those houses. So unless the Government continues the operation, there is no State law which gives the

schools the power to continue to operate. Unless we pass this measure, which authorizes $5,000,000, which is much less than we expended during the war, I think there will be some hundred districts which will have to close. I hope there will be no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3682) to extend the period for providing assistance for certain war-incurred school enrollments was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT INFORMATION PROGRAMS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29) establishing the Joint Committee on Government Information Programs, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the concurrent resolution provides for the appointment of a joint committee to study the so-called Voice of America program. A bill was reported from the Foreign Relations Committee dealing with this subject, and we had hoped it might be passed at the present session of Congress, but in view of the pressure of business it appears the bill will not be passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will say that the concurrent resolution does not appear on the printed calendar. The report on it was made yesterday. The resolution proposes to create a joint commission to investigate the Voice of America, and so forth.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, as I was saying, I recognize that because of the shortness of time we could not present and have debated the Mundt bill itself. The bill remains on the calendar and can be brought up in January next.

I took from section 10 of the bill the provision providing for a joint committee to study this matter this summer, and report back at the beginning of the next session. If the Senate desires I can read the concurrent resolution in full and ask for its immediate consideration. I hope it will be adopted without objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have no objection to the concurrent resolution. I am definitely and affirmatively for its passage. I think it is of the highest importance that a study be made, not only within this country, but in those countries of the world where we want information about America to go. We not only ought to make a study and give consideration to the physical conditions which surround communications, but we ought also to know something about the attitude of other governments toward the problem. I very much hope that the concurrent resolution will be promptly agreed to.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I have tried to listen to the statement of the Senator from New Jersey, but I could not hear it all. What is the subject of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. SMITH. This has nothing to do with the matter of displaced persons which we have been discussing.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I understand.

Mr. SMITH. It is a concurrent resolution creating a committee to investigate the Voice of America program and report back at the next session of Congress.

Mr. REVERCOMB. What is the subject of it?

Mr. SMITH. The Voice of America program.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is there an appropriation in connection with the concurrent resolution?

Mr. SMITH. There is an appropriation.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is asking unanimous consent for consideration on the floor of the Senate of the concurrent resolution, without reference to the Committee on Rules and Administration for a budget.

Mr. SMITH. It will have to be done that way.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, yesterday I obtained unanimous consent that the rule be suspended and that the concurrent resolution be placed on the calendar without being referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29) establishing the Joint Committee on Government Information Programs was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Government Information Programs (hereinafter referred to as the joint committee), which shall be composed of five Members of the Senate (three from the majority party and two from the minority party) appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate and five Members of the House of Representatives (three from the majority party and two from the minority party) appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. The joint committee shall—

(1) make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the nature, manner of performance, and effect of all activities carried out by the State Department or any other agency of the Government (including private companies engaged in international broadcasts or other information activities) for the purpose of acquainting the peoples of foreign countries with the United States, its people and their activities, and the policies and objectives of its Government, including without limitation—

(A) the policies and methods employed, and their objectives;

(B) The qualifications of all personnel engaged in any such activities;

(C) whether the costs of such activities are justified;

(D) whether such activities are a proper function of government or should be carried out by privately owned organizations, with or without subsidies; and

(2) report to the Senate and the House of Representatives at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 1, 1948, the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1947, any amendment thereto or other necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

SEC. 3. (a) The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times (within the United States or abroad) during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

(b) The joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties.

(c) The expenses of the joint committee shall not exceed $50,000. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of disbursements so made.

MEMBERSHIP BY UNITED STATES IN SOUTH PACIFIC COMMISSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The present occupant of the chair asks unanimous consent to revert to Calendar No. 715, House Joint Resolution 232, providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

This is a purely advisory commission, created largely at the request of Australia and New Zealand, for the mutual consideration of island problems in that section of the world.

The expenditure will not exceed $20,000 so far as the United States is concerned. On the previous call of the calendar the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] objected for purely parliamentary and strategic reasons at the moment. He has withdrawn his objection.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments, on page 3, line 2, after the word "appropriated", to strike out "not more than $20,000 annually"; in line 4, after "(a)", to strike out "For" and insert "Not more than $20,000 annually for"; in line 9, after "(b)", to strike out "For" and insert "Such additional sums as may be needed for."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

JOINT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE HIGH PRICES OF CONSUMER GOODS

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to calendar No. 770, Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, a concurrent resolution establishing a joint committee to investigate high prices of consumer goods. It was passed over last night on objection by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR]. He now advises me that he desires to withdraw his objection. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that I do not think the investigation will do any good, but I am a rather soft-hearted person, and the Senator from Connecticut is a very fine gentleman. I am sure that he will handle his end of the job satisfactorily, and do his full part.

If it is found that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are to blame for high prices, I hope the committee will make a finding to that effect. It is a little too much to expect, but I still cling to that hope. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean it is too much of a hope to find that the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Nebraska are responsible for high prices?

Mr. TAYLOR. No. It is too much to expect the committee to report such a finding. [Laughter.]

Last evening the Senator from Connecticut stated that among others the AVC had urged that this resolution be passed. I had forgottten about the AVC, and that reminded me of it.

The other day when the AMVETS' charter was before us for consideration, I suggested that the AVC bill should be passed at the same time, in order that one of these veterans' organizations might not get a head start on the others. After considerable debate we were assured that the AVC bill would be reported either favorably or unfavorably; but I have seen nothing of the AVC bill. I have very little hope that things will be conducted according to Hoyle. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, let me express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Idaho for withdrawing his objection. I assure him that so far as I am able, and so far as the committee is able, every effort will be made to press a diligent, impartial, and thorough investigation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object because I am in favor of the resolution and so voted in the Committee on Banking and Currency—there is one thing I should like to ask with reference to membership on the various subcommittees.

The resolution provides that the subcommittees shall be appointed from the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, and that each subcommittee shall consist of three members, not more than two of whom shall be from one party.

The make-up of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report is: Four of the Republican Party from the Senate and four of the Republican Party of the House, three of the Democratic party from the Senate, and three of the Democratic party from the House, or a total of eight Republicans and six Democrats. If subcommittees are constituted on the basis of two-to-one, the subcommittees will not be organized in the same proportion in which the full committee is organized. I am wondering if it is contemplated that all the subcommittees will be appointed in that ratio—two from the majority party and only one from the minority party. That is one matter with respect to which the Senator from Connecticut may remember that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] raised a question last night when this subject was under consideration.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Let me say that I do not think there is likely to be any dispute in the committees. If there were a party dispute, the minority could present its views, whether the minority consisted of one or two. That would make no difference.

Certainly there is no desire to discriminate. I think it will be difficult to persuade Members to serve on the subcommittees and hold hearings. My recollection is that the Senator from Alabama is a member of the joint committee. I certainly intend to appoint him if he wishes to serve. If he does not wish to serve, we hope to find some other Democratic Senator who is willing to serve.

Mr. President, these committees do not do anything. It is not as though they made recommendations for the enactment of laws. They investigate; and the minority has a voice. That voice is just as loud with one as it would be with three.

Mr. President, I seem to have made an unfortunate statement. My statement is that the committees do not make recommendations for the enactment of law. They do not do anything but make reports, and the reports are made after hearings. The reports can show the minority views. So I do not see of what importance it is whether the ratio is 4 to 2 or 4 to 3. I cannot see the importance of the point raised by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, as I have said, I have no intention of objecting, because I believe that there is a real job to be done by the committee. I supported the resolution in the Committee on Banking and Currency, but I thought that point should be mentioned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a moment ago the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] referred to an assurance which he understood was given to him, or to the Senate, with respect to the American Veterans' Committee. It happens that I was the Senator who gave the assurance to which I judge he referred.

The Senator has inadvertently stated the assurance somewhat different from what it was. I am sure that his statement was entirely unintentional. I think the Senator from Idaho has acted in the best of faith. I want it distinctly understood what the representation was that was made by me.

I invite attention to the fact that on July 16, at page 9037 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, after some colloquy with respect to the AMVETS, the following statement was made by me:

> I do not know whether the Senator from New Mexico has in mind any organizations other than the Jewish War Veterans, the Catholic War Veterans, the Gold Star Wives, and the American Veterans' Committee. I may say that the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and I constitute a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, and the bills for the incorporation of those four organizations are pending before the subcommittee. It is the judgment of both the senior Senator from West Virginia and myself that we shall be able to make a report to the Committee on the Judiciary in time for it to make a report one way or the other in regard to each of those four bills.

Mr. President, the subcommittee, consisting of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and I, did make a report to the Committee on the Judiciary in time for that committee to act. The situation as disclosed with respect to the American Veterans' Committee was such that the Committee on the Judiciary did not deem it advisable to report the bill, but, on the other hand, determined to hold the matter over, with hearings to be held. I may say that subsequent to that particular action by the Committee on the Judiciary Mr. Patterson, the head of the American Veterans' Committee, asked leave to appear and did appear before the Committee on the Judiciary and made a further statement. The committee was still of the same opinion as before, and, consequently, the action of the Judiciary Committee has been as indicated, namely, to lay the matter over, with hearings to be held.

Let me say, in justice to the senior Senator from West Virginia, that my recollection is that he moved that the bill with respect to the American Veterans' Committee be reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, and that I moved as a substitute for his motion the action which was taken by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Let me say, Mr. President, without undertaking to go into the merits of the American Veterans' Committee in detail, that the facts as disclosed led me to conclude that the American Veterans' Committee had liabilities for services to

be rendered under the obligation arising from prepaid dues. From previous experience with the American Veterans' Committee as disclosed at the Des Moines conference in 1946, together with certain questioning in the Judiciary Committee, my opinion is reinforced that we acted wisely in not bringing to the floor of the Senate action on the American Veterans' Committee.

Mr. President, while I am on my feet, may I say with respect to the Gold Star Wives that they are included in the list. That matter was considered and the committee determined not to report it out.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. What question is now pending?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question pending is the request to consider Calendar 770, Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, establishing a joint committee to investigate high prices of consumer goods. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 19) establishing a joint committee to investigate high prices of consumer goods, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an additional amendment, to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the Joint Committee on the Economic Report is hereby authorized and directed through two or more subcommittees of the said committee, each to be composed of three members of the Senate (not more than two of whom shall be members of the same political party) and three Members of the House of Representatives (not more than two of whom shall be members of the same political party). Members of said subcommittees may be selected from the membership of said Joint Committee on the Economic Report or from Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives not members of said Committee on the Economic Report. Vacancies in the membership of the subcommittees shall not affect the powers of the remaining members to exercise the functions of the subcommittee and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee through the said subcommittees (1) to make a full and complete study and investigation of the present high prices of consumer goods and (2) to report to the Congress not later than February 1, 1948, the results of the study and investigation of its subcommittees together with such recommendations, as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

SEC. 3. (a) The subcommittees herein established are authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditure as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

(b) The Joint Committee on the Economic Report is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and clerical, and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties.

(c) The expenses of the subcommittees, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate. Upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, is it contemplated that this investigation shall apply to all types of commodities?

Mr. BALDWIN. The investigation will apply primarily to consumer prices on food, clothing, and matters of that kind. It will not apply to housing. There is a special resolution regarding housing.

Mr. CONNALLY. I should like to know whether it covers manufactured goods as well as agricultural products.

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes. I can say to the Senator that that is the purpose of the resolution.

Mr. CONNALLY. It will cover the entire country?

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it in order to ask for consideration of a bill which is not on the calendar?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Not until the present order is concluded.

The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution as amended.

The concurrent resolution as amended was agreed to.

CONSIDERATION OF BILL NOT ON CALENDAR

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, it is in order now, I understand, to ask for consideration of a bill which is not on the calendar?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I shall ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House bill 4169, but I ask that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from its further consideration. I do that after consulting with the chairman of the committee and with four members of the committee——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. The bill is not on the calendar.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I stated that it was not on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, we are working under an order which deals solely with bills upon the calendar.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did not the Senate just consider the resolution of the Senator from New Jersey?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It was on the calendar.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It was on the calendar for the day.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, when is the proper time to ask for the taking up of this matter?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Whenever the Senator can obtain the floor, when existing orders have been exhausted.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recur to Calendar 753, House bill 3613. The distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] last night asked that it go over. I understand that he is now willing to withdraw his objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3613) to amend sections 1802 (a), 1802 (b), and 3481 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

P. L. (SPUD) MURPHY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recur to Calendar No. 649, House bill 1492.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I objected when the bill was reached on the calendar, but I now withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1492) for the relief of P. L. (Spud) Murphy, owner and manager of Spud's Tailors, Laundry & Dry Cleaning Works, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMERICAN VETERANS' COMMITTEE

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, in regard to the matter of the American Veterans' Committee, I talked to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and said I did not care whether the bill was reported favorably or unfavorably. Nothing was said, and I took it as a tacit agreement that it would be reported. Evidently that was not the Senator's understanding. It is perfectly all right. I understand now, however, why the American Veterans' Committee is so anxious for this price inquiry. They are broke; they are in the red. I hope they will do their best to become prosperous.

AMENDMENTS TO FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. AIKEN submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1326) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, having met, after full and free conference,

have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That subsection (a) of section 508 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Commencing with crops planted for harvest in 1948, for the purpose of determining the most practical plan, terms, and conditions of insurance for agricultural commodities, if sufficient actuarial data are available, as determined by the Board, to insure, or to reinsure insurers of, producers of such agricultural commodities under any plan or plans of insurance determined by the Board to be adapted to any such commodity: *Provided*, That reinsurance for private insurance companies shall be limited to contracts covering farms in not to exceed twenty counties selected by the Board. Such insurance shall be against loss of the insured commodity while in the field due to unavoidable causes, including drought, flood, hail, wind, frost, winter-kill, lightning, fire, excessive rain, snow, wildlife, hurricane, tornado, insect infestation, plant disease, and such other unavoidable causes as may be determined by the Board. Any insurance offered against loss in yield shall not cover in excess of 75 per centum of the recorded or appraised average yield of the commodity on the insured farm for a representative period subject to such adjustments as the Board may prescribe to the end that the average yields fixed for farms in the same area, which are subject to the same conditions, may be fair and just: *Provided*, That, if 75 per centum of the average yield represents generally more protection than the investment in the crop in any area, taking into consideration recognized farming practices, the Board shall reduce such maximum percentage so as more nearly to reflect the investment in the crop in such area. Insurance provided under this subsection shall not cover losses due to the neglect or malfeasance of the producer, or to the failure of the producer to reseed to the same crop in areas and under circumstances where it is customary to so reseed, or to the failure of the producer to follow established good farming practices. In 1948 insurance shall be limited to not more than seven crops (including wheat, cotton, flax, corn, and tobacco) and to not more than three additional crops in each year thereafter. Insurance provided for any agricultural commodity, except wheat, cotton, flax, corn, and tobacco, shall be limited to producers in not to exceed twenty counties. Insurance for wheat, cotton, corn, flax, and tobacco shall be limited to producers in not to exceed 200 counties in the case of wheat, 56 counties in the case of cotton, 50 counties each in the case of corn and flax, and 35 counties in the case of tobacco. Counties selected by the Board shall be representative of the several areas where the agricultural commodity insured is normally produced. Insurance shall not be provided in any county unless written applications therefor are filed covering at least two hundred farms or one-third of the farms normally producing the agricultural commodity; nor shall insurance of any agricultural commodity be provided in any county in which the Board determines that the income from such commodity constitutes an unimportant part of the total agricultural income of the county. The Board may limit or refuse insurance in any county or area, or on any farm, on the basis of the insurance risk involved. The Corporation shall report annually to the Congress the results of its operations as to each commodity insured.'

"SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 508 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: '*Provided*, That such premiums may be established on the basis of the parity or comparable price for the commodity as determined and published by the Secretary of Agriculture, or on the basis of an average market price designated by the Board.'

"SEC. 3. Subsection (c) of section 508 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by striking out in the first sentence 'however', and inserting in lieu thereof 'That indemnities may be determined on the same price basis as premiums are determined for the crop with respect to which such indemnities are paid: *Provided, further*,'.

"SEC. 4. Section 502 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 502. It is the purpose of this title to promote the national welfare by improving the economic stability of agriculture through a sound system of crop insurance and providing the means for the research and experience helpful in devising and establishing such insurance.'

"SEC. 5. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect the validity of any insurance contract entered into prior to the enactment of this Act insofar as such contract covers the 1947 crop year. Any such contract which purports to cover a crop in the 1948 or any subsequent crop year in any county in which insurance on such crop will be discontinued pursuant to this Act is hereby terminated at the end of the 1947 crop year.

"SEC. 6. Subsection (d) of section 507 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end of the subsection and inserting a comma and the following: 'except that employees or agencies responsible for administering this Act in each county shall be selected and designated by the Corporation and shall be responsible directly to the Corporation without the intervention of any intermediate office or agency.'

"SEC. 7. Subsection (d) of section 506 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(d) Subject to the provisions of section 508 (c), may sue and be sued in its corporate name in any court of record of a State having general jurisdiction, or in any United States district court, and jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon such district court to determine such controversies without regard to the amount in controversy: *Provided*, That no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Corporation or its property.'

"SEC. 8. Section 505 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 505. (a) The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a Board of Directors (hereinafter called the "Board") subject to the general supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture. The Board shall consist of the manager of the Corporation, two other persons employed in the Department of Agriculture, and two persons experienced in the insurance business who are not otherwise employed by the Government. The Board shall be appointed by, and hold office at the pleasure of the Secretary of Agriculture, who shall not, himself, be a member of the Board.

"'(b) Vacancies in the Board so long as there shall be three members in office shall not impair the powers of the Board to execute the functions of the Corporation, and three of the members in office shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of the business of the Board.

"'(c) The Directors of the Corporation who are employed in the Department of Agriculture shall receive no additional compensation for their services as such Directors but may be allowed necessary traveling and subsistence expenses when engaged in business of the Corporation, outside of the District of Columbia. The members of the Board who are not employed by the Government shall be paid such compensation for their services as Directors as the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine, but such compensation shall not exceed $100 per day each when actually employed and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses when engaged in business of the Corporation away from their homes or regular places of business.

"'(d) The manager of the Corporation shall be its chief executive officer, with such power and authority as may be conferred upon him by the Board. He shall be appointed by, and hold office at the pleasure of, the Secretary of Agriculture.'"

And the House agree to the same.

GEO. D. AIKEN,
HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
WILLIAM HILL,
HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1498) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 907) to provide for the orderly transaction of the public business in the event of the death, resignation, or separation from office of regional disbursing officers of the Treasury Department, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

STUDY OF AGRICULTURAL LEGISLATION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to revert to Calendar No. 768, Senate Resolution 147, which pertains to the study committee on agricultural and forestry questions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 147) authorizing a study of agricultural legislation and of trends, needs, and problems of agriculture, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, may I ask whether this resolution requires the expenditure of any money?

Mr. THYE. It requires the expenditure of $15,000. It was objected to by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] last night, but he has withdrawn his objection.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not see how agriculture would be advanced by a further investigation. There have been agricultural problems ever since I have been a Member of the Senate and for many years before that.

Mr. THYE. The Steagall amendment contains the mechanics of the support price, and it will expire in 1948. Likewise, the Farm Credit Corporation will expire. Because of that, it is necessary that a study be made of the type of program which will be needed after December 31, 1948. That is the purpose of the study committee.

Mr. OVERTON. Is it a joint committee, or will the investigation be conducted by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry?

Mr. THYE. It will be conducted by a part of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It will work during the recess period in order to present a program at the next session of Congress. It has the unanimous support of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. OVERTON. Who appoints the subcommittee?

Mr. THYE. I presume it will be appointed by the chairman and the President of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that this measure also comes from the Committee on Rules and Administration, after rather exhaustive hearings on it, with the committee's entire approval, because it is a subcommittee of a standing committee, and we felt that it should make some study of the program to be adopted following the termination of the Steagall Support Act.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to make an observation.

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The standing committees have authority to conduct investigations of matters under their jurisdiction, during a recess of the Congress, without any specific authorization because of the recess. Probably the only additional thing that would be needed would be some additional funds. The general authority of the committee is sufficient to authorize the committee to investigate matters under their jurisdiction, during the recess. If the committee needs additional funds in order to make an investigation of agricultural conditions, in addition to its regular appropriation for clerk hire and its regular work, I have no doubt that the Senate would concur in a proposal for such an increase in funds.

But it really is not necessary to secure special authority from the Senate to enable the Committee on Agriculture or any other committee to carry on its work during the recess of the Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. OVERTON. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana objects. The resolution goes over.

AMERICAN INDIAN DAY

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we may revert to Calendar No. 183, Senate bill 309.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 309) designating American Indian Day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. REED. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made, and the bill goes over.

EXPORT OF GASOLINE AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask that we revert to Order No. 733, Senate bill 1653. A House bill, Calendar No. 732, House bill 4042, is similar, and it is to be substituted for the Senate bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana has asked unanimous consent that the Senate revert to the consideration of Calendar No. 733, Senate bill 1653, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1653) to control the export to foreign countries of gasoline and petroleum products from the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COOPER. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill goes over, under objection.

PROMOTION AND ELIMINATION OF OFFICERS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, the Armed Services Committee has reported to the Senate several bills which are on the calendar, and which I should like to have an opportunity on behalf of the committee to call up.

The first one is Calendar 637, House bill 3830, popularly known as the promotion bill. Would it be in order to take it up at this time?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator may make such a request.

Mr. BALDWIN. I make that request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut has asked unanimous consent that the Senate revert to Calendar No. 637, House bill 3830, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3830) to provide for the promotion and elimination of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to know something about the bill.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, it is my purpose to explain this bill fully. Would I be limited to 5 minutes, under the 5-minute rule, or might I obtain unanimous consent to proceed for a longer period of time?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is limited to 5 minutes, under the rule, unless he can obtain unanimous consent to the contrary.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I request such unanimous consent.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, if the bill cannot be explained in 5 minutes, it should not be considered at this time, during the call of the calendar, under the 5-minute rule.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CONNALLY. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being made, the bill goes over.

PROCUREMENT OF SUPPLIES AND SERVICES BY THE WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I now ask for the present consideration of Calendar No. 597, House bill 1366, the Army and Navy procurement bill. Let me state that I cannot explain the bill in 5 minutes. I am perfectly willing to defer my request for consideration of the bill until matters on the calendar which can be acted on in a short length of time are disposed of, provided that we have an opportunity to present these bills. They are extremely important, as pertaining to the national defense, and they should be passed at this session of the Congress. Both of the bills I have mentioned have already been passed by the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the Senator from Connecticut requesting consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 597, House bill 1366?

Mr. BALDWIN. I am.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1366) to facilitate procurement of supplies and services by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have no objection to having this measure acted upon, but I wish to have a little more than 5 minutes' time to speak on it. This bill gives the Army and the Navy certain privileges in connection with procurement which are denied to the Federal Supply Bureau and to other extremely important and necessary agencies of the Government, and I should like to explain that matter. It will take more than 5 minutes to do so. I hope the bill will come up later in the day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under objection, the bill goes over.

AMENDMENT OF ORGANIC ACT OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 434, House bill 3309, to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. TAFT. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill goes over under objection.

PROMOTION AND ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I renew the request that the Senate proceed to consider Order of Business 637, House bill 3830, to provide for the promotion

and elimination of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes. I have talked with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and he has agreed to withdraw his objection until we can have an explanation of the bill by the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico objects.

EXPLORATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND PRODUCTION OF DOMESTIC MINES

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 746, House bill 1602, to stimulate exploration, development, and production from domestic mines by private enterprise, and for other purposes, and I ask the attention of the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio.

In a moment I shall make objection to the immediate consideration of the bill, on behalf of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], who is absent from the Chamber, and who would object, but I should like to ask the senior Senator from Ohio what the plan is for the consideration of this important measure.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this is a bill relating to the proposed premium payments for copper, lead, and zinc, which I think should follow the measures which have priority at the moment. Those measures are the so-called Revercomb resolution and the last appropriation bill to be taken up, which will be taken up as soon as the call of the calendar is completed.

Mr. MILLIKIN. On behalf of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] I object to the immediate consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

AUTHORIZATION FOR STUDY OF AGRICULTURAL LEGISLATION AND PROBLEMS OF AGRICULTURE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that the Senator from Louisiana has withdrawn his objection to the consideration of Calendar No. 768, Senate Resolution 147.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate revert to the resolution and adopt it.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 147) authorizing a study of agricultural legislation and of trends, needs, and problems of agriculture, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 1, to strike out lines 1 to 5, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereto, is authorized and directed to make a study and inquiry into existing and pending agricultural legislation and of the trends, needs, and problems of agriculture in the United States.

And to insert:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittees thereof, is authorized and directed to make a study and inquiry into the trends, needs, and problems of agriculture in the United States, Territories, and possessions.

On page 2, line 6, after the word "authorized", to insert "during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress"; and on line 10, after the word "exceeds", to insert "$15,000", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittees thereof, is authorized and directed to make a study and inquiry into the trends, needs, and problems of agriculture in the United States, Territories, and possessions.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $15,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That concludes the call of the calendar.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4347, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, the last appropriation bill to be considered.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that the order was last evening that we would take up Senate Resolution 137, and after proceeding an hour with it the calendar would be called, and that upon the conclusion of the call of the calendar the Senate would again proceed with the consideration of Senate Resolution 137. That was an order made at that time, an order which I feel should be followed.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think that was quite the order, but if it was, it is all subject to the condition to which every agreement is subject, that when appropriation bills come before the Senate they shall be immediately dealt with. I agree that as soon as the supplemental appropriation bill has been disposed of, we will return to the consideration of the resolution of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, if the supplemental appropriation bill shall be considered, will there be another opportunity to take up other matters on the calendar?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is unable to respond to the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. It is not the intention to return to the calendar at any time, and the measures to be taken up must be taken up either by unanimous consent, or, if the Kem resolution is not before the Senate, by motion.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I make the inquiry, how long does the Senator from Ohio think it will take to dispose of the appropriation bill he proposes to have now considered.

Mr. TAFT. This is the second supplemental bill. I hope the debate will be short. Before we adjourn tonight the bill must go to conference, and we must also adopt the conference report. It is most important that we consider the bill now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I was in communication with one of the Members of the Senate regarding a bill on the Legislative Calendar. Is it the understanding now that the call of the calendar has been concluded?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The call of the calendar under the previous order has been concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. Under the previous order, could I return to one calendar number?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator can by unanimous consent.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I must object. We have finished the calendar, and it creates an entirely different parliamentary situation. We are now under a different condition and I think we must remain in that status if we are to conclude the session of the Senate today, as we all hope we may.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. As chairman of the Committee on Armed Services I must say that I have given notice to the officers of the Senate that it has been impossible for me to be on the floor of the Senate because of many conferences on many bills. Many of the bills on the calendar, most important to the national security, have been passed over. I must insist that we have time to consider them today or, if necessary, extend our deliberations into next week. The bills are necessary for the national security.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think the bills referred to by the Senator are extremely important, and I believe we should proceed to consider them as soon as we possibly can.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the Senator again whether there is much controversial matter in the bill he desires to have considered by unanimous consent.

Mr. TAFT. I shall have to ask the Senator from Minnesota, in charge of the bill.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, there may be one item, relating to the Interior Department, on which there will be a brief discussion. I do not know of anything in the bill that is very controversial.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4347) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Legislative branch," page 1, after line 6, to insert:

SENATE

Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper: For the compensation of 25 additional privates, Capitol Police Force, at the basic rate of $2,000 each per annum, from October 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948, $40,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 2, to insert:

Contingent expenses, Senate: To enable the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, or its authorized representative, to make final settlement of all authorized accounts outstanding against the Senate Restaurant at the close of business July 31, 1947, including payments for terminal and accrued leave and compensatory absence with pay authorized by the committee on the basis of services rendered prior to August 1, 1947, $19,000, together with the balance (exclusive of such amounts as required to cover outstanding checks) in the special deposit account on August 1, 1947, maintained in the Treasury of the United States for the United States Senate Restaurants, which balance shall be paid by the Architect of the Capitol to the committee or its authorized representative on August 1, 1947.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 3, to insert:

CAPITOL POLICE

General expenses: For an additional amount, $4,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 3, to insert:

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

REVISION OF ANNOTATED CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Salaries and expenses: To enable the Librarian of Congress to employ competent persons to revise and to extend the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America, and for travel (not exceeding $500), supplies and materials, and including not to exceed $5,000 for employees engaged on piecework and work by the day or hour at rates to be fixed by the Librarian, $35,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Independent offices," on page 3, after line 15, to insert:

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

Construction of memorials and cemeteries: For the permanent design and construction of memorials and cemeteries in foreign countries as authorized by the act of June 26, 1946 (Public Law 456), and H. R. 3394, $50,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Civil Service Commission," on page 3, line 25, after the word "including", to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$100,000"; on page 4, line 1, after the words "and", to strike out "$80,000" and insert "$150,000"; and in line 5, after the word "employees", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That nothing in sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code (18 U. S. C. 198 and 203) or in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99) shall be deemed to apply to any person because of his appointment for part-time service as a member of the Loyalty Review Board in the Civil Service Commission."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government," on page 4, line 15, after the numerals "152", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$1,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 15, to insert:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

PUBLIC BUILDINGS ADMINISTRATION

Costs of maintenance, upkeep, and repair paid by Government corporations pursuant to section 306 of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1948, shall be credited to the appropriations of the Public Buildings Administration bearing such costs.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 22, to insert:

BUREAU OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Maintenance and operation of schools: For carrying out the act entitled "An act to extend the period for providing assistance for certain war-incurred school enrollments" (H. R. 3682), $5,000,000, of which amount not to exceed $200,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, including the objects specified under the head "Defense public works (community facilities)" in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941, and the joint resolution approved December 23, 1941 (Public Law 371): *Provided*, That the availability of this appropriation is contingent upon the enactment into law of said H. R. 3682.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "United States Maritime Commission," on page 6, after line 16, to strike out:

The United States Maritime Commission is authorized to charter war-built tankers in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (Public Law 321, 79th Cong.), without regard to the time limitation specified in the last sentence of subsection (a) of such section 5.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill about the situation created by the amendment striking out the provision for the charter of war-built tankers, found in line 17, on page 6. I understood there was a great shortage of war-built tankers, and I should like to inquire how that situation is being worked out.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, in the law which passed Congress providing for the disposal of these vessels, the legislative committees of both Houses prohibited the chartering of tankers, in fact, I think the chartering of any vessel, but particularly the tankers, although the Maritime Commission had sought it. In this session of Congress they sought the authority to charter vessels, and it was refused. They do have the authority to operate them under what they call "general agency," where an operator operates a ship on a fixed fee, and all profits go to the Government. Under a charter, the Corporation chartering the vessel gets all the profits.

The testimony before the committee was to the effect that the legislative committees were unaware of this provision. They said it would make a difference of $150,000 a year per vessel in revenue to the Government. They insisted the language should go out, inasmuch as both Houses had since specifically refused the authority on legislative bills in the present session.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Maritime Commission will continue to operate tankers for another year?

Mr. BALL. Oh, yes; they would do that under general regulations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 6, after the word "Treasury", to strike out "as miscellaneous receipts."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Agriculture," on page 8, after line 3, to insert:

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Insect investigations: For an additional amount for "Insect investigations," including the same objects specified under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1948, $15,000: *Provided*, That this additional amount shall be used for the maintenance and operation of a research laboratory at Quincy, Fla., for the study of insects and fungi affecting cigar-wrapper tobacco.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 19, to insert:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Materials distribution and liquidation of Office of Temporary Controls: For an additional amount for "Materials distribution and liquidation of Office of Temporary Controls," $300,000, and the total amount appropriated under this head shall be available for carrying out the purposes specified under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, and for necessary expenses of carrying out the purposes of H. R. 1602, Eightieth Congress, if said bill is enacted into law: *Provided*, That the amounts specified in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, for transfer from the appropriation under this head of the appropriations of the Department of Commerce of "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce," and "Printing and binding, Department of Commerce," are hereby increased by $295,000 and $5,000, respectively: *Provided further*, That

this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of H. R. 1602, Eightieth Congress, during the first session of that Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 15, to insert:

WEATHER BUREAU

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," $350,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of the Interior," on page 9, after line 19, to insert:

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Management, protection, and disposal of public lands: For an additional amount, for "Management, protection, and disposal of public lands," $503,000, and the limitation on the amount for carrying out the provision of the act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U. S. C. 8A), hereby increased from $398,000 to $901,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 2, to insert:

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Constructon, and so forth, buildings and utilities: For an additional amount for the construction and equipment of a new school building in the town of Moclips, Grays Harbor County, Wash., as authorized by Public Law 138 (80th Cong.), approved June 30, 1947, $88,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Missouri River Basin," on page 10, line 17, after the word "the", to insert "Act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law 534), Seventy-eighth Congress, and the."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 4, to strike out "Heart Butte Dam" and insert "Heart River project, Heart Butte and Dickinson Dams."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Minnesota does not object, I should like to have all these projects considered together. One of them involves a Senate committee amendment, and I desire to ask a question after we conclude the other amendments. I ask that the amendment now pending be passed over temporarily.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the Senator referring to the amendment on line 4?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be passed over temporarily. The next amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 13, to insert:

BUREAU OF MINES

Coal mine inspections and investigations: For an additional amount for "Coal mine inspections and investigations," including, in addition to the objects specified under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1948, printing and binding, and the purchase of 50 passenger motor vehicles, $500,000, and the limitation upon the amount that may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia is increased to $150,000. This appropriation is contingent upon the enactment into law of Senate Joint Resolution 130 or House Joint Resolution 244.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 5, to insert:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFCE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries: For an additional amount for "Salaries," $113,145.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 9, to insert:

Contingent expenses: For an additional amount for "Contingent expenses," $21,255.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 11, to insert:

Printing and binding: For an additional amount for "Printing and binding," $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 13, to insert:

Penalty mail costs: For an additional amount for "Penalty mail costs," $5,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 15, to insert:

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," $214,100, and the limitation for personal services in the District of Columbia is hereby increased from $2,202,700 to $2,740,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Navy Department," on page 12, after line 21, to insert:

The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to procure temporary services in accordance with section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Treasury Department—Coast Guard," on page 17, line 23, after the word "Guard", to strike out "$4,050,000" and insert "$8,050,000"; and on page 18, line 2, after the word "to", to strike out "$74,836,000" and insert "$78,836,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General provisions," on page 20, after line 8, to insert:

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be transferred from any appropriations for the War Department for the Military Establishment, and from any appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service, to the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense such amounts as may be determined by the President to be necessary until such time as the Congress shall have made appropriations therefor, and the amounts so transferred shall be available, without regard to the purposes of the appropriation from which such transfers shall be made, for expenses of the agencies to which such funds are transferred, including personal services at the seat of Government; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600), at rates not to exceed $35 per diem for individuals; printing and binding; and health-service programs as authorized by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 658): *Provided*, That the War and Navy Departments may transfer such equipment (including motor vehicles) and furniture as may be necessary to the National Security Council, the National Resources Board, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense: *Provided further*, That the foregoing authority is contingent upon the establishment by law of said agencies to which transfers may be made hereunder: *Provided further*, That transfers authorized hereunder shall not exceed $2,000,000 in the aggregate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 9, to change the section number from 4 to 5.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I send to the desk two amendments to the Maritime Commission provision.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota offers two amendments, which the clerk will state.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, in line 21, it is proposed to strike out "$4,250,000" and insert "$5,750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, line 1, it is proposed to strike out "$90,000,000" and insert "$100,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, between lines 16 and 17, it is proposed to insert:

WAR DEPARTMENT

REMOUNT SERVICE, QUARTERMASTER CORPS

For the operation and maintenance of the Army Remount Service, including the subsistence and care of riding and draft animals and for other purposes as specified in the Military Appropriation Act, 1948, under the heading "Quartermaster Corps, Quartermaster Service, Army," following the caption "Horses, draft, and pack animals"; $500,000: *Provided*, That in the event of the transfer of the Army Remount Service or its functions to the Department of Agriculture, the unobligated balance of the sum hereby appropriated shall be transferred to the Department of Agriculture to be expended for the purposes authorized by the act providing for such transfer.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the amendment?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I shall be glad to explain the amendment. The Senator will remember that there has been an effort to transfer the Remount Service from the Army to the Department of Agriculture. Thus far, the effort has not been crowned with success. The amendment merely keeps the Remount Service in being until a decision can be made on the matter. It allows not so much as is annually appropriated for the Service, but allows $500,000. Should the transfer from the Army to the Department of Agriculture be concluded, the unexpended balance would then follow the transfer. I am quite sure that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], who represents a certain school of thought, will have no objection to the amendment, written in the way it now stands.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the amendment provides an appropriation of $500,000 to continue the maintenance of four remount stations located in the United States. One is located at Front Royal, Va., another at Crawford, Nebr., another at Pomona, Calif., and still another is located at Fort Reno, in my State of Oklahoma.

Heretofore it has cost the War Department almost $3,000,000 a year to maintain the four stations.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I have a memorandum from the War Department to the effect that the Department of Agriculture estimated it would need $861,000 to operate the Service for 1 year. My amendment does not authorize that amount, but authorizes $500,000.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes; I understood the Senator's amendment. My statement stands, that it has cost the War Department almost $3,000,000 a year to maintain the four stations. It is true the Department of Agriculture estimates it will cost approximately $850,000 to maintain them as agricultural institutions. The amendment provides only for the $500,000.

Mr. President, I am not undertaking to tell the Congress what shall be done with the Pomona, Calif., station; I do not know what should be done with it. I am not presuming to tell the Congress what should be done with the Front Royal station. I have seen the land at Front Royal. I do not know to what use it could be put, other than the raising of horses. I am not trying to suggest any particular use for that reservation. I am not trying to suggest the procedure to be followed in Nebraska. If Nebraska, Virginia, and California want to have the stations in those States maintained for the purpose of breeding light-draft horses, such as riding horses, jumping horses, race horses, and show horses, and to put Uncle Sam in the horse-racing business, I have no objection; but, so far as my State is concerned, I object. I do not want a large amount of good land in Oklahoma, including some of the best land in my State, which is adapted to the raising of fine alfalfa as well as corn, wheat, oats, and cotton, turned over to the breeding of horses for the benefit of the favored few. I know it is nice for men of means to have riding horses. I saw in the press not so long ago that a Senator-elect brought his favorite riding horses to Washington, and at every stop for refueling purposes he gave an interview as to the success he was having with his horses. I have no objection to that. It is commendable if anybody can afford it. But, Mr. President, in my State the ex-servicemen want the land for themselves. It is public property. In place of raising horses in Oklahoma for the benefit of the favored few, our people want the land subdivided and made available to the ex-servicemen of Oklahoma and the country, under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. Such a use of the property will save the Government a sum of money, whereas it will cost a considerable sum to maintain the reservation as a horse-breeding station. If it can be subdivided and sold to the ex-servicemen under the Farm Tenant Act, it will yield the Government at least $1,000,000, and it will provide homes for a large number of soldiers.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. In a moment, please. It is obvious we can take no action on the regular bill proposing to transfer the stations to the Department of Agriculture. That can come next winter. I want to make this suggestion for the consideration of the Presiding Officer. The bill when introduced was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. That was proper, because the Committee on the Armed Services is supposed to represent, and does represent, the military establishments. But when the committee recommended that the Armed Services be divested of further jurisdiction over these lands, then I contend the Armed Services Committee either in effect lost jurisdiction, or should lose jurisdiction, over these lands. I contend further, since the bill provides that the lands shall be returned to the Agriculture Department, that before the bill is considered by the Senate, it should be referred to the Agriculture Department, and should be considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. That course was pursued in the House satisfactorily. I do not know what consideration was given to the bill by the Committee on Agriculture, but the Committee on Armed Services in the House recommended to the House that the bill be sent to the Committee on Agriculture of the House for consideration and report before they acted upon the bill. The report will be found in the nature of a letter from Chairman Hope of Kansas in the House report.

When Congress meets again in January I shall request that the bill be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for consideration by that committee before the Senate is asked finally to pass upon the bill. It cannot be acted upon now, but that matter will come up at the next session of Congress in January.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I shall be glad to make the motion now to take the bill off the calendar and refer it to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is handling the bill in the Senate. I asked unanimous consent on a former occasion to have the bill referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and the Senator from Oregon objected. So in his absence I could not agree to permit the bill to be referred.

Mr. GURNEY. I did not know that the Senator from Oregon had objected.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I want that statement to appear in the RECORD. I have no objection at all to the amendment submitted by the Senator from South Dakota. I think it should be adopted, because someone must take care of these lands in the interim, and this money will enable the proper department to take care of these reservations until Congress reconvenes in January.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senator in charge of the bill [Mr. BALL] to the language beginning in line 15 on page 10, providing for certain dams and public-work projects in the Missouri River Basin. I should like to have the Senator indicate which one of these projects has the benefit of a budget estimate, and which one does not have the benefit of a budget estimate.

Mr. BALL. I will say to the Senator that no one appeared before the subcommittee regarding these particular projects, but the House committee report has the following to say about the matter:

> The committee recommends a total of $6,400,000 in connection with the flood-control program in the Missouri River Basin. The amount recommended is $3,600,000 below the budget estimate. The committee has denied funds for several of the projects listed in the budget estimate (H. Doc. 400)—

So there are with respect to some, budget estimates. I continue to read:

> and has provided definite amounts in the bill for the projects which it considers to be of most urgent need from a flood-control standpoint. The amount recommended—which is all to be expended on construction of dams in order to secure maximum flood control at the earliest practicable date—is to provide for the following projects:

The projects are then listed.

The supplemental estimate was for $10,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I understood there was a budget estimate of $10,000,000 over-all, but I had further heard that the House recommendation as to the construction of these dams did not follow the estimate, but embraced entirely new projects not recommended by the budget which were inserted in the bill by the committee without any particular hearing on those particular dams. I should like to know which ones they are in order that I may call them to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I should like to say that all these appropriations listed under the Bureau of Reclamation are the result of the President's request for additional funds for flood-control purposes in the Missouri and Mississippi River Basins. These are all flood-control dams.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand they are all flood-control dams, Mr. President. I had some experience the last evening with flood-control dams in other sections of the country that had the benefit of engineering approval and approval by the Senate. What I wanted to ascertain was whether or not all these dams were embraced within the President's budget. I had understood that there had been some transferred, that some which the President recommended had been eliminated, and others inserted in their stead.

Mr. YOUNG. In the matter of the Heart River project in North Dakota, with which I am familiar, the budget figure was $1,500,000. In the Interior Department appropriation bill about $1,100,000 was allowed. This will bring the amount approximately up to the budget

figure. That is one project with which I am familiar.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is that the project in line 4, on page 11?

Mr. YOUNG. It is.

Mr. RUSSELL. Can the Senator cast any light as to the location of the other dams and as to whether they are contained in the budget estimate?

Mr. YOUNG. The Cannonball Dam is also in North Dakota, but I not sure whether allowance was made for it in the budget or not. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that in all the history of North Dakota we have had less than $5,000,000 spent on all kinds of water projects. There is no State in the Union which has received less than North Dakota.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not complaining about the expenditures. I will say to my friend, the Senator from North Dakota, that his State has some projects which have been recommended by the Board of Engineers and which promise to eclipse all other projects. I congratulate the Senator from North Dakota on having secured approval from the Board of Engineers for these great projects.

Mr. YOUNG. I think the Senator from Georgia is probably the most able defender of his State that I know of in the entire Senate, and he has also been of great help to me in respect to North Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Georgia that I shall give the location of the dams I know about. The Boysen Dam is in Wyoming. The Bixby Dam is in South Dakota. The Shadehill Dam is in South Dakota. It is an authorized project. I do not know about the amount, because the House put in the figures. I do not know as to whether these amounts agree with the supplemental budget lately sent to Congress by the President. I do not know where the Bonny Dam, the Culbertson Dam and the Enders Dam are located. The Platte Basin Narrows Dam is undoubtedly in Nebraska. The Cedar Bluff Dam is in Kansas.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I have examined the budget estimates on which the House was working in considering these items, and I should like to answer the question. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that the estimate on Boysen Dam was $1,000,000 and the House allowed $700,000. On the Moorehead Dam, in the Yellowstone Basin, the estimate was $900,000. That is the amount allowed.

There was no estimate for either the Bixby Dam or the Cannonball Dam, for which the House allowed $500,000 and $400,000, respectively.

For the Heart River project, Heart Butte Dam, there is an estimate of $400,000, which is what the House bill allowed.

There was no estimate for the Keyhole Dam, for which the House bill allows $200,000.

There was no estimate for the Shadehill Dam, for which the House allowed $300,000.

In the Republican Basin, the $800,000 allowed for the Bonny Dam is the budget estimate.

The $300,000 for the Culbertson Dam is the budget estimate.

The $700,000 allowed for the Enders Dam is $300,000 below the budget estimate, which was $1,000,000.

In the Platte Basin, the Narrows Dam, the estimate was $300,000, which is the amount contained in the bill.

In the Kansas Basin, Cedar Bluff Dam, the estimate was only $500,000, and the bill provides $900,000.

I will say to the Senator from Georgia that I do not like these items coming in at this late date. As an individual—but I cannot speak for the committee—I would certainly support a motion to strike out all the projects for which there are no budget estimates, and to lower the Cedar Bluff Dam to the budget estimate. I think the Congress has gone hog wild on flood-control projects. I do not believe the amount of money we have appropriated already can possibly be spent efficiently and economically.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I am glad to have the Senator in charge of the bill explain to the Senator from Georgia that the three projects mentioned in the Republican River Basin are provided for in the budget.

I should also like to invite the attention of Senators to the fact that all these items in the supplemental bill came in as a result of the President's special message to Congress only a few days ago. I can say very truthfully and sincerely that the projects in the Nebraska area for which there are budget estimates are desperately needed. In the Republican Valley alone, in the past few years we have lost approximately 125 lives by flood damage.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I heard the Senator mention the Boysen Dam in Wyoming, in connection with flood control. I should like to advise the Senate that this dam is largely for reclamation and irrigation, and also serves the purpose of flood control on the Wind River in northern Wyoming. The dam is situated at the southern end of the Wind River Canyon. Also, if my memory serves me correctly, it will be equipped with a power unit. It is a very important dam for the irrigation and reclamation of a great area in the Big Horn Basin in Wyoming. The dam has already been started, and it is very necessary that the work should proceed to the earliest possible completion.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Wyoming refers to the Boysen Dam.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. That project has a budget estimate. I had not offered any objection to it.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. It has a budget estimate; the Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. In view of the statement made by the Senator from Minnesota, it seems to me that the projects which have had no budget estimate should at least be considered by the conferees, because of the haphazard hearings, which were the only kind that were possible in the last days of the session. Bills come over from the House very late. Never in my service in the Senate have we been so involved in the last moments in trying to keep up with conferences.

In view of the lack of information on these dams, I move that the items for the four unestimated dams be stricken out, in order that they may be taken to conference.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, so far as I am personally concerned, I shall support the Senator's motion to strike out all the projects for which there is no estimate and reduce the one which is $400,000 over the estimate, to the estimate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator submit the list to the desk?

Mr. BALL. I will make the motion.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Minnesota if the Bonny Dam, listed on page 11, an item of $800,000, comes under the budget estimate?

Mr. BALL. That is the budget estimate.

Mr. WHERRY. How about the Culbertson Dam, $300,000?

Mr. BALL. That is the budget estimate.

Mr. WHERRY. How about the Enders Dam, $700,000?

Mr. BALL. That is $300,000 under the budget estimate.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask about the Platte Basin, Narrows Dam, $300,000.

Mr. BALL. That is the budget estimate.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to say that in the Interior Department Subcommittee we held hearings on these questions. This is the particular area in which there has been so much flood damage. Not only has there been loss of life, but there have been great losses of property. The estimate of the engineers, who testified after the Interior Department appropriations had been considered, was to the effect that the damage exceeded by far the amount which was first estimated. Also an independent agency in Kansas City, Mo., made estimates. The testimony of the Army engineers was that flood damage in the Republican River and the Missouri River Valley Basin would total more than $110,000,000 for this year alone.

I should like to say just as forcefully and sincerely and honestly as I can that the Department of the Interior considered these appropriations. They have all been authorized. The Enders Dam has been under construction, and the only reason why it comes up in a supplemental bill is that we were not permitted to have the amount which was necessary in the first instance. These projects all come within the budget. I think all of them are still in the budget which has been allowed. So far as these projects are concerned, they are meritorious. They come within the budget, and I hope that at least these projects may not be stricken out of the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the motion of the Senator from Georgia relates only to projects without the benefit of budget estimates.

Mr. WHERRY. Earlier in the day I had a discussion with certain Senators who, I understood, were objecting to any supplemental appropriations. I wished to make the record clear that so far as these four appropriations with reference to the State of Nebraska are concerned, they have already been recognized. They are authorized; and the only reason there is a supplemental budget is that the engineers and those in authority felt that additional amounts were necessary at this time.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Minnesota if the Bixby Dam, for which the House allocated $500,000, is within the budget.

Mr. BALL. There is no budget estimate at all for that project.

Mr. GURNEY. How about the next one, the Keyhole Dam, in Wyoming?

Mr. BALL. There is no budget estimate for that.

Mr. GURNEY. How about the Shadehill Dam?

Mr. BALL. There is no budget estimate for that. There is none for the Cannonball.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Let the Chair observe that if the Senate is to act on these amendments, they will have to be sent to the desk.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think the amendments can be offered in the form of a motion.

I move to strike out line 2 on page 11, line 3 on page 11, line 6 on page 11, and line 7 on page 11, in order that the conferees may have an opportunity to examine these projects, which are brought forward on the last day in the session, and which do not have the benefit of any budget estimate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair believes that the Senate understands the motion.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may the motion be stated for the information of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, it is proposed to strike out lines 2, 3, 6, and 7.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any desire to have the items considered separately? Without objection, the items will be considered en bloc.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia to strike out, on page 11, lines 2, 3, 6, and 7.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, on page 11, line 4.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, what is the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, at the beginning of line 4, it is proposed to strike out "Heart Butte Dam", and insert in lieu thereof "Heart River project, Heart Butte and Dickinson Dams."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 8, after line 2, to insert the following:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

REGULATORY AGENCIES

Office of Recorder of Deeds: For an additional amount for the "Office of Recorder of Deeds," $12,000, to be available for salaries and expenses of the Auto Lien Division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a moment ago when I inquired about the dams in the Missouri River Basin I desired certain information with regard to them and I did not understand that Senators had stated on the floor that they were familiar with the projects. I was confused as to them. The Senator from South Dakota made a motion, and I was confused about the projects. He advises me that the motion resulted in action on the dam about which he had made a statement. In view of all the confusion on the floor of the Senate at the time, I wish now to make a motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia moves to reconsider the action previously taken by the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, while we are considering the Interior Department items in the bill I should like to make a statement which I think should relieve the minds of some of my constituents in Yuma, Ariz.

Mr. President, in connection with the amendment included in the Interior Department appropriation bill transferring the Yuma air base property, buildings, equipment, material, and acquired lands to the Bureau of Reclamation, it is my understanding that the Bureau of Reclamation will work out with the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the War Department and the War Assets Administration, any necessary details for the operation of the hangars, runways, and immediate related facilities for an approved airport for the city of Yuma. Arrangements to this effect were under consideration when this amendment was adopted and everything should be done to make available to the people of Yuma and other agencies the constructed airport facilities at the air base. The city of Yuma and other agencies will, of course, be expected to cooperate with the Bureau of Reclamation in the operation and maintenance of these facilities so that the activities on the Gila project can be carried on effectively and economically.

At the hearings before the Senate Committee on Appropriations it was explained that the transfer of the Yuma air base would be handled along the same lines as were the transfers of the War Relocation Authority camps in the 1947 Interior Department appropriation bill. The amendment to the 1947 bill provided that the War Assets Administration is authorized and directed to transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation funds required for maintenance and protection of the transferred property pending its final disposition. It is my understanding that a similar arrangement will be made for handling the Yuma air base as is being carried out in connection with the War Relocation Authority camps. The funds required for this purpose are limited and would have to be expended by the War Assets Administration if the property were not turned over to the Bureau of Reclamation.

It is also my understanding that the regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior for the disposal of lands, improvements, buildings, furnishings, and equipment to veteran settlers and nonprofit organizations, including municipalities, school districts, and so forth, in connection with the war relocation centers are to be used by the Bureau of Reclamation in connection with the Yuma Air Base in the most simplified form possible. The airport facilities, of course, may be leased to the city of Yuma or any other qualified agency.

This statement is made at this time in order that all concerned may understand that the amendment was intended primarily for the benefit of veterans in the settlement, operation, and construction activities of the Bureau of Reclamation, for the general activities of the Bureau, and for the communities it serves, in the order named, including especially the city of Yuma, for airport and other public purposes. The Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, delegate to the Commissioner of Reclamation any of the authority vested in him in connection with the handling of the air-base transactions.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota a question. I have been called out of the Chamber several times while the bill has been under consideration. I spoke to the Senator yesterday about this matter. Under the Taft-Hartley Labor Act all labor unions are required to register with the Department of Labor before a certain date, I think, in September. That is quite a task. I am advised by the Department of Labor that they have no force at this time to be assigned to the task, and they have no appropriation which would enable them to employ an additional force to do the work. Is there anything in the bill which takes care of that situation? Furthermore, unless the registration takes place there is no way by which the law itself can become effective, because it is a prerequisite to the knowledge of the Department as to labor unions throughout the country and to other functions with respect to further preparation for the enforcement of the act itself.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, as a member of the subcommittee I was very much aware of the Department's obligations under the act, and if the Senator will examine page 12 of the bill he will find

a committee amendment covering that subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, ask for a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BALL, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. TYDINGS conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 885. An act to provide that the Canadian-built dredge *Ajax* and certain other dredging equipment owned by a United States corporation be documented under the laws of the United States;

S. 1661. An act to provide additional inducements to physicians, surgeons, and dentists to make a career of the United States military, naval, and Public Health services, and for other purposes; and

S. 1720. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 479. An act relating to the income-tax liability of members of the armed forces dying in the service; and

H. R. 3173. An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 2181. An act relating to institutional on-farm training for veterans; and

H. R. 3690. An act to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 2173. An act to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 2659. An act to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance, and provide for the medical and scientific treatment of persons found to be alcoholics by the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3045. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe the processes and procedures for recording instruments of writing in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4269) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 40, 41, and 42 to the bill, and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 17, 58, and 64 to the bill, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43 to the bill.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution establishing a joint committee to investigate high prices of consumer goods; and

S. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution relating to surplus buildings and lands for community purposes.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 104) to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Housing.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 107) authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means to have printed for its use additional copies of the digest of testimony, index to hearings, and each part of the hearings held during the current session relative to tax revision, 1947–48, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

INVESTIGATION OF THE IMMIGRATION SYSTEM

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in accordance with the agreement made yesterday, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be laid aside and that the Senate return to Calendar 595, Senate Resolution 137.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 137) to make an investigation of the immigration system.

Mr. REVERCOMB obtained the floor.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. For what purpose?

Mr. BROOKS. I ask the Senator to yield for the purpose of presenting a conference report on the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BROOKS submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 17, 18 and 19.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and proposed by said amendment insert the following:

"For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281–1407) (except the provisions of sections 201, 202, 303, 381, and 383 and the provisions of titles IV and V), including personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; $228,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1948, for compliance with programs under said provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended, pursuant to the provisions of the 1947 programs carried out during the period July 1, 1946, to December 31, 1947, inclusive: *Provided*, That not to exceed $24,500,000 of the total sum provided under this head shall be available during the current fiscal year, for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such programs, including the peanut-marketing quota program, the cost of aerial photographs, however, not to be charged to such limitation; but not more than $7,080,813 shall be transferred to the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided further*, That payments to claimants hereunder may be made upon the certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out the conservation practice or practices and has complied with all other requirements as conditions for such payments and that the statements and information contained in the application for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge and belief, under the penalties of the Act of March 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C. 80): *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order Numbered 9069, of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State or county information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information to individual farmers: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1948 programs (amounting to $150,000,000, including administration, and formulated on the basis of a distribution of the funds available for payments and grants among the several States in accordance with their conservation needs as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That the proportion allocated to any State shall not be reduced more than 15 per centum from the 1946 distribution

and that no participant shall receive more than $500) of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended, and programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; but the payments or grants under such program shall be conditioned upon the utilization of land with respect to which such payments or grants are to be made, in conformity with farming practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as determined and approved by the State committee appointed pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended for the respective States: *Provided further,* That the Secretary may, in his discretion, from time to time transfer to the General Accounting Office such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative expenses of said Office in auditing payments under this item: *Provided further,* That such amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary under programs provided for herein: *Provided further,* That the Secretary is authorized and directed to make payments to farmers who complied with the terms and conditions of the agricultural conservation programs, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, if the Secretary determines that, because of induction into the armed forces of the United States, such farmers failed to file, or were prevented from filing, applications for payment under any such program during the period the applicable appropriation for such program was available for obligation, such payments to be made out of the unobligated balance of the appropriation, "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources", in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1946: *Provided further,* That an application for payment on the prescribed form is filed by any such farmer (or the person entitled to payment in case of death, disappearance, or incompetency of the farmer under regulations issued pursuant to section 385 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C., 1940 edition, 1385)) within one year from the date of his discharge from the armed forces, or by December 31, 1947, whichever is later: *And provided further,* That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the Act of July 11, 1919 (18 U. S. C. 201), to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal aprpopriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$15,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement the amendments of the Senate numbered 43 and 59.

C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
CHAN GURNEY,
CLYDE M. REED,
HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
CLARENCE CANNON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to propound a question to the Senator from Illinois with reference to an item in the agricultural appropriation bill. I am not certain that the item is at this time in controversy——

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I understand that I have the floor, having yielded temporarily for the presentation of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The floor will be restored to the Senator as soon as this matter is disposed of.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, to clarify this matter, let me say I have reference to the item in the agricultural bill having to do with meat inspection. Will the Senator please tell us whether that item was in dispute in the conference?

Mr. BROOKS. For the information of the Senator from Nevada, let me say there were four items in controversy. One was the meat-inspection item, one was the conservation-and-use item, one was the school-lunch-program item, and the fourth was tenant loans under the FHA. They were disposed of in the following manner:

As to tenant loans, the House voted a reduction of $35,000,000. The Senate restored $20,000,000. The conference has decided on $15,000,000.

As to the school-lunch program, the House voted $45,000,000 and eliminated the provision for matching funds derived from payments by the school children. In the conference the match provision was restored, and the appropriation was fixed at $65,000,000. As the conservation and use item, $30,000,000 was restored of the amount the House had voted to eliminate.

As to meat inspection, the Senator from Illinois will state that, reluctantly, we receded on the amendment on meat inspection, because the House was adamant. The conferees on the part of the House were unanimous, except for one Member. In the House, two votes were taken on this matter, and they were the largest of any votes taken in the House on amendments and other matters considered by the House. So, Mr. President, for the purpose of obtaining the enactment of a bill for the Agricultural Department, the Senator from Illinois reluctantly receded.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I realize that at this late hour in the session it is not practicable to send this report back to a further conference. But in my opinion a great disservice has been rendered the people of the United States by taking out the item providing for public inspection at public charge of the meat consumed by the people of the United States. Today we are spending hundreds of millions of dollars year after year for public health. There cannot be anything more important than to see to it that the meat consumed by the people of our Nation is properly inspected by disinterested inspectors.

The result of taking the action recommended by the conferees will be, in my judgment, that all the small independent packers will go out of business, because the large packers will be able to have private inspection and will charge the cost of the inspection as part of the price of the commodities they sell. However, the small packers will not be able to compete, because they will not be able to pay for the private inspection. The result will be to close down the small packers and the independent packers everywhere.

However, that is not the worst feature of the situation. The worst feature is that governmental inspection of the food the people of this country use will be ended. Especially in view of the fact that the people are paying such high prices for meat at the present time, certainly the inspection provision should be retained in this appropriation bill.

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. ELLENDER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BROOKS. I shall yield in a moment, but first I must not let the statement the Senator from Nevada has made stand without an explanation of my position in reference to the observations the Senator from Nevada has made.

In the first place, the meat inspection will continue exactly as it has been conducted in the past. The inspectors will be Federal inspectors; they will be under civil service. We have not changed the law. I did not agree to this provision originally; but, as I stated before, I say again that I yielded on this point, for the purpose of having the bill enacted, and because of the importance of the other programs provided by the bill, such as the school-lunch program, the conservation and use program, and the tenant loan program, as to which—and they constitute a majority of the items in dispute—the will of the Senate has prevailed. The other conferees will state that I did object, but finally I yielded reluctantly on this point.

But so far as the inspection of meat is concerned, it will go on just the same as always, except in the case of a packer who does not wish to engage in interstate commerce with his meat. Anyone who wishes to engage in interstate commerce with meat must have it federally inspected. For all of the total number of pounds of meat slaughtered in the

packing houses in the United States, and the $11,600,000 which it has cost the Government, the cost for meat inspection amounts to less than one-tenth of 1 cent a pound.

Even though I did not want to yield on this point, I believe that the packers themselves will more adequately emphasize, in advertisements and otherwise, the importance of having the Government stamp on their meat, and as a result the people will want the inspection made, and that will force the packers to have their meat inspected universally. Thirty percent of the meat is not inspected at the present time, under the present Federal inspection program, even though this law has been in existence for 40 years.

I was reluctant to yield on this point; but I say that anyone who wishes to engage in interstate commerce with meat must have it inspected. It will not be privately inspected.

The Department of Agriculture would not take a position on this matter. The chairman of the subcommittee questioned the representatives of the Department of Agriculture at length, trying to get from the Department an answer to the question, "How do you feel about this matter?" The only answer I got was that the meat inspection would continue. They would not even express their view as to whether this provision would diminish the amount of inspection.

So the Department has not expressed its view as to whether this provision is good or bad. The representatives of the Department simply say that this does not change the law or change the status of the inspectors or change anything, except that the packers will pay the inspection fees to the Government. The inspectors will still be Government inspectors, and still will have Government status and civil-service status and rights.

I think the packers brought this on themselves. The proposal did not come from me or from any other Member of the Senate, but the House was adamant. All but one of the conferees on the part of the House stood fast in their position that they wanted this inspection charge transferred to the packers. One of the reasons they assigned was that during the war, when the packers asked the civil-service inspectors provided by the Government to work overtime, the packers paid the overtime charges. So the packers are already paying a part of the salaries of the Federal inspectors, in the form of fees paid to the Government. This provision merely makes them pay all the salaries of the inspectors.

I say again that it means, in the overall program, less than one-tenth of one cent a pound. When people say that the cost of the inspection will be transferred to the consumers or to the producers, it is difficult for me to understand how it will be possible to transfer a cost of one-tenth of one cent a pound or how it will make a difference in maintaining the meat inspection program.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, what the able Senator from Illinois has said is true, but let me state what the result will be. As he has said, the small packers cannot ship their meat across State lines unless the meat and the meat products are federally inspected.

Mr. BROOKS. That is true.

Mr. McCARRAN. That we agree upon. So the small packer must pay that additional item, in that he must pay for the Federal inspection. Otherwise he is confined to his State line. This one-tenth of 1 percent in the overall charge, or one-fiftieth of 1 percent, about which the Senator speaks, is scarcely felt by the big packer, because he is handling millions of pounds of meat, and it amount to but little. But with the little packer, who is handling a limited poundage of meat, it amounts to much, and much more than one-tenth of 1 percent.

In my judgment, the result is going to be that the little packer will not be able to stamp his meat "Federally inspected," because he will not be able to pay the charge of the civil-service inspector who will have to be in his packing house. Therefore the big packer may come along and say, "We have federally-inspected meat," and no one else can compete with him because the public wants federally inspected meat.

I make the prediction that the result will be that hundreds of the small packers of the country, who have limited territory, are going out of business, to the great augmentation of the business of the big packers.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the school-lunch appropriation had been reduced to $65,000,000?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will that amount be spent in strict accord with the law as it now stands, or has the committee surrounded the appropriation with limitations?

Mr. BROOKS. The law provides that $10,000,000 of whatever is appropriated must be spent for nonfood assistance, namely, equipment. We removed that restriction, so that it might be spent for food for the school lunches.

Mr. ELLENDER. So that this restriction will apply solely to the present appropriation, and will have no effect on the organic law?

Mr. BROOKS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I merely wish to bear witness to the sincere effort made by the Senator from Illinois to maintain the provision in the meat-inspection appropriation. The amendment was voted into the bill in the first instance in the other body, and when the bill came to the Senate it was stricken out after hearings by the Senate committee. The bill went back to the House in disagreement, and the House took a second vote upon the matter. At that time effort was made for a yea-and-nay vote in the other body, but the Senate amendment did not have sufficient strength in the House even to get a call of the yeas and nays. Even those who were in favor of the Senate position agreed that the decision of the House would be the same if the amendment went back for another vote. Therefore it would have been futile for the Senate to attempt to maintain its position longer on that particular item.

On the whole I think we got a very good bill. There are provisions which were not very satisfactory to me, but we provided funds to enable the Government to carry on next year the most important farm programs.

The Senate will observe that the Senate conferees receded on the last House amendment, which allowed a total of $265,000,000 for soil-conservation payments. It was stated in the conference by those who have great familiarity with the program that in view of the pulling down of the program which was brought about by the action of the House in reducing the appropriation $165,000,000 in the first instance, that $265,000,000 would pay the farmers all to which they would have been entitled for soil conservation. It does not pay them in full. There will be a small balance, which we can seek to have appropriated in a deficiency bill next year.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I have received communications from Oklahoma stating that some of the county offices would have to be closed if funds were not provided. Is there sufficient money provided in the bill to keep the soil-conservation offices open?

Mr. RUSSELL. It may be that in some counties there are not extensive farm programs, and it will be necessary to consolidate, but it will be possible, with the funds for administration, at least to maintain a skeleton staff in all the offices.

The reduction in the administrative item was severe, there can be no question. The budget estimates were around $36,000,000 for all purposes, including the quota programs on tobacco and peanuts. The House figure was originally $15,000,000, and the conference figure was $22,500,000.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. What was the original budget estimate for soil-conservation practices?

Mr. RUSSELL. The original budget estimate provided, roughly, for $300,000,000 for soil conservation and administration.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. How much is carried in the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. Two hundred and sixty-five million dollars.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope the conference report will be agreed to. It is as good a bill as we could get. It was the result of long and tedious effort.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia a question with regard to the school-lunch program. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] propounded a question which the Senator from Illinois answered,

but I should like to make doubly sure about the provision of $10,000,000 for nonfood assistance, which is to be found in the General Law, section 5, I think it is, which provides that of any sum appropriated, $10,000,000 is to be used for nonfood assistance. In the opinion of the Senator from Georgia, is that sufficiently negatived by the specific language in the conference report?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question in my mind, and it was made perfectly clear by the report, that the $65,000,000 will be used for getting food. There is a very obvious reason for that. If it was necessary to cut somewhere, it would have been folly to cut down on food, and have a program for $10,000,000 that would have been spread so thin over the United States. The most important part of the program is the getting of food for the school children. As much as the Senate conferees regretted to be compelled to surrender the $10,000,000 for nonfood purposes, we had to reach an agreement at some time, and we were compelled to make this agreement. There can be no question however that under the language of the bill, it takes the funds from section 32 funds rather than a direct appropriation from the Treasury. The entire $65,000,000 that will be carried when the bill is signed by the President will go for food for the school-lunch program.

Mr. O'CONOR. Notwithstanding the provisions of the general law?

Mr. RUSSELL. Notwithstanding the provisions of the general law, which are negatived by the language which is carried legislatively to divert the funds from section 32 sources.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I believe the amendments that were in question have been adequately explained.

I now move that the Senate agree to the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 3601, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
July 24, 1947.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43 to the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: Strike out "$75,000,000" where it occurs in said amendment and insert "$65,000,000"; and at the end of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the period, insert a colon, and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of such funds shall be used for non-food assistance under section 5 of said act."

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59.

The motion was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF IMMIGRATION SYSTEM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 137) to make an investigation of the immigration system.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, just prior to the call of the calendar last night we were proceeding with the consideration of Senate resolution 137. The resolution calls for an investigation of the immigration system of this country in its various phases.

I feel that in the discussion of last evening we rather thoroughly laid the whole subject before the Senate. I believe that it is understood. The resolution does not give any greater powers to the Committee on the Judiciary than exist at this time. It does provide an appropriation out of Senate funds which will enable the Committee to set up a staff to deal with the subject.

I have pointed out how imperative it is that this staff be created and go to work if we are really to ascertain the facts upon the subject of immigration and its various phases. So it is not my intention today to speak at length, because I hope that we may shortly bring the issue to a vote. I realize that there are Senators with other subjects which they desire to bring up, and I am going to have full respect for their position.

Mr. President, the Committee on the Judiciary has closely followed this resolution. The resolution was first reported by the Committee on the Judiciary unanimously. Later, under our procedure, it having been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, that committee reported it without objection, and made the allocation of the funds for carrying on the work. Several Senators interested in the subject and various phases of it, have discussed with me certain amendments to effect the purpose they had in mind. Those amendments were submitted to the Judiciary Committee, and that committee has authorized me to present them upon the floor. One of the questions raised in committee was the problem of displaced persons. A number of Senators, not members of the Judiciary Committee, showed an interest in this subject. I want to make a part of my remarks at this time, by reading, a resolution adopted on July 24, which appears in the minutes of the meeting of the Committee on the Judiciary of that date. It reads:

Resolved, That the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary be, and he is hereby, authorized to invite the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, each to designate one member of the committee of which he is chairman, to give to the Committee on the Judiciary their advice on the problem of displaced persons.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Would the Senator mind reading that again? There was some noise here and I could not hear what the amendment was.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It is not an amendment. It is a resolution which was adopted by the Committee on the Judiciary when the Senator from New Jersey was appearing before that committee, on July 24, and this subject was before the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, that is the same amendment which had been proposed by the junior Senator from Michigan and placed on the table, submitted in behalf of the junior Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], except that the date was changed and made 10th of January?

Mr. REVERCOMB. No; I am speaking now of a resolution adopted by the committtee—not an amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. But going back to the amendment, that amendment was approved by all the committee present at the meeting of the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I think the Senator is now speaking of an amendment which was first suggested by the Senator from Michigan on behalf of himself and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL].

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That amendment reads:

Provided, however, That the committee shall report its findings and recommendations in a separate report with respect to displaced persons in Europe, on or before January 10, 1948.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is an amendment about which the Senator consulted me, and which was agreeable to me. It was submitted to the Judiciary Committee and received its unanimous approval.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point in his remarks for a clarifying question?

Mr. REVERCOMB. In a moment. I want to say the amendment will be offered by me in due course as a part of the pending resolution.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield at this point for a clarifying question in relation to the so-called Ferguson amendment, was the report to be made to the Judiciary Committee or to the Senate?

Mr. REVERCOMB. It was to be made to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, is there a provision as to the date on which the Judiciary Committee shall report to the Senate?

Mr. REVERCOMB. No; there is no provision as to when the full committee shall act on the amendment.

Mr. SMITH. I have some further questions I want to ask the Senator, and I assume he would rather continue his discussion now, and will advise me when he is prepared for questions.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am prepared to hear the Senator now.

Mr. SMITH. I have a number of questions which I want very much to propound.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall be very glad to have the Senator ask the questions, because I do not intend to indulge in a long statement on the subject. We discussed it at quite some length last

evening. I think the Senate very thoroughly understands what is in the resolution, and I want to proceed to a vote as quickly as we can so that a decision may be reached about the matter.

Mr. SMITH. I am in entire accord with the Senator's view. I should like to ask unanimous consent, to save time, to insert in the RECORD at the appropriate place in connection with my remarks certain editorials on this subject, which tend in a very effective way what the issue of displaced persons is.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I should prefer that they not be introduced at this point in the discussion.

Mr. SMITH. I meant at the close of my remarks today.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall ask that they be placed in the RECORD with any statement the able Senator has to make. If the Senator has a question he wants to ask me, I shall be glad to hear it.

Mr. SMITH. I shall be glad to postpone my request for the insertion of the editorials in the RECORD, as the Senator requests.

I may preface my questions with this statement: As the Senator knows, the only difference I have had with him in the whole dicussion has been with regard to the scope of the inquiry. My first preference in dealing with the matter was to have it dealt with by a concurrent resolution of the House and Senate. I realize that time is past, and that cannot be done. It was in my judgment the proper way to deal with the subject of displaced persons, because it involves more questions in my judgment than simply immigration.

My second preference, as the Senator knows, would have been an amendment to his resolution, which would have set up a special displaced persons subcommittee, consisting, of course, of the judiciary group, but also consisting of members of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Armed Services Committee, and any other committees that might be concerned with the problem. But I do not wish, if I can avoid it, to complicate the matter by offering amendments. It occurred to me that if I could ask the distinguished Senator a few questions, which will appear in the RECORD, and make plain what is the scope of the investigation, it would probably cover the situation, and we could go ahead and adopt the resolution without complications arising. So, if the Senator will answer the questions I have prepared, as briefly as possible, I will appreciate it.

Does the scope of the investigation which is contemplated include the following:

First. Our American foreign policy abroad, including our relations to the United Nations Organization and the cooperation with the International Refugee Organization on the displaced-persons question.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Of course, the Senator understands I can only answer for myself; I shall not attempt to answer for the committee, or the subcommittee that will act under the resolution, if adopted. According to my point of view, the subcommittee would act upon every subject which would be taken into consideration in the formation of any statute on this subject.

Mr. SMITH. For the moment, I will pass that question, and will probably return to it presently in connection with certain other questions. My second question is, Whether the proposed investigation would include the responsibility of the Army for the care of displaced persons now in Germany, and the time within which their settlement should be accomplished?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Naturally, my answer would be the same. We would inquire into any question which would affect legislation dealing with the subject. From my own point of view, we would certainly consider what had been done, and what the Army knew about that subject or any other subject dealing with immigration.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator. My next question is this:

Does the Senator—and his committee, I assume, when I ask this question—recognize that there are two distinct phases to this problem of the displaced persons: First, a proper check-up on our immigrational laws, as the Senator has suggested, in order to see that undesirable aliens are kept out of the United States; and, second—and this is the phase I want to emphasize; I think it is the important one in this emergency we are facing—how we can cooperate with other nations of the world, through the United Nations, to solve the resettlement problem of displaced persons in the various countries of the world, and, in particular, what percentage the United States should be willing to admit in connection with such settlement in proportion to the percentage which other nations would admit?

Or does the Senator simply take the position that we are not committed by implication or otherwise to admit anyone?

Mr. REVERCOMB. We are not committed to bring in anyone.

Mr. SMITH. It is true we are not committed to bring in anyone, but——

Mr. REVERCOMB. I want to have the situation made clear. We are not committed to bring in anyone, but we are dealing with a particular question. I know the viewpoint held by the able Senator. I am sure the committee will be glad to have the viewpoint of the Senator as to what he thinks should be done, and, on the basis of what we find, the committee will recommend what should be done.

Mr. SMITH. Further to bring out what I am trying to have brought out, I ask this question: Will the Senator agree that the solution of the problem of the displaced persons involves three aspects:

First. Foreign relations.

Second. The administration of the occupied areas where at the present time we have taken care of those 600,000 people.

Third. The resettlement in other countries of those people, including a fair share of them as immigrants into the United States.

Does the Senator agree that those problems are involved in the problem of displaced persons?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Those will be questions to be considered, certainly. They will be the questions that will be presented. But I do not for one moment wish to say what shall be done in answer to that.

Mr. SMITH. I am not pretending to say that now either. I am trying to find the scope of the inquiry.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Anything dealing with displaced persons, where they are today, what shall be done with them, is naturally within the scope of the inquiry. Let me say that the Judiciary Committee has directed me to offer another amendment to the resolution, which I am very glad to offer. That is on page 2, in the first line, under clause (4) that we shall add the language: "and all aspects of the displaced-persons problem."

In other words, clause (4) would then read:

> The situation with respect to displaced persons in Europe, and all aspects of the displaced-persons problem."

I do not think that language is necessary, but I am very glad to add it, because if we go into any part of the subject of immigration, whether it be with respect to immigrants who desire to come to this country, of who some desire to send here, of who some desire to bring here, whether they be displaced persons or not, we have got to go into every phase of the subject dealing with the problem.

Mr. SMITH. I deem then, from the Senator's answer that the report which he contemplates making on the tenth of January under the Ferguson amendment would include an answer to all the questions I have propounded to him covering these areas, such as the foreign policy of the United States, our foreign relations, the administration of the occupied area, and the question of how these poor people are going to be settled somewhere in the world.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall have to say to the able Senator again that what I say is what I must personally say as a Senator, and not for the committee. But my viewpoint is that the report, while it would not attempt to transgress upon the jurisdiction of the Foreign Relations Committee as to international relations or obligations, would certainly deal with the subject of what might have been done in international relations with respect to displaced persons.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator's answer brings out then what has been troubling me, because obviously the Senator can not speak for more than himself. He has very honestly and candidly stated that he feels he would cover these fields.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Furthermore, the Senator from West Virginia is not going to state any conclusion upon these facts until the investigation has been made.

Mr. SMITH. I understand that. I am trying to find the scope of the investigation. My point is that if the investigation has the scope he has stated, and the Senator, of course, cannot speak for his committee, is it not appropriate for the Senate of the United States to determine what that scope should be,

what subjects we want covered in dealing with this question, and that we should have members of the other committees concerned with the problem represented to serve with the Judiciary Committee in determining the policy?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I think the Senator can be fully at rest when the Judiciary Committee has said it would deal with "the situation with respect to displaced persons in Europe, and all aspects of the displaced persons problem."

If that does not cover the whole situation I do not see how language can describe it. I think under that language the committee will look into all aspects of the displaced persons problem. I can not construe the language in any other way.

Mr. SMITH. Would the Senator agree specifically that the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary will invite the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee to add to the Senator's committee advisers or—I do not know what the Senator would call them—fellow members, who would be full members of the Senator's committee, who would go with the committee to Europe in investigating this question from their standpoints, and who would be taken care of for their expenses by the fund the Senator's committee has?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I think the Senator's question has already been answered when I said that the Judiciary Committee on July 24 adopted a resolution, which I shall read again. I think the resolution answers the question very explicitly, except with respect to the Appropriations Committee. I read the resolution:

Resolved, That the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary be, and he is hereby, authorized to invite the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, each to designate one member of the respective committee of which he is chairman, to give to the Committee on the Judiciary their advice on the problems of displaced persons.

That is going a long way. We are not trying to invade any province of the Foreign Relations Committee, but at the same time, so far as I am concerned, and certainly, as expressed in the resolution, so far as the whole Committee on the Judiciary is concerned, we are glad to have the advice of the representative of the Foreign Relations Committee and the representatives of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SMITH. I want to ask the distinguished Senator whether "advisers" means that these gentlemen, whoever they may be, appointed by the chairmen of these other committees, will be invited to go with the Senator's committee, and that the Senator will permit them to go and visit these camps with his committee, and together deal with these problems we have to settle, and whether the Senator's committee's fund is adequate to take care of that addition to his committee?

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator is asking me if I personally would be willing to do that. I would be entirely willing personally to do it, but the Senator well knows that the committee itself will determine that question. So far as I am concerned, I will be happy to have the representatives of those committees go anywhere the committee goes.

Mr. SMITH. I do not want the Senator to feel that I am laboring the question. But when we are told by the Senator from West Virginia that he will do his best, it makes us feel that we should offer an amendment enlarging the committee in the way suggested.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator can offer an amendment. I shall be glad if he will do so. But I wish to say that the matter has been taken up by the Judiciary Committee. The Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction exclusively over immigration. That does not, however, make the committee feel that it would not be willing to accept advice and assistance from representatives of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee. We want to hear them. We are glad to have them be with us as advisers. But the matter of jurisdiction of the matter of immigration remains in the Judiciary Committee, and the Judiciary Committee decided on the program the other day.

Mr. SMITH. The Committee on the Judiciary has jurisdiction over the principle and question of immigration, yes, but the Senator has not answered satisfactorily, I regret to say, to me at least, the question of the other issues which must be covered.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator from New Jersey seems to be disturbed about the advisers. I have read the resolution reported by the Judiciary Committee. The Senator is familiar with it. I believe he has a copy of it. He was present at the meeting of the Judiciary Committee on July 24 when this question was raised. The committee made its position quite clear. I do not think there will be any trouble about the advisers. The Senator continues to insist, as though he were fearful that he would not be heard or consulted. So far as I am concerned, I certainly will hear him and consult with him. I want him to advise us upon any part of this problem upon which he wishes to advise us, at any time, anywhere. That is my personal view, and I believe it is the view of every member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Does the Senator suggest that this is solely a matter for the Judiciary Committee, and that it is not just as much the concern of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the other committees concerned with the over-all policy? I am not questioning the immigration feature. I am questioning the rest of the problem, that of displaced persons over which I insist the Senate as a whole has jurisdiction and authority.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator is speaking about the displaced-persons problem. Certainly if the Foreign Relations Committee is interested in it, it might well appoint a subcommittee. We are not urging that. We want to be cooperative. For that reason the committee will invite the chairmen of those respective committees to designate members of those committees to advise with us. This is an unusual procedure.

Mr. SMITH. The whole thing is unusual.

Mr. REVERCOMB. There is nothing unusual about the resolution. This is a matter within the jurisdiction of the committee; and at the request of the Senator from New Jersey the committee invites members of other committees to cooperate with it.

Mr. SMITH. I was agreeing with the Senator that it was an unusual procedure. I appreciate that.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The resolution itself is not unusual. However, the action of the Judiciary Committee in inviting other committees to come and sit with us is rather unusual.

Mr. SMITH. I agree.

I should like to ask one further question. It seems to me that the importance of this investigation requires whoever is on the committee—and the Senator knows by now that I think there should be on it members of the Judiciary Committee, members of the Foreign Relations Committee, and members of the Armed Services Committee, to consider the over-all problem—to make an investigation. It is my judgment that the Members themselves should make the investigation, and not delegate the work to certain experts or staff members. I raise that question only because I understood from what the Senator said that certain investigations had been made by staff members. In my judgment those investigations should be made by Members of the Senate themselves. Otherwise we shall not be discharging our responsibility in determining a great question of national and international policy which this problem presents. What is the Senator's attitude on that question?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I think it would be well for the committee members to go if they can go. I think it would be best for individual committee members actually to see these things. But situations may arise in which we shall have to use staff members, and have them report to us.

Mr. SMITH. There is no doubt about that. I agree that with respect to the phase of the question in which the Senator is interested, the amendment of the immigration laws, the assistance of technical experts will be required. Technical staff work will be necessary. But the over-all problem of displaced persons is not a matter to be delegated to a staff. The whole policy must be investigated by Members of the Senate, who will bring back to the Senate a report to show us where we should go in solving this great problem.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am glad to have the Senator's views on the question of who shall make the examination and investigation. The committee will determine that. I think it is always best for those who have to decide to see the evidence first hand. But as to who shall be sent, and how the hearings shall be conducted, that is a question for the committee to determine. We shall have hearings. Evidence will be produced by the Army, and by those who have had contact with these people. That is a

part of the information which we shall get. Then, of course, the visual evidence will be very helpful.

Mr. SMITH. May I ask the Senator further, in the light of this discussion, whether he does not feel that the problem is of sufficiently wide scope to justify a larger subcommittee from the Committee on the Judiciary than is contemplated?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not.

Mr. SMITH. I am not reflecting on the Judiciary Committee in any way, but I am wondering whether it would not be better to have a larger subcommittee to take charge of the various phases of the problem.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Judiciary Committee has indicated that there will be a subcommittee of five from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SMITH. That is one of the questions I wanted to ask.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is the decision which was made in the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That was at the request of and with the full concurrence of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and myself. We are delighted to have it that way, because more Senators will be available to work on the subject, and I welcome it.

Mr. SMITH. I thought the Senator would say that. I gather from his remarks that he would welcome the cooperation of other Senators, and that so far as he personally is concerned he would be happy to have them go on this trip, if there is to be a trip, in order to make full inspection and in order to deal with the other problems which are not primarily the responsibility of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have expressed my delight in welcoming, in a consultative capacity, members of other committees. The Judiciary Committee will eventually shape this legislation for report to the Senate.

Mr. SMITH. That is what I assume. The Judiciary Committee as such will shape the legislation, and will make a report to the Senate on the tenth day of January, under the terms of the resolution of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

Mr. REVERCOMB. As to who shall go, and where they shall go, that will be determined by the committee itself.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to make a few observations on this question to see whether or not we can arrive at a happy solution.

No one could be more interested in the displaced-persons question than is the Senator from Michigan. I introduced one of the bills which is now before the Judiciary Committee. I wonder whether we could not solve the problem in this way:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. It is his desire that one of the members of that committee do something in relation to the displaced persons problem. The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations has full power to name a subcommittee. He might designate one member of a subcommittee of that committee, and arrange to have that committee pay the expenses of the particular member. The same thing might be true of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations. Then all those Senators could cooperate. Their expenses would be paid to Europe.

The Judiciary Committee has always cooperated with other committees and with individual Senators. The various Senators designated by the respective committees could act as advisers. They could return and give to their respective committees the information which they had obtained, which would be beneficial to the committee. The commitee which has charge of the legislation, the Committee on the Judiciary, will ultimately be required to pass upon the question and make a report to the Senate. I feel that the suggestion which I have made would obviate loss of time and would result in a better job than would be done if a special committee were created.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is the Senator referring to the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator does not want a special committee, does he?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; that is what I am trying to avoid. However, the Judiciary Committee could allow members of other committees to observe and confer, and we could get the whole picture. I think the problem could be solved in that way.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is the Senator suggesting that the advisers must be included in the inspection trips which may be made? I do not know what trips will be made.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is impossible to tell; but I know that the Senator's committee will be glad to cooperate with a subcommittee or a member of any other committee.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Not only is that true, but we shall be glad to cooperate with anyone whom the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations or the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, or the chairman of any other committee interested in this subject may designate. We have gone so far as to adopt a resolution to assure members of other committees that we welcome them as advisers. We have authorized the chairman of our committee to request the chairmen of the two other committees to appoint members as advisers.

Mr. President, in order that there may be no misunderstanding, I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that the resolution, as reported by the Judiciary Committee, and later reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration, provides that the expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

That, of course, would include the expenses of the committee and of the committee staff. I do not know whether it would cover the expenses of another Senator, but, in my opinion, under the language, it would not.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. One of the questions which addresses itself to my mind and about which I would like to ask the Senator from West Virginia, and which, to my own mind, seems to be the crux of the inquiry, is this: Is it to be considered that the committee will make a determination as to whether these people shall be received or left in Europe, or is it the opinion of the Senator from West Virginia that there is already an obligation directed toward them and their resettlement, and that the inquiry by the committee is to determine whether that obligation is to be resolved, and in what manner?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I will say that this committee would gain all the facts it could, and then make its recommendations under the express language of the resolution as to what part of those persons should be brought into this country, and how they should be brought in. I know of no obligation existing to bring anyone into this country.

Mr. COOPER. I believe that an obligation was already attached to bring at least a part of them into this country under conditions to be determined, first, by inquiry on the part of the committee, upon its recommendation to the Congress and upon the action of the Congress.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Upon what does the Senator found that obligation?

Mr. COOPER. I found it upon facts representing our course of conduct. At the close of the war we did take custody and charge of displaced persons.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In Europe.

Mr. COOPER. In the American zone. Whether we act or not we will in a measure determine their resettlement. Our nonaction will mean that they will be left there or be forced to return to the country of their nationality against their will.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator is absolutely right in stating those problems. But they are problems, not obligations. They are problems to be met and solved. An obligation is something which involves a persons's right to say, "You owe me this," and to require its fulfillment.

Mr. COOPER. I am taking the position that I believe that morally, at least, an obligation is already attached. My second reason is that we have subscribed to the International Refugee Organization——

Mr. REVERCOMB. With the express reservation that no one shall be permitted to enter this country without the action of Congress.

Mr. COOPER. If it has any meaning or purpose at all, it means that finally we shall have something to do with their resettlement. I think every one of us will agree that unless this country leads the way the International Refugee Organization is meaningless and helpless.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I approach the problem from this standpoint. Perhaps

there are many displaced persons who should be brought in and can be brought in, but the Senator looks upon it not from the standpoint of this country, but from the point of view that there is an existing obligation which must be carried out at any price. I do not subscribe to that view. I subscribe to the idea that if they can be taken, take them; but there is no obligation.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator has misinterpreted my statement.

Mr. REVERCOMB. There is no obligation.

Mr. COOPER. I did not say that all of them should come here and that no tests or screening should be made. I still believe in my own mind that we have assumed some obligation and that eventually we must bring some of them here under rules laid down by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Would the Senator bring in just any of them?

Mr. COOPER. I did not say that; I said, under standards made by the Congress as to their proper screening.

Mr. REVERCOMB. When the able Senator uses the word "obligation" it means a fixed thing. The one who owes the obligation does not fix the limits of it. The obligation fixes them. The Senator says that we must lay down rules, to which I agree. There must be selectivity, and that repeats the idea of a fixed obligation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator from West Virginia that there is no obligation as such to bring people into this country. There is an obligation on the part of this country to gain peace in the world. In the attaining of peace the problem of displaced persons is a vital one.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator is using the word "problem," not "obligation."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What I hope to see is a workable program in conjunction with the problem. That is one of the problems which must be solved, and which this country must do its part in solving in order to get peace in the world. Does the Senator agree with that?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes. Any law which is enacted would give consideration to that subject.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And the committee's investigation is sufficiently broad to include a recommendation, if it pleases to so recommend, to make it possible to bring selected displaced persons into this country as a part of the problem of attaining peace?

Mr. REVERCOMB. If it is wise and feasible to do so. But I will not make a decision as to whether that is so.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think the Senator from West Virginia will recall the interest in and attention given to the International Refugee Organization set-up when the question was before the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am a member of that committee, and I recall that the Senator from West Virginia visited the committee on a number of occasions because he was interested in the problem.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I was interested, I may say, in that particular problem at that time.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In connection with the inquiry by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], rather suggesting that there was an obligation resting upon this country—I do not say that he necessarily went as far as that; I am not certain what his own interpretation would be. I will ask the Senator from West Virginia if he did not hear repeatedly that very question raised in connection with the advisability of going into the International Refugee Organization, as to whether, if we went in, it would create an obligation, and if he did not hear repeatedly a number of officials of the Government factually state to the committee that our going into the organization did not necessarily create an obligation to take any of those displaced persons; that that was a question which would have to be settled at a later date, after investigation and examination?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I think the Senator is correct, and that the position was taken time after time—certainly I know it was the position of the Senator from West Virginia, although I was not a member of that committee——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think the Senator will recall that it was the position of the Senator from Iowa, also.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It was stated that that was a matter which would be determined when it was reached.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say to him that in just the last few minutes I made an attempt to get the record of the hearings. I have not been able to get it yet. But I say to the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Kentucky that as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, having sat through those hearings and having cast my vote in favor of reporting the bill which provides that we shall join the International Refugee Organization, it was my firm conviction then, and it is my firm conviction now, that the intent of that act all the way through was clearly that it did not place on the United States any specific obligation to admit any persons into this country, but that that problem could be fairly and properly met and answered only after a fair and decent and humanitarian investigation not only into the needs and requirements and conditions of those people, but of the abilities of the other peoples of the world to absorb these refugees. I still say there is no present obligation on the United States, that is fixed in any way, requiring that we take a percentage or a certain number or, in fact, any, if our Nation determines that it is not wise to do so. But, on the other hand, we can take such numbers as investigation might indicate to be wise and proper.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I am glad to hear that statement from the able Senator from Iowa, who is an outstanding member of the Foreign Relations Committee. Certainly no one should know better than he what was meant by our joining of the International Refugee Organization. I am glad to have his statement, because I believe he expresses very clearly what I know I have felt about that Organization.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Question has been raised as to the meaning of what I said a moment ago about obligations. I am not going to contend that under international law or under any law there is any obligation for us to accept any of those who are known as displaced persons. But, on the other hand, if we enter upon this investigation without having in mind the possibility and idea that eventually we shall accept some of these persons, then I cannot see the reason or excuse for the investigation, so far as it relates to displaced persons.

The obligation of which I speak is, in essence, moral.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I respectfully inquire whether it is possible to secure reasonable quietude in the galleries and on the floor of the Senate. I respectfully submit that the Senate is entitled to hear what is being said, and that the Senators who are participating in the debate are entitled to be able to state their positions. If the galleries are constantly in a hum, in addition to the noise here on the floor of the Senate, it is impossible to conduct the debate or the proceedings in the public interest. So I submit the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken. The Chair cautions the occupants of the galleries to be as quiet as possible, because of the nature of the debate now going on.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am speaking about what I think has been developed by our own course of conduct during and after the war. In the first place, rules were adopted by the military and civil leadership of our country and transmitted to the commanders in the European theater of operations, placing upon the Army the responsibility of assuming custody of, and control over, and making arrangements for the repatriation of, displaced persons. We are yet charged with that responsibility.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, let me interrupt to say that was done for the benefit of the unfortunate displaced persons.

Mr. COOPER. Exactly. But, as I have stated before, when we fail to act, when we fail to discharge to the limit our responsibility, we do affect their resettlement, because if we do not act, we say, in effect, that they will remain where they are or will be returned to countries to which they do not desire to go and in some instances cannot safely go.

Again and again we have said we would not force any national of an allied nation to return to a country to which he did not desire to return. That has been said by those in high authority in

the United States. If we do not act, in practice and effect, we violate the promise.

The second point I make, and, again, it may have no legal basis, I admit, respects our adherence to the International Refugee Organization when the agreement was passed by this body, it contained a condition to the effect that no provision of the agreement could be construed as being a revision or an alteration of the immigration laws of the United States. Yet the ultimate purpose of passing the resolution and the ultimate purpose of the International Refugee Organization is to effect the resettlement of these people. I say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Iowa, that if we pursue his argument to its logical conclusion, we must conclude that his argument means that the International Refugee Organization is actually ineffective, and meaningless, for under his argument, resettlement is not assured.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I must interrupt at this point to say that one of the main purposes for the existence of the International Refugee Organization was to take over from UNRRA and to look after these people and to aid in looking after them and in resettling them, as the Senator has said. I say to the Senator that his argument should be made after the matter is before the court. We should not make up our minds in advance.

Mr. COOPER. But, Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator how this country can ask other countries to resettle these people, if we take no position about the matter. That is my point of view.

The third point I make, is that when we assented to the incorporation of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania into the Russian sphere, we did not positively assent, but we made no objection, we assented normally to a closing of the homes to which many Latvians, Estonians, and Lithuanians had wanted and hoped to return. So I think there is a moral obligation as to these particular nationalities.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; a great wrong was done in that way, and we joined other countries in doing it.

Mr. COOPER. Fourth, Mr. President, we have urged Great Britain to do something about Palestine. I do not think we can speak out of one corner of our mouth in that way, telling another country to do something about such a matter, and then, speaking out of the other corner of our mouth, say that we will not take any steps in that direction ourselves. The points which I have made indicate that we have already affected the ultimate resettlement of these people; and under requirements which this Congress itself must lay down, respecting the number and the conditions under which displaced persons should be admitted, I believe we have a moral obligation to move forward in meeting this problem.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. As to the statements that there is an obligation, moral or otherwise, to admit these people to this country, does not the Senator realize that the United States has already admitted more than 300,000 refugees from Nazi and Communist terror in Europe, many times more than Great Britain or any other country has admitted?

As to the statement that we must rush through this matter without an investigation, merely to show our good faith, since we have asked Great Britain to help, I submit that the complete answer is that the United States already has done more than all the other nations combined have done.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I am very glad to have the contribution of the able Senator. I do not believe this Congress, either the Senate or the House, will act upon this subject in any respect until it has the facts before it.

At this time, so that we may hasten to an end, I send to the desk an amendment which I offer at the direction of the Committee on the Judiciary and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of section 2, after the word "available", it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided, however*, That the committee shall report its findings and recommendations in a separate report with respect to displaced persons in Europe on or before January 10, 1948."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I offer a second amendment, at the request of the Committee on the Judiciary, and ask that it be read also.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 2, after the word "Europe", it is proposed to insert the words "and all aspects of the displaced persons problem."

Mr. REVERCOMB. I move the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I did not hear the wording of the amendment. It is to the resolution of the Senator regarding the subject of immigration and displaced persons?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes. I may say to the Senator that it was offered by me at the direction of the Committee on the Judiciary at a meeting held on July 24.

Mr. PEPPER. Would the Senator be good enough to summarize what change it is he seeks?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes. I invite attention to the provision on page 2 under subsection (4). The language in the resolution as it is now reads, "The situation with respect to displaced persons in Europe." Then would be added, "and all aspects of the displaced persons problem." That is placed in the resolution at the suggestion of the Senator from New Jersey and other Senators.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, is that one aspect of the inquiry, or is the displaced persons one subject and the general subject of immigration another?

Mr. REVERCOMB. There are some five points of inquiry set forth in the resolution, and that is one of them.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator contemplate an inquiry in Europe?

Mr. REVERCOMB. That question has been asked, and I think such an inquiry will be made. I cannot answer for anyone but myself, and the matter has not been discussed by the committee, but I have already stated that the resolution authorizes the committee in conducting the investigation to go anywhere.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to make just one other observation. I regret very much that Congress has not seen fit to adopt the Stratton bill, as I believe it is called, which proposes to allow 400,000 of the displaced persons of Europe to come into this country. I am glad, as I am sure the whole Congress is, that the Secretary of State and the President have both urged upon the Congress the enactment of that measure. The proposal suggested the assumption by this country of our obligation to admit that percentage of these people.

There are certainly a large number of displaced people who need to find sanctuary and refuge somewhere in the world. I know we cannot take them all, as we at one time perhaps hoped we might be able to do. I do not propose anything so radical as that we should live up to what is on the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor, and really hold out the hand of invitation to the oppressed people of the world, and certainly to those who are denied their civil liberties in other parts of the world. But I do not know of any reason why we cannot set an example, which will speak louder than any words we can utter, extending our sympathy for these people by assuming our share and doing it promptly, because every day they are denied access to this country they are suffering in some foreign land.

I do not know what the attitude of the able Senator from West Virginia is toward this subject. I hope he is sympathetic. I hope he is not going to adopt the shortsighted and selfish view held by some persons in this country who feel the policy of helpfulness is detrimental to our national interest and contrary to peace in the world. I believe that America owes this debt to the people who have so pitifully suffered, who have been so grievously persecuted in other parts of the world by the evil forces of the world.

I hope that the purpose of the resolution is to acquaint the committee firsthand with the unspeakable conditions under which these people live, and that the committee will return at the first of the year, if we do not have an earlier opportunity, and will give the Senate from first-hand information about the privations and the sufferings and the tortures of those pitiful people, and will so prick the conscience of the Congress that it will promptly, in a magnificent display of real Americanism, do what the President and the Secretary of State urged us long ago to do, take merely our share of these suffering people, who would constitute 400,000 in a nation of 140,000,000.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the able Senator believe that a committee of this kind is

necessary to determine whether or not these people have suffered and have been tortured and have been driven from one place to another over the world. It strikes me that we now have all the information we need, if we are truly interested in displaced persons. We do not need to send a committee to Europe to find out the conditions. There is now on file in the executive branch of the Government plenty of information that would give all the light Congress needs. It seems to me this kind of resolution is useless, and is a step of delay, not one of action. In addition to that, definitely in my opinion it interferes with the United Nations organization.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I must say that I agree with what has been said by the Senator from Illinois. In the law we say that the principle of judicial notice is that what everybody knows the court knows, and I would suppose that what everybody knows the Congress knows, and if there is a tragedy in the world today, it is the plight of these people. I would have supposed that the Congress, from its common knowledge of the subject, and from the recommendations of the President and the Secretary of State, would have been able to act on the bill to which I have referred, to admit the limited number of 400,000 as our part of these pitiful people, without the necessity of our having to go and see first-hand their broken bodies, their shriveled minds, and their anguished hearts, because of the torture which has been inflicted on them by the dastardly evildoers of the recent past.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief comment on the pending resolution and the situation which faces us and the world with regard to the subject under discussion.

As every Senator will recall, the President of the United States sent two messages to the Congress recommending legislation allowing the admission of 400,000 displaced persons over a period of 4 years within the quotas provided under the existing immigration law. A week ago last Monday the President asked Members of the two Houses occupying positions of leadership, including the presiding officers of the House and Senate, to confer with him in regard to this matter, with particular reference to his recommendation for the admission of 400,000 displaced persons into the United States. The situation was such as to make it obvious that no such legislation could be enacted at this session of Congress. The Members of both Houses who were invited to that conference advised the President frankly that there was no chance to get the bill through the Congress. The bill had been introduced into the House of Representatives by Representative STRATTON. No action had been taken upon it, and no action has yet been taken. We recognized the fact that we have, through the State Department, been urging upon other nations to make some constructive contribution to the solution of the displaced-persons problem in Europe.

Two years ago the Congress appointed a joint committee, in response to the invitation of General Eisenhower, immediately upon the uncovering of the concentration camps in Germany, to send a joint committee of the two Houses to Germany at once in order that they might before it became necessary to clean up the concentration camps, see precisely what had happened in the camps, more than 100 of which had been established in Germany under the Hitler regime. I happened to be the chairman of that joint committee. We visited 3 or 4 out of the 100 camps, and made a report in May 1945, which is a Senate document. It was unnecessary for the joint committee to visit all the camps, even if the committee had had the time; because after they had visited the third camp, the conditions were so revolting and so sickening to every member of the committee, as they would have been to any civilized human being, that it was unnecessary and undesirable to subject the committee to further torture by visiting additional camps within Germany. Of course, the concentration camps have in a measure been cleaned up, but there are still displaced-persons camps within the occupied portions of Germany, over which the United States Army presides, and over which the French and the British and the Russian Armies preside. Moreover, there are literally hundreds of thousands of people who were compelled to leave their homes in the countries in which they resided, in order that they might save their very lives; many of whom, after the war ended, returned to their native countries, from which they have again been compelled to leave. I am told that 600,000 displaced persons who went back to their original homes, have been compelled because of conditions which they found, and which were imposed upon them, again to flee from their original homes in order to reach a safe place where their lives even may be preserved, under the worst conditions imaginable.

Mr. President, many of us have read Eugene Sue's immortal book, The Wandering Jew. There are literally thousands not only of wandering Jews all over Europe, but thousands and hundreds of thousands of other wandering human beings who have no homes, no resources, whom I found and whom we all found and saw 2 years ago on the highways of Europe, pushing baby buggies, with a bundle of clothes and a bundle of food, not knowing where to lay their heads when night should come. It illustrated the saying of the Son of Man, "The birds have nests and the foxes have holes, but the Son of Man hath not where to lay his head."

There is a moral obligation that civilzation and Christianity owe to their fellow man. It is not a legal obligation; it is not an obligation that can be enforced in any court of justice. But there is a moral and a human obligation that civilized Christian men owe to their less fortunate brothers, growing out of the great holocaust which has cost so much in treasure and in blood and in morale among the people of the world. We are not responsible of course for that. We had no part in bringing on the war that has brought such disaster and devastation to the world. We have as a Christian Nation, without regard to denomination, from time immemorial sent our missionaries into foreign countries in order to convert them to Christianity, which itself creates a moral obligation to recognize the fact that we are our brother's keeper, in a sense. So, Mr. President, in an effort to carry on our part of the burden, after urging other nations to do it, we recognize the fact that the peace of the world cannot be preserved when a million or two displaced, distressed despairing men and women, wander all over the face of the earth, trying to discover a place where they may find safety and security. The peace of the world is not guaranteed by that; the peace of the world is not fostered by that. Interested in the peace of the world, and knowing the peace of the world must be preserved, and that it cannot be preserved so long that it is endangered anywhere in the world—we have learned that—the President of the United States recommended that we pass legislation admitting a certain number. It was obvious that that legislation could not be enacted. I might say that members of the Committee on Foreign Relations participated in the conference, because it directly affects the relations between our country and other countries. It was on our initiative that UNRRA was set up. When it was about to expire, we agreed to the International Refugee Organization as a part of our obligation to the unfortunate millions who, without any fault of their own, are victims of war and prejudice and injustice. We have done that because we have recognized that this fermenting caldron of despair and chaos and disorder in the world could not go on indefinitely if we hoped to preserve the peace of mankind and to fulfill our obligations and the obligations of the nations which set up the United Nations in order that world peace might be preserved. It was obvious that we could not pass the legislation. I myself am not committed to it; I am not committing myself to it now. I do not know now what sort of bill I would vote for, or how many refugees I would vote to admit into this country. It depends upon conditions. It depends upon the circumstances, when the legislation arises. With respect to the 200,000 who have been taken by Great Britain, the 100,000 who have been taken by Belgium, and the 100,000 or 150,000 by France, the question has been raised whether the displaced persons have been screened by those nations, so that we would receive men, women, and children of a lower order of intelligence and desirability, in view of the fact that the other nations have already taken a large proportion of the displaced persons. I do not think that is true, because I do not think that any screening process in that sense has taken place in Europe or elsewhere in determining whom the other nations would accept.

The REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am glad the very able Senator has referred to that subject. I know nothing about the suggestion, but that is one of the very purposes of an investigation of the kind proposed in the resolution, namely to

find out such facts, to find out what persons remain, to find out who may be taken, to find ways of taking them in, to find out where they will go, to find out who will receive them, who will look after them after they come, what places will have them, and what they could do here to make a living. All those are questions that arise under the resolution providing for inquiry. If we do not adopt the resolution the very question raised by the able Senator will be in the same situation, respecting an answer, when we meet again in January, as it is today. The resolution would provide for making inquiry into the subject. We do not desire to decide the question before we make inquiry, because, as the Senator says, he does not know what kind of bill he will vote for. I do not. I doubt if there is a Senator who does. The Senate is not going to vote upon any bill until it has the facts and the facts can be secured only by the most careful inquiry.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with that statement of the Senator. That is why I mentioned the subject, because we have to deal with a practical legislative situation. We know that the Congress of the United States in all likelihood is not going to let the bars down for everyone who may want to come into the United States, and therefore we may have to be selective in our admissions. Therefore I know, as other Senators know, that neither the House nor the Senate will pass legislation which does not in some substantial way safeguard the interests of our own country in admitting whatever number we are finally willing to admit into the United States. It was because of that very thing that in the conference to which I have referred, the suggestion was made by the House leaders that a small joint committee ought to be set up to go in person and see the conditions in Europe, with a small appropriation provided, sufficient to pay their expenses. I had hoped that before now such a joint committee might be provided for in a resolution which was supposed to originate in the House of Representatives. It has not been submitted, and now in the closing days of the session such a resolution will not be acted upon. Therefore, I agree that unless this particular resolution is adopted, with whatever modifications the Senate sees fit to make in it, there will be no investigation of the problem which faces us, and which will face us when we come back together in January.

When the Senator from West Virginia the other day first discussed this resolution I got the impression from him that it was intended to send a staff of some kind to Europe to make an investigation. I may have gotten the wrong impression, but I want to say there is no staff, however capable or able it may be, that can investigate this problem as the members of a committee of both Houses can themselves investigate it. The staffs cannot vote. They cannot transmit to members of the committee impressions they gain by looking at these people or the conditions under which they live, or by visiting the camps, and, therefore, I hope whatever committee may be created, whatever subcommittee may be appointed, or whether it is made up exclusively of members of the Judiciary Committee or other committees, including the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee, the Appropriations Committee or others, the members of the committee will go in person.

While I am on that subject, I will say that I take no stock in the criticism of Members of Congress, either in their personal capacity or as members of a committee, visiting Europe or Asia or any other part of the world with which we have got to deal, and for which we have got to appropriate money in the years to come. We know that we have to deal with these problems. We know that we are never going to escape our relationship and our connection with every nation of the world and every condition in the world. I am not afraid to say, Mr. President, that it would be money well spent if Congress would appropriate sufficient money to send every Member of the House and the Senate to every nation with which we have to deal or which we have to help or in any way undertake to restore to any sort of economic stability. I believe that. It may be called a junket or whatever anyone may choose to call it, but we gain our best information by going on the ground ourselves and with our own eyes seeing conditions, and with our own ears hearing testimony, so we may have a picture of the conditions which exist in every nation we are called upon to help. While I do not anticipate that Congress would do such a thing, I believe it would be money well invested if Congress would do so and if the Members would go in good faith, in the discharge of their duties, and try to ascertain the conditions which we must undertake to alleviate.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am delighted that the Senator from Kentucky made that statement. I think he is entirely correct with respect to what he said about seeing conditions first hand. I do not want him to be under the impression that I am not in favor of such a thing. The question was put to me as to what would be done. I said I could not answer personally. I hope that some members of the committee, if not all of them, can go and see conditions at first hand. They may be obliged to take some members of the staff with them.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course.

Mr. REVERCOMB. But I think the members of the committee should see at first hand the conditions prevailing.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, they must take some of the staff with them. But I say that no staff, however capable it is, can transmute into our own minds and hearts what they themselves find. We cannot learn the true conditions merely by reading the printed page. Therefore I have been hoping that the Senator from West Virginia would accept an amendment or two, which I understood the Senator from New Jersey intended to offer, which would make it possible for members of the Foreign Relations Committee and one or two other committees to act with the Judiciary Committee in this matter. It directly affects our foreign relations and our foreign policy. It affects conditions with which the Foreign Relations Committee must deal, and, so long as we have an Army in Germany, with which the Armed Services Committee must deal.

I feel that no harm can be done, and no reflection would be made on the Judiciary Committee, if one or two members of these other committees, under the appointment of the chairman of the committees, could be made officially a part of this committee, because after all we have to do with the problem, no matter what committee we may be on in the Senate or the House.

I do not know whether the Senator from New Jersey is going to offer the amendments or not. If he does I shall support them. If he does not offer them, I hope we may arrive at an understanding of some sort as to the scope of the investigation to be conducted by the committee.

I want to say also that I think there is more haste to determine the facts with regard to displaced persons, than the facts with reference to the immigration system of the United States generally, which has grown up over the years. This is an emergent condition. It may be that as the result of the report we would not be very liberal in regard to the admission of displaced persons, or it might be that we would be. I do not think we can overlook the human element, and our obligations to bring about conditions in the world which will promote the peace of mankind. So whether the Senator from New Jersey offers his amendment or does not, I myself want to thank him. I do not believe I can speak for the Committee on Foreign Relations, though if I had the right to do so I would thank the Senator from New Jersey on behalf of that committee for bringing to the attention of the Senate and to the Senator from West Virginia the vital interest and concern of the Committee on Foreign Relations, because of its dealing with these problems, in the question of the displaced persons.

I shall vote for the resolution, whatever its imperfections may be, because I think that it now offers the only chance to get any sort of investigation so we may have dependable information by the time Congress reassembles in January.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I have given serious thought, as I stated earlier in the debate, to the procedure in this matter. My first preference, before I talked at all with the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, was to deal with the matter by trying to have a concurrent resolution agreed to, so that the House and the Senate could both join in this matter.

My next thought, as I stated earlier, was to have the type of amendment to which the Senator from Kentucky has just referred, which would set up a joint committee.

But in considering the question of possible verbiage and possible questions of jurisdiction, and other matters, it occurred to me it would be well to ask the Senator from West Virginia to yield to me, which he has so courteously, to answer certain questions which I put to him, so we could develop the field or the scope of the investigation, the scope of the interests of other committees of the Senate in these matters, and ask

him directly whether he would be in favor of inviting members of other committees to become a part of the investigating committee. It seemed to me it would be the wise policy, without precipitating a discussion of the particular form of amendment, to accept at face value what the Senator from West Virginia has said so fairly, and to say we are looking to him to take this responsibility, with the full understanding of what we all feel in this matter should be the scope of the investigation and should be the approach to the problem.

I cannot help but feel that the Senator from West Virginia believes that his responsibility is to see to it that the bars are not let down to let in undesirable aliens. My point of view is that I want to do everything I can to see if it is not possible for the United States to cooperate with the other nations of the world by lifting the bars to let in desirable people from abroad; subject, of course, to all our immigration restrictions. My approach is entirely positive. I want to make it clear that I am urging on my distinguished friend from West Virginia, with all the sincerity I can, the principle of recognizing that these people who have been displaced in foreign countries have been put into concentration camps not because they were the scum of the earth but because they had the courage of their convictions and were willing to endure persecution and imprisonment because they believed in certain fundamentals with respect to which they were not willing to yield. If America is not open to the idea of screening and finding those people who had such convictions, then I raise the question as to when my country will be prepared to meet its responsibilities in this day, when we are facing these postwar problems.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD certain editorials which seem to me to develop these points in a good way, and indicate American public opinion on this question.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENTRY OF DP'S URGED—PASSAGE OF STRATTON BILL SAID TO BE IN AMERICAN TRADITION

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Hearings on the Stratton bill—introduced by a Republican Representative, WILLIAM G. STRATTON, of Illinois, for the admission into this country of 400,000 of Europe's displaced persons—are now going on in Congress before the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Committee on the Judiciary.

America's traditions plead for the passage of the bill, which is an emergency measure aimed at saving some of the victims of the Nazi-Fascist catastrophe. It calls for the admission of less than half of the 850,000 homeless now in camps in Germany, Austria, and Italy—100,000 annually over a 4-year period—outside the quota system but subject to all the immigration requirements, e. g., health, moral character, literacy, financial resources, and political beliefs. Relatives, friends, church organizations, etc., have agreed that they will not become a public charge.

These homeless folk are of no one race and of no one faith. They are former nationals of Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Czechoslovakia; 680,000 are Roman Catholics, Greek Catholics, and Protestants. The remainder are Jews.

PERMANENTLY HOMELESS

We err when we refer to them as displaced persons—the wretched hundreds of thousands who were up-rooted from their homes and, in camps throughout Europe, await a futureless future. Rather they should be called the homeless ones, for displacement suggests that they are temporarily out of place and that, quite normally, they will be replaced mid the scenes which they had transiently left. They are homeless—permanently barred from their former dwelling places—because they fear to return to their homelands, where race hatred and pogroms had been their lot

These are just the kind of people who would make fine citizens. Men and women whose very survival indicates their sturdiness. They have established their devotion to democratic ideals. They are eager to work, eager to give their utmost to this land of their dreams. And ours is just the country that must lead the way. We have the room, we have the foodstuffs, we have the tradition and the conscience.

The Stratton bill does not aim to change America's present immigration policy. After the 4 years have passed, the regular quota system will prevail as it exists now. Our immigration quotas have for years been unfilled. Our existing laws permit an annual immigration of 153,879. If our quotas had been completely filled, for example for the years 1940 through 1946, 1,057,153 immigrants would have entered the country. Actually, throughout those 7 years we received only 161,971. And 914,762 quota numbers were never used, for quotas are not cumulative and they expire at the end of each year. To admit these 100,000 for each of the next 4 years would simply mean, for those years, we would open the gates to less than one-tenth of 1 percent of our population.

FARMERS AND WORKERS

Those who would come in under the Stratton program include 77,000 farmers, 18,000 agricultural workers of other types, 31,000 domestic and household workers, more than 20,000 construction workers, 4,000 nurses—people who would be an asset to any community. The newcomers will be distributed throughout the country.

William Green, president of the A. F. of L., and Philip Murray, president of the CIO, have united in urging the passage of this measure. Joining them are the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, the National Catholic Welfare Council, the American Jewish Committee, and the American Jewish Congress, and Assistant Secretary of State John H. Hilldring, until recently a major general supervising the military government directly under General Eisenhower.

Even from the cold viewpoint of money gains, this bill should win our support. To take care of 500,000 of these homeless who are in camps in the American zone, we answered the call of humanity to the extent of an outlay of $130,000,000 last year. It will continue to cost us $90,000,000 a year under the International Refugee Organization. Admitting the number called for by the Stratton bill will not only save that money, but will enrich America by adding the value of these newcomers as producers and as purchasers of our output.

So far as population growth is concerned, America is approaching stagnation. That is apparent from a study of population trends, which reveals the fact that we can expect a static population by 1990, at which time our population will have reached its maximum of 164,000,000. Today Russia has a population of 196,000,000 and, at its rate of growth, it will reach 250,000,000 by 1970.

COUNTRY'S WEALTH

Since the real wealth of a country, fortified by the resources to maintain them, is its people, we are short-sighted indeed not to welcome these folk who will strengthen our country and counter the trend toward a static population.

We in America are all immigrants or the descendants of immigrants. Until a few decades ago America welcomed immigrants from all the world. Those immigrants, with their differing cultures and capabilities, have helped to build this country. I dare to hope that the concept of America, as the haven of the oppressed, is not a dead tradition.

It is the European closed-door attitude that we seem to be adopting in so many disturbing ways. We suddenly bar Government employees who think along lines opposed by those in power. We are beginning to scan books lest they express heretical views. We are beginning to seek to control people's thoughts, the attitude of restriction that had been associated with the petty principalities that dotted the Old World.

America cannot escape the responsibility and the opportunity of international leadership. Our primacy demands that we lead the way, that we afford refuge to the 400,000. Surely we cannot expect other countries to open their gates while we do nothing. And just as surely as we do our part, the other nations will make a home for the rest. When America has been worthy of its noble record, it will have helped to erase a blot on the history of our time.

NATHANIEL PHILLIPS.

NEW YORK, *June 17, 1947.*

[From the Daily Journal of Elizabeth, N. J., July 10, 1947]

ADMITTING DISPLACED PERSONS

Humanity has never called in vain for aid from the people of America. Wherever great catastrophies have occurred we have been prompt in rendering every assistance possible. No greater calamity has ever befallen a people than that which we are witnessing today in the so-called displaced persons of Europe. In our effort to restore something like order throughout the world we have a part to be played in their behalf that cannot be ignored.

President Truman in his recent message to Congress pointed the way. He called for special legislation whereby a reasonable proportion of these refugees can be admitted to this country where they can make permanent homes with a feeling of security. Other nations in Latin America and western Europe have opened their doors to these homeless. We can do no less.

There are some 1,000,000 of these people. The great majority fled from the northern Baltic areas, Poland, the Russian Ukraine, and Yugoslavia. They are to be found mainly in the western zones of Germany, Austria, and Italy, and most of them are under American jurisdiction. They are, perhaps, the greatest problem our occupying forces have to deal with.

These people cannot be absorbed where they are. The economic strain is already too great for the native population. To force them to return to their former homes would be to deliver them into the hands of their enemies. They would, in a sense, be condemned to death. Such a cruel fate is beyond our comprehension. Yet they cannot remain indefinitely in the concentration camps where they are now herded awaiting their final disposition. They are, to a large extent, our responsibility. It is a situation that must be faced and the sooner we act the better.

Here is a human tragedy that must appeal to the American heart. As the President points out, "these displaced persons are hardy and resourceful or they would not have survived." In appealing for the admission of a goodly quota into this country it is declared there will be careful discrimination. The requirements of existing immigration laws would have to be met. These laws, as the President said, "provide adequate guaranties against the entry of those who are

criminals or subversives, those likely to become public charges, and those who are otherwise undesirable."

Two bills are before Congress to carry out the President's idea. One in the Senate is backed by a strong bipartisan group including Senator SMITH of New Jersey. This measure would give priority to war orphans under 21 years of age, to relatives of American citizens and to persons who fought in the United States armed forces; after that to those who possess "special trades, skills, professions, or aptitudes as will best meet the economic needs of the United States." No particular number is specified. In the House the bill provides for the admission of 400,000 of these displaced persons over a period of 4 years.

In view of our leadership in the world today Congress can do no less than work out a compromise and pass a bill along the lines specified. It would seem that disposing of this problem is fundamental. European affairs cannot be straightened out while this unsettled state continues. Just as it is necessary to remove the debris before construction can be started, so these 1,000,000 homeless must be provided for in order to build for a permanent future.

[From the New York Times of July 15, 1947]

IT'S NOT TIME THAT'S LACKING

Senator VANDENBERG came out of yesterday's bipartisan conference with President Truman with the announcement that it seemed "all but impossible" to adjust the immigration laws at this session to admit displaced persons. If this is true, the Stratton bill and one of similar intent in the Senate will die. Something else will die, too. We have posed as a great humanitarian nation. In loans and gifts, made and projected, we act in a humanitrian manner, but our kindliness, down to the present moment, seems to be for far-away peoples. We turn chilly at the prospect of admitting, by an adjustment of quotas, within a space of 4 years, the equivalent of 1 stranger for each 350 of our present population. The strangers would be of several faiths and various national origins. The overwhelming majority of them would be refugees from communism, which most of us don't like, either. What will die if these bills die in the refugees' faith in us.

Congress is in a hurry to get home. The refugees, who have spent two or more years in camps, without homes, are probably in a hurry to get somewhere, too. The proposal to let some of them in by diverting unused quotas has been before the Eightieth Congress since January 6, when President Truman included it in his message on the State of the Nation. The Stratton bill has been in the House since the beginning of April. There has been time enough.

The program of the Stratton bill is a little thing to do for those who stood with us in the late war, and stand with us now. It is much more of a thing to do for ourselves, for these would be carefully selected immigrants, many of them bringing skills we need. Congress can find time for this measure, or for a compromise between this and the Senate bill, if it wants to. If it does want to, it can make many more than 400,000 friends for us; it can increase our own self-respect; it can answer the critics who call us hard-hearted hypocrites.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of July 15, 1947]

NOT IMPOSSIBLE

Congressional leaders have told President Truman that "extreme legislative difficulties" make conclusive action now in behalf of Europe's displaced persons "all but impossible." It is our conviction that this issue calls for the impossible. Provision for the human being displaced by the war was and is a first responsibility of the peace. The war against the Nazis was fought to preserve a civilization in which the dignity of the individual is basic. Yet, for 2 years these individual victims, most of them nationals of our allies, have wandered homeless or have been supported by international charity in the vacuum of internment camps. Thousands are in the very concentration camps from which the Allied Armies rescued them. Pleas for more time in which to rescue them have a very hollow sound.

Ira C. Hirschmann, who knows the problem of the displaced through special missions and work with United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, points out that of the 850,000 for whom resettlement is the only hopeful solution, 170,000 are children under 17 years of age. Surely there is no part of the peacemaking more important than to provide these young recruits for democracy the minimum prospect of a home and useful occupation. Eighty percent of the displaced are Christians. Common humanity requires that this predominantly Christian Nation take the lead in allowing a fair share of them to start a new life here. Twenty percent are Jews, for whom a Palestinian settlement may yet offer opportunity. If it does not, again, common humanity requires that these most tragic of refugees not be left stranded at the scene of unparalleled pogroms and persecution.

The Stratton bill would admit 100,000 of the displaced here every year for 4 years; all would be carefully screened in accordance with established immigration safeguards against admitting criminals or prospective troublemakers, invalids, and paupers. The President last week reiterated in an eloquent special message his request for some such measure. The bill's principle has the support of the State Department, of church, labor, civic and veterans' groups through the country. The chief opposition comes from persons and organizations still overwhelmed by isolationist timidities. Recognition of the measure as an essential part of the Nation's accepted international policy, and as itself dictated by humanity, justice and love of peace, will far outweigh the opposition. We urge that the leaders of Congress hurdle the difficulties, do the all but impossible and see this measure through.

[From the Washington Post of July 16, 1947]

TOO LITTLE TIME

Europe's 850,000 displaced persons seem doomed to sympathy but precious little action as far as the United States is concerned. Senator VANDENBERG's announcement that bipartisan congressional leaders find it impossible to wedge in the Stratton refugee bill before adjournment must come as a cruel joke to the men and women who have already spent 5 or even 8 years of their lives in a homeless limbo. Statistically no doubt it is possible to show that Congress has its hands full with other matters without taking up the bill that would admit 400,000 refugees to this country within a period of 4 years. But these people are not mere statistics; they are 400,000 human beings with human aspirations, coldly classed under the label of "DP's." During the concentration camp days many of them lived by sheer spiritual strength in the hope of deliverance. That hope cannot sustain them much longer when the verdict on the measure that would enable them to reestablish themselves is "too little time."

We have been generous, yes, in feeding and caring for DP's, the bulk of whom are in our zone in Germany. But this is an expedient which in the end may be far more costly than a permanent solution. For what the great majority of these people want is not a soup-kitchen existence as vagrants, but an opportunity to earn their bread and lead constructive lives. Our ability to absorb refugees in the numbers envisaged in the Stratton bill within our quota system is beyond question. So, too, is the fact that these people, most of them anti-Communist and of the hardiest stock of Europe, would contribute greatly to the income and welfare of this country. The principal barrier is the necessary adjustment of immigration quotas and permission to employ unused existing quotas—plus the matter of time. We share a sense of the difficulties facing Congress in winding up the legislative session. We also know that Congress is capable of both speedy and humanitarian action when it sets its mind to it. Anything less in this case would be unworthy of the high principles the United States is upholding before the world.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of July 18, 1947]

A MAJOR RESPONSIBILITY

Secretary of State Marshall has once more intervened with Congress to point the full importance which he attaches to United States leadership in providing for the displaced persons. He urged the House Judiciary Committee to act on the Stratton bill to admit 400,000 in 4 years. Action alone will prove that this country is not retreating behind the Atlantic Ocean, but is willing to practice what it preaches in regard to these allies of ours. Secretary Marshall made clear the direct and inescapable bearing of this problem upon our entire foreign policy. The Soviet Union advocated in prolonged and stubborn debates before various United Nations groups that all these people be returned to their homelands. The United States led the United Nations in repudiating forcible repatriation for those who feared or rejected return to totalitarian regimes. Until the subjects of that debate are cleared out of Europe and settled in friendly nations, they remain a constant sources of international friction.

Secretaries Patterson and Harriman, of War and Commerce respectively, added their pleas for action at this session. Questioning by committee members pointed an invidious source of opposition—fears lest the bill aid special groups. In plain English, which Representative GOSSETT of Texas was at times crude enough to use, the question was: Will the bill give special aid to Jewish refugees? In view of the particularly tragic history of the Jewish refugees, one can understand shamefacedness about putting it bluntly. However, the answer is "no." Eighty percent of the nonrepatriable refugees now wasting away life and hopes in Europe's camps are Christians. They are against totalitarianism, be it Fascist or Communist, and most are potential recruits for democracy. And if Congress is afraid of aiding special groups, it can specify a pro rata basis according to ethnic origins for those admitted to insure complete impartiality.

The important thing is to make provision, now, while hope and faith still survive in the refugee camps, to acquit a major responsibility of the peace. Representative CHELF of Kentucky says the whole thing: "Although millions of dollars were spent under the Marshall plan, all would be in vain if the DP problem remained to plague us."

[From the New York Times of July 23, 1947]

THE DP'S AT THE GOLDEN DOOR

Congress has no more important obligation during the few remaining days of the present session than to arrange for the early admission to this country of a fair share of those war victims who carry the pathetic title of displaced persons. There are no arguments against this proposal that will stand examination by daylight. Let us look at the main points.

1. The Stratton bill in the House would admit 400,000 within the next 4 years, at the rate of 100,000 a year. A similar bill in the

Senate sets no figure, but would doubtless admit as many. Existing quotas, which have not been filled for many years, would admit 154,000. The pending measures would merely adjust the quotas, letting some of those who desperately need new homes take the places of those who do not want to come.

2. The newcomers, to use the words of former Immigration Commissioner Earl G. Harrison in his eloquent support of the Stratton bill, would not be an assorted group of revolutionists, Communists, crackpots, bums, criminals, wealthy black-marketeers, and indolent paupers. Nearly all of the DP's are now homeless because they will not or dare not go back to Communist-dominated countries. They possess skills which will enable us, as Mr. Harrison said, to "put them to productive use."

3. Economy-minded Members of Congress might be asked to consider the fact that about 600,000 of these refugees are in our own camps in Germany and Austria, where they are maintained at an expense to the American taxpayer of many millions of dollars a year. In this case, humanitarianism may actually be a paying investment. We do not believe the American public would tolerate the only other possible economy, which would be to let the DP's starve or to deport them to countries where they would be savagely punished for their political views.

The sources of opposition to this measure have not been fully exposed, and the articulate opposition has not been candid. The supporters include both our great labor organizations; they include spokesmen for our principal religious faiths; they include every Federal official, from President Truman down, who has studied the subject.

We owe it to ourselves, in our own best interest, to pass the Stratton bill or its equivalent. We owe it to those who suffered during the Second World War for the common cause. We owe it to our prestige and dignity abroad, of which we can buy more with simple human kindliness and a touch of wisdom than we can with dollars. Congress this week might well remember the lines of Emma Lazarus about the "lamp beside the golden door." Our hospitality at best in these latter days does not extend to millions. Still it would be like a breath of the splendid and spacious past, in which America was loved by millions, if Congress took time out this week from its lesser knitting and passed this law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB].

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, in order that there may be no possible misunderstanding, I invite the attention of the Senator from New Jersey to certain language in the resolution. I have already covered this point once. I called it to the attention of the Senator from New Jersey in our discussion. The resolution provides that—

The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amount is based upon a budget which is set up for the staff and for the committee members. It therefore would not, in my opinion, include anyone outside the committee and the staff. I made that point a while ago to the Senator.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia a question. In his statement he referred to the language in Senate Resolution 137 in regard to the expenses of the committee. He stated, in substance, that in his opinion the language of the resolution would not cover the expenses of anyone except members of the committee and the committee staff. I take it the committee to which he refers is the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Exactly so. That is the committee mentioned in the resolution.

Mr. DONNELL. And that is the meaning of the Senator in what he stated.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That was my meaning.

LETTER FROM SENATOR LANGER TO VETERANS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter which I have prepared to send to the veterans of the country.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE,
July 26, 1947.

To the Veterans:

When this country entered the war I made a motion upon this Senate floor that the pay of a private in the armed forces should be at least $100 a month. The only support that I received from anyone was from Senator Bennett Clark, the first national commander of the American Legion, who voted with me. While the monopolists and cartelists made billions upon billions of dollars, the American private served at $50 a month. When President Roosevelt sent in a message to the Congress asking that all civilian salaries be limited to $67,200 a year and compared that to the $600 a year that the Army private received, I was one of the few who supported the President's plea.

Thousands more war millionaries were created by World War II than the 72,000 created by World War I. We have seen the insatiable greed of big business sending lumber, automobiles, steel, building materials, and practically all other products to every foreign country on the globe, while our own people were deprived thereof. The veterans who were promised so much when they entered the war have not even received a decent insurance policy. The farms they were told they would be able to buy when they returned, they have been unable to obtain because prices for these farms have skyrocketed—and the same is true of homes. The businesses that they expected to establish they are unable to create because on every side the large monopolies are in control—of the filling stations, the drug stores, the grocery stores, the banks, the department stores, and in fact all lines of business. Although we have had a law against monopolies on the statute books since 1890, not a single monopolist has ever been sent to jail. But if a veteran stole a loaf of bread swift punishment has been meted out.

The veterans are never going to get their rights until they organize—organize politically, and organize together with millions of small businessmen, farmers, miners, factory workers, laboring people in all walks of life. They cannot organize alone. They must organize as a part of the body politic of America. To make America the great country for which they offered their lives, they must in peacetime support that Government by their active participation in politics and by actually voting. I know of no better method of doing this than the one that I have outlined in A Call To Action, a copy of which I am enclosing. I want every veteran to read it carefully, to sign the pledge at the bottom thereof, and to enlist in this fight to make a reality of the ideals for which they fought.

Very sincerely,

WILLIAM LANGER.

LETTER FROM SENATOR LANGER TO THE AGED PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter which I have prepared to send to the aged people of the United States.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE,
July 26, 1947.

To the Aged People of the United States:

I regretted that this Congress adjourned without bringing to the attention of this body once more the desperate plight of the aged people of this country.

At the time when this body voted to increase the pay of the Senators and Congressmen from $10,000 to $12,500, plus $2,500 more for expenses they did not have to account for on their income-tax reports, I voted against the same. Later, I stated that the cost of living had gone up just as much for the aged people as it had for the rest of the people in America, including the Congressmen and Senators, and endeavored to get the old-age assistance raised to $100 a month. The only raise they got was $5 a month, but at that time in the debate it was stated that a special committee to be headed by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] would make a study of the entire subject matter. It was conceded on all sides that owing to the cost of living a substantial increase should be made.

One year has passed. The cost of living for the aged has gone up and up, but this Congress has done nothing about it. No report has yet been made by that committee, and the aged people are still in want, and misery, and despair—in many cases comparable to the plight of the displaced persons in Europe who in concentration camps are being fed better, and clothed better, and housed better at our expense than are these pioneer citizens in our own country.

While I was Governor of North Dakota, ours was the first State to adopt State aid to aged people. That was before the Townsend plan was even heard of; and now, after 16 long, long years of experience in trying to get these people justice, my only advice that I can give them is to read carefully A Call to Action which I am enclosing and to join together politically to get justice, to get equality, to get fair play, to get a part—even a small part—of the vast wealth which they helped to create and which today is being kept from them by the unscrupulous, selfish monopolists who no longer need them in their scheme of living and who are perfectly willing to see them slowly starve to death on the pittance handed out to them.

Very sincerely,

WILLIAM LANGER.

LETTER FROM SENATOR LANGER TO THE FARMERS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter which I have prepared to send to the farmers of the United States.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE,
July 26, 1947.

To the Farmers of the United States:

In Germany and even in Japan prior to World War II, 95 percent of the farmers had light and power on their farms. The same is true of the Scandinavian countries. In this America of ours the reverse is true, and we still find far less than half of our farm people enjoying the comforts and conveniences of electricity. Powerful public utility monopolies for years have deprived this class of our citizenry of this service.

Whenever in a democracy private capital refuses or fails to give the citizens what they demand, then it becomes the duty of the Government owned by the people to give them relief. Out of this condition was born the Rural Electrification Administration. Farmers were forced through cooperative action and Government assistance to do that which private capital failed or refused to do.

Just what has the present Congress done to further expand and promote this worthwhile project that would bring so much happiness and relief to its farm citizens and which in itself was self-supporting? No doubt at the behest of the most powerful, well-financed lobby on Capitol Hill, the power interests with the support of this Congress cut the appropriation for REA in the total sum of $25,000,000, thus halting the expansion of farm electrification in this Nation. In addition, huge power projects built with the taxpayers' money are supplying privately owned public utilities with power which they in turn—at a profit to themselves—sell to the consumer. This is typical of the help farmers have received in credit. Trucks and automobiles in the war assets—106,000,000 of them were carefully kept out of the farmers' reach.

Thus is witnessed the trend of the times. How is the farmer to show his resentment at such treatment? There is only one method to use that the men in authority understand, and that is the power of the ballot. The farmer still retains that ballot. My suggestion to them is contained in A Call to Action, a copy of which is enclosed. They should read this carefully, sign the pledge at the bottom thereof, and join together in a fight to protect this country.

Very sincerely,

WILLIAM LANGER.

LETTER FROM SENATOR LANGER TO HIS PATRIOTIC AMERICAN FRIENDS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter which I have prepared to send to my patriotic American friends.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE,
July 26, 1947.

To My Patriotic American Friends:

Time and time and time again upon this floor I have asked the administration to reverse entirely the Morgenthau occupation plan for Germany. His idea of tearing down and destroying all of the industrial plants of the most industrialized areas of Europe and turning them into agricultural fields and pastures meant starvation, hunger, want, and suffering to the millions in Germany and in Europe as a whole.

Millions of good, loyal, honest, fine, patriotic American citizens are relatives of those millions. They agree with former President Herbert Hoover that if Europe is to be saved, Germany and Austria must be saved. They agree with him that the inhuman Morgenthau plan has resulted in chaos, hunger, want, and suffering—all at an added cost to the taxpayers of the United States. And, Mr. President, although the war has been over for 2 years, we find millions of Germans still being tried in denazification courts, hundreds of thousands of them unable to get a job and held in concentration camps until they have been denazified. And we find this at a time when our Department of State and War Department are agreed that the United States must make friends with a new Germany and Austria if our influence is to mean anything in Europe.

To those millions of patriotic Americans of German and Austrian descent, I can only say that I, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Civil Service, which includes the Post Office affairs, have succeeded in getting the weight of food and clothing packages to these countries increased to 22 pounds. But the discrimination against permitting these citizens of ours who have relatives in those countries from having these relatives admitted to this country under the German quota still exists. These citizens of ours even today cannot bring into this country their fathers or mothers or sisters or brothers or other relatives, although we have 5,000,000 refugees and aliens living here without hindrance.

The only suggestion that I can give to these American citizens is contained in A Call to Action, a copy of which is enclosed. I ask them to read this carefully, sign the pledge on the bottom thereof, and join together to get justice for themselves and for their relatives.

Very sincerely,

WILLIAM LANGER.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1181. An act for the relief of Robert F. Parks;

S. 1198. An act to authorize leases of real or personal property by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes;

S. 1215. An act to authorize conversions of certain naval vessels; and

S. 1431. An act for the relief of Mrs. Edna Mary Jakimowicz.

The message also further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 597) to protect American agriculture, horticulture, livestock, and the public health by prohibiting the unauthorized importation into, or the depositing in the territorial waters of, the United States of garbage derived from products originating outside of the continental United States, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4347) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. CANFIELD, Mr. STEFAN, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CANNON, Mr. KERR, and Mr. MAHON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1326) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act.

The message also further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 493) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 edition).

The message also further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3756) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29 to the bill and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4002) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, and 12 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 6, 7, and 8 to the bill and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3308. An act to increase the minimum allowance payable for rehabilitation in certain service-connected cases; and

H. R. 4055. An act to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to veterans of Indian wars and the dependents of such veterans.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON HOUSING

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on a certain amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 104), to establish a Joint Congressional Committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Housing, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
July 26, 1947.

Resolved, That the House disagree to the amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 104) entitled "Concurrent resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Housing."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from its amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

RELATIONS WITH ITALY, BULGARIA, HUNGARY, AND RUMANIA WITH RESPECT TO PATENTS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today the Senate passed Senate bill 1707. There has come over from the House House bill 4070, which is an identical bill. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the House bill.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4070) to carry into effect certain parts relating to patents of the treaties of peace with Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania, ratified by the Senate on June 5, 1947, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the vote on the passage of Senate bill 1707, similar to the House bill just passed, will be reconsidered and it will be indefinitely postponed.

COURTS-MARTIAL INVESTIGATION

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I had expected to make an address today on the subject of courts martial. However, because of the congested condition of the docket, I ask unanimous consent to have my address printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COURT-MARTIAL INVESTIGATION

Mr. President, I am gravely concerned over the air of public suspicion which surrounds the court-martial systems of the Army and Navy. Judging from letters I have received from people from all sections of the Nation and personal conversations I have had with a great many former members of the military services, both officers and enlisted men, there is a broad feeling that our military tribunals are not courts of true justice.

I am confident that every member of the Senate knows of many cases in which the defendants complained, and probably with justification, that they did not receive fair hearings before military courts.

I well realize that discipline is one of the foundation stones of any successful military arm, and I know that during times of war it is extremely difficult to secure full and impartial hearings for each defendant who is called before a court-martial board. This is indeed regrettable. I, personally, believe that there were many abuses of military justice in both the Army and Navy during World War II. Judging from correspondence I have received from a great many soldiers, sailors, and marines, and from personal experiences visiting military establishments, I believe that the weaknesses in the military court-martial systems have caused grave suffering and in some cases ruined the lives of young men. I regret that it is not within our power to rectify past errors, but, Mr. President, it is within our power to do everything possible to see that these errors are not repeated in the future.

In the past, the Congress has maintained a hands off policy regarding the administration of military justice. In the past, the Congress, apparently, has accepted the explanations of the top military figures that the systems were being improved and insofar as possible the past errors were being corrected.

It is true that some improvements have been made, but, in my opinion, they fall short of the desired goal of true military justice. Last year we had the notorious Lichfield trials. Certainly, it is not necessary for me to review those trials. They were widely publicized, and I am confident that every Member here is familiar with them.

The commanding officer of the Lichfield depot, a Colonel Kilian, was reprimanded and given a small fine—strange justice in view of some of the sentences meted out to enlisted men during the war. After the President took Colonel Kilian's name off the promotion list, he petitioned Congress to get his name restored to the list. Failing in that effort, he recently went into Federal Court seeking a mandamus action against the President. The court rejected his petition. As far as I am personally concerned, I shall use all the influence at my command to block any attempt this man makes to secure a promotion. If he were guilty—and the military court found him guilty—certainly his sentence was extremely light. And there is a question as to whether or not he will be able to gain the confidence of men serving under him—in view of the past record. There is much more I could say about this trial, but I think it is so widely known that there is no need for me to fully review the case.

This year we had the Little trial which ended last month. I doubt whether very many Members of this body are familiar with the details of that case and certainly the public knows nothing of the facts surrounding the case because the Navy Department saw fit only to announce that Lt. Comdr. Edward N. Little, United States Navy, was acquitted on three specific charges:

First, conduct unbecoming an officer.

Second, conduct prejudicial to good order and discipline.

Third, maltreatment of prisoners subject to his orders.

The Navy Department announced, also, that during this 97-day trial, conducted in secrecy, 38 of Lieutenant Commander Little's one-time fellow prisoners of war testified for the prosecution and 37 of them testified for the defense. The trial was conducted at the Naval Gun Factory here in Washington, D. C., and the order to convene the court was issued on January 7, 1947. I would like to invite the Senate's attention to a news release issued by the Navy Department on May 19, 1947. I wish to point out that this news release was issued more than 3 months after the order was issued to convene the court martial. The news release reads as follows:

"Lt. Comdr. Edward N. Little, United States Navy, is now on trial before a general court martial convened by order of the Secretary of the Navy at the Naval Gun Factory, Washington, D. C.. The order to convene the court was issued on January 7, 1947.

"Lieutenant Commander Little is charged with maltreatment of a person subject to his orders, conduct to the prejudice of good order and discipline and conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman. Conviction on these charges is punishable by such sentence as a court martial may adjudge, including imprisonment and dismissal, except only that the death penalty may not be inflicted.

"The charges against Lieutenant Commander Little are based upon allegations concerning his conduct toward his fellow prisoners when he was senior officer in a Japanese prison camp. The charges were preferred as a result of an exhaustive investigation by a naval court of inquiry of which Capt. Kenneth M. Hoeffel, United States Navy, was senior member. The court of inquiry was authorized to proceed to various points in the United States for the purpose of taking testimony, and its proceedings extended over a period of about 3 months.

"Shortly after the general court martial was convened, Lieutenant Commander Little requested that the proceedings of the court be held behind closed doors. Under provisions of naval courts and boards, any accused person may waive his rights to the public trial guaranteed him by the Constitution of the United States. The decision as to whether or not the trial should be behind closed doors then rests with the court. In this case, the court decided to comply with Lieutenant Commander Little's request.

"It is not known at this time how much longer the court will be in session, nor can it be accurately predicted when the review of his case will be completed.

"The constitution of the court before which Lieutenant Commander Little is being tried is Capt. Julian B. Wilson, United States Navy, president; Capt. Lee B. Sartin, Medical Corps, United States Navy; Capt. Robert L. Morris, United States Navy; Capt. Donald McClench, United States Naval Reserve; Capt. Maynard R. Sanders, United States Naval Reserve; Commander Robert R. Fulton II, United States Navy; Commander Arthur C. Bushey, Jr., United States Naval Reserve; Lt. Comdr. Howard J. Bergman, United States Navy, judge advocate; Commander Harold B. Pagett, United States Naval Reserve, counsel, to assist the judge advocate."

In this announcement the Navy pointed out that under provisions of naval courts and boards, any accused person may waive his rights to the public trial guaranteed him by the Constitution of the United States. However, the decision as to whether or not the trial should be behind closed doors then rests with the court. According to the Navy Department's statement, the court decided to comply with Little's request.

Mr. President, there may be cause for secret courts martial during times of war. However, there certainly is no justification for secret courts martial of this nature in times of peace. Such secrecy is contrary to our concept of justice, and the fact that this court martial was conducted in secrecy demonstrates, in my opinion, the need for a complete congressional investigation of the military court-martial systems.

Many people throughout the Nation believe that the Navy Department deliberately attempted to whitewash or hush up the Little court martial. It is indeed regrettable that the naval court-martial system should be under such a cloud of suspicion, but it is and, in my opinion, the Navy Department is largely responsible for the sad state of affairs. The Navy Department failed in its duty to the public in not making known to the entire Nation the circumstances surrounding the Little court martial. Although the court martial acquitted Lieutenant Commander Little, it will be a long, long time before he is acquitted in the eyes of the public, and it may be a long, long time before the public regains any measure of confidence in military tribunals unless we in the Congress take firm steps to eliminate any cases of this nature in the future.

For some unknown reason the Navy Department did not explain the connection between Lieutenant Commander Little and Isao Fukahara, a captain in the Japanese Imperial Army. Captain Fukahara was tried as a war criminal in the Yokohoma district court, Yokohoma, Japan, in 1945. Captain Fukahara was commanding officer of prisoner-of-war camp 17–B, Osumi, Kyshu, Japan. On February 14, 1946, a military commission found him guilty of participating in ordering or permitting the murdering of three prisoners of war and the torturing of two or three others in violation of the articles of war, and he was sentenced to death by hanging.

The commanding general of the Eighth Army, United States Army, appointed the commission and approved the sentence but withheld execution pending action by the supreme commander for the Allied Powers. On July 15, 1946, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, supreme commander for the Allied Powers, confirmed the sentence.

I mention these facts because the charges against Lieutenant Commander Little grew

out of complaints made against him while he was mess officer and later commanding officer of the American prisoners of war in the prisoner-of-war camp commanded by Captain Fukahara. At Captain Fukahara's trial, several of the witnesses for the prosecution made very damaging statements regarding Lieutenant Commander Little. Several witnesses testified that he turned over to Captain Little an American prisoner of war for unlimited punishment. This prisoner of war died several days later from malnutrition and beating. This prisoner of war, a Private Knight, of the United States Army, allegedly had stolen some buns, according to testimony in the Fukahara trial. It was the second offense, and Lieutenant Commander Little turned him over to the Japanese officer for unlimited punishment although he was in a very weak condition at the time and despite the fact that he did not have to do so. Another prosecution witness testified that Lieutenant Commander Little even used Japanese commands in addressing American prisoners of war in the camps.

According to testimony at Fukahara's trial, conditions were very bad in this prisoner-of-war camp. Many were undernourished. These conditions grew worse during the closing days of the war. Captain Fukahara himself denied all of the charges which were placed against him, but the military court proved beyond any question that he was in on or knew of these atrocities and had failed to take the proper steps to eliminate them.

I wish to explain in some detail the set-up in this prisoner-of-war camp as was brought out in the Fukahara trial. There were approximately 1,700 Allied prisoners of war in the camp, and as a rule the senior prisoner-of-war officer was placed in charge of the prisoners. There was a senior prisoner-of-war officer in charge of the British prisoners of war, and a senior American prisoner-of-war officer in charge of the American prisoners of war, etc. According to testimony at the trial, the senior prisoner-of-war officer in charge of the prisoners of war was responsible for the discipline of these prisoners of war.

Captain Fukahara testified that insofar as possible he left discipline of the men up to these prisoner-of-war officers in charge. Lieutenant Commander Little, according to the testimony brought out at the trial, first served as mess officer and later when some higher ranking officer was transferred to another prisoner-of-war camp, he was placed in charge of the prisoners of war and was responsible for disciplining the men. Captain Fukahara testified that from about August 15, 1945, Lieutenant Little—he was then a lieutenant—put into force very strict rules regarding the disciplining of the camp. He testified that Lieutenant Little requested the Japanese guards to take very strict measures against Private Knight. Several American prisoners of war gave similar testimony.

Lieutenant Commander Little was tried by court martial—a secret court martial—and acquitted on three charges and thus he is innocent under our system. I have cited these examples because they will be remembered for a long time by a great many people.

Why should this court martial involving such serious charges be conducted in secrecy? And why after the court martial was concluded did the Navy merely announce the verdict? Mr. President, a great many people would like to have the answers to these two questions.

I also wish to invite the Senate's attention to the fact that the verdict in this case was first revealed, according to newspaper reports, by Lieutenant Commander Little's brother, Lee Little, manager of an Arizona Radio Station. Sometime after he announced that his brother had been acquitted, the fact was confirmed by the Navy.

Mr. President, I had hoped that the Department of the Navy would voluntarily make public a full report on the Little court martial, but, apparently, it has no intention of doing so, and under the circumstances I believe it is the responsibility and duty of the Congress to make a full investigation of the military court-martial system—not only this case but other cases.

Our armed services are endeavoring now to induce young men to seek military careers. They are encouraging young men to enlist in the various reserve branches. In my opinion, such cases as the Little case and other less publicized cases are a great deterrent to the promotion and improvement of our military service in peacetime.

There are several measures now pending before the Armed Services and Judiciary Committees calling for such an investigation as I have proposed. I hope the Congress will act favorably upon one of these resolutions in order that a full investigation can be carried out. After a full investigation is completed, the Investigating Committee would be in a position to recommend any appropriate action which it believes the Congress should take.

I am afraid, Mr. President, that if the action is not taken now, the Army and the Navy will conveniently forget their past errors and continue to operate military tribunals as they have in the past. The world either moves forward or it moves backward. Certainly, we desire to change our military tribunals to move forward toward the concepts of true justice. This is the responsibility we own the Nation which furnishes the money and the support so necessary to the success of the military services.

RIGHTS TO OFFSHORE PROPERTY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on June 23 of this year a decision was handed down by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the United States against the State of California, which in the opinion of many informed persons will affect the heretofore generally accepted conception of property rights in every State in the Union.

Reports indicate generally that the decision of the court affects only the offshore oil property on the California coast. Informed opinion, however, indicates that the effect of such opinion, together with the legal theories expounded therein affecting the State-Federal relations, may reach far beyond the particular type of property in question.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement by Hon. Beauford H. Jester, Governor of Texas, before the National Resources Economic Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands of the United States Senate on this subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. BEAUFORD H. JESTER, GOVERNOR OF TEXAS, BEFORE THE NATIONAL RESOURCES ECONOMIC SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, UNITED STATES SENATE

Some people have been under the impression that the case of the *United States Government* v. *California* for the recovery of submerged lands below low tide and out to the 3-mile limit (the recognized boundary of the State of California) was of serious concern only to the coastal States of the Union. Even after the decision was rendered by the Supreme Court of the United States against California on June 23, some people have understood that the Court's opinion related only to offshore oil property on the California coast.

A mere reading of the Court's opinion by Mr. Justice Black will arouse the officials of every State in this Union to the fact that the California case should be the deep concern of every State which has any desire to preserve its rights and property in accordance with the Constitution of the United States. Of course the decision at this time strikes hardest at California and the other coastal States. But the new legal theories of State-Federal relations announced in *United States* v. *California* is something that will haunt every sovereign State in the future if it is not nullified by appropriate congressional action.

To understand the far-reaching effects of the California decision, I would like to review briefly the legal and historic background connected therewith. California came into the Union in 1850 on an equal footing with the original States. Before entry into the Union, her seaward boundary was set at 3 miles out in the Pacific Ocean. The Government did not dispute the State's boundary or the fact that it was admitted on an equal footing with the other States. If the Original Thirteen States owned the soil beneath their navigable waters, it was undisputed that California enjoyed the same ownership. The submerged land in question was admittedly beneath navigable waters. Therefore, it came within a rule of property law which has been announced and followed by the Supreme Court of the United States in dozens of cases prior to the California decision.

Ownership of submerged coastal lands by the respective States has been recognized in the same manner as that of land beneath inland rivers, bays, and lakes since this Nation was founded. Previous to the American Revolution this ownership was recognized in the King of England, except insofar as he had granted to the original Colonies specific ownership in such lands and the seas thereunto adjoining.

It is beyond dispute that on July 4, 1776, all rights and properties of the Crown of England (not theretofore granted to the Colonies) passed to the 13 separate and independent States, and each State succeeded to all the rights and properties of the Crown within its own jurisdiction and territory. This the Government admitted in the California case.

In forming the Confederation and the Constitution the States reserved their sovereign rights and property. No interest was ceded to the National Government in and under navigable waters within the States except the paramount right given the Federal Government to regulate commerce and navigation, and defend the waters. This was not inconsistent with State ownership thereof, and as held by Mr. Chief Justice Marshall in *U. S.* v. *Bevans*, and by Mr. Justice Washington in *Corfield* v. *Coryell*, the grant of such powers "contain no cession, either express or implied, of territory, or of public or private property."

In the California case the Court recognized that heretofore the Supreme Court of the United States has written many decisions affirming the general property rule that the respective States of this Nation own all submerged lands within their boundaries. To understand the effect of these former decisions and how they have been treated by the Court in the California case it is deemed advisable to quote from several as follows:

Shively v. *Bowlby* (152 U. S. 1, 13 (1894)), opinion by Mr. Justice Gray:

"In England, from the time of Lord Hale, it has been treated as settled that the title in the soil of the sea, or arms of the sea, below ordinary high-water mark, is in the King. * * *

"And upon the American Revolution, all the rights of the Crown and of Parliament vested in the several states, subject to the rights surrendered to the National Government by the Constitution of the United

States." (Only navigation, commerce, and defense—no property ownership.)

County of St. Clair v. *Lovingston* (90 U. S. 46, 68 (1874)), opinion by Mr. Justice Swayne:

"By the American Revolution the people of each State, in their sovereign character, acquired the absolute right to all their navigable waters and the soil under them. The shores of navigable waters and the soil under them were not granted by the Constitution to the United States, but were reserved to the States respectively."

Weber v. *Board of Harbor Comm.* (85 U. S. 57, 65 (1873)), opinion of Mr. Justice Field:

"By that law (the common law) the title to the shore of the sea, and of the arms of the sea, and in the soils under tidewater is, in England, in the King, and, in this country, in the State."

Mr. Chief Justice Taney in *Martin* v. *Waddell* (1842) said the sovereign States after the Revolution "hold absolute right to all their navigable waters and the soils under them."

In 1845, Mr. Justice McKinney wrote in *Pollard* v. *Hagan* the following:

"First, the shores of navigable waters, and the soils under them, were not granted by the Constitution to the United States, but were reserved to the States respectively."

The case of *Pollard* v. *Hagan* (1845) has been cited with approval by the Supreme Court 52 times during the past 100 years, and the principles therein have become a rule of property under which thousands of titles have vested. The case is cited with approval in 244 cases by Federal and State courts.

This rule of property has been applied by our executive departments continuously during the past 100 years. (In more than 30 separate instances the Federal Government admits leasing or purchasing land in the marginal sea from the various States for improvements.) During the past 96 years the Attorney General of the United States has so held without a single exception in at least 49 opinions.

The Department of the Interior has so held in at least 31 opinions, beginning in 1882 and continuing to 1937, during which time (in 1933) Mr. Ickes wrote the law as he then saw it, as follows:

"Title to the soil under the ocean within the 3-mile limit is in the State of California, and the land may not be appropriated except by authority of the State."

So much for the history and background of the court and administrative decisions. We may sum it all up by saying that for 171 years our State and Federal Governments have recognized State ownership of all submerged lands within their respective boundaries. During all these years the Federal Government has been obtaining deeds and easements from the States for lighthouse sites, jetties, and other improvements lying in the marginal sea. All of this was recognized by the Supreme Court in its California decision. In writing the opinion, Mr. Justice Black said:

"As previously stated this Court has followed and reasserted the basic doctrine of the Pollard case many times. And in doing so it has used language strong enough to indicate that the Court then believed that States not only owned the tidelands and soil under navigable inland waters, but also owned soils under all navigable waters within their territorial jurisdiction, whether inland or not."

But the Supreme Court did not consider the Pollard case and the 52 former Supreme Court opinions restating and following the same general rule, or the 244 Federal and State decisions (some of which involved exactly the same land off the California coast), or the 49 Attorney General opinions, or the 31 Department of the Interior opinions, as even persuasive authority in support of State ownership of land under the marginal sea. Instead, the Court pronounced an entirely new legal theory of a paramount Federal right to take oil and natural resources without regard to whether the Federal Government actually owns the soil from which such resources are to be taken. And in direct support of this new theory of super-Federal rights and powers, the Court cited no constitutional provision, statute, or former decision.

The California suit was brought by the Federal Government for recovery of title and possession of the soil under 3,000 square miles of submerged land within the undisputed territorial limits of the State of California. While the Court said that it could not find that the Original Thirteen States and California owned their submerged coastal lands, it is most significant that the Court failed to find that the Federal Government owned the property. The decision was not based on ownership in the Federal Government. In this respect, the majority opinion says:

"The crucial question on the merits is not merely who owns the bare legal title to the lands under the marginal sea. The United States here asserts rights in two capacities transcending those of a mere property owner."

What are these two Federal rights which are more important than ownership of land in determining who has the right to take the oil and natural resources from beneath that land?

The Supreme Court says that the first is the right and responsibility of the Federal Government to conduct the national defense of this country. This is said to involve use of oil and other resources in national defense as well as protection of property immediately adjacent to the ocean. The second is described as the right and responsibility of the Federal Government to conduct United States relations with other nations. Therefore, the controlling question considered and determined by the Court was concisely stated in the opinion as follows:

"In the light of the foregoing, our question is whether the State or the Federal Government has the paramount right and power to determine in the first instance when, how, and by what agencies, foreign or domestic, the oil and other resources of the soil of the marginal sea, known or hereafter discovered, may be exploited."

So far as we have been able to find, this is the first American decision holding that any private or governmental agency has the right to take property and resources beneath the soil without lease or fee ownership, or without compensation to the true owner of the soil. It is also the first decision within our knowledge holding that exercise of the Federal Government's responsibility to protect the shores and lands of this country can ripen into rights heretofore identified with ownership of such shores and lands.

In this case the Supreme Court has announced Federal powers which the Congress has refused or failed to announce. Twice in recent years the Congress refused to grant specific authority to the Attorney General of the United States to sue California for these lands. Only last year, the Congress passed a resolution recognizing State ownership and quitclaiming to the States, only to be vetoed by the President.

In language broad enough to cover all of the States, which the exception of Texas' special claim, but without a finding of ownership, the Supreme Court has held:

"The Federal Government rather than the State has paramount rights in and power over that belt, an incident to which is full dominion over the resources of the soil under that water, including oil."

The language is so broad that some feel it could be extended to apply to private property, or to property to which a State has the undisputed title and ownership.

Hear again the words of the Court:

"The United States here asserts rights in two capacities transcending those of a mere property owner."

The decision for the Government was based only on those two rights, national defense and conduct of international affairs. As pointed out by Mr. Justice Reed in his dissenting opinion, the power of the United States in national defense and external affairs is precisely the same over every river, farm, mine, and factory of the Nation as it is over these undersea lands. As stated by Mr. Justice Frankfurter in his dissent:

"The fact that these oil deposits in the open sea may be vital to the national security, and important elements in the conduct of our foreign affairs, is no more relevant than is the existence of uranium deposits, wherever they may be, in determining questions of trespass to the land of which they form a part."

The wisdom and warning of this dissenting language is impelling when we consider the vital mineral deposits which could be considered "as vital to national security and important elements in the conduct of our foreign affairs." This national ownership doctrine could as well be applied to the potash of New Mexico and Texas; the mercury of California, Oregon, and Texas; the copper of Utah, Arizona, Montana, and Michigan; the iron of Minnesota; the aluminum of Arkansas; the phosphate of Idaho, Tennessee, and Florida; the coal of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Virginia, and Ohio; the lead and zinc of Oklahoma and Missouri; the tungsten of Colorado; the titanium of Virginia; the gold of South Dakota, Colorado, and California; and the silver of Montana, Colorado, and Idaho.

If there is established national ownership in important elements in the conduct of our foreign affairs and in our national security it is entirely reasonable to assume it would be extended to such vital elements as the bread of life: the wheat of Kansas, Oklahoma, Nebraska; the corn of Iowa, Nebraska and Illinois; the fish of waters bordering our States; and to clothing: the cotton of the Southern States; the wool and mohair of the Southwest and Western States; leather; and the innumerable products that can be made from natural gas.

This case will, no doubt, become a potent weapon for proponents of the nationalization of the entire oil and gas industry as well as other industries whose business, the portent of which is tied in with our national security and might become the subject of international dispute and settlement.

The threat to private industry within the States is also evidenced by the support that has been behind the Anglo-American oil agreement.

The California decision covers only lands beyond low tide. That is all the Government sued for. Inland States, prior to the decision, took great comfort in the fact that the Government was not suing for lands under bays, rivers, lakes, and harbors. But the California decision has disturbed this secure comfort by casting a cloud on title to inland waters. The Court carefully avoids a direct statement that the States own the soil under such inland navigable waters. The most that the decision says in this regard is that "State dominion over lands under inland navigable waters finds some argument for its support." At another place, the Court says: "California has a qualified ownership of lands under inland navigable waters such as rivers, harbors," etc. Webster defines the word "qualified" as "limited or modified, especially when used in the legal sense." It is hoped that such ownership will never be held to be limited or modified to the extent that the Federal Government has a paramount

right to take the oil and natural resources from beneath inland waters, but the decision leaves this question still in doubt, and seriously clouds our titles to inland submerged lands.

I think that this new theory of Federal power to take natural resources in the name of national defense and without compensation is a serious threat to the rights and property of every State. When and where will this super-Federal power end? It was not one of the powers delegated by the States to the National Government. It is not a power the Congress has ever asserted. We learn of it for the first time in the Supreme Court's California decision. Those of us who have studied the opinion are afraid that it could be stretched to cover State property other than that beneath navigable waters, and may be stretched some day to cover private property.

Mr. Justice Reed, in his dissenting opinion, pointed out that the power of the United States in national defense and external affairs is precisely the same over every river, farm, mine, and factory of the Nation as it is over these undersea lands.

In Texas we have always felt that we were secure in our ownership of coastal submerged lands because while a Republic, the Texas Congress set our boundaries 3 marine leagues (10½ miles) out in the Gulf of Mexico. When Texas entered the Union in 1845 Congress agreed that all public lands would be retained by the State. Texas has never ceded any submerged lands to the Federal Government. Revenue from leases on our rivers, bays, lakes, and Gulf lands is dedicated exclusively to the public-school fund. This means millions of dollars to the public schools of our State each year, and it could mean millions of dollars to each of the inland States in which oil may be discovered beneath your rivers and lakes. Although we retained our lands differently from the other States, we are worried over the California decision because we fear that the Supreme Court may extend this Federal power to take the resources from beneath our lands, regardless of ownership, and without compensation.

Texas is ready to join the other States of the Union in a Nation-wide fight for congressional action recognizing State ownership, and quitclaiming these lands and natural resources to the States in accordance with our heretofore long-recognized rights.

Let us not make the mistake of interpreting this decision as affecting only oil property of the coastal States. Far more valuable resources exist in both coastal and inland States in the heretofore recognized ownership of our fish, oyster beds, sponges, kelp, shell, sand, gravel, authority to tax port and harbor improvement, and many other rights which are clouded and questioned by the California decision.

The theory laid down in the California case with regard to the utilization of these submerged lands is destined to have a distinct influence on the long-range domestic oil supply of the United States. Not only the submerged lands off the coast of California, but the same lands off the coasts of many other States have been effectively taken out of commerce.

Already, major oil producers holding leases from sovereign States other than California have suspended operations in comparable areas. Whatever oil underlies these lands will not be made available for national security for many years to come, unless Congress, by appropriate act, settles this issue for all time. The technological know-how with reference to drilling for oil in this area has existed for only a relatively short time. It is constantly in the process of advancement and development. To cloud the title of the area to the extent that producers of oil will not know with whom to deal for their title—State or Federal—will retard further advancement and development. Technological know-how and advancement occurs only with opportunity for application. All of this, aside from the fundamental proposition that for a period of 171 years, the ownership of this area in the States had never been questioned.

I believe that there is reasonable grounds for fear that the theory of Government pronounced in this opinion could very well lead to nationalization of this and other industries. Technological advances and know-how with reference to this and other industries that have made this Nation great have existed under competitive private enterprise. It has developed under the various rules of property existing in the various States, and not under a national rule of property.

More important than mere property rights is the astounding blow that the California opinion strikes at State-Federal relations. This is the greatest of all usurpations of States' rights by the Federal Government. It is in line with the trend that must be stopped if we are going to continue as a Union of States instead of a highly centralized Federal state.

Fortunately, at various places in the California tidelands opinion, the right of the Congress to recognize State ownership, and quitclaim these lands and paramount rights is affirmed. The matter is still a proper question for congressional action. In his veto of congressional action on this subject last year, President Truman said he thought the question of ownership should be settled by the Court. Since the Court's decision was not based on ownership in the Federal Government but upon this new theory of paramount Federal rights, the original and vital question still remains for Congress to decide.

At this point it is interesting to note that the President did not leave it entirely up to the Supreme Court to decide this question. His thoughts and plans were placed before the Supreme Court of the United States in the argument of Attorney General Tom Clark (p. 24, official transcript of the argument in *U. S.* v. *California*) as follows:

"In this connection the President has authorized me to say that the Government wishes to do substantial equity between California and the private interests claiming under California here. In the event that the Government prevails in his case it would be necessary to have some congressional action with reference to this area. The President has authorized me to say that he will recommend to the Congress that California and its lessees be relieved of the necessity of accounting for the past oil runs that have been taken from this property.

"Justice RUTLEDGE. It is immaterial to the legal issues involved here.

"Mr CLARK. It is immaterial to the legal issues involved here, and in that connection even the expectancy of the State and of its subdivisions—for example, some of the subdivisions would be affected here, and the President also wishes to make recommendations to Congress as to that, which would take care of the equities of this situation."

This will not be the first time that Congress will have found it necessary to nullify decisions of the Supreme Court which smack of legislation rather than judicial interpretation. But I consider this the most important case we have ever had demanding attention by the Congress in favor of the States and the Constitution.

The marginal sea surrounding our Nation out to the 3-mile limit includes 65,000 square miles of land, an area as large as all the five New England States combined. Transplanting the former control of the respective States over this great area to the Federal Government would seem to be a drastic step toward further federalization and overcentralization of our Government.

A certain cause of the success of our Government for 171 years, has been the plan of leaving as many sovereign rights and powers as possible with the States and local governments—keeping as much of the total government as possible close to home, close to the observation and control of those being governed.

If the States fail to assert themselves and obtain from Congress a restatement of the fundamental law of our land—that the Federal Government has only such internal powers as were given to it by the States, we can never expect to win our battles for constitutional democracy in the future.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE "PHONY" CUTS IN THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET BY THE REPUBLICAN CONGRESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, last year we passed the Congressional Reorganization Act, designed to streamline the operations of Congress. One of the most interesting of all of the provisions of the Reorganization Act was section 133, which, for the first time in history, created a legislative budget. It directs the Appropriations Committees of both Houses, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance in the Senate, to meet at the beginning of each session and report a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for that year. This report is to be made by February 15.

We are now at the end of the first session of the Eightieth Congress. No report has been forthcoming from the committee on the legislative budget, although that report is now 5½ months overdue. I think we can begin to give up hope that we shall ever see a report from that committee, in spite of the very clear mandate of section 138 of the Reorganization Act.

Many people who have been watching the functioning of Congress, and who are interested in getting the operation of our Federal Government on the most businesslike basis possible, cheered the inclusion of section 138 in the Reorganization Act. Here at last, they thought, was a sensible proposal. Congress, they hoped, for the first time in history, is going to sit down at the beginning of a session and work out how much money is to be taken in, how much money is going to be spent and how much money is to be applied to the national debt. In this way, it was felt, instead of taxing and spending on a helter-skelter, hit-or-miss basis, the Federal Government would do what sensible families and businesses in America do, namely, find out how much they are going to take in and then try to live within that budget.

The first year that Congress was supposed to do that, we approach the very end of the session without having taken any action at all.

In a burst of enthusiasm, generated by their victory at the polls last November, the Republicans in the House of Representatives looked at the President's budget and said, "We can cut that by $6,000,000,000."

The Senate, a little more modest perhaps, said "We can cut that budget by $4,500,000,000."

On this disagreement between the two Houses of Congress, conferees were appointed to resolve the difference. My understanding is that the conferees met once several months ago and that that

was the end of it. They have not met since. They do not intend to meet. They do not propose to take seriously the provisions of section 138 of the act. Of course, no one can compel Congress to do anything which it does not choose to do. No citizens' committee can go into court and obtain a writ of mandamus, commanding Congress to take action. We are under no compulsion except the compulsion which we ourselves feel out of the abundance of our respect for the Constitution and the statutes which have been enacted. But, in this Congress, we apparently can take the positive command of a statute very lightly. If the requirement of a statute does not please us, apparently we can shrug it aside and behave as though it does not exist. The Republican majority are ardently pursuing the philosophy laid down by Ogden Nash when he said "Why did the Lord give us agility if not to evade responsibility."

I am looking at the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] who is on our side of the Chamber. We are glad to have him over here to absorb a little of this Democratic doctrine from time to time. I am sure he is one Republican who is not evading responsibility.

As an individual Member of the Senate, I have no control at all over the actions of the conference committee which is supposed to reconcile the differences between the House of Representatives and the Senate on this matter. However, I am at a loss to understand what I shall say to my constituents who ask, "Why did not Congress conform to the provisions of the Reorganization Act and give us a legislative budget?" I am afraid I shall have to answer that since the Republicans took control of the Congress, the President's budget became a political football, and in the course of kicking that football around, the Republicans have stubbed their toes.

Of course, this is not the only money matter which has become involved in the political game. We have seen two tax-reduction bills pass the Senate, which had a certain political color about them.

Now, of course, if you are a householder or a businessman and you ignore making a budget out of carelessness, or because you are so rich you do not need to worry about a budget, you spend what you think you have to and hope everything will come out all right. That is about what has happened with respect to the legislative budget provision. Without having a legislative budget, we proceeded to appropriate what Congress felt was necessary to appropriate to run the Federal Government. But in the course of these appropriations we played a little game designed to befuddle and confuse the American people. It became clear to even the most economy-minded of the majority in Congress that the President's budget had been submitted by an economy-minded President; that the President and the Bureau of the Budget had done a very workmanlike job of squeezing the water out of the various estimates submitted by the departments of the Government. In fact, the President is as economy-minded as anyone, while at the same time keeping in mind the absolute necessity for maintaining the essential services of the Federal Government.

When this realization dawned on the majority of the Congress, and particularly the Appropriations Committee of the House, they began frantically working to reduce that budget to create the impression that they were saving money where there was no money to be saved.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. In order that the Senate might adjourn earlier, would the Senator object to a motion to suspend the rules and permit the Senator's statement to be printed in the RECORD in large type?

Mr. LUCAS. I will not agree to the "large type" part of it.

Mr. TAFT. I mean, the ordinary size type.

Mr. LUCAS. I will read a little more. If the Senator from Ohio does not wish to hear this speech, I can put it into the RECORD. But I think I shall read a little and then skip some of it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I think the Senator ought to get the Senator from Ohio to agree that he will read the speech when it is printed.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not want to try to do the impossible.

To return to the manipulation of the budget—I have gone into this matter in some detail, because I think the Senate and the country ought to know just exactly what has been done. I regard it as the height of folly to try to fool the people about the size of our expenditures. This is a very important topic and should not be made the victim of political considerations.

My calculations of the phony reductions in the budget estimates for the appropriations for the fiscal year 1948 comes to the staggering total of $1,075,268,854, on the basis of eight phony items, as follows:

Bureau of Internal Revenue	$803,200,000
Public Health Service	50,100,000
Atomic Energy Commission	75,000,000
Veterans' Administration:	
Pensions and compensations	50,000,000
Hospital and domiciliary facilities	30,300,000
Philippine War Damage Commission	20,000,000
Public Roads Administration: Elimination of grade crossings and Federal aid, postwar highways	36,288,854
Government Printing Office: Working capital and congressional printing and binding	10,380,000
Total	1,075,268,854

The largest item on this list and the one that is easiest to understand is the reduction in the estimate for tax refunds. Let us see what happened in connection with that matter. In recent years, we have been in the habit of making an indefinite appropriation for refunds of internal revenue collections, customs refunds and draw-backs, and other money which the Treasury has to repay because they collected more money than was due the Government. The Treasury has been authorized in the past to spend money in whatever amount was needed to repay to taxpayers and other claimants against the Treasury for amounts which exceeded the amounts of their obligations to pay. When the President submitted his budget this year, he again requested an indefinite appropriation for these items, but he estimated the amount that would be needed to make payments under the existing laws.

This year, however, we departed from the practice of making an indefinite appropriation and made the appropriation specific. Treasury estimated that it would need $2,031,000,000 to make refunds of internal revenue collections. The House Appropriations Committee in its wisdom, however, decided that the Treasury could get along with $800,000,000 less than that amount. The House Committee on Appropriations said that the $1,231,000,000 appropriated "is the committee's best estimate as to what these refunds may amount to." Apparently, the committee has ways of estimating what tax refunds will be made, which are superior to the methods employed by the Treasury Department where experts have spent their careers making these estimates. There is no allegation in the report that the Treasury has a bad record in making these estimates, nor any suggestion as to the kind of crystal ball which was used by the House Appropriations Committee in substituting the judgment of its members for the judgment of the Treasury. The report goes on to say that—

> with manifestly improved public education and information concerning the procedure and method of filing income-tax returns, coupled with the expectation of several million less taxpayers filing as a result of prospective changes in the tax laws, it is felt that the reduced figure would more nearly approximate the amount required for these rebates than the Bureau's estimate therefor.

Of course, the prospective changes in the tax laws have not materialized at this session. As every Senator knows, the truth is that not a single person would have been removed from the tax rolls, had the Senate passed the tax bill which was supported here by the majority.

In a creditably candid statement, the chairman of the subcommittee handling the Treasury appropriation bill, Representative CANFIELD, said:

> We do not intend to leave the impression that this $800,000,000 reduction will save a single dollar for the taxpayers. The Government will still have to pay out whatever taxes are paid unnecessarily. We do feel, however, that it is sound business and in the interest of responsible Government financing that the estimate should be as nearly correct as possible. We believe our figure is the more nearly correct and should be used in budgetary computation.

I leave it to the Members of the Senate who have had experience with the work of Appropriations Committees, high as my regard is for them and their experts, to say whether the Treasury, which is occupied 365 days in the year with the collection and refund of taxes, is in a better position to say what we shall have to pay back in refunds than in the House Appropriations Committee. But, apart from that judgment, I think that Repre-

sentative CANFIELD, the chairman of the subcommittee, said everything that there is to say about this reduction in the President's budget when he said:

We do not intend to leave the impression that this $800,000,000 reduction will save a single dollar for the taxpayers. The Government will still have to pay out whatever taxes are paid unnecessarily.

On this basis, the Republican majority is claiming a reduction of close to $1,000,000,000 out of the President's budget.

Let us turn to some of the other items they have "saved."

The Hospital and Construction Act, approved August 13, 1946, provides for allotment by the Public Health Service to the States for the fiscal years 1947–51 for hospital construction. That act authorized an appropriation of $75,000,000 for each fiscal year, and provides that where the amount authorized has not been appropriated, then the authorization of the previous year shall be carried over into the next year. No appropriation was made for construction for the fiscal year 1947, so that the maximum authorized for the fiscal year 1948 was $150,000,000, consisting of $75,000,000 for 1947 and $75,000,000 for 1948. The budget of the President recommended that $50,965,000 be appropriated. The Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act makes no appropriation at all for construction. It does provide $365,000 for administrative expenses. But, again, the chairman of the subcommittee in the House has obligingly explained why there is no real reduction here in the President's budget. He said:

We have never intended, nor have we tried to show that there was any cut.

The Hospital and Construction Act provides that the Federal Government will match with $1 every $2 put up by the State governments for hospital construction. Representative KEEFE explained that under the appropriation made, the Congress is saying to the States, "If you go out and raise the money to meet the dollars we have raised, or will raise, you can go ahead with your program, and the Federal Government will match it as a contractual obligation. If the States raise $150,000,000, we will put up $175,000,000." This amount is, of course, in excess of the amount recommended by the President. Representative KEEFE went on to say:

My Democratic friends know that this is the truth, as well as anything. We do not claim there was any cut in this budget, as a result of that action, but we do claim we are carrying out the will of Congress with respect thereto. Do not let anybody kid you on this floor that we have made a lot of phony cuts.

When we turn to the appropriation for the Atomic Energy Commission, we find an alleged saving of $75,000,000, which is a nice, substantial sum—if it had actually been saved. The House voted to appropriate $175,000,000, instead of $250,000,000 contained in the budget estimate. In its report, the House Appropriations Committee complained that it was unable to get detailed justifications in the estimates for the Atomic Energy Commission appropriation, so it gave the Commission $175,000,000 and invited it to come back in the early part of the next session for whatever else the Commission needed. Here, again, we find out of the mouth of the Appropriation Committee what the truth is. The Appropriations Committee report says:

The purpose of the committee in withholding funds for a portion of the last half of the fiscal year is to defer final action on all requirements for the fiscal year until information in some detail is available on which it can act * * * the amount in the bill will provide adequate funds for all purposes for a period beyond the first half of the next fiscal year, and until the committee and the Congress have had an opportunity to secure tangible facts on which to pass a final recommendation as to total needs for the full fiscal year.

So, Mr. President, when the fiscal year 1948 is ended, we shall probably find in the estimated budget more funds for atomic energy than we find today. Nevertheless, in regard to this measure they are claiming a reduction of $75,000,000.

In other words, the Appropriations Committee said to the Atomic Energy Commission, "We are making a half-year appropriation for you. Come back early next year and we will give you the rest of it." How this can be regarded as a saving in the President's budget, I am at a loss to understand. But that does not deter the Republican majority from claiming that in connection with this appropriation they have saved the taxpayers $75,000,000.

Another item in the same bill, which is the independent offices appropriation bill, involves an alleged saving of $50,000,000 in connection with pensions and compensations paid by the Veterans' Administration. The President estimates that the Veterans' Administration would need $2,221,915,000. The House voted to appropriate $2,171,915,000, which is a reduction of $50,000,000. This move was very much like the phony saving of $800,000,000 in tax refunds. The Appropriations Committee questioned General Bradley as to the amount that would be needed to pay pensions and compensations of veterans. The committee got him to agree that the figure in the budget for this amount was an estimate. Since it was an estimate, the committee undertook to do its own estimating, and figured that $50,000,000 would be as good a figure as any other. Representative WIGGLESWORTH, who was chairman of the subcommittee, explained to the Members of the House:

It is a matter of mathematics, and whenever the pensions are actually payable, the money will be forthcoming.

Everyone knows that is so. No Member of the Congress is going to renege on the payments of pensions to veterans. Here, again, the Appropriations Committee was prepared to play the guessing game for the sake of pretending to save as much money as possible. They "guessed" $50,000,000 off of this item.

In the same appropriation there is an item which is supposed to save $30,300,000, which is the amount recommended for the construction of new veterans hospitals. Instead of appropriating the money for these new hospitals, the Veterans' Administration contract authorization was increased from $257,950,000 to $338,250,000. The committee explained in its report that in eliminating the $30,300,000—

The committee is able to report definitely that the program has not been retarded or delayed in any respect. The committee has been assured by representatives of the Veterans' Administration that sufficient cash is now on hand and available to meet all business needs until at least the latter part of the fiscal year 1948, at which time additional funds can be provided if there is a demand and need for them.

In other words, the construction was authorized, and an invitation was issued to the Veterans' Administration to come back for whatever money might be needed during fiscal 1948 to carry on the hospital program. By this kind of maneuver the committee is trying to claim a saving of over $30,000,000.

The next item is the $20,000,000 saved on the appropriations for the Philippine War Damage Commission. In the Seventy-ninth Congress, we established the Philippines War Damage Commission to pay for the war damage in the Philippines. The President estimated that for that purpose we would need $90,000,000 in the fiscal year 1948. The House cut this to $70,000,000. In the report they explained the reason for doing so. They say the program has been slow getting under way, and that in all probability a considerably smaller number of claims will actually be handled and ready for payment during fiscal 1948 than was estimated when the budget was prepared. They then go on to say candidly—

It is not the intention of the committee to withhold funds for the settlement of these claims, but it is believed that the amount provided will be sufficient to meet all payments due during the next fiscal year.

Here, again, they are saying, "Well, we will give you most of what you think you will need. If it turns out you need more, come back, and we will appropriate the money." This is in line with the other actions of the committee which I have just discussed.

There remain two more interesting items of saving. The first is the appropriation for the Public Roads Administration. In the President's budget, there was an estimate of $5,000,000 for the elimination of grade crossings and $279,000,000 for Federal aid for postwar highways. The House made no appropriation for the elimination of grade crossings, and cut the Federal aid to postwar highways appropriation to $247,711,146, making a total reduction in the estimate of $36,288,854. The Appropriations Committee recommended the reduction on the theory that the State highway programs were proceeding more slowly than had been anticipated, and that the Federal Government would not have to put up as much money as was contemplated to match the money put up by the States. But here, again, the committee is up against the provisions of the law. When and if the States put up money for postwar highways, the Federal Government has to come forward and meet the amounts put up by the States, in the

proportion required by law. The Appropriations Committee has a different estimate as to what will be needed under that program. It is, however, very unsound to claim this amount as a saving.

The last item is also a very interesting one. It is contained in the legislative appropriation bill, and involves the Government Printing Office estimate for working capital and congressional printing and binding. The President's estimate submitted for that item was $20,000,000. The bill slices this amount in half, to $10,000,000. The report of the House Appropriations Committee said that the Public Printer had volunteered a reduction of $5,000,000, and the committee had added another $5,000,000 reduction of the estimate of the reduced volume of printing. But, again, the majority in Congress are pursuing the will-o'-the-wisp. Whatever the Government Printing Office requires as working capital and for congressional printing and binding will have to be spent, whether it be $20,000,000 or $10,000,000. You cannot save money by hoping to save money, and that is the theory of most of the cuts which have been claimed so far.

The Public Printer is going to get every dollar he needs as working capital. His work will go on. The Treasury is going to pay back every dollar of refund that is required. The Federal Government will match the moneys put up by the States in connection with the various grant-in-aid programs. The Philippine War Damage Commission will pay out every dollar they find to be owing under the act. There is not one dollar of truthful reduction in any of the appropriations which I have just discussed. They come to the staggering total of $1,075,268,854.

The kinds of reductions I have been talking about are claimed reductions in appropriations, but this is not all that the majority party has been claiming in its desperate effort to come somewhere near the goals which they set for themselves at the beginning of the session. They have begun to claim as savings additional unanticipated revenue of the Government. For example, they are claiming that they have saved $505,000,000 because of the sale of certain ships. How you can save money by getting additional income from the sale of ships, I do not know. That is certainly not a saving. It merely means the Government is getting more money in revenue, but it does not mean that anything has been saved in the way of expenditures. The $505,000,000 is supposed to come from additional sales and charters of ships. Maybe we will get that much more money than we thought we would. I hope we do. But that is money which comes into the Treasury without any action on the part of the Appropriations Committees, money which was not produced by the Appropriations Committee, money which may or may not come unexpectedly into the Treasury. On this theory, they might as well claim as a reduction in expenditures the income from delinquent taxpayers over and above what had been estimated.

In addition to this claim, some members of the majority are claiming a reduction of $642,000,000 as a result of the Treasury cancellation of Commodity Credit Corporation notes to the tune of $642,000,000. This is a very interesting item. When the Commodity Credit Corporation was set up, it was given a certain amount of money by the Treasury, and the Treasury took the notes of the Corporation in exchange for the money loaned. The Commodity Credit Corporation proceeded to do business. It suffered a very substantial loss in its operations, not through poor management, certainly, but because it paid very substantial amounts as subsidies to the producers of various food commodities, under the Government's inflation-control program. The money went for such commodities as butter and milk.

In his budget for 1948, among other things, the President recommended that the Commodity Credit Corporation be made whole, that the depletion in its capital be made up. This depletion was in the neighborhood of $642,000,000. The Appropriations Committee of the House under the impression that this was an amount that was going to be spent in the fiscal year 1948, hit upon the idea of having the Treasury cancel the Commodity Credit Corporation notes in the fiscal year 1947 instead of fiscal year 1948, so as to appear to save that much money. Here, of course, they stumbled over their own feet. The cancellation of the notes of the Commodity Credit Corporation is a bookkeeping transaction. The money represented by the $642,000,000 was spent in prior years. All that was involved here was a credit of $642,000,000 to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and a debit to the account of the Treasury in exactly the same amount, so that the net result of the transaction was zero. One pocket of the Government—the Commodity Credit Corporation—was enriched by $642,000,000 at the expense of another pocket of the Government, namely the Treasury Department. But little details of this character do not seem to bother the Appropriations Committee. On the theory that they can claim $642,000,000, they told the Treasury Department to cancel the Commodity Credit Corporation notes in fiscal 1947.

These are not, by any means, all of the claims made by the majority of their so-called savings. They are claiming the savings, as shown on the last page of the report for the independent offices appropriation bill, reductions in original budget estimates and revised estimates—which are the reductions by the President in his own estimates—and increases in revenue. This really takes in the whole field. It does not take into account increases in the President's budget which have been forced on the country, such as the $400,000,000 aid to Greece and Turkey, and other expenditures during this fiscal year which could not have been anticipated. Just how well the Republican majority has been able to reduce expenditures is something no one can say until the last day of June 1948, when fiscal 1948 will have closed. It will be interesting then to see what the actual results are.

In my opinion, the amount of money that will have been authorized to be spent by the Congress, at the end of fiscal 1948, will have exceeded the President's estimated budget sent to the Congress in January of this year.

Mr. President, I desire to condemn in a most vigorous way the slipshod and carefree methods that have been used by the Republican-controlled Congress in vain attempts to reduce the President's budget. In my 14 years of experience in the Congress, I have never seen a party bearing great responsibilities of power in a free government use such unfair and irresponsible methods, in order to attain a political objective. I boldly assert that such tactics are not in keeping with, and are far beneath, the dignity and the integrity of this deliberative body. I deplore the juggling of figures as a means of fooling the American people. In the end, they shall know the truth.

A Republican alibi which I wish to puncture with an 8-inch shell is found in the repeated assertions of the majority that their failure to reduce the expenditures according to the Republican schedule was because the Democratic Party and the agencies of the executive branch of the Government refused to cooperate with them. This position is tenuous and wholly indefensible. We have seen Republican Members of the Senate interested in reclamation, irrigation, flood control, and the general agricultural program, fight desperately at the side of Democrats to restore appropriations reduced by the House of Representatives. They conveniently forgot the economy pledge.

This fallacious argument is further subject to a bit of deflation.

The American people must remember that in the Eightieth Congress, the Republicans have had the majority of votes in the House of Representatives and in the United States Senate. The Republicans have had the power to make any reduction of expenditures they believed to be wise. They could cut expenditures based upon facts or upon arbitrary whim and caprice, but regardless of what course they pursued, the people will remember always that they had the power to do what they say they could not do.

The American people will also judge the actions of the majority in this Congress by the high standards our citizens have always demanded of those with whom they do business. Let a businessman indulge in questionable practices, and he will soon find his customers leaving him to deal with his more responsible competitor. Let a business concern juggle its figures and employ phony bookkeeping transactions to make its profits appear more attractive or its assets more valuable, and the American public will soon withdraw its support through investments.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask a question of the Sen-

ator from Illinois in regard to the bookkeeping. I think he has brought out clearly that there was a great deal of juggling of the books, in an attempt to make it appear the Republicans are saving some money for the taxpayers. I believe the Senator stated that next year they will be back before July 1 for supplemental appropriations which will make the appropriations amount to even more than the President's budget originally called for.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the opinion of the Senator from Illinois, in view of the deficiency appropriations which are coming in, and in view of world conditions as they exist at the present time. I do not think there is any doubt about it at all. When we figure these items accurately and honestly, we find they have actually saved a little over a billion dollars up to this time, and it is a far cry from $4,500,000,000 or $6,000,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Out of the President's estimated budget of approximately $37,000,000,000?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; the only reason I am discussing this matter is the fact that from the very day Congress convened in January 1947 we have heard the loud noise as to what the majority were going to do with respect to the cutting of the President's budget. Every Senator on the floor of the Senate is highly interested in economy and efficiency in the Government, of course. There is no doubt about that. But the promises the Republicans made, and the propaganda they spread throughout this Nation as to what they expected to do with the President's budget, have not been upheld. What I am attempting to do on the last day of the session, is to show that through the juggling of the figures from time to time, from one year to another, they are attempting to fool the American taxpayer and the American public.

The American people's inherent sense of sound, above-the-board business practices, and their refusal to tolerate violation of those practices are largely responsible for the solid foundation on which American business rests today.

We may be sure that the people of this country want and demand that their own business concern—the government of their country—be operated on the same honest, straightforward standards they require of others. And when the final figures are available on the fiscal gymnastics of the majority in this session of Congress, the stockholders in the United States Government, who are the citizens of this Republic, will experience a feeling of shock and outrage because of what they will consider the violation of their business code of honor.

For their information, I am placing in the RECORD now a table of figures which show plainly the failure of Republican bookkeeping and Republican promise keeping as of late last night. I shall review the table when the final figures are available, and I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD which will be printed after this session of Congress closes a table which will give the complete record of the action of this Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and the order is made.

	Amount submitted in President's budget	Amount appropriated	Amount claimed as reduction of President's budget	Amount of "phony" reduction (no actual saving to taxpayers)	Actual reduction after deducting "phony" reduction
Treasury, Post Office	$4,089,123,500	$3,216,509,450	$882,614,050	$503,200,000	$379,414,050
Labor, Federal Security	1,779,184,039	1,674,158,631	105,025,408	50,100,000	54,925,408
State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary	698,788,788	551,175,932	147,612,856		147,612,856
Navy	3,513,000,200	3,268,766,100	244,234,200		244,234,200
Interior	296,135,420	194,587,859	101,547,561		101,547,561
Legislative	76,153,077	55,254,435	20,898,642	10,380,000	10,518,642
District of Columbia	95,793,160	95,504,737	288,423		288,423
Independent Offices	8,509,497,759	8,189,122,927	311,374,832	211,588,854	99,785,978
Agriculture (annual and permanent) [1]	993,571,318	798,416,136	165,155,182		165,155,182
Government corporations [1]	50,137,500	31,746,918	18,390,582		18,390,582
Military [1]	5,716,791,500	5,616,618,799	100,172,701		100,172,701
War—civil functions [1]	619,727,100	539,927,499	79,799,651		79,799,651
Total	26,408,903,261	24,231,789,373	2,177,113,888	1,075,268,854	1,101,845,034

[1] As passed by the Senate—final figure not available.

This table shows that out of a total request in the President's budget for the fiscal year 1948 for appropriations of $26,408,903,261, the majority claim a reduction of $2,177,113,888. The actual fact is that they have only managed to reduce the budget request by $1,101,845,034. This is a far cry from the optimistic resolutions calling for a $4,500,000,000 or $6,000,000,000 cut in the budget.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the American people will decide that the Republican majority, by its bad business policies, and its shallow defense of them, has become very difficult; it can, with a little more effort, become impossible.

Mr. President, there is one further statement I wish to make. Ever since January 3 we have heard about economy from the majority in the Congress, and ever since I have been a Member of the Congress I have heard nothing but condemnation of what was termed New Deal spending, the spendthrifts on the Democratic side of the aisle in the Senate. The Republicans have condemned and criticized the record made by the Democrats during the last 14 years. Part of this time is within my service in Congress, and I speak from personal knowledge. Of course, they did it long before I became a Member of the Congress.

I desire to place in the RECORD a statement of what the Senate under Republican leadership and control has done up to the present time with respect to spending money in the legislative branch of the Government. They shout to the high heavens about the spending of money in the executive branch. They continuously call the attention of the American public to the tremendous amount of money that is being spent by the bureaucrats under a Democratic administration. Yet, the Senate of the United States, from January 3 to this moment, has spent more money for legislative purposes than any other Senate in the history of the United States. The Republicans put on an outrageous air about the spendthrifts in the executive branch of the Government, yet here in our own house, here in the Senate of the United States, they do not set the example they ask other branches of the Government to follow.

I now wish to read some figures which will be startling, to say the least, as a result of the charges which have been made from time to time:

Expenditures of Senate and House, by fiscal year

	Senate	House
1939	$3,704,611	$8,614,783
1943	4,233,370	9,360,752
1944	4,472,035	10,944,264
1945	4,671,811	11,650,981
1946	5,015,889	14,242,527
1947	8,066,169	15,731,847
Appropriation for 1948	10,518,640	17,787,315

Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, hardly a day has gone by that the subject of spending by the New Deal has not been trotted out here on the floor of the Senate. When January 6 came along, we were told the President's immense budget of $37,500,000,000 was going to be scaled down by compelling rigid economy in the operation of the Government. I reiterate, I yield to no man in advocating economy in the Federal Government. I condemn waste and extravagance, and I deplore the spending of one dollar more of the money of the taxpayers than is absolutely necessary in order to perform the Government's obligations to the people of the country.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will please be in order.

Mr. LUCAS. It takes the Presiding Officer to entertain the Senate of the United States. I wish he were making this speech. I am sure he could command order.

Although I hesitate to suggest it, it may be that one place to look for waste and extravagance is right here in the Halls of Congress. The taxpayer, you know, contributes his taxes not only to support the institution which the majority party is fond of calling the vast Federal bureaucracy, but also to the running of the Congress. The Bible tells us to "first cast out the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's." I would have supposed that before launching with great fanfare on a campaign to cast out the mote from the eye

of the executive branch of the Government we would have first cast out the beam of the eye of the legislative branch. Any other course, the Bible tells us, would be hypocritical.

The Congress controls all the expenditures of the Government. Not a penny can be spent by any of the three branches of the Government unless Congress approves the spending of the money. The Republican majority is in control. It has the votes to withhold or grant the money which is spent. One would have supposed, under those circumstances, that some effort would have been made to cut down the expenditures of the Congress. The only control over the amount of money spent by Congress on Congress is our own self-restraint. And yet this Congress is the most expensive lawmaking body in the whole history of the United States.

In the fiscal year 1939, which everyone will remember as the days of what some people call the free-spending New Deal, the Senate cost the country $3,704,611, and the House $8,614,783. Our appropriation for the Senate in the legislative appropriation bill we have just passed is almost three times that amount. It comes to the staggering total of $10,518,640. The House will cost the country, according to that bill, more than twice the 1939 amount of $17,787,315. These are figures which ought to give pause to some Members of Congress.

Why has the cost of Congress gone up so? For the same reason that the cost of the executive department has gone up, namely, higher wages, more employees, more publicity, and new projects. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a table showing the expenditures by fiscal years for the years 1939 to 1947 and the appropriation for 1948, for the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Expenses of investigations by fiscal years—Senate

Fiscal year:	
1939	$257,569.52
1940	138,474.75
1941	146,462.91
1942	211,777.66
1943	327,528.05
1944	349,876.68
1945	375,838.00
1946	530,997.72
1947 [1]	562,317.09

[1] As of July 15, 1947.

Expenditures from Jan. 1 to July 15, 1947, $391,332.24.

Authorized to be spent during the Eightieth Congress, $949,585.

Resolutions pending on Senate Calendar, Calendar Day, July 21, 1947, $285,000.

Mr. LUCAS. I submit that any executive agency which appeared before a committee of Congress this year and asked to spend more money than last year and three times as much as was spent in 1939 would have had very rough going before the economy-minded members of those committees. But apparently the economy principle is to apply everywhere in the Government except in the Senate and the House.

This Senate also means to do a lot of investigating. This was clear from almost the first day of the session, when there was considerable discussion about the continuation of the Special War Investigating Committee. In this first session, we have authorized investigation that will cost almost a million dollars. In the first session of the last Congress, up to July 15, 1945, we had authorized the expenditure of only $358,055. As of July 15 of this year, we have expended $562,317 for investigations. I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a table showing the authorizations for investigation in the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses and the expenses of investigations by fiscal years since 1939, in the United States Senate.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Authorizations for investigations in the Senate, 80th Cong., to July 21, 1947

Standing committees	[1] $260,000
Subcommittees of standing committees	260,000
Special investigating committees	200,000
Joint committees	229,585
Total	949,585

Authorizations for investigations in the Senate, 79th Cong., to July 15, 1945

Standing committees	$173,000
Subcommittees of standing committees	71,805
Special investigating committees	105,750
Joint committees	7,500
Total	358,055

[1] Includes $150,000 authorized by Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Aug. 2, 1946).

Mr. LUCAS. I invite the attention of the Members of the Senate to these tables, particularly because I think there is much food for thought in them. They help to explain why it is that this particular Congress is making such an extravagant record of expenditure, when at the same time, the majority party is trying so ruthlessly to weed out extravagances in the executive departments. We ought to practice economy as well as preach it. We ought to set the executive departments a good example. Economy, like charity, begins at home.

Mr. President, one more word with respect to these tables, and then I am through. I want to read this into the RECORD. The authorizations for investigations in the Eightieth Congress, to July 21, 1947, for standing committees, was $260,000. In fairness to the majority, $150,000 of that was authorized by the Legislative Reorganization Act of last year. The authorization for subcommittees of standing committees was $260,000; for special investigating committees, $200,000; for joint committees, $229,585; the total of $949,585, as compared to $358,055 as of July 15, 1945. Actual expenditures from January 1 to July 15, 1947, amounted to $391,332.34; authorized to be spent during the Eightieth Congress, $949,585; and resolutions pending on the Senate Calendar, on calendar day, July 21, 1947, $285,000. Since that time most of those pending resolutions have been approved.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I will be through in just a moment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would merely like to ask the Senator to yield for a question at this point.

Mr. LUCAS. I will yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask my distinguished colleague from Illinois whether he seriously believes that the expenditure of $10,000,000 by the Senate of the United States in carrying on the functions of Government is too high an expenditure, when compared with a total budget sent to the Congress by the President of the United States of $37,500,000,000, which has been increased greatly by supplemental appropriations, or requests for appropriations sent here by the executive branch of the Government.

I do not know how the Congress of the United States can be expected to do the type of job the people expect the Congress to perform unless Congress is fortified with sufficient funds to employ an efficient staff to go to the executive branch of the Government and obtain the information which the executive branch of the Government has been reluctant to give the Congress of the United States in carrying out its constitutional responsibility in the control of the purse strings of the country.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am grateful for the remarks made by my able friend from California. He repeats the argument made over and over again by the majority that no one in the executive branch of the Government has cooperated with the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate in a manner which would enable the Congress of the United States to make the cuts the people deserve and want. But I again remind the Senator that the members of his party on the other side of the aisle have the power, they have the votes. There is nothing they cannot do, because they have the votes, they have the power, and they have the responsibility. The member of the other party can cut the budget either on the basis of facts or arbitrarily through mere whim or caprice. That has been done. I have heard the debates from time to time upon the appropriation bills and have heard Senators refuse to provide the funds requested in connection with an appropriation bill for the reason that insufficient facts were available. On the other hand, cuts have been made when no facts to justify a reduction have been adduced. Arbitrary cuts of 15 percent or 20 percent or 25 percent have often been made on some particular item without any evidence to support such a conclusion. If the majority party desires to cut off $10,000,000,000 or any other amount, it can do so.

Let me remind my able friend from California who speaks of the large budget submitted by the President of the United States, that more money was appropriated 2 years ago for the operation of the Government in time of war, than now, and more money was appropriated for the operation of the Government in the fiscal year before that. Yet in wartime less money was spent for the operations of the United States Senate than is

asked for at the present time, in spite of the fact that the budget for other governmental operations were larger than they are now.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator speaks of the executive department sending budget estimates for appropriations to Congress. Only an hour or so ago the Senate passed a supplemental appropriation bill which carried several millions of dollars for which no budget estimate had been made. These millions of dollars were placed in the bill in spite of the fact that no budget estimates were made, and no request for the items came from the executive department. The items were placed in the bill simply because someone wanted that money spent in certain districts or States.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Alabama is stating unchallengeable facts. The only point I am making, and I am making it seriously, and I will continue to make it, is that so long as the majority party in the Congress attempts continually to lay the blame for spending and wasting money on the executive branch of the Government, controlled by Democrats, they should remember that "People who live in glass houses should not throw stones." I do so because on the last day of the first session of the Eightieth Congress, the Senate of the United States controlled by the Republicans, has spent more money to administer the affairs of the United States Senate than has been spent in any similar period of any other Senate in the history of the Nation, and three times as much as in the fiscal year 1945 when we, the Democrats, were in control of both the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

I repeat what I said before. If the majority party is going to continue to hold the executive branch of the Government responsible for what they term waste and extravagance, then they ought to begin here in the United States Senate to effect economies, and not shift the responsibility to some other branch. We ought to practice what we preach.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. In 1945, not only did we have more money to handle, but the Congress was in almost continuous session. We were in session practically every month of that year, and practically every year. Is that not true?

Mr. LUCAS. Precisely so.

Mr. HILL. Now Congress is getting ready to go home, to recess until the 1st of January.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, Mr. President. In all the time I have been a Member of the Congress of the United States I have never seen so many persons who were so anxious to be placed on some sort of a subcommittee, to investigate something, regardless of its merit.

I do not altogether agree with my distinguished friend from Kentucky. I do not charge that all committees go to Europe and Asia on junkets. But there have been plenty of junkets taken by Members of Congress during the war and since, and there are more to come. I do not think the taxpayers of America are particularly pleased with the fact that Members of the Congress go helter-skelter all over the world simply for the purpose of taking a trip and entertaining themselves and seeing the sights abroad at the taxpayers' expenses.

Of course, the resolution that is the pending business at the present time is an important one. The members of the proposed committee will be obliged to do considerable hard work and engage in much study in order to obtain material and pertinent facts.

The resolution proposed by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] asking for an investigation of the high cost of living is an important one. That subject will require a great deal of study. That is a serious national problem. But, Mr. President, if the truth were to be known, there will be plenty of trips made throughout the world with little or no information resulting therefrom, or any good coming therefrom insofar as helping the American taxpayer at this time. A considerable number of resolutions were approved by the Senate last night. I have been criticized for attempting even to ask for information respecting them. It is difficult to discover how many of them will result in useless and futile trips around the country. But I repeat that those Republicans who, for political reasons, are willing and ready to make these serious charges about bureaucratic spending, waste, and extravagance in the executive branch of the Government, controlled by Democrats, should put their Republican house in order in the United States Senate before they hurl these unjustifiable political innuendoes.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I could make just as good a political speech as the Senator from Illinois has made.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator can make a better one than I can.

Mr. TAFT. At this moment I am more interested in having the business of the Senate acted upon than I am to engage in a political discussion.

OFFICE OF RECORDER OF DEEDS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CAIN submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3045) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe the processes and procedures for recording instruments of writing in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 2, line 10, of the House engrossed bill, after the word "with", insert the following: "; and all deeds and other instruments of writing entitled by law to be recorded in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds which are recorded by means of such machines or equipment are hereby declared to be legally recorded"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment to the title: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title and agree to the same.

HARRY P. CAIN,
RALPH E. FLANDERS,
J. HOWARD MCGRATH
(By H. P. C.),
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
GREGORY MCMAHON,
T. G. ABERNETHY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

LICENSING OF UNDERTAKERS AND EMBALMERS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. COOPER submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2173) to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21 and agree to the same.

JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

A. L. MILLER,
JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
CHARLES B. DEANE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

REHABILITATION OF ALCOHOLICS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. COOPER submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2659) to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance, and provide for the medical and scientific treatment of persons found to be alcoholics by the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15,

16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 7, line 11, of the House bill, strike out "Commissioner" and insert in lieu thereof "Commissioners"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment strike out "Commissioner" and insert in lieu thereof "Commissioners"; and the Senate agree to the same.

C. D. BUCK,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

A. L. MILLER,
JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
CHARLES B. DEANE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

THIS ACTUALLY HAPPENED IN AMERICA—THE COTTON BELT CASE—UNEQUAL JUSTICE UNDER LAW

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the St. Louis-Southwestern Railway, known generally as the Cotton Belt, operates about 1,600 miles of line from St. Louis, south and west to Louisiana and Texas.

Nearly 12 years ago it petitioned for reorganization under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act. Today, it is ready to leave the court without being reorganized in the usual sense of that term. The Interstate Commerce Commission just the other day approved relatively minor modifications of its existing capital structure to enable it to do so.

Now the strange, almost incomprehensible thing is that this is going on at the very moment when the Supreme Court has refused a writ of certiorari to review the Commission's own previous reorganization plan. That plan is still the one and only legal plan of reorganization of the Cotton Belt under section 77. A mandate from the circuit court of appeals affirming the approval of that plan is likely to reach the District Court at about the same time the Commission's recent approval of the new plan—and the railroad's petition to be discharged from bankruptcy—reaches the same court.

These, however, are mere minor oddities—just passing fantasies of procedure—compared with the paradoxical facts.

To understand the full impact and public significance of these facts, and of the recent events in the reorganization of this important railroad, it is necessary to review very briefly the principal steps in the reorganization proceedings.

The Cotton Belt filed a petition for reorganization under section 77 in December of 1935. Incidentally, this was only about 6 months after the Interstate Commerce Commission had formally found that the Cotton Belt was "not in need of reorganization in the public interest at this time." This railroad thereby joined the ranks of many large systems which previously (in 1933–35) had been forced into bankruptcy, due to the unprecedented decline in rail traffic, caused by the catastrophic economic depression and a combination of other adverse factors. By that time about a third of the entire railroad mileage of the United States was operated by carriers in bankruptcy.

The reorganization plan eventually evolved by the Interstate Commerce Commission and certified to the Court was forged, as to all of its principal structure, during the continuance of that depression and principally upon the record of the comparatively meager earnings of this road—as of others—during the balance of the thirties. The main hearings before the Commission, conducted by one of its examiners, were held during 1937. In February of 1938, the Commission's examiner issued a proposed report and plan of reorganization. Thereafter, various parties filed exceptions thereto, additional evidence was adduced, and the matter was submitted to the full Commission on October 3, 1940.

On June 30, 1941, the Commission issued its order and plan—249 I. C. C. 5.

The capitalization of the St. Louis-Southwestern at the time it entered bankruptcy was approximately $106,000,000, and by the end of 1941 accumulated interest amounted to $15,000,000 more. On the basis of what the Commission (in 1940–41) estimated the future earnings of the Cotton Belt would be, it reduced the capitalization to $75,000,375.

In so doing the Commission deliberately and completely wiped out:

(1) All of the common stock of $17,186,100 par value; (2) all of the preferred stock of $19,893,600 par value; and (3) unsecured creditor's claims of over $8,000,000.

The Commission found that the holders of the preferred and common stock—

> are not to participate in the reorganization, and * * * that the equities of the holders of such interests have no value.

Chairman Eastman and Commissioner Miller dissented. Commissioners Lee and Patterson did not participate in the decision.

Petitions for the modification of this order and plan were promptly filed with the Commission by many parties. One or more of them pointed out that in the first 6 months of 1941 the Cotton Belt had earned in that period alone an amount equal to $8 per share of the wiped-out preferred stock. The Commission, in its final order of March 9, 1942, said: "We find no valid reason in the petitions for modification to change the approved total new capitalization"—of $75,000,375. Except for minor changes, the plan set forth in its order of June 30, 1941, was adhered to, including the complete forfeiture and extinguishment of the stocks and creditor's claims above described. (252 I. C. C. 325.) This was the plan certified to the district court for approval.

The fatal finality of that plan (and of similar plans affecting other railroads) is due principally to the fact that the courts have consistently refused to disturb them if there was originally evidence to support the Commission's conclusions. On the other hand, the Commission has taken the position that once it certifies a plan to the court, it is not required by section 77 to request, and it will not request, the court to return the plan for reconsideration, regardless of how grossly unfair and inequitable the plan has become by reason of the vast improvement in the carrier's financial affairs. This is most shockingly portrayed by the subsequent events in the Cotton Belt case.

The timetable ran like this:

February 9, 1944: The district court approved the Commission's forfeiture plan, over the protests of many parties in interest.

August 26, 1946: The circuit court of appeals affirmed the order of the district court approving the plan.

March 10, 1947: The Supreme Court of the United States refused to review the decision of the circuit court of appeals, and denied the petitions for writs of certiorari which sought such review.

June 23, 1947: The Supreme Court again refused to review the order of the Circuit Court of Appeals and denied the petitions for rehearing which again sought such review.

Thus, the Commission's forfeiture plan, based on a record submitted October 3, 1940, stands today approved by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Now, let us consider what has been happening in the meanwhile:

Please keep in mind the limit of $75,000,375 to which the Commission reduced the Cotton Belt's capitalization and which subsequently the courts approved. That is all that the Commission thought the property was worth in 1941, based upon its guess as to what the future earnings would be. It declared forfeited and wiped out all portions of the former capitalization upon which it guessed the Cotton Belt would not earn a return.

Then, after one arm of the Government, the Commission, later sustained by another arm—the courts—had decreed the complete forfeiture of existing investments and creditors' claims in this railroad, aggregating more than $45,000,000, another arm of the Government, the Internal Revenue Department, took out of the earnings of this railroad in cold cash a total of $70,613,427.

This sum is almost equal to the entire capitalization fixed by the Commission—93 plus percent.

This $70,000,000 was paid in Federal income and excess-profit taxes for the 5 years 1942–46. As we all know, such taxes were paid on income, after deductions were made for all fixed charges on the old capitalization of this carrier. These taxes were literally taken from what was earned on the wiped-out equity, after it was wiped out by the Commission.

This $70,000,000 collected in taxes is also equal to 876 percent of the amount of creditors' claims which the Commission proposed to wipe out and which the courts (including the Supreme Court) have said must be wiped out, even though there is enough cash on hand to pay them several times over. After full al-

lowance for these claims, this $70,000,000 tax figure is equal to 168 percent of the par value of the stocks wiped out, and reaches the exceptional total of 17.3 percent of the entire gross earnings for the 10-year period 1937–46. And please let me remind you that I have been referring to only part of the actual cash that was taken out of the property.

Next, and in addition to paying the Government over $70,000,000 this railroad also paid in principal and interest to its creditors the sum of $29,471,796 during the past 10 years. This figure by itself is equal to almost 40 percent of the entire capitalization authorized by the Commission. The railroad, and all the security that the creditors had at the beginning of the proceedings, are still there, and more too, as I shall note.

This service of debt was equal to another 368 percent of the claims which the Commission and the courts have said must be wiped out. It is equal to 58.3 percent of the par value of stocks wiped out, and is more than 7 cents per dollar of gross earnings during the entire 10-year period. The Cotton Belt took care of its creditors not ungenerously—paying out in cold cash an average of 3 percent a year on its old capitalization.

But this is not all. On top of those payments, in the 10-year period from 1937 to 1946, this railroad also put back into its property in capital improvements a total of $24,369,000. This is about 32 percent of the Commission's approved capitalization. Therefore, I say, if the property was worth $75,000,000 at the time the Commission said it was, it is certainly worth at least $100,000,000 now, on that basis alone.

And this figure of capital improvements is over 300 percent of the claims of creditors ordered to be wiped out; 44 percent of the par value of stocks wiped out, and represents another 6 cents out of very dollar of gross earnings taken in.

Now I want to give you the cumulative effect of these payments. The amount of cold cash that the Cotton Belt has paid out in the last 10 years is equal to 165 percent of what the Commission thought the entire property was worth before the railroad made most of these payments.

The amount of cash disbursed is equal to 1,549 percent—do not misunderstand me, 1,549 percent—of the amount of creditors' claims that the Commission, the district court, the circuit court of appeals, and the United States Supreme Court have all agreed must be wiped out, and ample additional cash is on hand to pay those claims several times over.

After allowing for these claims, these cash disbursements are equal to over 300 percent of the par value of the stock issues that these august bodies have all agreed must be wiped out—and it is equal to the impressive total of 31 cents out of every dollar the Cotton Belt has collected in the past 10 years.

Mr. President, I hope the Senators present will let that sink in. The Cotton Belt has been able to set aside for, to pay to the Government, to pay its creditors and to pay for capital improvements an average of 31 cents out of every dollar it had collected for 10 years.

Even this is not all. Mr. President, the railroad is still there. We have extracted $124,000,000 in cash from this property, but it is still there and functioning, newer and better than ever in road and equipment.

At the close of 1946—after earning and paying the impressive sums heretofore referred to—the company still had book assets of $161,000,000, and $22,000,000 of those assets was in cash.

This railroad property earned in 1946 alone a balance sheet equal to the entire amount of creditors' claims wiped out, equal—before income taxes—to 3.36 times fixed charges on the old capitalization, and equal after deducting such taxes and charges, to $23.45 per share on the wiped-out preferred stock and $21.36 on the wiped-out common stock—just in that one year.

And lastly—the latest news is that based on its report for the first 5 months of this year, 1947, this railroad property is now earning at the rate of three times what it earned last year.

So much for that side of this astounding paradox.

Fortunately, very fortunately, the number of parties involved in the Cotton Belt, as compared to other large rail systems, is relatively few. They were able to negotiate an agreement among themselves for the payment or satisfaction of their various obligations, and for the extension of maturities on the remaining debt. So, notwithstanding the relentless and successful progress through the courts of the Commission's forfeiture plan, gathering judicial sanctions with inevitable certainty and imminent finality, this railroad and its trustee, Berryman Henwood, filed a joint petition in the bankruptcy court, asking that such proceeding be dismissed. The stated ground for such dismissal was that this debtor railroad was now able to pay or satisfy all its matured obligations, and to meet its debts as they mature.

That was on April 30 of this year—less than 2 months after the Supreme Court of the United States had refused to review the order of the circuit court of appeals which approved the Commission's forfeiture plan.

On May 20 the district court—the same court which had originally approved the Commission's plan in 1944—entered an order in accordance with the joint petition. The court now found that the Cotton Belt was not in need of reorganization, that it had sufficient cash and other assets to carry out its program for dismissal of the bankruptcy proceedings and to meet its debts as they mature. The court ordered the railroad to apply to the Commission for approval of the extension or issuance of such securities as may be necessary to carry out the program.

On May 26 an application was made to the Commission for such approval. This came on for hearing June 23. On that very day, while counsel for this railroad were submitting conclusive evidence to the Commission of the complete solvency of the road and in support of the district court-approved program to emerge from bankruptcy, the Supreme Court a second time refused to review the old plan which wiped out $45,000,000 of stocks and claims in that railroad.

Finally, just a few weeks ago—July 2, to be exact—the Commission approved the extensions and issuance of securities to carry out the Cotton Belt's new program. Under that program the total capitalization of this railroad will be $92,881,950. It does not wipe out anybody. The millions of dollars of the old capitalization above this figure, together with all creditors' claims and accumulated interest, have been or presently will be paid or satisfied out of cash and assets available for such purpose. In addition, all of the preferred and common stock—$37,079,700 of it—remains undisturbed.

The Commission, in its report on this application, found that such extensions and issuance of securities were—

> compatible with the public interest, * * * are necessary and appropriate for and consistent with the proper performance by it—the railroad—of service to the public as a common carrier, and * * * are reasonably necessary and appropriate for such purposes (I. C. C. Fin. Doc. 15724).

It will take an order of the district court dismissing the bankruptcy proceedings and leaving the capitalization of the Cotton Belt intact to thwart the previous decisions of the Commission, the Circuit Court of Appeals, and the Supreme Court of the United States, which in effect decreed the needless extermination of $45,000,000 of investments in and claims against this railroad now proved and adjudicated to be sound.

Mr. President, if this story were not so tragic, if, indeed, it were not so shameful, it might border on the ludicrous. From any viewpoint it is incomprehensible. As incredible as these facts may appear, they may all be readily verified from such authorities as Moody's Investors' Service, the reports of the Commission, and testimony in the recent hearings on S. 249 and H. R. 3237. The facts are all there. I have merely assembled them in one place to give you an example of what can go on, is going on, and will continue to go on, under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, unless Congress enacts legislation to prevent it.

It is no answer to say that the Cotton Belt will undoubtedly be saved from the disastrous fate of section 77 proceedings because it now appears that it will emerge from bankruptcy. That will be done in spite of such proceedings. Other roads, large systems, like the Rock Island, the Missouri Pacific, and the New Haven are imminently threatened with a like fate, differing only in the relative proportion of sacrifice in their various securities but aggregating in each case a far greater loss of investments. These threatened losses involve vast sums. They aggregate over $700,000,000 par value of securities and claims completely wiped out under the Commissioner's forfeiture plans, and over one and one-fourth billion par value more impaired in quality. Several hundred thousand of our citizens will suffer these unjustifiable losses in their investments. Congress alone can stop it. Legislation carefully designed to enable the larger and more complex railroad systems to

effectuate an adjustment with their creditors in a manner not unlike the Cotton Belt is now pending before the Congress—S. 249 and H. R. 5980. That one of such measures was not enacted into law during the present session is unquestionably a most disheartening disappointment to countless thousands of investors.

To redeem—insofar as it can be redeemed—the traditional principles of a Nation pledged to uphold the system of private enterprise, individual initiative, and business economy, this legislation must be enacted at the earliest day possible in the next session.

INVESTIGATION OF IMMIGRATION SYSTEM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 137) to make an investigation of the immigration system.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], on page 2, line 2.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I realize that the problem of displaced persons is serious. I realize that it is a problem which must be met by the American Congress. But, Mr. President, in my judgment, the pending resolution, Senate Resolution 137, is one of the most important matters which we have considered at this session of the Congress.

It is necessary for the Congress to have the facts on which to act. Never in my experience have I seen a lobby better financed to fill the air waves and the newspapers and periodicals with propaganda to admit into the United States a flood of people from abroad. We must deal with this question with justice, but we must certainly know what we are doing.

In addition, we must see that other countries shoulder their part of the responsibility. No one will dispute the fact that the United States has done more for these people than has any other nation in the world.

Furthermore, the committee must investigate the system of classification to see who shall be admitted into this country, what classes of immigrants; as to whether they are farmers, laborers, white-collar workers, or whether they are persons who are needed here; or whether conditions may prevail in the future, as they have in the past, under which 95 percent of those who were admitted stopped in overcrowded cities, such as New York, Chicago, and other cities on the eastern seaboard.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator is speaking of the fact that the resolution would require a selection to be made of different classes?

Mr. EASTLAND. The point I am trying to make is that every country other than the United States uses a system of selection. Displaced persons are a very small part of the pending resolution. The resolution provides for a comprehensive investigation of our entire immigration establishment.

Mr. STEWART. Until I am better advised about it I shall support the resolution, if I understand it correctly. Last night I undertook at a late moment to interrogate the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] but unfortunately I did not get to it. As I understand the resolution, I intend to support it. I am glad to get the Senator's views. If the Senator has any information on the subject I should like to be advised whether this resolution goes into the investigation of the rumor or report that foreigners have been coming here unlawfully since the war.

Mr. EASTLAND. The investigation will go into that phase. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that I desire to speak on that subject a little later. I also say that the views of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee on the question of immigration are the same as my own.

Mr. President, last year there were admitted into the United States 108,721 immigrants. Of that number there were only 1,136 farmer-laborers, only 2,464 domestics, or other classes of people needed in the United States at this time, if we are to admit any of them. Moreover, every country on the globe except the United States has a system to investigate and weed out trouble makers, Communists, and radicals of all kinds; but I am ashamed to say, Mr. President, that our own State Department has destroyed any effective system of screening to keep out of the United States Communists and trouble makers. The State Department recently waived requirements of the immigration laws providing for birth certificates to establish the country of origin.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I did not understand what the Senator said.

Mr. EASTLAND. There has been a waiver by the State Department of screening requirements to weed out Communists and trouble makers.

Mr. STEWART. Does this resolution provide also for an investigation of the State Department?

Mr. EASTLAND. It provides for the investigation of all phases of the immigration laws.

In addition, Mr. President, the State Department waived the requirement of a police record to show no bad character on the part of an applicant. Further, they have waived the requirement of evidence that one will not become a public charge. I submit that no one will dispute that many dangerous persons have entered the United States because of the waiver of those requirements. We must have information, if we admit anyone, as to whether those admitted are exclusively displaced persons. I do not know the definition of a displaced person. There is a great hue and cry over the radio, a well-financed and great propaganda drive to admit displaced persons to this country, but I have seen no one who could define what was meant by that term. The committee must certainly decide, if anyone is admitted, whether he is an occupant of the displaced persons camps in Europe. We hear that persons in the displaced-persons group have a very low living standard, that they are at the very bottom of the ladder. What are the facts? There are 100,000 people in Europe who fought as allies of the United States in the war and who are hungrier today than are the occupants of the displaced persons camps. There are 100,000 friendly people there——

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. There are 214,000 Poles who fought valiantly against the Nazis and who are today included in the class labeled "displaced persons." They fought also.

Mr. EASTLAND. What the Senator says is true; and there is no reason why, as matter of law, we should give preference to the people who are inmates of camps. That is something which the committee must decide, if anyone is to be admitted—whether they will be limited to those inmates or limited to others who fought for the United States and who are infinitely worse off today than are the inmates of the displaced persons camps.

I want to say something else, Mr. President, regarding the inmates of those camps. I should like to read from the Meader report. Mr. George Meader, the chief counsel for the Senate Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, went to Europe and made an investigation of the conditions in the displaced-persons camps there. I read from the report which he made last year, which has been substantiated by investigations made by committees of the House of Representatives:

> Among the displaced persons there are a substantial number of undesirables. These persons do not desire to work, but expect to be cared for, and complain when things are not as well done as they think they should be. It is doubtful that any country would desire these people as immigrants.

There is a report made to the American Congress; and yet the cry goes up that we must admit them without even an investigation.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I merely rise to say that I know of no one who is making a contention that displaced persons should be admitted without restriction or without any understanding as to who they are. Some of us who have sponsored legislation which would admit some of these unfortunate people, a very few of them, into our country, have only asked that the Congress consider that legislation. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is trying his best to attach to this resolution an amendment which would give a special committee full authority to make every investigation that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi wants made. The only plea is that Congress act with some degree of expedition to consider this problem. I hope that in the remarks which the Senator is making in regard to the fact that Mr. Meader found that there were some undesirable people among the displaced

persons, he will not condemn all the 600,000 because of such a report.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from New Mexico certainly misunderstood me. I said that there is a propaganda drive in the United States to admit them without an investigation. I was saying, further, that the State Department has waived the requirements to screen those individuals to see who are desirable and who are not desirable. I do not think the Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program was set up to secure that information; and therefore the committee proposed to be created by the resolution should secure that information.

Mr. President, there is not even a requirement that a person be in good health; there is not even an examination to make sure that he is not diseased. The consul is forced to take the word of the applicant as to whether he is a Communist, as to whether he is in good health. This committee must certainly see that under any legislation a proper system of investigation and screening is set up for the protection of this country.

To be perfectly frank with the Senator from New Mexico, I do not think I shall vote to admit a great number of immigrants to this country. But I think we should deal with them with justice. I think we should assist them to locate in other countries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed at this point in the RECORD an article which appeared in the New York Times for Sunday, June 22, 1947. The article is entitled "British Columbia Seeks DP's." From the article we learn that the Canadian Government is inviting a great number of those persons to settle in Canada.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITISH COLUMBIA SEEKS DP'S—CANADIAN NORTHWEST HAS GREAT NEED FOR SETTLERS ON VAST UNINHABITED LAND

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

PRINCE RUPERT, B. C., June 21.—Northwestern Canada, with its vast expanses of uninhabited land, is actively urging that Europe's displaced people be allowed to migrate to this country. Fears expressed in some part of Canada over the admission of European refugees have had few echoes in British Columbia. Spokesmen for many different political faiths are asserting that the region's greatest need is more people.

The Associated Boards of Trade of Central British Columbia, meeting in the logging town of Terrace, recently asked the Dominion Government to "admit to Canada those people who were associated with our soldiers in the war." The resolution pointed out that fertile mountain valleys along the picturesque 700-mile Smithers Division of the Canadian National Railway are almost wholly without white population.

"Each immigrant will not only be a producer of new wealth but a consumer of all kinds of products made in our industries," said the Prince Rupert Daily News last week. "Immigration is vitally needed in British Columbia."

British Columbia, more than seven times the size of New York State, is inhabited by less than 900,000 people. Agricultural economists assert that many lonely uplands could produce grain, dairy herds and even orchard fruits. Although some labor leaders in Vancouver also support increased immigration, they qualify their stand by insisting that the newcomers go onto the land.

Many British Columbia newspapers have deplored the tendency to leave the farm. In recent years the Province's larger centers have gained in population at the expense of the hinterland. This urban drift has prevailed even among the Indians. Frank Anfield, Indian agent in the Skeena Valley, reports the dwindling tribal villages as Indians have moved to centers of the logging and canning industries.

Hopes for further development of the North Pacific region have been heightened by President Truman's announcement in Ottawa that the Canada-United States Joint Defense Board will continue to function. It was under the direction of this agency that the Alaskan Highway, the Haines Military Road, and other northern arteries were constructed. Canadian lumbermen say that thousands of immigrants could find employment in projects along the Alaskan Highway.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, let me say that I shall support the resolution.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question and an observation?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I wish to point out to the Senator that one of the difficulties we had with the immigration problem, when I served on the Immigration Committee, I recall, was in relation to the problem of how to deal with hardship cases. I hope the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] and the committee in their study will give particular attention to this problem, which must be considered in connection with the applications of persons who wish to be admitted. Instances will arise where one member of a large family may be allowed to come to the United States and become a citizen. A short time after the citizenship of that person has become established, it is often found that the so-called hardship rule is applied, and usually a great deal of emotion is stirred up by such a situation as the following: For instance, after such a young man has become a citizen of this country, it may be found that he is only one member of a very large family, comprising perhaps 8 or 10 persons, who still are in Europe. Or perhaps we are confronted with the case of a brother and sister who have come to this country, leaving 8 or 10 of their relatives in Europe. It is stated that it is cruel to separate families; and so the question arises, Why not permit the other 8 or 10 members of the family to come to this country, so that they may have a family reunion here? In that way we fill our country with foreigners. We already have approximately 140,000,000 persons in the United States, I am told. So far as I am concerned, I am opposed to any foreign immigration to this country at the present time. That is my position. I hope the committee which investigates this matter will make an especially careful study in regard to persons who, after being admitted to this country, may present hardship cases.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Senator realizes that these people are in desperate need, and that it is costing the United States $100,000,000 a year to feed them, and that the problem must be solved. However, we must require other countries to shoulder their part of the load.

Mr. STEWART. Yes. The problem can be solved in so many other ways that in my opinion it is absurd to claim that the solution now offered is the only possible one.

Mr. EASTLAND. I agree with the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I myself would prefer to vote for the bill introduced by the Senator from Michigan, but I think the only way we can obtain action is by first adopt adopting this resolution. For 3 hours we have listened to the remarks of various Senators, all of whom, so far as I can ascertain, are in favor of the adoption of the resolution.

So I suggest that we vote on the resolution now, in order that we may take up the next business, and may get this particular matter out of the way. I hope Senators who are seeking an opportunity to speak will permit us to do that, so that we can go on to the next measure, which is of great importance to the entire West. I refer to the bill relative to the copper-lead-zinc subsidy. If we do not promptly proceed to consider it, we shall never complete action on it by the time the various conference reports come in. I do not know what other measures we may be able to reach if Senators continue to speak on matters which are not controversial and should be passed promptly.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I appreciate the advice the senior Senator from Ohio has given, but I have a few remarks which I shall make on the pending resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

ACOUSTICAL PROPERTIES OF THE SENATE CHAMBER

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, before discussing the resolution, I wish to comment briefly on the several attempts which the Chair has made today to obtain order in this Chamber. It has been my conviction for some months past that the reason why we do not have better attention and better order in the Senate is because of the construction of the Chamber and because of its very bad acoustics. If Senators cannot hear, they will not pay attention. I was very hopeful indeed that during the recess an effort would be made to bring about a correction of the conditions existing in this Chamber. Frankly, I cannot see why a Government which is spending so much money as our Government is going to spend in the coming fiscal year, does not have sufficient to remodel the Chamber in which we transact the public business.

If it is impossible to have the mass of braces removed from the ceiling of this Chamber—although I cannot believe that it is—it seems to me that at least we should install some kind of a temporary acoustical mechanism, or a microphone of some kind, which would enable

us to hear the debate, and would enable Senators to be heard without having to speak so loud as to tear the ligaments of their throats.

So much for that.

INVESTIGATION OF IMMIGRATION SYSTEM

Mr. President, I wish now to comment on the pending resolution. On January 6, 1947, the President called our attention to the tragic plight of the displaced persons in his state of the Union message. However, we have gone along for 6 or 7 months and have done nothing about it. Today we hear much said about the necessity for America to exert a moral leadership in the world. We hear much said today about the necessity for America to assume her responsibility as the leading power among the family of nations. Mr. President, I say to the Senate that unless we assume that responsibility and unless we discharge it well, I see little hope not only for the world, but for this country.

No, Mr. President; we have not discharged our responsibility in this respect. I have listened to the Senator from West Virginia point out that there is not what he calls a legal obligation for us to do anything for these people who are rotting to death in the displaced-persons camps in Europe.

But I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that General Hilldring, an able general and a fine gentleman, who has made a thorough study of this situation, has pointed out to the House committee that there are only four things we could do with regard to the displaced persons. First, we could forcibly repatriate them to the countries from which they had fled. That course we honorably rejected in the United Nations, in conference on the subject, because a determined woman, the widow of the late President of the United States, stood up and fought that proposal to death. She told the Russians off, she got our delegation to back her up. We refused to send those people back to be liquidated. Does anyone now suggest that we should adopt that course?

The second course suggested was that we could turn these people loose on the already disintegrated economy of Germany. That would be an unthinkable thing to do. It would only complicate our own German problem.

The third alternative suggested was that we could maintain them in DP camps at a cost of $100,000,000 a year. That, too, Mr. President, is unthinkable.

The fourth course suggested was that we take a proper proportion of these people within our own borders. There has been an impression carefully cultivated that all these people are of one race and one religion. I was interested to see that General Hildring pointed out that so far as religious affiliations are concerned they are about 65 percent Catholic, 20 percent Jewish, 15 percent Protestant; 21 percent are children up to 18 years of age, 66 percent between 18 and 44.

As has been said time and time again, this is not a Jewish problem, this is not a Catholic problem, this is not a Protestant problem, but it is a human problem. We are supposed to stand for the dignity of man as opposed to the atheistic and communistic concept of man as a chattel of the state. I think it is high time we practice what we preach.

Is it proposed that we shall destroy our immigration laws, Mr. President? It is not. It is specifically provided in the Stratton bill upon which no action has been taken, that we shall follow every concept and every letter and every line of the immigration laws.

Is it proposed that we shall take in anyone who is antipathetic to our form of government, as suggested by the Senator from Mississippi? It is not.

Mr. President, I am not going to oppose the resolution, but I could not let the occasion pass without pointing out that I hope that the telegrams which I have received from my State which have suggested that this is merely another way of postponing the fulfillment of this country's obligation to God, to humanity, and to ourselves will not be justified by the course of events but that substantive and positive action will be taken.

Mr. President, I hope and trust that that which we could have done if we had done our duty in the last 6 months will not be so long delayed that when we finally get around to it there will be nobody left worth bringing over here.

Last year, Mr. President, I saw some of these camps. I saw the fine Balts and Finns and Poles from the northern countries who had fought valiantly and well and who were opposed to the regime which had taken over their countries. I saw Italians and Hungarians and Greeks and Czechs. I talked with them. They are still there. Many of them would eventually make fine citizens.

We have sat back and said, "Let somebody else take them; let them go somewhere else." The Statue of Liberty which stands in New York Harbor might well be turned around the other way.

Mr. President, I have little more to say except that I would impress upon the committee that if the Senate votes the resolution the committee should undertake its task objectively, without the preconceived notions I am fearful some members of the committee may possess on this subject, and that when Congress returns here next January we will get a report on the facts, and that then the Senate will have the courage, as I know it will have, to act on the report. It is time to do our duty to ourselves and to Christianity itself.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point several telegrams I have received on this subject.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLLINSVILLE, CONN., *July 24, 1947.*
Hon. BRIEN MCMAHON,
Senate Office Building:
Urge your strong opposition to Senate Resolution 137, and your influence to put through immediate legislation to permit entry of displaced persons.
WILLIAM and ELINER BISSELL.

COLLINSVILLE, CONN., *July 24, 1947.*
Hon. BRIEN MCMAHON,
Senate:
We urgently request you oppose Senate Resolution 137 in support any legislation this session to admit displaced persons.
GAYER and ELIZABETH DOMINICK.

DANBURY, CONN., *July 23, 1947.*
Senator BRIEN MCMAHON:
Protest bill Senate Resolution 137 as delaying action on admission of displaced persons, which I heartily support.
MRS. STANLEY RICHTER.

NEW LONDON, CONN., *July 22, 1947.*
Senator BRIEN MCMAHON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Greatly disturbed by Senate Resolution 137, which would postpone admission of displaced persons. Earnestly hope their admission can be approved before Congress adjourns.
KATHERINE BLUNT.

NEW LONDON, CONN. *July 22, 1947.*
Senator BRIEN MCMAHON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
I urge you to use your influence to secure action at this session of Congress for immediate admittance quota of displaced persons, also I trust you will oppose Senate Resolution 137 calling for investigation of the Immigration Service, which would prevent any action on displaced persons this year.
EDNA L. TYLER.

NORWICH, CONN., *July 22, 1947.*
Senator BRIEN MCMAHON,
Senate Office Building:
Strongly urge this session of Congress to admit DP. I am opposed to Senate Resolution 137, which impedes and delays. Imperative immediate action. Beg of you to make every effort humanly possible to provide for admission of DP this year before Congress adjourns. Thanking you,
Very sincerely yours,
MRS. NATHAN GILMAN.

STAMFORD, CONN., *July 23, 1947.*
Senator BRIEN MCMAHON,
Senate Office Building:
Please protest Senate Resolution 137, which will halt settlement of the DP problem.
KEY CAMMACK.

OLD LYME, CONN., *July 24, 1947.*
Senator BRIEN MCMAHON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Protest Senate Resolution 137 and urge action this session to admit displaced persons.
JULIA HENING.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the second amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the first amendment of the committee.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 2, page 2, line 5, after the word "shall" it is proposed to insert "make a"; on line 6, after the word "date" and the comma, to insert "but in no event later than March 1, 1948," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. The committee shall make a report of its findings to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but in no event later than March 1, 1948, together with such recommendations for changes in the immigration and naturalization laws as it may deem advisable.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, page 2, after line 11 to insert "during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress," and on line

16, after the word "exceed," to insert "$50,000", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress, to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, it was not my purpose to take part in the debate concerning the pending resolution. I had prepared a few brief remarks, but reflecting that the Senator from Ohio and the Senate would want to get through with the session's business, including the pending resolution, it was my purpose to ask consent that I might insert in the RECORD the few brief remarks I had prepared in the best of faith. But inasmuch as other Senators have been recognized, I wish to make my remarks, in connection with the pending resolution, regarding what I believe to be pertinent matters affecting the resolution, and it may be that I shall discuss some bitter truths.

Mr. President, at the end of the great war against the Axis Powers, we found all the peoples of the world gasping for peace, hoping for a chance to lick their wounds, to bury their dead, and rebuild their homes. The peoples of the world to whom we made many a generous promise during the war, holding out to them the prospects of a new democratic order based on the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter, fought on our side even while the Axis Powers invaded their countries and submitted their populations to a regime of brutal and cruel oppression. When the war was over those peoples, and particularly the peoples of the various oppressed and suppressed areas, reached out to partake of that promised new democratic order and of that prosperity which should have been its mainstay.

The great popular urge for liberty appeared in every spot in the world where men were denied the fundamental freedoms which we enjoy. But instead of freedom and prosperity, those peoples found themselves faced once more by a mighty opposition of great empires supported by modernized armies whose equipment, for the most part, came from these United States, built by American skill and paid for by the American taxpayer.

And so it is, that when we pick up our newspapers, in this, the third year of "peace and liberation," we see front-page headlines about suppression in Palestine, open warfare in Indonesia, disturbances in India, and only a few weeks ago it was Indochina—and who knows where it is going to be next week.

There is one fundamental fact outstanding in all this confusion which no one must overlook, and this is, that we cannot have imperialism and peace at the same time in this world. As long as some powers assume it to be their special privilege to exploit millions of human beings in foreign lands, as long as any nation in this world takes it upon itself to rule other nations, as long as we shall witness the sad phenomenon of an armed handful subduing great portions of the human race, we shall read each day of the increase of conflicts, of their spread and intensification.

There is a basic reason for this: While you can punish and exterminate people you cannot force them to become docile and obedient. This has been proved by the Hebrews in Palestine, by the Indonesians, by the Hindus, and by the Chinese in their lands.

How does it happen that Dutchmen, Englishmen, Frenchmen, are being hurt or killed in such remote parts of the earth? Would it be that the Hebrews in Palestine or the inhabitants of Indonesia have decided to wage an aggressive war against little England or tiny Holland? I do not know that the Indonesian air force sent out a few hundred bombers to mow down civilians and raze the cities of Holland. I do not know of the Hebrew underground having assembled a huge navy to blockade the British Isles. I do not know of the Hebrews having invaded Great Britain, establish there a police state, imposed curfew on the city of London, arrested at random innocent people and held them in concentration camps for years without charge, indictment, or trial.

But I do know of Dutch marines, some 14,000 miles away from Holland, engaged in a fierce and ruthless war against a people who are fully advanced in every art except warfare, and I do know from our Secretary of State that these Dutch forces are using lend-lease equipment which was given to them to fight the Axis during the war. I understand that the British again using lend-lease material and equipment are in Palestine, continuing to do to the Hebrew people much of the same which Hitler and his allies did to them, oppressing them in their own land and blocking its entrance to the last remnants of that ancient nation. I do know that His Majesty's Navy, once glorious and valiant, is now being used for acts that could be considered piracy on the high seas against unarmed mercy vessels carrying a cargo of human wrecks to the only spot in the world where they could be remade into free and happy human beings. It is, therefore, hard for me to conceive that a charge of aggression can be pinned on the victims of imperialism. To my mind, if there is a charge to be preferred, it can be laid only at the door of those empires which bent all their efforts in order to put the clock back, of all those who do not want to admit that we no longer live in the days of pirates or forms of organized robbery.

About a year ago the military headquarters of the British occupant in Palestine were blown up by the Hebrew underground. Someone had at that time the temerity to ask, "What were the British doing in the King David Hotel, anyway?" This I think is a very pertinent question that should be asked right now of the British in Palestine and in Egypt, of the Dutch in Indonesia, of the French in Indo-China, and the Russians in those lands where they have suddenly walked in and taken over. In the name of what do these "empire builders" go marching forth to the four corners of the world? Oh, yes; I know the answers. There are many of them. Sometimes it is in the name of the "white man's burden." Other times the reason is that of "advancing and spreading Christianity." And again it is for the sake of "preserving law and order."

Now why is it that the "white man's burden" has always proved to be so much heavier on those whose skins are red, brown, black, or yellow? That the burden which the white man allegedly is trying to take off the shoulders of the poor natives always proves to be a heavy rock that finally is crushing the native population, increasing ten-fold their misery and deepening their distress instead of bringing them relief?

Why is it that after so many decades of improving and developing the backward populations those populations have improved or advanced so little while their improvers have drawn untold amounts of wealth from those countries which they were allegedly improving and developing? Why is it that billions upon billions were flowing into the treasuries of the "developing" nations while not a single penny was being spent for the betterment of the lot of the common man in the countries that were being developed? Is it by fighting in 1840 the infamous opium war against the Chinese in order to compel them to legalize the opium trade in China and to grant to the British a monopoly on that trade, that the British were trying to "develop and improve the backward Chinese people?" Or is it by grabbing the rubber of Java or the tin of Malaya, or the oil of the Middle East that our western Christian-civilized countries are endeavoring to "develop and advance the backward peoples of those lands?"

Why is it that precisely in those countries where the greed of empires is being cloaked in the holy grab of preserving peace and order that precisely in those countries disturbances, violence, and unrest are more prevalent than anywhere else on this earth? Could it not be that the presence of those guardians of peace and law and order who are trying so hard to "keep apart" one section of the population from the other is the main root of all the evil? Might it not be that the British who so self-righteously have assigned to themselves the task of "keeping apart" Moslems and Hindus in India, Arab, and Hebrews in Palestine, are the main reason for unrest and disturbances?

It occurs to me that law and order would be much better served if those guardians of law and order would pack up and get back where they came from instead of continuing to pester the local population by inciting one segment against the other. I am pretty sure that law and order in Palestine would be much better served if the British who imposed upon that country so-called emergency regulations, who abolished the last vestiges of orderly government, who deny to the people of Palestine the most elementary human rights and civil liberties, would quit and leave the Hebrews

and the Arabs of Palestine to settle their own affairs in peace and mutual cooperation. Neither the Hebrews nor the Arabs of Palestine are savages or underdeveloped peoples in need of any tutelage.

I am confident that peace and order would be better served not only in Palestine alone, but the world over if the British would once and for all be compelled to withdraw from Palestine, and if that country would at long last be opened to its rightful owners, the Hebrew people, for them to rebuild the Holy Land as their free and independent State. I am sure of this, despite the fact that the British propaganda mills are trying to sell us the idea that if another single Hebrew were permitted to enter Palestine the whole Moslem world would erupt in a cold rage and wage war on Britain and the rest of the western world. Let me just cite one instance proving the utter futility of this argument of a holy war of Islam, so efficiently expounded by the British Foreign Office. There is a war being waged against a Moslem people of 77,000,000 in Indonesia by the Dutch. The people of Indonesia, Mohammedans in good standing, are fighting for independence and survival against Dutch and British imperialism of the Orient. Not a single word was uttered by the Arab league states who claim monopoly of the defense of Islam. They who so loudly talk about a holy war in the Middle East seem to have forgotten their brethren in Indonesia. They who so arrogantly defied the United Nations and tried to blackmail it by all sorts of devious and underhand procedure, remain utterly silent when Mohammedans are being slaughtered on the islands of Java and Sumatra. Could it be that the so much publicized Mohammedan solidarity is just another myth born somewhere and trumpeted from Cairo only because the Middle Eastern potentates are so richly paid in oil royalties that they would lend themselves to broadcast anything necessary?

Mr. President, I have allowed myself to take the time of my colleagues at this late hour because this is the last chance for the Senate of the United States to make its voice heard on these crucial matters. The coming few months will be fateful ones in determining the course of events that may lead to another cataclysm which would finally engulf the whole world, including the United States, in a holocaust even more terrible than the one from which the world has just emerged. We cannot pretend that we are not directly involved in the misdeeds of the numerous imperialisms rampant in the world. It is our money, our armaments, it is our equipment, that are being used for the subjugation of peoples who deserve freedom and independence in no less a degree than we deserve them ourselves. This country, which prided itself on being the arsenal of democracy, must not become the arsenal for and financier to all the corrupt imperialisms of the world. The United States must not become the bondsman ever ready to bail out any criminal imperialism caught red-handed in the act of aggression against a peaceful people in the far-away confines of the world.

We are no longer a nation in adolescence. We must once and for all realize that in the course of our history we have grown up and that we have long since reached the age of full responsibility. We must devise and follow up a positive foreign policy. We must stop begging of any imperialists. We must act and act on our own. We have assumed obligations, both moral and legal toward the people of the world. We signed, as far back as 1924, a treaty on Palestine with Great Britain, taking our full share of responsibility for the implementation of the mandate and for the reestablishment of Palestine as the homeland of the Hebrew people. We can no longer afford to evade our responsibilities. We must act. Senate Joint Resolution 149 is a step in this direction. It is a step towards redeeming our honor and fulfilling our commitments and obligations.

If we fail to act soon we shall be guilty of complicity in that hideous crime against humanity which is called imperalism. For if we fail to act soon to rescue the 4,500 pitiful human beings who are being cast like driftwood in the Mediterranean, if we permit the British to force them back into Europe, the graveyard of their loved ones, instead of helping them to get back home to Palestine, if we fail to ask the French not to lend any help to the British in perpetrating that crime, we shall be as guilty as any one of the empires. And if some day we shall have to pay a heavy price for our sins, we shall not be able to say that our conscience is clear.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 137.

The resolution was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to make an observation or two in connection with Senate bill 637, Calendar 144, a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, sponsored by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], which would increase payments to retired civil-service employees. The bill was reported from the committee on April 25, 1947. A similar House bill was reported from the committee and placed on the calendar on July 24, 1947.

Mr. President, I have received many communications, by letter, telegram, and through personal conference, urging adoption of the legislation. I hope that before Congress adjourns this evening we will pass the House bill, because, after all, the employees affected feel the pinch resulting from increased prices. I am absolutely convinced that they are more than entitled to the relief granted by the bill. Unfortunately, I am not a member of the Committee on Civil Service. I have spoken to the Senator from New Mexico and other members of the committee with the hope that the Senate bill might be taken up for consideration. Now that the House bill has been placed on the calendar, I hope it will be considered and passed.

A HOLLOW VICTORY—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON STAR

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Hollow Victory," published in today's Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A HOLLOW VICTORY

By stalling off a vote on the Kem resolution to investigate the Kansas City vote fraud, the Senate Democrats may well find that they have won a battle only to lose the larger political war. For the political implications of what has happened will loom large in next year's campaign.

The question at issue was whether the Department of Justice should be investigated for its handling or mishandling of the inquiry into fraudulent voting in last year's Democratic primary in Missouri's Fifth Congressional District. That was the election in which President Truman enlisted the aid of the Pendergast machine to drive former Representative Slaughter from public life.

As soon as the votes were tallied it became apparent that the election was "fixed," and that Mr. Slaughter was the victim of fraud in the Pendergast-controlled wards. Nevertheless, the Department of Justice was loath to move in. It was not until after a newspaper, the Kansas City Star, had turned up conclusive evidence of fraud that the Attorney General ordered the FBI to look into the case. Even then, by express direction of the Attorney General, the investigation was preliminary in character and severely restricted in scope.

This resulted in failure to find evidence of violations of Federal, as distinguished from State, law, and the Attorney General ordered the case to be closed. Later on, however, after the theft of supposedly incriminating ballots and after the Republican-controlled Senate had begun to probe into the matter, the Attorney General authorized the calling of a special Federal grand jury, and that body has already returned five indictments for alleged violations of Federal law which were not discovered in the preliminary investigation.

Naturally, this raises the question of why the FBI was not given the green light in the first instance. Why was it limited to an investigation of restricted scope when, as subsequent events have shown, evidence of Federal violations was present? The Senate, although possibly for partisan reasons, wants an answer to this question. So do a good many other people, however, who have no partisan interest in the matter, but who are concerned with the spectacle of fraudulent elections and the seeming reluctance of responsible Federal officials to dig into them.

Ordinarily, when a Federal agency has nothing to hide, it welcomes investigation of its conduct. If the Department of Justice has nothing to hide in this instance, why has the Attorney General remained silent while the Democrats in the Senate have fought to smother this proposed investigation?

Perhaps this question is unfair to the Attorney General and the Senate Democrats. Perhaps they have nothing to hide. But they can be sure that they will hear the question asked again and again when the Republicans take to the hustings next year. All in all, again assuming that there was nothing to hide, it looks as though the Democratic political strategy has been anything but smart.

THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement

prepared by me may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I was perhaps naive last February in believing that when we were devoting days and days to a discussion of whether the budget could or should be cut by $6,000,000,000 or $4,500,000,000, it was because the Senate and the Congress actually intended to follow the requirements of our own basic law, our Reorganization Act, and to carry out the provisions of that act for the establishment of a legislative budget.

There was enough heat generated on the other side of the aisle in that discussion over the extravagance and the profligacy and the waste and the inefficiency and the overlapping and the duplication represented by President Truman's $37,500,000,000 budget for the current fiscal year to have heated the Halls of Congress and the Senate office building and the two House office buildings and the Library of Congress and the Supreme Court and still have enough left over to pipe some of it into Republican national headquarters in case Mr. Carroll Reece and his staff, by some misadventure, stopped being hot under the collar and began to cool off a little bit. Oh, Mr. President, how we on this side of the aisle were condemned and castigated and attacked without mercy in the press and over the radio and here in this Chamber for our position at that time which was merely that before we start setting a fixed ceiling on the amount of money we intended to appropriate for this fiscal year, it might be a good idea to have a rough idea, at least, of what the requirements would be and to know a little bit about how $4,500,000,000 or $6,000,000,000 could be cut from that budget without disrupting our world-wide foreign policy, our commitments to friendly nations, our essential programs for maintaining America's role as a power determined—determined, I repeat—to see to it that freedom is restored insofar as possible throughout the world and is established in some areas of the world where it has never existed and that free peoples have the opportunity to determine their own destinies as peoples and as nations, and that the United Nations be given every opportunity and encouragement and assistance in bringing about, in this unhappy world of ours, some measure of real and enduring peace and security and freedom from aggression.

That was one aspect of the problem. Another was the necessity for maintaining our Army and Navy and Air Forces at a strength equal to the task of guaranteeing America's security with enough power to spare to lend strength and support to collective machinery for maintaining the peace.

Then, too, we wondered what would happen to our $7,000,000,000 program for veterans. It seemed pretty obvious that the Congress would be no more inclined to cut these obviously justified expenditures to keep faith with the veteran than it would to try to reduce the $5,000,000,000 payment of interest on the national debt. The latter cut would have been fiscally impossible, and the other item of cutting veterans' benefits would have been politically, if not impossible, then at least inexpedient.

So there we were last winter arguing back and forth about whether the budget could or should be cut $6,000,000,000 or $4,500,000,000 and the able and distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee told us not to worry, that even though he couldn't give us the break-down on how $6,000,000,000 would be cut from the budget, he had such a break-down, and he knew, and he would let us know at the appropriate time, and we could rest assured of the security of all of the essential functions of Government and let it up to the judgment of him and a gentleman from New York in the other body, who heads a similar committee.

I tried to find out in detail what the $6,000,000,000 cut or the $4,500,000,000 cut as proposed would mean to such programs, aside from the vital urgent aspects of foreign policy and national defense, as the school-lunch program, soil conservation, enforcement of the wage-hour act, the taking of various censuses, including a business census, so important to an intelligent appraisal of the economic condition of our Nation, flood control, rivers and harbors, mine safety, Bureau of Mines research work in minerals and in fuels, public works planning in preparation for future periods of unemployment, in terms of housing, public health, effective rent control, Federal aid to education, air safety, the Federal aid airport program, peacetime development of atomic energy, conservation of our forests and natural resources, expansion of social security and broadening of coverage, and a multitude of essential and important and traditional functions of Government which have become part of the fabric of our national life to such an extent that the Republican national platform of 1944 endorsed them all without exception and even went so far as to promise that were a Republican administration elected in 1944, not only would these programs be continued, but that actually the Republicans, under Mr. Dewey's banner, would make the Democrats and the New Deal administration of Franklin Roosevelt look like pikers in our efforts of recent years to raise the living standards of our people and put our economy on a firm foundation buttressed by that one most essential pillar of economic stability which is mass purchasing power and mass well-being at the bottom of our economic level, so that this towering superstructure of business and industry and finance can prosper.

Mr. President, I said I tried to find out in detail what would happen to these programs under a $6,000,000,000 or $4,500,000,000 cut in the budget. Of course I failed to find out. The gentleman from New Hampshire, the able chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, who claimed to have this information, had labeled it top secret in the same way that he and a few other Senators several years ago preserved the secret of the atomic bomb.

Well, Mr. President, the results are in now. The first session of the Eightieth Congress is grinding to an end. We have got the score card now. We know where we stand. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] on the basis of nearly complete returns, informed us last night that the actual reduction so far with all of the big appropriation bills just about out of the way, comes to just about $1,250,000,000 and this does not take into consideration the fact that millions and millions and millions more have been authorized for appropriation early next year on a deficiency basis.

So it would seem, Mr. President, that not only has the legislative budget disappeared from sight, buried somewhere in a Senate-House conference committee, which may or may not ever have had a meeting on it, but that the Republican leadership in the House, which was insisting on a $6,000,000,000 cut in the budget, and the Republican leadership in the Senate which was insisting on a $4,500,000,000 cut—although a goodly number of our Republican colleagues here were complaining that that was too small, and that the House figure was more realistic—were both doing exactly what we on this side of the aisle said they were doing, and that is playing blind-man's-buff blindfolded and in the dark and trying to come up with a magic figure which had nothing more in the way of evidence to support it than the wishes of a select few Republican Members of the House and Senate.

Do you remember, Mr. President, that when we urged delay on the legislative budget until the joint committee was able to provide us with a document which really had some facts in it, the Senator from New Hampshire, who personally favored a $6,000,000,000 cut in the budget, threw up his hands in horror and cried "No," no delay whatsoever, because the congressional Reorganization Act, the La Follette-Monroney Act, required that this resolution be submitted by February 15 and that what the Senators on this side of the aisle, what I and other members of my party were proposing, was—and he was very upset about this—we were proposing, he said, violation of the Congressional Reorganization Act. He was horrified at the very idea.

So we took action in the dark in early March on the legislative budget, and here it is, Mr. President, July 26, in the very last hours of the first session of the Eightieth Congress and we still have no legislative budget.

That is why, Mr. President, I ask what had happened to this resolution which the Republican leadership was in such frantic haste to pass more than 4 months ago.

Now it so happened that after that long and extended debate on the legislative budget the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] decided that the Democrats were stalling. He announced day and night sessions would be held if the Democrats did not stop stalling. Here is the headline "Taft hits Democrats for delay tactics." Now I have marked in red here one paragraph halfway down in this story by Jerry O'Leary of the Star when he wrote that story of the momentous decision of the Senator from Ohio to hold night sessions—day and night sessions—if the Democrats did not stop stalling. This is the paragraph:

"Pressed for details on his charge of Democratic delays, Senator TAFT mentioned only the recent budget ceiling resolution. He said there seemed to be an unnecessary amount of debate in that issue."

Mr. President, that was the only mention in the entire story to back up this headline. Now by a curious coincidence, I happen to have here the results of a tabulation I had made of the actual time and space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD taken by various Senators in discussing that legislative budget back in February and early March—that issue on which the Senator from Ohio said on March 8, 1947, there had been an unnecessary amount of debate. For the edification of the Members of the Senate, who can scan this table while enjoying their vacations, I ask unanimous consent to place this study in the RECORD at this point. I will mention only a few of the listings. It shows, for instance, that three Democratic Senators took up more than seven pages of the RECORD with their speeches and insertions on this issue. I was fourth among the Democratic Senators with six and three-quarters pages. That is a lot, I admit. No Democratic Senator took up more than seven and three-quarters pages, although I admit that's a lot, too.

However, all of the Democrats together, from February 19 to March 3, inclusive, took up sixty and a half or so pages, whereas, Mr. President, the Republican Senators consumed sixty-seven and a half pages or thereabouts. The interesting thing to me, Mr. President, as this table will show, is that of all the Senators in the United States Senate who spoke on the legislative budget between February 19 and March 3, the Senator from Ohio, who gave out this newspaper story

about Democratic delays and unnecessary debate on the legislative budget, by coincidence, rates at the very top of the list with nine and one quarter pages of oral and written material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

All that aside, the fact remains that the legislative budget, besides never being adopted was never paid the slightest bit of attention. Both the House figure of a six-billion-dollar cut and the Senate figure of a four-and-a-half-billion-dollar cut were patently impossible of achievement and all of the noise and the heat generated on the other side of the aisle in behalf of putting ourselves on record in favor of either a six- or a four-and-a-half-billion-dollar cut was, nothing more than hot air.

Now please understand, Mr. President, I am not criticizing the Republican leadership for not cutting the budget more than it did. Instead, Mr. President, I want to compliment the Senator from New Hampshire and the other Senators on the Senate Appropriations Committee for recognizing the utter ridiculousness of the cuts made in the other body in nearly all of the essential features of government, and in voting in committee to restore much of the funds cut for the Army and the Navy and the Air Corps and the State Department's various cultural relations programs and foreign relief programs, and for school lunches and soil conservation and flood control and all of these myriad activities whose budgets came to us in such maltreated and lascerated condition that, had the Senate not pumped some plasma in the shape of additional funds into these activities, the results might have been disastrous. Even so, the Senate conferees, running into complete bullheadedness on the other side of the Capitol, had to cave in and give in on such foolish amputations as the $20,000,000 cut from enforcement activities of the Internal Revenue Bureau at a probable loss to the Government of $400,000,000 in taxes. They also, in the last minute jam before adjournment, had to give in finally on the school-lunch program and Interior Department activities and the Voice of America and one after another of these things which we in the Senate recognize cannot safely be cut in the way the appropriations bills, as they are being enacted, proceed to cut them.

The results of all this false economy will make themselves evident in a very short time, and although we Democrats can certainly make political capital out of the utter asininity of these cuts, as Americans rather than as Democrats, we would much rather have seen the Republican Party, in its first opportunity since 1930 to direct the Congress of the United States, proceed to do a careful and a proper job, rather than bungle things up as the Republican leadership has done. The value of this bungling to the Democratic Party, being purely political, is more than offset by the horrible damage it does to America.

So what has this Congress done? It has raised the rents for the poor and has attempted to lower taxes in a veritable windfall for the very rich. It has told the President to get tough in his foreign relations and has denied him the funds to back up his words with the strength and the programs and the experts he needs. It has courted inflation and at the same time, has tried to let everyone in the big business and financial field get out from under any and all restraints on monopoly and on further inflation.

Mr. President, as we leave here with so many vital things undone, with nothing done about raising minimum wages or improving housing conditions, or taking action in this tragic situation involving displaced persons, and hundreds of other things which cry for action, I hope the Senators will enjoy their vacations.

But oh, Mr. President, there is so much on the conscience of this Senate.

Legislative budget survey—Feb. 19, 1947 (p. 1162), to Mar. 3, 1947 (p. 1594)

REPUBLICAN SENATORS

	Number of pages [1]
Aiken	1
Baldwin	1¼
Brewster	2
Bridges	7
Brooks	¾
Cain	1⅓
Capehart	⅙
Capper	⅔
Cooper	¾
Donnell	3
Dworshak	3¾
Ferguson	4¾
Gurney	1½
Hawkes	2¾
Hickenlooper	1½
Jenner	1⅓
Kem	½
Knowland	3⅓
Langer	¾
Lodge	3
Malone	½
Millikin	1
Morse	8⅛
Revercomb	1½
Saltonstall	2½
Taft	9¼
Thye	⅓
Tobey	⅙
Vandenberg	2
Wherry	4¾
White	1¾
Wiley	¾
Wilson	⅙
Young	1¾
Total	67¹³⁄₂₄

DEMOCRATIC SENATORS

Barkley	7½
Byrd	7½
Fulbright	1½
George	3½
Green	1
Holland	¼
Johnston	1½
Lucas	7¾
Magnuson	2¼
Maybank	1¾
McCarran	⅓
McGrath	⅓
McMahon	1½
Murray	1¼
Myers	6¾
O'Daniel	1
O'Mahoney	2⅔
Overton	1¼
Pepper	4⅙
Robertson	½
Stewart	2¾
Taylor	⅓
Hatch	1¾
Tydings	5½
Total	60¹¹⁄₂₄

[1] Including insertions.

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I had intended to make an extended statement respecting Senate bill 1156, a bill to authorize a Missouri Valley Authority. I have prepared a statement on the subject which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON S. 1156, A BILL TO AUTHORIZE A MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

The Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate has before it for consideration S. 1156, a bill to authorize a Missouri Valley Authority. In order that all those interested in this bill may be informed as to the constructive progress and accomplishments carried out to date on the river-basin developments contemplated in the bill, the following information will present a clear picture of the progressive steps taken by Congress regarding previous bills and existing legislation relating to this subject.

The Congress in 1944 authorized a unified and carefully integrated comprehensive plan of development of the land and water resources of the Missouri River Basin for the purposes of flood control, irrigation, hydroelectric power development, navigation, and other related water uses, to be correlated with the improvement of the watersheds in the basins for run-off and water retardation and soil-erosion prevention. This legislation approved by the Congress and by the President prescribed policies of the Congress and contained directives and procedures designed to accomplish unified basin-wide development, to recognize and preserve the interests and rights of the States in water utilization and control, and to protect the beneficial consumptive use of water west of the ninety-seventh meridian.

Although still in the midst of the greatest war in history, the Congress, recognizing the urgent necessity for an early start of the Missouri Valley development, promptly appropriated funds for preconstruction plans to be prepared by the Federal agencies charged with the responsibility of molding the valley development into a beneficial servant of the people of the region.

In 1945, a bill, S. 555, to establish a Missouri Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development, was introduced in Congress and exhaustive hearings were held on this bill by the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the United States Senate.

These hearings extended over a period of 20 days and filled 1,275 pages of testimony. The witnesses included representatives of practically every walk of life in the Missouri River Valley. The committees found that the great majority of sentiment in the Missouri Valley was opposed to the valley authority proposal. The legislatures of the States of Montana, Wyoming, Nebraska, Colorado, Iowa, and Kansas by official action recorded their opposition to the Missouri Valley Authority and the Missouri River States Committee, composed of the governors and two representatives from each of the 10 States in the basin unanimously adopted a resolution against the Authority. Some of the more important conclusions reached by the committees as a result of these hearings are as follows:

1. The plans authorized by unanimous action of both Houses of Congress provide a complete program of unified water-resources development in the Missouri Basin.

2. Existing laws and procedures provide for full coordination between the established Federal agencies charged with the responsibility of prosecuting the several phases of water-resource development.

3. The procedures already established by Congress for the development of water resources, protect States' rights, and prescribe full cooperation between local, State, and Federal interests.

4. Development of the authorized plan under existing Federal agencies will assure proper emphasis on the primary needs of flood control and irrigation.

5. S. 555 creates a Federal corporation with broad discretionary powers. The bill provides a means for the expansion of Government by Federal corporations. In essence, it is a proposal to create an instrument of Government with questionable and irresponsible powers affecting the social, cultural, and economic welfare of the people in a large section of the United States. It is a proposal to create a corporation to plan and to establish for the people of the Missouri River Basin a physical, social, cultural, and economic pattern over which they would have little or no control.

6. The creation of authorities, along the lines proposed in S. 555, involves the surrender to Federal corporations of legislative powers that should be exercised by the Congress. It is contrary to democratic traditions and would do violence to accepted notions of constitutional government.

7. Local autonomy is not assured by the enactment of measures such as S. 555. On the contrary, the people directly affected by the corporate form of government thus proposed would have no real control over its operations.

8. The creation of an MVA would amount to the welding of economic and political powers resulting in nothing short of autocracy. It would mean the substitution of arbitrary power for democratic processes. It would mean the creation of a super state—neither Federal nor State, and not contemplated by our Constitution. It would subject the social, cultural, and economic welfare of the Missouri Basin to the dictates and whims of a three-man board, not responsible to the people and largely irresponsible to the Congress itself. It would constitute a virtual abdication by the Congress in favor of government by Federal corporations wielding autocratic powers. It would challenge State sovereignty and destroy systems of laws, both State and Federal, under which western agriculture has grown and prospered. It would throttle in the West the reclamation program which has been prosecuted through the years by an experienced agency and which has met with the approval of the Congress and the people directly affected. It would permit a three-man board to avail itself of trust funds created for reclamation. It would be an excursion into an uncharted field of vast expenditures of public funds and of experimentation under a board unencumbered by the restraints that a democracy should erect against agencies of Government.

Following the cessation of hostilities, Congress in December 1945 appropriated additional funds to carry forward this development plan and at the present time, Congress is just concluding action to appropriate the third and largest increment of funds to proceed with construction of the unified development. Several units of the integrated plan are now rapidly taking shape on the ground, and increased progress may be expected during the coming year and subsequent years. No further legislation is needed at this time to bring into reality the benefits that are being created by this basin-wide undertaking.

When the Congress reconvenes next January, the Committee on Public Works will be glad to receive and consider any proposed additions to or revisions of the authorized Missouri Valley development plans that may be desirable at that time and if warranted by any changes in existing circumstances, hearings may be held on S. 1156 and any other proposed bills dealing with this subject.

STIMULATION OF PRODUCTION OF DOMESTIC MINES

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 1602, Calendar 746.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1602) to stimulate exploration, development, and production from domestic mines by private enterprise, and for other purposes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, House bill 1602 provides for a 2-year period, ending June 30, 1949, of assistance to marginal and high-cost mines producing copper, lead, zinc, and manganese in amount not exceeding $35,000,000 for each of those years. It provides for a 2-year continuation of the plan known as the premium price plan, which has given such successful results in stimulating production of vitally needed copper, lead, and zinc since 1942.

Under the bill the plan is operated by the Director of the Office of Premium Price Payments, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce. It is financed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It is motivated by the obvious desirability, as stated in the bill, of stimulating the exploration, development, mining, and production of strategic metals and minerals by private enterprise to supply the industrial, military, and naval needs of the United States by providing for the development and conservation of those materials in order to decrease and prevent, wherever possible, a dangerous and costly dependence by the United States upon foreign nations for supplies of such materials.

Just how are the premium payments made?

Under the premium price plan a work sheet is received showing an audit of the operation expenses of every mining company which makes application for premium payments. Officials of the plan study this accounting report and make a determination of how much is needed by each applicant company to sustain its operations. By this time a vast supply of information has been accumulated on every mining district—and I suppose almost every producing mine—in the United States. This information is also a working base of those who estimate whether premium prices should be granted. The premium is then paid out, in addition to the market price received for the metals; and the total of market price and premium paid may not exceed 16½ cents for zinc, 14.75 cents for lead, and 27 cents for copper.

For the information of the Senate, let me say that the market price as of July 24, 1947, at New York for copper was 21.5 cents a pound; for lead 15 cents; and for zinc 10½ cents. For manganese metal, 96 percent minimum, east of the Mississippi River, the price was 30 cents in carload lots and 32 cents a pound in ton lots.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a table showing the record of the premium price plan for 52 months since 1942.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Record of the premium-price plan for 52 months—February 1942 to May 1946, inclusive

[Short tons]

	Premium production	Nonpremium production	Total production	Percent premium production
COPPER				
February to December 1942	106,383	881,711	988,094	10.8
1943	240,532	841,286	1,080,818	22.9
1944	246,958	722,791	969,789	25.5
1945	212,381	761,851	974,232	27.4
January to May 1946	76,359	132,212	208,571	36.6
52 months	891,653	3,139,851	4,031,504	
ZINC				
February to December 1942	200,214	496,034	696,248	28.8
1943	402,487	338,181	740,668	54.3
1944	443,790	272,016	715,806	62.0
1945	404,053	210,305	614,358	65.8
January to May 1946	160,000	87,494	247,494	64.6
52 months	1,610,544	1,404,030	3,014,574	
LEAD				
February to December 1942	77,708	369,258	447,026	17.4
1943	148,136	295,864	444,000	33.4
1944	206,259	203,757	410,016	50.3
1945	242,876	147,955	390,831	62.1
January to May 1946	115,469	30,290	145,759	79.2
52 months	790,538	1,047,124	1,837,662	

Mr. MILLIKIN. From this table it will be observed that as to copper, under premium price production there were 891,653 short tons. Under nonpremium production there were 3,139,851 short tons.

As to zinc, in the same period there were 1,610,544 short tons of premium production, as contrasted with 1,404,030 tons of nonpremium production.

Senators are cognizant, of course, of the fact that these figures illustrate our dependence on premium payments for these short-supply materials. It should be perfectly obvious that if we were now to discontinue premium payments the mines which must have them would close and we would lose the amount of metal which is brought in to the market through this method of assistance.

As to lead, for the same period of 52 months, there were 790,538 short tons of premium production, and 1,047,124 short tons—under nonpremium production.

In 1946, premium payments of $75,000,000 were made to producers of lead, zinc, and copper in approximately 25 States. Let me remind Senators that under the terms of the bill the payments are limited to $35,000,000 for the 2-year period contemplated. Let me mention several of the States which have mines receiving premium payments: Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington,

Wisconsin, New Mexico and a half-dozen others. One thousand and eighty-two mines were kept open by the operation of the plan.

Manganese has been made subject to the bill. It is estimated that the necessary payments for manganese would not exceed $1,500,000 for the first year, and $3,000,000 the second year, or a total of $4,500,000. Based on manganese production figures issued by the United States Bureau of Mines, shipments of manganese ore, 35 percent or more manganese, from mines in the United States in the period from 1941 to 1946, in short tons, were as follows: 1941, 73,000 tons plus; 1942, 177,000 tons plus; 1943, 195,000 tons plus; 1944, 241,000 tons plus; 1945, 174,000 tons plus; and 1946, 141,400 tons.

Must we have metals from our marginal mines? Let me repeat the production history of premium and nonpremium mining during the months since the plan came into operation. I think we should fasten these figures firmly in mind, for they give us the key to the solution of our problem.

During the 52 months covered there were 891,653 tons of premium copper production, as contrasted with 3,139,851 tons of nonpremium production. I may mention that during some of those years the premium copper production went as high as 36.6 percent of the total amount produced. The figures I am giving are an average over the 52 months. The figures for zinc are 1,610,544 premium tons, as contrasted with nonpremium production of 1,404,000 tons; lead, 790,538 short tons of premium production as contrasted with 1,047,124 short tons of nonpremium production.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is my understanding that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to make these payments without an appropriation for the time being—that is, to advance the payments. Is that correct?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. From reading section 5 it is my further understanding that the Commerce Department, out of its current funds, can pay for the administration of the act.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I may say that the second supplemental appropriation act which has passed the Senate has in it an item to take care of the administrative expenses of this program.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In the Department of Commerce?

Mr. MILLIKIN. In the Department of Commerce.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not want to interrupt the Senator, but I wish to read at some time during the discussion a letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation concerning this matter.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have no objection to having it read now.

Mr. BARKLEY. It might be well to read it now, in order to have the Senator's comments on it. The letter is as follows:

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION,
Washington, D. C., July 22, 1947.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BARKLEY: Reference is made to H. R. 1602, which provides for the continuation of the premium-price plan for copper, lead, and zinc for an additional 2-year period beyond June 30, 1947, and which, as passed by the House of Representatives on July 22, 1947, adds manganese as an additional material on which premiums are to be paid.

We were not requested to submit a report to the House Public Lands Committee or to testify concerning the bill. However, inasmuch as it provides that the RFC shall disburse the premium payments, we consider it expedient to point out that, in the light of 5½ years of experience with the plan for copper, lead, and zinc, the amount of money authorized will be insufficient to accomplish the desired purposes.

The bill authorizes a maximum expenditure of $70,000,000, with not more than $35,000,000 to be expended during the year ending June 30, 1948. Other provisions make it quite plain that the premium-price plan as operated during fiscal 1947 is not to be curtailed as respects benefits to producers, but is to be expanded, particularly with regard to premiums for exploration projects. The present rate of disbursements on copper, lead, and zinc, based on available figures for March and April 1947, is in excess of $3,500,000 a month, and our estimate is that between $3,500,000 and $4,000,000 would be needed monthly for such metals during fiscal 1948 if the bill becomes law. This does not take into account premium payments on manganese, which has not heretofore been embodied in the plan and for which no procedure has been set up. Likewise, it makes no provision in the case of the four materials for a declining market. It should be borne in mind that if the prevailing high prices for the subsidized materials should decline, the amount of the subsidy paid will proportionately increase. During fiscal 1947, when price controls were eased and then gradually abandoned, we will have disbursed approximately $60,000,000 on copper, lead, and zinc premiums.

Under the terms of the bill we would feel obligated to discontinue disbursements when the $35,000,000 ceiling had been reached. However, we have reason to believe that producers will insist that the bill gives them a 2-year guaranty of operations and that they are entitled to payment for any eligible production derived during such period. Thus the question of a deficiency appropriation to pay off such accrued amounts would be presented. Further, a difficult administrative situation is created, which we believe might give rise to claims and possibly litigation against the Government for reimbursement of expenditures allegedly made in reliance on the statute.

If the present dollar limitation is to be retained, we feel that the Congress should indicate clearly that this is a limited program, to be tailored within the exact sums authorized. The Department of Commerce, which will certify the premiums to RFC for payment, would be able to project its quotas on a definite basis, and the producers could likewise raise no questions as to the exact amount of funds available.

We have not had an opportunity to give much thought to the question of the inclusion of manganese within this plan since the matter was first brought to our attention today. However, it is desired to point out that manganese is marketed in an entirely different manner than copper, lead, and zinc and that the existing procedures for copper, lead, and zinc could not apply to manganese.

We express no opinion as to the merits of the bill. Should further comments be desired, we shall be glad to supply same.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN D. GOODLOE,
Chairman.

From that letter, which is signed by John D. Goodloe, Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, there is no provision in the bill for any monthly allocation of the $35,000,000 a year, so that the amount would be spread out over the 12 months, and if the Department of Commerce should certify that the $35,000,000 might be exhausted before the end of the year, and, of course, unless Congress provided a deficiency appropriation, there would be no funds available toward the end of the year.

I should like the Senator's views upon the letter, in which Mr. Goodloe takes no position as to the merits of the bill, but calls attention to the possibility that the $35,000,000, under the contingencies suggested, might not be sufficient to pay the premium certified by the Department of Commerce, even on copper, lead, and zinc, to say nothing of the additional material involved in manganese.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the bill has nothing in its to justify the fears of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. As an administrative matter, it will be the duty of the Department of Commerce to tailor its premiums and plans according to the appropriations authorized, which are $35,000,000 for each of 2 years. There is no requirement that the Department of Commerce evenly apportion that amount month by month or that it make an uneven apportionment. It will be its job to draw up an operating plan that will operate within the amount of $35,000,000 a year for 2 years.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am trying to clarify the situation. Unless they set up an operating program in which they allocated for each of the 12 months the $35,000,000 available, how would they guard against the possibility of expending it in 10 months and have none for the last 2 months?

Mr. MILLIKIN. They have complete liberty of action in setting up standards on which the premium payments shall be paid. They can be expanded and contracted so that they can spend $200,000,000 a year or $1,000,000 a year. They have complete discretion to gauge their expenditures to fit the money authorization.

Mr. BARKLEY. The RFC is required to pay, under the plan as it has heretofore existed, whatever premiums the Department of Commerce certifies as being due?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation pays on the authorizations of the Department of Commerce. The Department of Commerce must look to the authority given by this bill and act accordingly. It seems clear as day that this bill limits its operation to

$35,000,000 a year for each of 2 years, and that they will have to tailor the program accordingly.

Mr. BARKLEY. The safest way to tailor the program would be to divide the $35,000,000 by 12 to see how much would probably be available each month.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Senator, I do not know that that would be practicable, because, offhand, I do not know how the load of business in this premium-payment plan runs, whether there is a level, equal monthly payment history or whether there are months of heavy and light loads. But the end point is that we are trusting this job to the Department of Commerce, and that department will have to regulate itself administratively to comply with the law.

There is one more observation that I should like to make as to the source of the funds——

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. The standards by which they are to administer the program are provided by the bill, are they not?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The authority of the Department of Commerce is in this bill. They have $35,000,000 to spend in each of 2 years. It is up to them to handle the matter in such a way as to keep within the authorization.

There has been some discussion as to where the money would come from for premium payments and for administrative expenses, and I should like to say something on that for the RECORD.

James L. Dougherty, general counsel, RFC; Morris Levinson, Director, Office of Metals Reserve, RFC; and Harold W. Sheehan, counsel, Office of Metals Reserve, RFC, are of the opinion that, due to an attitude recently expressed by Congressman WOLCOTT, section 5 of H. R. 1602, which states, "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated sums sufficient to carry out the provisions of this act," may later be construed that an appropriation of $35,000,000 by the Congress is necessary to provide funds for payment of metal premiums.

They state that RFC has, as a Government corporation, general funds on hand from which they will draw to pay premiums under H. R. 1602. H. R. 1602 will authorize expenditures from this RFC money, and these three men agree no separate appropriation is necessary to effectuate payments under H. R. 1602.

It was the intent at the time of drafting section 5 that it should authorize appropriations for the purely administrative functions of the Department of Commerce in administering this plan. As we know, the Bureau of the Budget authorized $300,000 for the Department of Commerce to use for the purpose. Earlier today the Senate approved an amendment to the second supplemental bill containing that $300,000; and the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] has just informed me that it has been approved in conference. So we shall be completely ready to go, without any further authorizations, when this bill is passed.

We were discussing the metal from marginal mines. Let me make a few brief observations on that subject:

All impartial estimates show that, at best, under present conditions we shall not be able to meet the demands for metals necessary to meet our present-day requirements. Estimates vary; but 1,200,000 tons of copper, 1,000,000 tons of zinc, and 1,000,000 tons of lead will certainly be needed this year; whereas, with all our present mines operating, both premium and nonpremium, we probably shall not be able to produce more than three-quarters of our estimated needs.

We shall be compelled to import more metal; but in doing so it should be remembered that there are world-wide shortages, that Europe has been devastated, and so have parts of the Near East; and it is also true that metals in ever-increasing quantities are needed in other countries for rehabilitation and new construction projects.

Mr. President, is the plan needed for national defense?

If these mines are allowed to shut down and become innundated and disintegrated, its crews and working personnel disbanded, its managerial know-how scattered, America will be less prepared to meet an emergency than she was in the last war, when many American boys lost their lives largely because of metal shortages needed to equip them with proper armament.

Mr. President, I have been quoting from a very fine statement on the subject by Robert Palmer, who is connected with our Colorado Mining Association. I continue to quote:

It involves not only an economic loss to our entire economy to shut down our mines, but it is particularly dangerous at this time in view of world-wide conditions. We should not forget that 54 out of 60 ships bringing ore and metal to our shores during the last war were sunk. Can we afford to rely on subsidized foreign production for our safety and security? Is it not possible for these supplies to be shut off almost overnight by foreign governments, especially of the dictator variety? Abandoned American mines cannot be reopened overnight in the event of an emergency.

Mr. President, the need for stock piling these metals is well known. I have made inquiries of the chairman of the Strategic Metals Committee, Army and Navy Munitions Board, who authorizes me to say:

The tightness of copper, lead, and zinc has precluded any stock piling purchases of these metals under the act.

Mr. President, I could go into detail on this matter, but I think everyone will appreciate that there are some confidential aspects to it, and that general disclosure of the exact facts should not be made.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. On that point, did the Senator observe the statement released today by Secretary of War Royall, to the effect that stock piling has been neglected to such an extent that today our metal reserves are at the all-time lowest point? He stressed emphatically the need of doing something to create reserves particularly of copper, lead, and zinc—metals which we would need in the case of another international disturbance.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I now remember the story, and I thank the Senator for reminding me of it.

I wish to say also that our strategic domestic peacetime needs—I cite copper as an example—in industry have been so dire that to help out stock-pile ores have been released to private industry. That was well developed in connection with the debate we had here on the duty free importation of copper.

Let me conclude with this: Although I do not know what the exact total amount of the appropriations will be, nevertheless, we are appropriating somewhere in the neighborhood of $10,000,000,000 or $11,000,000,000 to preserve the strength of our military establishment. It would seem to me to be the very height of folly to spend that much money for military preparedness, and at the same time neglect this fundamental opportunity to help get in hand at relatively modest cost the strategic metals without which all those larger plans are useless.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS AND INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE AGENCIES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. FERGUSON submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3756) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 17, 19, 24, and 26.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 11, 12, 16, 23, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31, and 33, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$18,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "one hundred and sixty-one"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided*, That of said unexpended balance, not less than

$12,000,000 is to be available for the construction of the Watauga and South Holston Dams"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 13 of said amendment strike out the figure "$4,714,397" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Tennessee Valley Authority: Not later than June 30, 1948, and not later than June 30 of each calendar year thereafter, until a total of $348,239,240 has been paid as herein provided, the board of directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority shall pay from net income derived the immediately preceding fiscal year from power operations (such net income to be determined by deducting power operating expenses, allocated common expense, and interest on funded debt from total power operating revenues) not less than $2,500,000 of its outstanding bonded indebtedness to the Treasury of the United States exclusive of interest, and such a portion of the remainder of such net income into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts as will, in the ten-year period ending June 30, 1958, and in each succeeding ten-year period until the aforesaid total of $348,239,240 shall have been paid, equal not less than a total of $87,059,810, including payment of bonded indebtedness exclusive of interest on such bonded indebtedness. Total payments of not less than $10,500,000 shall be made not later than June 30, 1948.

"Amount equal to the total of all appropriations herein and hereafter made to the Tennessee Valley Authority for power facilities shall be paid by the board of directors thereof, in addition to the total of $348,239,240 specified in the foregoing paragraph, to the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, such payments to be amortized over a period of not to exceed forty years after the year in which such facilities go into operation."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided*, That $175,000 shall be available only for the audit and revision of past accounting records"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 4 of said amendment strike out the figure "$290,600" and insert in lieu thereof "$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 307. Section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act (Public Law 248, 79th Congress) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 104. The Budget programs transmitted by the President to the Congress shall be considered and legislation shall be enacted making necessary appropriations, as may be authorized by law, making available for expenditure for operating and administrative expenses such corporate funds or other financial resources or limiting the use thereof as the Congress may determine and providing for repayment of capital funds and the payment of dividends. The provisions of this section shall not be construed as preventing Government corporations from carrying out and financing their activities as authorized by existing law, nor as affecting the provisions of section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended. The provisions of this section shall not be construed as affecting the existing authority of any Government corporation to make contracts or other commitments without reference to fiscal year limitations.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figure stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "308"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment No. 29

HOMER FERGUSON,
CLYDE W. REED,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

WALTER C. PLOESER,
BEN F. JENSEN,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
F. R. COUDERT,
GEORGE MAHON,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
ALBERT GORE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the report?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to explain it. I shall discuss the action of the House on the Senate amendments, particularly No. 32, being section 307, and No. 33, being section 308.

Mr. President, when the previous conference report was before the Senate yesterday, it was sent back to conference by an almost unanimous vote.

At the conference today, the conferees on the part of the Senate were able to obtain agreement to striking out section 308. That is the section which read as follows:

Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act (Public Law 248, 79th Congress) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

This was the language that was objectionable:

"This title shall apply to the same extent as to wholly owned Government corporations and for the same purposes to the following mixed ownership Government corporations: (1) The Central Bank for Cooperatives and the regional banks for cooperatives, (2) Federal home loan banks, and (3) Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, so long as these corporations have funds of or loans from the Government of the United States."

Mr. President, when Public Law No. 248 of the Seventy-ninth Congress was passed, it contained two sections, one relating to wholly owned Government corporations, and one relating to mixed ownership Government corporations. So, by striking out that section, section 307, which was left in the bill with one slight alteration would not apply to partly owned corporations, but would apply only to wholly owned corporations.

Mr. President, section 104 of Public Law 248 was, in a way, ambiguous. I shall read the language and then try to explain to the Senate exactly what we try to do by the conference report.

I read section 104, which was amended:

The budget programs transmitted by the President to the Congress shall be considered, and if necessary, shall be considered—

The clause "and if necessary" is what was complained of in the House of Representatives. They complained that every time they bring this matter up it becomes necessary to get a suspension of the rule on account of this language. It continues:

Legislation shall be enacted making available such funds or other financial resources as the Congress may determine.

What section 307 of the law really does is to allow, under the control of Congress, the right on the part of Congress to determine whether or not the capital or money advanced by the Government to any wholly owned corporation should be returned, and whether or not the dividends or any other money should be paid into the Government of the United States.

We have amended that section and deleted the words "for the fiscal year 1949 and each year thereafter," because when we eliminated section 308 there was no need for that language.

I should say to the Senate that the original language contained in the House bill, which we changed, read:

The budget programs transmitted by the President to Congress shall be considered—

It will be noted that we left out the words "if necessary" so that it now reads:

The budget programs transmitted by the President to the Congress shall be considered and legislation shall be enacted making necessary appropriations, as may be authorized by law, making available for use—

We have stricken out the word "use" and inserted this language, "making

available for expenditure for operating and administrative expenses such corporate funds or other financial resources or limiting the use thereof as the Congress may determine and providing for repayment of capital funds and the payment of dividends."

The reason for putting in the words "for operating and administrative expenses" was that, in auditing, one auditor may call an item "administrative expenses," and another auditing firm may refer to it as "operating expenses." The conference had in mind that all we want to cover is administrative expenses, but we did not want some departments of the Government or some of the agencies listing everything as operating expenses and nothing as administrative expenses, so that we would find the law to be meaningless. I state for the record that the intention of the conference was to apply this to the ordinary administrative expenses, as we did not want to find agencies listing expenses as operating expenses instead of administrative expenses.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator say that it is not intended that the word "operating" should cover the money which is used for lending purposes?

Mr. FERGUSON. I say for the RECORD that it was not the intention to include as "operating expenses," as the language is used in this section, anything other than plain ordinary administrative expenses. I say specifically that it does not include the money that may be loaned, money that may be lost on a loan, or similar expenses, or insurance funds. It does not cover anything in relation to an actual insurance fund in payment for a loss.

Mr. AIKEN. The directors of the farm-credit banks will determine the amount necessary for loans, just as they always have, will they not?

Mr. FERGUSON. Farm credit comes under section 308, and it is stricken out, so that it is not now covered.

Mr. AIKEN. Section 307 does cover the wholly owned Farm Credit Corporation, does it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; it covers the wholly owned Farm Credit Corporation in section 104 of the law, and is in the first title of Public Act No. 248, Seventy-ninth Congress, and applies only to wholly owned corporations.

Mr. AIKEN. Those are the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank and the Federal Farm Credit Corporation, which is virtually in process of liquidation since July 1. Production credit corporations are not included?

Mr. FERGUSON. By reference to title 1, Public Law 248, of the Seventy-ninth Congress, it will be seen many corporations are included. Production Credit Corporation is a wholly owned corporation, and would be covered by this language.

Mr. AIKEN. And would the original Agricultural Credit Corporation be covered?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; the original Agricultural Credit Corporation is included. It is now covered.

Mr. AIKEN. Section 307 also applies to the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. FERGUSON. It applies to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. AIKEN. It is not intended, is it, that the directors of these banks shall have to come to the Bureau of the Budget or the Congress each year to get permission in advance to do a certain amount of business?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator means businesses using a certain amount of capital?

Mr. AIKEN. In the making of loans.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is correct, as I understand the section.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the administrative costs are already covered.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is also correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Then, the sole purpose is to make sure that the law relating to administrative costs is not evaded by calling them "operating costs"?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is one thing. But I must explain to the Senator that another feature is that it allows Congress to retain the right to say to any of these agencies that they shall return a certain amount of money which has already been advanced by the Federal Government, or dividends thereon. I was of the opinion that that was true as a matter of law today, for that which Congress has granted Congress can revoke. But there was a desire that the matter be cleared up because in the old law, section 104, the words "if necessary" were used, and so we inserted in language a provision retaining that right.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sorry the House Committee on Appropriations permitted these two amendments to go into the bill without giving any of the agricultural credit agencies or any farm organizations an opportunity to be heard. It is rather difficult for me to see at the moment exactly what the effect of removing section 308 will be. I dare say it makes it better from an agricultural viewpoint.

I also agree that extending the time for the law to take effect for 1 year——

Mr. FERGUSON. That is not in the bill now.

Mr. AIKEN. Will it take effect immediately?

Mr. FERGUSON. It will take effect immediately, because section 308 is out.

Mr. AIKEN. I am afraid that the objection of the farm people has not been met. Since the conference report was submitted to the Senate yesterday I have received objections to it from the Council of Farm Cooperatives, who said it would disastrously affect them; the California Citrus Growers Association; a representative of the National Grange; the National Federation of Milk Producers; a representative of the Farm Bureau, and I have also had contacts with the Farm Credit Administration, and they say it will make it very difficult if not impossible for them to continue to do business.

Mr. FERGUSON. Are the corporations to which the Senator referred partly owned Government corporations?

Mr. AIKEN. Would the bill as amended apply to the Central Bank for Cooperatives, which is a partly owned Government corporation?

Mr. FERGUSON. It would not, because it would remain under title II of Public Law 248, where it is now.

Mr. AIKEN. However, the other banks, such as the Production Credit Corporation and the others, do depend on the intermediate credit banks to get their money. I am sure the Senate does not intend to do any harm to these agencies, which have been so conservative and have done so much good in the field of agricultural credit. That is the reason I am asking the questions. But as I understand, it is not intended by this conference report that these Government agencies shall have to go to the Bureau of the Budget to find out how much money they can lend during the year.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is correct on that.

Mr. AIKEN. The word "operating" was the word that was objected to most particularly by those who would have been affected if it were interpreted to mean the loaning of funds as well as administrative expenditures.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is the reason I make this explanation on the floor. I have a memorandum showing what the conferees decided and what was stated on the floor of the House. I think there was only one dissent by a Member of the House. I submit the memorandum, and ask to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Section 308 of this bill which includes the following mixed ownership Government corporations:

(1) The Central Bank for Cooperatives and the regional banks for cooperatives, (2) Federal home loan banks, and (3) Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has been eliminated.

It is the opinion of the conferees that it is for the best interests of our country that the mixed ownership of such corporations be terminated at the earliest opportunity that is practicable by their buying out the Government's interest.

It is our belief that this will in no way affect the proper operation of such institutions.

Legislation to accomplish this purpose is now before the Eightieth Congress in the case of FDIC. Eleven of the twelve Federal Land Banks have already achieved this.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. What change, if any, is made in title I of the original act, with reference to the wholly owned Government corporations?

Mr. FERGUSON. The change is in section 104.

Mr. BYRD. I have a copy of the act.

Mr. FERGUSON. I will read it the way it is amended:

The budget programs transmitted by the President to the Congress * * * shall be considered—

The words "if necessary" are stricken out. It then continues just the same.

And legislation shall be enacted making available such funds or other financial resources as the Congress may determine.

It now reads:

shall be considered and legislation shall be enacted making necessary appropriations—

This is added:

as may be authorized by law.

These are new words:

making available for expenditure for operating and administrative expenses such corporate funds or other financial resources or limiting the use thereof as the Congress may determine, and providing for repayment of capital funds and the payment of dividends.

Mr. BYRD. Does that remove any of the corporations in title I from Budget control?

Mr. FERGUSON. It does not remove any in title I from Budget control.

Mr. BYRD. In other words, all the corporations listed in title I are still subject to Budget control and to audit control?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. With respect to the section 308, which is eliminated by the conference report, that leaves the partly owned corporations where they are now, does it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct; exactly where they were left by Public Law 248.

Mr. BYRD. So as a matter of actual operation, the changes made in the conference report do not alter substantially the original act?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct, except clarifying it, as I have indicated.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator referred to the operating and administrative expense?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct, and the right of repayment or recapture.

Mr. BYRD. Can the Senator assure me that title I was not disturbed with respect to the Budget control of those corporations?

Mr. FERGUSON. I give the Senator that assurance, because in the discussions in the conference that was the understanding of the conferees.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not have the exact words before me, but the Senator will recall that when we had this bill up on a previous occasion the Senate agreed to the House provisions relative to housing authorities being permitted to pay to municipalities in lieu of taxes any amount "in excess," or, at least, any sum larger than was agreed to in the original contract between the housing authority and the municipality. Does the able Senator from Michigan have the language of limitation before him, so he can read it?

Mr. FERGUSON. I will read the language of the limitation:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay any public housing agency any contribution covered by payments in lieu of taxes in excess of the amount specified in the original contract between such agency and the Federal Public Housing Authority.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to have a statement from the Senator which might aid in clarification of the meaning of that act. It is my recollection that the able Senator from Michigan previously stated that that limitation did not apply to an original contract between the housing agency and a municipality, where no sum was agreed upon to be paid the municipality by the housing authority in lieu of taxes. I understood that the able Senator said that if no sum was agreed upon in the original contract, a subsequent agreement upon the subject would be permissible between the Authority and the municipality. I make that inquiry, Mr. President, because in my State about 20 or 21 of these authorities did not specify in their original contracts any sum to be paid to the municipality in lieu of taxes. I think there are 150 authorities having such contracts, so I want the able Senator to tell us whether under that act, if there were no sum agreed to in the original agreement, it would not be permissible for the housing authority and the municipality to agree upon and fix the sum to be paid in lieu of taxes which would ordinarily be paid by the municipality.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I hope that the explanation I make will not be too long, but I think it ought to be clear to the Senate that when the municipalities desired to build public housing, they were required by a Federal enactment to obtain legislation in each State to the effect there would be no taxation by local subdivisions, cities, counties, or States upon Government property used for the housing program; but that they would agree to make a contribution of 20 percent of the amount that the Federal Government was putting up, on its part, toward the payment of debt and interest.

Since my previous statement on the floor, I obtained one of the contracts which it was suggested might contain no provision for taxes. It was one from Louisville, Ky. An examination of it showed that the contract repeatedly provided that no taxes or amount in lieu of taxes would be assessed; therefore this section would apply in that instance. What I had in mind, and what I understood from the able Senator from Kentucky was that there was no contract at all covering the question of taxes or contributions. An examination of the contracts brought me to the conclusion—and I am satisfied that it is accurate—that all the contracts provide for an amount because it is stated that no sum shall be given, and therefore this section should apply. What the section really means is that when FPHA discovered that some cities had agreed to assess no taxes, and so specified in the contract, payments should be made by regulation of the FPHA, payments not called for by the contract. Some have provided for the payment of a dollar. Some have specified that the taxation would be the same amount as on the slum districts. Others have provided for 2 percent. Others have provided for 3, 4, and 5 percent. I do not believe there were any provisions above 5 percent. But FPHA went to these cities and said to them "You should change your contract. You should change it so that it will read 10 percent of the shelter rent." Then the Federal Government would be compelled to make up the amount between $1 and 10 percent, or where there was a stipulation that there would be no amount, the Federal Government would have to make up in a subsidy from no amount to 10 percent. Where it was 2 percent it would be raised to 10 percent.

Mr. President, I say that this provision applies to all contracts, because all contracts contain a provision in relation to payments in place of or instead of taxation.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. In that case the Senator fails to recognize the reason which caused the National Housing Agency to try to bring these contracts into uniformity. I have procured from the committee, at the suggestion of the Senator from Michigan, a statement listing the various categories of original agreements between the housing authorities and the municipalities. Here is a long list which covers more than a page of cases in which there was an agreement that nothing at all should be paid. Here is another category in which a certain percentage was to be paid. Here are other categories in which different amounts were to be paid. The Housing Authority was simply trying to establish something like uniformity in all these agreements. So they suggested that a common pattern generally be followed. That was the reason why the Housing Authority took part in what might be called the renegotiation of these original agreements. Today those agreements, as worked out by the Housing Authority and the municipalities, are in force all over the country. Now the provision in the bill is going to disrupt those contracts, those agreements which were made pursuant to the law of 1937, with legislative permission and authority. I see no reason why the Congress should invade this field where the Housing Authority and the municipalities have by mutual agreement worked out this arrangement, which shows what can be done.

I was hoping that the language would be literally construed as being what it says, namely, that at least if there were no specific agreement as to amount, the contract could be renegotiated and an amount provided which would be mutually satisfactory.

I want to say to the Senator that in my humble opinion, and from the advice I have received from the 21 housing authorities in my State—I understand there are 150 in the country—the provision as incorporated in the report, as the Senator now interprets it contrary to his previous interpretation, is going to render a great disservice to the poorer people of the country.

Mr. FERGUSON. In relation to what I said previously, I will say that I had not seen the contracts. I think the RECORD is clear on that. After an examination of the contracts I find, and I believe it to be the fact as to each of them, there is a provision in relation to taxes, and it is stated specifically that no amount shall be paid in lieu of taxes. Therefore it is a violation of this section.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I respectfully suggest that the able Senator is confusing the requirement that the cities surrender the taxes they would ordinarily collect to meet another provision of the national housing law, and that those agreements are not the kind of agreements we are now discussing. The agreement that is inhibited by this language in the bill is a distinct agreement as to an amount to be paid in lieu of taxes. The surrender of the taxes they would ordinarily collect was a condition precedent to a municipality receiving these housing projects at all. I am afraid the able Senator from Michigan is confusing that surrender of taxes on the part of the municipality with the agreement between the two pursuant to the act of 1937, that they could enter into an agreement and pay as much as they could pay. That is what has been done, and that is what is being overturned by the action the committee is now undertaking.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. When the bill was first under consideration I raised this point, and I think the proviso as left in the bill perpetuates a discrimination between cities. On the day the bill was under consideration I read to the Senator from Michigan a telegram which I had received from the mayor of Louisville, in which he stated that there was no provision in the contracts with the city of Louisville for the payment of any sum in lieu of taxes. I asked the able Senator from Michigan upon that day if he construed the provision in the bill to be applicable to such a situation, and as he stated upon the floor upon that day he did not so construe it.

I am not going to question his decision at this time, but I do want to say that I believe if the Members of the Senate had understood this situation clearly, they would not have voted to retain the provision in the bill. I say that for this reason: If it were a question of laying down a matter of policy and saying that no city having such a contract shall be permitted to receive from the Federal Government any sum in lieu of taxes, that would be one thing, and it would be logical, and one could stand upon it. But that is not what is being said. What is being said is that some cities that were sufficiently farsighted or that, using the experience of other cities, included in their contracts some payment for taxes, can use Federal money in lieu of taxes, but it is being said to more than 100 cities throughout the country in 15 or 20 States, "You cannot use any Federal money in lieu of taxes."

Mr. President, I believe the provision is discriminatory. I think it is an unfortunate provision. After the bill had been passed I wrote a letter to each one of the conferees. I discussed the matter with the distinguished Senator from Michigan and with the committee counsel. I believe many of the conferees agreed that it was discriminatory, and I urged that it be changed in the conference, and I submitted an amendment. I still believe that the wording of the proviso could be construed to mean that it applies only to a reduction of the amount and that it is not applicable in the case of those cities which have no contract at all.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the difference between the telegram which was read here and the actual contract was clear to the junior Senator from Michigan. So that there will be no misunderstanding, I must say upon the floor that this contract, and, as I am informed, all contracts in relation to taxes, are now covered by this provision. While some of us may say that there is discrimination, I must say that I cannot see that there is a discrimination between cities whose contracts contain provisions for 5 percent, 2 percent, or no amount at all, or $1 and 2 percent, or some other amount. This method was no more nor less than a different method of putting up capital, and if a city says it wanted a removal of slums, that it wanted public housing, and wanted to contribute to such housing by a reduction of taxes or an amount in lieu of taxes, it is up to that city to do that. Why should the Federal Government, at an expense of $1,500,000 a year as a subsidy, say to them, "We do not want you to contribute anything to housing. We do not want you to contribute 2 percent, or 5 percent. We do not want you to contribute only a dollar. We want to make it 10 percent. The Federal Government wants to pay the bill, rather than the municipality."

Why should not the people back home help to contribute to public housing? That is the theory of public housing.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. COOPER I believe the Senator will admit that under the provisions of the bill we are permitting a great many cities to accept Federal funds in lieu of taxes. Is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. Up to the amount specified in their contracts. It may be 2 percent, 5 percent, or a dollar.

Mr. COOPER. And we are saying to more than 100 cities, many of them large cities which have obligated themselves to the same type of services, "You cannot receive any Federal funds in lieu of taxes." Is that not correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. In effect that is true; but the same cities are contributing to the housing program. They can contribute in this way or in some other way. The conferees were unanimous. In fact, this provision was not in dispute at all, and therefore there could be no change.

Mr. President, I ask that the conference report be agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3756) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
July 26, 1947.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29 to the bill (H. R. 3756) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"The Virgin Islands Company is authorized to borrow from the Treasury of the United States, for the purpose of carrying out any of the programs of the Company set forth in the budget for the fiscal year 1948, sums of money not to exceed a total of $250,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds borrowed under this authority shall be available for repayment of bank loans outstanding at the date of enactment of this Act. For this purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to make loans to the Company, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, on such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Treasury shall determine. Such loans shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the making of the loan to the Company."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29. This is known as the Virgin Islands amendment. The original provision in the bill was that the Virgin Islands Company could borrow from the Treasury of the United States $500,000. We changed that amount to $250,000, and inserted a proviso that "None of the funds borrowed for this authority shall be available for repayment of bank loans outstanding at the date of enactment of this act."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BALL submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4269) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 11, 14, 46, 68, and 69.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 12, 13, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 39, 44, 45, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62, 66, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, and 101; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$40,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$15,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That subject to the limitations and requirements of this paragraph this appropriation shall be available for the transportation of voluntary relief supplies shipped by relief agencies licensed for operation in Europe and in Asia including the occupied areas under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

"Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans: For an additional amount for 'Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans', $5,000,000, to be available for the purposes specified under this head in the Act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 663)."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$40,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$675,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$65,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$40,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in line 2 of said amendment insert "$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,460,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$71,073,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$75,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$600,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 17, 40, 41, 42, 43, 58, and 64.

JOSEPH H. BALL,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
HOMER FERGUSON,
GUY CORDON,
CARL HAYDEN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOHN TABER,
RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4269) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
July 26, 1947.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 40, 41, and 42 to the bill (H. R. 4269) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert "and in addition military appropriations may be expended for such purposes, not exceeding $15,000,000, in contemplation of reimbursement if justified."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"FOREIGN SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses, Foreign Service: There is hereby transferred the sum of $400,000 from the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses, Department of State, 1948', and the sum of $100,000 from the appropriation 'Living and quarters allowances, Foreign Service, 1948', in all '$500,000, to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Foreign Service, 1948".'"

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of the matter inserted by said amendment after "available" insert "in an amount not exceeding $15,000 per annum."

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43 to said bill.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to amendments of the Senate numbered 17, 58, and 64.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BALL. I move that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 43.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, that completes action on the bill.

The main item in the bill was the appropriation for government and relief in occupied areas.

The conferees of the Senate and the House in agreeing on a cash appropriation of $600,000,000 for government and relief in the occupied areas did so with the understanding that further relief may be necessary in the fiscal year 1949 but that the 1949 appropriation bill for this item will be handled earlier than this year. If it appears that the appropriation bill for this item for 1949 will not reach the President by April 1, 1948, the Congress will consider a request for additional funds in connection with a deficiency bill. If we are going to continue this program after July 1, 1948, we are not going to let the pipe line dry up.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 794. An act to authorize the sale of a small tract of land on the Cherokee Indian Reservation, N. C.;

S. 892. An act for the payment of claims of one Fidelity Trust Co., of Baltimore, Md., and others, covered by findings of fact made by the United States Court of Claims, dated June 5, 1944, and contained in Senate Document No. 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session;

S. 1350. An act to authorize relief of accountable officers of the Government, and for other purposes;

S. 1361. An act to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit loans, capital grants, or annual contributions for low-rent-housing and slum-clearance projects where construction costs exceed present cost limitations upon condition that local housing agencies pay the difference between cost limitations and the actual construction costs;

S. 1463. An act to amend section 12 of the Immigration Act of 1917;

S. 1480. An act authorizing the conveyance to the State of Delaware of a portion of Pea Patch Island;

S. 1494. An act to amend section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944;

S. 1505. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Boise, Idaho, to the Boise Chamber of Commerce;

S. 1582. An act relating to the sale of Paxon Field, Duval County, Fla.;

S. 1590. An act to amend the District of Columbia rent-control law so as to provide that schools and universities may recover possession of housing accommodations in certain cases;

S. 1633. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the National Convention of the American Legion to be held in New York, N. Y., August 28 to 31, 1947, and the National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, September 4 to 9, 1947;

S. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to establish a Commission to formulate plans for the erection, in Grant Park, Chicago, Ill., of a Marine Corps memorial;

S. J. Res. 138. Joint resolution to provide for returns of Italian property in the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 148. Joint resolution to authorize the temporary continuation of regulation of consumer credit.

STIMULATION OF PRODUCTION FROM DOMESTIC MINES BY PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1602) to stimulate exploration, development, and production from domestic mines by private enterprise, and for other purposes.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and myself I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio on behalf of himself and the Senator from Alabama will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. 7. (a) Section 3 of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 (d) of this act, any war contractor who—

"(1) entered into a war contract to deliver, or to arrange to deliver, within specified periods of time, quantities of any strategic or critical mineral or metal (including manganese and graphite) to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or any of its subsidiaries; and

"(2) had his contract terminated or canceled because of his failure to deliver or to have delivered, within the specified periods of time, the quantities of such mineral or metal which he had contracted to deliver or to have delivered—

shall be deemed to have had his contract terminated or canceled for the convenience of the Government and shall be entitled to receive fair compensation for the termination or cancellation of such contract."

(b) Section 17 (a) of the Contract Settlement Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For the purposes of this subsection, a published, posted, or oral offer by any contracting agency to purchase any strategic or critical mineral or metal (including manganese and graphite) shall be deemed to be a request to proceed from such contracting agency; and any person who obtained from the War Production Board, or any of its predecessors or successor agencies, any priorities for articles or materials to be used by him in connection with the production of such strategic or critical mineral or metal shall be deemed to have arranged to furnish such strategic or critical mineral or metal to such contracting agency."

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, this amendment deals with the same strategic minerals that are involved in House bill 1602. House bill 1602 involves a premium-price program which will cost the Government, according to the figures in the bill, $35,000,000 annually for the next 2 years. I am advised by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that the cost for those 2 years will be much higher. No doubt other strategic minerals will be added to the list within the next year or two. I myself can think of one or two minerals which are just as important in the cause of national defense, just as useful in war, as the ones which are listed in the bill. So the estimated cost to the Government can no doubt be considered in terms of hundreds of millions of dollars in the few years ahead.

I agree that there should be a stock piling of strategic minerals. I agree that we should be ready for any national emergency; and yet I insist that before the Congress begins a new program of subsidies on strategic minerals or a premium-price program, we should give consideration to the program which was conducted during the war.

This bill was introduced in the early days of this Congress. It came to the Senate just a few days ago. It was reported from the committee without hearing. The committee submitted to the Senate only the recommendations of the House committee, which had held hearings. No opportunity was given to present an amendment, which I think is entirely unfair, not only to those who are going to mine the strategic minerals in the days ahead, but to those who mined them and furnished them during the war.

This amendment would substantially accomplish a fair consideration of those who put their money into mining operations in connection with strategic materials, the same materials considered in the bill, during the days of the war, patriotically tramping over the hills and looking for ores out of which they could obtain the metals so sorely needed in the war effort.

Many of them were not able to comply completely with the terms of their contracts. I know of one instance of 5,000 tons being required under the contract. The contract was insisted upon by the War Production Board, because, as was said by the contract authorities, "If you do not ask for 5,000 tons a year we cannot get you sufficient priorities on your materials in order to complete your plant and do the prospecting which is necessary to get the minerals out of the ores." They first mine the ore out of the ground and then extract the minerals from the ore. As the result of their failure to comply with the contract and furnish the complete tonnage, sometimes, because of the availability of such ores at other sources, in other countries, as the lanes of the oceans open and shipment is made across the Atlantic more cheaply, and in greater quantities than from the mines in this country, and many contracts are canceled.

At this time we are met by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation with the argument that they cannot consider a claim in these cases because the contracts were canceled by the Governn ent, or by the contracting authority, the War Production Board, or some other authority, with the result that those who spent their money when the Nation sorely needed these materials, and patriotically rendered a service to their Government, because they did not completely comply with all of the terms of their contracts, even though there was substantial compliance, and their contracts were canceled for that reason, have no recourse today.

The amendment would give them the right to file their claims with the RFC and ha e them considered as if the contracts had terminated for the convenience of the Government, like any other contracts terminated by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. There might have been an arbitrary action on the part of the contracting department of the Government. It might have been without due consideration of the rights of the contracting parties. All we ask is that those parties have an equal consideration with the others; and that before we embark upon a program of premium prices, before we enter into a new subsidy program for the procurement of strategic materials, let us do justice to those who have expended their money to help end the war. Considering the tremendous cost of the program upon which we are asked to enter, the amount which would be paid to these contracting parties who had their contracts canceled is an inconsequential amount. It is only a small fraction of the amount provided for in the bill which is now before the Senate.

The matter has been discussed with me by many persons. I was glad to discuss the amendment with my colleagues in the Senate and with the Members of the House of Representatives. They have said to me, "It is meritorious. We think it should be enacted into law. But if it is made a part of this bill, if it is submitted as a part of the bill, it will kill the bill."

Mr. President, this bill has been before the Congress for many months. It came before the Senate within the last week. There was no opportunity to

present the amendment before the committee, and I ask that it be given consideration by the Senate. Before we enter into a new program, let us clean up the debts of the country; let us fulfill our obligations to patriotic citizens who have expended their money and, in the meantime, have no recourse whatsoever.

If this bill will not carry the amendment, in the words of everyone who have contacted me over the telephone, in the mining States, there must be something wrong with the bill itself. The hour is not too late for the House to concur. I have been advised by Members of the House that they are willing to accept an amendment such as this. That cannot be verified, of course, until a vote is taken; but it should receive consideration here and likewise in the House.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not true that this matter did receive consideration before the Banking and Currency Committee and, as a matter of fact, an official of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation gave testimony to our committee regarding the operation of this amendment?

Mr. BRICKER. Not this amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will correct that. Regarding the subject matter of this amendment.

Mr. BRICKER. The subject matter was discussed with representatives of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, but this bill did not come to the Banking and Currency Committee, even though it involves expenditures by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. My reference was to the amendment and not to the bill. We did discuss the subject matter with the officials of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and it was in the light of that testimony that the amendment was prepared and presented to the particular bill which is now before the Senate?

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As a matter of fact, this amendment does not provide for giving to anyone any particular sum of money; it simply gives to those marginal operators the right to come forward and present their claims, just as the other producers had the right to do?

Mr. BRICKER. That is entirely correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not true that we were told by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that, under the law as it stands now, they could not even consider those claims, and the purpose of this amendment is to give the claimants the right to a hearing?

Mr. BRICKER. The right to a hearing in order that their claims may be considered.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. This amendment involves the adjustment of payments due to cancellation of contracts for any reason during the war. Is that correct?

Mr. BRICKER. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. I might remind the Senator that a bill of this kind was passed following World War I and the payments ran very high. In other words, payments due to canceled contracts, and for other reasons that could be alleged, are an entirely different matter from that which is under discussion, and could exceed the amount available for the purpose of this bill. It is an entirely separate subject, I submit, Mr. President. It has no relation to the objective of this legislation. There have been bills introduced at different times following World War II, but it is a separate subject upon which hearings should be carefully held, because, if the wording should be a little out of order, it could open the Government to claims of many times the amount that anyone is entitled to receive. Therefore there is no time at this late date, I submit, Mr. President, to give careful consideration to this matter.

Mr. BRICKER. The matter involved in the amendment is identical with the matter involved in the bill. It arose out of the same kind of program that is here proposed, to inaugurate a premium-price or subsidy program in the furnishing and stock piling of strategic minerals. The only difference is that we are furnishing them in peacetime. In wartime we were desperately in need of them. There is no distinction whatsoever in the arrangement that the Government had——

Mr. MALONE. The contracts which were canceled for any reason during or following the war are the same as contracts to construct munition plants or anything else of the kind, arising during the war, and have nothing whatever to do with the proposal contained in this bill to obtain further mineral supplies. Past losses are concerned wholly with the money expended in operation, in the purchase of machinery, and in doing work which has not resulted in the production of a sufficient amount of ore of a quality to pay out on the venture and yield a return on the capital invested. The principle of Federal reimbursement of such funds has been recognized in legislation prior to this time but is not involved in the proposed legislation now before this body.

The two subjects are not compatible and should not be considered in the same legislation.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, the only distinction between the Senator's example and the ones that are to be considered in connection with this amendment is that the ones he has mentioned are to be compensated. The RFC has full authority to take into consideration their losses, and to reimburse them for their losses. The people involved in this amendment have no recourse to any department of the Government at all.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to call attention to a portion of the amendment, and ask for an explanation of it. Perhaps the Senator has already given an explanation, but I do not understand that he has.

In the first part of the amendment it is provided that—

> (h) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 9 (d) of this act, any war contractor who—
>
> (1) entered into a war contract to deliver, or to arrange to deliver, within specified periods of time, quantities of any strategic or critical mineral or metal (including manganese and graphite) to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or any of its subsidiaries; and
>
> (2) had his contract terminated or canceled because of his failure to deliver or to have delivered, within the specified periods of time, the quantities of such mineral or metal which he had contracted to deliver or to have delivered—
>
> shall be deemed to have had his contract terminated or canceled for the convenience of the Government and shall be entitled to receive fair compensation for the termination or cancellation of such contract.

Mr. President, as I read that language, in the event that a contractor of his own fault had his contract terminated—if he himself failed or defaulted in his contract, if there was no fault on the part of the Government, but if the fault was on the part of the contractor—under this bill, as I read it, he would be entitled to what is called fair compensation for the cancellation or termination of his contract.

If the contractor has defaulted, and if the Government is not at fault in that matter, what justification is there for compensating the contractor for the fault that was all his own?

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, we cannot call it a "fault" if there was a mistake as to the amount which it was estimated might be supplied under the contract. Before the Senator from Missouri entered the Chamber, I believe, I cited an instance in which the Government itself agreed to take 5,000 tons a year of the production of a mine, in order to enable the contractor to get his plant established. As a result of the inability to obtain sufficient ore from his plant, and as a result of the Government's ability to get other ore from other concerns and from foreign sources of supply, the Government canceled his contract—simply because he was able to furnish only 3,000 tons. Due to various circumstances, part of them arising in connection with the contractor's operations and part of them related to the Government, simply because the contractor furnished only 3,000 tons, instead of 5,000 tons, his contract was terminated.

This amendment is limited to those who have failed to deliver the complete amount called for in the contracts.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I do not think the language contains any such limitation as that which the Senator has suggested The amendment does not provide that a contractor who has had his contract terminated or canceled because of his failure to deliver or to have delivered, by reason of circumstances beyond his control or without his fault, shall be deemed to have had the contract terminated or canceled for the convenience of the Government. As I read this measure, it seems that no matter what the reason is—whether it was absolutely the fault of a contractor, without refer-

ence to whether the circumstances were such that he should be excused—if he defaulted, he will still be entitled to compensation.

Mr. BRICKER. No; he will have the right to have his claim considered under the bill to which this is an amendment.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, with all due respect to the Senator, I do not think that is what the amendment says. It says that the contractor "shall be deemed to have had his contract terminated or canceled for the convenience of the Government and shall be entitled to receive fair compensation for the termination or cancelation of such contract."

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, that is exactly the wording of the contract-termination bill at the present time. All this amendment does is to bring within the provisions of the contract-termination bill the companies that have had their contracts canceled.

Mr. DONNELL. Would the Senator have any objection to amending his amendment by inserting on page 2, in line 3, following the word "had", the words "by reason of acts without the fault of the contractor"?

Mr. BRICKER. That would be fair.

Mr. DONNELL. I think that would bring the bill within the exception the Senator has suggested.

Mr. BRICKER. That would be fair, and I accept that as a modification.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator has accepted my suggestion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is understood that the Senator from Ohio perfects his amendment as indicated.

Mr. BRICKER. That is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado has pointed out the importance and necessity of enacting this proposed legislation. The Senate well knows the important part that the mines in the West played during the last World War. We well know the important part these marginal mines played in helping win that war.

All of us know that we had to have these strategic metals in order to win the war. We could not import foreign copper; in our war production we had to use the metals which otherwise could have been used for civilian production. But as a result there developed a shortage in these strategic metals. They are needed today. This program is not a new one, as has been suggested by the junior Senator from Ohio. It is a program which was in effect during the war and has continued since the end of the war.

The contract-termination amendment which has been offered would, in my opinion, kill this legislation. That fact has been demonstrated by the colloquy which has occurred between the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Ohio. I submit that the amendment which has been offered to the amendment, and which has now been accepted as a modification of the amendment, would not cure the defect of the amendment. We can readily see that the House would not accept this amendment in its present form.

I am sympathetic with the objectives the junior Senator from Ohio has in mind regarding his amendment. No one has had more trouble than I have in connection with the contract-termination problem in regard to the mines. But, Mr. President, what does the Senator's amendment provide? In the first part it provides that—

> (b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 (d) of this act, any war contractor who—
>
> (1) entered into a war contract to deliver, or to arrange to deliver, within specified periods of time, quantities of any strategic or critical mineral or metal (including manganese and graphite) to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or any of its subsidiaries; and
>
> (2) had his contract terminated or canceled because of his failure to deliver or to have delivered, within the specified periods of time, the quantities of such mineral or metal which he had contracted to deliver or to have delivered—
>
> shall be deemed to have had his contract terminated or canceled for the convenience of the Government and shall be entitled to receive fair compensation for the termination or cancellation of such contract.

Mr. President, some of these marginal mines failed to deliver the ore they had contracted to deliver. They failed to do so because they did not have it to deliver; they did not have as much ore as they had believed. I am in sympathy with such contractors and miners, but I do not believe the Congress of the United States would accept such a sweeping amendment at this late hour in the session.

I plead with the junior Senator from Ohio to wait until the first of the year, and then re-offer this amendment in the form of a bill. If he does, he will have a sympathetic hearing, and the only harm that will be done will be that there will be that much delay in the payment of this money.

But if this amendment results in killing this important legislation at this time, what will happen? Most of these mines are shaft mines, Mr. President. If this legislation is killed, those mines will have to close down. They will become watered; the timbers will rot; and everyone who has had any experience with mining knows what that will mean.

These mines will be lost to the people of the United States and we will lose the production, which is so sorely needed at this time, not only for defense purposes, but also for civilian uses.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The very fact that the Senator from Ohio so readily accepted an amendment to his bill proves to me that the language in his bill, as has been charged, has not been well considered. When we start amending a bill on the floor of the Senate, and change its complexion completely, it seems to me that it is a confession that the language has not been well worked out.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. The amendment suggested by the Senator from Missouri only carried out the purpose of the amendment, it did not change the purpose at all, and is in accordance with the decision of the courts on the War Contracts Termination Act.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, Mr. President; but the amendment to the amendment does not cure many of the defects of the original amendment which can be found by a casual perusal. As I stated, I am in sympathy with the objective of the Senator from Ohio, but I hope he will withdraw his amendment; if he does so he will have the sympathetic ear of the junior Senator from Arizona next January. But I do not want to see an important bill killed at this late hour. I do not want to see a bill killed of such importance to the people of the West and to the people of the United States generally.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. KEM. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The bill (H. R. 1602) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROMOTION AND ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN OFFICERS IN THE ARMY, NAVY, AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3830.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3830) to provide for the promotion and elimination of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, this bill was reported by the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and after it has been disposed of the Armed Services Committee is interested in three more bills, House bill 1366, House bill 3051, and House bill 1544, the Gold Star Mothers bill. I yield the floor now so that the Senator from Connecticut may take charge of the bill.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to reestablish a permanent promotion system for the armed forces; to make necessary improvements to the present Navy system; to change the present Army system of promotion by seniority to a selection system, and, insofar as is practicable at this time, to make uniform the promotion systems of the two services.

The Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives conducted exhaustive hearings over a period of 2

months. Every effort was made to make uniform related sections of the bill between the two services. However, the Navy has been under a selection system for a good many years. The Army cannot immediately readjust their old seniority system into the same pattern, and, therefore, there are some variations between the two systems. Generally speaking, it is believed that it will take quite a few years before the Army could follow the Navy system in its entirety. In reporting this bill, the House took the position that it was passing an equitable, economical, and forward-looking promotion program for the services; a program that will offer careers satisfactory enough to attract capable men.

This represents a codification of the existing Navy law on promotion, and brings together in one place the various existing statutes pertaining to the Navy selection program, and improves it in certain details. In this codification lies the real reason for the size of this bill. I am sure if we gather together all the existing statutes on this subject that they would be larger than the consolidation represented by the first four titles of this bill, which covers 247 of the 330 pages in the bill.

Both services earnestly recommend prompt consideration be given this bill because of the necessity of getting officers into their proper permanent ranks as rapidly as possible and meeting actual officer requirements. It must be recognized that practically all of the officers in the Army and Navy are serving in temporary wartime ranks, which have little relation to their standing on the permanent rolls. Uncertainty as to what the future holds for them is having a definite effect on the attrition of the younger officers, who are getting out of the service at an alarming rate. The Secretaries of War and the Navy have strongly urged the importance of this bill to the national security and the pressing need for its enactment during the present session of the Congress.

Insofar as the costs of the bill are concerned, representatives of both Departments have been questioned closely as to differences in cost between this bill and their present promotion plan. So far as the Army is concerned they have stated that there will be no immediate increase in cost and that over a period of some 10 or 15 years some additional costs will occur, but that by 1973, or approximately the life span of one group of officers, the cost will drop rapidly until there will be only an additional thirty-two one-hundredths of 1 percent additional cost.

The Navy states that over a period of relatively few years the cost under the Navy plan will be less than it would be under the present one. Both services state that the bill tends to bring officers along to higher rank at an earlier age than under the present law. It is believed that this is an improvement over existing law, because the last war clearly demonstrated the need for vigor and comparative youth in men holding positions of responsibility in the services.

Under the Navy program there is an important new feature which permits the accelerated promotion of specially qualified officers in advance of the average officer. Under existing law this has been impossible. However, under the present plan this may be accomplished and will result in outstanding men advancing at a slightly more rapid rate than their contemporaries.

Another important change in the Navy promotion plan is to establish a so-called limited-duty category of officers with full opportunty for former enlisted men to advance to the rank of commander. Such limited-duty officers will be enlisted men who are well qualified in a particular speciality, but do not have the broad background which permits them to compete favorably with officers of more general education and experience. In the past this has operated to the disadvantage of men commissioned from the ranks. This plan opens up an extremely desirable career to outstanding enlisted men and should have a very beneficial effect on the Navy as a whole.

The Navy for the first time will require officers in flag ranks to undergo the selection process. This will insure better top performance by flag officers and will provide a flow of promotion through all grades.

The basic change in the Army plan is that they are abandoning the archaic system of promotion by seniority alone. This, in the past, has resulted in some officers of dubious ability being promoted when they were reached within the normal course of time. In the past it has been impossible to eliminate undesirable officers or those unworthy of promotion from the list except by extremely drastic board action. This bill, provides that unqualified officers will be eliminated before they advance from one grade to another. The Army also has an equivalent of the Navy accelerated promotion plan which will further invigorate the Army officer corps. It also provides for forced attrition at the top, which will remove older officers and will begin to permit a more uniform flow of promotion than has heretofore been possible.

In both services considerable attention has been given to staff branches and speciality corps. This bill provides the same opportunities for promotion and advancement to such groups as are available to the line officers. In this connection, it should be noted that hereafter the Army will commission all officers, other than those in the Medical Department, the Chaplains, and the Air Corps into the Regular Army, rather than in branches of the Regular Army as heretofore. For instance, under existing law, an officer is commissioned in the Infantry or Ordnance Corps and could not be transferred without considerable administrative difficulty and the consent of the Senate.

However, this does not to the slightest degree contemplate any change in the existence of the special branches or their relative importance within the service. For example, the Corps of Engineers will continue to function exactly as it has in the past. These officers will be appointed as officers of the Regular Army but will be assigned as officers of the Engineer Corps. No officer can be promoted to a position of responsibility within the Corps of Engineers, or as Chief of Engineers, unless he has long experience and service in the engineers. Further, the board of selection which passes on these officers must have a proportion of qualified engineer officers to judge such men for promotion. There is no question as to the imperative need of fluidity in a modern army, which will permit the transfer of qualified officers from one branch to another, but this bill does not permit placing officers unqualified in a specialty in charge of that specialty.

One other matter which is corrected by this bill is the ranking of Army brigadier generals with rear admirals of the lower half, and major generals with rear admirals of the upper half. Heretofore, insofar as rank is concerned, the Navy has had no one-star rank. The net result has been that junior rear admirals of the Navy were considered senior to Army and Marine Corps brigadier generals, to whom they might have been junior while they were serving with ranks under that of flag rank. This bill provides equality of rank and eliminates one of the irritations which has resulted from this inequitable rank structure.

The bill, as amended, does not give either service as many full admirals or generals as they desired originally. As it passed the House, the bill authorized a total of 11 four-star officers in the services, with 4 assigned to the Army, 3 to the Navy, 3 to the Air Forces, and 1 to the Marine Corps. After careful consideration, the committee feels that this is not a proper balance between the services and these figures should be changed to a total of 5 for the Army, 5 for the Navy, 4 for the Air Force, and 1 for the Marine Corps. This leaves the Army, including the Air Force, with 9 and the Navy, including the Marine Corps, with 6. I might add also that the numbers of generals has been decreased materially below that requested by the Departments.

CONCLUSION

There might be a belief that careful consideration has not been given this bill. I would like to reassure the Senate on this point. This bill received many weeks of careful study and consideration by the House Armed Services Committee. After it passed the House our committee devoted many hours of consideration to the House bill, and our staff spent over 2 weeks in studying the bill. We do not believe that it is a perfect bill, but in substance it is sound, it is urgently needed, and we, therefore, recommend most earnestly that it be passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think that legislation along this line is very badly needed. I recall, several years ago, when the automatic promotion plan was adopted by the Congress, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and I made a losing fight which lasted several days. We lost, in trying to escape from the automatic promotion system. I have carefully listened to what the Senator has said, and I am convinced there is much merit in his proposal. It is a very complex matter. It seems to me that perhaps we are pyramiding favoritism

now upon automatic promotion. Automatic promotion was very bad, and it has not proved successful. High generals in the Army, and Senators on the floor who were members of the Military Affairs Committee fought against that bill. I noticed that we were honored today by the presence of former Senator from Indiana, Judge Minton, who helped to lead the fight that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and I waged against the automatic promotion bill. Nevertheless, it was adopted. It was a great mistake. I am glad to see that the high military leaders of this country acknowledge that it was a mistake, which they are now trying to correct. I wonder if the proper correction is being made to the automatic promotion system.

Mr. BALDWIN. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Colorado, who, I know, is familiar with the Navy system, if he was satisfied that that system provided a proper method of promotion?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I will say to the Senator that at the time the automatic promotion plan was adopted, it was my hope that the Army might adopt the Navy system.

Mr. BALDWIN. I want to say to my distinguished colleague that what the bill does is to apply to the Army insofar as is now possible the method of selection followed in the Navy. In other words, in the Navy, presently, when a man reaches the rank of a junior-grade lieutenant and is ready to be advanced to the rank of lieutenant, he must pass a selection board. The same rule is here applied to officers of the Army who reach the rank of captain.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. What I fear is this hybrid or cross between automatic promotion and the so-called favoritism method of selecting officers. If the outright merit system is followed, then of course I would be wholeheartedly in favor of it, but I have a fear of halfway measures. It seems to me we run the danger of adopting all that is bad in both systems when we adopt a hybrid system.

Mr. BALDWIN. I want to assure the Senator that the committee shared his view, and for that purpose and to that end we adopted a bill which endeavors to get away from the inequities of the old promotional system, which was almost automatic. This is really a selection system.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am sorry I am not more familiar with the terms of the bill. It sounds rather complex to me.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Connecticut has yielded the floor. He has concluded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Has the Senator from Connecticut concluded? Has the Senator yielded the floor.

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the Senator from Texas for a question. I desire to present some amendments.

Mr. CONNALLY. Before the Senator gets to the amendments, I demand the regular order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order is the motion of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 150, to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from further consideration of Senate Resolution 116.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is all right.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is that what the Senator demands?

Mr. CONNALLY. I demand the regular order. It is for the Chair to determine what that will be.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order is the motion of the Senator from Nebraska to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 150.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, is a motion in order?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry. What is the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas demands the regular order. The regular order is the motion of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to proceed to the consideration of Senate resolution 150, to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from further consideration of Senate resolution 116.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have a vote on that resolution?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the junior Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. McCARRAN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. My recollection is, and the Chair will correct me if I am wrong, that by unanimous consent the regular order was laid aside. The bill now being presented by the Senator from Connecticut was taken up. Am I in error about that? If that be the case, is not that bill now the unfinished business before the Senate, which was taken up by unanimous consent?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Chair understands what the Senator has said the Chair agrees with the Senator. The Senator from Nevada, furthermore, is entitled to the floor as the Chair recalls the arrangement under which the unfinished business was set aside. Therefore the Chair will have to recognize the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, under extreme pressure I withdraw my demand for the regular order. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—do I have to ask unanimous consent to return to the promotion bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No. The Senate is now considering House bill 3830.

Mr. BALDWIN and Mr. CONNALLY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment in addition to those already printed in the bill.

On page 249, line 21, of H. R. 380, my amendment is to amend subsection (c) of section 502 by changing the period at the end of the said subsection to a colon and adding the following proviso:

Provided, That assignments, transfers, and reassignments of officers of the Corps of Engineers to and from duties involving the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers shall be made only by approval of the Secretary of War upon the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to say that one of the reasons I demanded the regular order awhile ago was that the bill was called up for consideration this afternoon and I objected to it. Then, when I went down to get a bite to eat somebody brought up the bill, though he knew I was opposed to it. I want to debate the amendments somewhat.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I may be guilty of having asked for consideration of the bill. However, I thought it was pretty clearly understood——

Mr. CONNALLY. I have not yielded to the Senator. I have the floor.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I understood I had the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No. The Senator offered his amendment. The Senator from Texas rose to speak on the amendment. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President and Senators, this is a very simple little bill. It is only 300 pages long, a bill which the Senate is asked to swallow in 5 minutes. How many full generals does it make? I have not read all the 300 pages, because I only had about 20 minutes to read the 300 pages. Senators boast of the fact that in the committee the staff studied the bill 2 weeks. Well, the staff, unfortunately, does not vote.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; I will yield. The Senator would not yield to me, but I will yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. I want to ask the distinguished Senator if he was present in the Senate Chamber when I first made the statement on the bill, when I stated that the House Committee on Armed Services had held very extensive hearings on the bill and had done a great deal of work on it, more than the Senate committee, I am bound to admit. But the Senate committee staff and the Senate committee itself have given considerable time and attention to the bill. I pointed out, if the distinguished Senator will remember, that the bill is as long as it is in large part because it codifies a good deal of existing law.

Mr. CONNALLY. That may be. I want to congratulate the Senator though. His committee turns over the matter to the staff, and they study it in 2 weeks and write up a bill of 300 pages. Of course, I was not here when the Senator opened

up his discussion of his bill, because I was downstairs for a moment getting a little bite to eat. But the Senator knew that if I had been present, I would have objected to consideration of the bill.

Mr. BALDWIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I want to assure my distinguished friend from Texas that there was no intention on my part to take advantage of him. I met him out in the retiring room a little while ago and told him that we were going to press for this bill, and were going to ask that it be presented to the Senate, because, Mr. President, the bill concerns the national defense of the United States of America.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, we have just emerged from the greatest war that ever shook the foundations of the earth. We fought that war under existing law.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes, I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to inform the Senator that the minute the war broke out it was found necessary to scrap the whole system of automatic promotion, and to make promotions by selection. We would never have won the war otherwise.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not talking about scrapping the system of automatic promotion.

Mr. LODGE. We are. The Senator spoke of the war being fought under existing law.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts is violating the rule, sitting in his seat and attempting to address me or somebody.

Mr. President, I opposed the bill providing for automatic promotion. The Senator from Colorado will bear me out when I say that when the promotion bill was before the Senate I fought it, as did the Senator from Colorado. But that does not mean that I have to swallow 300 pages when I do not know what the 300 pages are about.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. The Senator asked a moment ago about how many generals and admirals the bill creates. I would like to advise the Senator on that subject.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well; go ahead.

Mr. BALDWIN. I may say at the outset that one of the chief features that makes it a bill which should be passed, is that it reduces the number of admirals and generals. It reduces the "brass hats," so-called.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am talking about how many full generals the bill provides.

Mr. BALDWIN. Four-star generals?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. BALDWIN. It creates, I think, 11 men of four-star rank in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

Mr. CONNALLY. Eleven full generals. And up to a few years ago we did not have any full generals, and a lieutenant general was a curiosity. [Laughter.] The bill makes 11 full generals.

Mr. BALDWIN. Would my distinguished friend allow me to make a brief statement based on a memorandum which is more accurate than my recollection, because, as the Senator says, there are many generals, and I want to make a correct statement?

Mr. CONNALLY. What does the Senator want?

Mr. BALDWIN. The bill represents a marked decrease in the number of high ranking officers in the service. Originally the Army and Air Corps requested 15 four-star generals. This bill would authorize only 9 four-star generals. The Navy requested 8 four-star admirals. The bill gives them only five.

So far as three-star officers are concerned, the change was even greater. In this rank the Army, including the Air Corps, asked for 46 and received 38. The Navy requested 29 and received 23.

So far as the rank below three-star officers is concerned, the bill establishes a numerical ceiling which cannot be exceeded. It also establishes a sliding scale of generals below that ceiling, based on a percentage of the total officers in the service. The lowest figure must be used.

Let me add to this memorandum that unless we adopt this system the number of high-ranking officers in all the services can be almost limitless. We have approved a great many advances in rank, and I do not recall that my distinguished friend was on his feet objecting to any of them.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not object to individual cases because I did not know anything about them.

When the Senator finishes his speech, I shall be glad to reclaim the floor.

Mr. BALDWIN. I have given the best information I can to my distinguished friend. I am perfectly willing to subside. Let me say, however, that I am advised that there are now in the Army more than 20 four-star generals.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is about 19 too many.

Mr. President, as I understand the Senator from Connecticut, the bill provides for 11 four-star generals and admirals. Is that correct?

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. How many admirals?

Mr. BALDWIN. Eight four-star admirals.

Mr. CONNALLY. How many in the Army?

Mr. BALDWIN. Nine four-star generals. The bill abolishes the five-star rank completely, reserving that only for those distinguished leaders of our armed services who led the armed forces of the United States with greater ability and courage than we have ever known before in our history.

Mr. CONNALLY. Under the present law.

Mr. BALDWIN. My distinguished friend will remember that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] stated that the old law had to be absolutely scrapped in order to get those men to the top.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Connecticut is clinging to it. I wonder if he is through.

Mr. BALDWIN. I have subsided. I thought the Senator was about to ask another question.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I would rather read the bill.

Mr. President, the bill would create eight four-star admirals——

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield. I hope the Senator will not contradict the Senator from Connecticut. That is what he said.

Mr. GURNEY. I am sure I shall not.

As the bill passed the House, it provided for three four-star admirals and one four-star general for the Marine Corps, making a total of four in the Navy Department. As it passed the House it provided for three four-star admirals in the Navy and one in the Marine Corps, making a total of four for the Navy Department.

As the bill passed the House, it provided for four four-star generals in the Army, and three four-star generals in the Air Force.

As the bill was reported from the Armed Services Committee, and as it now appears before the Senate, the Senate committee approved and recommended an additional four-star rank for the Army, making five, as the bill now provides, for the Army. We approved an increase of two four-star admirals for the Navy, making a total of five as the bill now stands. We also approved an additional one for the Army, making four as the bill now stands.

It will be noticed that the Senate committee increased the four-star rank by one for the Army, two for the Navy, and one for the Air Corps.

If the Senator will further yield, I am advised by the leadership in the House that they will not agree to the additional two four-star admirals for the Navy.

Before the debate is concluded, I intend to offer an amendment eliminating one four-star admiral for the Navy, leaving the Marine Corps as it is, and leaving the Army and Air Corps as the figures now stand, or as they were reported from the committee. As I understand—and I am sure that is correct—there will be no objection, and the House will agree to the Senate amendment, if the Senate agrees to the suggestion I am about to make, that one four-star admiral be deleted from the Navy list.

If the Senator will further yield, I will say that I have talked informally with Secretary Forrestal, who regards the passage of this bill as of such paramount importance that he is willing to accept the compromise arrangement between the House version and the Senate committee version with regard to the four-star rank, that is, one four-star admiral less. However, he wishes to refer to the original request of the Navy for six officers in the four-star rank. This request was altered to make provision for one four-star general in the Marine Corps. The arrangements now provided for in the bill would give the Navy two less in the four-star rank than it asked for; and

Secretary Forrestal expresses the hope that when Congress reconvenes in January it will be willing to give consideration to the request of the Navy for one additional four-star admiral rank which we are deleting if the Senate adopts my suggestion tonight. I assured Secretary Forrestal that our committee would give his request full consideration as soon as we return in the next session.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator; but his remarks simply accentuate the fact that the committee has not given this question proper consideration and thought.

This 300-page bill was passed by the House of Representatives on June 25, about a month ago. Mr. President, I am not against the Navy. I am what is called a big-Navy man. As a rule I vote for the highest appropriations for the Navy. I am not against the United States Army. I am strong for national defense. But I want to know something about bills when I vote on them. We have before us a bill which provides the Army with five four-star generals. The bill provides for five four-star generals, does it not? One is to be added.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. And for the Navy six four-star admirals?

Mr. GURNEY. No.

Mr. CONNALLY. There were four, and the bill gives them two more, does it not?

Mr. GURNEY. The House provided for three, and our committee recommended an additional two, making a total of five.

Mr. CONNALLY. The House provided for only three?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. And the Senator's committee made it five?

Mr. GURNEY. And one in the Marine Corps. That makes the six in the Navy.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course. If the Senator does not know it, the Marine Corps is a part of the Navy.

Mr. GURNEY. In the Marine Corps they are four-star generals, and in the Navy they are four-star admirals.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand that.

Mr. President, as I recall, up to several years following the War Between the States Washington had been the only full general in the history of the Nation. If I am in error, I hope some of the experts will correct me. After the War Between the States, somewhat in recognition of the services of General Grant, General Sherman, and, I think, perhaps General Sheridan, those officers were made full generals. I do not think old General Scott, who helped win the Mexican War, ever reached a higher rank than that of lieutenant general. If I am in error I shall be glad to be corrected. High ranks have never been adopted as a permanent policy by either the War Department or the Navy Department. When the war which has just been concluded began, I do not think there was any officer in the Army with full rank except probably the Chief of Staff. I do not know whether even he had full rank.

I am told there was one four-star general in the Army and one four-star admiral in the Navy.

Mr. President, I am advocating a study of this question. I am advocating taking some time and finding out what is in these 400 pages. All that I can see is the numbers of the pages. I cannot read tonight what is in the bill.

We fought, under the present law, the greatest war that ever cursed the earth, and it was fought under the generals who are still with us. We fought a great war on the sea, on the land, and in the air. We are told that if we do not pass this bill, our security will be terribly threatened within the next 6 months. I do not believe it, and I do not think the Senate believes it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should say that our security will not be seriously interfered with within the next 6 months, but what will result is great unfairness in promotions. By leaving in their present ranks officers who are not so competent as those who are underneath them, our security 4 years from now may be in more danger than it would be in if this bill should become a law at this time. In other words, we would be leaving in unfit men and putting more efficient men beneath them, without any opportunity of promotion.

Mr. CONNALLY As I understand the Senator, he wants a system of favoritism, where it is possible to reach down and pluck someone and bring him up further on the list.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I certainly do not want a system of favoritism. I want a system of fair selection. If we cannot trust the men at the top to select fairly and efficiently, who can be trusted?

Mr. CONNALLY. We should trust the law.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if I might observe that I think everyone will agree that what has just occurred shows the completely impossible situation in which we find ourselves tonight in trying to pass important legislation at the hour of 15 minutes of 9, without a full discussion. It leads me to say, Mr. President, that if this bill is so important as has been represented, if the national security and safety are involved now or 4 years from now, the Senate should take a recess at this time and come back on Monday morning, take up the bill, and discuss it intelligently, and act on it, without this mad rush to adjourn and go home.

Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I should like to say that if there is another unanimous-consent agreement proposed tonight to take up legislation when I am on the floor, I shall object to it.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I want to say for the benefit of the Senate that this bill was on the calendar on July 18, which was, as I recall, 8 days ago. I might also say to the Senator that within that time the Senate has listened to lengthy discussions of Senators on general and, in many cases uninteresting, subjects while some Senators were endeavoring to prevent a vote on the so-called Kem resolution. So it seems to me that we have had a fair and ample opportunity to consider this particular legislation. The bill was introduced a long time ago, and has been available to the Senators who might want to refer to it. Of course it was not in the form in which it was reported by the committee but, nevertheless, it was a complete bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I sincerely hope that this bill may be considered before we adjourn. The bill is intended, in connection with the unification bill, to put the Military Establishment on a firm and ready basis. The House of Representatives held hearings lasting for several months. It is not easy to revise the promotional system of the Army and Navy. The bill has the support of the high officers in the Army, Navy, and Air Force. It will do as much as anything I know of to put competent, skilled, intelligent, and young men, for the most part, in charge of our Military Establishment. We should remember that in this day of rapid movement it is important to have an army which is ready, a navy which is ready, and an air force which is ready. Never again will there be the luxury of time within which to prepare for war. Modern planes are flying at the rate of 10 miles a minute, or 600 miles an hour. We have such a plane. Other countries have such planes. From the standpoint of attack, Baltimore City and Washington, D. C., are within 4,000 miles of possible hostile countries. Assuming that atomic bombs are available to a hostile country, and it has modern bombers that can fly 4,000 miles at the rate of 8 or 10 miles a minute, this country is placed in tremendous jeopardy.

This bill is not a fly-by-night bill, but one which has been worked on most carefully by the House of Representatives while we were considering the unification bill. It is a bill in the A–1 category of the Nation's best interests.

I am extremely hopeful that, on second thought, and in view of this brief explanation as one of the members of the Committee on Armed Services, we can find the time and that the Senate will bear with us so that we can put this bill through. General Eisenhower wants it; Admiral Nimitz wants it; Admiral King wants it; General Marshall wants it; General Spaatz wants it. In their keeping, more than in that of any other five men in this Republic, rests our security tonight and for some time in the future. I sincerely hope this bill may have a chance to be considered.

By way of illustration, Mr. President, let me say that it took the Armed Services Committee, under the able chairmanship of the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], nearly 3 months to perfect the armed forces unification bill. By agreement with the House of Representatives, at the same

time the House was working on this bill, which to a large extent is a companion bill. Now that we have put through the armed forces unification bill, constituting a Department of the Army, a Department of the Navy, and a Department of the Air Force, it would be a shame if we did not put through this companion bill to staff those Departments with the best men in this Republic, men who experience has demonstrated are capable of manning those Departments all the way down the line.

I sincerely hope that my good friend and colleague on this side of the aisle, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], will not interpose objection to this bill. In my opinion there are no more important pieces of legislation coming before the Congress at this session than the unification bill and the new promotion bill which put the Army and the Navy and the Air Force pretty well on one plane. These bills represent 2 or 3 months of very hard work on the part of committees of the House and the Senate. I sincerely hope that the Congress will not take a recess until we have rebuilded our military and defense establishment to take care of any conceivable emergency to the best of our ability.

I thank the Senator from Texas for giving me a chance to make this brief explanation.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I think it is a tribute to my generosity, that I would yield to a colleague who has spent all his time tearing up what I had intended to say. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I have heard these arguments before. Are the officers who now are holding these responsible places going to quit the Army and the Navy if we do not pass this bill tonight? I had not heard that any of them were contemplating resigning in the morning if we do not pass this bill tonight.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that if we do not pass this bill, we shall have an excessive number of officers of four-star rank. This bill reduces the number of those officers to 15, I believe, whereas today there are many times that number in the armed forces. Not only that, but the bill reduces the number of officers all down the line. It forces a reduction in rank in each succeeding grade.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator should know that wartime ranks are temporary. Officers with the wartime rank of full general do not retain that as a permanent rank, simply because they served during the war as a full general. The Senator knows that numbers of officers who had the rank of lieutenant general during the war have returned to their regular Army rank.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I know the Senator from Texas is just as interested as is anyone else in this Chamber, inasmuch as he himself has been a soldier in two wars, in bringing our Army and Navy and our Air Force up to date. So I ask the Senator to allow me to state this point of view: It has been shown that in respect to the Army and the Navy—not yet in respect to the Air Force, because that has just been constituted as a separate organization—we are losing some of our very best men because of the situation which now exists, and which is crying out for correction.

Only the other day we passed the bill to give medical men in the Army and the Navy $100 a month more than they now are receiving. The reason for that, briefly, is that the men who are in the Medical Corps of the Army and the Navy educate themselves or their parents pay for their education, whereas men in the line are educated at Government expense. This $100 extra was provided so that at the time of retirement the men in the line and the men in the medical service will draw the same amount of money and will have the same benefits. We had to do that because there were not sufficient doctors in our Military Establishment to take care of the men in the service.

I entreat the Senator from Texas to let us discuss this bill. I appreciate that his initial reaction to it is the same as mine was; but I am satisfied that when he hears what was brought out before the committee, he will be satisfied that we have done a good job to bring our Army, Navy, and Air Force up to modern standards, as was necessary as a result of the lessons learned in the last war.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Maryland can justly charge me with not permitting other Senators to discuss the bill. It is true that I have had the floor, but most of the time I have yielded to other Senators, who have discussed the bill. I am not objecting to a discussion of the bill.

I am asking that the Armed Services Committee take the Senate into its confidence, instead of meeting in a room somewhere and having some conferences with a few generals and admirals, and saying to them, "Why, Generals and Admirals, we are going to let you keep your high rank," with the result that altogether there will be 13 four-star admirals and generals.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I know the able Senator from Texas wishes to be correct in his discussion of this subject. I should like to call attention to the case of Colonel Killian, whose name was mentioned so often in the newspapers a while ago, who was convicted of brutality against American soldiers when he commanded a detention camp.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; that was at Litchfield.

Mr. LODGE. That is correct. Today his name is a byword for cruelty, in many places. Yet under the present law we cannot get him out of the Army. In fact, he is trying to sue the President of the United States, to be promoted. Obviously we must meet that condition and situation.

If we are trying to persuade the people of the United States to put their sons under military training, we must convince them that the Colonel Killians are out of the Regular Army and the Reserves. This bill will enable that to be done.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am not defending Colonel Killian. He was a brutal officer. The Army had authority, under the law, to try him and expel him, if they wanted to.

Mr. LODGE. They cannot get rid of him now.

Mr. CONNALLY. But the Senator from Massachusetts knows that under the law the Army could have court-martialed him and expelled him. I am not familiar with all the details. I do not know all about such cases, and I am surprised that the Senator from Massachusetts would intimate that such is the case.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I hope that no Member of the Senate will accuse the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] of being in any way derelict in his duties as a Senator so as in any way to contribute to the Killian case. When the matter of promotions was before the Senate, the Senator from Texas stood almost alone against automatic promotions. The Senator from Texas and I opposed automatic promotions. We did not want a man to get into the Army as a second lieutenant, and then gradually be promoted up to the rank of colonel, automatically, grade by grade, simply because he kept his nose clean and did not violate the rules of the Army, even though he was not an efficient officer.

The Senator from Texas and I opposed that sort of thing and we told the Senate at that time that we would soon have under that system an army of colonels, that our Army would be, as it is jokingly referred to, a "Mexican Army," an army of colonels. That is exactly what has resulted under automatic promotion plan. The same generals to whom the Senator from Maryland has referred, who came in with this plan, were the very men who urged upon the Senate, upon the country, and upon the Congress, that we must have the automatic promotion scheme and the automatic promotion system. I hope no one is going to charge the Senator from Texas with any responsibility for that situation and for that condition.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree completely with what the Senator from Colorado has said, and I am delighted to know that he and the Senator from Texas, as I would imagine, have opposed this archaic scheme of promotion. What the bill does is to strike down that old system. What the bill does is to stop this system of automatic promotion, where all a man has to do is to stay in so many years in a certain grade, and then, though he may be the greatest incompetent in the Army, he automatically goes up

over more efficient, more dynamic, more skilled, and more intuitively great military leaders than would otherwise be the case.

Let me assure my good friend from Colorado that General Spaatz, General Eisenhower, and Admiral Nimitz, and all such men, want that old system abandoned. They say it clutters up the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force with deadwood.

The Navy has had the selective system for many, many years. This bill seeks to take away the automatic promotion regardless of rank, and to put a unified system of promotion, based primarily on merit, through all the three branches of the service under the unification system.

I am in thorough accord with what the Senator from Colorado has said and with what the Senator from Texas has stood for. The bill is directed primarily to cure the very thing for which these two able Senators have contended. I sincerely hope that it may have its day in court, so that we may put it on the statute books.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield while I address a question to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. As I understand the Senator's position, the Navy has had a very admirable method of promotion, that is, by merit, while the Army has had the automatic promotion system. The question I want to ask the Senator, in all seriousness, is this: Has that resulted in the Navy having finer admirals than the Army has had generals?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not an expert in military matters, and I do not know what my opinion would be worth, but offhand I would say "Yes," and for the following reasons. The Army has been unable at any time to retire an officer, because under the automatic system he went through all the grades up until he reached a certain term of years, while, on the other hand, in the Navy it was possible to take out an officer who did not for one reason or another have the qualifications to make a senior naval officer. In the Army it was impossible to retire him.

We have already taken into consideration, in the engineer department, that that service has certain civil functions which the remainder of the Army and the Navy do not have. The Senator from Louisiana very properly brought up that consideration, and we tried to meet it and fit it into the system, because the point of view the Senator expressed to our committee has real merit, and we attempted as best we could to make the exception, which was a deserved one, to fit in with the general scheme of promotions.

But to come down to the point. The Army authorities themselves said, in testifying before our committee, that they thought the Navy system was productive of more efficient and better qualified officers than was the Army system, because under the automatic system of promotion they had no alternative.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield further?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I think that the last war demonstrated that we had fine admirals and fine generals. I do not think there can be instituted any invidious comparison between the two classes of officers. I think we produced upon the field of battle the finest generals who served any country under any flag, and I think that under the Navy system we produced as magnificent admirals as ever served upon the high seas at any time in the history of the world.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not think the promotion system of the Navy and the promotion system of the Army have had so much to do with the magnificent admirals and generals who have been produced out of the loins of American fathers and American mothers.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I have not the floor. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr TYDINGS. I did not know whether the Senator from Texas wanted to be taken off the floor or not.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator from Texas has command of the situation, and if he wants me to take my seat I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not want the Senator to take his seat.

Mr. OVERTON. I have stated what strikes me forcibly. There is another thing that impresses me. The House committee had had the bill under consideration, I understand, for 5 months, and the Senate committee has had about 1 month in which to consider it. I think the trouble is that the House committee had ample time, but the Senate committee had a very short time.

The Senator from Maryland knows that I have a right to complain about the brevity with which the hearings were held, because while the committee has agreed in spirit with the amendment I wanted introduced into the bill—not exactly as I wanted it, but they have agreed to an amendment which in effect probably produces the same result—yet the Senator knows that the committee did not have time to give me any hearing on my amendment, and did not have any time to give four Members of the House of Representatives opportunity to be heard on amendments.

The result was that the bill was reported with only one of the amendments, the amendment now pending, which I wish enacted.

Mr. President, I think the Senate committee has had very little time in which to study this bill of three hundred and some odd pages. I doubt if they spent more than 12 hours, all told, on the bill. I do not know. Certainly, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] could make an estimate, and I am perfectly willing to accept any estimate he makes, because I know he is always perfectly candid. But it seems to me this bill, relating to the great arms of our national defense, and containing over 300 pages, which no Senator except the members of the committee have read through, should not be called up for a vote in the closing hours of the Congress.

Mr. President, in my opinion, there is not such an immediate urgency that the bill cannot lie over until the next session of the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to observe that under rule 19 of the Senate no Senator shall interrupt another Senator in debate without his consent, and to obtain such consent he shall first address the Chair.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator, and I am not going to transgress on his time; he has been most generous.

I should like to say to the Senator from Louisiana that during wartime the automatic promotion system does not prevail. General Eisenhower, for example, was a lieutenant colonel at the outbreak of the war. He was elevated over the heads of any number of colonels, brigadier generals, and lieutenant generals to become the commander in chief of our Army and Navy at the time of the invasion of the Normandy beaches. That was true likewise of many others. All the bill does is to try to do in time of peace what we had to do in time of war.

I wish to say to the Senator from Louisiana that if we had had the automatic promotion system in time of war, God help the Republic!

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am not advocating the automatic promotion plan, I am not advocating the so-called selective plan, which in essence is a plan which lets those at the top exercise favoritism if they desire in the promotion of officers. Neither system is going to prove satisfactory to the Army. There should be some sort of a medium between the two. But Congress will meet again in January, and I wish to ask, Does the whole fate of the Republic between now and January depend upon whether some major is made a lieutenant colonel by this bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to answer the Senator's question by saying that there are many junior officers, lieutenants, captains, and majors in the Army, and ensigns, junior grade, and lieutenants, in the Navy, who are leaving the Army and the Navy, or are trying to do so, because they see the obstacles to promotion by seniority ahead of them.

If the Senator will be good enough to let me remain on my feet for a minute, I should like to point out to him that when he and the distinguished Senator from Colorado worked on the former promotion bill, a bill which has been followed in peacetime for a good many years, that the Army consisted roughly of from 100,000 to 150,000 men, who are now civilians, and the Navy, well under 100,000, whereas there are now 400,000 enlisted men. What we ought to do is

to make it possible as quickly as possible to obtain the best officers to direct our tremendous Army and our great Navy, in order to get the most out of the men, by giving them the best possible training.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. That is a very noble attitude, a splendid attitude. But the Senator says they are quitting the Army and the Navy. Of course, many of them are anxious to leave the service.

I observe that the Senator from Massachusetts is conferring with one of his colleagues. I thought the Senator wanted me to answer him. The Senator says that the Army and Navy officers are leaving those services. Of course, a great many of them are doing that, because the war is over, and they wanted to return to their civilian positions. My mail is replete with applications from wartime officers wanting to obtain permanent commissions in the Army. They want to stay. They like the pay. They like the rank. They favor bills such as the pending one, intended to promote everybody. The Army and Navy are fine. In time of war they are gallant and brave. As soon as the war ends, they begin to devote their energies and time to matters of promotion and rank and grade. They surrounded the Committee on Naval Affairs that was and the Committee on Military Affairs that was, and now the Armed Services Committees are surrounded with generals and admirals, who may be seen in the Halls of Congress. If time permitted, I could doubtless look over the gallery and discover some of them there at this very hour; no doubt in civilian clothes.

Mr. President, I am not against the Army and the Navy. I vote for them. I fight for them on this floor. But I cannot pass on a bill of 300 pages that I doubt has ever been read in its entirety by anybody except the chairman of the committee. I doubt it. I do not charge it—I doubt it. The Senator from South Dakota displays a bit of merriment. It is possible he has not read it. I do not know. I am sure he has.

Mr. GURNEY. Not every word.

Mr. CONNALLY. Not every word? Why, the chairman of the committee has not even read the bill in its entirety. [Laughter.] The chairman of the committee has not read the bill, yet he wants to ram it down our throats. It is a big job to ram throats [laughter], at a night session, in the closing days of the session, Mr. President, in the closing hours—yes, I hope it is in the closing hours.

I plead that the bill may go over. The committee gave only 2 weeks to its consideration, according to a statement by the chairman. He said that in his opening statement, as I understood it. The Senator from Connecticut said the staff gave 2 weeks to it. Send out the staff, and let them study it. The staff does not vote, though. I vote. The responsibility is mine, when I vote on a measure of this kind. I cannot depend on my office force to do my voting. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I have a high regard for the Senator from Maryland, who requested me to yield. He made a considerable argument, and he has now left the floor. I think he ought to return and let me reply to some of his arguments.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Senator said he could not depend upon his office staff to analyze these bills?

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, no. I said, to do the voting on the floor.

Mr. TAYLOR. I was going to ask the Senator which editor he had for his executive assistant.

Mr. CONNALLY. This is not a journalistic matter.

Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland said General So-and-So was for it, and General Somebody Else, and Admiral So-and-So. Of course they are for it. It is their plan. They are sponsoring it. Of course they are for it. But the idea of this bill is to establish the four-star permanent rank—how many? Is it six? Is it 18? The Senator from Massachusetts kindly offers to assist me. [Laughter.]

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. May I say that the bill does not seek to establish the four-star rank permanently. It is only while an officer is serving as chief of branch; for example, as in the case of General MacArthur, while he is in the Far East. It is for the time an officer acts as chief of branch. It is not permanent.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am familiar with the chief of branch. That terminology was used in the old promotion bill. It was possible to make a colonel the chief of a bureau in the War Department. When he retired, he did not retire with the rank of colonel. He had been jacked up. Somebody reached down and got him from among the colonels and made him a chief of branch. That made him a major general. When he retired, he did not go back to his regular rank of colonel. He retired as a major general. That is another trick in the bill. Every man who has been the head of his corps or division becomes a full admiral or general for life, with all the perquisites, with all the emoluments, with all the privileges, and with all the stars that he can gather.

Mr. President, I had thought this was a bill for the regulation of the Army. On the contrary, the arguments are only about promotion. That is what the whole thing is about. It is a promotion plan. I do not blame officers in the Army for wanting a promotion. Of course, they all would like to be promoted. But it is our responsibility as to whether we are going to do it, in one way or another. I do not think the bill has been given sufficient consideration. I do not think the Senate is tonight prepared with a proper degree of intelligence, information, and understanding to pass the bill. Oh, of course, it can be done. It can be passed, just as another bill was passed over the protest from the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and myself. The majority may vote for the passage of the bill, but I want to say they will live to regret it. Advocates of the measure argue that they want a method of selection. Do Senators know how the selection system works? There is a board. It meets in secret. A Senator cannot speak to the members of the board. He cannot write to them. Nobody but the right person can approach them. The board members determine whom they will make colonels and generals and major generals. They handpick them. One cannot enter the board room without a summons, not even if he were to remove his shoes and get on his knees would he be permitted to enter the rooms where the admirals and the generals congregate. That is not said facetiously. It is true. Unless he belongs to the little Army clique or the little Navy clique, no one can speak to the board which does the selecting. Now do not be fooled. I do not want any politics in the Army, but there is more politics in the Army and the Navy to the square foot than there is even here in the Senate. [Laughter and manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair again admonishes the occupants of the galleries that the rule of the Senate does not permit any indications of approval or disapproval and the occupants of the galleries will please abide by the rule.

Mr. CONNALLY. There are more politics in the two services than there are in the Senate, even under the 1947 Republican dispensation under which we are suffering.

Mr. President, I do not want to weary the Senate. I know when the edict goes forth. I know when the ukase is issued. I know when the orders emanate from the headquarters. The orders are that the bill must be passed, and it must be passed tonight, and no matter what the arguments against the bill may be, no matter what the facts may be, no matter what conclusion may be reached, a lot of stars are going to be pinned on a lot of admirals and generals for life, and that is about all there is to it.

Ulysses S. Grant fought through the War Between the States. He fought at the Battle of Fort Donelson, where he began to win fame. He stood before Vicksburg and invested it with his troops until that starved, stricken city finally surrendered. Then he was brought north and went through Virginia against the gallant and intrepid Lee. Oh, but he was not a full general. Why, if the military and naval authorities of today had been then in power and could have had their way they would not have permitted General Grant to go on the battlefield until he had four big stars on each shoulder.

William T. Sherman, great military chieftain, did not have four stars on his shoulders until long after the War Between the States.

Phil Sheridan, who was "20 miles away" in poetry, and finally reached the battlefield, did not have four stars until long after the War Between the States.

But we have got to place four stars on generals immediately. We cannot wait until December or until January. We cannot let the danger to the country last

until January. We have a whole bucket full of stars out here that we want to put on generals and admirals.

Mr. President, I am not prepared to discuss the bill because I do not know anything about it except promotion. That is all I have heard about it. It takes 300 pages for the Armed Services Committee to provide who is going to be promoted and who is not. I do not know why they want the 300 pages to express it in. I know that the Senate will pass the bill. I want the RECORD, however, to show that I opposed it. I am not saying that I would vote against it in January. I might be for it then. I am for the Army. I am for the Navy. But I am not for a few favorites up at the top who not only receive these high ranks, but who determine the fate of all the officers under them through the selective system. If one has ever served under a general or a colonel, or been his "striker" he would be promoted and receive shoulder straps.

No, Mr. President, I think the Senate should have time to study the bill. I think the Committee on Armed Services should present us with the facts in the form of an adequate report which somebody could find time to read. I protest against the passage of the bill tonight. It ought to go over until January.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President there is before the Senate now an amendment which I had offered. I move the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I find myself in very strong accord with the sentiments just expressed by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas. I think no one questions his affection for the armed forces, for every branch of the armed forces, and I do not believe the affection of any Senator upon this floor for every branch of the armed services is subject to question for a single moment. At the same time I think we have a perfect right to know what is in the bill, which is of such vital importance to the national defense and of such vital importance to some hundreds of thousands—much more than a million men now—and will be of vital importance to a great many more than that in the course of the operation of the bill if it should be enacted into law.

Mr. President, the Senator from Texas has called attention to the fact that the bill is 300 pages long. As a matter of fact, it is 333 pages long. He could have called attention also—and I will—to the fact that the House committee report on the bill is 99 pages long. From the report made here on the floor by the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut I understand the bill has been very materially changed by the Senate. The report which we have, and the only one I have been able to obtain, is the House committee report, and it is 99 pages long, much of it single-space, and printed in double columns.

Mr. President and Senators, the docket shows that the bill came to the Senate and appeared on the calendar exactly 8 days ago. I do not think I have to remind the President of the Senate and other Members of the Senate as to what we have been doing in the last week. No one questions the patriotism or the devotion to duty of every man upon this important committee, but nobody who is not on the committee could have had a chance in these few days, of familiarizing himself in the slightest with what is in this important measure of over 330 pages, and in the House committee report of practically 100 pages, and in a Senate committee report, which if it exists, I have not been able to get hold of. I do not believe there is a Senate committee report unless I am not properly advised.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. There is a Senate committee report, Mr. President. It has been in the file right along.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am very happy to be corrected by the Senator from Connecticut. The fact that I have not been able to discover it simply bears out my statement that the matter has been so rapidly handled, and there are so many pages contained in the bill, that nobody could possibly familiarize himself accurately with the tremendous amount of detail that is in the bill.

Mr. President and Senators, on most bills of this magnitude, of course, we have to rely upon the committee, and that is proper. But we are talking about a bill now which is the very crux of the national defense of the Nation, and it relates to tens of thousands of men from every State in the Nation. I recall that at one time, in 1944, the last of that year, my own State, which is not a large State, had up to that time provided some 228,000 men in the various branches of the armed services. So this is a vital matter applicable to nearly every family in the Nation, applicable to every State, and it should be upon the conscience of every Member of the Senate, and I believe it is upon the conscience of every Member of the Senate.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a statement?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. BALDWIN. The distinguished Senator from Florida has made reference to the fact that the bill vitally concerns the national welfare and the national security. Indeed it does; and the men who recognize that fact most earnestly and seriously, and who are in a position to have the facts which make their judgment of extreme importance to us, are the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy. This is what the Secretary of War said in a letter addressed to the chairman of our committee:

> I urge that your committee do everything in its power to speed consideration of the bill to effect its passage before adjournment.

Today the President of the United States sent to the Senate for confirmation the nomination of the distinguished Secretary of the Navy, James Forrestal, to be Secretary of National Security. I might also mention that the committee has unanimously and enthusiastically endorsed this nomination and recommended its approval to the Senate. James Forrestal says:

> I cannot overemphasize, therefore, the importance to the national security of the completion by the Congress of action on H. R. 3830 during the present session.

I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

No one would think of questioning for a moment the conviction of the Senator from Connecticut or the sincerity of his feeling on the subject. But I remind him and other Senators that if under our form of government it had been decided that it was sound that the distinguished Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the new distinguished Secretary of National Defense, whose nomination I hope we shall confirm shortly, should have the formulation of vital law affecting our armed forces, such a provision would have been placed in our Constitution. It does not so provide. The responsibility is on the Congress. I do not think it is a responsibility which can be lightly shunted off in the closing night of a session when we are all weary after 7 months of effort, and when we are asked to digest and analyze in an hour or two three-hundred-and-thirty-odd pages of a bill and 100 pages of report, plus whatever is the number of pages of the Senate committee report, which I have not yet seen.

It might be—and I hope it would prove to be—the fact that when we have an opportunity to make such careful analysis, which I think a matter so vital requires, we would find that the bill was exactly what we wanted. I think there is a strong possibility that such would be the case. In such a vital matter we cannot surrender our responsibility, even to our distinguished fellow Senators, and much less to the heads of the Army and Navy.

So far as I am concerned, I wish to make it clear now that I do not propose to surrender my responsibility. I claim the right—and I believe every Senator should have the same right—to an opportunity to analyze the bill and the report and advise myself in connection with a matter which is so vital that it reaches into the family life of every family in every State in this Nation. I do not see how we could vote—like a bunch of rubber stamps—on a matter so vital; and I do not propose so to vote.

Mr. President, there are some questions which I wish to raise. They may be improperly raised, but they are raised out of the feeling that they should be answered, and I hope they can be answered. I hope there will be no disposition to give speedy answers and expect a vote from men who confessedly have not had an opportunity to read a bill of such importance.

Mr. President, this may be a bit out of order, but I am wondering if Senators who have read the three-hundred-and-thirty-odd pages of the bill will be good enough to raise their hands so that we may see how many such there are.

I note one hand, Mr. President. Are there others? Apparently one Senator—and I congratulate him upon his diligence—has had the opportunity to read the bill and has read it. I have not had that opportunity. I think I should be allowed such an opportunity, and I think every other Senator should be allowed that opportunity.

Mr. President, if the Senate tonight rams through a measure so important without knowing what is in it, we assume responsibility for everything that is in it, whether it is right or wrong. I am not willing, by my affirmative vote, to assume responsibility in a matter so vital without knowing more about it than has been communicated to us.

I find no fault with the distinguished Senator who has explained the bill in the brief space of time which has been allowed him. Apparently he did not have an opportunity to read the bill, because he did not raise his hand. I find no fault with him. I would find fault with us if we were to pass a bill of such consummate importance without knowing any more about it than we do.

Mr. President, I should like to ask several questions, and I hope some Senator will be in a position to answer them. They are not asked out of caprice. They are asked out of a sincere desire to find out what is in the bill. I hope Senators will give me their attention, because I think these are questions which will give us concern, and should give us concern, and will cause concern to others in the event we should enact this bill.

The first question is, What provision is made in the bill for the independent Air Corps? I have pursued the inquiry as diligently as possible. I have talked very briefly with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], for both of whom I have the highest regard, and who I know are deeply bound up in this measure, or they would not take the position they have taken.

With the enactment of the unification law there is created an independent, separate, autonomous Air Corps. Senators will recall that the other day when we passed the bill I had some references to make to the fact that it had been a dream toward which I had been working, and toward which I am sure many others had been working for years, including the late General Mitchell. That dream is now being realized.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wonder if the able Senator from Florida read the unification bill from beginning to end.

Mr. HOLLAND. I did not.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to say to the Senator from Florida, for whatever my opinion is worth, that the revolutionary thing which was done with the defenses of our country—and I think it was a constructive revolution—was the enactment of the unification bill, which put all the military forces of the country together and then separated them into three different departments, and at the same time created a Munitions Board, a Natural Resources Board, and a Central Intelligence Agency, among other agencies which had to be put into a modern bill because of the lessons of the last war.

If the Senator could take on the faith of the Armed Services Committee a bill which completely tore down and reerected the entire Military Establishment of the Government, it is a little difficult for me to see why he should be so exercised over a bill which deals solely with the promotion of officers.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Maryland. Let me say, in the first place, that while I did not read the last text of the unification bill, I did read the first text of it from one end to the other. I read some of the later provisions of it, those in which I was particularly concerned. I read a great deal of information about it in the newspapers; and in other places I discovered things about it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Not at this time. Let me have an opportunity to say what I have to say.

I had the opportunity to confer with respect to that bill, and I did confer with some of the high-ranking Army and Navy officers, and with others.

Mr. President, I do not believe that any Member of the Senate has had an opportunity to confer with respect to the pending bill. I do not believe that any of us has heard very much about it. It is quite apparent that very few Senators know anything about it, because, judging from the show of hands a moment ago, only one Senator has even read the measure.

Let me conclude with the question I am asking about the independent Air Corps.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Not at this moment. Let me finish my point with respect to the Air Corps. I have hurriedly, but as well as I could, consulted, as I stated, with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and one or two others, in connection with this matter, but I find, as I expected, that there is no provision directly in the bill with reference to the independent Air Corps. Quite to the contrary, the bill is drawn, and the title of the bill will show, "to provide for the promotion and elimination of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes." It is true, as I read the report and as I read the bill hurriedly, that there was in contemplation the fact that there would be, or might be, an independent Air Corps. Here is what the report—not the Senate report, which I have not had an opportunity of seeing, but the House report—says on this subject. On page 8 of the House report—and I am not advised whether the subject appears at all in the Senate report, because I have not seen it—appear these words:

> However, there is one problem involved in the Army program which, in itself, requires the promotion list concept at the present time. The Army Air Forces, scheduled to become independent of the Army in the event of enactment of the so-called merger bill, is constituted as a separate promotion list in order to permit that branch of the Army to function with respect to itself in a personnel way to the greatest possible extent.

I note in the bill, in the only two places where I can find any references to them at all, the Army Air Corps, Medical Corps, and chaplains were excluded in general from the provisions of the bill applicable to the Army as such. At any rate, to continue reading from the report:

> Further, similar provision is made for the various corps of the Medical Department and for the chaplains, the personnel of which are not readily transferable to other military duties, as, for example, are Army engineers, infantry officers, or quartermaster officers. These promotion lists may eventually become unnecessary—perhaps after the Air Corps situation has been determined finally—but for the present the committee agreed as to the need therefor and as to the Army plans for officering the various promotion list groups.

It is very evident that when the report was made up and when the bill was being considered the matter was in a state of flux, and even the committee was unable to say with finality what the situation would be.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Not at this time.

Mr. TYDINGS. Would the Senator like to have an answer to his question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like very much to have an answer.

Mr. TYDINGS If the Senator wants light——

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be very happy to get light, but let me state my position and then I shall be happy to hear from the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland. I do not think he can effectively answer my question until he knows what is bound up in it.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have heard the Senator's question, and I shall be delighted to answer it.

Mr. HOLLAND. In a moment I shall be glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. President, I find that in the brief check which I was able to make the only references to the Army Air Corps which I have found in the report were in the few lines which I have read. In the bill itself, in two sections thereof, the Army Air Corps, the Medical Corps, and the Chaplains were excluded from the other provisions of the bill. Whether that is sufficient to meet the problem is a question on which I should like to be advised now, and as to which, regardless of what the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland may say, feeling that anyone who believes as I do and as the junior Senator from Massachusetts believes, that the Army Air Corps is the first line of our national defense, I think one should have the right to familiarize himself with the situation and to know that there are adequate safeguards.

I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. The question the Senator from Florida asks is a very proper question. There is no doubt in the world that it is pertinent to this discussion. Let me say to the Senator from Florida that in the unification bill ample provision is made for carving, so to speak,

the new Air Force out of the Army. In other words, we cannot simply say there shall be created an Army Air Force and let it go at that. There the mechanics are set up, the procedure by which the new Air Force will be carved out of the Army. If this bill shall pass, provision is made in the unification bill for the officers in the Air Force. The promotion list would be identical, because it is provided there how the transfer is to be made, the grades in the Air Force, and so forth. But all of those things cannot be put into one bill.

The Senator's question is a proper one. All I wanted to do was to try, in my humble way, to give him the answer to it. I cannot quote verbatim the exact language in connection with the transfer, but in general terms what I have said to the Senator I am sure upon examination he will find it to be accurate.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. The unification law has recently become effective by the President's signature. Consequently the draftsmen of this bill, both the House and Senate committees, dealing with the unification bill had to have the factors in mind, and they were taken care of in this way. There is, as the distinguished Senator from Maryland has said, a method of promotion provided for in the so-called promotion bill. There is in the unification bill, in section 204 (f), this language:

> So much of the functions of the Secretary of the Army and of the Department of the Army, including those of any officers of such Department as are assigned to or under the control of the commanding general of the Army Air Force or are as deemed by the Secretary of Defense to be necessary or desirable for the operations of the Department of the Air Force or the United States Air Force, shall be transferred to and vested in the Secretary of the Air Force and the Department of the Air Force.

So it will be seen that by that particular language the Secretary of the Air Force is vested with all the authority that the Secretary of War had heretofore, so that the authority given transfers to him, by virtue of that authority, the full authority which is referred to in the promotion bill. Thus is the authorization made from the Secretary of War to the Secretary of Air. So there is a complete intergration of the two bills.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator, and I hope that he is entirely correct. I still think that every Senator should have a chance to advise himself by inspecting the language and then by checking, as he may see fit, as to whether vital matters of the type which I have just mentioned are properly handled in the bill, which apparently was drafted about the same time as was the unification bill. It has not been the subject of general discussion and general information as has been the unification bill which was drafted applicable to the Army in which there was no separate Air Corps at the time.

There are three other points about which I should like to ask, Mr. President. One has to do with the selection board. As I understand, the selection of officers for promotion will begin under the bill, at a rank considerably lower than has been the case under the present law, which means the question of how the selection board is set up, who constitutes the board, and whether the selection board will give fair representation to men from the Academies as well as to men from civil life, men from the Reserve who are on temporary duty with the Army and the Navy, or men from the National Guard who are there. I think it becomes of even more vital importance than it has been under the present law, as to how these boards are set up, who is on them, and what power they have.

Mr. President, I am speaking on a subject about which I have a little bit of information, because I ran into this subject repeatedly, not only in the First World War but during the Second World War when, because of my position at the time I was, in a sense, the spokesman for my people in the State of Florida and the defender of the National Guard personnel and the reserve officer personnel in that State, both in the Army and in the Navy. I wish to remind the Senate that even as set up and even as they functioned under the conditions in both World Wars, there was a great deal of criticism and feeling that there had been discrimination against good men and good officers who happened to come from the National Guard or the Reserves, or, even if they were in the Regular Establishment, happened to have entered them from civil life, rather than after a career in the appropriate academy.

Mr. President, I have hurriedly and briefly, but to the best of my ability, scanned the provisions of this bill in reference to the selection boards. It appears to me, from that brief scanning of the provisions of this measure, that none of the safeguards which it seems to me it is imperative that we provide in regard to the selection boards and the manner in which their personnel is chosen, are provided in this measure, unless I have overlooked them in my brief and cursory inspection. I would be unfair if I were to suggest to the Senate that any more than a brief and cursory inspection was possible.

Mr. President, I do not care how badly Senators may wish to shove this measure through. I am simply stating that the folks back home who have served in the National Guard and in the Reserve Corps, or who have had their boys enter the service from civil life, will not be satisfied if we make it possible for the selection boards to be dominated by the professional soldiers or sailors, to the exclusion of those who have entered the service from civil life.

I know—not simply from a few experiences, but from dozens of them, and, in fact, I believe they would run into the hundreds—that as a result of the constitution of the boards and the selections which the boards have made in the case of officers of various ranks, there has been a great lack of confidence and much criticism and much hurting of the hearts of good people and sons of good families, at least in my State, and I think in many other States. Certainly there has been the feeling, whether justified or not justified, that proper selections have not been made by the boards in making selections for promotions, when dealing with officers or enlisted personnel who enter the service, not from the academies, but from civil life.

I should like to hear from anyone who is able to tell us—because I have not been able to find out, from my cursory inspection—whether in respect to the setting up of the boards, the bill contains any safeguard which would tend to give protection and confidence to Reserve and National Guard officers and officers from civil life who are not graduates of the regular academies.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN SECOND-CLASS MAILING PRIVILEGES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WHERRY (for Mr. LANGER) submitted the following conference report:

> The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2857) to extend second-class mailing privileges to bulletins issued by State conservation and fish and game agencies or departments, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:
>
> That the Senate recede from its amendment.
>
> WILLIAM LANGER,
> KENNETH MCKELLAR,
> *Managers on the Part of the Senate.*
>
> EDWARD H. REES,
> ROBERT J. TWYMAN,
> JOHN E. LYLE,
> *Managers on the Part of the House.*

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, may we have a brief explanation of the report?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the report simply provides that the wildlife departments in the States shall have the right to second-class mailing privileges.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 144) authorizing the President to bring into effect an agreement between the United States and the United Nations for the purpose of establishing the permanent headquarters of the United Nations in the United States and authorizing the taking of measures necessary to facilitate compliance with the provisions of such agreement, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 351, adopted by the House of Representatives July 26, 1947, the Clerk of the House had appointed Mr. Harry Newlin Megill as the official in his office to be the Acting Clerk of the House provided for in said resolution.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4347) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 11, 12, 21, and 39 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 13 and 27 to the bill, and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution of the Senate, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 609. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claims arising out of the deaths of Norman Ray Pedron and Carl Franklin Morris;

S. 907. An act to provide for the orderly transaction of the public business in the event of the death, resignation, or separation from office of regional disbursing officers of the Treasury Department;

S. 1070. An act to provide for the cancellation of the capital stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the refund of moneys received for such stock, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 130. Joint resolution relating to safety in bituminous-coal and lignite mines of the United States.

PROMOTION AND ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN OFFICERS IN THE ARMY, NAVY, AND MARINE CORPS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3830) to provide for the promotion and elimination of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield in a moment, but first let me add one more point about the selection of the personnel of the boards. This is an important point, and I base it upon personal experience: I think it is of peculiar and, I think, transcendent importance that the boards in the Air Corps shall be so set up as to give adequate representation and protection to the men from civil life. There never will be a time when in the Air Corps the number of officers who are graduates of the Academies will begin to compare with the number of officers who come from civil life. Officers who come from civil life are entitled to the same kind of consideration as that received by officers who are graduates of the Academies; and officers who come from civil life get the same kind of consideration from a selection board composed entirely of officers who are graduates from Annapolis or West Point. But there have been times in the past when such was not the case, and there have been plenty of times in the past when the people back home and the great majority of the officers who have not had the privilege of graduation from one of the Academies did not feel that such officers were getting a fair deal from the selection boards in the Air Corps, in particular. However, I think my remarks are applicable to all the selection boards in all the branches of the service.

Mr. President, I close with this point: It seems to me that in the Air Corps there is a peculiar necessity for providing very clearly that the membership of the selection boards shall reflect, at least in fair proportion, the constitution or constituency of the corps that is being passed upon by those selection boards, because there never will be a time when any more than a very small proportion—almost a negligible percentage—of the flying officers will be graduates of the Academies, unless there is a complete departure from what has been the case up to now.

So I hope we may have the reply of the Senator from Connecticut as to what safeguards are provided as to the selection boards which govern promotions, so that those boards will be better constituted than they have been under the present law, and will function in a much better way than they have in the past.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, let me say that this bill does not apply to Reserve officers who are not on active duty. Reserve officers who are on active duty receive exactly the same "break" under this bill as do the officers in the Regular Army. Furthermore, those who have come up from the ranks, and are not Academy graduates, receive exactly the same treatment under this bill as do the Academy graduates.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in order that it may be perfectly clear, let me inquire whether there is anything in the bill which would require a different condition than this: that the entire membership of the selection boards would be made up or could be made up of officers who were graduates of the Military Academy or the Naval Academy, as the case might be.

Mr. BALDWIN. I answer by saying that we all know that during the recent war a very small percentage of the officers were graduates of the academies. One thing the committee has found out is that there is a very sincere, wholehearted desire on the part of the men who have had the privilege of graduating from the academies, not to set up any distinctions at all.

If in this bill we were to provide that on each selection board there should be so many men who were graduates of the academies and so many men who were not graduates of the academies, then we would preserve, by means of that legislation, what my good friend is so interested in avoiding, namely, a cleavage, something which the graduates of the academies and the officers who come from the National Guard and the Reserves alike are so anxious to avoid. So that is why we put that provision in the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I judge from what the Senator has said, though he has not said it in so many words, that the provisions of the present law are being preserved.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. A short time ago my distinguished friend made reference to the fact that in the old selection boards preference was made in favor of Military Academy men. Of course there were very few selection boards; as I recall, there were none. That is what we are trying to avoid. In this particular measure for the first time we do set up the selection boards. The members must be taken from ranks higher than the ranks of the men who are being considered for advancement. They must be very representative of the different specialties which are involved in the particular promotions.

It seems to me the committee has put in the bill all the safeguards which a sound policy and national welfare and fair play require.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. If I understand his answer, it means that in the matter of setting up the personnel of the selection boards there has been no departure from the wholly unsatisfactory provisions of the present law, which have brought plenty of heartburn, and every Senator on this floor knows that is the case.

The Senator overlooks the special part of my question, which had to do with the Air Corps. Because there are relatively very few Military Academy graduates in the Air Corps, and so many who have not been, there has been a particular feeling in that corps, and I think with some justification, that the officer from the regular Academy got his promotion, got the eagles on his shoulders, and then went on up, long before the time he had acquired anything like the experience, either in flying, or at command, that had been acquired by many who were left below him but who had had more experience and greater ability.

I could name, though I shall not do so, because the officers themselves are not chargeable with the results of a system, many such cases. I recall what happened at a certain Army air base in Florida during the war, when a young colonel who was a graduate of West Point, an estimable chap, who was a fine gentleman, who was a splendid officer, but who did not compare in either experience, flying time, executive ability, engineering knowledge, and skill, who did not compare in any field at all, with many who were under him. He reported as a new commanding officer at one of our air bases. I remember the feeling created. I remember how many there were who felt that an injustice had been done simply because a system which was wrong had been applied in a corps where it was peculiarly wrong because there were so few of the graduates of the Academy in that particular field.

I am not trying to criticize anyone for what happened in the past, though I think there is just ground for criticism. I am trying to bring about a condition under which we will eliminate the possibility for not only as much criticism and as much wrongdoing and as many mistakes of judgment as have been made in the past, but for the many more which will result under the system under which so many more officers, proportionately, will be elevated by selection than has been the case under the present law.

As far as the junior Senator from Florida is concerned, I want to make it plain right now that if I had no further information on this bill at all than this, namely, that there is not one line in the bill with reference to the setting up of the selection boards in any of the corps, but particularly in the new Air Corps, and instead it is proposed to perpetuate and to put upon a much greater scale the possibilities of discrimination which have existed in the past—upon that ground alone I would oppose the bill in its present form, because it could be worked out.

There are a few more questions I want to bring up. One has to do with the members of the Reserves and the National Guard when on active duty. As I understand the Senator from Connecticut—and I think he is exactly right—and from my brief and cursory examination of the law, it seemed to me there was no application of the law to the officers of the civilian ranks, we might say, National Guard officers and Reserve officers, except when they were upon active duty.

They are upon active duty whenever there is any time of crisis. They are on active duty long before the war breaks if we have war—and I am one who hopes we will not ever have one, and that we will do everything in our power to avert it and avoid it.

During the last war there were plenty of National Guard officers, there were plenty of Reserve officers, who felt, and I think many times with justice—and I had a chance to observe them in some degree as they performed—that they were passed over in favor of much less able, much less experienced, much less trained men, because of the system of selectivity and because, I think, of the fact that there was not a voice on the selection board to speak for the Reserve officers and the National Guard officers who were on active duty.

I do not have the figures, perhaps the Senator from Connecticut can give them to me, but I remind the Senator from Connecticut that there are many thousands of Reserve officers still on active duty, under the appropriations which we pass here to protect our Nation and to continue the effort toward national defense, and there will, in the very nature of things, be many thousands of Reserve officers and National Guard officers who will remain on active duty.

I think we might as well admit that when we are making a start on a new system we should profit by the lesson, we should learn under the old one, and set up a system which will be calculated to give greater equity and bring better satisfaction and to bring higher morale than has been possible under the old system.

Mr. President, perhaps I have been a little heated in what I have said. What I have said has come from the depths of a very sincere conviction that we would be making a grave mistake, in this last evening of a session, when we have had to face many problems—and we have worked very hard, and my hat is off to all the other Senators who are present, because they have worked hard—I think we would be making a terrible and tragic mistake if we passed a bill without more than one Member of the Senate having read it, without anyone having a chance to examine the reports of the House committee and of the Senate committee, which I have not had a chance even to see yet, and which, as the Senator from Connecticut has admitted—and the Senator has been responsive and fair, just as I knew he would be—has admitted, and if he has not he may of course take issue with me—that there is no effort to make any change under this new law from the provisions of the old one with reference to the setting up of the selection boards, even though the new system is to reach down very much further in the ranks than was possible under the old. I dare say there is not a Senator on the floor—and I appreciate the presence of so many—who has not had in his own experience and from his own home folks, and from the experience which they had during the war, very definite knowledge that there has been plenty of heartburn and plenty of destroyed morale, and many men coming home after honorable service in the armed forces who have felt, ofttimes with justice, that they had been deprived of their recognition and promotion which their service had deserved, simply because of the fact that they were not represented and their cause was not adequately spoken for in the selection boards, which alone had the authority to put a man's foot one step higher up the ladder of rank.

Mr. President, I shall not longer take the time of the Senate. I believe we will make a grave and tragic mistake if we pass this bill without reading it, and go home to our people, good people, in every State of the Union, and admit that we have passed a bill which, instead of correcting defects which have been talked of in every community in this Nation, have passed a bill which enlarges those defects, and which projects them into a much greater field than has been possible under the present law, which has proven itself to be defective.

I am willing to stay here until next week. I am willing to stay here just as long as may be determined necessary for all of us to have a chance to see the bill and to offer amendments if in our judgment amendments are required, to consult with high ranking officers and civilians, men in whom we have confidence, but to whose judgment we should not defer in this matter, because we are representing the people of the Nation and are responsible to them as well as to those who command and lead our important armed services. I hope we shall defer consideration of the bill. Word has been sent out that we are to adjourn tonight. I think that fact should not alone, by any manner of means, prevent our remaining here long enough to give adequate consideration to this vital matter, if it is thought of sufficient importance to have it enacted into law at this time.

I hope, Mr. President and Senators, that we shall not act, merely because we are tired, merely because we are worn out, merely because we have worked ourselves down perhaps to a point where we are not seeing so clearly as we should, or thinking so effectively as would have been possible under other conditions; merely because we would like to be away and we want to pass the bill—a measure which we have not read, and which affects millions of men now, and will affect many more millions in the future, and which at least, in the humble judgment of one freshman, will perpetuate and enlarge injustices which have already shown themselves to exist in the present law.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I realize it is growing late, and I realize how anxious Senators are to vote. I share that anxiety, but I want to say just a word about the situation which confronts us. I hope it will be an impartial observation in regard to our present situation. I have the utmost respect for the sincerity and the honesty of those who have spoken on both sides of this measure. It is true it is unfortunate that a bill of this importance could not have been brought in sooner, but circumstances have made that obviously impossible.

I want to say this about the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, for whose integrity, ability, and patriotism we all have the greatest respect. I doubt whether there is a Senator who has worked so hard in more diverse capacities and in more varied fields in the Senate than has the Senator from South Dakota. As chairman of the Armed Services Committee he had the obligation to supervise the long and controversial consideration of the unification bill, bringing together the two armed services under one head, in accordance with the recommendation of the President of the United States, made many months ago. In addition to that, the Senator from South Dakota has been chairman of some of the important subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee, which has engrossed his time. With all these duties incumbent upon him, and also with this bill in the offing, which comes as a sort of companion piece to the unification bill, it is amazing that the Senator from South Dakota has been able to devote as much time to these various measures as he has, and to do it with such assiduity, ability, and conscientious performance of duty. I think the Senator from South Dakota is entitled to that statement, because we all realize it is true.

I grant that most of us have not sat down and studied the bill meticulously, but, Mr. President, it is not the first time

the Senate has been required to vote upon bills which it has not examined, word for word, page for page, and sentence by sentence. We have done that throughout this session, with regard to appropriation bills. We do it with regard to tax bills because we have confidence that the committees that have jurisdiction of legislation of various kinds have given meticulous attention and careful study to the measures, and we are bound to a very large degree to rely upon the judgment of the members of the committee, whatever the committee may be, whether it be a committee on appropriations or a committee on taxing, or a committee on naval or military affairs, as it was or as it is now, the Committee on the Armed Services.

I do not in any way question the propriety of the opposition to the bill that has been expressed. Mr. President, I think we have a very good Army and a very good Navy. I think we have some of the outstanding military and naval officers of the world, who demonstrated their capacity in the recent war. We spend millions of dollars every year to maintain the Naval Academy and the Military Academy, in order that we may train men for military and naval service, in order that they may become our military and naval leaders, to the end that we shall not have to go out into the field every time we get into war and call some Cincinnatus to control or to lead the Army and the Navy of the United States.

We spend millions of dollars every year training these men, and yet, as soon as they get above the rank of first lieutenant, we begin to refer to them as "brass hats." I do not like that term. It is a term of opprobrium, and it is intended to be. I do not think it is fair to our men who have gone through our Military and Naval Academies, men who have earned the gratitude and respect and honor of the American people, because they happen to be high-ranking officers, to refer to them as "brass hats," as if that meant that there was some derogation to be attached to them because of the fact they are high-ranking officers. Mr. President, I do not share this sort of contemptuous reference to our military and naval officers. I do not think that putting a uniform on them has robbed them of their human qualities or made them any different from the rest of us, who may have attained high rank in some station or other, whether or not it be outside the ranks of military or naval activity. I do not think it is fair to our high-ranking officers, men who have devoted their lives to the service of their country, to refer to them in any such terms. I never have done so, and I hope I never shall.

I am not seeking to influence any Senator's vote. Personally, I am going to give the benefit of whatever doubt there may be to the Committee on the Armed Services, in the belief that it has conscientiously worked upon this problem in connection with the House, and that the House committee, and the House itself, and our committee have formulated as good a bill as circumstances would permit. I am going to vote for it with the understanding first that if in the meantime defects or mistakes are discovered, we may correct them in the future just as we are trying now to correct mistakes that have arisen out of our experiences in the past.

There is one thing that disturbs me, though, about this matter. I have been running through the bill since the debate started. I have found a number of amendments. I do not know how many amendments have been put in the bill by the committee, but there are quite a number of them. The legislative mechanics now give me some concern; that is, whether we can adopt the amendments and have them agreed to by the House, or whether the House committee has coordinated or cooperated in any way with the Senate committee, so that they understand these amendments that have been adopted by the Senate committee——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. In a moment. So that there is now an understanding between the two committees as to what these amendments are, and whether the House is prepared to act upon them promptly if we adopt them in the Senate.

I now yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], would probably give the same answer that I do. I would say that these amendments were worked out by the joint staff of the House committee and the Senate committee and submitted to both for approval.

Mr. GURNEY rose.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator.

I now yield to the Senator from South Dakota if he wishes to amplify that answer.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, first I desire to thank the Senator from Kentucky for his kind remarks. I may say that I may have done a little bit, but I am justly proud of our committee's accomplishments during the present session of Congress.

Let me say that there are a number of amendments in the bill. It has taken months for the staff of the House committee and the Senate committee to work them out and present them to members of the committees of both Houses. Our committee has studied them. The House committee has studied them. There are in the room now members of the House Armed Services Commitee waiting to see what action we take on the bill. If we place a number of amendments on it which have not been agreed on, of course they will not handle it tonight. But I have talked it over with the House committee members. There is an amendment pending which was offered by the Senator from Connecticut about three lines long which has to do with the Army Engineers. When that is adopted I want to offer one more amendment changing the word "four" to "three". Those are the only two amendments that are not printed in the bill on which we are asking the Senate to act tonight.

Then it is my intention to make an unusual request, because of the number of technical amendments that run through the pages of the bill. I shall ask that the Senate consider the amendments en bloc. I know someone will say that is an unusual request. It is an unusual time. We are trying to adjourn tonight. If that request is agreed to we can get along with the bill. As I understand from the Senator from Ohio, I am then authorized to present the one conference report still remaining, and I know many Senators desire quick action on it; that is the conference report on the civil functions bill.

Have I answered the Senator sufficiently?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. I thank the Senator for the information he has given in reply to my question.

I wish to say one other thing. We are bound to assume that both committees of the House and Senate have worked this legislation out in cooperation with the heads of the departments, the Army and the Navy. I happen to know that it has been worked out in consultation with the retiring Secretary of the Navy, who has just been nominated today to be Secretary of National Defense, whose nomination I fervently hope will be confirmed before we adjourn the session. He has been one of the ablest Secretaries of the Navy in the history of the United States, and I think we all agree to that.

It has been worked out in cooperation with the retiring Secretary of War, the Honorable Robert P. Patterson, who has just retired, and who has been one of the ablest Secretaries of War we have had.

The same is true with respect to the present Secretary of War, Mr. Royall, whose nomination we confirmed the other day.

It has been worked out in cooperation with the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, the Chief of Military Operations, the Chief of Naval Operations, and other naval and military officers.

I think I have a right to say that the bill and its progress is not altogether unfamiliar to the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States under the Constitution—the President of the United States. He feels that it is an improvement over the present law and under the system which has existed heretofore.

Under all these circumstances, Mr. President, I feel it my duty to support the bill, and I shall vote for it when it comes to a vote.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I should like to be able to vote for the bill, and therefore want to propound a question either to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] or the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY]. I recall that a member of the professional staff of the Senate Appropriations Committee several weeks ago was assigned to make a study of officer personnel of the War Department. The officials of the War Department were most cooperative in making data available to the staff, and finally the conclusions which were reached were somewhat shocking to me.

I want to ask a question of the members of the committee as to what effect the proposed legislation will have upon the situation which obviously exists in the War Department if we are to rely upon the conclusions reached by the member of the staff of the Appropriations Committee who made an extensive and thorough study, research, and everything that goes with it.

This is the conclusion reached:

The War Department's commissioned officer personnel policies will needlessly cost the Nation's taxpayers $250,000,000 during this fiscal year. This study disclosed that the excessive cost resulted from a higher proportion of commissioned officers than heretofore and failure to downgrade officers from the high temporary ranks they attained during the war. Officer strength from 1922 to 1940 averaged 9.3 percent of total military strength. During the war it dropped to as low as 6.7 percent, but is scheduled to level off at 13.6 percent during this fiscal year.

This current rate is as high as the officer strength was during the war years.

An increase in officers to 10 percent could be justified by the Air Force's need for a greater proportion of officers; with this percentage as a base, the Army still has 38,649 more officers than should be required, or 132,809 instead of 94,160. Using a conservatively-estimated cost average of $5,500 per officer and considering the preponderance of senior ranks, anyone can readily see that the extra cost approaches a quarter of a billion dollars for this year.

Now I should like to know what effect the bill will have upon this particular personnel status in the War Department. I think we have a right to know. We all are proud of the efficiency of the War Department. We have confidence in the integrity of the officers. Yet the data submitted by the War Department to the professional staff of the Appropriations Committee indicates that this conclusion is based upon the facts.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I will say in answer to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Idaho, that in my opening remarks I pointed out that it would require considerable time for the provisions of the bill to come into general operation. Take the general officers, for example. As I remember, there are over 20 four-star generals in the Army. The bill would reduce that number to nine. It would reduce the number of general officers in the Army to 75 percent, that is three-quarters of 1 percent of all the personnel. It would reduce proportionately all the other officer personnel.

One reason why it is going to cost so much for officers next year is because a long time ago we have not done the thing provided by the bill to be done. We have a large number of officers. Under the terms and provisions of the bill they will be retired, for one cause or another, either because they have reached a certain grade or because they are not approved for advancement under the selective system. So I would say to my distinguished friend that one of the main things the bill will accomplish is the reduction in the number of officer personnel of high rank, and at the same time it will open opportunities for officer personnel of the younger ranks whom we are losing very rapidly now, and those are the men we are very anxious to keep in the armed services.

Mr. DWORSHAK. If the legislation is passed we can look for a decided improvement for the current fiscal year, so far as the officer personnel is concerned?

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, as promised in the colloquy with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], I now offer the amendment reducing the number of four-star admirals in the Navy by one. It appears on page 226 of the bill. I move that in line 20 the word "four" be stricken out, and that there be inserted in lieu thereof the word "three."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I now move that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in the first place I should like briefly and kindly say to the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] that he, and he alone, has injected into this debate the reference to so-called "brass hats." So far as the junior Senator from Florida is concerned, no such term, no such thought, and no such inference was injected into the debate. We all know of the very fine service and the unexampled leadership that we have had from the officers of the Regular Establishment. At the same time, it is our duty, and not theirs, to determine what law shall govern the personnel, the millions of men who are serving and will have to serve in the armed forces.

Mr. President, I should like to mention one further point, if I may have the attention of Senators——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not remotely or by inference attribute to the Senator from Florida or to any other Senator any reference to the designation "brass hats." However, we all know that it is a common term, used in conversation and in newspapers and speeches. It is that tendency, that attitude, which I deplore; but I have no reference whatever to what the Senator from Florida or any other Senator had said in regard to this measure.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad that that term is not used in the conversations of the Senator from Kentucky, as it is not used in my conversations.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas never used such a term in his remarks. He does not use it privately or publicly. The insinuation of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] to that effect is wholly unwarranted.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I did not insinuate that the Senator from Texas had used that term. I did not hear him use it. I was talking about the general run of conversation and comment which we hear all the time, and the use of that term in such conversation and comment. I do not think anyone has escaped it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I was referring to the debate on the floor of the Senate. I never heard any Senator use it except the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not say that any Senator had used it.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Kentucky introduced the term.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am glad that it appears that the Senate—at least so far as Senators who have spoken on the subject are concerned—is unanimous in its feeling that there is no such thing as "brass hats."

I wish to call attention to one further aspect of the bill. Senators may ignore it if they wish. It is an aspect with respect to which I have heard no discussion. Perhaps there was some that I missed, because I was trying to check on the provisions of the bill.

The bill not only provides for the promotion of officers in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, but it also provides for their elimination. The title of the bill is "To provide for the promotion and elimination of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes."

I shall not discuss this subject at length, but I feel that if changes from the present law are proposed in this bill on the important subject of how commissioned officers of the armed forces terminate their services in the armed forces, either by resignation or retirement, or by any of the less agreeable methods, I think the Senate has a right to hear those changes, and I hope the distinguished Senator who is piloting the bill will see fit to give us some information, at least, on that question. I think I speak not only for myself, but for every other Senator, when I remind the Senate that it is not only on the subject of promotions that we have had trouble during the two great World Wars, but also on the subject of terminations or "elimination," as the term is used in the title of the bill. I confess that I have had no opportunity to pursue that subject. I am unable to give any information to the Senate upon what may be the provisions of the bill on the subject of elimination of officers. I think the Senate is entitled to hear whether there are changes, and, if so, what those changes may be, from the present law.

Mr. President, the further we go the more clearly it appears to me that no one knows anything about this truly vital measure. For that reason, and without intending to debate my motion in the slightest, I now move that the Senate recommit the bill to the Committee on

Armed Services. I think the bill is entitled to have greater study than has been possible. I believe that Members of the Senate are entitled to have more information than is available. I think the people of the Nation will have a great deal of respect for Members of the Senate if we insist upon knowing something about this vital question before we cast our votes, by which alone it can become law. Therefore, my motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida to recommit the bill to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida to recommit the bill to the Committee on Armed Services.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] to agree to the committee amendments en bloc.

The motion was agreed to.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 3, after "Sec. 431", to strike out "Definition of the word 'act'", and insert "Computation of retired pay";

On page 3, after "Sec. 433", to strike out "Acts repealed", and insert "Amendment of the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947";

On page 3, to insert:

"SEC. 434. Amendments to the act of April 16, 1947 (Public Law 36, 80th Congress)";

On page 3, to insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 435. Special provision for nurses";

On page 3, to insert a new section 436, as follows:

,"SEC. 436. Acts repealed";

On page 6, line 12, after the word "of", to strike out "chief" and insert "commissioned";

On page 6, line 16, after the word "sections", to strike out "12" and insert "112", and in the same line, after the word "and", to strike out "13" and insert "113";

Under the subhead "Distribution of Officers", on page 6, line 20, to change the section number from 3 to 103;

On page 7, line 25, after the word "exceed", to strike out "ninteen" and insert "nineteen";

On page 8, line 23, after the words "as of", to insert "the date of approval of this act and thereafter as of"; on page 9, line 11, after the word "subsection", to strike out "7 (b)" and insert "107 (c)"; in line 21, after the words "as of", to insert "the date of approval of this act and thereafter as of"; on page 10, line 15, after the word "determination", to strike out the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That officers who elect to continue service on the active list in the grade of lieutenant pursuant to the authority of subsection (g) of section 12 of this act shall be carried as excess numbers in the grade of lieutenant, and the authorized number of officers in the grade of lieutenant, and in the combined grades of lieutenant (junior grade) and ensign, shall be correspondingly reduced in the proportion of one out of the grade of lieutenant to two out of the combined grades of lieutenant (junior grade) and ensign; the authorized number of limited-duty officers in the line in the grade of lieutenant, and in the combined grades of lieutenant (junior grade) and ensign, shall be computed on the basis of the authorized number of line officers in these grades before the foregoing reduction is applied"; and on page 11, line 8, after the word "to", to insert "titles I through IV";

Under the subhead "Promotion by Selection; Retention of Rear Admirals", on page 11, line 19, to change the section number from 4 to 104;

On page 12, line 3, after the word "subsection", to strike out "7" and insert "107", and in line 5, after the word "by", to insert "titles I through IV of";

Under the subhead "Selection Boards", on page 12, line 8, to change the section number from 5 to 105; in line 19, after the word "lieutenant", to strike out the comma and "and for the recommendation of lieutenants for continuation on the active list,", and on page 13, line 2, after the word "designation", to insert "and classification";

On page 13, line 16, after the word "grade", to insert a comma and "or for the consideration of officers for continuation on the active list in the same grade";

Under the subhead "Oath for Members of Selection Boards", on page 13, line 23, to change the section number from 6 to 106, and in line 24, after the word "section", to strike out "5" and insert "105";

Under the subhead "Eligibility of Officers for Consideration by Selection Boards", on page 14, line 5, to change the section number from 7 to 107;

On page 15, line 11, after the word "service", to insert "or who will attain the age of sixty-two years";

On page 16, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "2" and insert "102";

On page 16, after line 15, to strike out:

"(e) Lieutenants not restricted in the performance of duty holding permanent appointments in the Regular Navy in the grade of ensign or above who have first failed of selection for promotion to lieutenant commander in the immediately preceding year, and who are not recommended for promotion by the selection board convened for the purpose of recommending officers for promotion to lieutenant commander in the current year, shall be eligible for consideration by such board for recommendation for continuation on the active list";

Under the subhead "Information to be furnished selection boards", on page 17, line 2, to change the section number from 8 to 108;

On page 22, line 7, after the word "subsection", to strike out "12" and insert "112";

Under the subhead "Duties of selection boards", on page 25, line 4, to change the section number from 9 to 109; in line 9, after the word "section", to strike out "8" and insert "108", and on page 26, line 8, after the word "subsection", to strike out "11" and insert "111";

On page 27, line 2, after the word "section", to strike out "8" and insert "108";

On page 27, line 11, after the word "section", strike out "8" and insert "108";

On page 27, after line 11, to strike out:

"(d) From among those lieutenants who are eligible for consideration for continuation on the active list the board shall recommend for such continuation such officers as it considers qualified for continued service on the active list in the grade of lieutenant";

On page 27, line 17, to change the subsection letter from (c) to (d);

On page 27, line 23, to change the subsection letter from (f) to (e);

On page 28, line 4, to change the subsection letter from (g) to (f);

Under the subhead "Reports of selection boards", on page 28, line 12, to change the section number from 10 to 110; in line 16, after the word "section", to strike out "8" and insert "108"; in line 21, after the word "subsection" to strike out "9" and insert "109"; in line 25, after the word "section", to strike out "9" and insert "109", and on page 29, line 7, after the word "list", to strike out "The report of the board convened to recommend lieutenants for continuation on the active list shall certify that, in the opinion of at least two-thirds of the acting members, the officers therein recommended are selected as qualified for continued service on the active list in the grade of lieutenant";

On page 29, line 23, after the word "purpose", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso "*And provided further*, That in case any lieutenant recommended by the board for continuation on the active list be not acceptable to the President, the board shall be informed of the name of such officer, and such officer shall be held for all purposes as not having been so recommended for such continuation by the board";

On page 32, line 18, after the word "years", to strike out "actual"; in line 19, after the word "sea", to insert "or foreign"; in line 21, after the word "sea", to insert "or foreign"; in line 24, after the word "only", to strike out the comma and "nor to officers of the Naval Reserve"; and in line 24, after the amendment just above stated, to insert: a colon and the following proviso: "*And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy shall determine the types of duty which may be counted for the purpose of this subsection";

Under the subhead "Retirement of Officers Below the Grade of Rear Admiral", on page 33, line 5, to change the section number from 12 to 112; in line 8, after the word "subsection", to strike out "11 (c)" and insert "111 (c)"; in line 19, after the word "subsection", to strike out "11" and insert "111 (c)"; and on page 34, line 14, after the word "then", to strike out "currnt" and insert "current";

On page 34, line 19, after the word "section", to strike out "11" and insert "111";

On page 35, line 7, before the word "in", to insert "following the month";

On page 35, line 14, after the word "section", to strike out "11" and insert "111";

On page 37, line 17, after the word "retirement", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "*And provided further*, That nothing in this subsection shall be held to reduce retired rank or pay to which an officer would be entitled under other provision of law";

On page 37, line 25, after the word "subsection", to strike out "9 (f)" and insert "109 (f)"; on page 38, line 3, after the word "subsection", to strike out "9 (f)" and insert "109 (f)"; in line 7, after the word "subsection", to strike out "2 (d)" and insert "102 (d)"; and in line 12, after the word "payment", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That lieutenants whose names are included in the approved report of a selection board convened to recommend lieutenants for continuation on the active list shall have the option of being discharged as provided in this subsection or of continuing on the active list until they complete 20 years' total commissioned service as determined in accordance with section 2 of this act, at which time they shall be retired with the rank of lieutenant commander and with retired pay computed as prescribed in subsection (f) of section 12 of this act";

On page 39, line 5, after the word "the", to strike out "grade" and insert "rank", and in the same line, after the word "selected", to strike out the comma and "unless entitled to higher retired rank or pay under other provisions of law";

On page 39, after line 12, to insert:

"(j) Nothing in this section shall be held to reduce the retired rank or pay to which an officer would be entitled under other provisions of law";

Under the subhead "Retirement of officers above the grade of captain", on page 40, line 10, after the word "subsection", to strike out "8" and insert "108", and in line 21, after the word "the", to insert "then";

Under the subhead "Marine Corps", on page 43, after line 10, to strike out:

"(b) Of the authorized number of commissioned officers above the grade of colonel, there is authorized 50 percent in the grade of major general and 50 percent in the grade of brigadier general: *Provided*, That except in time of war or national emergency declared after the effective date of this act, the total number of such officers shall not exceed 36, of which number not exceeding 13 shall be allowed in the grades of major general and above, including the officer serving as Commandant with the rank of general, those holding the rank of lieutenant general pursuant to the provisions of section 415 of this act and the head of the Supply Department; and the remainder shall be allowed in the grade of brigadier general, including those officers carried by law as additional numbers in that grade";

And in lieu thereof, to insert:

"(b) Of the authorized number of commissioned officers above the grade of colonel who are not restricted in the performance of duty, not more than 50 percent may be major generals and the remainder brigadier generals: *Provided*, That after July 1, 1948, except in time of war or national emergency declared after the effective date of this act, the number of such officers shall not exceed 32, of which not exceeding 12 may be major generals";

On page 44, line 22, after the word "sea", to insert "or foreign";

On page 45, line 5, after the word "the", where it occurs the first time, to insert "acting", and in line 14, after the word "subsection", to strike out "5" and insert "105";

On page 47, line 3, after the word "subsection", to strike out "11" and insert "111", and in the same line, after the numerals "423", to insert "(b)";

Under the subhead "Effective Date of Title I", on page 54, line 24, to change the section number from 16 to 116; in line 24, after the word "sections", to strike out "1, 2, 3, 4," and insert "101, 102", and in line 25, after the word "distribution", to strike out "section 14" and insert "sections 103 and 114";

Under the heading "Title II—permanent provisions relating to officers of the staff corps of the Navy—permanent status of title II," on page 55, line 13, after the word "of," to strike out "lieutenants" and insert "lieutenant";

Under the subhead "Definitions," on page 55, line 21, after the word "Engineer," to strike out "and," and in the same line, after the word "Dental," to insert "Medical Service, and Nurse";

On page 56, line 23, after the word "of", to strike out "chief" and insert "commissioned";

At the top of page 57, to insert:

"(2) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection, the number of years' service to be credited to each lieutenant (junior grade) of the Nurse Corps shall, for the purpose of this title in regard to separation from the active list, be based on her total active service under an appointment as a commissioned officer in the Nurse Corps of the Navy or the reserve component thereof and all active service in the Nurse Corps and the Nurse Corps Reserve abolished by the Act of April 16, 1947 (Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress), shall for this purpose, be regarded as commissioned service in the Navy";

On page 57, after line 11, to insert:

"(3) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, an officer commissioned in the Medical Service Corps pursuant to the Act of April 18, 1946 (Public Law 347, Seventy-ninth Congress) shall, for the purpose of this title in respect to separation from the active list, be deemed to have total commissioned service equivalent to that of his line officer running mate";

Under the subhead "Distribution of officers", on page 58, line 3, after the word "Corps", where it occurs the first time to insert "Chaplain Corps"; in line 10, after the words "next", to strike out "natural"; in line 12, after the word "That", to strike out "there may be not to exceed four rear admirals in the Dental Corps, and not to exceed two rear admirals in the Chaplain Corps;"; in line 17, after the words "Supply Corps", to insert "Chaplain Corps"; in line 17, after the amendment last above stated, to strike out the word "and"; in line 18, after the word "Corps", where it occurs the first time, to strike out "and Dental Corps"; in line 19, after the word "thirteen", to strike out "and" and insert "two"; in the same line, after the word "four", to insert "and four", and in the same line, after the word "respectively", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That the number of captains in the Medical Service Corps and the number of commanders and lieutenant commanders in the Nurse Corps shall not exceed 2 percent, seven-tenths of 1 percent, and 1.6 percent, respectively, of the officers in the corps concerned on the active list of the Navy at any one time";

On page 59, after "(b)", to strike out "To determine the authorized number of officers in the grade of rear admiral in the Medical Corps, Supply Corps, Civil Engineer Corps, and Dental Corps, respectively, as provided in this section, computation shall be made by the Secretary of the Navy as of January 1 of each year, and the resulting number in the grade of rear admiral in each such corps, as so computed, shall be held and considered for all purposes as the authorized number of officers in the grade of rear admiral in each such corps and shall not be varied between computations" and insert "To determine the authorized number of officers in the grade of rear admiral in the Medical Corps, Supply Corps, Chaplain Corps, Civil Engineer Corps, and Dental Corps, respectively, and the authorized number of captains in the Medical Service Corps and the authorized number of commanders and lieutenant commanders in the Nurse Corps, as provided in this section, computations shall be made by the Secretary of the Navy as of the date of approval of this act and as of January 1 of each year thereafter; the resulting number in the grade of rear admiral in each corps in which such grade is authorized, as so computed, shall be held and considered for all purposes as the authorized number of officers in the grade of rear admiral in each such corps and shall not be varied between computations; the resulting number in the grade of captain in the Medical Service Corps and in each of the grades of commander and lieutenant commander in the Nurse Corps, as so computed, shall be held and considered as the authorized number of officers in the grade of the corps concerned until a subsequent computation shall be made";

Under the subhead "Promotion by Selection", on page 60, line 13, after "Sec. 204", to strike out "(a)";

Under the subhead "Selection Boards", on page 60, line 25, after the word "commander", to insert "except with respect to officers of the Medical Service Corps and of the Nurse Corps"; on page 61, line 5, after the word "lieutenant", to strike out "and for recommendation of lieutenants of the Supply Corps and the Civil Engineers Corps for continuation on the active list", and in line 7, after the amendment last above stated, to insert "except with respect to officers of the Medical Service Corps and of the Nurse Corps";

On page 61, line 18, after the word "membership", to strike out: "No officer may be a member of two successive selection boards for the consideration of officers for promotion to the same grades";

On page 61, after line 20, to insert:

"(c) Boards for the recommendation of officers of the Medical Service Corps and of the Nurse Corps for promotion to grades above lieutenant (junior grade) shall be composed of not less than six or more than 9 officers above the grade of commander on the active or retired list of the Medical Corps: *Provided*, That in case there be not a sufficient number of officers of the Medical Corps legally or physically capacitated to serve on such a selection board, officers of the line of the active list of the grade of captain may be detailed to duty on such board to constitute the required minimum membership";

On page 62, after line 6, to insert:

"(d) No officer may be a member of two successive selection boards for the consideration of officers for promotion to the same grade";

On page 62, at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "(c) These boards" and insert "(e) The boards prescribed in this section", and in line 15, after the word "direct", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That a selection board to recommend officers of the Medical Service Corps for promotion to the grade of captain or officers of the Nurse Corps for promotion to the grade of commander or lieutenant commander shall be convened only if there exists a vacancy in the grade concerned or if the Secretary of the Navy estimates or determines that a vacancy will occur in the ensuing 12-month period";

Under the subhead "Eligibility of Officers for Consideration by Selection Boards", on page 63, before the word "Captains" to insert "(a)"; and in line 15, after the word "service", to insert "or who will attain the age of 62 years";

On page 63, line 19, after the word "grade", to insert a comma and "except captains in the Medical Service Corps and commanders in the Nurse Corps"; in line 24, after the word "Dental", to insert "Medical Service", and at the top of page 64, line 1, to insert "and officers of the Nurse Corps in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade)";

On page 64, after line 19, to strike out:

"(d) Lieutenants of the Supply Corps and the Civil Engineer Corps not restricted in the performance of duty holding permanent appointments in the Regular Navy in the grade of ensign or above who have first failed of selection for promotion to lieutenant commander in the immediately preceding year, and who are not recommended for promotion by the selection board convened for the purpose of recommending officers for promotion to lieutenant commander in the current year, shall be eligible for consideration by such board for recommendation for continuation on the active list";

Under the subhead "Information to be furnished selection boards," on page 65, line 22, after the word "commander," to insert "except with respect to the promotion of officers of the Medical Service Corps to the grade of captain and of officers of the Nurse Corps to the grade of commander";

On page 67, line 21, after the word "Corps," to insert "Civil Engineer Corps, and Nurse Corps to the grade of lieutenant commander," and in line 22, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "and Civil Engineer Corps, not restricted in the performance of duty, to the grades of lieutenant commander";

On page 69, after line 8, to insert:

"(j) The number to be furnished the board in respect to the promotion of officers of the Medical Service Corps to the grade of captain shall be determined by the Secretary

of the Navy as of the date of the convening of the board and shall be equal to the difference between the allowed number of officers in that grade and the actual number of officers therein plus the number of officers estimated to be separated from that grade during the ensuing 12-month period and minus the number of commanders then on the promotion list";

On page 69, after line 13, to insert:

"(k) The number to be furnished the board in respect to the promotion of officers of the Nurse Corps to the grades of commander and lieutenant commander shall be determined by the Secretary of the Navy as of the date of the convening of the board and shall for each grade be equal to the difference between the allowed number of officers in the grade and the actual number of officers therein plus the number of officers estimated to be separated from the grade during the ensuing 12-month period and minus the number of officers of the next lower grade then on the promotion list";

On page 70, after line 3, to insert:

"(l) The number to be furnished the board in respect to the promotion of officers of the Nurse Corps to the grade of lieutenant shall be determined by the Secretary of the Navy as of the date of the convening of the board and shall be equal to the number of lieutenants (junior grade) in that corps in and senior to the promotion zone minus the number of lieutenants (junior grade) then on the promotion list";

Under the subhead "Duties of Selection Boards", on page 71, line 2, after "(junior grade)", to insert "in the Supply and Civil Engineer Corps or if of the grade of lieutenant in the Nurse Corps"; in line 4, after the word "promotion", to strike out "if of the Supply Corps or Civil Engineer Corps, or, if of any other corps"; in line 5, after the amendment last above stated, to insert "if of the grade of lieutenant or lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Corps, Dental Corps, Chaplain Corps, Civil Engineer Corps, or Medical Service Corps, or of the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Nurse Corps", and in line 20, after the word "grade", to insert "except with respect to lieutenant commander and lieutenant of the Nurse Corps";

On page 72, after line 15, to strike out:

"(c) From among those lieutenants of the Supply Corps and Civil Engineer Corps who are eligible for consideration for continuation on the active list the board shall recommend for such continuation such officers as it considers qualified for continued service on the active list in the grade of lieutenant";

Under the subhead "Reports of Selection Boards," on page 73, line 20, after the word "lieutenant", to strike out "commander or above, or if designated for limited duty in grades above ensign, are, subject to the limitations prescribed in subsection 209 (a) of this title, selected as the best fitted to assume the duties of the next higher grade, and if of the grade of lieutenant or lieutenant (junior grade), are, if of the Supply Corps or Civil Engineer Corps, selected as best fitted, subject to the limitations prescribed in subsection 209 (a) of this title, and, if of any other corps, selected as"; and insert "commander or above, if of the grade of lieutenant or lieutenant (junior grade) in the Supply Corps or Civil Engineer Corps, or if of the grade of lieutenant in the Nurse Corps are, subject to the limitations prescribed in subsection 209 (a) of this title, selected as the best fitted to assume the duties of the next higher grade, and, if of the grade of lieutenant or lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Corps, Chaplain Corps, Dental Corps, or Medical Service Corps, or if of the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Nurse Corps, are selected as", and on page 74, line 20, after the word "list", to strike out "The report of the board convened to recommend lieutenants for continuation on the active list shall certify that, in the opinion of at least two-thirds of the acting members, the officers therein recommended are selected as qualified for continued service on the active list in the grade of lieutenant.";

On page 75, line 11, after the word "purpose", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "*And provided further*, That in case any lieutenant recommended by the board for continuation on the active list be not acceptable to the President, the board shall be informed of the name of such officer, and such officer shall be held for all purposes as not having been so recommended for such continuation by the board";

Under the subhead "Promotion of officers; precedence; running mates", on page 75, line 23, after the word "officer", to insert "except a commander of the Medical Service Corps or a lieutenant commander or lieutenant of the Nurse Corps", and on page 76, line 7, after the word "and", to insert "except officers of the Medical Service Corps promoted to the grade of captain and officers of the Nurse Corps promoted to the grades of commander and lieutenant commander";

On page 76, after line 12, to insert:

"(2) Promotions to fill vacancies in the grade of captain in the Medical Service Corps and to the grades of commander and lieutenant commander in the Nurse Corps shall be made from among officers whose names appear on the promotion list for the grade concerned. When so promoted each such officer shall have the same date of rank which has been, or in due course will be, given the line officer who is to be his or her running mate in the grade to which promoted, but no increased pay or allowances shall accrue to any such officer by virtue of his promotion prior to the date of occurrence of the vacancy which he is promoted to fill or prior to the date of his selection for promotion, whichever shall be later";

On page 77, line 8, after the word "is", to strike out "promoted but no increased pay or allowances shall accrue to such officer prior to the date of occurrence of the vacancy which he is promoted to fill", and insert "promoted", and in line 11, after the amendment just above stated to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That if such running mate shall not have been promoted, the staff officer shall be given as his date of rank the date of the occurrence of the vacancy which he is promoted to fill until such running mate shall have been promoted to the grade of rear admiral, at which time the staff officer shall be given a new commission with the same date of rank given to such running mate: *And provided further*, That each staff officer promoted to the grade of rear admiral shall be entitled to the pay and allowances of that grade only from the date of occurrence of the vacancy which he is promoted to fill";

On page 78, line 22, after the word "engineers", to strike out "and", and in line 23, after the word "officers", to insert "(g) officers of the Medical Service Corps, and (h) officers of the Nurse Corps";

On page 79, line 1, after the word "the", to strike out "enactment" and insert "approval";

Under the subhead "Retirement of officers below the grade of rear admiral", on page 83, line 23, after the word "Captains", to insert "of the Medical Service Corps shall be placed on the retired list on June 30 of the fiscal year in which they complete 31 years of total commissioned service, and captains of each other corps";

On page 85, line 24, after the word "occur", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That commanders in the Medical Service Corps shall not be involuntarily retired by reason of failure of selection for promotion until June 30 of the fiscal year in which they shall have completed 30 years of total commissioned service";

On page 86, line 6, before the word "in" to insert "following the month";

On page 86, line 10, after the word "duty", to insert "and lieutenant commanders of the Nurse Corps", and in line 19, after the word "duty", to insert "and lieutenant commanders of the Nurse Corps";

On page 88, line 21, after the word "retirement," to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "*And provided further*, That nothing in this subsection shall be held to reduce the retired pay to which an officer would be entitled under other provisions of law";

On page 88, line 25, after "(junor grade)", to insert "except lieutenants of the Nurse Corps", and on page 89, in line 17, after the word "payment", to strike out the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That lieutenants whose names are included in the approved report of a selection board convened to recommend lieutenants for continuation on the active list shall have the option of being discharged as provided in this subsection or of continuing on the active list until they complete 20 years' total commissioned service as determined in accordance with section 202 of this act, at which time they shall be retired with the rank of lieutenant commander and with retired pay computed as prescribed in subsection (f) of section 212 of this act:";

On page 90, after line 16, to insert:

"(j) Nothing in this section shall be held to reduce the retired rank or pay to which an officer would be entitled under other provisions of law";

Under the heading "Title III—Terminable Provisions Relating to All Officers of the Navy on Active Duty—Definitions", on page 96, line 21, after the words "Marine Corps", to insert "except in the Nurse Corps of the Regular Navy";

On page 98, line 4, after the word "authority", to strike out "of subsection (c)";

On page 99, line 15, after the word "sections", to strike out "212" and insert "312", and in the same line, after the word "and", to strike out "213" and insert "313";

Under the subhead "Distribution of Officers", on page 100, line 17, after the word "above" to insert "exclusive of fleet admirals";

On page 101, line 15, after the words "Supply Corps", to insert "Chaplain Corps"; in line 23, after the word "further", to strike out "That there may be not to exceed two rear admirals in the Chaplain Corps", and in line 25, after the amendment last above stated, to insert "That the number of captains in the Medical Service Corps and the number of commanders and lieutenant commanders in the Nurse Corps shall not exceed 2 percent, 0.7 of 1 percent, and 1.6 percent, respectively, of the officers in the corps concerned serving on active duty at any one time";

On page 102, line 10, after the words "as of", to insert "the date of approval of this act and thereafter as of"; in line 14, after the word "shall", to insert "subject to the provisions of subsection (k) of this section"; in line 24, after the words "as of", to insert "the date of approval of this act and thereafter as of"; and on page 103, line 15, after the words "*Provided further*", to strike out "That officers who elect to continue service on the active list in the grade of lieutenant pursuant to the authority of subsection (h) of section 312 of this act shall be carried as excess numbers in the grade of lieutenant, and the authorized number of officers in the grade of lieutenant, and in the combined grades of lieutenant (junior grade) and ensign, shall

be correspondingly reduced in the proportion of one out of the grade of lieutenant to two out of the combined grades of lieutenant (junior grade) and ensign; the authorized number of limited duty officers in the line in the grade of lieutenant and in the combined grades of lieutenant (junior grade) and ensign, shall be computed on the basis of the authorized number of line officers in these grades before the foregoing reduction is applied: *And provided further*,";

On page 104, after line 12, to strike out:

"(h) To determine the authorized number of staff officers in the grade of rear admiral in the Medical Corps, Supply Corps, Civil Engineer Corps, and Dental Corps, respectively, as provided in this section, computations shall be made by the Secretary of the Navy as of January 1 of each year, and the resulting number in the grade of rear admiral in each such corps as so computed shall be held and considered for all purposes as the authorized number of officers in the grade of rear admiral in each such corps and shall not be varied between such computations."

And in lieu thereof to insert:

"(h) To determine the authorized number of officers in the grade of rear admiral in the Medical Corps, Supply Corps, Chaplain Corps, Civil Engineer Corps, and Dental Corps, respectively, and the authorized number of captains in the Medical Service Corps and the authorized number of commanders and lieutenant commanders in the Nurse Corps, as provided in this section, computations shall be made by the Secretary of the Navy as of the date of approval of this act and as of January 1 of each year thereafter; the resulting number in the grade of rear admiral in each corps in which such grade is authorized, as so computed, shall, subject to the provisions of subsection (k) of this section, be held and considered for all purposes as the authorized number of officers in the grade of rear admiral in each such corps and shall not be varied between computations; the resulting number in the grade of captain in the Medical Service Corps and in each of the grades of commander and lieutenant commander in the Nurse Corps, as so computed, shall, subject to the provisions of subsection (k) of this section, be held and considered as the authorized number of officers in the grade of the corps concerned until a subsequent computation shall be made";

On page 106, line 11, before the words "of title", to strike out "3" and insert "103"; in line 14, after the word "line", to strike out "and in each staff corps"; in line 16, after the word "ensign", to insert "and in each grade in a staff corps where computations are prescribed to determine the authorized number"; in line 19, after the word "making", to strike out "such" and insert "the"; in line 20, after the word "computations", to insert "prescribed by subsections (g) and (h) of this section"; in line 21, after "(junior grade)", to strike out the comma and "in the line or in any staff corps"; in line 22, after the word "number", to insert "of officers"; in line 23, after the word "the", to strike out "authorized" and insert "computed"; in the same line, after the word "officers", to strike out "which may serve under temporary appointment therein", and insert "for that grade"; in line 25, after the word "the", where it occurs the last time, to strike out "authorized number may be reduced accordingly" and insert "lesser number shall be held and considered to be the authorized number for that grade"; on page 107, line 3, after the word "reduction", to strike out "may be"; in line 4, after the word "in", to strike out "the next" and insert "any", and in line 5, after the word "grade", to insert "or grades";

Under the subhead "Redistribution; lineal lists; retention of rear admirals", on page 108, line 14, after the word "appointment", to insert "except officers serving with the rank of rear admiral without appointment to that grade or rank shall be placed upon such list in accordance with the grade and precedence which they would hold were they not serving with the rank of rear admiral";

On page 111, line 1, after the word "subsection", to insert the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That officers designated for engineering duty, aeronautical engineering duty, or special duty who solely by reason of the limitation of subsection 103 (b) are not permanently appointed to and regularly commissioned in the grade of rear admiral may be permanently appointed to and regularly commissioned in the grade of captain:";

On page 118, line 6, after the word "principles", to insert "except with respect to officers of the Nurse Corps";

On page 121, line 16, after the word "corps", to insert "(2) the number of captains which may be appointed in the Medical Service Corps, and (3) the number of commanders and lieutenant commanders which may be appointed in the Nurse Corps,";

On page 122, line 5, after the word "subsection", to strike out "(h)" and insert "(i)"; in line 15, after the word "subsection", to strike out "(h)" and insert "(i)"; on page 125, line 19, after the word "upon", to insert "(1)", and in line 21, after the word "corps", to insert "(2) the number of captains which may be temporarily appointed in the Medical Service Corps, and (3) the number of commanders and lieutenant commanders which may be temporarily appointed in the Nurse Corps",

On page 127, line 2, after the word "who", to strike out "were" and insert "are";

On page 128, line 8, after the words "fiscal year at", to strike out "lest" and insert "least", and in line 10, after the word "section", to strike out "2" and insert "102";

Under the subhead "Selection Boards", on page 129, line 5, after the word "lieutenant", to strike out "and for the recommendation of lieutenants for continuation on the active list,", and in line 13, after the word "designation", to insert "and classification";

On page 130, line 3, after the word "grade", to insert "or for the consideration of officers for continuation on the active list in the same grade";

On page 130, line 16, after the word "commander", to insert "except with respect to officers of the Medical Service Corps and of the Nurse Corps"; in line 21, after the word "lieutenant", to strike out "and for the recommendation of lieutenants for continuation on the active list", and insert "except with respect to officers of the Medical Service Corps and of the Nurse Corps";

On page 131, line 9, after the word "membership", to strike out "No officer may be a member of two successive selection boards for the consideration of officers for promotion to the same grades";

On page 131, after line 11, to insert:

"(3) Boards for the recommendation of officers of the Medical Service Corps and of the Nurse Corps for temporary promotion to grades above lieutenant (junior grade) shall be composed of not less than 6 nor more than 9 officers above the grade of commander on the active or retired list of the Medical Corps: *Provided*, That in case there be not a sufficient number of officers of the Medical Corps legally or physically capacitated to serve on such a selection board, officers of the line of the active list of the grade of captain may be detailed to duty on such board to constitute the required minimum membership";

On page 131, after line 22, to insert:

"(4) No officer may be a member of two successive selection boards for the consideration of officers for promotion to the same grade, or for the consideration of officers for continuation on the active list in the same grade";

On page 132, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "(3) These", and insert "(5) The"; in the same line, after the word "boards", to insert "prescribed in subsection (b) of this section", and in line 9, after the word "direct", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That a selection board to recommend officers of the Medical Service Corps for temporary promotion to the grade of captain or officers of the Nurse Corps for temporary promotion to the grade of commander or lieutenant commander shall be convened only if there exists a vacancy in the grade concerned or if the Secretary of the Navy estimates or determines that a vacancy will occur in the ensuing twelve-month period";

Under the subhead "Eligibility of Officers for Consideration by Selection Boards", on page 134, line 9, after the word "service", to insert "or who will attain the age of sixty-two years";

On page 135, line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "subparagraph" and insert "paragraph";

On page 135, after line 10, to strike out:

"(5) Lieutenants not restricted in the performance of duty holding permanent appointments in the Regular Navy in the grade of ensign or above who have first failed of selection for temporary promotion to lieutenant commander in the immediately preceding year, and who are not recommended for temporary promotion by the selection board convened for the purpose of recommending officers for temporary promotion to lieutenant commander in the current year, shall be eligible for consideration by such board for recommendation for continuation on the active list";

On page 136, line 13, after the word "service", to insert "or who will attain the age of sixty-two years";

On page 136, line 17, after the word "grade", to insert "except captains in the Medical Service Corps and commanders in the Nurse Corps"; in line 22, after the word "Dental", to insert "Medical Service", and in line 24, after the word "lieutenant", to insert "and officers of the Nurse Corps in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade)";

On page 137, after line 17, to strike out:

"(4) Lieutenants of the Supply Corps and the Civil Engineer Corps, not restricted in the performance of duty, holding permanent appointments in the Regular Navy in the grade of ensign or above who have first failed of selection for temporary promotion to lieutenant commander in the immediately preceding year, and who are not recommended for temporary promotion by the selection board convened for the purpose of recommending officers for temporary promotion to lieutenant commander in the current year, shall be eligible for consideration by such board for recommendation for continuation on the active list";

Under the subhead "Information to be furnished selection boards", on page 146, line 21, after the word "commander", to insert "except with respect to the temporary promotion of officers of the Medical Service Corps to the grade of captain and of officers of the Nurse Corps to the grade of commander";

On page 148, line 18, after the word "of", to strike out "the Supply Corps and Civil Engineer Corps, not restricted in the performance of duty to the grades of lieutenant commander", and insert "the Supply Corps, Civil Engineer Corps, and Nurse Corps to the grades of lieutenant commander";

On page 149, after line 2, to insert:

"(6) The number to be furnished the board in respect to the temporary promotion of officers of the Medical Service Corps to the

grade of captain shall be determined by the Secretary of the Navy as of the date of the convening of the board and shall be equal to the difference between the allowed number of officers in that grade and the actual number of officers therein plus the number of officers estimated to be separated from that grade during the ensuing 12-month period and minus the number of commanders then on the promotion list";

On page 149, after line 12, to insert:

"(7) The number to be furnished the board in repect to the temporary promotion of officers of the Nurse Corps to the grades of commander and lieutenant commander shall be determined by the Secretary of the Navy as of the date of the convening of the board and shall, for each grade, be equal to the difference between the allowed number of officers in the grade and the actual number therein plus the number of officers estimated to be separated from the grade during the ensuing 12-month period and minus the number of officers in the next lower grade then on the promotion list";

On page 149, after line 22, to insert:

"(8) The number to be furnished the board in respect to the temporary promotion of officers of the Nurse Corps to the grade of lieutenant shall be determined by the Secretary of the Navy as of the date of the convening of the board and shall be equal to the number of lieutenants (junior grade) in that corps in and senior to the promotion zone, minus the number of lieutenants (junior grade) then on the promotion list";

Under the subhead "Duties of selection boards", on page 154, after line 20, to strike out:

"(4) From among those lieutenants who are eligible for consideration for continuation on the active list the board shall recommend for such continuation such officers as it considers qualified for continued service on the active list in the grade of lieutenant";

On page 155, line 16, after "(junior grade)", to insert "in the Supply and Civil Engineer Corps or if of the grade of lieutenant in the Nurse Corps"; in line 19, after the word "promotion", to strike out "if of the Supply Corps or Civil Engineer Corps, or, if of any other corps" and insert "or, if of the grade of lieutenant or lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Corps, Chaplain Corps, Civil Engineer Corps, Dental Corps, or Medical Service Corps, or of the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Nurse Corps", and on page 156, line 21, after the word "grade", to insert "except with respect to lieutenant commanders and lieutenants of the Nurse Corps";

On page 157, after line 16, to strike out:

"(3) From among those lieutenants who are eligible for consideration for continuation on the active list the board shall recommend for such continuation such officers as it considers qualified for continued service on the active list in the grade of lieutenant";

Under the subhead "Reports of Selection Boards", on page 158, line 21, after the words "of the", to strike out "acting members, the officers therein recommended, if line officers holding permanent appointments in the Regular Navy or staff officers of the grade of lieutenant commander or above or designated for limited duty in grades above ensign holding such appointments, are subject to the limitations prescribed in section 309 of this title, selected as the best fitted to assume the duties of the next higher grade, and if staff officers of the grade of lieutenant or lieutenant (junior grade) holding such appointments, are, if of the Supply Corps or Civil Engineer Corps, selected as best fitted, subject to the limitations prescribed in section 309 of this title, and, if of any other corps, selected as fitted to assume the duties of the next higher grade, and, if either line or staff officers not holding such appointments, are selected as qualified" and to insert "acting members, the officers holding permanent appointments above the grade of commissioned warrant officers in the Regular Navy, if line officers, or if of the grade of lieutenant or lieutenant (junior grade) in the Supply Corps or Civil Engineer Corps, or if of the grade of lieutenant in the Nurse Corps, are, subject to the limitations prescribed in section 309 of this title, selected as the best fitted to assume the duties of the next higher grade, and, if of the grade of lieutenant or lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Corps, Chaplain Corps, Dental Corps, or Medical Service Corps, or if of the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Nurse Corps, are selected as fitted to assume the duties of the next higher grade, and if officers of any grade in the line or staff corps who do not hold permanent appointments above the grade of commissioned warrant officer in the Regular Navy, are selected as qualified";

On page 169, line 14, after the word "list", strike out "The report of the board convened to recommend lieutenants for continuation on the active list shall certify that, in the opinion of at least two-thirds of the acting members, the officers therein recommended are selected as qualified for continued service on the active list in the grade of lieutenants";

On page 161, line 5, after the word "purpose", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "*And provided further*, That in case any lieutenant recommended by the board for continuation on the active list be not acceptable to the President, the board shall be informed of the name of such officer, and such officer shall be held for all purposes as not having been so recommended for such continuation by the board";

Under the subhead "Temporary Promotions and Permanent Appointments", on page 163, line 14, after "(3)", to strike out "No officer", and insert "On or after July 1, 1949, no officer holding a permanent commission in the Regular Navy above the grade of commissioned warrant officer"; in line 16, after the word "be" to insert "temporarily"; in line 18, after the word "years'", to strike out "actual"; in the same line, after the word "sea", to insert "or foreign"; in line 23, after the word "duty" where it occurs the second time, to strike out "only, nor to officers of the Naval Reserve" and insert "only: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy shall determine the types of duty which may be counted for the purposes of this paragraph";

On page 164, line 9, after the word "officer", to insert "except a commander of the Medical Service Corps or a lieutenant commander or lieutenant of the Nurse Corps", and in line 19, after the word "and", to insert "except officers of the Medical Service Corps temporarily promoted to the grade of captain and officers of the Nurse Corps temporarily promoted to the grades of commander and lieutenant commander";

At the top of page 165, to insert:

"(2) Temporary promotion to fill vacancies in the grade of captain in the Medical Service Corps and to the grades of commander and lieutenant commander in the Nurse Corps shall be made from among officers whose names appear on the promotion list for the grade concerned. When so promoted each officer shall have the same date of rank which has been, or in due course will be, given the line officer who is to be his running mate in the grade to which promoted, but no increased pay or allowances shall accrue to such officer by virtue of his temporary promotion prior to the date of occurrence of the vacancy which he is promoted to fill or prior to the date of his selection for promotion, whichever shall be later";

On page 165, line 14, to change the subsection number from (2) to (3), in line 19, after the word "*Provided*", to strike out "That when so promoted each such officer shall have the same date of rank which has been given to the running mate assigned him in the grade to which he is promoted, but no increased pay or allowances shall accrue to such officers prior to the date of occurrence of the vacancy which he is promoted to fill", and in line 24, after the amendment last above stated, to insert: "*Provided*, That when so promoted each such officer shall have the same date of rank given to the running mate assigned him in the grade of rear admiral upon the running mate's temporary promotion to that grade: *Provided further*, That if such running mate shall not have been promoted, the staff officer shall be given as his date of rank the date of the occurrence of the vacancy which he is promoted to fill until such running mate shall have been promoted to the grade of rear admiral, at which time the staff officer shall be given a new commission with the same date of rank given to such running mate upon the latter's temporary promotion to rear admiral: *And provided further*, That each staff officer promoted to the grade of rear admiral shall be entitled to the pay and allowances of that grade only from the date of the occurrence of the vacancy which he is promoted to fill";

On page 166, line 15, after the word "to", to strike out "all" and insert "line and staff";

On page 166, line 18, after the word "officer", to insert "of the line or of a staff corps";

On page 167, line 16, after the word "Navy", to insert "in grades above commissioned warrant officer", and in line 24, after the word "subsection", to strike out "2" and insert "102";

On page 168, line 7, after the word "is", to strike out "authorizd" and insert "authorized", and in line 20, after the word "list", to insert the following additional provisos: "*Provided further*, That each officer appointed to the grade of rear admiral pursuant to this paragraph shall be given in his appointment the same date of rank stated in the permanent commission of his running mate in the grade of rear admiral: *Provided further*, That if such running mate shall not have been permanently appointed to the grade of rear admiral, the staff officer shall be given as his date of rank the date of rank stated in his temporary commission in that grade until such running mate is permanently appointed to the grade of rear admiral at which time the staff officer shall be given a new commission with the same date of rank given to such running mate upon the latter's permanent appointment as rear admiral:";

On page 169, line 12, after the word "grade", to insert "below rear admiral"; in line 15, after the word "Navy", to insert "in grades above commissioned warrant officer"; in line 23, after the word "Navy", to insert "in grades above commissioned warrant officer", and on page 170, line 20, after the word "promotion", to insert the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That nothing contained in this subsection shall operate to increase the allowed number of captains in the Medical Service Corps or the allowed number of commanders or lieutenant commanders in the Nurse Corps, as determined pursuant to section 203 of this title";

On page 173, line 1, after the word "officers", to insert "(g) officers of the Medical Service Corps, and (h) officers of the Nurse Corps";

Under the subhead "Retirement of Officers Below the Grade of Rear Admiral", on page 178, after line 22, to insert:

"(b) Captains of the Medical Service Corps shall be placed on the retired list on June 30 of the fiscal year in which they complete

thirty-one years of total commissioned service, and captains of the line and of each other corps", and on page 179, line 4, after the word "section", to strike out "2" and insert "102";

On page 181, line 6, after the word "occur", to insert the following new proviso: "*Provided*, That commanders in the Medical Service Corps shall not be involuntarily retired by reason of failure of selection for temporary promotion until June 30 of the fiscal year in which they shall have completed 30 years of total commissioned service";

On page 181, line 15, before the words "in which", to insert "following the month";

On page 181, line 19, after the word "duty", to insert "and lieutenant commander of the Nurse Corps"; on page 182, line 3, after the word "duty", to insert "and lieutenant commander of the Nurse Corps", and in line 12, after the word "sections", to strike out "2" and insert "102";

On page 184, line 6, after the word "retirement", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "*And provided further*, That nothing in this subsection shall be held to reduce the retired rank or pay to which an officer would be entitled under other provision of law";

On page 184, line 10, after the word "Lieutenants", to insert "except lieutenants of the Nurse Corps"; in line 22, after the word "subsection", to strike out "2" and insert "102"; and on page 185, line 3, after the word "payment", to strike out the following proviso: "*Provided further*, That lieutenants whose names are included in the approved report of a selection board convened to recommend lieutenants for continuation on the active list shall have the option of being discharged as provided in this subsection or of continuing on the active list until they complete 20 years' total commissioned service as determined in accordance with sections 2 or 202 of this act as appropriate, at which time they shall be retired with the rank of lieutenant commander and with retired pay computed as prescribed in subsection (g) of section 312 of this act:";

On page 185, line 22, after the word "selected", to strike out the comma and insert "unless entitled to higher retired rank or pay under other provisions of law";

On page 186, after line 8, to insert:

"(k) Nothing in this section shall be held to reduce the retired rank or pay to which an officer would be entitled under other provisions of law";

Under the subhead "Marine Corps", on page 193, after line 10, to strike out "(b) Of the authorized number of commissioned officers above the grade of colonel, there is authorized 50 percent in the grade of major general and 50 percent in the grade of brigadier general" and in lieu thereof, to insert: "(b) Of the authorized number of commissioned officers above the grade of colonel who are not restricted in the performance of duty, not more than 50 percent may be major generals and above and the remainder brigadier generals";

On page 194, line 7, after the word "sea", to insert "or foreign";

On page 194, line 16, after the word "the", where it occurs the first time, to insert "acting";

On page 196, line 15, after the numerals "423" to insert "(b)";

Under the subhead "Special provisions", on page 204, line 24, after the word "to", to strike out "chief" and insert "commissioned";

On page 205, line 15, after the word "of", to insert "titles I through IV of";

On page 205, line 19, after the word "above", to strike out "chief" and insert "commissioned";

On page 206, line 18, after the word "of", to insert "titles I through IV of", and in line 24, after the word "of", to insert "titles I through IV of";

On page 207, line 7, after the word "in", to insert "titles I through IV of";

On page 207, line 20, after the word "Navy", to insert "above the grade of commissioned warrant officer";

On page 210, after line 9, to insert:

"(n) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, each officer who, pursuant to section 304 of this title, is not appointed to the grade in which he was serving at the time of establishing the lineal list, may be continued in that grade until his temporary appointment is terminated or until the date of his appointment to a lower grade pursuant to section 304";

Under the heading "Title IV—Miscellaneous Provisions—Assignment of Officers to Limited Duty", on page 215, line 8, after the word "but", to insert "with respect to line officers appointed for limited duty only"; in line 9, after the word "the", to strike out "authorized" and insert "maximum"; in line 10, after the word "of", to insert "such officers"; in the same line, after the word "grade", to insert "as last computed pursuant to subsection 103 (f)"; in line 24, after the word "appointment" to insert "Original appointments pursuant to this subsection shall be effected with such dates of rank and registered numbers as may be necessary to place each appointee in a lineal position within the grade to which initially appointed commensurate as far as possible with his total length of acitve naval service"; on page 216, line 5, after the words "subsection to", to strike out "grades" and insert "a grade"; in line 8, after the word "the", to strike out "authorized" and insert "total"; in line 9, after the word "officers", to strike out "designated for limited duty in the various grades" and insert "authorized in the grade concerned";

Under the subhead "Establishment of officer grades in the staff corps", on page 217, line 25, after the words "or of", to insert "titles I through IV of";

Under the subhead "Examination of officers prior to promotion", on page 221, line 13, after the word "in", to insert "titles I through IV of", and in line 18, after the word "to", to insert "titles I through IV of";

On page 222, line 8, after the word "promotion", to insert "Officers of the grade of ensign who fail on such reexamination shall be honorably discharged from the service with a lump-sum payment computed on the basis of 2 months' active duty pay at the time of discharge for each year of active commissioned service in the Regular Navy and Naval Reserve, exclusive of duty for training, but not to exceed a total of 1 year's active duty pay";

Under the subhead "Retirement of Officers Specially Commended for Performance of Duty in Combat", on page 223, after line 2, to strike out:

"SEC. 412. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, or the Reserve components thereof, who may hereafter be specially commended for the performance of duty in actual combat by the head of the executive department under whose jurisdiction such duty was performed, shall not by virtue of such commendation, upon retirement, be placed upon the retired list with any higher rank or grade than that in which serving at the time of retirement, nor shall any increase in pay be hereafter granted because of any such commendation: *Provided*, That such officers who have heretofore been accorded higher rank or pay, or both, because of such commendation, shall, if subsequently assigned active duty, be recalled to active duty in the grade or rank in which serving at the time of retirement."

And in lieu thereof, to insert:

"SEC. 412. (a) All officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and the Reserve components thereof, who have been specially commended for their performance of duty in actual combat by the head of the executive department under whose jurisdiction such duty was performed, when retired, except officers on a promotion list who may be retired for physical disability, shall, upon retirement, be placed upon the retired list with the rank of the next higher grade than that in which serving at the time of retirement and with three-fourths of the active-duty pay of the grade in which serving at the time of retirement and the grade in which serving at the time of retirement shall be construed to mean the highest grade in which so serving whether by virtue of permanent or temporary appointment therein: *Provided*, That all officers heretofore and hereafter holding rank or grade on the retired list above that of captain in the Navy or colonel in the Marine Corps solely by virtue of such commendation, if hereafter recalled to active duty, may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be so recalled either in the rank or grade to which they would otherwise be entitled had they not been accorded higher rank or grade by virtue of such commendation, or in the rank or grade held by them on the retired list: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this subsection shall not apply in the case of any officer who has been so commended if the act or service justifying the commendation was performed after December 31, 1946: *Provided further*, That nothing in this subsection shall be construed to increase the retired pay of officers heretofore or hereafter placed upon the honorary retired list for the Naval Reserve: *Provided further*, That officers of the classes described in this subsection who have been retired prior to the date of approval of this act shall be entitled to the benefits of this subsection from the date of approval of this act: *And provided further*, That nothing in this subsection shall be held to reduce the retired rank or pay to which an officer would be entitled under other provision of law.

"(b) Section 309 of the act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1183) is amended by deleting the period at the end of the section and adding the following: "; however, all naval reservists heretofore and hereafter holding rank or grade on the honorary retired list above that of captain in the Naval Reserve solely by virtue of such commendation, if hereafter recalled to active duty, may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be so recalled either in the rank or grade to which they would otherwise be entitled had they not been accorded higher rank or grade by virtue of such commendation, or in the rank or grade held by them on the honorary retired list: *And provided further*, That the provisions of the preceding proviso shall not apply in the case of any naval reservist who has been so commended if the act or service justifying the commendation was performed after December 31, 1946";

Under the subhead "Designation of naval officers for certain commands or unusual missions," on page 226, line 11, after the word "sections", to strike out "3" and insert "103"; in line 18, after the word "Operations", to strike out "the commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet, and the commander in chief of the Atlantic Fleet shall", and insert "and four others may"; and in line 23, after the word "of", to strike out "the Senate, the rank of admiral while so serving in addition" and insert "the Senate, unless entitled under other provisions of law to higher grade, rank, pay, or allowances, the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of admiral while so serving and shall be in addition";

Under the subhead "Retirement of Officers With Highest Grade Held Under Provisions of Section 413," on page 228, line 14, before the word "hereafter" to insert "heretofore or";

Under the subhead "Designation of officers of the Marine Corps for special purposes," on page 229, line 6, after the word

"sections", to strike out "3" and insert "103"; in line 7, after the word "sections", to strike out "14" and insert "114"; in line 13, after the word "President", to strike out "or" and insert "as"; and in line 15, after the word "the" where it occurs the second time, to strike out "rank" and insert "grade, rank, pay, and allowances";

Under the subhead "Retirement age limit for officers," on page 230, line 19, after the word "in", to insert "titles I through IV of";

On page 230, line 23, after the word "in", to insert "titles I through IV of";

Under the subhead "Amendment of the act of June 30, 1914 (38 Stat. 404), as amended," on page 232, line 18, after the words "Dental Corps", to strike out "and"; in line 19, after the word "Corps", to insert "and Nurse Corps"; in line 22, after the words "per centum", to insert "and six-tenths of 1 per centum"; on page 233, line 3, after the word "officers", to strike out "warrant officers, and midshipmen" and insert "and warrant officers on the active list of the Navy and Marine Corps, and the actual number of midshipmen on active duty for flight training pursuant to the act of August 13, 1946 (Public Law 729, 79th Cong.)"; in line 10, after the words "Dental Corps", to strike out "and"; and in line 11, after the words "Chaplain Corps", to insert "the Medical Service Corps, and the Nurse Corps";

Under the subhead "Service in grade to include service in grade under temporary appointment," on page 233, line 22, after the word "of", to insert "titles I through IV of";

Under the subhead "Continuation of temporary appointments of certain members of the Hospital Corps and the Naval Reserve," on page 234, line 13, after "SEC. 422", to insert "(a)"; in the same line, after the word "Members", to strike out "of the Hospital Corps of the Navy and members";

On page 235, after line 13, to insert:

"(b) Members of the Hospital Corps of the Navy and Naval Reserve who, on the date of approval of this act, are serving under temporary appointments pursuant to the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, in grades above commissioned warrant officer may continue to serve under such temporary appointments until the effectuation of their appointments in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy or until and including the last day of the 11th month following the date of approval of this act, whichever may be earlier";

Under the subhead "Specifications by Secretary of Navy of qualifications to be required in certain officers for selection to flag rank, on page 236, line 5, before the words "this act", to insert "titles I through IV of";

Under the subhead "Special provisions," on page 239, line 9, after the word "in", to insert "titles I through IV of";

Under the subhead "Amendment of the act of December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 666)," on page 239, line 18, before the words "this act", to insert "titles I through IV of";

Under the subhead "Amendment of Public Law 56, Eighteth Congress," on page 240, line 3, before the words "of this act", to insert "of titles I through IV";

Under the subhead "Amendment of the act of January 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 10, 34 U. S. C. 622)," on page 240, line 16, after the word "words", to strike out "'Lieutenant General'" and insert "'Lieutenant general'", and in line 17, after the word "substituting", to strike out "therefore" and insert "therefor";

Under the subhead "Limitation on number of Reserve and retired officers serving on active duty in flag ranks," on page 240, line 20, after the words "In addition to", insert "fleet admirals and to"; in line 21, after the word "admirals", to insert "and above"; in the same line, after the word "titles", to strike out "I and" and insert "I", and in line 22, before the word "of", to insert "and III and by section 413", and at the top of page 241, to insert "titles I through IV of this act: *And provided further*, That the above restrictions shall not apply in time of war or national emergency declared after the date of approval of this act";

On page 241, after line 4, to strike out:

"DEFINITION OF THE WORD 'ACT'

"SEC. 431. As used in titles I through IV of this act, the word 'act' shall be construed to mean titles I through IV of this act";

On page 241, after line 8, to insert:

"COMPUTATION OF RETIRED PAY

"SEC. 431. Officers of the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Reserve components thereof, heretofore or hereafter retired under any provision of law shall have their retired pay computed on the basis of the rates of pay which are now or may be hereafter provided by law for officers on the active list,";

Under the subhead "Amendments to certain acts relating to retired pay," on page 241, line 21, after the word "following", to strike out *"Provided"* and insert *"And provided further"*; in line 22, after the word "retired", to insert "except those retired for physical disability or in accordance with section 412 of this Act", and on page 242, line 7, after the word "captain", to insert "in the Navy or colonel in the Marine Corps";

On page 242, line 13, after the word "third", to strike out "provision" and insert "provisos", and in line 22, after the word "captain", to insert "in the Navy or colonel in the Marine Corps";

On page 242, line 26, before the words "of this", to strike out "enactment" and insert "approval";

At the top of page 243, to insert:

"AMENDMENT OF THE ARMY-NAVY MEDICAL SERVICES CORPS ACT OF 1947

"SEC. 433. The Army-Navy Medical Service Corps Act of 1947 is hereby amended as follows:

"(a) The second paragraph of section 201 and sections 202 and 208 are hereby repealed.

"(b) Renumber the present sections 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, and 209, as sections 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, and 207 respectively.

"(c) In the first sentence of the present section 204, strike out '203' and substitute therefor '202'.

"(d) In the present section 206 strike out '204' wherever appearing and substitute therefor '203'; and in said section 206 insert before the colon the following: ', as amended'";

On page 243, after line 14, to insert:

"AMENDMENTS TO THE ACT OF APRIL 16, 1947 (PUBLIC LAW 36, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS)

"SEC. 434. (a) Section 201 of the Act of April 16, 1947 (Public Law 36, 80th Congress), is hereby amended by striking out the colon as it appears after the word 'ensign' in the second sentence thereof and substituting a period therefor, and by deleting the proviso and the last sentence thereof.

"(b) Section 203 of the Act of April 16, 1947 (Public Law 36, 80th Cong.), is hereby amended by deleting the last sentence and the proviso thereof.

"(c) The Act of April 16, 1947 (Public Law 36, 80th Cong.), is hereby amended by striking out the words 'the Medical Corps and the Dental Corps' as they appear in section 205 thereof and substituting therefor the words 'the Medical, Dental, and Medical Service Corps.'

"(d) Section 207 of the Act of April 16, 1947 (Public Law 36, 80th Cong.), is hereby amended by striking out subsection (a) thereof, and by redesignating the present subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), and (j) thereof as subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), and (i), respectively";

On page 244, after line 11, to insert:

"SPECIAL PROVISION FOR NURSES

"SEC. 435. Nurses appointed in the Nurse Corps of the Regular Navy pursuant to section 203 of the Act of April 16, 1947 (Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress), shall be deemed for all purposes as holding permanent commissions in the Regular Navy";

Under the subhead "Acts repealed", on page 244, line 19, to change the section number from 433 to 436; in line 20, after the word "of", to insert "titles I through IV of", and in line 21, after the word "of", to insert "titles I through IV of";

On page 245, line 13, after the word "amended", to strike out the comma and "but the provisions of the said Act which are made applicable to the Navy Nurse Corps by the Act of April 16, 1947 (Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress), shall remain in effect insofar as they relate to the Navy Nurse Corps";

On page 245, line 21, after the word "amended", to strike out the comma and "but the provisions of the said Act which are made applicable to the Navy Nurse Corps by the Act of April 16, 1947 (Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress), shall remain in effect insofar as they relate to the Navy Nurse Corps";

On page 246, after line 17, to strike out:

"(o) The second proviso of section 309 of the act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1183; 34 U. S. C. 855h)";

On page 246, after line 21, to insert:

"(p) Section 206 of the act of April 16 1947, (Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress)";

Under the heading "Title V—Army—table of contents", on page 247, after the table of contents, to insert:

"SEC. 523. Saving clause";

Under the subhead "Regular Army officers—authorized strength", on page 247, line 2, after the word "of", to strike out "fifty" and insert "fifty-one";

Under the subhead "General Officers—Assignments—Positions Carrying Rank of General and Lieutenant General", on page 257, line 21, after the word "than", to strike out "seven" and insert "nine"; in line 22, after the words "of the", to strike out "seven" and insert "nine"; on page 258, line 2, after the word "remaining", to strike out "five" and insert "seven"; in line 3, after the word "than", to strike out "three" and insert "four", and in line 4, after the word "than", to strike out "two" and insert "three";

Under the subhead "Regular Army Officers—Selection Boards—Promotion Generally", on page 275, after line 2, to insert:

"(7) Officers on a recommended list for promotion to any grade under the provisions of this title, who, at any time prior to promotion, are found incapacitated for service by reason of physical disability contracted in line of duty shall, when retired, be retired in the grade for which they were recommended, with retired pay at the rate of 75 per centum of the active-duty pay of the grade to which recommended, unless entitled to higher retired rank or pay under other provisions of law";

On page 276, line 13, after the word "colonel", to insert a colon and the following proviso: *"Provided*, That in the case of any Regular Army officer who on the date of enactment of this act has been nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate for appointment to any grade but not yet appointed in that grade, such officer shall be appointed in that grade as soon as a vacancy exists therein irrespective of the requirements of this title with respect to promotions";

Under the subhead "Regular Army Officers—Promotion to Grade of First Lieutenant", on page 278, line 1, after the word "appointments", to strike out the period and "('Years'" and insert "('years'";

Under the subhead "Regular Army officers—Promotion to Grades of Captain, Major, and Lieutenant Colonel—Elimination of those not Promoted", on page 282,

line 11, after the word "section", to strike out "Upon promotion to the next higher grade of any officer whose name appears below his on their promotion list, each 'deferred officer' shall" and insert "Each 'deferred officer' shall suffer loss in precedence for promotion purposes to those officers who were recommended by the selection board which failed to recommended him, and shall"; in line 24, after the word "major", to insert a semicolon and "however, such loss in precedence for promotion purposes and such loss in years of service for promotion purposes shall not result in any loss in seniority by such 'deferred officer' until his juniors are promoted to the next higher grade";

On page 283, line 7, after the words "list and", to strike out "if recommended shall be placed upon the recommended list without loss of rights other than loss in seniority and loss in years of service for promotion purposes hereinbefore prescribed. If not recommended" and insert "if recommended by such board his name shall be entered on the applicable recommended list with the other officers recommended by such board and with the same precedence among themselves as exists on the applicable promotion list but below the names of officers placed on such recommended list by any earlier board. If an officer fails of selection for any grade but is subsequently recommended and promoted to that grade, his failure in the grade from which promoted shall not in any sense be counted as a failure of selection when he is subsequently considered for further promotion. If a 'deferred officer' is not recommended";

On page 286, line 10, after "(d)", to insert "and (g)";

Under the subhead "Regular Army officers—Promotion to grade of colonel," on page 287, line 2, after the word "prescribed", to insert "except in those cases governed by the proviso to the first sentence of subsection 507 (d) of this title";

On page 288, line 23, after the word "list", to insert "at the foot thereof";

Under the subhead "Regular Army officers—Promotion to grade of brigadier general," on page 290, line 8, after the word "title", to insert "and except in those cases governed by the proviso to the first sentence of subsection 507 (d) of this title";

Under the subhead "Regular Army officers—promotion to grade of major general," on page 293, line 8, after the word "title", to insert "and except in those cases governed by the proviso to the first sentence of subsection 507 (d) of this title;

Under the subhead "General officers—Chiefs and assistant chiefs of services—Promotion to general officer grade with a view to assignment as chief or assistant chief of service," on page 296, after line 4, to strike out:

"SEC. 513. (a) Each of the offices of chiefs of branches, arms, or services, and each of the offices of their respective assistants as provided by law, respectively, shall be filled by the President appointing, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among general officers holding office in the grade prescribed by law for such office, under permanent or temporary appointment (including general officers of the Army of the United States and each of the several components thereof serving on extended active Federal duty), an officer who has demonstrated by actual and extended duty in such arm, branch, or service or on similar duty that he is qualified for such assignment. Normally an officer shall be assigned to any such office for a tour of duty of 4 years, but any such assignment may be terminated at any time, or such tour may be extended, by the President in his discretion. General officers now serving as chiefs of branches, arms, or services and their respective assistants will not be affected by this section. This section shall become effective for each such office on the date that office is vacated by the present incumbent. This section shall not apply to the office of Chief of the National Guard Bureau.

"(b) If, after consultation with the Secretary of War, the President shall determine that there is no general officer of the Regular Army in the prescribed grade who possesses suitable qualifications, and is available, to fill any of the offices described in subsection (a) of this section, he may, from time to time, for the purpose of filling any such office, direct the Secretary of War to convene a selection board to select and recommend one or more Regular Army officers for promotion to the permanent grade of brigadier general or major general in the Regular Army, as the case may be, with a view to assignment to any such designated office. The Secretary of War shall furnish to such board a list of the names of the officers to be considered by it, which list of names shall include the names of all Regular Army officers in permanent grade next below that for which selection is to be made, who have demonstrated by actual and extended duty in the branch, arm, or service concerned or on similar duty that they are qualified for promotion to that grade and for such assignment, and may include the names of such additional officers, next in order of their seniority. From among the officers named for consideration, the selection board shall select and recommend the prescribed number. From among those selected and recommended by such board, the President shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint one such officer in the grade of major general or brigadier general in the Regular Army, as the case may be. If such officer cannot be appointed because of advice by the Senate that the appointment does not have its consent, the President may select another name from such recommended list or direct the Secretary of War to convene a selection board to select and recommend additional officers in accordance with the procedure heretofore prescribed in this subsection. Officers who are selected and recommended by any selection board for appointment in the grade of major general or brigadier general in the Regular Army, with a view to assignment to any such designated office and who are not so appointed shall, for the purpose of determining their status, be deemed not to have been selected and recommended for that grade, but this shall in no way prejudice their eligibility for selection and recommendation for that grade under the provisions of sections 511 and 512 of this title. Whenever any such officer is to be appointed in the grade of major general or brigadier general with a view to his assignment to any such office, the total authorized number of officers in that grade shall be temporarily increased, if necessary, to authorize such appointment."

And in lieu thereof, to insert:

"SEC. 513. (a) Each of the offices of chiefs of branches, arms, or services, and each of the offices of their assistants as provided by law, respectively, shall be filled by the President appointing, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an officer, not below the grade of lieutenant colonel, who has demonstrated by actual and extended duty in such arm, branch, or service or on similar duty that he is qualified for such assignment, and who has been recommended for such office by a board of officers as prescribed in subsection (b) of this section. Upon the appointment of a Regular Army officer to any such office, he shall at the same time, if he does not already hold permanent appointment in the Regular Army in the grade called for by such office, be permanently appointed in grade of major general or brigadier general in the Regular Army, whichever is the rank specified for such office. An officer appointed to any such office shall normally continue in that assignment for a tour of duty of 4 years but such assignment may be terminated at any time, or such tour may be extended by the President in his discretion. The termination of an officer's assignment as chief or assistant chief of a branch, arm, or service shall have no effect upon the permanent general officer grade held by him. Whenever any Regular Army officer is to be appointed as a chief or an assistant chief of a branch, arm, or service and at the same time in the permanent grade of major general or brigadier general in the Regular Army, whichever is the rank specified for such office, the total authorized number of officers in that grade shall be temporarily increased if necessary to authorize such appointment, but such temporary increase in authorized numbers in such grade shall continue only until a vacancy shall occur in such grade. Officers now serving as chiefs of branches, arms, or services, and their respective assistants, will not be affected by this section. This section shall become effective for each such office on the date that office is vacated by the present incumbent. This section shall not apply to the office of Chief of the National Guard Bureau.

"(b) Officers shall be recommended to fill the office of chief of a branch, arm, or service, or the office of an assistant chief of a branch, arm, or service, as follows: The Secretary of War shall appoint a board of five general officers which shall include the then incumbent, if any, of the office to be filled and at least two other officers, if available, of a rank above that of the position for which selections are to be made who have had actual and extended service in the branch concerned. The Secretary of War shall furnish to such board a list of the officers to be considered by it and shall specify the number to be recommended, which number shall not be less than three. The list to be considered shall include all Regular Army officers of the branch concerned in the permanent grade of colonel, all Regular Army officers above the grade of colonel who have demonstrated by actual and extended duty in such arm, branch, or service, or on similar duty, that they are qualified for such assignment, and may in addition thereto and to the extent determined advisable by the Secretary of War, include the names of Regular Army officers of the branch concerned in the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the order that their names appear upon the promotion list concerned, and the names of officers of any component of the Army of the United States serving on extended active duty in grades above lieutenant colonel who have demonstrated by actual and extended duty in the branch, arm, or service concerned, or on similar duty, that they are qualified for such assignment. From among the officers named for consideration the board shall select and recommend the prescribed number. From among those recommended by such board, the President may appoint an officer in the position concerned. If the President declines to appoint any of those so recommended or if those he may nominate cannot be appointed because of advice by the Senate, the Secretary of War shall convene a board to select and recommend additional officers in accordance with the procedure heretofore prescribed. Officers who are recommended and who are not appointed shall be deemed not to have been recommended but this shall in no way prejudice their eligibility for selection and recommendation for the grade of major general or brigadier general under the provisions of sections 511 and 512 of this title";

Under the subhead "Regular Army officers—Elimination from active list—Mandatory retirement or separation," on page 303, line 3,

after the word "years", to insert the following proviso: "*Provided*, That officers holding appointments on the date of enactment of this act as chiefs and assistant chiefs of services shall not by reason of the enactment of this section be retired while so serving until age sixty-four years is reached if serving with the rank of major general or until age sixty-two years is reached if serving with the rank of brigadier general:";

On page 303, line 19, after the word "is", to insert "hereafter";

On page 306, line 14, after the word "of", to strike out "elimination" and insert "elimination", and in the same line, after the words "from the", to strike out "actve" and insert "active";

On page 307, line 23, after the word "that", to strike out "grade" and insert "permanent grade in the Regular Army";

On page 308, line 23, after the word "grade", to insert "in the Regular Army";

On page 312, line 2, after the word "pay", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That in the case of any officer whose computation of active-duty pay is not based upon years of service the phrase 'the number of years of service creditable to him under the law in the computation of his active-duty pay' as used herein shall be construed to mean the number of years of service which would be creditable to him under the law in the computation of his active-duty pay if he were serving in the grade of colonel";

Under the subhead "Regular Army officers—Promotions to be made on July 1, 1948, to fill initial requirements in grades of captain, major, and lieutenant colonel," on page 325, line 25, after the word "of", to strike out "section" and insert "subsection";

On page 333, after line 4, to insert:

"SAVING CLAUSE

"SEC. 523. Nothing contained in this title shall operate to reduce the retired grade or retired pay of any officer heretofore retired."

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I shall take very little time. I simply want to say that I anticipated the result of the vote. I want the RECORD to show, however, that I have undertaken to do what I thought was my duty.

I hold in my hand a bill of over 300 pages. Not a single member of the Armed Services Committee has said on the floor that he has ever read the bill. The chairman of the committee admits that he has not read it all. He probably read the part that he liked and then quit. I want the RECORD to show that I am protesting against the passage of this bill under these circumstances. It is nearly 11 o'clock. I know the leadership is anxious to conclude and to adjourn at the end of the day. I am not undertaking to obstruct, but I want the country to know that the Senate is passing bills hurriedly, under pressure of the leadership on both sides of the aisle, without the consideration and deliberation which the Senate of the United States should devote to matters of great public concern.

I have a high regard for the Army and the Navy. I have made no disparaging reference to them. I know that such a situation as this occurs after every war. The Army and the Navy begin to press upon the Congress for some new kind of promotion plan. They cannot promote the men in the lower ranks unless they eliminate, I will say to the Senator from Florida, a number in the higher ranks.

The bill provides for 14 full star admirals and generals. I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] how many lieutenant generals there will be, under this bill.

Mr. GURNEY. May I ask the Senator from Connecticut to answer that question? I believe there are about 28, if I remember correctly.

Mr. CONNALLY. Lieutenant generals?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes.

Mr. BALDWIN. I might say to the distinguished Senator that there is one point that he should carefully consider. He has made reference to four-star generals and admirals. None of those men hold permanent rank. The highest permanent rank in the Army will be major general.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is not my question. I want to know how many lieutenant generals will there be.

Mr. BALDWIN. The only way the Senator knows is by reading the bill which the Senate has passed. I would ask the Senator to turn to page 258, line 6, which limits the number in the Army to 27 lieutenant generals or higher, and in the Air Corps to 17.

Mr. CONNALLY. That makes 44 lieutenant generals in time of peace. How many lieutenant generals did we have following the War Between the States? They can be counted on the fingers of one hand.

Mr. BALDWIN. This provision includes lieutenant generals or higher. There are five of higher rank.

Mr. CONNALLY. That makes 39 lieutenant generals and 5 four-star generals?

Mr. BALDWIN. There will be five four-star generals in the Army and four four-star generals in the Air Corps. There are 34 less 9.

Mr. CONNALLY. What about the Air Corps?

Mr. BALDWIN. That is included.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Army has five four-star generals and the Air Corps has three, according to my arithmetic.

Mr. BALDWIN. The Army has five, the Air Corps has four. That makes nine.

Mr. CONNALLY. How many four-star admirals does the Navy have?

Mr. BALDWIN. Five. That figure includes one four-star general in the Marine Corps.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the audience and the Senate will not take this matter lightly. I am trying to get information. As I recall it, under this bill there will be 14 four-star admirals or generals. Is that correct?

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. There will be 30 lieutenant generals?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator is including the admirals in the computation of generals. In the Air Corps and the Army there are 9.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not like to argue with the chairman of the committee, but he brought me this paper a while ago, which shows that there will be five four-star generals in the Army, five four-star admirals in the Navy. That is 10. There is one in the Marine Corps, making 11. In the Air Corps there are 4. That adds up to 15. One is dropped, which leaves 14.

Mr. BALDWIN. That has been our position all along.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is not the position which the Senator took awhile ago. He said there were 9.

Mr. BALDWIN. There are 9 in the Army or in the Air Corps. The Navy is not in the Army or Air Corps.

Mr. CONNALLY. But it is in this bill, and that is what I am asking about.

There will be 14 four-star admirals or generals. How many four-star generals did we have during the war?

Mr. BALDWIN. My recollection is that we had over 20.

Mr. CONNALLY. Full generals?

Mr. BALDWIN. Full four-star generals.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is news to me.

Mr. President, I simply want the RECORD to show that I think the Senate is not living up to its high duty in considering this bill at this late hour. It is one which no one has read, and the committee report is not at all satisfactory. If the committee had made a full report, no one could read the bill and the report tonight. I want the RECORD to show where I stand on the question. I had no hope that the bill would be defeated. The high command has passed out the word. The four-star generals on both sides of the aisle have issued the orders, and we enlisted men have got to vote according to orders, or will have to be disciplined—put into the brig or into the guardhouse. I am prepared to go. I shall have to go from the time the Congress adjourns until next January with my soul oppressed with the dereliction of the Senate and the indifference of the Senate to information. It is getting to be allergic to facts and information.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? [Putting the question.]

Mr. HOLLAND. I ask for a division.

On a division, the bill (H. R. 3830) was passed.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BALL submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4347) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5 and 31.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 15, 16, 17, 18, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 32, 33, 35, and 40, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

"Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper: For the compensation of fifteen additional privates, Capitol Police Force, at the basic rate of $2,000 each per annum, from October 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948, $24,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$2,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,650,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$5,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "preliminary examinations and surveys (in an amount not exceeding $100,000) and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$275,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

"Management, protection, and disposal of public lands: For an additional amount, for 'Management, protection, and disposal of public lands', $300,000, and the limitation on the amount for carrying out the provisions of the Act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U. S. C. 8A), is hereby increased from $398,000 to $698,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed insert:

"BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

"Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $100,000, and the limitation for personal services in the District of Columbia is hereby increased from $2,202,700 to $2,327,700."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$6,050,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$76,836,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 9, 11, 12, 13, 21, 27, and 39.

JOSEPH H. BALL,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
HOMER FERGUSON,
GUY CORDON,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
GORDON CANFIELD,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE H. MAHON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 4347, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
July 26, 1947.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 11, 12, 21, and 39 to the bill (H. R. 4347) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lines 5 and 6 of said amendment strike out "$5,000,000 of which amount not to exceed $200,000" and insert "$2,500,000 of which amount not to exceed $50,000";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27 to the bill and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

Insert the matter proposed by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"BUREAU OF MINES

"Coal mine inspections and investigations: For an additional amount for 'Coal mine inspections and investigations,' including, in addition to the objects specified under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1948, printing and binding, and the purchase of 25 passenger motor vehicles, $250,000, and the limitation upon the amount that may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia is increased to $150,000. This appropriation is contingent upon the enactment into law of Senate Joint Resolution 130 or House Joint Resolution 244."

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to amendments of the Senate Nos. 13 and 27.

The motion was agreed to.

PRINTING OF HEARINGS BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 107, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Ways and Means be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,000 additional copies of the digest of testimony, index to hearings, and each part of the hearings held before the said committee during the current session relative to tax revision, 1947–48.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF ORGANIC ACT OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 434. House bill 3309, to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, May I ask the Senator from Ohio, when the civil functions conference report will be submitted?

Mr. TAFT. As soon as we finish with this matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

There being no objection the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3309) to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with amendments.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY submitted the following report:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4002) making appropriations for the civil functions administered by the War Department, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 13.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 10, and 11, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,190,387"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$246,072,825"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, and 42.

CHAN GURNEY,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
HOMER FERGUSON,
CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
ELMER THOMAS,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
HARVE TIBBOTT,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE H. MAHON,
W. F. NORRELL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a total for the items in the bill. This statement shows that the bill as it comes from the conference carries a total of $502,123,912.

The appropriations for actual flood control, general, for construction total $246,072,825. We add to that the appropriation items for the lower Mississippi and the Sacramento, and for maintenance and operation of water mains, and then we add the appropriations for rivers and harbors works, and a few other small items, to make up the total. So I ask unanimous consent that this statement may be printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Total for items in the bill

Quartermaster Corps:	
Cemeterial expenses	$4,190,387
Cemeterial expenses, no year	60,000,000
Signal Corps:	
Alaska Communication System	1,804,000
Corps of Engineers:	
Rivers and harbors:	
Maintenance and improvement	[1] 116,718,700
Alteration of bridges over navigable waters	500,000

[1] This figure of $116,718,700 for rivers and harbors as just accepted by the House omits the projects in disagreement:

Black Warrior, Warrior, and Tombigbee, Ala	$750,000
Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers, Ga. and Fla	2,500,000

Corps of Engineers—Continued	
Flood control:	
General	$246,072,825
Mississippi River and tributaries	50,000,000
Emergency fund	500,000
Sacramento River, Calif	1,750,000
Maintenance and operation, Federal water mains	12,000
Total, Corps of Engineers	415,553,525
Panama Canal:	
Maintenance and operation	13,374,000
Sanitation	3,552,000
Civil government	2,900,000
Additional facilities	750,000
Total, Panama Canal	20,576,000
Total, regular annual appropriations, War Department civil functions	502,123,912

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I have requested permission to have that table printed in the RECORD, because we do not have a printed copy of the conference agreement.

Accordingly, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a list of projects as passed by the conference, together with summaries, both for flood control and rivers and harbors works.

There being no objection the lists and summaries were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Rivers and harbors

CONSTRUCTION

Project	Amount in House bill	Amount in Senate bill	Amount agreed to in conference
Alabama: Black Warrior, Warrior, and Tombigbee Rivers		$750,000	(1)
California:			
San Diego Harbor	$70,000	50,000	$50,000
San Diego River and Mission Bay		1,000,000	1,000,000
Connecticut:			
Bridgeport Harbor	400,000	855,000	855,000
New Haven Harbor	200,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
Delaware: Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware		500,000	500,000
Florida:			
Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers, Ga. and Fla		2,500,000	(1)
Caloosahatchee River and Lake Okeechobee drainage areas, Florida	12,700	12,700	12,700
Hollywood Harbor (Port Everglades), Fla		410,000	410,000
St. Johns River, Fla., Jacksonville to Lake Harney	200,000	300,000	300,000
St. Lucie Inlet, Fla	53,000	53,000	53,000
Lake Worth Inlet, Fla	106,300	106,300	106,300
Tampa Harbor, Fla	200,000	200,000	200,000
Georgia:			
Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers, Ga. and Fla. (See same project listed under Florida.)			
Savannah Harbor, Ga	100,000	300,000	300,000
Illinois:			
Illinois waterway		180,000	180,000
Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis. (See same project under Wisconsin.)			
Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers. (See same project under Missouri.)			
Ohio River open channel. (See same project under Ohio.)			
Peoria Harbor	44,000	44,000	44,000
Indiana: Ohio River open channel. (See same project listed under Ohio.)			
Iowa:			
Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis. (See same project listed under Wisconsin.)			
Missouri River, Kansas City to Sioux City	2,500,000	5,000,000	4,500,000
Kansas: Missouri River, Kansas City to Sioux City. (See same project listed under Iowa.)			
Kentucky: Ohio River open channel. (See same project listed under Ohio.)			
Louisiana:			
Calcasieu River and Pass, La		550,000	550,000
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway between Apalachee Bay, Fla., and the Mexican border (New Orleans district)	200,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
Empire, La., to the Gulf of Mexico, waterway from		250,000	250,000
Maryland:			
Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Md		$400,000	$400,000
Crisfield Harbor, Md	$45,000	45,000	45,000
Michigan:			
Keweenaw Waterway, Mich		145,000	145,000
St. Marys River, Mich	600,000	600,000	600,000
Minnesota:			
Harbor at Lake City		95,200	95,200
Harbor at Red Wing		13,800	13,800
Mississippi River at Winona		20,400	20,400
Mississippi River at Wabasha		27,300	27,300
Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis. (See same project listed under Wisconsin).			
Two Harbors (Agate Bay)		250,000	250,000
Missouri:			
Mississipni River between Missouri River and Minneapolis. (See same project listed under Wisconsin.)			
Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers	3,000,000	5,000,000	4,500,000
Missouri River mouth to Kansas City	1,300,000	2,300,000	2,250,000
Missouri River, Kansas City to Sioux City (See same project listed under Iowa.)			
Montana: Missouri River at Fort Peck	100,000	200,000	150,000
Nebraska: Missouri River, Kansas City to Sioux City. (See same project listed under Iowa.)			
New Jersey: Delaware River, Pa., N. J., and Del., Philadelphia to the sea. (See same project listed under Delaware.)			
New York:			
Cape Vincent Harbor, N. Y	19,200	19,200	19,200
Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, N. Y	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
New York Harbor	400,000	400,000	400,000
Oswego Harbor	236,000	236,000	236,000
North Carolina: Cape Fear River, N. C., at and below Wilmington	100,000	300,000	300,000
Ohio: Ohio River open channel		200,000	200,000
Oregon:			
Columbia River, Oreg. and Wash., McNary Dam	3,000,000	6,500,000	4,500,000
Columbia River between Vancouver and The Dalles		201,000	201,000
Snake River. (See same project listed under Washington.)			
Umpqua River		127,500	127,500
Yaquina Bay and Harbor		495,000	495,000
Salmon River		7,000	7,000
Columbia River at Bakers Bay		270,000	270,000
Coos Bay		500,000	500,000
Columbia River at Astoria		500,000	500,000

[1] Disagreement; omitted as House agreed to conference report.

Rivers and harbors—Continued

CONSTRUCTION—continued

Project	Amount in House bill	Amount in Senate bill	Amount agreed to in conference
Pennsylvania:			
Delaware River, Pa., N. J., and Del., Philadelphia to the sea. (See same project listed under Delaware.)			
Ohio River open channel. (See same project listed under Ohio.)			
South Carolina: Winyah Bay	$500,000	$800,000	$800,000
Texas:			
Gulf-Intracoastal Waterway between Apalachee Bay, Fla., and the Mexican border (Galveston district)	500,000	2,187,000	2,187,000
Neches and Angelina Rivers, Tex	800,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
Sabine-Neches waterway, Texas	500,000	1,500,000	1,000,000
Brazos Island Harbor, Tex	500,000	685,500	685,500
Port Aransas-Corpus Christi waterway	150,000	150,000	150,000
Virginia:			
James River	80,000	80,000	80,000
Newport News Creek		145,000	145,000
Oyster Creek		54,600	54,600
Virginia—Continued.			
Onancock Creek		$25,500	$25,500
Tangier Channel		13,200	13,200
Hampton Creek		15,000	15,000
Washington:			
Columbia River, Oreg. and Wash., McNary Dam. (See same project listed under Oregon.)			
Columbia River between Vancouver, Wash., and The Dalles, Oreg. (See same project listed under Oregon.)			
West Virginia: Ohio River open channel. (See same project listed under Ohio.)			
Wisconsin: Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis	$271,500	500,000	500,000
Power plant, Fort Peck Dam, Mont. (construction)		657,500	657,500
Total, construction	17,367,700	44,226,700	37,176,700

Summary for rivers and harbors

Advance planning	$3,500,000
Maintenance	50,000,000
Operation and care	20,000,000
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies	3,645,000
Other recurring items	2,397,000

Construction (total of projects listed) $37,176,700

Total in bill for rivers and harbors (without 2 items in disagreement) 116,718,700

Items in disagreement on rivers and harbors:

Alabama: Black Warrior, Warrior, and Tombigbee Rivers	$750,000
Florida: Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers, Ga. and Fla	2,500,000
Total for items in disagreement	3,250,000

Flood control, general

CONSTRUCTION

Project	Amount in House bill	Amount in Senate bill	Amount agreed in conference
Arkansas:			
Blakely Mountain Reservoir		$2,000,000	$2,000,000
Bull Shoals Reservoir	$3,000,000	6,700,000	6,700,000
Cardens Bottoms levee district No. 2		300,000	300,000
Conway County levee districts Nos. 1, 2, and 8	400,000	400,000	400,000
Crawford County levee district		400,000	400,000
Little Rock to Pine Bluff	168,000	500,000	500,000
McLean Bottom levee district No. 3	217,000	652,000	652,000
Narrows Reservoir	1,761,500	2,562,000	2,000,000
Near Dardanelle	221,500	221,500	221,500
Red River below Denison Dam, Okla., Tex., Ark., and La		4,000,000	2,500,000
Roland drainage district		150,000	150,000
Van Buren		210,000	210,000
California:			
Big Dry Creek Reservoir and diversion	771,000	771,000	771,000
Burbank Western System (lower)		100,000	100,000
Isabella Reservoir		2,500,000	1,250,000
Kings River and Tulare Lake Basin, including Pine Flat Reservoir		3,000,000	1,750,000
Los Angeles River	1,314,000	4,016,000	4,016,000
Lower San Joaquin River		500,000	
Merced County stream group	250,000	500,000	500,000
Pajaro River		500,000	500,000
Sacramento River levees and tributaries		500,000	500,000
San Gabriel River (Canyon to Santa Fe Reservoir)	1,085,000	1,085,000	1,085,000
Santa Fe Reservoir	730,000	730,000	730,000
Ventura River		500,000	500,000
Colorado:			
Cherry Creek Reservoir	2,700,000	5,000,000	4,500,000
John Martin Reservoir	550,000	550,000	550,000
Connecticut: Hartford	293,000	293,000	293,000
Georgia:			
Allatoona, Reservoir	6,572,100	8,425,000	8,425,000
Clark Hill Reservoir, Ga. and S. C	1,481,000	6,250,000	5,000,000
Idaho: Heise-Roberts area, Snake River	300,000	500,000	500,000
Illinois:			
Chouteau, Nameoki and Venice		130,000	130,000
Clear Creek drainage and levee district	200,000	200,000	200,000
Columbia drainage and levee district		500,000	500,000
DeGognia and Fountain Bluff levee and drainage district	300,000	1,063,000	1,063,000
East St. Louis and vicinity		750,000	750,000
Farm Creek reservoirs		3,000,000	2,000,000
Galena	465,000	465,000	465,000
Grand Tower drainage and levee district		700,000	500,000
Harrisonville and Ivy Landing drainage and levee district	130,000	260,000	260,000
Henderson County drainage district		47,000	47,000
Lacey, Langellier, West Matanzas, and Kerton Valley drainage and levee districts		500,000	500,000
Mounds and Mound City		500,000	500,000
Mouth of Sangamon River		200,000	200,000
Prairie du Rocher		500,000	500,000
Preston drainage and levee district and vicinity		323,000	323,000
Illinois—Continued			
Sny Basin	$200,000	$1,500,000	$1,000,000
Stringtown-Fort Chartres and Ivy Landing drainage and levee district	329,000	700,000	700,000
Wilson and Wenkel and Prairie Du Pont drainage and levee district	378,000	478,000	478,000
Wood River drainage and levee district		750,000	750,000
Indiana:			
Cagles Mill Reservoir		1,000,000	500,000
Cannelton		600,000	500,000
Delphi		65,000	65,000
Indianapolis, Fall Creek section		750,000	750,000
Jeffersonville-Clarksville	209,000	209,000	209,000
McGinnis levee		300,000	300,000
Muncie	60,000	60,000	60,000
New Albany	400,000	400,000	400,000
Shufflebarger levee		300,000	300,000
Iowa:			
Council Bluffs	500,000	500,000	500,000
Des Moines		350,000	350,000
Dry Run		531,000	531,000
Missouri River between Kensler's Bend, Nebr. and the combination bridge at Sioux City, Iowa	500,000	800,000	800,000
Missouri River levees, Sioux City, Iowa, to the mouth	500,000	7,500,000	6,000,000
Red Rock Reservoir (see advance planning)		3,000,000	
Kansas:			
Fall River Reservoir	3,000,000	4,100,000	3,000,000
Kanopolis Reservoir	2,000,000	2,900,000	2,900,000
Kansas Citys, Mo. and Kans	1,800,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Wichita and Valley Center		500,000	500,000
Kentucky:			
Covington		700,000	500,000
Dale Hollow Reservoir, Tenn. and Ky	900,000	800,000	800,000
Dewey Reservoir		2,000,000	1,500,000
Louisville	650,000	2,000,000	1,650,000
Maysville		400,000	
Newport	600,000	1,400,000	1,200,000
Taylorsville		240,000	240,000
Uniontown		504,000	504,000
Wolf Creek Reservoir	4,000,000	8,600,000	8,000,000
Louisiana:			
Bayou Bodcau, Red Chute and Loggy Bayou	86,500	86,500	86,500
Bayou Bodcau Reservoir		800,000	800,000
Bayou Pierre in vicinity of Shreveport		129,000	129,000
Red River below Denison Dam, Okla., Tex., Ark., and La. (See Arkansas.)			
Shreveport	900,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Massachusetts:			
Holyoke and Springdale	70,000	70,000	70,000
Tully Reservoir	340,000	726,000	726,000
Michigan:			
Mount Clemens		250,000	250,000
Sebewaing		100,000	100,000
Minnesota: Red Lake and Clearwater Rivers	300,000	400,000	400,000

Flood control, general—Continued

CONSTRUCTION—continued

Project	Amount in House bill	Amount in Senate bill	Amount agreed in conference
Missouri:			
Chariton River	$300,000	$300,000	$300,000
Clearwater Reservoir	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Kansas Citys, Mo. and Kans. (See Kansas.)			
Montana: Forsyth		171,000	171,000
Nebraska:			
Alen (bank protection)		500,000	500,000
Harlan County Reservoir	3,775,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
Indianola		75,000	75,000
Missouri River between Kensler's Bend, Nebr., and the combination bridge at Sioux City, Iowa. (See Iowa.)			
Omaha	1,200,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
New Hampshire: West Peterboro		500,000	500,000
New York:			
Almond Reservoir	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
East Sidney Reservoir		900,000	900,000
Elmira	1,600,000	1,900,000	1,900,000
Lancaster		230,000	230,000
Montour Falls		820,000	820,000
Mount Morris Reservoir		3,000,000	2,000,000
Olean	500,000	500,000	500,000
Owasco Inlet and Outlet and tributaries	235,500	235,500	235,500
Syracuse		500,000	500,000
North Carolina:			
Buggs Island Reservoir, Va. and N. C.	3,800,000	4,800,000	4,800,000
Goldsboro	85,200	85,200	85,200
North Dakota:			
Baldhill Reservoir		900,000	900,000
Garrison Reservoir	6,500,000	20,105,625	20,105,625
Park River Reservoir	200,000	300,000	300,000
Ohio:			
Burr Oak Reservoir		600,000	600,000
Cincinnati	850,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Delaware Reservoir	1,800,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
Dillon Reservoir	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Portsmouth-New Boston	1,400,000	2,200,000	2,000,000
West Fork Mill Creek Reservoir		500,000	500,000
Oklahoma:			
Canton Reservoir	2,000,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
Fort Gibson Reservoir	4,700,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Hulah Reservoir		1,000,000	1,000,000
Jenks	107,000	107,000	107,000
Polecat Creek		1,117,000	1,000,000
Red River below Denison Dam, Okla., Tex., Ark., and La. (See Arkansas.)			
Tenkiller Ferry Reservoir		2,000,000	2,000,000
Wister Reservoir	2,950,000	2,950,000	2,950,000
Oregon:			
Arlington		156,000	156,000
Coquille River		131,000	131,000
Detroit Reservoir	1,000,000	1,250,000	1,250,000
Dorena Reservoir	1,750,000	5,000,000	3,750,000
Oregon—Continued.			
Amazon Creek		$305,000	$305,000
Fern Ridge Reservoir		20,000	20,000
Lookout Point Reservoir	$2,850,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Mill Four district		116,000	116,000
Nehalem River		23,000	23,000
Pudding River		110,000	110,000
Umpqua River and tributaries		194,000	194,000
Willamette River (bank protection)	300,000	500,000	500,000
Pennsylvania:			
Conemaugh River Reservoir	5,200,000	5,200,000	5,200,000
East Branch, Clarion River Reservoir		1,000,000	1,000,000
Punxsutawney	400,000	400,000	400,000
Sunbury	1,169,000	1,369,000	1,369,000
Williamsport	1,836,000	2,236,000	2,236,000
South Carolina: Clark Hill Reservoir, Ga. and S. C. (See Georgia.)			
South Dakota:			
Fort Randall Reservoir	[1] 5,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
Hot Springs	200,000	200,000	200,000
Oahe Reservoir. (See advance planning)		6,000,000	
Tennessee:			
Center Hill Reservoir	5,703,000	8,000,000	6,500,000
Dale Hollow Reservoir, Tenn. and Ky. (See Kentucky.)			
Memphis	566,000	1,052,000	1,052,000
Texas:			
Buffalo Bayou	1,654,700	1,854,700	1,854,700
Hords Creek Reservoir	1,103,800	1,303,800	1,303,800
Red River below Denison Dam, Okla., Tex., Ark., and La. (See Arkansas.)			
San Angelo Reservoir and floodway		1,000,000	1,000,000
Trinity River:			
Benbrook Reservoir		1,600,000	1,600,000
Lavon Reservoir	1,900,000	500,000	500,000
Grapevine Reservoir		500,000	500,000
Whitney Reservoir	4,625,000	5,700,000	5,200,000
Utah: Redmond and vicinity		583,000	583,000
Vermont: Union Village Reservoir	100,000	100,000	100,000
Virginia:			
Buggs Island Reservoir. (See North Carolina.)			
Philpott Reservoir	250,000	250,000	250,000
Washington:			
Mud Mountain Reservoir	448,000	448,000	448,000
Tacoma	850,000	1,350,000	1,350,000
Yakima	202,000	202,000	202,000
West Virginia:			
Bluestone Reservoir	5,000,000	5,700,000	5,700,000
Elkins	628,000	628,000	628,000
Parkersburg	300,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Point Pleasant		600,000	600,000
Total, construction	[2] 121,269,800	258,829,825	231,800,825

[1] Of this amount, the House committee in its report earmarked $850,000 for planning on the Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. The Senate committee in allowing a total of $6,000,000 for the Oahe Reservoir has included funds for planning within that total for this project. The full amount of $9,000,000 recommended by the committee for the Fort Randall Reservoir, S. Dak., will be available for that project.

[2] The House report shows $122,269,800 for construction, which includes $500,000 for snagging and clearing and $500,000 for emergency bank protection.

Advance planning	
Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak	$850,000
Dyberry and Prompton Reservoirs, Lackawaxen River Basin, Pa	200,000
Eufaula Reservoir, Okla	500,000
Red Rock Reservoir, Iowa	800,000
Total earmarked for advance planning out of $4,500,000 in bill	2,350,000
Summary for flood control, general	
Advance planning	$4,500,000
Preliminary examinations, surveys, and contingencies	5,000,000
Salaries, office, Chief of Engineers	497,000
Emergency repairs pursuant to section 5, Flood Control Act of 1941	1,000,000
Transfer to Geological Survey	375,000
Maintenance of completed works	2,400,000
Emergency bank protection	500,000
Construction (total of projects listed)	231,800,825
Total in bill for flood control, general	246,072,825

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from South Dakota. Are the items for preliminary engineering and planning for dams and rivers and harbors changed by the conference report at all?

Mr. GURNEY. For preliminary examinations and surveys, the amount as passed by the Senate was $5,000,000; and in the conference that was reduced to $3,500,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, in an article entitled "Decline of the Forests," in the February 1945 issue of Fortune magazine, this paragraph appears:

> Estimating on the basis of privately owned old growth and large second growth, the Forest Service last year prophesied that the mills of Washington and Oregon would be out of logs in 18 years at the present rate of cutting. If all publicly owned timber were added to the private holdings, the theoretical cut could be extended to 37 years.

I mention this because a statement which I made on July 16, in connection with the introduction of Senate bill 1647, a bill to establish a Columbia Valley Authority, has been challenged, and I should like to submit a brief explanation.

This is my previous statement:

> The United States Forest Service reports that 80 percent of the first-grade timber in the Pacific Northwest has been logged off, and that about 20 percent of it remains. The Forest Service has estimated that at the present rate of timber cutting in our region all of the merchantable timber—both publicly and privately owned—will be cut down and hauled off in 25 years.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. For a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I should like to put into the RECORD a matter in connection with the conference report, which apparently was omitted.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I refuse to yield.

Mr. Lyle F. Watts, chief of the forest service, has now written me saying that:

> We feel certain there has been some misinterpretation of information originating in the Forest Service. The forest situation in the Pacific Northwest as a whole is not as bad as indicated in your speech.

Mr. Watts then submitted a table showing that present Forest Service es-

timates are that at the 1944 rate of drain and standards of cutting practice, there would be a 39-percent decline in the estimated saw-timber volume after 20 years, in the States of Oregon and Washington. The figures for Idaho and western Montana, also included in the C. V. A. area, were not broken down separately.

In a report on the Forest Resources of the Pacific Northwest by the Pacific Northwest Regional Planning Commission, and issued in 1938 by the National Resources Committee of the Federal Government, composed in part of the Secretaries of War, Agriculture, Commerce, Interior, and Labor, this statement appears:

Within about 25 to 30 years certain important parts of the region's lumber industry will be devoid of raw materials unless the annual depletion is sharply reduced before that time has expired. Thereafter, the regional industry can be maintained for another 20 or 30 years only by much migration and considerable substitution. But even these figures are far too optimistic.

Mr. President, I am sorry if in quoting printed digests of the Forest Service estimate, the information was misinterpreted so as not to fully reflect present Forest Service findings.

But I should like to say that whether the figure be 25 years, 37 years, or 50 or 75 years, my point remains. That point is that the lumber resources of the Northwest are being cut down faster than new growth is coming on, and we are within a foreseeable end of the raw material from which lumber is made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Prsident at this point I should like to refer to another subject.

Last week the Senate passed, without dissent, Senate bill 1394, to increase subsistence allowances for veterans attending college. Following passage of the bill, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] declared that the proposed increase was justified by the sharp rise in the cost of living. But, Mr. President, this same bill is now languishing in the House, with no chance of passage, because of the adamant stand of the Republican leadership. Yesterday, the majority leader of the House [Mr. HALLECK] blamed this delay in passage of vital veterans' legislation on the President, declaring that "it is certainly to be assumed that he would veto any such bill that the Congress might send to him."

Mr. HALLECK showed no concern over the possibility or even the certainty of a Presidential veto of the Taft-Hartley bill or the tax bill. It would appear that yesterday's statement was merely another attempt to excuse the Republicans' lack of interest in vital social legislation and their preoccupation with bills to benefit the corporations and the taxpayers whose incomes are in the upper brackets.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. No; I refuse to yield for any purpose.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have asked the Senator if he will yield for a question.

Mr. TAYLOR. I refuse to yield, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho declines to yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, there are over 1,800,000 veterans attending schools and colleges under the GI bill of rights. The sharp rise in living costs, combined with depleted savings, will force an increasing number to drop out of school next fall, unless this bill becomes law.

If the Republican leadership of the House is truly interested in passage of this bill, they will place it on the President's desk before the closing of today's session. If not, we can state, with complete justification, that the Republican Party is more concerned with political gains in 1948 than with veterans' needs in 1947.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, when the calendar was called, Calendar 790, House bill 4111, authorizing the construction of flood control works on the Little Sioux River and its tributaries in Iowa, was objected to by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. He has informed me that he has examined the bill and has no objection to it now. I ask unanimous consent——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will have to suggest to the Senator that the Senate is considering a privileged matter which will first have to be concluded. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 4002, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
July 26, 1947.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, and 12 to the bill (H. R. 4002) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$116,718,700."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "in view of the threat to human life", and after the amount "$200,000" strike out the comma.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In the second line of said amendment after "herein" insert "not to exceed $500,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: Strike out the last paragraph of the Senate amendment and insert:

"That said contract shall be submitted to the Congress on or before the first day of June 1948: *Provided, however*, That notwithstanding said contract or the provisions of this Act, the said Three Affiliated Tribes may bring suit in the Court of Claims as provided in section 24 of the Act of August 13, 1946, on account of additional damages, if any, alleged to have been sustained by said tribes by reason of the taking of the said lands and rights in the said Fort Berthold Indian Reservation on account of any treaty obligation of the Government or any intangible cost of reestablishment or relocation, for which the said tribes are not compensated by the said $5,105,625."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 6, 7, and 8.

The motion was agreed to.

THE REMOUNT SERVICE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the body of the RECORD as part of my remarks two memoranda setting forth data on the remount situation because in January I shall press again for the passage of the remount bill, H. R. 3484.

There being no objection, the memoranda were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESENT VALUES OF REMOUNT SERVICE INSTALLATIONS

It is conservatively estimated by remount officials that the present value of land and buildings comprising the four Remount Service breeding stations is from $12,000,000 to $15,000,000.

HORSES

It is estimated that the horses now in the remount program are worth approximately $1,000,000 on a conservative basis.

VALUE OF REMOUNT SERVICE TO FARMERS, RANCHERS, AND OTHERS

Under present policy, Remount Service stallions are bred to mares of farmers, ranchers, and others at a maximum fee of $20, whereas the owners of mares, if breeding to stallions of like quality in the hands of private owners, would have to pay a fee of about $100. On this basis, the Remount Service saves farmers, ranchers, and others about $1,000,000 per year in breeding fees. Of greater value, however, not possible to relate to a dollars-and-cents basis, is the value of the approximately 10,000 blooded animals resulting each year from the remount breeding program. These animals when matured have a definite value to farm and ranch owners in their daily work, and such animals as are surplus to their needs provide an additional source of income.

It should be understood that the purpose of the Remount Service is not breeding of horses for use of Government agencies, but, instead, the production of superior stallions to be used by farmers, ranchers, and others for the improvement of light horses for useful purposes throughout the entire country.

H. R. 3484, A BILL TO TRANSFER THE REMOUNT SERVICE FROM THE WAR DEPARTMENT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

H. R. 3484 proposes to transfer the records, property, both real and personal, and civilian personnel of the Remount Service of the Quartermaster Corps to the Department of Agriculture effective July 1, 1947, with the proviso that the Secretaries of War and Agriculture shall enter into a written agreement on the property and personnel covered by this transfer. Section 2 of the bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to receive this property and to carry on the horse-breeding program under such rules and regulations

as are deemed necessary by him. The Secretary of War is further authorized by section 3 to detail to the Department of Agriculture such military personnel as he may determine with the Secretary of Agriculture to be required to carry out the provisions of the bill and to safeguard the interests of the United States.

The War Department is most anxious to transfer the Remount Service to the Department of Agriculture since no funds have been included in the fiscal year 1948 budget to carry on this program. The decision to terminate the horse-breeding program was reached due to the fact that the need for horses in military operations has virtually disappeared. As this program is now, for all intents and purposes, a civil function of the Federal Government, the Agriculture Department is considered to be the proper agency to continue the administration of the program, and has concurred in the provisions of this bill.

Unless this bill be enacted this session, the War Department will be forced to declare the property and installations affiliated with this program as surplus and turn them over to the War Assets Administration for disposal. Such action will, of course, tend to make it most difficult for the Agriculture Department to resume this function if such authority be granted in the next session.

In order that the contemplated transfer be handled expeditiously, a survey has been made on the ground by representatives of the War and Agriculture Departments and the Agriculture Department has submitted to the Secretary of War a written list of the property and personnel required for the continuation of the program. The War Department has taken such preliminary steps as are feasible to effect the transfer pending enactment of this measure.

The proposed transfer of military personnel which will include officers of the Veterinary Corps of the Medical Department, will terminate as soon as the Agriculture Department can procure the necessary specialists to carry on this activity.

The War Department still holds property and installations relating to the Remount Service pending Senate action on this bill. Although the effective date of the measure is July 1, 1947, immediate consideration by the Senate will not be too late as the War and Agriculture Departments have already reached agreement relative to the continuation of this program and its rapid turnover.

RELIEF TO THE PEOPLE OF EUROPE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, in type showing that it was not delivered on the floor of the Senate, a speech which I had intended to make, but because of the lateness of the hour I shall not make it. It relates to our responsibilities and obligations concerning the people of Europe, insofar as feeding and clothing them are concerned, which is now being done, I think, in a very fine, Christian way, by a relief agency known as CARE.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WAYNE L. MORSE

Mr. President, when I returned from Europe last winter I was greatly disturbed at our lack of understanding of the daily struggle for existence that consumes the full time of many millions of people abroad. The mass catastrophe which I witnessed then has widened and deepened. Europe passed through a winter as bitterly cold as the memory of the people could remember; the winter and spring plantings were almost destroyed by frost and flood. There is little flour in France today; England has reduced her already stringent rations. A food crisis exists which must sound its overtones in conflicting ideologies, and if we as a people and as a Government would meet this challenge, we cannot again sink our heads in the ostrichlike pose of national economic isolationism.

Mr. President, I warned last winter, and I warn now once again, that if we are as blind this time as we were after World War I, we will sentence our children to the punishment of another war; we will initiate the decline of our Nation as a world power; we will be evading our responsibilities toward winning the peace.

Mr. President, I do not believe such a narrow perspective reflects the vision and the desire of our American people. And I point to the meteoric success of the organization CARE as proof of my conviction. Barely more than 1 year old, CARE—Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe—is the European synonym for American concern with human suffering abroad.

Although the organization has been so briefly in existence, it, in fact, had its genesis as a part of Herbert Hoover's relief program after World War I—a relief program which still remains an outstanding accomplishment of a singularly distinguished career. Under that American Relief Administration, individual Americans and groups were enabled to purchase food drafts here and send them to friends and corresponding groups abroad. The drafts were honored at American Relief Administration warehouses in Europe, where food parcels were issued directly to beneficiaries upon presentation of their remittances from America.

The end of World War II brought widespread famine once again. Here in America the first letters from Europe brought their desperate pleas for food from people in allied and enemy nations alike. Americans tried to help by sending parcels. But mails were disrupted and parcels were lost by the thousands. Others were pilfered by people for whom theft had become the only source of sustenance. Still others, ordered through fly-by-night firms which sprang up overnight to take advantage of the emergency, never materialized at all. People who wanted to help found themselves frustrated in their efforts; Europeans who looked to well-nourished Americans for some bit of food felt themselves abandoned.

There was need for an organization to step into the breach. Based on the experience of the Hoover organization in World War I, the President's War Relief Control Board suggested a similar service in principle, to meet a need for relief that could not be fulfilled in any other way. The President's Board brought together 24 leading American voluntary agencies which, with the encouragement of the President's Board, formed a new relief organization.

Today, CARE has in its membership 27 American agencies, uniting the efforts of major religious and other relief organizations, and operating CARE on a nonprofit, nonpolitical basis. I shall insert the list of those agencies at the close of this speech. They are all recorded with the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid, the organization established at the request of the President by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Agriculture to coordinate private relief programs and the programs of the Government, and to facilitate their field efforts in war-devastated areas.

CARE began delivery of its food packages in Europe in April of last year. They were surplus Army 10-in-1 rations made available by the War Assets Administration. They were delivered in countries where CARE obtained special government agreements with the assistance of our State Department. Since that time the organization has expanded steadily to meet the almost overwhelming demand made upon it by American citizens in every State of the Union, who sought, individually and personally, to meet the deepening crisis in Europe. Part of CARE's expansion program was the design of a new food package, when the Army 10-in-1's were exhausted, and the design of blanket, woolen, cotton, children's and other packages to cover nakedness as well as to relieve hunger.

Mr. President in its short period of operation, CARE has delivered more than 60,000,000 pounds of food alone to over two million European families, as the gifts of approximately that many Americans.

Whether or not they all realize it, 2,000,000 Americans are indicating a statesmanship which reflects international understanding in its most vital sense, and I would like today to acknowledge this leadership which is pointing the way for those who legislate and negotiate.

This leadership of average citizens comes to us from Jane Doe, John Smith, and Mary Brown, and, as it steadily increases day by day, it may yet be a turning point in a world crisis. This kind of statesmanship on the part of our people is especially significant at this time. For now, within the past month, the treacherous gap between the emergency program of UNRRA and the inauguration of permanent machinery to promote welfare has widened suddenly and dangerously. There is no denying the fundamental responsibility and ability of the American Government—and it alone—to occupy the role of rescuer-Nation. But in a supplementary position, the American people faced the challenge, and they are accepting it, through CARE.

Think of what it means when a European receives a CARE package—clearly marked "CARE, United States of America"—together with the name and address of the sender. There usually follows a letter—and with it basic international understanding between people—such as this one from a young composer in Prague, Czechoslovakia, named Sasa Rezov. This is what he writes to the American donor:

"Yesterday I received a CARE package from you. When I unpacked it, I found in addition to many pleasant and useful things something which cannot be weighed and cannot be felt. I do not know what to call it, but it is something very close to what we call humanity. It was something warming, and every small integral part of the gift was consecrated by it. Perhaps it was this something in your gift which cannot be named that pleased me most. Please believe me, dear American friend, that in reality there is no iron curtain able to separate people. In the world there is only one kind of person, and that is the human being, despite all his faults and prejudices. Permit me to shake your hand, dear American friend."

There are many variations of that kind of feeling in the letters which come into thousands of American homes every day from European relatives, friends, or from the new friend made every time a CARE package reaches its destination.

One does not need to know a European to send a package and many do not. Professors in colleges are sending packages to professors personally unknown to them; doctors to doctors; mothers to mothers; children to children; trade union members to trade union members; religious groups to religious groups—the list is endless. This is the way our people are strengthening the hand of our Government abroad—for each and every package is its own American ambassador of good will.

And what of the reaction of our own citizens? There is the example of the thoughtful young American father in New Jersey, who, in sending 10 packages to war-orphaned children in Greece, wrote, "In humble gratefulness to God for having

given my child the protection of an American home I wish to share our blessing * * * with those abroad." And here is another typical letter from Mrs. W. J. Smith, of Franklin, Tenn.

"Tony Bekker is not only a citizen of France, but he has become these last few days a friend, a human being in whom I have the greatest interest though I have never seen him.

"He is my friend. Why? Because in a small measure I have been able to relieve some of the hunger which he must endure in his impoverished country.

"May I thank CARE for the privilege of serving this Frenchman? I knew no one in any of the countries which had given this great American organization the freedom of serving its citizens without tax or toll, but if I, with $10, could bring to one unhappy individual some of the things that were plentiful on my board, it seemed a plea I could not fail to heed.

"Several days ago, my receipt came. Tony Bekker of Paris, France, is the recipient of my gift. I salute you, Tony, for now you are my friend. Distance, nationality, speech separate us, but we are held together because each has shared something of the other."

This one letter alone, Mr. President, expresses the spirit which provides a leadership for all of us. It is such Americans as Mrs. Smith who—not in the spirit of charity but in the spirit of friendship—are making America's basic contribution to winning the peace.

One of the most critical winters in Europe's history lies ahead and the European people, tired and undernourished, will face it with greater courage and endurance in the knowledge that the American people will not abandon them. Every American can, and many will personally enter the field of international relations in this tangible way. CARE tells me it is equipped to handle 50,000 orders a day through its headquarters at 50 Broad Street, New York, and its 500 branches in 67 cities across the continent—one of them being its office here, in room 1023 of the Dupont Circle Building in Washington.

Mr. President, the New York Times carried an article on July 5, describing the CARE service and what it means. I ask unanimous consent for its insertion in the RECORD together with the basic facts about the organization.

I am glad to do this, Mr. President, for even while the Congress acts, the American people, individually, are showing us the direction in which we must go if we would indeed exert world leadership and see the democratic ideal prevail.

[From the New York Times of July 6, 1947]

THE PACKAGE THAT MEANS LIFE AND HOPE—IT IS THE FOOD BUNDLE SENT TO EUROPE BY CARE AND BY INDIVIDUALS—AN AMBASSADOR OF MERCY

(By Gertrude Samuels)

Madame Marie Dsierzanowska, in her shabby black dress with the neat white bow at her throat, stood in the doorway of her home at Francuska 8-M-9, Warsaw, and looked inquiringly at the Polish jeep driver and the American relief worker. Her wise old eyes, apparently oblivious of the rubble-heaped street, turned in fascination to what her visitors carried—two packages.

Suddenly four more women, bent and ancient, appeared silently behind her, peering out. At the sight of the packages, their eyes, too, reflected Mme. Dsierzanowska's emotion. Wordlessly they led their visitors to a tiny, gloomy basement room a flight below, and their trembling hands accepted one of the packages marked "From an unknown American—for a worthy Warsaw person." They broke it open and drew out the incredible contents—canned meat and stews, a pot of jam, biscuits, sugar.

The scene was one of controlled excitement. Mme. Dsierzanowska set the other package to one side. It was marked: "To some needy Polish children—from the University of Chicago Nursery School." She told her visitors that each noon many women gathered here for their only meal—usually soup; that 30 needy schoolgirls, ranging in age from 5 to 13 years, came at 4 o'clock for cocoa, sometimes furnished by Caritas, the Polish branch of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, sometimes out of her small savings. So the two packages were highly welcome. She gave the American a long, searching look. "To say thank you," she said finally, "is not enough. It is too wonderful. And yet I feel I must ask—what can we do to make America understand how much the people need this help?"

This gratitude of one 72-year-old Polish woman and her stubborn, desperate question illustrated the story of millions in Europe today who know what hunger means. And it points up the role of the organization called CARE and its ambassador of mercy—a food package.

In the past year Americans have privately contributed more than $789,400,000 in cash and goods for the relief of relatives, friends, institutions, and many needy families abroad. Aid was extended through 55 private agencies including the Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, Inc., better known as CARE, and in addition there were direct donations from individuals to friends estimated at $296,900,000 and gift parcels valued at $125,500,000.

Within the past 6 months alone, religious groups in the United States have bought 81,875 packages through CARE for similar organizations in Europe; the CIO and AFL some 20,000 packages for needy trade-unionists; industrial groups some 43,195 packages for their opposite numbers abroad; hospitals and schools, 2,760 packages. The figures give some idea of how traditional American generosity has responded to need. And letters streaming back to CARE and the donors tell how democracy works when it becomes this living thing:

"It is impossible to find suitable words," writes an artist from Athens. "I send you only thanks from the cracked heart of one ill man to whom you gave the happiest day of his life." "From the bottom of my heart, accept my thanks for all Americans," writes a Helsinski mother. "The boys' father died at Karhumäki on January 28, 1944. And we are now without husband and father and the food you sent was even more welcome as the time of the year is hard for everything." "You ask if we were pleased?" writes a Belgian. "You should have seen the children when the package was opened. The youngest said to me, 'Does this gentleman know we have been hungry?' "

"With the food shortage in Italy," writes the Reverend Ranato Ausiello Lanteri, of the Casa Buoni Franciulli orphan home, in Rome, "packages like yours are a real providence." And from the Reverend Jan Mechanicky, of Czechoslovakia, "This is really a more effective publicity of peace and friendship than all diplomatic service." "Besides," write Spanish exiles now living in France, "the packages arrived in perfect shape, wonderfully wrapped, and they clearly prove that they are in the best shape of all packages from North America."

What the figures do not show is how tremendous the need is today and to what extent individual good will is sought. UNRRA, which operated chiefly in central eastern Europe, shipped its last ton of food 3 months ago. Europe's big hope—the spring crop—has been virtually destroyed by floods and frosts, and bread, prime source of existence for Europe, is disappearing country by country.

There is no international agency to replace UNRRA. There are two other organizations in the field, but they are focused on just two aspects of UNRRA's broad mission, and both have had difficulty in starting. One is the UN's International Children's Fund, which may take months before its limited operations can begin. The other is the International Refugee Organization, which is taking over UNRRA's job of caring for refugees and displaced persons in Europe, but also on a limited basis. Thus Europe is forced to look to the American people.

The Nation's welfare groups anticipated this situation when they formed CARE last year. Thousands of American food packages sent by individuals overseas had been lost or pilfered on delivery, or took from 6 months to a year for arrival. Fly-by-night firms emerged, taking money for packages which never materialized. In February 1946, 22 agencies, representing all leading relief, religious, labor, and cooperative groups handling mass relief work, organized a nonprofit cooperative to be called CARE in the District of Columbia with the approval of the State, War, and Agriculture Departments, the President's War Relief Board and UNRRA. They bought about a million Army surplus packages, each with enough food for 30 balanced meals; stored them in warehouses in Europe for on-the-spot delivery at $15 each, and empowered CARE to act as the broker for individual Americans seeking to buy. To Europeans on below subsistence diets it was a miracle of riches, and President Truman, buying 100 big packages said: "I commend it to the people of the United States."

Since CARE's first food shipments arrived at Havre in May 1946, virtually all the Army surplus has been sold. CARE in less than a year distributed more than 60,000,000 pounds of food to over 2,000,000 families. And, responding to worsening economic conditions, the agency greatly expanded operations. Its member groups increased to 28; there are 500 branches of CARE in 67 cities, and it has agreements with 14 countries—Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Finland, France, Great Britain, Greece, Austria; the American, British, and French zones of Germany and all sectors of Berlin; Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Rumania. These agreements guarantee that the packages—now $10 each—shall enter the country tax- and duty-free; that they will be ration-free, not deductible from an individual's normal rations; and that they will receive police protection until delivered.

Of great significance is the fact that CARE is working behind the so-called iron curtain, in countries such as Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Rumania, with American personnel and without Government interference. At no point does the Government determine where the packages may go; that is predetermined at the point of origin; but on undesignated packages the Government may be consulted. If after 120 days a beneficiary is untraceable, the full dollar payment is refunded.

Today CARE prepares four critically needed "basic packages." The big food package has changed its character, substituting for Army surplus a broad selection which grew out of conferences among leading nutritionists from the Red Cross, the city of New York, Presbyterian Hospital, Teachers College, and others. Designed to meet the most acute basic shortages in Europe, and to provide food which can be cooked to meet national preferences, the 21½-pound package includes 7 pounds of white enriched flour; 1 pound of high-protein braised beef; 1 pound of liver loaf, high in iron value; chocolate, egg powder, coffee, soap, sugar, shortening, etc. Containing 40,963 calories (against the less than 1,500 a day on which most Europeans live), the big package is worth 3 to 5 times its dollar cost abroad; an individual sending a similar package via ocean freight would pay $9.64 for the food plus $10.60 for freight, bill of lading, and insurance costs, etc.; even more by parcel post.

Apart from the big package are a woolen package with enough material for an adult's suit or two suits for children; a package containing two all-wool blankets with instructions for converting them, if desired, into clothes; a cotton package with 17 yards of assorted dress and shirting materials—all selling for $10 each. In these packages are such supplementary items as thread, buttons, scissors, etc.

A fifth package is being planned. Last April the first British agreement with CARE was signed, and the agency's chief of mission asked whether Whitehall had any suggestion about the packages. Sir Stafford Cripps, president of the board of trade, said he had. "If you ship even one textile package to Britain, can you make it what we need most—a baby layette package?"

CARE—which turns its surplus moneys back into packages—said it probably could. And soon it will offer a stork special, replete with diapers, receiving blankets, flannel kimonos, training pants, a rubber sheet, powder, oil, and, of course, safety pins.

The importance of CARE as a public service and humanitarian symbol is driven home as one talks to the package senders. At its New York headquarters at 50 Broad Street—which began with a skeleton force of 30 and now has a staff of 550 persons here and overseas—the contents of each of the $10 packages are arranged in showcases, and clerks advise purchasers about the forms to be filled out. Most of them require no help—they have filled out so many. Quietly they give the few details—their names and addresses and those of the beneficiaries and pay their money—$10, $20, $50, $100, depending on the number of packages. They are sent to friends, relatives, "to anyone who is hungry, what does it matter where?"

Mrs. Eleanor B., a lawyer in the Wall Street district, sending a food package to "a needy Greek family," put it this way: "I try to send one food parcel a month. It's really quite a selfish act. I find I can eat better myself after I've done it."

Frank Groeger, 61-year-old Park Avenue doorman, his white head bending over the application on which he wrote his brother's name, Johann, who lives in the Russian zone of Berlin, said he sent packages regularly to about 20 persons. "These old people in the Russian zone," he said, "have four or five different ration cards—'Himmelfahrt Karte,' get very little because they don't work. And 'starvation cards' they call them—and they my sister, Margarete Zachwey, is in the British zone with her 13-year-old son. They, too, write that these packages have helped to keep them alive."

CARE is in the position to meet Europe's need for food, at least in part. Speed is the watchword. And on the war-devastated Continent, large areas of which still lack communications and transport, the organization is doing its job with a minimum of red tape, and with a priority on governmental cooperation. Perhaps its biggest appeal is that its packages are already stock piled in warehouses all over Europe—there are now, for instance, 500,000 food packages awaiting consignment in the CARE countries—and a steady pipe line of all four packages keeps the warehouses at maximum. Now handling 10,000 to 12,000 orders a day, CARE estimates that it can easily expand to 50,000 orders.

It was obviously no accident that the organization chose a name whose initials would spell "care." It was designed to tell Europe that Americans do care what happens to hungry persons—and to warn Americans that an island of plenty in a sea of want can be in a dangerously isolated position.

FACTS ABOUT CARE—COOPERATIVE FOR AMERICAN REMITTANCES TO EUROPE, INC.

CARE is a nonprofit, Government-approved cooperative with a membership comprised of 27 leading American voluntary agencies.

CARE PACKAGES FOR EUROPE

Food package: 21.6 pounds net of flour, coffee (tea is substituted in the packages for Britain), chocolate, sugar, fruit, shortening, meat, milk, and egg powder, etc. (Also, a kosher version of this package).

Blanket package: 2 all-wool Army-surplus blankets; sewing accessories for converting blankets into clothing if desired; soles and heels for repairing worn shoes; comb; etc.

Woolen package: 3½ yards of all-wool herringbone tweed fabric by-the-yard; for a man's suit, woman's suit or coat, or two garments for children. Also, cotton drill lining material, buttons, thread, other sewing accessories.

Cotton package: 17 yards of assorted cotton fabrics by-the-yard, for clothes for all members of a European family, plus sewing accessories for making the garments.

Infant-food package: Cereal, sugar, milk powder, vitamin concentrates. Complete, or supplementary, diet for an infant aged up to 6 months.

Baby-food package: Cereal, sugar, milk powder, vitamin concentrates, strained vegetables, meat, and fruit. Complete, or supplementary, diet for baby between ages of 6 months and 1 year.

Layette package: Garments and blankets furnishing a complete wardrobe for a baby.

COMPLETE COST

Complete cost of all the CARE packages mentioned above is $10 each. This includes guaranteed delivery to the beneficiary named in Europe.

DELIVERY

CARE assembles its packages on American assembly lines; ships them in quantity to Europe; warehouses them in local warehouses throughout Europe. Orders are sent from CARE headquarters in New York by air express to CARE offices in European capitals. The orders are then referred to the local warehouse nearest to the home of the beneficiary. The package is then delivered to the recipient from the stockpile in that local warehouse.

TAX-FREE, DUTY-FREE, RATION-FREE

CARE has special agreements with the governments of each country in which it operates. CARE packages enter tax-free, duty-free, ration-free, without customs inspection; with full police protection.

DELIVERY GUARANTEED

Because it operates through Government agreement, and because its own staff members supervise its operation throughout Europe, CARE can guarantee delivery of every package, in perfect condition. The purchaser receives an initial receipt from CARE, acknowledging his order. After delivery of the parcel, he receives a second receipt, signed by the recipient in Europe. If, for any reason, delivery cannot be effected, the full purchase price is refunded.

COUNTRIES SERVED

CARE serves Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, France, Finland, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, Hungary, Rumania, Poland, the United Kingdom (England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland), Eire, Germany (American, British, and French-occupied Zones and all Berlin).

MEMBER AGENCIES OF CARE

American Aid to France, Inc.; American Baptist Relief; American Friends Service Committee; American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, Inc.; American Relief to Austria, Inc.; American Relief for Czechoslovakia, Inc.; American Relief for Poland, Inc.; Brethren Service Committee; Church World Service, Inc.; Congregational Christian Service Committee; Committee on Christian Science Wartime Activities of the Mother Church; Cooperative League of the United States of America; General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists; Greek War Relief Association, Inc., United States of America; International Rescue and Relief Committee, Inc.; Labor League for Human Rights, AFL; Mennonite Central Committee; National CIO Community Services Committee; Paderewski Testimonial Fund, Inc.; Save the Children Federation, Inc.; Tolstoy Foundation, Inc.; Unitarian Service Committee; United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America, Inc.; United Yugoslav Relief Fund of America; War Relief Service—National Catholic Welfare Conference; Y. W. C. A.—World Emergency and War Victims Fund; United Ukrainian American Relief Committee.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO MONTGOMERY COUNTY, PA.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I objected to the consideration of a bill which had been introduced by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], which appears on the calendar I believe as order of business 749, House bill 3862. I have had a conference with the Senator from Pennsylvania, and I wish to say that the facts are—and they were not clear when I objected—that his bill refers to a little strip of land about 12 feet wide and about 100 feet in length, or thereabouts. The Federal Government is receiving from the State of Pennsylvania adequate compensation for the value of the property. Therefore I withdraw my objection.

INVESTIGATION OF IMMIGRATION SYSTEM

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, because of the lateness of the hour and my inability to secure the floor to make a brief address, I ask unanimous consent to insert a statement in the RECORD, a statement by me regarding Senate Resolution 137, a resolution providing for an investigation of the immigration system.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I have believed for a long time that the United States aggressively should move toward the intolerable situation which has faced our fellow humans existing behind barb-wire enclosures in Central Europe for 2 years under our flag.

It has been a most bitter disappointment to me that the United States has tolerated such a deplorable tragedy with such patient complacency. In these circumstances I do not relish uttering one word of criticism of any other government. Nevertheless I cannot close my eyes to the horror of the floating concentration camp known as *Exodus 1947*. May we consider its plight briefly.

Mr. President, last week, while Members of the Senate were discussing the fact that Great Britain's regime in Palestine has become one of military occupation, at that very same time, a vessel carrying 4,500 Hebrews to Palestine, the *Exodus 1947* was rammed at sea by British destroyers. An American member of the crew was killed by the British boarding party, and there were numerous casualties among the passengers. This action took place on the high seas, 17 miles from the coast of Palestine, at a point clearly beyond British jurisdiction. Certainly there are strong overtones of piracy in this British action.

Clearly this is an act of provocation. The pattern of incitement underlying the British action was tersely explained in a New York Post editorial on July 25:

"They know how events run. The British block immigration. Then comes an incident. The British harass the whole Jewish

population by mass searches and humiliation. Somebody throws a grenade. The British discharge all their weapons at random through the streets of Jerusalem or Haifa or Tel Aviv. The underground explodes a land mine. Again there's British mass retaliation. There comes a lull in hostilities. The British initiate a new and harsher policy."

What is to become of the 4,500 who are now floating around the Mediterranean in three British vessels? These people have lived in concentration camps for 8 years.

At the present time the British are seeking to force the French Government to admit passengers of the *Exodus 1947* to France. They are alleged to have sailed from a French port; therefore they must be punished by being returned to a French port; and there is the obvious inference that this will be a lesson to the French Government also; France will be left with the choice of housing and feeding the 4,500 or accepting the onus of returning them to the concentration camps from whence they came. I hope the French remain firm and do not yield to the British pressures.

The excuse used by the British for throwing these Hebrews back into France is that their concentration camp in Cyprus is not big enough. Has it ever occurred to the British that the only place in the world which is big enough, and ready, willing, and able to absorb these people is Palestine?

The hour is late, Mr. President. We are adjourning our session, while these 4,500 human beings, heroic allies in the war, are still floating at sea, having exchanged concentration camps for prison ships. We have a duty and a responsibility toward these people who were seized in international waters and are now being tossed hither and yon across the seas. We cannot permit anyone to play with human lives, and certainly not with the lives of these people who have suffered so much.

It is within the province of the United States to take these 4,500 Hebrews under our immediate protection. It is within the power of the President to extend the protection and assistance of the United States to these people, pending some final solution. It would seem to me, and to millions of Americans, that the President would be acting completely in accord with the traditions and precedents of our country if he would direct our military and naval establishments in Europe to offer these 4,500 concrete help. The least that can be done is to remove them from the British prison ships and put them on vessels bearing the American flag. Above all, they must not be returned to the continent of Europe from which they have escaped; it would be gross inhumanity and completely illegal and would be assisting the British campaign to break the spirit of these people and set a dangerous precedent. To return them to Europe would be virtually to confirm this death sentence.

If we want to forget power politics for a moment and regard the problem of 4,500 persons caged on British transports from the point of view of justice and legality, then we must ask precisely where do these people belong?

They certainly do not belong in displaced persons camps. We have long agreed that these camps were merely emergency shelters, serving to house those whose homes were destroyed, or who could not be reabsorbed because of political or physical conditions in Europe. Now that these people have moved out of the camps, there is no authority which can legally make them return to these camps.

They do not belong in France. The mere fact that they sailed from a French port does not mean that France has any responsibility toward them.

It is quite obvious that they cannot remain at sea, floating around indefinitely until the UN report has been filed, studied, debated, and finally has become the basis of British procrastination.

I submit, Mr. President, that the 4,500 Hebrews whom the British have forcibly removed from the *Exodus 1947* are, and of right ought to be, citizens of Palestine. All international covenants dealing with this issue make it crystal clear that these people have every right to go to Palestine, and that anyone who willfully interferes with their move to Palestine is committing an offense against international law as well as inflicting a most cruel and inhuman hardship against a people.

If one looks at the League of Nations mandate, which is basic law for Palestine today, then these people have a right to go there. If one looks at the Anglo-American Treaty of 1924, one finds that we, the United States, have a specific responsibility to assist the Hebrews to return to their homeland. If we hold any regard for the right of self-determination, then they surely are entitled to swift and unhampered entry.

We, the United States, have a right to help assist these people only in accordance with strict regard for their legal rights and status. We cannot take upon ourselves the implementing of a solution which would put these people in concentration camps. And we certainly cannot ask the French Government to do something totally in violation of the rules and laws which we respect, and ask that France permit its shores to be used by the British as a dumping ground. If the only proper and legal place for these people is Palestine, then we must see to it that they get there and not meddle with any other course.

I, therefore, repeat that now is the time for the President of the United States to offer these 4,500 people the protection of the American flag on an American vessel. When the proper time arrived, this vessel would sail to Palestine and disembark the 4,500 peacefully and with proper dignity. If this were done, it would demonstrate that we are in earnest, and it would stop cold the current attempt to block every avenue of escape for the Hebrews in Europe.

And, Mr. President, it would be worth a thousand protests to the British.

HEADQUARTERS OF UNITED NATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 144) authorizing the President to bring into effect an agreement between the United States and the United Nations for the purpose of establishing the permanent headquarters of the United Nations in the United States and authorizing the taking of measures necessary to facilitate compliance with the provisions of such agreement, and for other purposes, which were, on the first line of page 4 of the preamble strike out "a copy of which is annexed hereto;" and insert "which agreement is incorporated herein;"; on page 4, line 15, strike out "agreement." and insert "agreement: *Provided*, That any supplemental agreement entered into pursuant to section 5 of the agreement incorporated herein shall be submitted to the Congress for approval. The agreement follows:

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA REGARDING THE HEADQUARTERS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The United Nations and the United States of America:

Desiring to conclude an agreement for the purpose of carrying out the Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 14 December 1946 to establish the seat of the United Nations in The City of New York and to regulate questions arising as a result thereof;

Have appointed as their representatives for this purpose:

The United Nations:
TRYGVE LIE,
Secretary-General,

and

The United States of America:
GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State,

Who have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I—DEFINITIONS

Section 1

In this agreement:

(a) The expression "headquarters district" means (1) the area defined as such in Annex 1, (2) any other lands or buildings which from time to time may be included therein by supplemental agreement with the appropriate American authorities;

(b) the expression "appropriate American authorities" means such federal, state, or local authorities in the United States as may be appropriate in the context and in accordance with the laws and customs of the United States, including the laws and customs of the state and local government involved;

(c) the expression "General Convention" means the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations 13 February 1946, as acceded to by the United States;

(d) the expression "United Nations" means the international organization established by the Charter of the United Nations, hereinafter referred to as the "Charter";

(e) the expression "Secretary-General" means the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

ARTICLE II—THE HEADQUARTERS DISTRICT

Section 2

The seat of the United Nations shall be the headquarters district.

Section 3

The appropriate American authorities shall take whatever action may be necessary to assure that the United Nations shall not be dispossessed of its property in the headquarters district, except as provided in Section 22 in the event that the United Nations ceases to use the same; provided that the United Nations shall reimburse the appropriate American authorities for any costs incurred, after consultation with the United Nations, in liquidating by eminent domain proceedings or otherwise any adverse claims

Section 4

(a) The United Nations may establish and operate in the headquarters district:

(1) its own short-wave sending and receiving radio broadcasting facilities (including emergency link equipment) which may be used on the same frequencies (within the tolerances prescribed for the broadcasting service by applicable United States regulations) for radiotelegraph, radioteletype, radiotelephone, radiotelephoto, and similar services;

(2) one point-to-point circuit between the headquarters district and the office of the United Nations in Geneva (using single sideband equipment) to be used exclusively for the exchange of broadcasting programs and inter-office communications;

(3) low power micro-wave, low or medium frequency facilities for communication within headquarters buildings only, or such other buildings as may temporarily be used by the United Nations;

(4) facilities for point-to-point communication to the same extent and subject to the same conditions as permitted under applicable rules and regulations for amateur operation in the United States, except that

such rules and regulations shall not be applied in a manner inconsistent with the inviolability of the headquarters district provided by Section 9 (a);

(5) such other radio facilities as may be specified by supplemental agreement between the United Nations and the appropriate American authorities.

(b) The United Nations shall make arrangements for the operation of the services referred to in this section with the International Telecommunication Union, the appropriate agencies of the Government of the United States and the appropriate agencies of other affected governments with regard to all frequencies and similar matters.

(c) The facilities provided for in this section may, to the extent necessary for efficient operation, be established and operated outside the headquarters district. The appropriate American authorities will, on request of the United Nations, make arrangements, on such terms and in such manner as may be agreed upon by supplemental agreement, for the acquisition or use by the United Nations of appropriate premises for such purposes and the inclusion of such premises in the headquarters district.

Section 5

In the event that the United Nations should find it necessary and desirable to establish and operate an aerodrome, the conditions for the location, use and operation of such an aerodrome and the conditions under which there shall be entry into and exit therefrom shall be the subject of a supplemental agreement.

Section 6

In the event that the United Nations should propose to organize its own postal service, the conditions under which such service shall be set up shall be the subject of a supplemental agreement.

ARTICLE III—LAW AND AUTHORITY IN THE HEADQUARTERS DISTRICT

Section 7

(a) The headquarters district shall be under the control and authority of the United Nations as provided in this agreement.

(b) Except as otherwise provided in this agreement or in the General Convention, the federal, state and local law of the United States shall apply within the headquarters district.

(c) Except as otherwise provided in this agreement or in the General Convention, the federal, state and local courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction over acts done and transactions taking place in the headquarters district as provided in applicable federal, state and local laws.

(d) The federal, state and local courts of the United States, when dealing with cases arising out of or relating to acts done or transactions taking place in the headquarters district, shall take into account the regulations enacted by the United Nations under Section 8.

Section 8

The United Nations shall have the power to make regulations, operative within the headquarters district, for the purpose of establishing therein conditions in all respects necessary for the full execution of its functions. No federal, state or local law or regulation of the United States which is inconsistent with a regulation of the United Nations authorized by this section shall, to the extent of such inconsistency, be applicable within the headquarters district. Any dispute, between the United Nations and the United States, as to whether a regulation of the United Nations is authorized by this section or as to whether a federal, state or local law or regulation is inconsistent with any regulation of the United Nations authorized by this section, shall be promptly settled as provided in Section 21. Pending such settlement, the regulation of the United Nations shall apply, and the federal, state or local law or regulation shall be inapplicable in the headquarters district to the extent that the United Nations claims it to be inconsistent with the regulation of the United Nations. This section shall not prevent the reasonable application of fire protection regulations of the appropriate American authorities.

Section 9

(a) The headquarters district shall be inviolable. Federal, State or local officers or officials of the United States, whether administrative, judicial, military or police, shall not enter the headquarters district to perform any official duties therein except with the consent of and under conditions agreed to by the Secretary-General. The service of legal process, including the seizure of private property, may take place within the headquarters district only with the consent of and under conditions approved by the Secretary-General.

(b) Without prejudice to the provisions of the General Convention or Article IV of this agreement, the United Nations shall prevent the headquarters district from becoming a refuge either for persons who are avoiding arrest under the federal, state, or local law of the United States or are required by the Government of the United States for extradition to another country, or for persons who are endeavoring to avoid service of legal process.

Section 10

The United Nations may expel or exclude persons from the headquarters district for violation of its regulations adopted under Section 8 or for other cause. Persons who violate such regulations shall be subject to other penalties or to detention under arrest only in accordance with the provisions of such laws or regulations as may be adopted by the appropriate American authorities.

ARTICLE IV—COMMUNICATIONS AND TRANSIT

Section 11

The federal, state or local authorities of the United States shall not impose any impediments to transit to or from the headquarters district of (1) representatives of Members or officials of the United Nations, or of specialized agencies as defined in Article 57, paragraph 2, of the Charter, or the families of such representatives or officials, (2) experts performing missions for the United Nations or for such specialized agencies, (3) representatives of the press, or of radio, film or other information agencies, who have been accredited by the United Nations (or by such a specialized agency) in its discretion after consultation with the United States, (4) representatives of non-governmental organizations recognized by the United Nations for the purpose of consultation under Article 71 of the Charter, or (5) other persons invited to the headquarters district by the United Nations or by such specialized agency on official business. The appropriate American authorities shall afford any necessary protection to such persons while in transit to or from the headquarters district. This section does not apply to general interruptions of transportation which are to be dealt with as provided in Section 17, and does not impair the effectiveness of generally applicable laws and regulations as to the operation of means of transportation.

Section 12

The provisions of Section 11 shall be applicable irrespective of the relations existing between the Governments of the persons referred to in that section and the Government of the United States.

Section 13

(a) Laws and regulations in force in the United States regarding the entry of aliens shall not be applied in such manner as to interfere with the privileges referred to in Section 11. When visas are required for persons referred to in that Section, they shall be granted without charge and as promptly as possible.

(b) Laws and regulations in force in the United States regarding the residence of aliens shall not be applied in such manner as to interfere with the privileges referred to in Section 11 and, specifically, shall not be applied in such manner as to require any such person to leave the United States on account of any activities performed by him in his official capacity. In case of abuse of such privileges of residence by any such person in activities in the United States outside his official capacity, it is understood that the privileges referred to in Section 11 shall not be construed to grant him exemption from the laws and regulations of the United States regarding the continued residence of aliens, provided that:

(1) No proceedings shall be instituted under such laws or regulations to require any such person to leave the United States except with the prior approval of the Secretary of State of the United States. Such approval shall be given only after consultation with the appropriate Member in the case of a representative of a Member (or a member of his family) or with the Secretary-General or the principal executive officer of the appropriate specialized agency in the case of any other person referred to in Section 11;

(2) A representative of the Member concerned, the Secretary-General, or the principal executive officer of the appropriate specialized agency, as the case may be, shall have the right to appear in any such proceedings on behalf of the person against whom they are instituted;

(3) Persons who are entitled to diplomatic privileges and immunities under Section 15 or under the General Convention shall not be required to leave the United States otherwise than in accordance with the customary procedure applicable to diplomatic envoys accredited to the United States.

(c) This section does not prevent the requirement of reasonable evidence to establish that persons claiming the rights granted by Section 11 come within the classes described in that section, or the reasonable application of quarantine and health regulations.

(d) Except as provided above in this section and in the General Convention, the United States retains full control and authority over the entry of persons or property into the territory of the United States and the conditions under which persons may remain or reside there.

(e) The Secretary-General shall, at the request of the appropriate American authorities, enter into discussions with such authorities, with a view to making arrangements for registering the arrival and departure of persons who have been granted visas valid only for transit to and from the headquarters district and sojourn therein and in its immediate vicinity.

(f) The United Nations shall, subject to the foregoing provisions of this section, have the exclusive right to authorize or prohibit entry of persons and property into the headquarters district and to prescribe the conditions under which persons may remain or reside there.

Section 14

The Secretary-General and the appropriate American authorities shall, at the request of either of them, consult as to methods of facilitating entrance into the United States, and the use of available means of transportation, by persons coming from abroad who wish to visit the headquarters district and do not enjoy the rights referred to in this Article.

ARTICLE V—RESIDENT REPRESENTATIVES TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Section 15

(1) Every person designated by a Member as the principal resident representative to the United Nations of such Member or as a resident representative with the rank of ambassador or minister plenipotentiary,

(2) such resident members of their staffs as may be agreed upon between the Secretary-General, the Government of the United States and the Government of the Member concerned,

(3) every person designated by a Member of a specialized agency, as defined in Article 57, paragraph 2, of the Charter, as its principal resident representative, with the rank of ambassador or minister plenipotentiary, at the headquarters of such agency in the United States, and

(4) such other principal resident representatives of members to a specialized agency and such resident members of the staffs of representatives to a specialized agency as may be agreed upon between the principal executive officer of the specialized agency, the Government of the United States and the Government of the Member concerned, shall, whether residing inside or outside the headquarters district, be entitled in the territory of the United States to the same privileges and immunities, subject to corresponding conditions and obligations, as it accords to diplomatic envoys accredited to it. In the case of Members whose governments are not recognized by the United States, such privileges and immunities need be extended to such representatives, or persons on the staffs of such representatives, only within the headquarters district, at their residences and offices outside the district, in transit between the district and such residences and offices, and in transit on official business to or from foreign countries.

ARTICLE VI—POLICY PROTECTION OF THE HEADQUARTERS DISTRICT

Section 16

(a) The appropriate American authorities shall exercise due diligence to ensure that the tranquility of the headquarters district is not disturbed by the unauthorized entry of groups of persons from outside or by disturbances in its immediate vicinity and shall cause to be provided on the boundaries of the headquarters district such police protection as is required for these purposes.

(b) If so requested by the Secretary-General, the appropriate American authorities shall provide a sufficient number of police for the preservation of law and order in the headquarters district, and for the removal therefrom of persons as requested under the authority of the United Nations. The United Nations shall, if requested, enter into arrangements with the appropriate American authorities to reimburse them for the reasonable cost of such services.

ARTICLE VII—PUBLIC SERVICES AND PROTECTION OF THE HEADQUARTERS DISTRICT

Section 17

(a) The appropriate American authorities will exercise to the extent requested by the Secretary-General the powers which they possess with respect to the supplying of public services to ensure that the headquarters district shall be supplied on equitable terms with the necessary public services, including electricity, water, gas, post, telephone, telegraph, transportation, drainage, collection of refuse, fire protection, snow removal, et cetera. In case of any interruption or threatened interruption of any such services, the appropriate American authorities will consider the needs of the United Nations as being of equal importance with the similar needs of essential agencies of the Government of the United States, and will take steps accordingly, to ensure that the work of the United Nations is not prejudiced.

(b) Special provisions with reference to maintenance of utilities and underground construction are contained in Annex 2.

Section 18

The appropriate American authorities shall take all reasonable steps to ensure that the amenities of the headquarters district are not prejudiced and the purposes for which the district is required are not obstructed by any use made of the land in the vicinity of the district. The United Nations shall on its part take all reasonable steps to ensure that the amenities of the land in the vicinity of the headquarters district are not prejudiced by any use made of the land in the headquarters district by the United Nations.

Section 19

It is agreed that no form of racial or religious discrimination shall be permitted within the headquarters district.

ARTICLE VIII—MATTERS RELATING TO THE OPERATION OF THIS AGREEMENT

Section 20

The Secretary-General and the appropriate American authorities shall settle by agreement the channels through which they will communicate regarding the application of the provisions of this agreement and other questions affecting the headquarters district, and may enter into such supplemental agreements as may be necessary to fulfill the purposes of this agreement. In making supplemental agreements with the Secretary-General, the United States shall consult with the appropriate state and local authorities. If the Secretary-General so requests, the Secretary of State of the United States shall appoint a special representative for the purpose of liaison with the Secretary-General.

Section 21

(a) Any dispute between the United Nations and the United States concerning the interpretation or application of this agreement or of any supplemental agreement, which is not settled by negotiation or other agreed mode of settlement, shall be referred for final decision to a tribunal of three arbitrators, one to be named by the Secretary-General, one to be named by the Secretary of State of the United States, and the third to be chosen by the two, or, if they should fail to agree upon a third, then by the President of the International Court of Justice.

(b) The Secretary-General or the United States may ask the General Assembly to request of the International Court of Justice an advisory opinion on any legal question arising in the course of such proceedings. Pending the receipt of the opinion of the Court, an interim decision of the arbitral tribunal shall be observed on both parties. Thereafter, the arbitral tribunal shall render a final decision, having regard to the opinion of the Court.

ARTICLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Section 22

(a) The United Nations shall not dispose of all or any part of the land owned by it in the headquarters district without the consent of the United States. If the United States is unwilling to consent to a disposition which the United Nations wishes to make of all or any part of such land, the United States shall buy the same from the United Nations at a price to be determined as provided in paragraph (d) of this section.

(b) If the seat of the United Nations is removed from the headquarters district, all right, title and interest of the United Nations in and to real property in the headquarters district or any part of it shall, on request of either the United Nations or the United States, be assigned and conveyed to the United States. In the absence of such request, the same shall be assigned and conveyed to the subdivision of a state in which it is located or, if such subdivision shall not desire it, then to the state in which it is located. If none of the foregoing desires the same, it may be disposed of as provided in paragraph (a) of this section.

(c) If the United Nations disposes of all or any part of the headquarters district, the provisions of other sections of this agreement which apply to the headquarters district shall immediately cease to apply to the land and buildings so disposed of.

(d) The price to be paid for any conveyance under this section shall, in default of agreement, be the then fair value of the land, buildings and installations, to be determined under the procedure provided in Section 21.

Section 23

The seat of the United Nations shall not be removed from the headquarters district unless the United Nations should so decide.

This agreement shall cease to be in force if the seat of the United Nations is removed from the territory of the United States, except for such provisions as may be applicable in connection with the orderly termination of the operations of the United Nations at its seat in the United States and the disposition of its property therein.

Section 25

Wherever this agreement imposes obligations on the appropriate American authorities, the Government of the United States shall have the ultimate responsibility for the fulfillment of such obligations by the appropriate American authorities.

Section 26

The provisions of this agreement shall be complementary to the provisions of the General Convention. In so far as any provision of this agreement and any provisions of the General Convention relate to the same subject matter, the two provisions shall, wherever possible, be treated as complementary, so that both provisions shall be applicable and neither shall narrow the effect of the other; but in any case of absolute conflict, the provisions of this agreement shall prevail.

Section 27

This agreement shall be construed in the light of its primary purpose to enable the United Nations at its headquarters in the United States, fully and efficiently to discharge its responsibilities and fulfill its purposes.

Section 28

This agreement shall be brought into effect by an exchange of notes between the Secretary-General, duly authorized pursuant to a resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations, and the appropriate executive officer of the United States, duly authorized pursuant to appropriate action of the Congress.

In witness whereof the respective representatives have signed this Agreement and have affixed their seals hereto.

Done in duplicate, in the English and French languages, both authentic, at Lake Success the twenty-sixth day of June 1947.

For the Government of the United States of America:

G. C. MARSHALL
Secretary of State

For the United Nations:

TRYGVE LIE
Secretary-General

ANNEX 1

The area referred to in Section 1 (a) (1) consists of (a) the premises bounded on the East by the westerly side of Franklin D. Roosevelt Drive, on the West by the easterly side of First Avenue, on the North by the southerly side of East Forty-Eighth Street,

and on the South by the northerly side of East Forty-Second Street, all as proposed to be widened, in the Borough of Manhattan, City and State of New York, and (b) an easement over Franklin D. Roosevelt Drive, above a lower limiting plane to be fixed for the construction and maintenance of an esplanade, together with the structures thereon and foundations and columns to support the same in locations below such limiting plane, the entire area to be more definitely defined by supplemental agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America.

ANNEX 2

MAINTENANCE OF UTILITIES AND UNDERGROUND CONSTRUCTION

Section 1

The Secretary-General agrees to provide passes to duly authorized employees of The City of New York, the State of New York, or any of their agencies or subdivisions, for the purpose of enabling them to inspect, repair, maintain, reconstruct and relocate utilities, conduits, mains and sewers within the headquarters district.

Section 2

Underground constructions may be undertaken by The City of New York, or the State of New York, or any of their agencies or subdivisions, within the headquarters district only after consultation with the Secretary-General, and under conditions which shall not disturb the carrying out of the functions of the United Nations.

On page 6, line 14, strike out "authorized" and insert "authorized: *Provided*, That any money appropriated under this authorization shall be spent only on a basis of reimbursement by the United Nations in accordance with section 3 of the agreement, and that the money thus reimbursed shall be deposited and covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts"; on page 7, line 18, after "States" insert "to safeguard its own security and", and on page 7, line 20, strike out "vicinity" and insert "vicinity, as to be defined and fixed in a supplementary agreement between the Government of the United States and the United Nations in pursuance of section 13 (3) (e) of the agreement."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This is the House of Representatives counterpart of the Senate action on the United Nations business. Without objection, the Senate will concur in the amendments of the House.

There being no objection, the amendments were concurred in.

USE OF CERTAIN WAR DEPARTMENT PROPERTY AS MILITARY CEMETERIES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 272) to provide for the utilization of surplus War Department-owned military real property as national cemeteries, when feasible, which were, on page 1, line 9, after "utilize" insert "and expand existing facilities at Fort Rosecrans, Calif., and Jefferson Barracks, Mo.; on page 1, line 9, after "practicable," insert "through the use of"; on page 2 line 5, strike out "establish thereon" and insert "expand existing"; on page 2, line 7, strike out "of such cemeteries" and insert "thereof", and on page 2, line 7, strike out "established" and insert "as expanded."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

LEGISLATION PASSED IN THE FIRST SESSION OF THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, earlier in the session this afternoon the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] obtained unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a summary of the legislation passed in the first session of the Eightieth Congress. I ask unanimous consent now that the summary be printed as a Senate document, together with a preliminary statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

AUTHORITY FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON SURPLUS PROPERTY OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS TO FILE REPORTS DURING RECESS

Mr. WHERRY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 162), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Subcommittee on Surplus Property of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments be authorized to file reports with the Secretary of the Senate following the adjournment of the Senate.

CELEBRATION OF FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF AMERICAN AND CUBAN VICTORIES IN WAR WITH SPAIN

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a day or two ago the House passed House Concurrent Resolution 108, providing for the creation of a joint committee to prepare a plan for the participation by the United States in the observance and celebration in Cuba of the fiftieth anniversary of American and Cuban victories in the war with Spain. The celebration is to be held during the summer of 1948.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 108) to provide for the creation of a joint committee to prepare a plan for the participation by the United States in the observance and celebration in Cuba of the fiftieth anniversary of American and Cuban victories in the war with Spain.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby created a joint committee to be composed of eight members, as follows: Four Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate; and four Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The committee shall serve without compensation and shall select a chairman from among their number.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the committee to prepare an appropriate plan for the participation in the observance and celebration in Cuba during the summer of 1948 of the fiftieth anniversary of the victories of the military and naval forces of the United States and of their Cuban allies in the war with Spain, resulting in the liberation of Cuba. In the preparation of such plan the committee is authorized to cooperate with official representatives of Cuba.

(b) The committee shall, not later than February 2, 1948, submit a report to the Congress setting forth the plan prepared pursuant to subsection (a) of this section and containing such recommendations for carrying out such plan as it deems advisable. The committee shall cease to exist within 30 days after the date of the submission of such report.

SEC. 3. The committee is authorized, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and prescribe the duties, and fix the compensation, of such employee as are necessary for the execution of its function. The committee may make such expenditures as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this concurrent resolution, including expenditures for necessary traveling expenses and subsistence expenses of the members of the committee and of employees of the committee.

SEC. 4. The necessary expenses of the joint committee herein authorized not exceeding $25,000 shall be paid one-half out of the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives on vouchers authorized by the joint committee and signed by the chairman thereof.

CONDITIONAL FINAL ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I send a concurrent resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 33) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Saturday, July 26, 1947, they shall stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Friday, January 2, 1948, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the third day after their respective Members are notified to reassemble in accordance with section 2 of this resolution, whichever event first occurs.

SEC. 2. The President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the majority leader of the Senate and the majority leader of the House of Representatives, all acting jointly, shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House respectively, to reassemble whenever in their opinion the public interest shall warrant it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as I understand, the concurrent resolution is not debatable.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. May I ask the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] a question by unanimous consent?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it the purpose of the Senate majority leader and the Senator from Ohio and others cooperating to have an executive session before we adjourn this evening?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. I hope the Puerto Rican bill can be passed. I think it will take only a short time. After that I shall move to go into executive session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution is not debatable.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio permit me to ask him a question? Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that he intended, after the concurrent resolution was agreed to, to take up only the Puerto Rican bill, and leave all the other unfinished business?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think we have only 20 minutes remaining. I do not like to enter into any commitments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair must rule that the concurrent resolution is not debatable, and that Senators cannot yield for questions in connection with it.

The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

DATE OF MEETING OF SECOND REGULAR SESSION OF EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution to fix the date of meeting of the second regular session of the Eightieth Congress, and I request its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 156) fixing the date of meeting of the second regular session of the Eightieth Congress was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second regular session of the Eightieth Congress shall begin at noon Tuesday, January 6, 1948.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 34) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Concurrent Resolution 34

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That notwithstanding the adjournment of the two Houses until January 2, 1948, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF FIRST SESSION OF EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him on the work and accomplishments of the first session of the Eightieth Congress, which appears in the Appendix.]

WORK OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement dealing with the work of the Committee on Public Landis, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RECORD OF CONGRESS ON HOUSING

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him on the record of the first session of the Eightieth Congress in connection with housing, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CRISIS FACING AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address recently delivered by him on the subject of the crisis facing agricultural commodities, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE THIRD PARTY—EDITORIALS BY JOSEPHUS DANIELS

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials on the subject of a third party written by Hon. Josephus Daniels and published in the Raleigh (N. C.) Observer, which appear in the Appendix.]

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN SENATOR LUCAS AND EMERSON P. SCHMIDT

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him under date of July 14, 1947, from Emerson P. Schmidt, and a letter dated July 26, 1947, in reply thereto, addressed by him to Dr. Emerson P. Schmidt, director of economic research department, Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, which appear in the Appendix.]

REGULATION OF GAS TRANSMISSION COMPANIES — ARTICLE BY RUTH FINNEY

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Gas Bill's Cost Estimated at Fifty-two and a Half Million," written by Ruth Finney and published in the Scripps-Howard newspapers, which appears in the Appendix.]

RENT-CONTROL LEGISLATION—EDITORIAL FROM PITTSBURGH PRESS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Letting the Cat Out?" published in the Pittsburgh Press of July 24, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNITED NATIONS USEFUL OPEN FORUM—EDITORIAL FROM PITTSBURGH PRESS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "UN's Useful Open Forum," published in the Pittsburgh Press of July 24, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

RECORD OF THE HONORABLE JAMES J. DAVIS AS SECRETARY OF LABOR

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement of the record of Hon. James J. Davis as Secretary of Labor, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOUSING—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ELLENDER

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on housing, delivered by Senator ELLENDER, at Washington, D. C., on July 26, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT AND VALLEY AUTHORITIES—ADDRESS BY HON. C. GIRARD DAVIDSON

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Resource Development and Valley Authorities, by Hon. C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, before the Valley Authority Conference in Washington, D. C., July 18, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PEOPLE AND ROOSEVELT—EDITORIAL FROM ATLANTA CONSTITUTION

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The People and Roosevelt," written by Ralph McGill and published in a recent issue of the Atlanta Constitution, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN FAMILY—ARTICLE FROM AMERICAN OUTLOOK

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "American Family," published in the May 23, 1947, issue of American Outlook, which appears in the Appendix.]

STRENGTHENING THE UNITED NATIONS—ADDRESS BY DR. FRANK P. GRAHAM

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in RECORD an excerpt from an address by Dr. Frank P. Graham, president of the University of North Carolina, dealing with the need for strengthening the United Nations, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT ABOUT EISENHOWER?—AN EDITORIAL IN THE CHURCHMAN

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "What About Eisenhower?", published in the July 1947 issue of the Churchman, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE VALLEY'S NEED—AN EDITORIAL

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Valley's Need," published in the Friday, July 18, 1947, issue of the Idaho Sun, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEMORIAL ADDRESS BY HON. OSCAR ZAPF BEFORE NEVADA VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

[Mr. MALONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a memorial address delivered by Hon. Oscar Zapf, Judge Advocate of the Nevada Department of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, before the Nevada Veterans of Foreign Wars, at Elko, Nev., on June 12, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALL TO ACTION BY SENATOR LANGER

[Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a "Call to Action" by Senator LANGER, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE IMMIGRATION PROBLEM—STATEMENT BY UGO CARUSI

[Mr. COOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made on June 20, 1947, by Ugo Carusi, Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, before the Subcommittee on Immigration of the House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary, which appears in the Appendix.]

TREATMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS—STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

[Mr. COOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by the Secretary of State before the

House Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, which appears in the Appendix.]

TREATMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS—STATEMENT BY LT. COL. J. M. SAGE

[Mr. COOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement relative to the treatment of displaced persons in Europe, made by Lt. Col. Jerry M. Sage, United States Army, before the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMENDMENT OF ORGANIC ACT OF PUERTO RICO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3309) to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the pending bill and ask the attention of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 12, it is proposed to strike out section 5, and to renumber the succeeding sections accordingly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, we are willing to accept the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ORGANIC ACT OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I had prepared some remarks which I had desired to present to the Senate when House bill 3309 to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico was under consideration. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Public Lands has recommended that H. R. 3309, which would amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico, be passed in substantially the same form as it was passed by the House, with the addition of two new sections.

The Organic Act of Puerto Rico, which H. R. 3309 would amend, is an act of Congress which serves the same purpose in Puerto Rico as a State constitution does in a State. Under the present Organic Act which was passed in 1917 and amended in various ways since then, the government of Puerto Rico has three branches—executive, legislative, and judicial. The legislative is popularly elected, but the Organic Act provides that the President of the United States shall appoint, and the Senate of the United States shall confirm, the Governor; two of the heads of the executive departments, the commissioner of education, and the attorney general; and all the justices of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico, which is the highest court in the judicial system of the island. H. R. 3309 would amend those sections of the Organic Act which deal with the Governor, the heads of departments, and the justices of the supreme court.

Section 1 of the bill would authorize the voters of Puerto Rico to elect the Governor for a 4-year term, beginning with the general election in 1948. To be eligible for election the candidate would have to be a citizen of the United States, at least 30 years old, able to read and write the English language, and must have been a resident of Puerto Rico during the 2 years immediately preceding the election.

Section 2 would prescribe impeachment procedure if the Governor were charged with treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors. The insular house of representatives would have power to impeach, and the Senate of Puerto Rico would sit as a court to try the Governor. Upon conviction he would be removed from office.

Skipping to section 4 of the bill, it would provide a line of succession, in case the Governor was for some reason unable to act.

In case of a vacancy in the office of Governor, or during the Governor's temporary absence or disability, the attorney general would act as Governor. If he could not act for any reason, the treasurer would act as Governor. The Legislature of Puerto Rico would be authorized to provide for additional successors, as it saw fit. If a newly elected Governor could not take office, the Legislature of Puerto Rico, at its next succeeding regular session, would elect, by majority vote, a temporary successor to hold office until a successor was elected at a special session to be held within 120 days after the adjournment of the legislature.

Section 3 of the bill deals with the heads of executive departments. The Governor now has authority to appoint the heads of five of the seven executive departments created by the Organic Act; the treasurer, who heads the department of finance; the commissioner of the interior, head of the department of the interior; the commissioner of agriculture and commerce, head of the department of agriculture and commerce; the commissioner of labor, head of the department of labor; and the commissioner of health, head of the department of health. These appointments are confirmed by the Senate of Puerto Rico. The Governor does not appoint the head of the department of justice, the attorney general, or the head of the department of education, the commissioner of education. These two officials are appointed now by the President with the approval of the United States Senate. The bill would authorize their appointment by the Governor with the approval of the Senate of Puerto Rico. All the heads of the executive departments at the present time, whether appointed by the Governor or by the President, are Puerto Ricans, in conformity with the long-standing policy of the United States to encourage people of the Territories to participate increasingly in their local governments. There would therefore be no practical difference from the present situation if the elected Governor were empowered to appoint the attorney general and the commissioner of education as well as the other heads of departments.

In order to avoid confusion, I should point out that the auditor of Puerto Rico is not designated by the Organic Act as a head of an executive department. He is now appointed by the President and would continue to be appointed by the President even with the enactment of the bill before the Senate. The bill makes no reference whatsoever to the auditor or to his duties.

The fifth section of the bill would authorize the Governor to fill, with the advice and consent of the Senate of Puerto Rico, all vacancies hereafter occurring in the offices of chief justice and associate justices of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico. At present all the justices of that court are appointed by the President.

Section 6 merely deletes from the Organic Act language which would be inapplicable upon the enactment of H. R. 3309.

Sections 7 and 8 of the bill were added by the committee. Section 7 provides for an administrative officer with the title of "Coordinator of Federal agencies in Puerto Rico," appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. This section was added because of the committee's belief that there was a certain amount of duplication and conflict among the activities of the 58 or more Federal agencies operating in the island, and that the observations of a Federal representative, not associated with any particular agency, when embodied into recommendations made to the President and the Congress, could be of considerable aid to the latter in putting Federal agencies on a more efficient basis as regards their Puerto Rican operations. The Coordinator would have the power to recommend only, not to institute reforms on his own initiative.

Section 8 would make Puerto Rico subject to the same extent as one of the States to the comity clause of article IV of the Constitution of the United States, extending to citizens of each State the privileges and immunities of the citizens of the several States. Congress has not expressly extended the Constitution to Puerto Rico, as it did in the case of Alaska and Hawaii, and the committee considered it advisable to bring Puerto Rico expressly within the operation of the comity clause so as to leave no doubt that there may be no discrimination against citizens of the United States who are not residents of Puerto Rico.

When Puerto Rico first came under the sovereignty of the United States in 1898, it was not thought advisable to make available extensive opportunities for self-government. Therefore the upper house of the legislature was not at first popularly elected; the governorship was to be filled by appointment of the President; the top judiciary was to be Presidentially appointed, too. The people of Puerto Rico were not at first made citizens of the United States. But they have been citizens since 1917. They have been electing their legislature since that date, and, under the authority granted by Congress in the Organic Act, they have been administering their affairs on their own initiative. Although the laws they have enacted have embraced a wide range of subject matter, Congress has never found it necessary to exercise its prerogative of annuling a law enacted by the Puerto Rican Legislature. The appointed Governors now choose the heads of the executive departments, their "cabinets" from among qualified Puerto Ricans. The people of Puerto Rico want a further opportunity to participate in their local government: they want the right to elect their Governor, and they want the Governor to have the right to select the members of their Supreme Court. They feel that since they have been authorized for so many years to enact their laws that it is only just that they have some voice, directly or indirectly, in the selection of those who will execute and interpret those laws. Puerto Ricans of all political faiths are united in their support of this bill.

Its enactment would be entirely in keeping with American principles of self-government and democracy. It would enhance the prestige of the United States in the eyes of the world at a time when the rights of nonself-governing territories are a matter of world-wide interest. The United States has nothing to lose by the enactment of this bill. It would not alter the political or fiscal relationship between Puerto Rico and the United States in the slightest degree. It grants no new substantive powers to the Governor, the supreme court, or the legislature. Congress does not surrender any of its constitutional authority to legislate for Puerto Rico, or to review laws enacted by the Legislature of Puerto Rico. Although the justices of the supreme court will be appointed by the Governor, if H. R. 3309 is enacted, the decisions of that court will continue to be reviewed by the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and by the United States Supreme Court upon certiorari. The bill makes no change

in the jurisdiction of the Federal District Court for Puerto Rico, which has the same jurisdiction as all other Federal district courts. The judge of the Federal district court is appointed, and will continue to be appointed, by the President.

In short, the enactment of H. R. 3309 would, by amending the Organic Act, make the structure of the Government of Puerto Rico reflect the advances in ability to govern themselves made by the people of Puerto Rico in the years since 1900, when control through appointment of Governor and supreme court was considered wise and necessary.

INVESTIGATION OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE IN CONNECTION WITH ALLEGED ELECTION FRAUDS IN MISSOURI

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. WHERRY to proceed to consideration of Senate Resolution 150, to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from further consideration of Senate Resolution 116.

Mr. FERGUSON. I want to speak to the Senate for a few moments.

Mr. President, many days ago a matter was called to the attention of the Senate, and I have been reading about a charge against the minority of the Senate and shall call it to their attention, because I hope at the end we shall be able to make progress on a matter which has been pending.

Senate Democrats are inevitably adding to the suspicion that in blocking the inquiry into the Missouri vote scandal they have something to hide. This seems to us to be poor politics. The mere attempt to suppress a probe by the Senate Judiciary Committee has made the matter a sure issue in the 1948 campaign, regardless of the facts in the case. Moreover, if, as the administration contends, the Department of Justice did nothing to whitewash the original investigation, then the Senate bloc has done a disservice to Attorney General Clark.

I attempted, Mr. President, to call that to the attention of the Senate a few days ago.

If his skirts are clean, Mr. Clark should welcome an opportunity to tell his story fully. The issue now has gone far beyond the attempt by President Truman to urge ex-Representative Roger Slaughter at last summer's primaries. The mechanics of the steal engineered by the Pendergast machine in Kansas City are now being brought out by the Federal grand jury and the FBI.

This was all called to the attention of the Senate by the junior Senator from Michigan.

These facts will come to light irrespective of congressional action. It will be impossible to camouflage them. But there are other relevant questions which ought to be answered by the administration. The country has a right to know why the preliminary FBI investigation was so restricted in scope and why the matter was dropped by the Department of Justice until outside pressure forced the administration to take it up again. That outside pressure, Mr. President, was the action of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Possibly there is a logical explanation for this seeming effort to call off the dogs. But certainly the obstructionism of the Senate Democrats only weakens the administration's pose of innocence.

Mr. President, I think it is only fair that we should offer to the minority of the Senate the last agreement that they will be able to accept for an investigation of the Department of Justice as set forth in the resolution. We should ask them—and I shall ask them—for unanimous consent to consider and adopt the resolution, so that an investigation may be made. We do not want this session to close with a filibuster like that which was conducted for the purpose of endeavoring to keep Mr. BILBO in the Senate, when it has been closed in the last few days by a filibuster to keep the Pendergast machine from being investigated.

Mr. President, I hope that the majority party of the Senate tonight will see fit on this occasion, at a quarter to 12 o'clock, to adopt the resolution and take away from the thoughts of the people these things which are being charged against them. They have this last opportunity, and I hope they will accept it.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the Senate return to the regular order and accept the opportunity to adopt the resolution to permit an investigation of the Department of Justice which is under the jurisdiction of the Democratic Party and the present administration.

INCREASED ALLOWANCE TO VETERANS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there are two or three small matters which are entirely agreed to, and I should like to get them out of the way. So far as I know, there will be no objection. If there is any objection, I shall be willing to set them aside. Yesterday we passed a bill which provided an increased allowance to disabled veterans on vacation. The House refused to accept it, but passed its own bill, providing a somewhat smaller allowance.

I ask unanimous consent to suspend the rule and to consider and pass the House bill in order that at least a small amount may be given to disabled veterans.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is it the intention of the Senator from Ohio to take an adjournment at 12 o'clock?

Mr. TAFT. No. I think we will run on a while. I suggested that, but I withdraw the suggestion.

Mr. TYDINGS. What I am interested in, Mr. President, is that at midnight those who have been waiting patiently for 2 or 3 days on the promise of an executive session shall not be crowded out.

Mr. TAFT. I will give the Senator that assurance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3308. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3308) to increase the minimum allowance payable for rehabilitation in certain service-connected cases was read the first time by its title, the second time at length, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STUDY AND ACTIVITIES OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT AND OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate passed a resolution to create a special committee in relation to the so-called Mundt resolution.

The House has refused to accept the resolution. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has a Senate resolution to create a special committee to do the same thing. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Jersey have permission to submit his resolution. It is the same resolution which was passed yesterday, except that it is a Senate resolution instead of a joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 161) was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the nature, manner of performance, and effect of all activities carried out by the State Department or any other agency of the Government (including private companies engaged in international broadcasts or other information activities) for the purpose of acquainting the peoples of foreign countries with the United States, its people and their activities, and the policies and objectives of its Government, including, without limitation—

(1) the policies and methods employed, and their objectives;

(2) the qualifications of all personnel engaged in any such activities;

(3) whether the costs of such activities are justified; and

(4) whether such activities are a proper function of Government or should be carried out by privately owned organizations, with or without subsidies.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress until its final report is submitted to the Senate, to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 3. The committee shall make its final report to the Senate not later than February 1, 1948, containing the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1947, any amendments thereto or other necessary legislation as it may deem desirable. The committee or its duly authorized subcommittee, is authorized (for the purposes of this resolution) to cooperate with any subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives which is appointed from the membership of such committee for such purposes.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO MONTGOMERY COUNTY, PA.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, recurring to Calendar No. 749, House bill 3862, very recently the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] withdrew an objection made to the consideration of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the pending

business be set aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3862.

Mr. CONNALLY. I object for the moment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

INVESTIGATION OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE IN CONNECTION WITH ALLEGED ELECTION FRAUDS IN MISSOURI

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] in these closing hours has seen fit again to undertake to impute to the Attorney General, the Honorable Tom Clark, improper motives, and to attempt to cast reflections upon his character and official conduct. Heretofore, I have not said anything about this question; but I sat here the other night and heard the junior Senator from Michigan in a great tirade for hours upon the Attorney General, with regard to the resolution.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I have known the Attorney General for many years. He first came to Washington and accepted a rather obscure position in the Department of Justice with my recommendation and my endorsement. He was promoted step by step, not by one Attorney General, but by several Attorneys General, and he was later selected by the President to be Attorney General. The reputation of Mr. Clark in Texas is above reproach.

Now what has he done? In this matter he followed the precedents of three or four Attorneys General who preceded him. He went before the Senate Judiciary Committee as a witness. I was not there, but even now I can see the junior Senator from Michigan, with his insinuations and with his political bile and with his political rancor and with his political prejudice, undertaking to cross-examine and harass and annoy the Attorney General of the United States. Mr. Clark was not afraid to go before the committee. He went there freely. He gave them all his files in this case. That is correct; I am sure no member of the Judiciary Committee will deny it. He gave them his files. He hid nothing; he concealed nothing.

What happened? The Judiciary Committee—which is a committee of this body, representing the Senate of the United States—after a long period of investigation, reported adversely, by majority vote. The junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], because the Senate committee did not act in the way that he wanted it to act, denounces and repudiates the action of that committee of this Senate.

Mr. President, if we establish a precedent that when the standing committees of this body do not respond to the promptings of prejudice and political expediency, and when they do not respond to the demands of those who want to capitalize on something and make a political reputation, they shall be discharged and the matter shall be brought to the floor of the Senate, we might as well disregard the committees entirely and bring up all matters on the floor of the Senate in the first place.

Mr. President, I wish to denounce the attacks on the private and official and personal conduct of the Attorney General. I daresay that when that conduct is shown under the white light of publicity it will compare very favorably with that of some of those who are barking at his heels.

Mr. FERGUSON rose.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, does the Senator wish me to yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall take the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator will not get the floor until I get through.

Mr. President, I wish to say that there has been no filibuster by those of us on this side of the aisle. If there was any filibuster the other night, it was prompted and promoted and conducted by the junior Senator from Michigan. He held the Senate in session the other night, literally for hours. Everyone knew what he was going to say, before he got up; everyone knew what his tactics were going to be. Everyone knew he was playing for headlines and publicity and political venom and spleen. Everyone knew what he was going to say; and he did not disappoint anyone. He said it over and over and over again.

Mr. President, anyone with two legs can stand on this floor, if he is a Senator, and can take advantage of the platform here, and the publicity he receives, to denounce and abuse someone in official or private life, who has no opportunity to reply to him, who has no opportunity to answer him. But the Attorney General answered him in the committee; and your committee, a committee of this Senate, by a majority vote voted "No." When it did that the Senator from Michigan—I beg the Chair's pardon; I meant the junior Senator. He may be junior in some respects, of course, but he is senior in vilification and abuse and insinuation. [Laughter.] I award him the doctor of philosophy degree with regard to those things.

Mr. President, heretofore I have never said a word about this matter. But my patience has been exhausted, as has the patience of some of the other Members on this side of the aisle and some of the Members on the other side of the aisle, who want to be fair and just, and want to give a man a hearing and, when he testifies at the hearing, want to have his testimony considered.

In this case was the testimony considered by the junior Senator from Michigan? No; it was not.

Now he is a judge; the junior Senator from Michigan has been invested by the Senate with a high and responsible position on the Judiciary Committee of the Senate—an honorable place, a place of high responsibility. I was once a member of that committee, and I regarded it as a great honor to serve on that committee. So in this case the junior Senator from Michigan was going to be a judge, and in that committee he was a judge on this resolution and on the Attorney General and on his conduct. In that situation he was a judge; but before he ever received the information at the investigation, he had already made up his mind, he had already arrived at his verdict, he already had his verdict written, and he was all ready to call in the defendant and convict him and oust him, after charging him with all the things that the imagination of the Senator from Michigan can conceive—I mean the junior Senator from Michigan, Mr. President. I hope he always remains junior.

That is what he is trying to do to a faithful servant of this Government, one who has been trying to perform his duty in the way that other Attorneys General have performed theirs. But he did not perform it according to the way the junior Senator from Michigan wanted him to perform it. I am going to advise the Attorney General that hereafter as to any question which comes up in his Department, he should first consult the junior Senator from Michigan, so that the Senator will know what he is doing, and will do it right.

Mr. President, I think this is unseemly. If the Senator wants to hit our committee in the face or insult our committee by undertaking to discharge it from the consideration of a resolution, why does not the Senator use some of his influence on the members of the committee with whom he served? Why does not he use some of the persuasive powers that he thinks he possesses?

No, Mr. President; the Attorney General has been unjustly and unfairly hit with obloquy, covered all over with insinuations, covered all over with the slime of slander and repudiation.

I have no interest in this matter except that of a citizen and a Senator. But I do have an interest when a judge, a man who is going to judge a case on the Judiciary Committee, makes up his mind in advance, before hearing any of the testimony, before hearing any of the evidence, and writes his verdict in advance of hearing the evidence and the testimony.

If a justice of the peace in my State should do that, he would be removed. If a judge on the bench of the district court in my State should in a law case show the venom and the spleen and the political hatred exhibited by the junior Senator from Michigan, he would be disqualified. Either party to the proceeding would have the right under the laws of my State—I do not know what they are in Michigan; I do not know whether the Senator from Michigan knows the law in Michigan or not. Anyway, under the laws of my State, where we believe in fairness and justice and equity, any party to the proceeding could file a motion to disqualify the judge, and he would be disqualified.

So I think that a proper resolution in this case, instead of to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from the consideration of the resolution, would be a resolution to discharge from the Committee on the Judiciary the junior Senator from Michigan.

Is that judiciary? What does judiciary mean? It means judicial. What does judicial mean? It means considering both sides of a question, it means fairness, it means consideration. But the Senator from Michigan has already done his considering, he has already made up his mind, and in another case which I understand the committee acted upon, I believe the vote of the junior Senator from Michigan was the only ad-

verse vote. Every member of the committee other than himself voted against the contentions of the Senator from Michigan. Yet he now seeks to take over the Judiciary Committee and hold some sort of a star chamber proceeding—not strictly a star chamber proceeding. He wants to hold a proceeding where all the reporters will be present, he wants a free press, provided it carries his name in the headline. He would like to go to Kansas City himself, be right there on the ground, and conduct any kind of an investigation which would throw any slime or any opprobrium or any blame upon the Attorney General of the United States or upon his chieftain, the President of the United States.

I heard the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] here the other day interrupt the debate by wanting to know of some Senator on the floor discussing this matter whether the committee had invited Harry Truman—not the President of the United States, oh, no—had they invited Harry Truman to come before the committee.

Of course Harry Truman is the President of the United States. No other President would ever have come before any committee, when he knows the committee, part of it at least, has already made up its mind. That question was decided a hundred years ago in the trial of Aaron Burr, when there was an effort to drag Thomas Jefferson to Richmond as a witness. Of course he did not go. The idea of a little two-bit committee summoning or inviting the President of the United States to come down and appear before a committee composed of gentlemen like the junior Senator from Michigan. [Laughter in the galleries.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore rapped with his gavel.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, is the Presiding Officer knocking for me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is suggesting to the occupants of the galleries that the rules do not permit any sort of demonstration.

Mr. CONNALLY. The senior Senator from Michigan is correct, even though the junior Senator from Michigan may not be correct.

Of course, Mr. President, the occupants of the galleries must not make any demonstrations. They must keep quiet. That is correct. Some of the Senators who have made speeches here on this case should have been under the same rule; they should have kept quiet.

Mr. President, I have stood all this I can stand. I had no desire to engage in this debate, and had not the junior Senator from Michigan gotten up here again and covered the whole case with the vomit of his prejudice and rancor and hatred and hope and ambition—

O Mr. President, ambition is a fatuous thing, it is an alluring thing. When a politician begins to get his sights up at something higher, he follows it like a will-o'-the-wisp. He is hoping, he is ambitious, he craves the headlines, he craves notice. "My God, let me follow this thing."

Mr. President, it has ruined many a good man. It is something like what I said some years ago, that a Senator, whenever he gets the ambition to run for the Presidency of the United States—he may have been a good Senator, he may have been a fine Senator—but whenever he gets the ambition to run for President of the United States, no longer is he worth a damn as a Senator. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, if I wanted to give any advice to the junior Senator from Michigan—he is a lawyer; he has been a judge. How would you have liked to be tried in his court when he was a judge, whether you were innocent or whether you were guilty? You had no assurance that you could get a fair trial before the junior Senator from Michigan.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I call the Senator to order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will take his seat.

Mr. CONNALLY. Why should I take my seat?

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I move that the Senator from Texas may proceed in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee moves that the Senator from Texas may proceed in order. [Putting the question.] The ayes have it, and the Senator will proceed in order.

Mr. CONNALLY. Have I the floor, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. They want me to speak in order. Well, I have been speaking in order ever since I got up on my feet. I know some of those on the other side do not like it.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield—in order.

Mr. BROOKS. I should like to suggest that the senior Senator from Texas——

Mr. CONNALLY. Thank you.

Mr. BROOKS. Whenever he uses the floor to challenge the character of a brother Senator, to the extent of saying that when the junior Senator from Michigan was a judge before whom nobody could have received a fair trial, he is going beyond the bounds of decency, even in a police court, and I object to it.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore rapped with his gavel.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I did not say that. I said how would any of you Senators——

Mr. HAWKES. The RECORD will show the Senator said it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course the RECORD will show, and if it shows what you understood, I withdraw it. But I did not say it. I said how would any Senator like to be tried in a court presided over by the junior Senator from Michigan. That is what I said. I think the RECORD will show it.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask that the RECORD be read.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is made. The rules provide that the RECORD be read.

Mr. BARKLEY. May I suggest that the Senator has already said that if he said that, or if Senators understood him to say that, he withdrew the remark. Is not that sufficient?

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask that the RECORD be read. I want the occupants of the galleries to hear what was said.

Mr. CONNALLY. Boo!

[Laughter in the galleries and on the floor.]

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will suspend until the galleries and the Senate are in order. This procedure is going no further in any such atmosphere as we have just been witnessing. The Senator has asked that the reporter's record be read to determine what was said. The reporter will read the record.

Mr. CONNALLY. All right. Read it.

The Official Reporter, John D. Rhodes, thereupon read as follows:

> How would you have liked to be tried in his court when he was a judge, whether you were innocent or whether you were guilty? You had no assurance that you could get a fair trial before the junior Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, the language just read very definitely collides with the section of rule XIX, which says:

> No Senator in debate shall, directly or indirectly, by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am a Senator. I respect the Senate, and I respect Senators. I do not think there was anything wrong in that I said, "How would you like to be tried?" If, however, the language is offensive, I withdraw it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The language is withdrawn.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. CONNALLY. I have the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator cannot make a point of order. I do not yield to a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator must yield, if a point of order is to be made. A parliamentary inquiry cannot be made without the Senator yielding.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I challenge the ruling of the Chair. I am not interested in this controversy, but under the rules of the Senate, Mr. President, no Senator can be interrupted, except for one reason, and that is that he himself is out of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair entirely agrees with the Senator and the rule will be pursued, as indicated.

Mr. CONNALLY. All right. Now, Mr. President, I do not want to reflect on any Senator. I do not carry around a mirror to reflect on Senators. The Senate knows what the junior Senator from Michigan has said on this floor. That stands for itself. He made a record for himself. He spoke here the other night for hours. Most of the Senators went out and went to bed. I sat here patiently. I heard every word he uttered. After having taken up hours of the Senate's time, he now accuses certain Senators on the minority side of filibustering. I have participated in no filibuster. It is the first time I have ever spoken on this floor with regard to the matter, but Tom Clark is my friend of many years' standing. The Attorney General is one of my constituents. He has made a great record. He has come up from the lower ranks of the bar to fill the most distinguished legal office in the United States. I have a right to defend him.

One cannot say anything about a Senator, but a Senator can say what he pleases about an officer, an official, or a private citizen. That is a one-way street, as I understand it. Senators know what the junior Senator from Michigan said about Tom Clark. He said he was whitewashing, and that what he did was a rewhitewash of a whitewash. Is not that casting reflections upon his integrity and his character? Mr. Clark went boldly before the committee and told everything there was about the case. He gave the committee all his files on the case. The committee dragged three district judges from Kansas City here to testify, and they brought the United States district attorney to testify. What more is it they want? They heard all the pertinent witnesses. I asked a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, in the course of debate the other day, whether or not the junior Senator from Michigan, before the evidence was taken in the committee, had demanded the appearance of additional witnesses. He said, "No." I said, "Did he express a desire to invite any other witnesses to come before the committee?" "No; he did not." Why did he not? If he wanted a complete investigation, the place to have had it was in the committee, the servant of the Senate, allowing that committee to report the result to the full committee. He did not call any additional witnesses, except three Federal judges, the district attorney, the Attorney General, and I do not know who else—Assistant Attorneys General and so on. After hearing the testimony, the committee by a majority vote ruled that the resolution for an investigation was not justified. Do Senators want to repudiate their own committee?

Do Senators comprising the machinery on that side of the aisle want to say to any committee, after it has taken testimony and has acted, "You did not please some of the political manipulators?"

Mr. President, I feel that it is unnecessary for me to continue discussing the facts. The record has revealed the facts. The report of the committee has revealed that all the charges were thoroughly investigated in the Committee on the Judiciary. Why have another investigation perhaps in Kansas City, while Congress is in recess? Newspapermen will then have nothing else to do except to write up the junior Senator from Michigan and his attack upon the Attorney General of the United States; and his attacks by innuendo and reference and insinuation against the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I wanted to put this statement in the RECORD. I was weary and tired and annoyed at the attacks upon a faithful, upon an honest Attorney General, an upright official of integrity, who has been serving the Nation honorably, faithfully, and well. The attacks upon him are wholly unjustified. They have no foundation in fact.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I realize the lateness of the hour. I have sat in the Senate on two occasions and have received the personal vilifications of Members on the other side.

Mr. HATCH. O Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, not to entrench upon the merits or demerits of the case, but to make a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. FERGUSON. I decline to yield at present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I realize that on occasions like this, when a personal attack has been made upon the junior Senator from Michigan, it is difficult to reply in moderate language.

Mr. President, I realize the solemnity of the occasion. I realize the lateness of the hour. I realize that the cause we are discussing is of greatest significance to America, for it deals with the preserving of that great free institution, the ballot.

Mr. President, the proposed investigation would not be an investigation of one man. I said on the first occasion I spoke on the subject that I thought it was unfair to Mr. Clark to have the investigation stopped with a mere study. I have read tonight the very same language, and I yet think that there should be a complete investigation.

Mr. President, any personal attack can be made upon the junior Senator from Michigan, and I am not going to return in the same language, because I realize that the cause is too great a one to make it a subject of personal dispute between Senators. Oh, yes; we could make this into a personal dispute. We could attack each other. But what we on this side believe it should be, what the Senator is contending for by his resolution, is that the Department should be investigated, and that the facts should be brought to light, so that the world might see what has been done. Is that the making of an unfair charge against the Attorney General or against any man? I have pleaded upon this floor that we have all the facts, and I plead again with the minority that they allow the matter to come to a vote, and that we have a vote upon the real issue, not upon me, not upon the junior Senator from Michigan. Oh, I understand the slur that has been made respecting the junior Senator from Michigan that the Senator wanted him to remain always the junior Senator. I know that I am willing to remain such. I know that the able Senator from Nevada used the same expression, and in his voice one could tell what he had in mind in referring to the junior Senator from Michigan.

The President, there is a great cause involved. Editorials appearing in newspapers all over this great Nation of ours recognized that cause. It is not a personal matter with the Senator from Michigan. No, it is a question whether or not the Senate of the United States has a right to investigate a department in the executive branch of the Government. I say to the Senate tonight that if we ever give up fighting for that cause we will lose our free institutions. I read from an editorial tonight which said that some day it is true we will go back to the free institutions of America, when the Senate of the United States can investigate, and is supreme, and can lay before the public all the facts so that the public may be the judge.

So I plead with Senators on the other side of the aisle that they permit the resolution to come to a vote and allow the Senate of the United States to investigate to ascertain the facts.

This is not a personal matter, and I decline to make it a personal matter. The cause is too great to have a personal question injected into it. Let us vote upon the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state the parliamentary situation. The question is on the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Ohio to proceed to the consideration of House bill 3862.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I should like to be informed whether we are proceeding on daylight saving time or on regular time. [Laughter.] I should like to apprise the President pro tempore that under daylight saving time it is now 25 minutes past 12, and it is July 27.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is entirely correct. The resolution of adjournment has just been amended so that it runs into July 27. Is there anything else the Senator wishes to ask about?

Mr. OVERTON. There is so much going on here tonight that I cannot keep up with everything that is going on. I thank the Senator though for the information.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there are four bills which have been objected to, to which the objections have been withdrawn. So far as I know the bills are completely uncontroversial, and I promised to bring them before the Senate. In every case, so far as I know, the objection has been completely withdrawn.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio a question. If after the four bills he speaks of are passed, under a unanimous-consent agreement, will the Senator object to the Senate going back to the regular order of business, which is the motion on the so-called Kem resolution?

Mr. TAFT. The regular order will still remain the unfinished business. If the Senator from South Carolina wishes to speak on the unfinished business I should not object. But I have promised to move that the Senate go into executive session as soon as the four bills are acted upon.

Mr. MAYBANK. Oh, no, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. MAYBANK. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina objects.

Mr. MAYBANK. No, Mr. President; I withdraw the objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator withdraws his objection.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not object to the Senator from Ohio bringing up the four bills he referred to, but when action has been taken on the bills, under the unanimous-consent request, I understand the unfinished business will be before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio, to proceed to the consideration of House bill 3862? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representative, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2857) to extend second-class mailing privileges to bulletins issued by State conservation and fish and game agencies or departments.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3830) to provide for the promotion and elimination of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 156) fixing the date of meeting of the second regular session of the Eightieth Congress.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3309) to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 34) authorizing the Presiding Officers of the two Houses to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions after adjournment on July 26, 1947.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (H. R. 3645) relating to the exchange of certain private and Federal properties within Gettysburg National Military Park, Pa., and for other purposes; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 33) providing for adjournment of the two Houses of Congress until January 2, 1948, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3645) relating to the exchange of certain private and Federal properties within Gettysburg National Military Park, Pa., and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1181. An act for the relief of Robert F. Parks; and

S. 1661. An act to provide additional inducements to physicians, surgeons, and dentists to make a career of the United States military, naval, and public-health services, and for other purposes.

CONDITIONAL FINAL ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
July 26, 1947.

Resolved, That the concurrent resolution from the Senate (S. Con. Res. 33) entitled "Concurrent resolution providing for adjournment of the two Houses of Congress until January 2, 1948," do pass with the following amendment:

Line 1, strike out "Saturday, July 26, 1947" and insert "Sunday, July 27, 1947."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—am I recognized, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, it is a conference report, is it not?

Mr. BARKLEY. No. The motion, Mr. President, is not debatable, but, the House having changed the date, is that amendment debatable?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair and of the parliamentarian, it is not debatable.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to.

GRANT TO MONTGOMERY COUNTY, PA., OF CERTAIN LAND

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask for the present consideration of House bill 3862.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3862) to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to grant and convey to Montgomery County, Pa., a certain parcel of land of the United States in Norristown Borough, Montgomery County, Pa., for the purpose of erecting an additional annex to the present courthouse was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALE OF TIMBER WITHIN THE TONGASS NATIONAL FOREST

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 205, Calendar 596.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I am chairman of the subcommittee which has been considering that question. I have great doubt as to the constitutionality of the measure, but I shall not make a formal objection. We wanted to protect the rights of the Indians by adoption of proper amendments. Others have passed on these amendments. They think I am wrong, and for the purpose of accomplishing the building of a great pulp industry in the Territory of Alaska, I am not going to file an objection at this time, but permit the measure to be acted upon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 205) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell timber within the Tongass National Forest was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the identical Senate measure, Senate Joint Resolution 118, will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. BUTLER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following the passage of the Tongass Forest bill a few moments ago several telegrams from Alaska.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KETCHIKAN, ALASKA, *July 11, 1947.*

Hon. HUGH BUTLER,
Chairman, Public Lands Committee,
Washington, D. C.:

We strongly urge that Senate Joint Resolution 118 or House Joint Resolution 205 as reported out of committee be enacted into law. We feel that future welfare of Alaska will be adversely affected unless this resolution is passed in toto.

Mayor WANO HENRICKSON,
Juneau, Alaska.
Mayor CARL VELVSTAD,
Petersburg, Alaska.
Mayor DORIS M. BARNES,
Wrangell, Alaska.
Mayor ROBERT E. ELLIS,
Ketchikan, Alaska.

JUNEAU, ALASKA, *July 17, 1947.*

Hon. HUGH BUTLER,
Chairman, Committee on Public Lands,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Reference Indian statement, page 8568, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 10, our opinion no points raised are based on facts and comments on paragraphs following: (1) Circuit court of appeals has ruled that Indians possess individual rights but no aboriginal tribal rights and all individual and Government agencies recognize these individual

rights without question to lands which are actually used by these Indians but no tribal rights have ever been recognized as these Indians were not organized in tribes, but into clans within each race or large family group. Under Senate Joint Resolution 118 these individual rights will receive full protection. Hearings Department of Interior held were for purpose of determining whether Indians had possessory right, and results indeterminate until Secretary Ickes arbitrarily made determination not in accordance with facts brought out in hearings: (2) no encroachment on private property involved as all Indian property will be scrupulously protected; (3) circuit court of appeals has ruled that no aboriginal rights exist and this decision superior to that of Mr. Ickes; (4) pulp companies interested in entering Alaskan field have stated they feel House Joint Resolution 205 as passed by House would give ample protection; (5) circuit court of appeals decision based on treaty cession with Russia and should be fairly conclusive as to Government protection as we must depend on our courts for determination of rights under Constitution; (6) no fair play is involved and any recognition of Indian rights not based on court decisions would be giving valuable rights to one group of full citizens at expense of all other citizens as these extensive lands under consideration have never been recognized as Indian owned; (7) these lands have never contributed to Indian livelihood except for hunting and berry picking by individuals and these privileges are enjoyed by all citizens which includes Indians. Pulp development would provide opportunity for long-season work, 10 months or more per year, for Indians along with whites and make them much more self-sustaining than any reservation idea possibly could. Indians here enjoy all rights enjoyed by whites and will continue to do so. Pulp sales will provide only means for Indians to become self-supporting through own efforts and do much to remove inferiority of race in economic struggle as fishing is short-seasonal occupation and gradually producing less income for them. Estimated 25,000,000,000 feet of timber on 1,600,000 acres under consideration. Curry's representation shown CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 10, that he represents town of Juneau is misleading. He does not represent town of Juneau and we are fairly certain he does not represent any organization in Alaska except perhaps some Indian group. P'ease insert this telegram in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

JUNEAU CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

MATANUSKA VALLEY
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Palmer, Alaska, June 25, 1947.

The Honorable HUGH BUTLER,
Chairman, Senate Public
Lands Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Matanuska Valley Chamber of Commerce endorses, unanimously, House Joint Resolution 205, which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to sell timber within the Tongass National Forest.

We feel that this bill, if passed, will have great influence on the future development of Alaska.

Very truly yours,
ZOLA M. FINEMAN,
Secretary, Matanuska Valley
Chamber of Commerce.

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, *July 9, 1947.*

Hon. HUGH BUTLER,
Chairman, Senate Public
Lands Committee,
Washington, D. C.:

Contemplated pulp industry very important to development of Alaska. Intensive efforts being made to interest potential investors this industry. Possessory rights could be stumbling block and set back development program many years. We believe House Joint Resolution 205 best available interim legislation, and respectfully urge favorable action before adjournment of Congress.

FRED AXFORD,
President, Anchorage Chamber of
Commerce.

WRANGELL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Wrangell, Alaska, June 26, 1947.

The Honorable HUGH BUTLER,
Chairman, Senate Public
Lands Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BUTLER: This letter is to record with your committee our unanimous approval of Senate Joint Resolution 118.

We believe early adoption of this resolution necessary if pulp and paper industry is to be brought into southeast Alaska.

Yours very truly,
W. L. EASTAUGH,
Secretary.

EXTENSION OF VETERANS' PREFERENCE BENEFITS TO WIDOWED MOTHERS OF CERTAIN EX-SERVICEMEN

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 1426, Calendar No. 701.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1426) to extend veterans' preference benefits to widowed mothers of certain ex-servicemen.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this is a bill sponsored by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], which was objected to by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], who has withdrawn his objection.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, there is an amendment to the bill on the desk, which I ask to have acted upon.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I warn the Senator that if an amendment is put on the House bill it will not be passed by the House of Representatives.

Mr. TYDINGS. The bill ought not to be passed without the amendment, because it will draw a discrimination between women who have lost their only sons and others.

Mr. TAFT. I do not mind the bill being passed with the amendment, if the Senator wishes it, but I asked that only House bills be considered because I did not think the House would pass on any amendments at the present time.

Mr. TYDINGS. I understand they will consider my amendment, and in view of the fact that it is not my fault that the bill comes up for action at this time, at this late hour, I shall insist upon action upon my amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There are a number of amendments. Does the Senator wish to have them considered as one amendment?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 5, it is proposed to strike out the second "and."

On page 2, line 3, it is proposed to strike out the semicolon and insert a comma.

On page 2, line 7, after the word "conditions", it is proposed to insert a semicolon and the following: "and (6) a mother of a deceased ex-serviceman or ex-servicewoman who lost his or her life while on active duty in any branch of the armed forces of the United States during any war, or in any campaign or expedition (for which a campaign badge has been authorized) or of a service-connected permanently and totally disabled ex-serviceman or ex-servicewoman, if (A) said ex-servicemen or ex-servicewoman was separated from such armed forces under honorable conditions, (B) the mother was divorced or legally separated from the father of such ex-serviceman son or ex-servicewoman daughter, and (C) said ex-serviceman son or ex-servicewoman daughter is the only child of said mother."

On page 2, line 11, strike out "and (5)" and insert in lieu thereof "(5) and (6),"

On page 2, line 14, strike out "and (5)" and insert in lieu thereof "(5) and (6),"

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, this bill is the same as Calendar No. 506, Senate bill 416. I therefore ask that the House bill be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and substituting the language of Senate bill 416, as reported from the committee with amendments, plus the amendment which I have offered to the House bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the order number which I asked to take up was the House bill. It was not the Senate bill. It was Calendar No. 701, House bill 1426.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, that was not the bill to which the Senator from Minnesota objected. The bill to which the Senator from Minnesota objected was another calendar number, and that is the reason for the confusion. The Senator said he was taking up the bill to which the Senator from Minnesota had objected, but that the Senator from Minnesota had withdrawn his objection.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have no objection to the House bill being returned to the House with the suggested amendments.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, we shall have to send to the House the proper bill. What is that bill?

Mr. TYDINGS. There are two identical bills, Calendar No. 506, Senate bill 416, being identical with Calendar No. 701, House bill 1426.

Mr. TAFT. My original request was with respect to Calendar 701, House bill 1426. It was the House bill which I sought to take up. That is the bill which has been before the Senate at all times.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then I offer my amendment to that bill, which will make it all right.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, House bill 1426 is amended as indicated.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That section 2 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a semicolon and the following: "(5) widowed mothers (if they have not remarried and were widows at the time of the death or

disability of their ex-serviceman son or ex-servicewoman daughter)—

"(A) of deceased ex-servicemen or ex-servicewomen who lost their lives while on active duty in any branch of the armed forces of the United States during any war, or in any campaign or expedition (for which a campaign badge has been authorized), or

"(B) of service-connected permanently and totally disabled ex-servicemen or ex-servicewomen,

if said ex-serviceman or ex-servicewoman was separated from such armed forces under honorable conditions" and (6) a mother of a deceased ex-serviceman or ex-servicewoman who lost his or her life while on active duty in any branch of the armed forces of the United States during any war, or in any campaign or expedition (for which a campaign badge has been authorized) or of a service-connected permanently and totally disabled ex-serviceman or ex-servicewoman, if (A) said ex-serviceman or ex-servicewoman was separated from such armed forces under honorable conditions, (B) the mother was divorced or legally separated from the father of such ex-serviceman son or ex-servicewoman daughter, and (C) said ex-serviceman son or ex-servicewoman daughter is the only child of said mother."

SEC. 2. Section 3 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 is amended by striking out "and (3)," after the second comma in the first sentence, and inserting the following: "(3), (5), and (6),"

SEC. 3. Section 10 of the Veterans' Prefence Act of 1944 is amended by striking out "and (3)" and inserting "(3), (5), and (6),"

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to extend veterans' preference benefits to widowed mothers of certain ex-servicemen and ex-servicewomen."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senate bill 416 is indefinitely postponed.

CONSTRUCTION OF FLOOD WORKS ON LITTLE SIOUX RIVER AND ITS TRIBUTARIES

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 790, House bill 4111, in which the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is interested. I understand that the bill was objected to by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], but that the objection has been withdrawn.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4111) authorizing the construction of flood-control works on the Little Sioux River and its tributaries in Iowa.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LAPEL BUTTONS FOR WIDOWS, PARENTS, AND NEXT OF KIN OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO LOST THEIR LIVES IN WORLD WAR II

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this is my last request. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 697, House bill 1544.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1544) to provide appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the armed forces who lost their lives in the armed services of the United States in World War II.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, my purpose is to move for an executive session, if there is no objection. I do not wish to shut off any discussion.

AUTHORIZATION TO PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO MAKE APPOINTMENTS

On motion of Mr. TAFT, it was—

Ordered, That notwithstanding the recess of the present session of the Congress, the President pro tempore be, and he is hereby, authorized to make appointments to commissions or committees authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate.

AUTHORIZATION TO SECRETARY OF SENATE TO DESIGNATE OFFICIAL TO SIGN PAPERS, ETC.

On motion of Mr. TAFT, it was—

Ordered, That during the period following the recess of the present session of the Congress, the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized to designate an official in his office to attest, in his name, during his absence, the certification of papers and documents for which he may receive requests.

AUTHORIZATION TO SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES, ETC.

On motion of Mr. TAFT, it was—

Ordered, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives subsequent to the recess of the said session.

BILL OBJECTED TO

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 792, House bill 4127, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. TAFT. I object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT OF WORK OF NATIONAL RESOURCES ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a preliminary statement of the work done by the National Resources Economic Committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT, NATIONAL RESOURCES ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The United States has been endowed with vast raw material resources, including mineral, agriculture, fuels, forestry, and fisheries, whose equal in quantity and variety have not yet been found in any like area of the world. Possession of these resources and ability to utilize them have made possible the preeminent industrial position of the United States and its unexcelled standard of living. The deposits of iron ore, coal, petroleum, metals, and other basic materials essential to an industrial civilization thus comprise one of the Nation's assets vital to every citizen in the land.

The committee is making a particular point of determining the ability of this country to produce the individual products for the national market, and an approximation of the differential cost of production of specific products in this country as compared to the chief competitive foreign areas due to the difference in the wage standard of living.

It was with this basic premise in mind that in February of this year the Public Lands Committee created a new committee, the National Resources Economic Committee, in order to "make a full and complete study and investigation of the factors affecting minerals, fuels, forestry, fisheries, and reclamation projects, and report at the earliest practicable time the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable."

Hearings on the general subject of minerals have brought out the fact that during the recent war the United States was hard pressed to obtain mineral raw materials adequate to meet military and civilian requirements. Once again it was evident that the Nation's storehouse of minerals lacked several important commodities without which an industrial machine could not function. Some of the mineral industries, from which ample supplies were derived in the past, were unequal to the task of meeting the war-inflated demand. These experiences naturally caused anxiety as to the extent to which the mineral resources of the United States have been exhausted, and how the supply can be expanded in the future.

The United States Department of the Interior, recognizing the need for taking stock of the outlook for the future, undertook an inventory of the United States mineral position early in 1944. The results of this study, a 325-typewritten-page paper, were presented to the committee on its first day of hearings, and will be included in the published hearings of the committee as an inventory of blocked-out ore known through exploration work by private operators.

The committee's hearings to date reveal that the United States is by no means a have-not nation with regard to those minerals that are basic to the maintenance of a modern industrial society. Certain strategic minerals, however, are deficient in supply, but testimony before the committee indicates that great progress is being made to alleviate this situation. This is being accomplished through the use of Government laboratory and pilot plants. Thus continued dependence upon foreign sources for supplies of these minerals can largely be done away with through expansion of domestic production of the development of substitute metals.

Testimony showed that some minerals, hitherto of little value, have suddenly become of commercial importance through the development of processes now being worked out in such laboratories and pilot plants. It is the function of a pilot plant to (1) open up greater fields in minerals through laboratory and metallurgical experiments, and (2) to test and determine the economic feasibility of their use.

For instance, during the war manganese was used as a substitute for nickel in an alloy where there was no carbon. The pilot plants sent their new electrolytic manganese and it was found to be an adequate substitute for the scarce imported nickel to stainless-steel companies.

By this method we were able to conserve our limited supply of nickel, which in the main is imported.

Also, in the case of aluminum, which is obtained normally from imported bauxite, we find that, if pilot plants continue to operate successfully using domestic low grades of bauxite in Arkansas, we will open up an entirely new raw-material field in this country.

Testimony also showed that in Idaho there exists the largest concentration of vanadium in the world. Vanadium is used principally as an alloying element in steel, and at the present time we import a great deal of our supply of vanadium. If this deposit is properly developed, it can produce the substitutes for expensive and rare alloys used in the manufacture of steel, which are available outside of the United States.

Another metal with which the pilot plants have been doing extensive work is titanium, which is three to four times as strong as magnesium alloys and weighs only half as much. It will fulfill many of the uses of stainless steel. It is the fourth most abundant material found in the earth's crust from which structural material can be made. The same is true of zirconium, a sister element, which is more resistive to corrosive influences than titanium. With regard to both of these minerals, the pilot plants are experimenting in an effort to lower the costs of production so that both may be used more widely in industrial operations.

The committee is collecting all available data to show the relative self-sufficiency of the United States in metals and minerals; the domestic, compared with the foreign, cost of producing these minerals, and a study of the reasons for the differences in cost.

The desirability of furthering domestic production by the imposition of tariffs, import fees, etc., to eliminate the differential in costs of production is also being carefully studied, together with ways and means to further encourage the investment of venture capital.

The consensus of testimony by Government and industry representatives before the subcommittee indicates that there is neither a short-term nor a long-term over-all shortage of oil in this country.

The spot shortages which are predicted to take place this fall and winter, largely in the Midwest, will be the result primarily of the lack of steel to build new pipe lines and tank cars. Additional pipe lines and tank cars are necessary to transport crude oil and petroleum products from production points to marketing areas.

Another reason for the expected spot shortages of oil is the small number of new oil wells drilled during the last 5 years. Testimony indicated that a shortage of steel during and since the war to build oil-drilling equipment has resulted in there being 67,000 fewer wells than otherwise would now be in operation

James Terry Duce, vice president, Arabian-American Oil Co., asserted that no worldwide oil shortage exists today. He pointed out that in the Middle East alone there is an estimated reserve of 30,000,000,000 barrels. The total United States reserve is about 22,000,000,000 barrels. Mr. Duce also indicated that the Russian reserve is immense.

Dr. Wilburn Schroeder of the Synthetic Fuels Division of the Department of the Interior stated that there is enough oil shale, coal and natural gas to produce synthetically 2,000,000 barrels of crude oil per day for an indefinite period. This represents a 40 percent increase above present daily output of crude oil. To accomplish this, Dr. Schroeder said that a minimum of a year's time would be needed, plus adequate capital, manpower, and steel and other structural supplies and equipment.

Testimony also showed that one of the salient reasons for the lack of steel available in the United States has been the increased export of steel tubular goods to foreign countries. In 1938, the United States exported 6.8 percent of the total amount of steel tubular goods produced during that year. For the first quarter of 1947, the total amount of tubular goods exported was 12.1 percent, or an increase of 78 percent over 1938.

Also brought out in common testimony was the fact that if in the past there had been more venture capital allowed to flow into the oil industry, the present situation of spot shortages would have been materially alleviated.

FISHERIES

In testimony before the subcommittee regarding programs for the determination of supply and the conservation of fishery resources, representatives of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior stated that the United States fisheries and related industries have a total value of $1,000,000,000. Vast fishery resources in the Pacific area, hitherto unexploited, are reported available in the near future.

With respect to those fish resources threatened by excess exploitation, President Truman's proclamation on September 28, 1945, that certain areas of the high seas should be set aside as fishery conservation zones, was brought out during the hearing as an important step in the conservation of our fishery resources. These zones would be established in areas where fishing activities have been or may be developed and maintained on a substantial scale, to be subject to regulation by the United States where the area has been developed by our nationals only, and to be administered under international agreement where fishing is a joint activity in the area.

The International Resources Division of the State Department testified that the State Department intervenes when the United States acting alone cannot effectively protect the resource in question. To the technical and economic information, which they receive from outside sources to help them judge a given problem, the State Department adds its diplomatic experience in questions on international law. It stated that it was a general policy of the State Department to develop fisheries stock in order that the annual production take may be sustained on a permanent basis at the highest possible level.

It also stated that it was the established policy of the Department to assure and protect the rights of American nationals on the high seas and in foreign ports in the harvesting of the resource. With respect to international trade, the Department stated that it was in general its policy to reduce trade barriers, even at the expense of some trade elements in this country, when international political considerations might make it necessary.

Forestry experts of the United States Department of Agriculture testified that the United States has enough forest land ultimately to produce all of the forest products we might need in this country, with a sizeable overage for national security, and for export.

About a third of our land area, some 640,000,000 acres, is still classified as forest lands. Of that amount, about 460,000,000 acres are available, suitable for growing commercial timber crops.

Although we have tremendous basic forest resources to start with, testimony showed that so far we have not treated it very well. By unwise land clearings, by loss from forest fires, and by improper cuttings through the years, we have reduced the volume of saw timber in this country from perhaps 8,000,000,000,000 board-feet in the beginning to about 1,600,000,000,000 board-feet at the present time.

One might expect that that downward trend would have been reversed by this time. Unfortunately enough for the United States, that isn't true. During the last 40 years we have reduced the volume of our saw timber by 43 percent. During the past 7 years we have reduced that volume by 9 percent and currently we are depleting our saw timber volume one and one-half times as fast as it is being replaced by growth.

Also brought out in the hearings was the fact that the larger industrial owners, who hold only about 16 percent of the privately owned commercial forest land, are first in adopting conservation methods. It is the small owner who is not doing so well with regard to the conservation of his forest.

With regard to the world situation on forests we, in comparison with other nations, are not a rich nation. For example, the United States has about 8 percent of the world's forest area, which is roughly 6 acres per capita, and yet we produce and consume about a third of the world's production and consumption of lumber. We have a higher per capita consumption of lumber than any other nation except the Scandinavian countries.

Except during the World War I and World War II periods, the United States has been a net exporter of lumber.

Also to be noted was the fact that a large number of the nations of the world, particularly those of eastern and southern Europe, are undersupplied with timber. The United States doubtlessly will be looked to by these nations as a partial source of lumber for the next few years at least.

It should also be pointed out that the shortages of lumber over the world are in soft woods, the pines, and other woods that are used in construction.

In general, America's mineral and raw materials outlook is favorable, but it is obvious that a program of research and exploration must be pursued if new sources are to be developed to supply future needs. This Nation can no longer afford to continue the policy of letting nature take its course.

AGRICULTURE

During the past 12 months agricultural production has continued at a high level, with some crop production the highest in the history of this Nation. We also broke all records for total exports while continuing domestic food consumption at a record per capita level.

All of this was done because of America's tremendous expansion in the use of mechanized farm equipment, increased use of fertilizer, lands rich in mineral wealth and proved technical "know-how" in the operation of farms. Preliminary indications are that production in 1947 and 1948 will be somewhat lower than 1946, but still 30 percent above prewar levels.

Nearly 18,500,000 long tons of grain and other foods were exported from the United States in the year ending June 30, 1947. This was the largest total of food ever shipped from one country in a single year. On a price-weighted basis, this amounts to about 9 percent of our total food supply. Preliminary indications for 1947 and 1948 are for exports amounting to a slightly smaller percent of our total food supply. In anticipation of the time, when exports of food products will not continue at such tremendous rates and when there may be domestic surpluses of food products, the Government through its experimental stations is attempting to find methods to utilize such surpluses and presently-wasted culls, low grade or residue materials to the benefit of the general agricultural program through conversion to industrial uses.

Practically all of the vast amount of potential raw material can be converted through known processes into liquid fuels which are suitable substitutes for petroleum. In fact, the motor fuel outlet is the only source large enough to absorb farm surpluses of starch crops such as occurred in the 1930's.

During the last war, the reconstruction Finance Corporation financed three plants which processed grains in order to produce industrial alcohol used in the making of synthetic rubber. These plants are now op-

erated on a lease basis from the RFC and are private.

The Omaha, Nebr., plant is rated at a capacity of 75,000 gallons of 190 proof industrial alcohol per day. Through the conversion method, the Omaha plant is now recovering 2¾ gallons of 190-proof alcohol from one bushel of grain. At the present time, because of the high prices being paid for grain, it is economically impossible to attempt to compete with other commercial sources of industrial alcohol. If all of the rubber that is used in America could be made out of alcohol from grain, it is estimated that it would consume some 200,000,000 bushels of our surplus grains per year.

Mr. MALONE. The factors affecting the production of minerals, agriculture, fuels, forestry, and fishery products include reciprocal trade treaties, tariffs, subsidies, quotas, empire preferential rates and the manipulation of foreign currencies, including the sterling bloc; and processed and manufactured products.

The work of the committee of which I am chairman will be published and made available to the second session of the Eightieth Congress.

DOMESTIC MINERAL PRODUCTION

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD an additional statement to follow my discussion of House bill 1602, to be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I defend the system under which we operate—the free American system which has made America great. I believe in this system so strongly that I want to keep America free—free from foreign controls which certainly would result if we depend upon foreign producers for our mineral requirements. Who can say whether tomorrow morning a foreign supply of a given mineral will be shut off? Is it not possible overnight for foreign governments to change, for new policies to be adopted, for an embargo to be placed upon the export of raw materials?

Mining is a long-range development. There is no time to develop mines after the emergency arrives, therefore there must be an incentive for the investment of venture capital in this hazardous business to maintain the potential production and the technical know-how so necessary and vital in any shipping interruption.

America cannot exist without a constant new supply of metals. Our supplies today are dangerously short. Take, for example, lead—our Government stock pile stands at zero. At one time, in March of 1943, there were 275,000 tons of lead in this stock pile alone. This has been diminished because the production has not kept up with consumption. We will use in the United States, provided we keep our manufacturing industry operating, better than a million tons of lead. All indications are that with present mines operating we cannot possibly meet this heavy demand from domestic production. For 1946 we were able to collect only 850,000 tons from primary and secondary production and importation.

Is it sound business to shut down mines—marginal mines, if you please—which have been made marginal largely because of lack of development work during the war period? Development programs were abandoned in an effort to get out the greatest amount of metal in the shortest possible time. The rich ore bodies were mined quickly, the leaner ore reserves remained.

The situation in copper is equally critical—great demand by industry and less production. Copper consumption is averaging 150,000 tons a month today, while production is down to 75,000 tons. The Congress has removed the tariff on copper of 4 cents a pound in an effort to encourage imports, but with all of the imports which are anticipated the best informed will agree that there will be a shortage of copper for at least 2 years.

Zinc supplies are also tight and likely will continue so, and leaders in the galvanizing industry have only recently cautioned the steel industry with respect to possible shortages.

Mr. President, I want to emphasize the experience of those in the mining industry; the experience of finding new ore bodies and new mines by developing new prospects. These prospects are generally developed by little miners. Thousands of these men make it a practice to go into mineralized areas and try to seek out new mineral wealth and bring into production new mines. Every large mine in America was once a small mine, and yet some of the big miners would have us believe that the little mines of America should be cut off and not encouraged to continue operations at a time when admittedly the Nation is terribly short of metals. I have had enough experience in the mining areas to appreciate the lack of wisdom through the adoption of such a policy. We must encourage our mining industry; we must take into consideration the economic factors which deter the production of metals from our marginal mines.

These mines are not inefficient; they are, however, high-cost mines. Many costs can be attributed to the action of Government and certainly are no fault of the miners themselves. In order to eliminate these obstacles, I consider it wisdom for this Congress to immediately enact legislation such as that incorporated in the Allen bill, which will keep the mines of America operating until a sounder plan can be worked out which will insure America of adequate mineral supplies to meet our requirements in the event of an emergency, and especially to keep our national economy functioning. If the metal is not produced under this plan, it will not cost the Government a thin dime, but if the metal is produced and mines are developed, new ore bodies will be found, little mines will develop into big mines, and America will become self-sufficient at a time when world conditions justify us in developing self-sufficiency.

It is my contention, Mr. President, based on my experience in the mining industry and my knowledge of it and as a result of my studies and the studies of my committee of the requirements of industry for copper, lead, and zinc, that unless we keep our mines operating, terrific shortages will be experienced in the next few months. These studies show that 469 (96 percent by number) of the 488 lead-zinc mines reporting to the United States Bureau of Mines were drawing subsidies up to the present time when the subsidy program has expired. This deplorable condition exists today in spite of the high price of metals and is largely the result of the mistakes which were made by the Administration prior to the war in not preparing this country for the terrific emergency which occurred. The testimony before my committee showed that the production of the mines being subsidized was equivalent to 52 percent of the domestic mine production of lead and 73 percent of the domestic mine production of zinc. With these facts before us, can we afford to follow the philosophy recently publicized by the State Department of relying upon foreign sources for supplies of metals? Can we adopt the have-not theories of the present Secretary of the Interior Department? I know that the course suggested by these two men would lead us to destruction, to dependence upon foreign sources for our national well-being. This seems to be the objective of our State Department to have America depend upon the whims and fancies of some foreign dictator who, overnight, may be overthrown or change his mind. Can we afford to rely upon such a program for the development of the greatest Nation on the face of the earth? Any thinking person would realize that this course will lead us down to the lowest level Americans have ever experienced and will eventually result in the utter destruction of our economic system. We have become great by our ability to mine and produce metals. We are the greatest Nation on earth. With 6 percent of the world's population, we are able to do 40 percent of the world's work. We enjoy a standard of living such as is enjoyed in no other country. We have subsidized practically all foreign government and foreign producers of most everything. Can we afford in an emergency such as the present to turn a deaf ear to the pleas of the mining industry?

It is my contention, Mr. President, that this matter is a serious matter and demands our immediate action in the passage of the legislation which is designated H. R. 1602.

Analysis indicates that some 30 percent of our domestic mine production of copper and lead-zinc may be considered marginal, at least until further development is possible; that is at present peak prices to some 3 cents below them, 30 percent of the production of those metals will be eliminated unless the premium price plan is continued.

Since early 1942 the plan has operated to sustain our marginal production. It is a system of direct payment for marginal production only. The record shows that good, but not exorbitant, profits have been earned by participators, that many new mines have been opened under its operation, and that operating efficiency has been maintained at mines receiving the payments.

It is not a cost-plus system. Its ability to operate under free market conditions has been demonstrated since October 1946. By payments directly to producers it avoids marketing charges which vary directly with open market prices. Its administration is efficient, costing less than 1 percent of the funds disbursed. Its use during the war is estimated to have saved our taxpayers more than $5,000,000,000 at an expenditure of less than $225,000,000.

In 1946, at the direction of Congress to the administrators to encourage exploration, a widespread program of premiums to operators for exploration was initiated. Five million dollars worth of projects have been approved for 500,000 feet of exploration work at 76 mines. Early reports indicate good results.

The plan should be continued for the following reasons:

1. National security: The plan will maintain in active operation our maximum productive capacity. It will tend to conserve low-cost, high-grade ores by meeting a part of our stock pile and industry demands from marginal ores. The low-cost, high-grade ores are our great source of strength in national emergencies.

2. Conservation: The plan makes possible the complete exploitation of ore bodies at moderate cost, through the mass mining of low-grade marginal ores concurrently with high-grade competitive ores, spreading the total cost over both classes. This compares with the wasteful orthodox method of selective robbing of high-grade ores and abandonment of low-grade ores which, if recovered in the future, will be subject to the high (often prohibitively so) capital costs of reequipment, organization rebuilding, dewatering, and repair of caved workings.

3. Diffusion. In maintaining the broad marginal sector of the industry, the plan tends to increase diffusion of control of operations, with all the attendant benefits of varied management. During 3 years of its operation, 1,900 new mines opened and old mines reopened, with a combined annual

maximum productive capacity in excess of 1,300,000,000 pounds of copper, lead, and zinc.

4. Exploration. In addition to the direct payments for exploration projects described above, the plan assures maintenance of two fruitful categories of search for new ore bodies:

(a) In maintaining marginal producers, it maintains a vigorous group of explorers who are driven continually by the inadequacy of their ore reserves. Specially sponsored development campaigns by 45 such producers in the early war years added 145,000,000 pounds of annual lead-zinc capacity to our production.

(b) In providing additional price incentives to small prospectors it eases their financing problems and provides higher income from their minute production. Three hundred and sixty such prospectors have been assigned limited exploration premiums during the past year.

5. Adequate supplies. The plan assures that all possible metal supplies will be forthcoming and that much of it will not be committed to fabrication by integrated concerns.

Mr. MALONE. The National Resources Economic Committee, of which I am chairman, is conducting a series of hearings which include the entire mineral industry to determine the ability of this country to produce each specific mineral for our own needs—and the approximate differential of cost of such production between this Nation and in the chief competitive foreign areas.

A long-range plan of automatic, flexible tariffs or import fees meeting such differential of cost of production would result in such imports coming in on our wage-living standard—lowering as the wage-living standards increased in such competitive areas—and when the cost of production approximates our own in the production of any specific product free or unrestricted trade would immediately result.

ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. DWORSHAK, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (S. 1756) for the relief of Carey Act settlers in the Black Canyon irrigation district under the Payette division of the Boise reclamation project in Idaho, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 26, 1947, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 338. An act to amend the Plant Quarantine Act approved August 20, 1912, as amended, by adding a new proviso to section 1; and

S. 758. An act to promote the national security by providing for a Secretary of Defense; for a National Military Establishment; for a Department of the Army, a Department of the Navy, and a Department of the Air Force; and for the coordination of the activities of the National Military Establishment with other departments of the Government concerned with the national security.

NATIONAL SOIL FERTILITY PROGRAM

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding the national soil fertility program, prepared by himself, which appears in the Appendix.]

MORE VALUABLE THAN DOLLARS—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "More Valuable Than Dollars" from the Washington Star, of July 26, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

A VOTERS' REVOLUTION—ARTICLE BY ROSCOE DRUMMOND

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A Voters' Revolution" written by Roscoe Drummond, which appears in the Appendix.]

A PEOPLE'S PRESIDENT IN '48—ARTICLE BY ROSCOE DRUMMOND

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A People's President in '48" by Roscoe Drummond, reprinted from the magazine "'47" which appears in the Appendix.]

THE DISPLACED PERSONS PROBLEM—STATEMENT BY MARVIN KLEMME

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Marvin Klemme, former UNRRA official, in reference to displaced persons in Europe, which appears in the Appendix.]

WORLD-WIDE INFLUENCE OF TVA—STATEMENT BY MRS. ELIZABETH U. CRAIB

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "World-Wide Influence of TVA," by Mrs. Elizabeth U. Craib, at the recent Valley Authority Conference in Washington, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE OHIO—STATEMENT BY LOUIS BROMFIELD

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "The Ohio" by Louis Bromfield, delivered at the Valley Authority Conference in Washington on July 17, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

HELPING NATURE TO CHANGE ENVIRONMENT—ADDRESS BY J. RUSSELL SMITH

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Helping Nature to Change Environment," by J. Russell Smith, professor of economic geography at Columbia University, at the recent Valley Authority Conference held at Washington, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN DEMOCRACY ENDANGERED BY RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL BIAS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR KILGORE

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "American Democracy Endangered by Religious and Racial Bias," delivered by Senator KILGORE before the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPOINTMENTS IN THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY—CASE OF JUDGE WILLIAM CLARK

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement with regard to appointments in the Federal Judiciary, with particular reference to the case of Judge William Clark, which appears in the Appendix.]

WORK OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN REDUCING FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement with reference to the work of the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the accomplishments of the first session of the Eightieth Congress in reducing Federal expenditures, which appears in the Appendix.]

REORGANIZATION OF RAILROADS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR REED AND SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. REED asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding the reorganization of railroads prepared by himself and Senator MYERS, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXPANSION OF OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, a few days ago I introduced a bill to expand the present Federal old-age and survivors-insurance program under the Social Security Act. There is now pending before the Senate Committee on Finance, H. R. 3818, a bill recently passed by the House of Representatives dealing with social security. I earnestly hope that while the Finance Committee is giving consideration to the House bill they will also give consideration to the bill which I have just introduced.

PUBLIC SUPPORT FOR SOCIAL SECURITY LEGISLATION

The bill which I have introduced amends our present system of old-age and survivors insurance by greatly expanding its coverage and by adding protection against the risk of extended disability. Similar proposals were recommended to the Congress more than 8 years ago by an Advisory Council on Social Security composed of 25 leading representatives of employers, employees, and the public.

Most of the provisions incorporated in the bill were endorsed in principle in a poll taken by the United States Chamber of Commerce. The social-security committees of several leading life-insurance associations also have come out in favor of many of the provisions of the bill.

COVERAGE OF THE EXPANDED PROGRAM

The program of retirement disability and survivors' insurance, proposed by the bill, would cover some 15,000,000 persons in addition to the industrial and commercial wage earners now covered by the social-insurance program. The major groups to be added are agricultural and domestic wage workers; employees of educational, charitable, and nonprofit organizations, State and local government employees not already protected by their own systems; persons serving in the Army and Navy; and independent business and professional persons, including farmers and operators of small businesses. All of these groups are subject to the risks of disability, premature death, and dependency in old age. Among the groups which are not covered by our present program of old-age and survivors insurance but which would have the protection of the improved system, are some of the workers whose employment conditions are the most uncertain, whose pay is the lowest and who, in consequence, are the least able to safeguard themselves and their families through individual effort.

Extension of social insurance coverage will be advantageous to workers already included in the present system as well as to the newly covered groups. Many wage earners shift back and forth in the course of a working lifetime between types of employment now covered and those not now covered; self-employed individuals commonly spend their early years working for wages while they are accumulating the stake and experience necessary before setting up in business for themselves. Under a limited coverage system, these shifts may result in loss of eligibility for benefits or in reduced benefits. We are a nation with a mobile labor force, and a healthy amount of freedom of movement should be encouraged, not stifled. Only if the coverage of our system is as broad as possible can individuals take advantage of opportunities which enable them to move from job to job without breaks in insurance protection.

ADDITION OF EXTENDED DISABILITY INSURANCE

The earnings loss suffered by permanently disabled individuals and their families probably runs from $1,500,000,000 to $2,000,000,000 a year. In its effect on the earning power of the individual, long-term disability closely resembles old age because it frequently results in permanent retirement from the labor market. But in its effect on family security, extended disability may have even more serious consequences than does old age, in that disability may strike during youth or middle age when family responsibilities are greatest and before there has been opportunity to accumulate savings.

Our bill bridges a serious gap in the present system of old-age and survivors' insurance by providing cash benefits—similar in amount to old-age benefits and with supplementary benefits for family dependents—to compensate for the earnings loss which results from extended disability. The provisions of the bill are such that the rights of individuals and their families to future retirement and survivors' benefits will be protected during periods of disability.

HIGHER BENEFIT LEVELS

Benefits under our present system of old-age and survivors' insurance are admittedly inadequate because no adjustment has been made to take account of the rising levels of wages and living costs. In a social-insurance system, which acknowledges individual energy and skill by relating benefits to past wages, the adequacy of the benefit depends not only on the formula but on how closely the wage base used in the benefit computation reflects the individual's normal earnings. In raising the benefit level, the bill gives due recognition to both of these factors.

The primary benefit payable to retired and disabled beneficiaries would replace 40 percent of the first $75 (instead of the present $50) of the individual's average monthly earnings and 10 percent of the remainder up to a total credited amount of $300 (instead of the present total of $250). In determining the earnings base on which benefits would be computed, periods during which the individual was not in covered employment—whether due to disability, to failure to find a job, or to some other cause—would no longer act to reduce the average wage; as a consequence, benefits would bear a much closer and more reasonable relationship to normal earnings. The minimum and maximum benefits for individuals and for families are also raised. These liberalizations will be applicable to the benefits of persons already receiving retirement or survivor payments as well as to persons who qualify after the enactment of the bill.

So that beneficiaries may have more adequate incomes and may continue to derive the psychological advantages of occasional jobs, the bill amends the present work clause and permits earnings up to $30 a month in covered employment before benefits are withheld.

Even with the broadly expanded coverage proposed by the bill, there will continue to be some areas of employment which are not included under the social-insurance program. Some individuals who ordinarily work in these noncovered areas will be able to engage in just enough covered employment to establish eligibility for social-insurance benefits. Moreover, the eligibility requirements of the present system of old-age and survivors' insurance will be modified in order to remove the handicap which newly covered groups would otherwise suffer on entrance to an already functioning system. In recognition of the contributions which individuals make toward their protection, there should be some differentiation between the size of the benefits of persons who qualify after relatively brief periods of coverage or on the basis of in-and-out employment and the benefits of persons who contribute to the system throughout their entire working lifetime. This differential is achieved by increasing the basic benefit for each year of coverage and decreasing it for each year of noncoverage; further explanation of this provision is included in the section-by-section analysis of the bill.

INCREASED FAMILY PROTECTION

The Social Security Act amendments of 1939 added supplementary benefits for the dependents of retired men and provided insurance against the risk of death before the worker has been able to provide for his family. The social-insurance system thereby became a system of family protection.

Our bill reinforces this principle of family protection by recognizing additional classes of dependents. For instance, the disabled husband of a retired woman, or the disabled widower of a deceased female worker, and their children, may receive benefits on the basis of her earnings record. The benefits payable to children of retired or deceased individuals would be continued after age 18 if the child were disabled.

By reducing the retirement age for women to 60—a reduction applicable to women qualifying for supplementary benefits on their husbands' earnings records as well as for primary benefits on their own records—the bill will make it possible for men with wives a few years younger than themselves to retire at age 65 and immediately draw the family benefit.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

To serve its true purpose, a social insurance system must be a democratic system of, and for, the people. In recognition of this important principle, our bill establishes a National Social Insurance Policy Advisory Council composed of 12 persons, representing labor and employers in equal numbers, and the public. The council is specifically authorized to make recommendations concerning the coverage, adequacy of benefits, and methods of financing the program of retirement, extended disability, and survivors' insurance.

FINANCING THE SOCIAL INSURANCE SYSTEM

The bill which we have introduced today does not specify the total contribution rate which is to be collected for retirement, extended disability, and survivors' insurance, nor does it indicate how such costs would be divided among workers and their employers, the self-employed and the Government. We recognize that there is danger that this deliberate omission may be construed as an indication that the sponsors of the bill are either entirely ignorant of social insurance costs or wish to fool the people into thinking that they are getting something for nothing. I hasten to assure you that this is not the case.

We believe that social-security legislation should be handled on its merits as social legislation and should not be considered as a tax matter. Social insurance contributions are premiums for insurance protection—not general taxes for paying the expenses of government. Unfortunately, however, social-security contributions were called taxes in the original legislation of 1935 and under the Constitution all tax bills must originate in the House of Representatives. No general hearings on social security were held by the Ways and Means Committee in the House during the period between 1939 and 1946. Because of the failure of the House to take action, the Senate was deprived of the opportunity to translate its views on social security into legislation. In the spring of 1946, the Ways and Means Committee held hearings on proposals for amending social-security legislation. Although there was wide support for amendments such as those included in our bill, the hearings were not concluded in time to permit congressional enactment of comprehensive amendments before the close of the session. We consider that it is extremely important to the welfare of the Nation that this bill escape the fate of the many other social-security bills which have died in committee.

It is important, also, that the financial provisions of the various social-security programs be considered at the same time. The costs of all these programs are interrelated, and contributions paid for social insurance protection should be considered as a whole. We are, therefore, planning to introduce in the near future

a comprehensive bill dealing with the financing of social-security measures.

With respect to the contributions to support the retirement, disability, and survivors insurance system proposed by our bill, I might say that we intend to include in our social insurance financing bill a 1-percent contribution rate paid by covered persons and matched by their employers to finance the retirement, survivors, and disability benefits in this bill. This combined rate of 2 percent would cover current disbursements of the expanded program for the next several years. By that time, it would be necessary either to increase the contribution rate or provide a Government subsidy to the insurance system out of general revenues.

I have long been in favor of a substantial Government contribution to the social insurance fund. There are, however, difficult problems involved in providing a governmental subsidy to an insurance system which covers only part of the population. Extension of coverage of the insurance system, and provisions for systematic financial review as specified in the bill introduced today, makes a Government contribution both equitable and desirable.

The costs of a social insurance program are not entirely new and additional costs. The contributions paid by or on behalf of insured persons represent, in the main, a method of distributing the burden of these already existing costs among all members of society through relatively small regular payments, rather than permitting the unfortunate families for whom risks actually occur to bear the whole loss. We have always met these costs, whether through individual sacrifice to support dependent relatives or through taxation to finance public assistance or relief programs, and we shall continue to meet these costs in the future.

The economic security of the Nation and of its families demands that we start now to purchase security instead of continuing to pay the bill for insecurity.

SOCIAL SECURITY IN OUR NATIONAL ECONOMY

A nation's economic strength stems from the economic well-being of its individual citizens. An opportunity to achieve self-support through gainful employment is—and will continue to be—the fundamental requisite for the economic security of individuals and their families. As long as our national economy was primarily agricultural and had its outlets of new frontiers, the principles of democracy and free enterprise on which this great Nation was founded were in themselves sufficient to provide almost unlimited opportunity for individual and family security, for development and advancement.

But our economy has changed radically and we have reached the limits of our geographical frontiers. We live today in a money economy, an economy which—without proper safeguards—has been characterized by periods of depression, and which is constantly plagued by the poverty and insecurity of countless families. In such an economy, social-security measures to increase and safeguard the economic security of individuals and their families are vital to the general welfare and progress of the Nation.

By strengthening and upholding the freedom and dignity of the individual and of the family, social-security measures strengthen and uphold democracy itself. True social security, because it consists of rights which are earned rights, reinforces the human values of independence and individual enterprise; assurance of a basic minimum protection in adversity stimulates rather than destroys the interest of individuals in making what additional provision they can for themselves. And because social-security measures increase the basic stability of our economy, they help to make our system of free enterprise operate more smoothly and effectively.

Almost 12 years of experience with the Social Security Act has provided conclusive proof that these principles are sound. We have made a successful beginning toward the goal of a socially secure America by demonstrating that people can be insured against the major causes of want. But because our program is limited with respect to the groups covered and the risks insured against, it cannot be considered more than a beginning. Congress, in enacting the social security program in 1935, recognized that we were undertaking a new and tremendously important venture and wisely limited the early program to a mere groundwork on which, with time and experience, a comprehensive program could be built. We now have—and have had for some time—sufficient experience to permit a broad expansion of the social-security program. There is no wisdom now in postponement. We should move ahead without further delay to enact measures designed to enable every individual to be economically independent in old age and in the event of prolonged disability and to enable him to provide for his dependent survivors.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF BILL FOR RETIREMENT, SURVIVORS, AND DISABILITY INSURANCE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an explanatory statement of a bill providing a program of retirement, survivors, and disability insurance.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF PROVISIONS OF BILL PROVIDING PROGRAM OF RETIREMENT, SURVIVORS, AND DISABILITY INSURANCE

Section 201 increases the types of benefits payable under title II and makes certain liberalizations in some of the qualifying requirements. New benefits are those for a worker under age 65 who has been disabled for an extended period of time; an attendant's benefit when the Federal Security Administrator finds an attendant necessary for a disabled worker; benefits at age 65 for the disabled husband of a woman primary beneficiary and for the disabled widower of a woman who was fully insured when she died. Provision is made for continuing payment of a child's benefits after the attainment of age 18 if the individual is incapable of work because of extended disability.

The bill permits women to qualify for all types of benefits at age 60, while the qualifying age for male beneficiaries remains at 65. Wife's benefits would be payable to a wife under age 60 as long as she has an entitled child under age 18 in her care. Changes are made in the provisions about child's dependency to permit payment of benefits on the wage record of the person upon whom the child had been dependent. Changes in the widow's current benefit would enable a divorced wife of a deceased wage earner to draw monthly benefits under some circumstances. Benefits would be payable to dependent parents if the deceased wage earner was not survived by a widow, widower, or child eligible in the month of death for a monthly benefit. The bill provides for payment of a lump-sum death benefit at the death of a fully or currently insured individual whether or not monthly benefits are payable in the month of the worker's death. A more detailed explanation of these changes follows.

Subsection 201 (a): Paragraph (1) lowers the age of eligibility for women from 65 to 60. For reasons explained later, the eligibility age for wife's and widow's benefits is changed from 65 to 60. It seems undesirable to permit wives to qualify for benefits on their husbands' records at an earlier age than that at which working women may qualify on their own wage records. The change was, therefore, made in the section on primary insurance benefits.

Paragraph (2) provides for the payment of primary disability benefits at any age to an insured worker who is under a long-term, total disability if he has been disabled for no less than six full, consecutive months. To be insured a worker must have had both substantial and recent covered employment—i. e., he must have ha ' 20 quarters of coverage out of the 40 quarters just preceding his current disability and he must also be a currently insured individual. Entitlement to these benefits ceases if the individual recovers from his disability, becomes entitled to primary old-age insurance benefits, or dies.

Paragraph (3) provides, as a general rule, that no person applying for benefits may be found to have been under a disability earlier than 6 months before the month in which he could first receive benefits, based on the application he has filed. This provision (together with the provision of subsection (j) which permits benefits to be established retroactively for no more than 3 months before the month of filing) means that a worker who becomes disabled after the program is in operation can delay filing until he has been disabled 10 months without suffering a loss of benefits.

The purpose of this limitation is to require individuals whose earnings have ceased and who wish to establish the fact that their loss of earnings is due to total disability to submit themselves for examination within a reasonable period of time. In effect, the provision will prevent the entitlement of persons who unduly delay filing applications. However, the worker who has been regularly employed will not lose insured status until approximately 2½ years after onset of disability.

In fairness to a worker who is insured as of the date the new program goes into effect but was disabled before that time, the general rule is modified by providing that if his application is filed within 1½ years after the effective date of the act, such an individual may be considered under a disability as of the date the act goes into effect, but no earlier.

This paragraph has the further effect of permitting the system to pick up, as a backlog, a considerable number of previously disabled individuals who can meet the insured status requirement as of the effective date of the act.

Paragraph (4) provides that, in addition to the monthly primary benefit payable to the disabled worker, a sum not exceeding $25 a month may be paid to cover the cost of services for an attendant, if it is found that such services are necessary.

Subsection 201 (b): Because wives are usually younger than their husbands, in only comparatively few cases can a wife become

entitled to monthly benefits in the same month in which her husband first becomes eligible for his primary benefits. This subsection lowers the eligibility age for wives to 60, which, in the majority of cases, will allow a husband and a wife to become entitled to benefits at the same time.

With the addition of benefits for disabled workers, there will be many families with young children who will have as much need of their mother's care as do the young children in homes where the father has died. This subsection provides, therefore, for the payment of a wife's benefit to the wife under age 60 of a primary beneficiary if she has in her care an entitled child of her husband. This will enable some young wives of retired workers to receive benefits before age 60. In the majority of cases, however, it will affect the young families of workers disabled before retirement age.

As at present, the wife's benefit is half the amount of her husband's primary benefit.

Subsection 201 (c): Paragraph (1) provides for the payment of a monthly benefit at age 65 or over to the permanently and totally disabled husband of a woman worker who is entitled to a retirement or disability benefit on her own wage record. Where the wife has been responsible for furnishing a substantial part of the family income, her normal dependents should have the same type of protection as would the dependents of a male worker. Disabled husband's benefits are analogous to the wife's benefits now payable. To be eligible for disabled husband's benefits an individual must have been disabled since his wife became entitled to her own primary insurance benefit, and this disability must have existed for at least 6 months. In addition, he must be living with his wife at the time he files application. These requirements support the presumption that the husband has lost income when his wife has stopped work. It appears reasonable, if dependency is thus established, to authorize benefit payments to these individuals since they cannot replace the income loss by going to work. Recovery from the disability would terminate the husband's rights to benefits as would death of either spouse, divorce, and other factors similar to those terminating wife's benefits.

Paragraph (2) provides that a disabled husband must meet the conditions for entitlement on or after January 1, 1949.

Under the provisions of paragraph (3), disabled husband's benefits are payable in the same proportion of the wage earner's primary benefit and under similar conditions as wife's benefits.

Subsection 201 (d): Paragraph (1) liberalizes the present provision that benefits may be continued to a child adopted after the death of the insured wage earner by a stepparent, grandparent, aunt, or uncle to permit such continuation of benefits to a child adopted after the death of his parent by any person

Paragraph (2) provides for the payment of monthly benefits to a disabled child at age 18 and thereafter where the child was entitled (or could have been entitled) to child's insurance benefits under paragraph (1) at the time he became permanently and totally disabled. To receive these new benefits the child must have been under a continuous disability at the time he reached age 18 and such disability must have lasted at least six full, consecutive months. Disabled child's benefits are to be paid as a continuation, so to speak, of regular child's benefits because the child is incapacitated for any gainful employment. It may be presumed that the parent would have continued to find it necessary to support a totally disabled child if the parent's wage income had not been cut off by old age or death, and therefore these benefits fulfill an evident social need. These benefits are payable under paragraph (3) only to disabled children whose child's insurance benefits under paragraph (1) are terminated after January 1949 by reason of attainment of age 18. The new benefits are terminated when the child is no longer disabled or upon any of the occurrences which terminate regular child's benefits.

Paragraph (4) provides as at present that the amount of a child's benefit shall be half the primary insurance benefit of the wage earner on whose record the benefits are paid.

In addition to the present provision for determining that a child is dependent on his mother, adopting mother, or stepparent if the child was not living with or receiving contributions from his father, paragraphs (5) through (9) permit a determination of dependency on any of those individuals when the child was not living with his father and was receiving at least half his support from the particular one of those individuals involved. A child of a disabled father is deemed dependent on his mother or stepmother, even though living with his father and without regard to any contributions the father may make, if the father's disability has endured for at least 6 months. A child may qualify for benefits on the wage record of a foster parent who supplies at least half the child's support, if his father was not living with the child or contributing to his support and if no welfare agency was contributing to it. The present definition of "child" is expanded to include a foster child of an individual under conditions comparable to those in which an adopted or stepchild is now defined as a "child."

Subsection 201 (e): The subsection reduces the qualifying age for receipt of widow's insurance benefits from 65 to 60, the age at which women may become entitled to a primary, wife's, or parent's benefit under this bill. It is considered best to have a uniform age at which women may become eligible for these different types of benefits. Also, studies have shown that it is difficult for women, particularly those who have been out of the labor force for some time, to secure employment after reaching 60 years of age.

Subsection 201 (f): Paragraph (1) provides monthly benefits at age 65 or over for an unremarried, disabled widower of a woman worker who dies fully insured. The situation of the disabled widower parallels the dependent status of the aged widow whose income has been cut off or reduced by the death of the family's wage earner. Further, the same reasons which justify payment of benefits to the disabled husband of a living beneficiary would require that a benefit be paid to him when she dies. To insure that the disabled widower was dependent on his wife, the bill requires a condition of entitlement that he be living with her at the time of her death. He must also have been disabled at the time of her death and for the entire period after her death up to the time of filing application. In every case the disability must have existed for at least 6 months. Recovery from the disability would terminate the disabled widower's benefit, as would his remarriage, death, and other factors similar to those terminating wife's benefits.

Under the provisions of paragraph (2), conditions for entitlement can be met only after January 1, 1949.

Paragraph (3) provides that disabled widower's benefits would be payable in the same proportion of the primary benefit and under similar conditions as benefits to a widow.

Subsection 201 (g): Widow's current insurance benefits under this subsection are renamed mother's insurance benefits and benefits are added for a surviving divorced wife of a deceased wage earner if she has in her care a child of herself and the deceased wage earner entitled to receive a child's insurance benefit, she has not remarried and she was receiving more than one-half of her support from the wage earner when he died. Unless a benefit is paid to the mother, she may be unable to stay at home and care for the child or children. Payments to the divorced wife under these circumstances will increase the protection given a wage earner's children. The amount of the benefit is half of the wage earner's primary benefit.

Subsection 201 (h): Paragraph (1) permits a parent who had received 50 percent or more of his support from a deceased wage earner to draw parent's benefits if there is no surviving spouse or child who could, upon application, receive a benefit in the month of the worker's death. The parent's benefit may be paid, however, even though a child's benefit is payable on the same wage record, provided the child is entitled to equal or larger benefits on another wage record. These provisions are consistent with the original intent that dependent parent's benefits are to be paid when no other individual is receiving monthly benefits on the wage record of the insured worker. For reasons already stated under the subsections relating to other benefits for women, a woman becomes eligible for a parent's benefit at age 60 instead of age 65.

Paragraph (3) permits a foster parent to qualify for parent's insurance benefits, provided the foster relationship began before the wage earner attained the age of 16. It is reasonable to assume that a foster parent who has established dependency on his foster child has the same need for the partial replacement of the income lost as a result of the death of the insured worker as do natural parents, stepparents, or adopting parents.

Subsection 201 (i): The subsection provides that lump-sum death payments shall be paid whether or not other types of survivors' benefits are payable on the wage record of the deceased individual. The need for a lump-sum payment to help with the extra expenses at the time of death does not seem to be significantly less in cases where there are survivors who are eligible for monthly benefits to provide for regular current needs than in cases where there are no such survivors.

Subsection 201 (j): The subsection makes provision for the same retroactive payment of new benefits added by this bill as now exists for benefits under the present law.

SECTION 202. AMOUNT OF BENEFITS

Section 202 liberalizes the method of computing the average monthly wage and the formula for figuring the amount of the primary insurance benefit.

Subsection 202 (a): Paragraph (1) changes the basic primary benefit to 40 percent of the first $75 of average monthly wage instead of the present $50 and 10 percent of the remainder up to $300 instead of $250.

Under paragraph (2), the basic primary benefit is increased by one-fourth of 1 percent for each quarter of coverage the individual has prior to the quarter as of which his benefits are computed, which is the equivalent of the present 1 percent increment but modified to take account of the changed method of computing the average monthly wage. Since the average monthly wage is calculated only on quarters of coverage instead of total elapsed time, the basic primary benefit is reduced under paragraph (3) by one-half of 1 percent for each quarter which was not a quarter of coverage (excluding the quarter in which the individual died or any quarter for any part of which he was under a prior or current disability). Although this bill extends the coverage of the old-age and survivors insurance program, there will still be large numbers of persons whose normal occupations remain outside the scope of the law. Many of these individuals will work in covered employment just long enough to be insured for monthly benefits. Unless some reduction is made in the benefit amount for periods out of covered employment, these short-time, intermittent workers will receive benefits comparable to those paid individuals at the same wage who have engaged steadily in covered employment. The formula proposed in this subsection varies the benefit amount for two individuals who had the same wage while

working with the extent to which each was attached the covered labor market.

TABLE 1.—*Illustrative benefits payable to insured persons who have worked in covered employment during various proportions of the elapsed period since 1937, when contributions first became payable under the insurance system*

Elapsed period since 1937 and years of coverage	Primary insurance benefits by average monthly wage while covered		
	$100	$200	$300
10 ELAPSED YEARS			
5 years of coverage	$31.00	$41.00	$50.00
8 years of coverage	34.00	45.00	55.00
10 years of coverage	36.00	47.00	58.00
20 ELAPSED YEARS			
10 years of coverage	30.00	39.00	48.00
15 years of coverage	35.00	45.00	56.00
20 years of coverage	39.00	51.00	63.00
40 ELAPSED YEARS			
10 years of coverage	[1] 20.00	22.00	27.00
20 years of coverage	26.00	34.00	42.00
30 years of coverage	36.00	47.00	58.00
40 years of coverage	46.00	60.00	74.00

[1] Raised to minimum benefit.

The minimum primary insurance benefit is raised from the present $10 to $20, and provision is made for rounding benefits of odd amounts to the next higher dollar.

Subsection 202 (b): To provide a benefit base more closely related to wages while employed, the average monthly wage is defined as the quotient obtained by dividing the total wages paid an individual before the quarter as of which his benefit is computed by three times the number of quarters of coverage before that quarter. Wages paid in quarters during which he was under a prior or current disability are excluded from the dividend and the quarters of disability are excluded from the devisor.

TABLE 2.—*Comparison of primary insurance benefits payable under the present Social Security Act and under the proposed bill to insured persons who have worked in covered employment during various proportions of the elapsed period and whose average monthly wage while working was $100*

Elapsed period and number of years of coverage	Primary insurance benefits	
	Present law	Proposed bill
10 ELAPSED YEARS		
5 years of coverage	$21.00	$31.00
8 years of coverage	24.84	34.00
10 years of coverage	27.50	36.00
20 ELAPSED YEARS		
10 years of coverage	22.00	30.00
15 years of coverage	25.88	35.00
20 years of coverage	30.00	39.00
40 ELAPSED YEARS		
10 years of coverage	11.00	[1] 20.00
20 years of coverage	24.00	26.00
30 years of coverage	29.25	36.00
40 years of coverage	35.00	46.00

[1] Raised to minimum benefit.

Subsection 202 (c): Provision is made for computing or recomputing the benefit amount as though the individual had filed his application in the calendar quarter as of which it would have yielded the highest benefit rate. The section also permits computation of a disabled person's benefit without exclusion of the period of disability from the formula if this method results in a higher primary insurance benefit for the individual.

TABLE 3.—*Illustrative monthly old-age retirement or total-disability insurance benefits under the bill*

Elapsed period and number of years of coverage	Insured person	Insured person and wife	Insured person, wife and 1 child	Insured person, wife and 2 children
	Average monthly wage $100			
10 ELAPSED YEARS				
5 years of coverage	$31.00	$46.50	$62.00	$77.50
8 years of coverage	34.00	51.00	68.00	[2] 80.00
10 years of coverage	36.00	54.00	72.00	[2] 80.00
20 ELAPSED YEARS				
10 years of coverage	30.00	45.00	60.00	75.00
15 years of coverage	35.00	52.50	70.00	[2] 80.00
20 years of coverage	39.00	58.50	78.00	[2] 80.00
40 ELAPSED YEARS				
10 years of coverage	[1] 20.00	30.00	40.00	50.00
20 years of coverage	26.00	39.00	52.00	65.00
30 years of coverage	36.00	54.00	72.00	[2] 80.00
40 years of coverage	46.00	69.00	[2] 80.00	[2] 80.00
	Average monthly wage $200			
10 ELAPSED YEARS				
5 years of coverage	$41.00	$61.50	$82.00	$102.50
8 years of coverage	45.00	67.50	90.00	112.50
10 years of coverage	47.00	70.50	94.00	117.50
20 ELAPSED YEARS				
10 years of coverage	39.00	58.50	78.00	97.50
15 years of coverage	45.00	67.50	90.00	112.50
20 years of coverage	51.00	76.50	102.00	[2] 120.00
40 ELAPSED YEARS				
10 years of coverage	22.00	33.00	44.00	55.00
20 years of coverage	34.00	51.00	68.00	85.00
30 years of coverage	47.00	70.50	94.00	117.50
40 years of coverage	60.00	90.00	120.00	[2] 120.00

[1] Raised to minimum benefit.
[2] Reduced to maximum benefit.

TABLE 4.—*Illustrative monthly survivors' insurance benefits under the bill*

Elapsed years and years of coverage	Widow	Widow and 1 child	Widow and 3 children	2 parents
	Average monthly wage $100			
10 ELAPSED YEARS				
5 years of coverage	$23.25	$38.75	$69.75	$31.00
8 years of coverage	25.50	42.50	76.50	34.00
10 years of coverage	27.00	45.00	[1] 80.00	36.00
20 ELAPSED YEARS				
10 years of coverage	22.50	37.50	67.50	30.00
15 years of coverage	26.25	43.75	78.75	35.00
20 years of coverage	29.25	48.75	[1] 80.00	39.00
40 ELAPSED YEARS				
10 years of coverage	15.00	25.00	45.00	20.00
20 years of coverage	19.50	32.50	58.50	26.00
30 years of coverage	27.00	45.00	[1] 80.00	36.00
40 years of coverage	34.50	57.50	[1] 80.00	46.00
	Average monthly wage $200			
10 ELAPSED YEARS				
5 years of coverage	30.75	$51.25	$92.25	$41.00
8 years of coverage	33.75	56.25	101.25	45.00
10 years of coverage	35.25	58.75	105.75	47.00
20 ELAPSED YEARS				
10 years of coverage	29.25	48.75	87.75	39.00
15 years of coverage	33.75	56.25	101.25	45.00
20 years of coverage	38.25	63.75	114.75	51.00
40 ELAPSED YEARS				
10 years of coverage	16.50	27.50	49.50	22.00
20 years of coverage	25.50	42.50	76.50	34.00
30 years of coverage	35.25	58.75	105.75	47.00
40 years of coverage	45.00	75.00	[1] 120.00	60.00

[1] Reduced to maximum benefit.

SECTION 203. REDUCTION AND INCREASE OF BENEFITS

This section increases the maximum benefits payable on one wage record and provides for deductions from benefits when the beneficiary has wages or income from self-employment of more than $30 a month and when a wife or widow under age 60 has no child under age 18 entitled to benefits in her care.

Subsection 203 (a): The subsection increases from the present $85 to $120 the dollar maximum payable on one wage record, eliminates the present provision that total family benefits may not exceed twice the primary insurance benefit, and raises from $20 to $30 the amount below which the family benefit may not be reduced by the provision that benefits shall not exceed 80 percent of the wage earner's average monthly wage. Elimination of the provision that total benefits may not exceed twice the amount of the primary benefit will provide a more adequate replacement of the lost wages for survivor families with three or more children and for the families of disabled workers having two or more children.

Subsection 203 (b): No change is made by this subsection in the present provision for reducing all benefits except the primary benefit, when reductions are necessary because the total family benefits as computed exceed one or the other maximum.

Subsection 203 (c): This subsection increases from $14.99 to $30 the amount which a beneficiary may earn in wages in any month and still draw benefits. Because of the special needs of the blind, a blind beneficiary will not have his benefit suspended for any month in which he earns $50 or less. As is now true of a widow's current benefit, mother's or wife's benefit will be suspended for any month in which the beneficiary did not have an entitled child of the wage earner in her care.

Subsection 203 (d): No change is made under this subsection in the present provision that wife's and child's benefits shall be suspended for any month in which the primary benefit on which the auxiliary benefits are based is suspended because of earnings over the permitted amount. Suspension of a disabled husband's benefits because of the earnings of his wife is also provided.

Subsection 203 (e): This subsection provides for a suspension of benefits paid to a person receiving net income from self-employment on a scale comparable to the provision for suspending benefits when the beneficiary earns more than $30 a month in employment. A beneficiary who has income from self-employment in excess of $360 for a calendar year will have 1 month's benefit suspended for each $30 in excess of that amount. In the case of a blind individual, $600 a year income for self-employment is permitted before suspension of benefits, and 1 month's benefits are withheld for every $50 in excess of $600.

Subsection 203 (f): This subsection provides for the suspension of benefits payable to wives, children, and disabled husbands of primary beneficiaries when the primary beneficiary has his own benefits suspended because of net income from self-employment.

Subsection 203 (g): There is no change made in the present provision that only 1 month's benefit shall be suspended when more than one event causing suspension occurs in any month.

Subsection 203 (h): The same penalty as in the present act is provided in this subsection for beneficiaries who knowingly fail to report an event which requires the suspension of a benefit.

SECTION 204. ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS

The changes made in the requirements for fully insured and currently insured status are designed principally to reduce the handicap which newly covered workers would otherwise suffer on coming into an already-functioning

system and to take account of periods of disability.

Subsection 204 (a): Paragraph (1) modifies the present requirements for fully insured status to eliminate from the base (elapsed) period any quarters after a woman attains the age of 60 and all quarters of disability. Paragraph (2) provides as an alternative method of becoming fully insured, that an individual will be fully insured if he had at least 20 quarters of coverage out of the 40 quarters immediately preceding retirement or death. Quarters of disability are not counted in the 40-quarter period. Paragraph (3) retains the present provision that an individual is permanently fully insured if he has 40 quarters of coverage.

Subsection 204 (b): The subsection changes the definition of currently insured status to eliminate quarters of disability from the count of quarters immediately preceding the quarter of death. This change eases the eligibility requirement for individuals who die after a long illness.

Subsection 204 (c): Provision is made for the allocation to calendar quarters of wages reported on a semiannual basis in 1937, as in the present act.

Subsection 204 (d): This subsection provides a method for establishing quarterly "wages" on the basis of net income from self-employment reported for longer periods. As a general rule, such income will be reported for a calendar year and will be allocated equally to the four calendar quarters. The Administrator is authorized to establish regulations to provide for the relatively unusual cases in which self-employment does not continue throughout the year, the income from self-employment is low or is reported on a fiscal or part-year basis.

SECTION 205. ADJUSTMENT OF DUPLICATE BENEFITS

The purpose of section 205 is to prevent undesirable duplication of Government benefits and thus make possible a more efficient use of the funds which are available for social purposes. The section would provide that any benefit payable to any person for any month under title II would be subject to certain reductions. Specifically, where both a benefit under title II and a noncontributory benefit are payable to an individual with respect to the same loss of earnings (whether because of the worker's retirement, disability, or death), the title II benefit would be reduced by one-half of the smaller of the two benefits.

The term "noncontributory benefit" would include Federal benefits paid by reason of the "death, disability, old age, or retirement, and the past employment or services, of an individual" or a benefit paid under a Federal or State workmen's compensation program, if the benefit system "is supported without direct and substantial contributions by employees."

Section 205 would not interfere with the operation of section 207 (b), which restricts the special survivorship protection for veterans provided in section 207 to cases in which no benefits are paid under legislation administered by the Veterans' Administration.

SECTION 206. NATIONAL SOCIAL INSURANCE TRUST FUND

Subsection 206 (a): This subsection creates the National Social Insurance Trust Fund and transfers to it the assets of the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and such other amounts as may be paid into the fund. As in the present law, there is an authorization for the appropriation of the trust fund of such additional sums out of general revenues as may be required to finance the benefits and payments of the Social Insurance System.

Subsection 206 (b): This subsection provides for the continuation of the present board of trustees of the trust fund, composed of the Secretary of the Treasury as managing trustee, the Secretary of Labor, and the Federal Security Administrator, all ex officio. The board of trustees, as at present, is to hold the trust fund, to report to Congress regularly on the status of the trust fund, and to make special reports to Congress whenever it appears that for the ensuing 5 years the trust fund will be excessive or unduly small.

Subsection 206 (c): This subsection sets forth the duties of the managing trustee with regard to the investment of the trust-fund assets. These duties are the same as the duties in the present law of the managing trustee of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund.

Subsection 206 (d): The managing trustee is directed to pay from the trust fund such amounts as are authorized by Congress to be so expended. The section enacts into the basic law the provisions contained in recent appropriations acts in which certain direct payments from the trust fund were authorized. The remainder of the section, dealing with reimbursement of the Treasury for other administrative expenses and availability of trust-fund assets, is the same as in the present law.

SECTION 207. BENEFITS IN CASE OF DECEASED WORLD WAR II VETERANS

Section 207 continues the special survivorship protection for servicemen which was provided by the Social Security Act amendments of 1946.

SECTION 208. COVERAGE PROVISIONS AND DEFINITIONS

Definitions required by the addition of new types of benefits and of other liberalizations previously mentioned are added and present definitions are modified as required by changes made elsewhere.

Subsection 208 (a): To take into account the increases in wage scales since the present provisions were enacted, the amount of annual remuneration which is counted as wages is increased from the present $3,000 to $3,600. Specific provision is made to allocate to the proper quarters wages paid under Federal and State legislation designed to protect the rights of workers and of individuals during their service in the armed forces. Dismissal payments which an employer is not legally required to make are not now counted as wages. This subsection provides for including them. Excluded from the definition of wages is the value of services exchanged for other services when there is no other payment than the exchange. For purposes of the program, the term "wages" is defined to include income from self-employment.

Subsection 208 (b): This subsection would extend the coverage of title II to the following employments (these groups are now specifically excluded):

1. Certain employment performed outside of the United States in connection with civil aircraft of the United States.

2. Certain employment performed outside the United States by citizens of the United States working for an American employer.

3. Agricultural labor.

4. Domestic service.

5. Service performed in the employ of the Tennessee Valley Authority on an hourly basis.

6. Active service in the military or naval forces of the United States. (Under this coverage proposal servicemen would receive credit for the actual amount of their pay and allowances, plus the value of the perquisites they receive. This extension of coverage would not interfere with or duplicate the special survivorship protection provided veterans under the Social Security Act amendments of 1946; it would, however, replace that protection in some cases.)

7. Service performed for State and local governmental units which falls within the scope of a voluntary compact entered into under section 209.

8. Service performed for nonprofit organizations, except service performed by members of the clergy and by members of religious orders.

9. Certain employment in the fishing industry.

10. Service performed by newsboys.

Subsection 208 (c): This subsection continues the present coverage of certain employment performed for the Bonneville Power Administrator.

Subsection 208 (d): No change is made in the provision for counting as covered employment all services an employee renders in a pay period for an employer, if more than half of such services are covered employment.

Subsection 208 (e): The present problems arising from attempts to determine whether some persons are employees or self-employed would not be solved merely by extension of coverage to the self-employed, since the difference in the contributions to be paid by the individual and his alleged employer would lead to dispute. This subsection defines as an employee an individual who is a servant under the law of master and servant and one who performs service of any nature for anyone unless the service is a part of the individual's own independently established business.

Subsection 208 (f): The subsection contains the definition of "American vessel" which is in the present law, and in addition defines "civil aircraft of the United States." (These terms are used in the coverage provisions of sec. 208 (b).)

Subsection 208 (g): The term "American employer," which is used in the coverage provisions of section 208 (b), is defined.

Subsections 208 (h) and (i): These subsections retain the present definitions of wife and widow.

Subsection 208 (j): Because benefits for disabled husbands have been added to the program, a definition of husband in terms comparable to the definition of wife is added. For purposes of the program, a husband must have been married to his wife for at least 36 months before filing a claim for benefits, unless they had a child.

Subsection 208 (k): The subsection defines a widower as the surviving husband of a woman worker, provided they had been married for more than 12 months before the wife's death.

Subsection 208 (l): The subsection retains the present provision for determining that a wife is living with her husband, or that a widow was living with her husband at the time of his death, on the basis of being members of the same household, or of the husband's contributions to his wife's support, or of his having been under a court order to contribute to her support.

Subsection 208 (m): Subsection 208 (m) provides for determining that a husband or widower was living with his wife under circumstances comparable to those under which a wife or widow is deemed to be living with her husband.

Subsection 208 (n): Disability is defined as "total inability to work by reason of illness or injury." To be considered totally unable to work a disabled person must be either blind, or suffering from an impairment which continually makes it impossible for him to engage in any substantially gainful work. Under this concept of disability, it is not sufficient that an individual be only partially disabled, or that he be disabled only for his most recent or usual type of employment. The individual's total disability must be for work in general. Total disability is regarded, for purposes of establishing entitlement, as permanent after it has continued for a specified period. Provisions for periodic reexamination assures adequate medical checks on the permanency of the disability. This subsection also defines "current" and "prior" disability for purposes of permitting insured status and average monthly wage to be calculated without

counting against an individual any periods when he was prevented from earning wages because of his disablement.

SECTION 209. VOLUNTARY COMPACTS FOR COVERAGE OF STATE AND LOCAL EMPLOYEES

The section authorizes the Federal Security Administration to enter into voluntary compacts with individual States to extend coverage under title II to the employees of State and local governmental units. Employees covered under an existing pension plan could not be covered under a compact; all other employees of a governmental unit electing coverage would be covered under the compact except elective officials and employees compensated on a fee basis, who might be excluded from coverage at the option of the employing unit.

SECTION 210. EVIDENCE, PROCEDURE, AND JUDICIAL REVIEW

This section, which establishes the authority of the Federal Security Administrator to make rules and regulations necessary to carry out the provisions of the social insurance program and provides for judicial review of his decisions in contested cases, is largely the same as in the present law. The period beyond which the statute of limitation bars changes in the wage records is changed to run concurrently with that of the Bureau of Internal Revenue on tax collections. Revisions within the statutory period are limited to cases where specific allegations are made to the Admnistrator by the worker concerned or by his surviving spouse, child, or parent that the wage record for a specific quarter is erroneous. Beyond the statutory period, the records may be changed to conform with tax returns in order to correct certain types of errors.

SECTION 211. REPRESENTATION OF CLAIMANTS BEFORE THE FEDERAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATOR

The provision in the present law is unchanged.

SECTION 212. OVERPAYMENTS AND UNDERPAYMENTS

The section modifies the provision in the present law to provide that overpayments to an individual may be recovered from benefits payable to him or to any other individual on the basis of the same wage record. The change gives the Administrator authority to determine and use the most equitable method of recovering the amount erroneously paid. With respect to underpayments, the present law is modified to permit payment of the amount erroneously withheld to the estate of the underpaid individual or to persons equitably entitled. In the present law, adjustment of underpayments can be made subsequent to the death of the beneficiary only if other benefits are being paid on the basis of the same wage record.

SECTION 213. ASSIGNMENT

The section makes no change in the present provision concerning assignment.

SECTION 214. PENALTIES

No change is made in the present provision on penalties.

SECTION 215. DETERMINATION OF DISABILITY AND REHABILITATION OF DISABLED INDIVIDUALS

Subsection 215 (a): The Administrator is given authority to make determinations or redeterminations of disability He is also given the power to order examinations or reexaminations by physicians of his own choosing in connection with such determinations. In case a claimant refuses to be examined, the Administrator can withhold benefits. Efficient administration of a disability insurance system requires control over the initial determination and subsequent periodic redeterminations of disability. Otherwise, the nature and extent of disability for purposes of entitlement or continuation of entitlement cannot be made.

Subsection 215 (b): The subsection permits the Administrator to provide medical, surgical, and institutional rehabilitation services to beneficiaries entitled to disability benefits. Rehabilitation services will be furnished if they will aid the individual to return to gainful work. They will not be given if they are available to the individual under State programs or from other sources. Funds for this work will be limited each year to 2 percent of the amount paid to disability benefits in the preceding year. Where feasible, it is highly desirable that beneficiaries be restored to health or have the handicap of their disability reduced sufficiently to enable them to return to gainful work. This would result in savings to the trust fund by reducing the number of benefit payments and, of course, would greatly aid the disabled person and society generally.

SECTION 216. PROVISIONS OF EXISTING LAW WHICH REMAIN IN EFFECT

Section 216 protects, in certain cases, the rights of individuals who would otherwise suffer a diminution of benefits by reasons of changes made by this bill. Any individual who was eligible for benefits before the effective date of this bill would have his benefit computed by the method used in the present law or the new method proposed by the bill, whichever resulted in the higher amount.

SECTION 217. NATIONAL SOCIAL INURANCE POLICY ADVISORY COUNCIL

Section 217 establishes a National Social Insurance Policy Advisory Council to make recommendations to the Federal Security Administrator about the coverage, adequacy of benefits, and methods of financing the social insurance program. The Council would be composed of 12 persons, representing labor and employers in equal numbers and the public. Members of the Council would be appointed by the Administrator for a term of 3 years.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr, TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

NOMINATION OF JAMES V. FORRESTAL TO BE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rules be suspended and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Mr. Forrestal to be Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio that the rules be suspended for the purpose of the immediate consideration of the nomination of James V. Forrestal to be Secretary of Defense?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, is the suspension of the rules to be applied only to that one nomination?

Mr. TAFT. That is all.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James V. Forrestal to be Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. GURNEY. I ask that the President be notified immediately.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

The clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—NOMINATION OF PHILIP B. PERLMAN TO BE SOLICITOR GENERAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Philip B. Perlman to be Solicitor General of the United States, which nomination had been previously passed over.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask that the nomination be passed over.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, what was the request?

Mr. BREWSTER. I asked that the nomination be passed over.

Mr. TYDINGS. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. When a name is reached on the Executive Calendar under these circumstances, the situation with respect to an objection is reversed. The question is, Is there objection to passing over the nomination?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; there is objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Therefore, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Philip B. Perlman to be Solicitor General?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should prefer that we proceed with the nominations for which there is no necessity of consideration, which I think this nomination is entitled to.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am very much interested in what the Senator from Maine is saying, but I cannot hear him. I should appreciate it if he would speak more loudly.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should very much prefer that we proceed first with the consideration of any names upon the calendar to which there is no objection, in order that we may then reduce to a residue the names to which there is objection and as to which there will be the necessity of discussion. But, under the rules of the Senate, if that be not permitted under objection, then I think it is time that very serious thought should be given to the question presented in this case.

I realize the situation which exists when we are confronted with a committee report so nearly unanimous, and I trust that the Members of the Senate will understand that in rising to raise objection to the confirmation of this nomination I am fully aware of the responsibility which must be borne when a committee, after hearing a matter—the great Committee on the Judiciary—was so nearly unanimous in its consideration and approval of the nomination. However, the examination which I have given to the matter, not based primarily upon the considerations which apparently motivated the committee, but relating to the solemn and very much broader consideration that should govern the constitutional responsibility of the Senate in its undertakings——

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HATCH. It is now 20 minutes to 1 o'clock on Sunday morning. Are we going to be confronted with this sort of a discussion at this time of day? If that be the case, Mr. President, I insist that the Senate adjourn and go home and get a little rest.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should be very happy to adjourn. I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Maine. The motion is not debatable.

Several Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HILL (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and will vote. I vote "nay." If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. The Senator from New Hampshire if present and voting, would vote "yea," and the Senator from New York, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. The transfer of that pair to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has previously been announced by the Senator from Alabama. The Senator from Oregon, if present and voting, would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. The transfer of that pair to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has previously been announced by the Senator from Kansas. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

I announce further that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] would vote "nay," if present.

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—38

Aiken	Ferguson	Moore
Baldwin	Flanders	O'Daniel
Ball	Gurney	Reed
Brewster	Hawkes	Robertson, Wyo.
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Taft
Brooks	Ives	Thye
Butler	Jenner	Vandenberg
Cain	Kem	Watkins
Capehart	Knowland	Wherry
Capper	McCarthy	White
Cooper	Malone	Williams
Dworshak	Martin	Young
Ecton	Millikin	

NAYS—41

Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Overton
Chavez	Kilgore	Pepper
Connally	Langer	Revercomb
Donnell	Lucas	Robertson, Va.
Downey	McCarran	Russell
Ellender	McClellan	Smith
Fulbright	McFarland	Sparkman
George	McGrath	Thomas, Okla.
Green	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Hatch	Magnuson	Tydings
Hill	Maybank	Umstead
Hoey	Murray	Wiley
Holland	Myers	

NOT VOTING—16

Bridges	Lodge	Taylor
Buck	McKellar	Tobey
Bushfield	Morse	Wagner
Cordon	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Eastland	Saltonstall	
Hayden	Stewart	

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

Mr. BREWSTER and Mr. TYDINGS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will have to continue to recognize the Senator from Maine.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to permit me to make a statement for about 3 minutes?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I would certainly lose the floor if I did.

Mr. TYDINGS. I simply wanted to ask the Senator if he would act in accordance with the wishes of those Republicans on that side of the aisle who, in spite of the fatigue, still felt they could be fair to a man whose nomination had come to this body, and who had asked for a vote "yea" or "nay" before adjournment.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, before I conclude, I propose to give the Senate a rather full exposition of the attitude of the Senator from Maryland in another very distinguished case before this body, when Mr. Robert Jackson, now an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, came before this tribunal clothed in all the majesty of his service as Attorney General, and the senior Senator from Maryland took up, as is shown by the volume I have here, a great many pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to dilate upon the utter unfitness of Mr. Justice Jackson for promotion to that position.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. For a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to tell the Senator—I cannot put it in the form of a question—that in all my life I have never been prouder of anything I ever did than I have been of what I did that day, and I never took a word of it back.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is very fine, and I feel the same way tonight. I am motivated by the same high principles which the Senator from Maryland has ascribed to himself in his customarily eloquent address; and although my words may not attain the heights achieved by those of the Senator from Maryland, I assure him that my depths of conviction are equally as great.

Since we are approaching adjournment it is necessary to determine whether a man shall ascend to the high office of Solicitor General of the United States, the chief legal officer representing 140,000,000 people before the Supreme Court of the United States, it seems to me that the Senate may well pause and consider not only whether we should give our advice, under the Constitution, but also whether we should give our consent. I think the question invites very grave exploration. I may say that I am not here primarily concerned with whether the gentleman who comes before us seeking our confirmation has been——

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BROOKS. The Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is well taken.

The Senate will please be in order.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, it seems to me that we have been drifting into an unfortunate situation in connection with our consideration of nominations. Perhaps it was inevitable, during the days when there were overwhelming majorities in the Congress upon the same side as the administration, that more and more cursory consideration would be given to matters of this consequence and importance.

It seems to me, now, in view of the change which has occurred——

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, may we have order, please?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has repeatedly sought to get order. The guests of Senators will please be seated in the rear of the hall, and will suspend their conversations. Senators will take their seats. The clerks of the Senate will take their seats.

The Senator from Maine may proceed.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, it seems to me that it is high time, in the closing days of this first session under the change of control in the Senate and in the House, that more careful consideration should be given to nominations of this importance.

Without reflection upon the Committee on the Judiciary, which considered this matter, as I have read what I could of the deliberations before that committee—not having the benefit of a report, which is not customary in the case of affirmative action by the committee on such a nomination—it has seemed to me that meticulous care was given to the question whether the charges of misconduct were proved. I was quite willing to accept the verdict of the majority of

the committee which considered this matter, namely, that the allegations of whether there had been improprieties and improper procedures and irregularities were not satisfactorily or sufficiently proved. However, that is not the subject to which I feel we should give attention in connection with a matter of this kind.

Rather, it seems to me that we should give attention to the question of whether we should consider, first, the very high responsibilities of this office—not whether the man has simply been a good citizen, not whether he has been a member of the bar, not whether he has conducted himself properly at the bar, but whether his record in the practice of the law lends substance to the notion that he would be able to fulfill the high duties and meet the high qualifications of the office of Solicitor General of the United States.

I am not acquainted with this gentleman. I have, regarding him, no personal feeling of any character whatsoever, nor certainly regarding his distinguished sponsors in this body, particularly the Senators from Maryland, who accord him their endorsement.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair believes that the conversation in the galleries is overwhelming on the floor of the Senate. With great respect and great earnestness, the Chair requests the occupants of the galleries please to be quiet and not talk.

The Senator from Maine may proceed.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, it seems to me that we should consider what are the responsibilities of this office, the very great legal talent and experience which are essential to the proper performance of its functions, and then consider whether in measurable degree the candidate presented seems to have those qualifications.

It seems to me that it cannot be seriously contended that this gentleman, whatever may be his abilities, has ever had occasion to demonstrate qualifications requisite for fulfilling the functions of this position.

I think this is evidenced if one takes a glance at the names of the very distinguished men who have occupied this office in the past. Beginning in the very present day, the last occupant of the office was one who is now a colleague, and whose talents and ability we have had occasion to observe upon the floor of the Senate; one who has served as governor of his own State and came to Washington as Solicitor General, clothed with the overwhelming support of the people of his State by reason of his having risen in public life through various offices until he became governor, and after fulfilling the functions of that high executive office he was then nominated for Solicitor General, in which office he served for a time, and was then elected by the citizens of Rhode Island to be a Member of this body. Of course, Senators know I am referring to the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH].

Going back, we find Mr. Charles Fahy, whose talents previously were shown when he served in this office, and whose experience became familiar to the people of our country.

Back of him was Mr. Francis Biddle, who subsequently became Attorney General of the United States.

Preceding him was Robert Jackson, who later became Attorney General of the United States and was subsequently confirmed by the Senate with almost complete unanimity as a member of the Supreme Court of the United States, where he has acquitted himself certainly with a distinction which had earlier marked his service in public life. As we know, he went to the assignment of carrying on as prosecutor of the war-crimes trials in Nuremberg where he blazed new trails in the application of international justice and the development of international law.

I shall recur to a discussion of Mr. Robert Jackson later, because, as I earlier pointed out, it was the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] who discussed at very great length his qualifications for promotion under circumstances and upon premises which seem to me to have a certain relation to the matter which we are now considering.

Before Mr. Jackson in the office of Solicitor General was Stanley Reed, now a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. Stanley Reed came to Washington to service in the Government some 15 or 20 years ago, in various positions of legal responsibility, rising steadily up the scale, gaining more and more the acclaim and support of those in both parties who came to recognize his capacity for public service, until he finally was nominated to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, where he has carried on with the same learning and distinction which earlier characterized him in his service here in public life and in other positions.

Before him was James D. Thatcher, of New Jersey, who came here from his State to practice in one of the great law firms of this country, served as assistant United States attorney in 1907 and 1908, served as United States district judge in 1925, by appointment, then was appointed as Solicitor General of the United States, in which office he served for 3 years, returning again to the practice of the law. He served with the American Red Cross with distinction in Russia during the war as a major.

Mr. President, as I read this roster of names of men who came from all sections of the country I think it will be calculated to impress the least thoughtful person that the very high office of Solicitor General has been occupied by some of the most distinguished men in the annals of American jurisprudence.

James C. Biggs of North Carolina, coming here after having been a judge of the superior court in his State, served for 6 years, coming here as a special assistant to the Attorney General. He had a distinguished record as Solicitor General.

Continuing back in the record, the next we find is Charles E. Hughes, Jr., bearing a distinguished name, and carrying that name of his great ancestor worthily in his service as Solicitor General of the United States. Mr. Hughes, coming from one of the great law schools of this country, practiced at the bar of New York for many years, appeared here in many public and private causes, appeared many times before the Supreme Court of the United States, as had all these other men of whom I have spoken, so that they brought legal training and experience and a competence that had been tested by the acid of appearance in all the courts of our land.

The next one back of Mr. Hughes, in 1925, was William D. Mitchell, a lawyer from Minnesota, a Democrat, selected as Solicitor General by a Republican President because of his distinguished legal characteristics and competence. He served in the interim between his service at the bar of New York and going back to that after his service here as Solicitor General.

Next back of him was James M. Beck, another name well known in the annals of the law.

Back of him was John W. Davis, honored by his own party with the nomination for President of the United States, a man who is known not only in America but abroad, not only in every town and hamlet in America but throughout the world as a distinguished advocate of those principles of justice which are at the basis of the Anglo-Saxon conception of jurisprudence.

One might go on through the various names. Further back, in 1890, I find the name of William Howard Taft, who later became President of the United States and later Chief Justice of the United States.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the recitation of these names is sufficient to demonstrate the very high qualifications which have been considered requisite for the filling of this great office, and that very careful consideration should be given when a nomination comes to the Senate of a man to be a successor to men of the character I have mentioned.

Our query becomes whether or not we have here a man of this character and caliber. I have searched the records of the hearings of the Committee on the Judiciary and of the courts which have been filed and the discussions which have ensued, and, so far as practicable, the records of the Supreme Court of Maryland and of the Supreme Court of the United States, to ascertain in what positions this nominee has appeared which would demonstrate that he had the qualifications which are requisite.

I have a notation here from the United States Supreme Court. The unofficial report, according to the one who has kept the records of the lawyers appearing there over a period of 20 years, shows that he has no recollection of the nominee ever having appeared in the Supreme Court. I do not say he has never appeared; I merely say that this was the report which I received, which would indicate at least a lack of familiarity with his appearance in the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does the Senator know that Mr. Perlman has appeared many times before the Supreme Court of the United States? Does the Senator know that I hold in my hand a list of 70 cases in which Mr. Perlman has appeared, not in the United States district courts, not in the circuit courts, but in the appellate courts—70 cases? There they are—case, title, and number. And yet the Senator has the effrontery to stand here and tell the Senate that he has heard a rumor, when this is in the testimony—showing that the Senator has not even read the testimony, and is purporting to speak on the case without even having read the testimony and knowing the facts.

Mr. BREWSTER. I trust the Senator——

Mr. TYDINGS. I hope the Senator will correct the erroneous statement he just made, in the light of this statement, which is in the RECORD.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator be happy to inform me as to how many times he has appeared in the Supreme Court of the United States?

Mr. TYDINGS. Either two or three.

Mr. BREWSTER. Very good. I am happy to know it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me tell the Senator, in addition to that he has appeared many times in the United States circuit court of appeals.

Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I will be happy to yield for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator just made the statement that he heard that Mr. Perlman had never appeared in the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. BREWSTER. That was not my statement.

Mr. TYDINGS. What was the Senator's statement?

Mr. BREWSTER. I will read my statement, so as to be very precise:

> That there is no record kept there by lawyers, but according to the clerk who has taken care of the lawyers appearing there for the past 20 years, he has no recollection of his having appeared.

That was my statement. If the Senator informs me that in three instances he has appeared there, I think that is not a serious reflection upon the recollection of the clerk who was consulted in this matter.

Mr. TYDINGS. Oh, the Senator——

Mr. BREWSTER. That was my precise statement.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is most plausible, but he shows he has not read the record, because here, on the first page of the record I have in my hand, is this:

> Baltimore Transit Co. and others versus the National Labor Relations Board; petition for writ of certiorari; Supreme Court of the United States, October term, 1943.

That information is given, together with 68 other cases tried in the circuit courts of the United States and the court of appeals of Maryland—not district courts—70 cases. I would like to know how many lawyers in this or in any other body have appeared in the appellate courts of the Government of the United States, and in the highest court in his respective State, 70 times. For the Senator to rise here and make that sort of statement shows clearly he has not read the record. He did not attend the hearings, and yet he presumes to pass judgment on this man, without any evidence in his mind.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am obliged to pass judgment upon him in my capacity, and I am doing it to the best of my ability.

Mr. TYDINGS. Well, it is poor.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think that when we compare the legal competence of Mr. Perlman with that of Mr. Robert Jackson, we may conclude as to the character of those who respectively sponsored and proposed their promotion.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will answer the Senator, in due time.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator will, in his own time, not in my time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine declines to yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. The question, as I have said, is whether or not the record and the experience and the legal training and the past record of the man justify his promotion to a position of this character. I have read the report of the minority. No report was filed by the majority. That is not unusual; it is customary not to do so. Therefore it does not constitute an omission of any significance; but certainly in the report of the minority member there appeared many questions which had been raised. Here I address myself not to whether or not any reflections were proved but whether or not he had been primarily occupied with work of what we could properly term of a semiprofessional character. Work before a legislative group was, I think, admitted and agreed, and work in connection with the activities of a municipal government, which in no way necessarily reflected upon the man or his character, but it bore upon the question of whether or not he has been devoting himself to the practice of the law in such a fashion as to commend himself to our consideration.

I now come to what seems to me to be the very pertinent situation in connection with the earlier case to which I refer and I should like to have the clerk read the remarks of the Senator from Maryland at that time dealing with that matter.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I will not yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I have asked for the clerk to read from the RECORD of the earlier case.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. For a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator permit me to give him a synopsis of what occasioned the remarks of the Senator from Maryland concerning Mr. Robert Jackson, the idol of the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BREWSTER. I think it would be very much better if the Senate could have the benefit of the eloquence of the Senator on the occasion to which I have referred.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator give me the opportunity to tell him the substance of the reason for the attack of the Senator from Maryland upon Mr. Robert Jackson?

Mr. BREWSTER. I think it appears very clearly in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I should like to have the clerk read from the RECORD.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator give me an opportunity to give the synopsis of the reasons?

Mr. BREWSTER. At the conclusion of the reading.

Mr. TYDINGS. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine asks that the clerk read an excerpt from the RECORD. Without objection——

Mr. MAYBANK. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question, thereupon, is put to the Senate as a matter of order, as to whether the clerk shall read.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me? May I have the floor? Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Did the Senator withdraw his suggestion of a quorum call?

Mr. MAYBANK. I did not.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Myers
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Ball	Hill	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hoey	Overton
Brewster	Holland	Pepper
Bricker	Ives	Reed
Brooks	Jenner	Revercomb
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo
Cain	Kem	Russell
Capehart	Kilgore	Smith
Capper	Knowland	Sparkman
Chavez	Langer	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McCarthy	Thye
Downey	McClellan	Tydings
Dworshak	McFarland	Umstead
Ecton	McGrath	Vandenberg
Ellender	McMahon	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wherry
Flanders	Malone	White
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
George	Maybank	Williams
Green	Millikin	Young
Gurney	Moore	
Hatch	Murray	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is, Shall the excerpt from the RECORD be read by the clerk as requested by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]?

Mr. BREWSTER. On that question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Chair state the question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the paper be read by the clerk as requested by the Senator from Maine?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HILL (when his name was called). Mr. President, I have a pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and will vote. I vote "nay." If present and voting the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. The transfer of that pair to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has been previously announced by the Senator from Alabama. The Senator from Oregon, if present and voting, would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. If present and voting the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

I announce further that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] would vote "nay" if present.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I inquire how I am recorded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recorded as having voted "nay."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask for a recapitulation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is entitled to have a recapitulation of the vote after the result of the vote is announced.

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—41

Aiken	Butler	Dworshak
Baldwin	Cain	Ecton
Ball	Capehart	Ferguson
Brewster	Capper	Flanders
Bricker	Cooper	Gurney
Brooks	Donnell	Hawkes
Hickenlooper	Millikin	Vandenberg
Ives	Moore	Watkins
Jenner	O'Daniel	Wherry
Kem	Revercomb	White
Knowland	Robertson, Wyo.	Wiley
McCarthy	Smith	Williams
Malone	Taft	Young
Martin	Thye	

NAYS—38

Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor
Chavez	Kilgore	Overton
Connally	Langer	Pepper
Downey	Lucas	Robertson, Va.
Ellender	McCarran	Russell
Fulbright	McClellan	Sparkman
George	McFarland	Stewart
Green	McGrath	Thomas, Okla.
Hatch	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Hill	Magnuson	Tydings
Hoey	Maybank	Umstead
Holland	Murray	

NOT VOTING—16

Bridges	Lodge	Taylor
Buck	McKellar	Tobey
Bushfield	Morse	Wagner
Cordon	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Eastland	Reed	
Hayden	Saltonstall	

So the Senate ordered the excerpt paper read.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I withdraw the request for a recapitulation of the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). The clerk will read.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What is the order of business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order of business is the request of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] for the reading of certain parts of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Objection was made to the reading, and under the rules of the Senate that question was put to a vote of the Senate, and by a majority vote the Senate directed that it be read.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will the Chair state what part of the RECORD is to be read at this hour of the morning?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be determined by the marked references in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will the Chair at least announce what part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is to be read under the present order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The parts indicated by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will the Chair indicate what part the Senator from Maine desires to have read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will give the page and the date of the extracts to be read.

The clerk will read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 7, 1941, second column, page 5830:

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should be very much obliged to my colleagues if I might have their unidivided attention. I shall not talk exceptionally long unless there be unforeseen interruptions. However, I deem this a matter of such importance that I feel that the Senate should know the complete case, and I shall attempt to relate it.

Opposing one who is nominated for high office such as membership on the Supreme Court of the United States is not a pleasant task. No man can find pleasure in standing on the floor of the Senate and opposing the confirmation of one nominated to sit on the Supreme Court. I am getting no pleasure out of it. I am approaching the matter merely from a sense of duty, of public obligation, believing it is my duty, with the knowledge of the facts I have, to call to the attention of the Senate of the United States the question of the fitness of Mr. Jackson for this high office.

There is one thing which we can carry with us all through this investigation; there is one thing which stands out in the whole controversy like a lighthouse, and that is that we are agreed on the facts. There is no disputing the facts in the case. The facts I am about to relate are admitted by Mr. Jackson. Therefore, there is not presented by me for the consideration of the Senate a set of facts which are disputed by Mr. Jackson. He has admitted, both in writing and in testimony before the Committee on the Judiciary, that the things I shall relate are the true facts.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask for order in the Chamber. Also I would appreciate it if the clerk, who has a good voice, will raise his voice a little because I do not want any Senator to miss this. I want Senators all to hear it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I share the desire of the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The occupants of the galleries will be in order. The clerk will resume the reading.

The legislative clerk resumed reading, and read as follows:

What are facts? Briefly, they are as follows: In the summer of 1939 Messrs. Drew Pearson and Robert Allen, speaking on a Nation-wide radio hook-up, delivered a broadcast, in which broadcast they made reference in the most lurid statements to the criminal conditions in the State of Louisiana. Then coming on down the line, they brought the name of Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland, into the controversy, in the particular language I shall read, which I ask the Senate to remember carefully throughout my remarks.

This is the portion of the broadcast I want my colleagues to remember in the light of the other circumstances which I shall reveal.

"Bob," meaning Robert Allen, "and don't forget Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland, Drew.

"DREW. That's right, Bob. Senator TYDINGS has promised us a poke in the eye. I'd forgotten.

"ANNOUNCER. Well, what's the Senator sore about?

"DREW. Well, we suddenly became interested in checking up on Government works and discovered that the Senator had put through a very interesting little deal. Just to help keep the WPA workers busy, he had them build a road and yacht basin on his private estate."

I read that last sentence again:

"Well, we suddenly became interested in checking up on Government works and——"

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STEWART. This is all very interesting, but does it come under what is termed the special order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This is a request of the Senator from Maine and, under the rules of the Senate, when

objection is made to the reading of a document the matter is immediately submittted to the Senate, which was done in this case, and the clerk was directed to read it.

Mr. STEWART. My inquiry is, Does it come under the special order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the clerk is proceeding under order of the Senate.

Mr. STEWART. I am sure the Chair does not want to evade my inquiry. I want to know if it is under what we term a special order. This is a rather unusual hour of the night for this proceeding, and I would not propound the inquiry at any other time, but, very frankly, I should like to know whether it comes under what we term a special order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; it is not under a special order.

Mr. STEWART. The Chair makes that as a ruling?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Tennessee has a point of order or a parliamentary inquiry he may state it, and the Chair will wish to take it under advisement, to consider the rules and the precedents of the Senate. Frankly, the Chair is not clear on the point that the Senator from Tennessee is endeavoring to make.

Mr. STEWART. I shall not press it, sir. I do not care to be unduly pressing in my question.

As the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is about to propound an inquiry, I will listen to that. I understand that we do not ask the clerk to yield, so I shall not be subject to the rule which obtained a few nights ago when we were laboring under many efforts along that line. I shall propound my inquiry further after the Chair takes my question under advisement, which I understand he desires to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will resume reading.

The legislative clerk resumed reading, as follows:

In other words, Senator TYDINGS used the funds of the Government of the United States for his own private purposes. That is thievery; that is larceny, if you please. I was charged with stealing funds from the unemployed and using them to improve my own property. The word "estate" was used in the broadcast because that made me a little bit more well to do than the word "property," and the idea was to make it as bad as it could be made.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire whose language that is which charges the Senator from Maryland with thievery?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, that is my language, commenting on the broadcast referred to in the quotation. I said that.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I am very happy that the distinguished Senator from Illinois brought that out and that the Senator from Maryland explained it, because I was a little in doubt. It is rather hard to understand it otherwise.

The legislative clerk resumed reading, as follows:

I immediately called up the broadcasting station, for the broadcast had been carried on some 20 stations throughout America, and I understand it was rebroadcast an hour or two later with the reference to me deleted. I do not know whether that is true.

I let the matter drift along until I learned that one of the persons engaged in this broadcast, Robert Allen, had written a letter to Colonel Harrington. The occasion for the letter to Colonel Harrington by Mr. Allen was upon the following circumstance: When I called the attention of those in control of the broadcasting to the fact that the report was, of course, a lie, they immediately got in touch with Colonel Harrington, the head of the WPA, and Colonel Harrington wrote to the ones in charge of the broadcasting that this charge had been frequently made by Pearson before, that it had been thoroughly investigated by the WPA, and that never had a cent of Government money been spent on the property of Senator TYDINGS. He gave that to Mr. Carlton Smith, the vice president of the National Broadcasting Co., and Mr. Smith put that statement on the radio the week following.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I hope we can have order in the Chamber, because I do not want any of this statement to miss the ears of any person in this room.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate and the occupants of the galleries will please be in order. The clerk will resume reading.

The legislative clerk resumed reading, as follows:

When that happened Mr. Allen then sat himself down and wrote Colonel Harrington a letter in which he took the colonel to task for exonerating me. Let me read the letter from Mr. Allen to Colonel Harrington:

"DEAR COLONEL: Your letter to Senator TYDINGS and the National Broadcasting Co. was certainly a gracious action. Of course, we had it coming to us. It was very fitting that we, who had defended and fought for WPA from its inception, should be kicked in the teeth by the WPA Administrator in the interests of a man who has done nothing but heap fire and brimstone on WPA and vote to gut it.

"We particularly appreciate your action because you didn't even have the decency to get in touch with us about it or to be frank about it and the real facts of the case. When I was an officer in the Army some years ago, it was the custom for an officer to be a gentleman as well as an officer, but, apparently, times have changed.

"Very truly yours,

"ROBERT S. ALLEN."

In other words, Mr. Allen was peeved with Colonel Harrington because he, forsooth, had spoken out to prove the statement of Pearson to be an outrageous, unjustifiable, and bold-faced lie, and Mr. Allen said——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, there is good order in the Chamber now, and if the clerk will raise his voice a little I shall be grateful to him. I hope the Senator from Maine will listen to this, because I want to draw a parallel later.

Mr. BREWSTER. I have read it three times, and I am very much impressed with it.

The legislative clerk resumed reading, as follows:

"What kind of a man are you to exonerate Senator TYDINGS? You ought to have left the public under the impression that he used the money appropriated for the poor and the unemployed to improve his own private property."

When I heard of that letter, which was express malice—and Senators who are lawyers know the difference between express and implied malice—it occurred to me that the time for action had come, and so I called up Mr. Pine, who was then the district attorney in Washington, first having looked up the law to see what my rights were, and I found that Congress in all its majesty—not the Senate, not the House, not the President, but the House and the Senate and the President together—had enacted a law dealing with such happenings. The law is as follows:

"Libel: Whoever publishes a libel shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $1,000 or imprisonment for a term not exceeding 5 years, or both."

That is the law of the United States, Senators, passed by your predecessors in this Chamber and in the Chamber down the hall, and signed, if you please, by the President of the United States.

So having that remedy, and knowing that there was not a scintilla of truth in this libelous statement, I went to the district attorney to exercise my right as a citizen, and asked for the privilege of going before the grand jury of the District of Columbia and asking for a criminal indictment, not only because a libel had been uttered, but because it had been maliciously uttered, and I have the documentary proof in the facsimile letter, the photostat, from Robert S. Allen to prove it.

I know that Senators usually do not adopt that course. It is not pleasant to get into public controversies. The easiest way is to let it go off your back like water.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, may we have order in the Chamber?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Senators desiring to converse will please retire to the cloakrooms.

The clerk will resume reading.

The legislative clerk resumed reading, as follows:

But I thought that when lies—and that is all they were; known to be lies by the utterers—were maliciously uttered, as differentiated from chance remarks written in heat or in passion, the time had come to call a halt. Here let me say, parenthetically, that I am holding the broadcast of Pearson and Allen in my hand, and I want to get down in front where all Senators can see it.

These many typewritten pages [indicating] constituted the broadcast. Do not think it was struck off on the spur of the moment. It bristles with corrections made in pen and ink, many corrections, words changed here and there, sentences eliminated, new words put in, but no change in the statement that Senator TYDINGS had stolen Federal funds and used them to improve his own property.

That was not written in the heat of the moment. That was written deliberately in the cold, staccato tone of the typewriter, and then reread for corrections, and copies of it distributed in the National Broadcasting Co.'s office. So do not think this is some chance remark or some rapid bit of writing that was done without due consideration.

When I went to Mr. Pine with this situation he immediately said:

"All right, Senator, we will proceed with it."

He said:

"I would like the FBI to investigate it if you do not object."

"Well," he said, "I do not see why you want the FBI to investigate it. The WPA

have investigated it, but if you feel that the FBI is necessary to your preparation of this case, go ahead and have them investigate it."

And, so Mr. Jackson testifies, the request came up to him as to whether the FBI could be employed, and Mr. Jackson approved the investigation by the FBI. He told them to go to it. Representatives of the FBI came to my office, and I turned over to them everything I could think of pertaining to every road that was ever built on my property, gave them all the checks for materials, for contractors, and for what not that had worked on that road. They took them and went all over Philadelphia, where I had bought the tar, and all over my whole county investigating these things. My telephone would ring and a good friend would say, "Do you know, Senator, the FBI are here in Harford County investigating you?" I said, "No, my friend; they are not investigating me. I am asking them to investigate a road matter, and they came to you in the course of that." "Oh, I did not know that." From Philadelphia I was called up. "Do you know that the FBI are investigating you?"

How would you, Mr. President, like to be called up by the people in your community and told that the FBI was investigating you, and have them tell each other that Senator Johnson, or Senator Norris, or Senator Austin, or Senator McNary was being investigated by the FBI?

The FBI finally finished their investigation, and what Colonel Harrington had said, namely, that there was not an iota of truth in the charge of Pearson and Allen, the FBI also said. They said:

"There has never been a dollar of public money spent on the property of Senator TYDINGS."

Then I thought we would go ahead again. In the meantime Mr. Pine had been promoted to the Federal bench; so I went to see Mr. Curran, the new district attorney—and, incidentally, I shall go again to see him before long, for this matter is not going to stop here in the floor of the Senate today. I went to see Mr. Curran. Mr. Curran said:

"Senator, you have a good case and I am all ready to proceed."

That sounded good.

"But," he said, "I have a letter from the Attorney General's Department."

And he pulled open a drawer and read the letter, which is in the RECORD, in which letter the Attorney General ordered him, in effect, to dismiss the case, although I had not yet had the privilege of appearing before the grand jury. The Attorney General told him to close the case, after he had approved the investigation.

Do Senators think Attorney General Jackson, who says he knew of the investigation and approved it, and knew of the letter closing the case and approved it, acted spontaneously? Why, Senators, if you have a nose on your face or a head on your shoulders, you must know he was reached. More than that, by his fiat he set aside the law of the United States of America, passed by the Senate, passed by the House, signed by the President. He said:

"Yes, it is true—I have his letter here—you were charged with using public funds on your private estate. Yes, it is true that after Colonel Harrington, the head of the WPA, said that was a lie, Mr. Allen showed his malice by giving Colonel Harrington a call-down for telling the truth. Yes, it is true that I then had the FBI investigate this matter, Senator, and your connection with your own property, and they exonerated you. Yes; that is all true; and it is likewise true there is a statute, which you have cited, pertaining to libel, and this case is libel, but just the same, I have ordered the District Attorney not to prosecute it."

Those are the facts. I am not here asking for vindication. I am only a symbol, Mr. President. I have no personal antagonism in the sense it might be assumed I have against Mr. Jackson. I am again only a symbol. I am here trying to uphold a principle, which is the only difference at this very hour between the United States of America and Germany. Ours is a Government of laws. Theirs is a government of men. That is why we have appropriated billions and billions of dollars. That is why we have thousands of men in the training camps, because we are determined, we say, to keep this a government of laws and not let it become a government of men. Yet Mr. Jackson by his ipse dixit, by his fiat, wipes out the entire act of Congress, and denies a citizen the right which the law passed in solemn form by the two Houses and signed by the President, gives him.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I note on page 54 of the document on our desks, in the letter of the Attorney General, he states that this provision respecting libel is in the District of Columbia Code of Laws, and that there are no Federal statutes covering the subject. This statement causes me some confusion. Was it the Senator's idea that the Federal statute applied outside the District?

Mr. TYDINGS. No. This is a bit of special pleading by Mr. Jackson. Mr. Jackson says there is no Federal statute, meaning thereby, of course, that the States make their own libel laws, as the Senator knows; but for the District of Columbia, where there is no State government, the Congress makes the criminal laws. Congress defines the different crimes and penalties therefor, and among them is the provision with respect to libel. Mr. Jackson has no more authority to set it aside than he has to set aside the statute against murder, the statute against arson, the statute against manslaughter, or the statute against rape. They are all in the Criminal Code. He cannot set them aside. His duty is to enforce them.

This broadcast, as I have proved, was deliberate. It was coldly calculated. It was no chance remark. It was made from a manuscript with many corrections in pen and ink. Then the indelible seal of malice was put upon it when Mr. Allen asked Colonel Harrington what he meant by telling the truth and proving that the statements of Pearson and Allen were lies.

I have already read the act of Congress. I digress as this point to ask, Does any Senator doubt that that is the act of Congress; that it is the law of the United States and of the District of Columbia, in which we are living? No Senator will rise and say that that is not the criminal law of this jurisdiction

What are Mr. Jackson's excuses as to why he wrote the letter to which I have referred? Let us see what a great Supreme Court Justice Mr. Jackson would make with the philosophy which he boldly expresses in his letter. This is his testimony before the committee as to why he told Mr. Curran not to prosecute the case:

"Now, I suggested to Senator TYDINGS that he prosecute the case himself; that I did not feel that the Department should enter into feuds which might come up between any Senator or administrative officer and any columnists; that he was at perfect liberty to institute a civil action, and if there was a malicious misstatement, he could get punitive damages for any injury suffered, and if he did not collect after that, then he might have body execution."

In other words, if I should hold up the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Norris] at the point of a gun and rob him of $50——

Mr. NORRIS. That would be impossible. [Laughter.]

Mr. TYDINGS. Well, $25. If I should hold him up in a dark alley and take his money away from him, he should not go to the police or the district attorney to have the criminal apprehended. What he should do would be to sue the robber and get his money back. If he could not obtain damages, he ought to take a club and beat the robber over the head. Is not that an exact analogy? If the father of a family is murdered, the wife, instead of having the criminal law enforced, should enter suit against the robber to recover damages for the loss of her husband's services.

Let me read on. That is only the preface. Mr. Jackson is attempting to tell me what remedy I should employ. Who is Mr. Jackson? I have been taking care of myself for 51 years without either his legal or personal help, and, God willing, I think I shall be able to get along for a considerable time in the future without any of his expedient opinions.

This is what he next says:

"Senator TYDINGS said that he did not intend to spend his own money in prosecuting this case and that he had others that he wanted instituted after this one was over."

That is true; and I do not think Jackson can stop me, because he has no more right to interfere with the processes of justice than has the King of Timbuctu. Yet he has done just that. In Tammany Hall such procedure is known as "getting to the court." We can put men in high places and "doll them up" with high-sounding titles; but the truth is that this case was stopped by the interference of the Attorney General, who conceded every fact which I stated. He had already ordered an investigation of the case before I knew anything about it. Why in the world did he want to have the FBI investigate the case if he did not intend to try it? Why submit the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], for example, to the humiliation of having FBI agents delve into his affairs, as it was necessary to delve into mine when a road on my place was in question, and submit him to indignity all over his State if, when the thing is proved to be just as he represents it to be, the same man is going to interfere and say, "That makes no difference. It is true that I ordered the investigation. It is just as you said it was in the beginning, but we are not going to prosecute the case."

Here is a choice bit. This comes from Mount Olympus itself. However, the mount is standing on its head. [Laughter.]

"He then claimed that his case was different because he was a United State Senator. There is no such exception in the statute"—mark that—"there is no such exception in the statute and what he virtually wanted me to do was to amend the statute to apply only to cases where a Senator was involved and where certain kinds of offenses are charged, and I pointed out that that would involve a course of distinguishing between different kinds of libel which would be impossible for us to pursue."

Let us go back over that:

"There is no exception in the statute."

Then why did not Jackson allow me to have it enforced? The statute applies to Senators, to colored people, to WPA workers, to bankers, to millionaires, and to everybody else. All I said to Jackson was this:

"Not only am I charged with misappropriating public funds, but the Senate of the United States is charged with having a Member who has done so; and I owe a duty to the Senate to exonerate it, as well as myself, of the charge; and that is an added reason in these times, when the integrity of public officials ought to be always above reproach."

Let us see what he says next:

"At least it involved the investigation of matters outside of the District"—mark this well, Senators—"and, of course, it was apparent on the face of it that a very important question of policy was involved and it seemed to me that we should not pass on it without the facts, and therefore the investigation was made to get the facts. But in disposing of

this case. I did not dispose of it on the technical phase, I disposed of it on the general policy."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is not the fact that the Senator from Maryland was a Senator the very gist of the libel? The libel was that the Senator from Maryland had used his official position to bring about certain things for his own private advantage. That was the very gist of the libel.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So far as any exception in the law of libel is concerned, the fact that that was the gist of the libel makes the Senator's position as a United States Senator the center of the whole charge.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Also let me ask the Senator if it is not true that the charge is not only a charge against the Senator from Maryland, but also a charge against the Administrator of the WPA, because both are accused of a crime, which in my State is libel per se. As I understand, Colonel Harrington is said by Mr. Allen to be not a gentleman, because he refused to remain silent under the charge that he himself had committed a crime.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is true.

Senators may vote for Mr. Jackson, but I ask them, on their word of honor, on their conscience, and on their manhood, is there any Member of this body who will condone the action of Robert Jackson? If so, let him rise. That is a pretty sweeping statement. Of course, no Senator can condone it. In cold print Pearson and Allen wrote this damnable charge that a Member of his body used funds appropriated for the poor not for the poor, not for the unemployed, but to build a yacht basin, a luxury, and a road on his private property. They did it not in the heat of passion, but in the cold quiet of the room in which the radio broadcast was prepared.

Mr. LUCAS. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire whether or not the clerk is going to read the entire volume before him?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the Chair understands not, that there are certain marked passages.

Mr. LUCAS. A further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Is there any limitation at all on what the Senate can compel a clerk to read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; except that as the Chair understands the Senator from Maine has asked permission to have the clerk read certain passages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which were designated in the RECORD. It is not the entire RECORD, the Chair might say.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that, but I make a further parliamentary inquiry. Assuming that the Senator from Illinois made a motion that the clerk read the Bible from beginning to end and the majority said he should do it——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not understand the question.

Mr. LUCAS. Assuming this hypothetical situation, that the Senator from Illinois made a motion that the clerk be directed to read the Bible from beginning to end, and the majority on a vote decided that that should be done; does the Chair hold that that could be done?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the hypothetical case the Senator from Illinois has indicated should occur, and it was the order of the Senate, the order would be carried out.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure we would lose a good clerk if that should happen. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair assures the Senator from Illinois that we will have a relief here at the proper time for the clerk so that we will not lose a good clerk.

Mr. LUCAS. This is peculiar. The question arises only because of the tremendous volume that is in front of the clerk. No one seems to know how long he is going to read, and if he reads the entire volume——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that there was no intention that the entire volume be read. It is a certain marked section of the RECORD.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield——

Mr. LUCAS. Just a moment. I would respectfully disagree with the ruling of the Chair that the Senate of the United States can force a clerk to read as long as the Senate of the United States wants the clerk to read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say, and the Chair is sure the Senator from Illinois will agree, that when the order of the Senate is that a paper shall be read, it is not an order to a particular clerk to read the entire paper, but, as often happens in a parliamentary body, the clerk would be relieved and the reading would go on, but the order of the Senate is that the paper shall be read.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, the Senate, if so minded, can order the clerks of the Senate to carry on a filibuster.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate can order the paper read.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be read by one or more clerks, depending, of course, on the length of the paper.

Mr. LUCAS. If that is the case, of course, that would be a very simple way to carry on a long and unusual filibuster, because Senators would not have to participate in it at all; they could merely compel the clerk to do all the filibustering for the Senate.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I am wondering if the Senator from Maine would yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. If it is in order. I do not know whether it is in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If it is a parliamentary inquiry, the Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. No, I say I am wondering if the Senator from Maine, whose mouthpiece I take it the clerk now is, will yield for a moment to an inquiry by myself of the Senator from Maine?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Maine yield to an inquiry?

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to have a ruling as to whether or not I can do so without losing whatever rights I may have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would think that by unanimous consent that could be done, certainly. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. DONNELL. My inquiry, Mr. Chairman, is occasioned by my slight bewilderment to know just what light the Senator from Maine thinks the reading of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will throw upon the fitness of Mr. Perlman to be Solicitor General of the United States. I should like to have the Senator from Maine enlighten me as to what the relevancy of this is, if he does not mind doing so.

Mr. BREWSTER. I shall be very happy to do so, if it is in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, unanimous consent has been granted. The Senator may proceed to answer the inquiry of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BREWSTER. As it seemed to me, it was a very parallel case to that with which we are presented, in which the very eloquent and able Senator from Maryland was opposing the confirmation of a nominee.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator be good enough to speak loud enough so that we can all hear?

Mr. BREWSTER. The relevancy of this particular matter seems to me to rest on the fact that here, in the instant case which we are now having read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—and I may say for the relief of my friend, the genial Senator from Illinois——

Mr. LUCAS. I do not need any relief at all. I am in perfect condition.

Mr. BREWSTER. There are limits to the RECORD. It is comprised approximately within the limits of the address of the Senator from Maryland upon the subject, so that I am sure the clerks will not suffer by being permitted and privileged to read his remarks. It seemed to me a very parallel case. Here was a very high judicial office, parallel, as it seemed to me, with the Solicitor General, who is the chief legal officer of the United States, as I earlier pointed out in my discussion. We now come to consider whether or not this man is worthy of the position to which he has been nominated. In the instant case, the Senator from Maryland, very properly and within his rights, pointed out the considerations as it seemed to him. Mr. Robert Jackson, although he had served in all the positions I have hitherto pointed out, had a distinguished legal career, had gone up through several positions, had become the Attorney General; finally, it was desired to promote him to be Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court; but, as it seemed to the Senator from Maryland, he was not fit for that position. Now, it may be argued, what has that to do with Mr. Perlman?

Mr. DONNELL. If the Senator will allow me to interrupt, that is the very question that is in my mind.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is what I am coming to.

Mr. DONNELL. I cannot see yet what light that throws on Mr. Perlman's qualifications for the office of Solicitor General of the United States?

Mr. BREWSTER. Perhaps the Senator from Missouri was absent from the Senate when I earlier led up to this subject, or was temporarily inattentive, as even Jupiter occasionally nods.

Mr. DONNELL. I do not claim to be in the class with Jupiter. [Laughter.]

Mr. BREWSTER. There seemed to me, in the record of Mr. Perlman, so far as we had it before us, very much less to commend him for the position of Solicitor General than there was in the record of Mr. Jackson, to commend him to the position of Associate Justice. I thought the Senator from Maryland was quite right in raising the issue, about which he felt very strongly, as I feel very strongly about this matter, as to the competence of Mr. Jackson to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. He very properly asked the Senate, in his opening remarks, to pay careful attention, because he felt it was a very serious matter; and I have undertaken to impress that upon the Senate in this instance.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I inquire what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The parliamentary situation is that during the course of the discussion on the pending question, the Senator from Maine requested that a paper be read. Under rule XI of the Senate when objection is made to the reading of a paper, the matter is determined by a vote of the Senate. The Senate determined by majority vote that the paper should be read. The clerk was in the process of reading it, when the Senator from Missouri asked unanimous consent that he might address an inquiry to the Senator from Maine. The Senator from Maine agreed to that, provided he did not lose any of his rights on the floor, under the present situation, and he was in the process of answering the inquiry from the Senator from Maine. The Senator from Maine will proceed.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, it is now 20 minutes after two, and it seems to me we should have some understanding of what we are to do here tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine will proceed in his answer to the inquiry.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, it seemed pertinent to point out that in exactly a parallel case the Senator from Maryland was urging the rejection by the Senate of a man who, as it seemed to me, possessed far superior qualifications for the position to which he was nominated, to the one he is now sponsoring, that he had had a distinguished legal career, that he had been honored with all these offices, and yet, in the words of the Senator from Maryland, he considered him unfit for promotion. As it seemed to me, the nominee in this case, whom we are considering, had far less to commend him for what, in many respects, is an even more responsible position, and it was that to which I was addressing myself.

I am not unmindful also of the fact that the instant case has very significant application to another matter which we have been considering here intermittently for the past 2 weeks; that this case presents also an amazing parallel to another case with which the Senator from Missouri is concerned, and that is whether or not we should be concerned with whether or not the Attorney General of the United States had properly carried out his functions. In this case, the record of which is being read——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. Not at present. In this case we find the Senator from Maryland, who has been so ardent and eloquent an opponent of the proposal that the Judiciary Committee should conduct an inquiry into the competence of the Attorney General, challenging the Attorney General of the United States at that time on the ground that in another very comparable case he had utterly failed to carry out his responsibile legal functions.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator does not want to make a misstatement.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, just a moment, please. I have addressed the Chair. The Senator from Maryland did not. I ask recognition for my inquiry, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is proceeding under a temporary unanimous-consent agreement that the Senator from Missouri might address an inquiry to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator from Maine yield for a further inquiry?

Mr. BREWSTER. To the extent I may without forfeiting my rights.

Mr. DONNELL. Would the Senator from Maine not agree with me that we are here tonight on a very serious piece of business, and that is the consideration of whether or not Mr. Philip B. Perlman shall be confirmed as Solicitor General of the United States, and should not the Senate, rather than devote itself to what the Senator from Maryland may have said some years ago about Mr. Jackson, or Mr. Drew Pearson, or Mr. Allen, or someone else, tonight devote itself to the consideration of the competency, the integrity, the experience, and other qualifications, or absence of such qualifications, of Mr. Perlman? Would not the Senator agree with me that that is a reasonable line of thought?

Mr. BREWSTER. I can well understand how the Senator from Missouri feels, and I share much of the sentiment he expresses. It is possible that there has been a certain contagion in this Chamber, resulting from another matter in which the Senator from Missouri was concerned, about which we have sought to address the attention of the Senate for the past 2 weeks, all in vain, as a result of the periodic flow of eloquence which has burst forth on the other side of the Chamber whenever we have suggested that we should investigate the Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. MAYBANK and Mr. DONNELL addressed the Chair.

Mr. BREWSTER. I will answer the first question. I am just getting warmed up.

Mr. DONNELL. Before the Senator gets warmed up further——

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like the Senator to listen to me for a moment. The Senator has listened to the other side.

Mr. DONNELL. Would the Senator be kind enough to yield? I mean this in no unkindly sense, because I think it is a proper inquiry.

Mr. BREWSTER. Let me finish.

Mr. DONNELL. Would the Senator be kind enough to indulge me for a moment to make one statement and then I shall desist?

Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Senators will take their seats.

Mr. DONNELL. The thought I have in mind, I will say to the Senator from Maine, is that I share fully his convictions in regard to what should have been done on the Kem resolution. I think the Senate should have adopted that resolution. I come from the State in which the facts sought to be developed by the resolution arose, and it seems to me it would have been perfectly proper that the Senate should investigate the reason for the action or the inaction of the Attorney General.

So I share with the Senator from Maine his views as to the impropriety, if you please, of our body failing to go into that investigation.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator give the reasons why we failed? Will the Senator answer that question?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the point I respectfully submit to the Senate is this: It seems to me that we have gone now into another piece of business, and that we should now confine ourselves to the inquiry as to whether or not Mr. Philip B. Perlman is qualified to be confirmed as Solicitor General of the United States. I shall not proceed further with any interruption, but I want respectfully to submit that matter such as what the Senator from Maryland may have said 6 years ago about Drew Pearson, or even about Mr. Jackson, are not of particularly informative value to the Senate, not because of the fact they may not furnish information, but because of the fact that they are not really addressed to the inquiry in which we are now engaged, namely, the question as to whether or not Mr. Perlman is qualified to be confirmed as Solicitor General of the United States.

I thank the Senator for his courtesy and patience, and I shall desist from further inquiry.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like first——

Mr. TYDINGS. Would the Senator allow me to correct a misstatement he made respecting the Senator from Maryland, or will he not be courteous enough to yield? The Senator made a misstatement which I want to correct for the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is working under a difficult situation.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not want to call the Senator from Maine to order, but the Senator from Maryland does not propose to sit on the floor of the Senate and have it stated that he has filibustered against the Kem resolution. I am for the Kem resolution, and I told the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] so in this chamber, and I have not said one word about it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator attempt to persuade his colleagues?

Mr. TYDINGS. Do not say that I have filibustered against the Kem resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are operating under a temporary unanimous consent agreement that the Senator from Missouri may address an inquiry to the Senator from Maine. The regular order is that by order of the Senate the clerk shall read the paper.

Mr. BREWSTER. I understood that I had permission to reply to the Senator from Missouri. Is my understanding not correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. He may reply to the inquiry.

Mr. BREWSTER. I want to say to the Senator from Missouri that there is certainly no Member of this body whose patriotic devotion to duty I hold in higher respect than that of the Senator from Missouri, and I can well understand how this situation may arouse some question in his mind, as he indicates, when we have before us a question to which he would desire to address himself. It is a matter on which I have profound convictions which are at variance with those of the Senator from Missouri, and I am sure he will accord me sincerity of purpose.

Mr. DONNELL. I certainly do.

Mr. BREWSTER. Now as to the question of the discussions which are here involved. It seems to me we have been setting a very bad example, and it seems to me that we cannot disregard the history of the deliberations of this body in the past months. As the Senator from Missouri has said, he sought very earnestly to secure a vote upon this matter, but a vote was denied by reason of the tactics of certain gentlemen on the other side, and I now exempt the Senator from Maryland from participation, when he says that to be the case, and I know him to be a man who states things as they are. We have been denied any opportunity to pass upon the resolution, which seems to me to be of profound significance. Action upon the resolution has been denied by reason of the dilatory tactics indulged in.

We have now come to another situation in connection with which I trust I may be permitted to say I hold as deep convictions as those which have animated the various gentlemen in this Chamber who have participated in such tactics. It seems to me that we might well here, perhaps profitably, even on this Sabbath day, consider the significance and the implications of the situation, when a majority of those in the Chamber for more than 2 weeks have been denied the opportunity to cast a vote. Even the Senator from Maryland says he would have voted with this side of the Chamber had he been permitted to cast a vote. Still the majority were defied, by tactics which in my judgment are not compatible with the serious consideration which the Senator from Missouri proposes.

Now it seems to me that with the injustice which has been perpetrated in this Chamber by the tactics which have been followed—and I am sure the Senator from Missouri agrees with me—it comes with very poor grace on the part of Senators on the other side who seek now to force the consideration of the nomination at this time, at this late hour, as they seek to do, when the Senate has already been exhausted by the week's work. This matter could very well go over for that more deliberate consideration which in my judgment its importance requires it should have. If it shall seem that we have learned some evil lessons from the opposite side, we shall bear in mind certain injunctions from learned philosophers—"the lessons you teach me I shall practice." It may come hard, but we shall better the instructions.

I am thoroughly disgusted with the use of the dilatory tactics—I shall not use a stronger term—by which the minority in this body have defied the will of the majority. It seems to me that on this Sabbath day, during the close of this session of the Senate——

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. BREWSTER. We may well pause to consider whether or not it is about time for these tactics to come to an end.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas raised a point of order. Does the Senator from Maine yield for that purpose?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I have finished that particular part of my statement.

Mr. LUCAS. I demand the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order has been demanded.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, with the consent of the Senate, and on condition that the Senator from Maine does not lose the floor, will he permit me to address a brief inquiry to him?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there unanimous consent that the Senator from Missouri may address an inquiry to the Senator from Maine without the Senator from Maine losing the floor? The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask the Senator whether or not he feels that merely because he and I both think the Kem resolution is righteous and should be adopted, on this particular question, the Perlman nomination, we should follow an example which we do not favor and do not regard as proper, and perhaps actually do the same thing that we are criticizing.

Let me conclude my statement to this effect: I ask the Senator from Maine if he does not think there is justice in my view. The Perlman nomination has been pending in the Senate since some time last January, and assurances were given tonight by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] that we would have an executive session, which I think involves a fair inference that we would take matters up in the executive session with reasonable dispatch. Does not the Senator feel that what we should do is to consider the Kem resolution as having been in one category, and the Perlman nomination in another?

With respect to the Kem resolution, we have not had the treatment which we perhaps think we should have had. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Maine that the Kem resolution should have been adopted. However, at the same time I ask the Senator from Maine if he does not think there is justice in my view that, now that we have proceeded to another piece of business, separate and distinct, we should go into the question of the qualifications of Mr. Perlman, and the question as to whether his nomination should be confirmed or not, rather than to go into matters which it would appear to me are somewhat extraneous and are not particularly informative—at least to me—with respect to the question which I think is at hand. Does not the Senator agree?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I can quite recognize how a Senator of the judicial temperament of the Senator from Missouri might find it extremely difficult to understand how one could feel that sometimes it is necessary to fight fire with fire. If we are to yield, as we have done in connection with the Kem resolution, to the dictation of a minority over a period of 2 weeks, where are we to end? How are these little boys ever to be taught that they should not play with matches? That is the question which we face. It seems to me that this matter far transcends the issue of whether or not Mr. Perlman is to be confirmed. This issue as I see it in these closing days of the session is whether or not the tactics of a filibustering minority shall rule the Congress.

I am somewhat regretful that on this side of the Chamber, which has suffered by these tactics, there should be any doubt as to the wisdom of seeking to impose the same sort of practices that have been imposed upon us. That may not be a Christian precept, but it seems to be a precept which can alone bring to an end the tactics by which this body has been repeatedly paralyzed.

While I may be an utterly inadequate advocate, and there may be limitations to what I can do, I hope that this evening which we are spending here may in some measure serve to accentuate, not only for the Senate but for the people of the country, the utterly indefensible tactics which in my judgment have prevented action.

I should like to submit a unanimous consent request, if I dared, that we proceed to the consideration of the Kem resolution, and that we be allowed to

have a vote upon it. I am sure that we could then proceed very promptly with the consideration of any other matters which it might be necessary for the Senate to act upon.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further inquiry under the same conditions?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator can yield only by unanimous consent, without losing the floor.

Mr. DONNELL. May the Senator yield upon the same conditions, that he will not lose the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is there a unanimous-consent request pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a temporary unanimous-consent request pending.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will the Chair advise us what he means by "temporary unanimous-consent request?" Is there a unanimous-consent request pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a unanimous-consent request pending.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The regular order is called for, and the clerk will resume reading.

The legislative clerk resumed reading, as follows:

> Then after every charge was proved to be a lie from beginning to end——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For what purpose does the Senator address the Chair?

Mr. TYDINGS. Before making a motion, I hope the Senator from Maine will indulge me. I have no disposition——

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, what is the situation?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am about to make a motion.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, how does the Senator obtain the floor?

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask the Chair if it is in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator addressing a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes. I ask the Chair if it is in order, now that the case has been so fully covered, that the pending question be disposed of, and that the reading by the clerk conclude with the page which the clerk has before him.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I do not understand how the Senator is to obtain the floor for that purpose.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator addressing a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair?

Mr. DONNELL. In a sense it is. I should like to ask that I may propound a unanimous-consent request at this time, that I may submit to the Senator from Maine a question and a brief observation, with the understanding that in responding thereto or in permitting me to have the floor for that purpose, the Senator from Maine will not lose the floor. I ask the Chair if I may submit that unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may submit a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. DONNELL. I submit such a unanimous-consent request at this time, and ask unanimous consent on those terms.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I can well understand the feeling of regret on the part of the Senator from Maine, and I mean no disrespect for his views or for his attitude, or for his skill or sincerity. It would seem to me, however, that it does not devolve upon the majority side to teach the "little boys," as has been said by the Senator from Maine, not to play with matches. I think those gentlemen, or at least many of them, as, for illustration, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], realize something of what the Senator from Maine and I realize with respect to the Kem resolution. It would appear to me that the best example that we on the majority side can set is not to play with matches ourselves, but to proceed in a sober, common-sense, and reasonable method toward solving the particular problem we now have, which is whether or not the nomination of Mr. Perlman for the office of Solicitor General of the United States should be confirmed.

I again say that I mean no disrespect and no criticism. But it would seem there is a difference of view.

I respectfully submit to the Senator from Maine that our time will be conserved, the dignity of this body will be best served, a better lesson will be taught to our friends upon the other side when they differ with us as to the proper handling of the Kem resolution, if we, when we are in executive session on the Perlman nomination, should proceed without resort to anything of that kind; that we should get down to the meat in the coconut and to the question of whether or not Mr. Perlman possesses the experience, knowledge, and integrity to justify his nomination.

I ask the Senator most respectfully and courteously, I trust, whether he would share in the reasonableness of the viewpoint which I have expressed.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I certainly would always recognize the reasonableness of any opinions which the Senator from Missouri, for whom I have very great respect, should express; and I trust he will accord me equal consideration.

Mr. DONNELL. I assure the Senator that I do.

Mr. BREWSTER. I recall the distress which I experienced when the question of whether or not certain Senators would be seated was under consideration, and we were obliged finally supinely to surrender—the majority to the minority. We now come to the close of the session, and again for the past 2 or 3 weeks we have been treated to a similar spectacle.

I suggest to the Senator from Missouri and to the others concerned that we are approaching a situation where we must give consideration to far higher factors than simply whether or not a certain policy or a certain nominee shall be favorably considered. We will consider whether we shall continue here to function under a situation which permits a complete paralysis of the majority in this Chamber. While on this subject there is disagreement and, while it is not clear as to what might be the conclusion, it is a matter which I have felt should very properly go over until the next session in order that there might be more of the time which has already elapsed, which the Senator has pointed out, but which I think could well be given to the consideration of whether the President of the United States might not find someone among the members of the bar of the United States with far superior attainments than those of Mr. Perlman. I suspect that among the acquaintances of the Senator from Missouri and of every other Member of the Senate, without hesitation, there could be named a half-dozen lawyers of proper political complexion, any one of whom could far better assume the responsibilities of that high office.

It seems to me that in the instant case, while we accord very great consideration to the President's nominations—I myself voted, which is a sufficient indication of absence of partisanship upon my side, for the confirmation of Henry Wallace as a member of the President's Cabinet, which I think will sufficiently indicate that I do not let small or mean or petty things enter into my approach—in this instance such a situation has arisen in that it seems to me it is almost disrespectful to the Supreme Court of the United States to send a man of this particular volume of experience and legal learning to appear and argue cases for 140,000,000 Americans before the Supreme Court of the United States.

There is no question whether he is irregular or improper in his practice, but there is no indication that he is in any way of the class or the caliber of the men who have hitherto occupied that high position. For that reason I feel it would be far more appropriate if the Senate should now move to postpone consideration of the matter until there can be further opportunity for the President to give consideration to whether a better man might be found.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator yield again upon the same unanimous-consent agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to say to the Senator that in my judgment, in the last few sentences before the conclusion of what he said, he was approaching a discussion of the qualifications of Mr. Perlman. I think that is proper. I think it is proper to enter upon a discussion of the qualifications of Mr. Perlman; and anything the Senator may say I know will be based upon his best judgment and his investigation of the matter. I think the Senate should have that information. I personally do not think we should defer action. I think the nomination has been pending long enough and that we should go ahead tonight and complete our work on it.

I shall not interrupt the proceedings further at this time; but I should like to say that the mere fact that there may have been done what we think is an injustice, and what I still think was an improper action in not adopting the Kem resolution, nevertheless we might very well follow the rule of doing as we would be done by rather than to follow a practice which we do not ourselves favor. It would seem to me, very respectfully, that our own side of the aisle will have conducted itself with far more dignity, with far more attention to the actual matter at hand, if, instead of going into matters such as the remarks of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] in 1941 in this extensive reading, we should now go ahead and discuss the merits or demerits of Mr. Perlman. I do not see how anyone could have a legitimate objection to the Senator's giving us his views fully, either pro or con, or both, as he may weigh the evidence with respect to the qualifications of Mr. Perlman, his ability, his experience, his integrity, or the contrary, which would throw light upon whether his nomination should be confirmed.

So, Mr. President, I conclude this observation with the very earnest expression of hope and belief that we shall best serve our country and our own party and the dignity of the Senate by proceeding to get down to a discussion of the merits of this particular candidate.

I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am reminded of King Agrippa's reply to Paul: "Almost thou persuadeth me to be a Christian."

I have heard the eloquence expended in this case. I do not recall whether the Senator expressed himself with equal eloquence when the Senators on the other side of the aisle were in the discussion. If we could only have an exhorter competent for the task of getting all the Members of the Senate to hit the sawdust trail and agreeing that in the future we will confine ourselves to matters before the Senate—and I do not think there is anyone more nearly able to do that than is the Senator from Missouri—we may get all the Senators on the other side to march down the aisle and take the oath that in the future we shall confine ourselves to the questions before the Senate, and for the immediate future we will take up and dispose of the Kem resolution. If that should be done, I am sure the whole country would rise up and call us blessed and that the people would realize we had accomplished a reform which would be significant throughout the history of our country.

Mr. DONNELL. I will say to the Senator that I should be most happy to see the Kem resolution adopted, even at this late hour. I think it should have been adopted. I had the privilege and pleasure of sitting on the Judiciary Committee. I was one of the six men on that committee who voted to report the Kem resolution, or voted against the motion to table it, and, I believe, a subsequent motion.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that clearly the Kem resolution should be voted on. I think it is a proper resolution.

I think my distinguished colleague deserves the highest commendation for having offered his resolution and fought for it. But with all due deference to my distinguished friend from Maine, I still think that the proper procedure at 10 minutes to 3 o'clock in the morning is not to proceed with the reading of ancient history and with comments upon Mr. Pearson and the various incidents recited in the book, but to get down to deciding whether Mr. Philip Perlman, of Baltimore, is competent to be Solicitor General of the United States.

Mr. BREWSTER. I will ask the Senator from Missouri if he and the other members of the Judiciary Committee who voted for the Kem resolution will join with me in disposing of this matter. There can be no more effective lesson, I think, in the future history of this body. While it may seem that temporarily tonight we may be expending some unnecessary time, it will save an infinitely greater amount of time in the next session of the Senate.

I regret that the Senator from Missouri, who is, as I know, sincerely interested in the Kem resolution, does not display the same belligerency and persuasiveness in seeking to bring the Senators on this side of the aisle to a realization that they shoud insist upon a vote on the Kem resolution. If we on this side of the aisle were to unite and were to show a united front in demanding that the Kem resolution be considered, the Senators on the other side of the aisle certainly should not consider that to be an unnecessary and unjustified action.

Mr. President, the legal processes of the United States will suffer in no way if action on this nomination is deferred. Rather, it is my sober and considered judgment, and that of many eminent members of the bar of this country, that with a recess appointment, which then would be possible for the President, it would be very likely that the quality of service in the office of Solicitor General would be very greatly improved.

I plead now, with the same eloquence that my friend the Senator from Missouri has shown, that if Senators on this side of the aisle will simply unite and show to Senators on the other side of the aisle that those tactics do not pay, a very salutary advance will be achieved in the processes of representative government, and America will call us blessed.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I have said several times to the Senator from Maine that I am strongly in favor of the Kem resolution.

Mr. BREWSTER. Except in everything but uniting to enforce action, as we can do.

The Senators on the other side of the aisle want the Perlman nomination confirmed. Why have the Perlman nomination confirmed, if they are not willing to let the rottenness in Kansas City be investigated? How can they demand that we take action in regard to the things on which they desire to have action taken, and at the same time demand that we must supinely submit to their insistence that no action be taken on the things on which they do not want action taken?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that earlier I had an opportunity to express myself on the Kem resolution. If opportunity were afforded at this hour—although I take it that it would be decidedly improper for me to launch forth on a discussion of the Kem resolution without first obtaining unanimous consent to discuss that subject—I would be glad to advocate earnestly and ardently the adoption of the Kem resolution.

But as I see it, we have gone into executive session. We are engaged in considering a separate piece of business, namely, whether the nomination of Mr. Perlman to be Solicitor General of the United States which has been reported by the Judiciary Committee, should be confirmed. It appears to me that the better part of wisdom would be for us to get to that piece of business and determine whether that nomination should be confirmed.

So I wish to say, so clearly that my distinguished friend, the Senator from Maine, cannot misunderstand me, that I am just as much and as strongly in favor of the adoption of the Kem resolution as he is; and I myself would plead just as strongly and earnestly—although not with the same power of eloquence that he possesses—with my friends on both sides of the aisle to join unanimously in adopting the Kem resolution.

Mr. BREWSTER. Then would the Senator join with me in moving that the Senate return to legislative session, so that we might consider what has been the unfinished business for 3 weeks, and then proceed in an orderly way with consideration of the Kem resolution?

If we do that, and dispose of that resolution, I will promise the Senator from Missouri and all other Senators who are concerned with this matter that I will then join in seeing to it that we proceed promptly to the consideration of any other matters which the Senate may desire to consider.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield to permit me to respond to his statement, let me say that it would seem to me that this is not the time to renew the attempt to have that resolution taken up.

Mr. BREWSTER. Why not?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to wait just a minute so as to permit me to answer the question. It seems to me that that matter has been before the Senate and that assurance was given here tonight by the Senator from Ohio to the Senator from Maryland that the Senate would go into executive session; and obviously the Senator from Maryland was interested in the appointment of Mr. Perlman.

Mr. BREWSTER. We have been in executive session 3 hours.

Mr. DONNELL. Now we are in executive session, and I think we should go on to complete our action on the nomination of Mr. Perlman. After action on that nomination is concluded, if the Senator from Maine desires to move that the Senate return to the consideration of the other piece of business, I shall actively,

and as forcefully as is within my power, attempt to obtain a favorable outcome on that resolution.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri is more naive than any Yankee from the State of Maine. The Senator from Missouri is insistent that, inasmuch as the Senate has gone into executive session, we should complete all action on executive matters, and then should return to legislative session and should consider and adopt the Kem resolution. It is true that we have now been some 3 or 4 hours in executive session. Of course, when the motion to take up the Kem resolution was being considered we flitted about, going into executive session and out of executive session, and taking up orders of the day and matters on the calendar. We took them up and laid them aside as lightly as could be, by unanimous consent, and the Senator from Missouri did not object.

So I am sure the Senator from Missouri should show his appreciation of the importance of this matter by saying to Senators on the other side of the aisle that it is scarcely consistent for them to want their pound of flesh—to want the nomination to be confirmed—but not to be willing to have the Kem resolution considered.

The Senator from Missouri is the last Member of the Senate I would expect to say that he would not favor having the Senate go into legislative session for the purpose of considering the Kem resolution. Certainly we should propose that the Senate go into legislative session for that purpose; and if Senators on the other side of the aisle then object to that procedure, that will show where the responsibility lies.

But I, for one, am not willing to go on in this fashion, when for three long weeks they have shown utter disregard for proper parliamentary procedure.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say—although I may be the only Senator on this side of the aisle who takes this position—that I do not agree with the Senator as to the statement he has just made.

I observe, with some concern, that the Senator from Maine would rather imply that he has some doubt whether I am behind and in favor of the Kem resolution. I assure him once and for all that I am strongly in favor of that resolution.

Mr. BREWSTER. Actions speak louder than words.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I do not relish that sort of an answer. We are here tonight engaged in a serious piece of business, namely, consideration of the question of what action we should take on the nomination of Mr. Perlman. I take it that the thing for us to do is to go on and continue to consider the Perlman nomination, and act upon it. Any evidence either for or against Mr. Perlman should be brought forth upon this floor and presented to the Senate.

I do not favor the course of procedure that is being followed here, nor do I favor, at this moment, the suggestion that while we are in the midst of consideration of the Perlman nomination, we should renew the attempt to take up the Kem resolution. I shall be glad to join with other Senators, as forcefully and as persuasively as it is within my power to do, after the Perlman nomination is disposed of, in urging all Senators, on both sides of the aisle, to join in having the Senate consider the Kem resolution.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, how long does the Senator from Missouri think it will take to adjourn this body after the Perlman nomination is disposed of?

Mr. DONNELL. I have no idea.

Mr. BREWSTER. Then I will inform the Senator that in exactly 2 minutes after the nomination is acted upon, we will adjourn; and then the Kem resolution will be in the wastebasket.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAPEHART. How many hours do we have before we are forced to adjourn under the concurrent resolution, to discuss the Perlman nomination?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To midnight Sunday.

Mr. CAPEHART. That means midnight tonight. That means we have 21 hours?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-one hours.

Mr. CAPEHART. Another parliamentary inquiry. Possibly the Chair cannot answer this, but perhaps some of the able Senators can.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair suggests the Senator address the inquiry to the Chair.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Chair feel that we have sufficient time, that 21 hours is sufficient time to discuss the merits of the Perlman nomination?

Mr. LUCAS. I submit that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is a matter which the Senate will have to determine for itself.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, now that the Senator from Maine has resumed the floor, will it not——

Mr. BREWSTER. No, the Senator from Maine has not lost the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Has resumed the floor, I say, is now holding the floor in his own right; will it not require another order for the clerk to continue reading the record?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, the Chair would rule not. The Senate itself ordered the reading of the particular document by majority vote. The proceedings which have been conducted up to this moment have been conducted by unanimous consent of the Senate with the understanding that the Senator from Maine would not lose any of his rights. The Chair consulted with the Parliamentarian, when an inquiry was previously directed to the Chair, as to whether there was any procedure by which the reading of the document once ordered might be suspended.

Mr. LUCAS. Regular order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian indicated that there were no Senate precedents in that regard. The Chair is now ready to rule on the question, and perhaps to make a precedent in regard to this matter.

Under rule 11 of the Senate it is stated that—

> When the reading of a paper is called for, and objected to, it shall be determined by a vote of the Senate, without debate.

It is the opinion of the Chair that anything the Senate determines to do by majority vote it can undo by majority vote. It is the opinion of the Chair that the rules of the Senate should be to expedite the public business and not to obstruct the public business, and the Chair would entertain a motion at any time during the reading of the paper that the Senate might direct that the reading of the paper should be suspended.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If that is done, however, the Chair would rule that the floor would go to the Senator from Maine at that point, which was the situation prior to the time the reading of the paper had been ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is a motion to dispense with the further reading of the document in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the ruling of the present occupant of the Chair, such a motion would be in order.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I make that motion, Mr. President, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BREWSTER. I ask for a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question of a quorum has been raised, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Murray
Baldwin	Hayden	Myers
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Barkley	Hill	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pepper
Brooks	Ives	Revercomb
Butler	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Capehart	Kem	Smith
Capper	Kilgore	Sparkman
Chavez	Knowland	Stewart
Connally	Langer	Taft
Cooper	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McCarthy	Thye
Dworshak	McClellan	Tydings
Ecton	McFarland	Umstead
Ellender	McGrath	Vandenberg
Ferguson	McMahon	Watkins
Flanders	Magnuson	Wherry
Fulbright	Malone	White
George	Martin	Wiley
Green	Maybank	Williams
Gurney	Millikin	Young
Hatch	Moore	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] that the reading of the document ordered some time ago under rule 11 be suspended, and the yeas and nays have been requested.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HILL (when his name was called). Mr. President, I have a pair with the

senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], who is necessarily absent, and I will vote. If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea" and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

Mr. JENNER (when his name was called). Mr. President, I have a pair with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], who is necessarily absent. I the Senator from Mississippi were present, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—44

Aiken	Hoey	Murray
Barkley	Holland	Myers
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	O'Daniel
Connally	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Donnell	Knowland	Pepper
Downey	Langer	Robertson, Va.
Ellender	Lucas	Russell
Fulbright	McCarran	Sparkman
George	McClellan	Stewart
Green	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Gurney	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Hatch	McMahon	Tydings
Hayden	Magnuson	Umstead
Hill	Maybank	

NAYS—35

Baldwin	Ferguson	Robertson, Wyo
Ball	Flanders	Smith
Brewster	Hawkes	Taft
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Thye
Brooks	Ives	Vandenberg
Butler	Kem	Watkins
Cain	McCarthy	Wherry
Capehart	Malone	White
Capper	Martin	Wiley
Cooper	Millikin	Williams
Dworshak	Moore	Young
Ecton	Revercomb	

NOT VOTING—16

Bridges	Lodge	Taylor
Buck	McKellar	Tobey
Bushfield	Morse	Wagner
Cordon	Overton	Wilson
Eastland	Reed	
Jenner	Saltonstall	

So the Senate ordered the reading discontinued.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading of the paper, under rule XI, is discontinued. The Senator from Maine has the floor.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I appreciate the consideration which has been accorded and also the injunction which has been given by the Senator from Missouri, to which I have given most careful consideration. I hope that my efforts in this direction may have served some salutary purpose. I feel entirely equal to matching the great records which have been made in this body in other days by distinguished exponents of the gentle art of dilatory discussions upon the other side of the aisle. I profoundly regret that the eagerness and anxiety of many of the Members to proceed without further delay persuades me that I should set the example which the Senator from Missouri has so eloquently, although as I feel unfortunately, expounded. I have sought to direct attention to the question of Mr. Perlman, on which as I have indicated I feel very deeply. I do not feel that his legal experience or talents qualify him for confirmation for so important an office and responsibility. I feel further that it is unfortunate the Senate should leave Washington confessing that it is impossible to function upon a matter of far higher moment than whether or not Mr. Perlman is confirmed. That is the question of whether or not there should proceed an investigation of what are alleged to be the derelictions of duty in the office of one superior to Mr. Perlman.

I should be very happy to carry on and to dwell further upon the lessons which have been taught me so bitterly in recent weeks. But in deference to my colleagues who have so sympathetically supported my position, which, I would have made clear to the Senate, was taken entirely upon my own motion, without discussion or deliberation, I shall not do so. I appreciate the way they have borne with me during this evening. I trust it will not have been in vain. So far as I am concerned, I shall now be willing to conclude my discussion of this matter with the hope that when the Senate votes it will vote with the single purpose of trying to advise the President of the United States that he send us the name of a man of far more legal competence for this high office.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, it is not my desire now to speak long. It has never been my desire to prevent in any way a vote upon the confirmation of Mr. Perlman.

In conscience I heard the testimony. I decided the issue upon the evidence in the case. I shall make a very short statement now, because I feel it is my duty to the Senate to do so, as a member of the Judiciary Committee and chairman of the subcommittee that heard the case.

The importance of the office to which Mr. Perlman has been nominated cannot be minimized. It is an office requiring the services of an individual whose stature and standing as a legal practitioner are beyond reproach.

The accumulation of evidence before the subcommittee in my opinion casts a serious cloud of reasonable doubt over the qualifications and fitness of Mr. Perlman for this high office. When such a reasonable doubt exists it is the opinion of the chairman that the public interest demands its acknowledgment.

The doubt here raised is of a kind not likely to be resolved by further investigation within the scope of the subcommittee. This subcommittee is charged only with the duty of inquiring into the qualifications of a nominee for public office in the United States Government—that is, to be Solicitor General. An investigation into undisclosed political, social, and contractual relations of the nominee with public and other officials cannot adequately be conducted within the limited powers, jurisdiction, and facilities of the Senate subcommittee.

In such circumstances it is for the members of the subcommittee to state on the facts adduced whether they believe the nominee to be fit for the office for which he has been proposed, because here we face a great issue, and we must consent to or reject this particular nomination.

Mr. President, on July 25 I was able to file with the Senate my individual views. They have been before the Senate. I shall not speak longer. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. I hope that we may have an immediate vote, and as I said, I cannot in conscience vote for Mr. Perlman. The matter is not a personal one. It is not a political matter at all. It is a matter of conscience upon the evidence adduced at the hearing.

There being no objection, the individual views of Mr. FERGUSON were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS—STATEMENT OF HOMER FERGUSON, SENATOR FROM MICHIGAN, CHAIRMAN OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE NOMINATION OF PHILIP B. PERLMAN

The nomination of Mr. Philip B. Perlman, of Maryland, to be Solicitor General of the United States, vice J. HOWARD MCGRATH, resigned, was referred to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. The nomination was referred to a subcommittee consisting of the Senator from Michigan [HOMER FERGUSON], chairman, and the Senator from Rhode Island [J. HOWARD MCGRATH].

At a later date the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary determined that it was advisable to enlarge the subcommittee and, accordingly, the Senator from Missouri [FORREST C. DONNELL], was, on May 27, 1947, appointed a member. The reasons for the appointment of a third member to this subcommittee were the extreme importance of the office, a development which showed that facts in connection with the nomination were exceedingly involved, and a realization that pertinent facts were not readily available to the subcommittee.

On July 21, 1947, the nomination was reported favorably to the Senate by the full committee of the Committee on the Judiciary. Senator FERGUSON, chairman of the subcommittee considering the nomination, requested leave to file his individual views concerning the nomination with the Senate on July 24, 1947. Without objection, it was agreed that the nomination would be reported immediately but that the committee

would ask that consideration of the nomination by the Senate be deferred until the subcommittee chairman had filed his report.

The duties of the office of the Solicitor General briefly are as follows:

Under the direction of the Attorney General, he has special charge of the business of, and appears for and represents, the Government in the Supreme Court. When requested by the Attorney General, the Solicitor General may conduct and argue any case in which the United States is interested, in any court of the United States, or may attend to the interests of the Government in any State court or elsewhere, conferring with and directing the activities of the Federal law officers throughout the country when the occasion so requires. No appeal is taken by the United States to any appellate court without the authorization of the Solicitor General. In the absence or inability of the Attorney General to perform his duties the Solicitor General becomes the Acting Attorney General.

The high importance of this office placed a serious responsibility, and duty, upon the subcommittee to pursue any and all matters which might reach its attention in order that it might ascertain fully all facts as to the qualifications of the nominee.

The subcommittee, however, faced many difficulties. It should be noted that it had at its command no investigatory staff and, therefore, it was necessary to rely principally on the cooperation of the nominee himself to develop the facts.

It is not too much to say that full cooperation was not forthcoming from Mr. Perlman and that considerable time and effort consumed in the course of the hearings might have been unnecessary had he been somewhat more candid or helpful in the presentation of facts.

Because no investigating staff was available to this subcommittee, it became necessary to send a member of its professional staff on several trips to aid in the development of information. Certain of the witnesses were either reluctant to testify or, through lack of understanding of what was desired, otherwise delayed and impeded the hearings. One witness, through failure to present papers which were ordered on subpena duces tecum, made two additional trips between his home office in Jamestown, N. Y., and Washington, thus requiring the holding of two unnecessary hearings. A few of the points in question concerned events which occurred many years ago, and as to them some witnesses were reluctant to testify and the memory of others was poor. The inevitable result of this was again to prolong the hearings.

This background will demonstrate the difficulties under which the subcommittee labored.

At the outset, information came before this subcommittee from numerous sources which would seem to cast a reflection upon the fitness of Mr. Perlman to fulfill the requirements for this, the highest advocate position in the Government. As the inquiry proceeded certain paramount and serious questions became manifest.

The first was represented by a cartoon published in the Baltimore Sun January 8, 1947, prior to Mr. Perlman's nomination, and which appeared to demonstrate with some significance a conception of his place in the Baltimore and Maryland political scene. The cartoon depicted Mr. Perlman as a coachman in the operation of a Maryland political chariot. Attention is directed to the fact that, at that time, January 8, 1947, Mr. Perlman held no official position either in Baltimore or the State of Maryland, and had not held any official position for many years, yet he obviously was considered by the Sun as one of those who, by proximity at least, was an instrument in directing the political affairs of the State.

Secondly, it soon became clear that in his practice of law Mr. Perlman had represented primarily certain special interests in the State of Maryland. It was early called to the attention of the subcommittee that, when these interests desired special consideration from either the State of Maryland or the city of Baltimore, or both, Mr. Perlman was employed, and it was evidenced that this type of practice constituted a major portion of his business.

The possibility of a significant interrelation of these two facts was emphasized to the subcommittee in further evidence that much of the nominee's service to his clients was performed behind the scenes rather than in the usual manner in which legal services are ordinarily rendered and performed by attorneys.

Certainly his was not the usual legal practice. He worked where it was necessary to know men—men of authority in State and local affairs—rather than to know the law.

A review of his relations with certain clients as brought forth in the hearings will illustrate this conclusion.

BALTIMORE & OHIO RAILROAD

In 1929 Mr. Perlman was approached by Mr. R. Marsden Smith, general attorney for the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., in regard to the nominee's employment by that company. At that time the railroad was considering a merger or a consolidation with the Western Maryland Railroad, a procedure involving many State and municipal interests.

The services to be performed by Mr. Perlman, as set out in his letter of retainer, were very vague and indefinite, other than that he was to examine some of the early ordinances of the city of Baltimore to determine what effect said ordinances might have on the contemplated merger. The merger never developed and, therefore, Mr. Perlman's services were never of any benefit to the railroad.

Nevertheless, Mr. Perlman was retained by the railroad from July 1, 1929, to June 1, 1942, with retainers as follows:

$5,000 per year for 2½ years, from July 1, 1929, to Jan. 1, 1933	$17,500
$2,500 per year for 7 years, from Jan. 1, 1933, to Jan. 1, 1940	17,500
$1,000 per year for 2½ years, from Jan. 1, 1940, to June 1, 1942	2,500
Total	37,500

On February 9, 1940 (more than 2 years before the retainers ceased), Mr. John J. Cornwell, general counsel for the railroad, wrote to Mr. George M. Shriver, the senior vice president, who had retained Mr. Perlman, as follows:

"An examination of the file does not disclose that Mr. Perlman has handled any matters whatever for us, and I know of no reason why this relationship should not be terminated."

Mr. Perlman, himself, the testimony developed, had requested over a period of years that the retainer be terminated because, as he is on record of having written the company:

"I do not feel I am earning the retainer, even at the reduced rate * * * unless you know of some reason why it ought to be continued, such as anticipated legislation or litigation in which I might be helpful."

The Baltimore & Ohio had competent legal counsel, and the nominee, with one possible exception of inconsequential nature, was not employed to render any of those services customarily required of attorneys. It is my inference that he was retained by the railroad solely because of the influence which he held in the city of Baltimore and in the State of Maryland.

It is also to be noted that the nominee is on record as having stated that he was greatly indebted to the railroad for his large do-nothing retainers. This is the same railroad which has had extensive dealings with the RFC. I cannot escape a conviction that should Mr. Perlman, as Solicitor General, be confronted by any action to which the railroad is a party he would have a very real conflict of interest and obligation.

KENNEDY CASE

In the early twenties a case arose in Baltimore in which Mr. Perlman was employed by a Mr. Joseph P. Kennedy, of that city. By reason of the fact that this occurred some 25 years ago, it would ordinarily have been forgotten. However, there were involved charges of such serious nature that the committee could not ignore them, as they involved Mr. Perlman's good name, and considerable time was spent in developing facts surrounding the incident. Mr. Perlman was then, in addition to being a practicing lawyer, the secretary of state of Maryland.

The facts of the case in question were that a Peter R. Quinn was convicted of conspiring to falsify various tax assessments in the city of Baltimore. A charge was made incident to this case that Kennedy had given Quinn $100 to reduce a tax assessment on property belonging either to Kennedy or his mother from $55,905 to $35,905, a reduction of $20,000.

The case was of a sensational nature at the time and evoked newspaper account to the effect that "All the big fellows got out, and just the small fellows were prosecuted," and rumors that the grand jury had been tampered with.

Testimony before the subcommittee showed that Mr. Perlman had written a letter to the State's attorney and asked him to present it to the grand jury. The first question before the subcommittee was whether or not the facts set forth in Mr. Perlman's letter to the State's attorney contained a full, frank, and truthful statement of all the facts known to Mr. Perlman at that time. In his letter to the State's attorney, Mr. Perlman stated that he had made a full investigation with his client of the facts of the case and that his investigation did not disclose his client, Kennedy, was in any way culpable.

Mr. Perlman was requested to bring before the subcommittee all records relating to the alleged change in the assessment. He produced a letter from a Mr. M. Frank Fitzpatrick, director, department of assessments, Baltimore, dated June 17, 1947. This letter from Mr. Fitzpatrick was obtained for Mr. Perlman by Mr. Harry T. Gross, who is an associate in Mr. Perlman's office. The Fitzpatrick letter was to the effect that no change in the assessment, as reflected by either the field book or the assessor's card, had been made. This letter did not cover or purport to cover the annual roll. The annual roll is the record from which the tax statements and files are made up and sent to the individuals owing the tax.

This committee determined that it should send a member of the professional staff to Baltimore to investigate the facts in connection with this tax matter. He discovered that an alteration had been made—but in the annual roll. No change had, in fact, been made in either the field book or the assessor's card, and the alteration was in the annual roll; therefore, the statement produced before this subcommittee by Mr. Perlman was not an untrue statement, although because it did not present all the facts its effect was indeed misleading.

When these facts were presented before the committee it then developed that Mr. Gross (Mr. Perlman's office associate), after obtaining the original Fitzpatrick letter and prior to the time that this information regarding the alteration was disclosed by the subcommittee, had been back to the collector's office and had discovered the fact that the Fitzpatrick letter was misleading. Still, neither

Gross nor Perlman made any disclosures of any of these facts to the committee until after the committee produced a photostatic copy of the collector's records which showed that an alteration existed.

Attention is also directed to the fact that, in Mr. Perlman's own personal file, there appeared a tax statement showing a tax based on an assessment $20,000 less than that which was paid by Mr. Kennedy in the particular year in question. It is impossible for me to believe that Mr. Perlman had been unaware of the alteration at all, and his producing the Fitzpatrick letter must have been done with the intention and purpose of misleading this subcommittee on certain facts which he, Perlman, knew to be untrue at the time the Fitzpatrick letter was produced to this committee.

It is inconceivable to me that a lawyer of Mr. Perlman's standing, who at the same time was secretary of state of Maryland, would have become connected with a case of this seriousness without going into all of the records, particularly the one which happens to be the most obvious one, that is, the annual roll. He stated that he had thoroughly investigated the case. If his statement were true, and if he had thoroughly investigated the case, he would have known that alterations had occurred, and his producing to this subcommittee a letter intended to mislead it by stating no alteration had been made, is inexcusable.

Although it is not necessarily to be adduced that Mr. Perlman had misrepresented facts in his letter of the State's attorney and the grand jury, for it cannot positively be demonstrated that he was, at that time, aware of any alteration in the assessment figures, certainly his lack of candor in presenting fully to the subcommittee all information surrounding the incident casts a shroud upon his good faith in the matter.

BALTIMORE CITY TRANSIT CO.

The Kennedy case is an incident in the hearings which, among other things, is illustrative of the procedural difficulties that confronted the subcommittee. It was necessary for the subcommittee to spend considerable time and energy also in studying the nominee's relationship in all its various phases with the Baltimore City Transit Co. Here, again, is an illustration of the admixture of Mr. Perlman's political activities with the legal activities of his clients. The facts were difficult to ascertain from questioning of the nominee alone, and it was necessary to bring before the subcommittee numerous other witnesses to complete the factual picture. Furthermore, in addition to all of this it was necessary for the subcommittee to promote its own investigation of certain illustrative facts.

Since about 1927 the nominee has been attorney for the Baltimore City Transit Co. of Baltimore City, Md. His retainer in recent years has been between $13,000 and $14,000 per year. For some time the city of Baltimore has been seeking some tax authority over the rails and bus operations of the subject company, and in this regard it sponsored senate bills 126 and 127, which were presented at the opening of the State legislature on January 1, 1947. These two bills had the overwhelming support of the city administration and the metropolitan population. Mr. Perlman, as a counsel for the railroad, was opposed to these bills, and to plead the transit company's case he appeared before a joint meeting of the Senate Finance Committee and the Ways and Means Committee of the house of delegates at Annapolis, in March of 1947.

Despite Mr. Perlman's appearance before the joint committee, the bills were passed and presented to Gov. William Preston Lane for his signature. The bills were not signed by the Governor; he vetoed them.

Mr. Perlman has been, for a considerable period of time, a close friend and adviser to Governor Lane, and in fact Governor Lane consulted Perlman on a number of matters that dealt with the Governor's legislative program. This relationship between Mr. Perlman and the Governor was well known throughout the State of Maryland.

Speculation is immediately invited as to the coincidence of Mr. Perlman's views and the Governor's views, both of which represented a minority view as far as the people of Baltimore and the State legislature were concerned, on the tax measures which were vetoed.

In this same connection Mayor Theodore R. McKeiton, of Baltimore, vehemently complained to the governor concerning the activities of Mr. Perlman, in a telegram which received wide circulation in the Baltimore papers. I quote from the Baltimore Sun:

"The mayor complains to Lane about the attorney for B. T. C. A telegram charging continued misuse of the prestige of the Governor's office by attorney of the Baltimore City Transit was received today by Gov. William Preston Lane from Mayor Theodore R. McKelton."

The mayor stated in his telegram:

"The continued misuse of the prestige of your office by the representatives of his corporation is a public scandal. You should not tolerate it."

As a side light on this case, it is significant to note that when the nominee made his appearance before the joint committee at Annapolis as an opponent to Senate bills 126 and 127, he was not registered under the legislative counsel statute of Maryland which is what is commonly known as the lobby law. In reply to questioning concerning this, the nominee expressed an opinion that, under that law, he was not required to register. The Maryland legislative counsel statute is very broad and quite extensive in its scope and it is my own opinion that he should have registered. (For reference, see Annotated Code of Maryland—Flack, vol. I, art. 40, secs. 4 through 13, attached hereto.)

In support of the contention that he was not liable for registration under the statute he was supported by an opinion written for him by the attorney general of the State of Maryland. This opinion was secured by writing a letter to the attorney general stating a set of facts, delivering it by messenger to the attorney general's office in Baltimore, and receiving on the next day an answer from the attorney general which was subsequently filed with the subcommittee. The very dispatch with which the opinion was rendered, to say nothing of the rather amazing feature of the highest legal authority of the State rendering an opinion on behalf of a private citizen as to whether that citizen was liable for a criminal prosecution, testifies significantly in the chairman's mind to the peculiar circumstances in which Mr. Perlman has established himself in his own political community.

It is to be noted further that, if the nominee is confirmed, he will occupy a position with regard to the Baltimore City Transit, which is similar in its inconsistency to that with the Baltimore & Ohio, for the reason that there is now pending a suit by the Department of Justice against the parent company of the Baltimore City Transit.

MARYLAND RACING COMMISSION

Sylvester Labrot and William L. Brann were the owners of certain racing stables in the State of Maryland. They were associated with certain persons, primarily trainers, for said stables. The trainers were charged by the racing commission with committing some illegal acts in the nature of stimulating or doping horses. The racing commission was considering the cancellation of the stable's license to race. Mr. Perlman represented these racing interests, first before the racing commission of Maryland, and later in the courts. The fee paid for these services was $12,500. This subcommittee had great difficulty in learning what the true facts were. Mr. Perlman obviously did not wish to disclose the fact that he had appeared before the commission, nor why he had appeared before it.

AUTOMATIC VOTING MACHINE CO.

Mr. Perlman's relations with the Automatic Voting Machine Co. comprise an interesting and enlightening combination of the elements that mark his practice on behalf of other clients. There is, first, the element of legislation, or action, by public officials necessary to accomplish the purposes of the client. Mr. Perlman is anomalously retained, or openly employed, as legal counsel, as the occasion seems to require. The necessary legislation is enacted, or official action taken. Mr. Perlman is, at all times, behind the scenes, and he does not appear in the customary legal procedures hearings. His fees are large, however, despite the ambiguous nature of his assignments and work. And in this particular case it is clearly evident that his fee is not a customary legal retainer but is, in fact, by way of a commission, contingent upon the success of the company in placing its machines after all legislative or legal barriers are removed.

The Automatic Voting Machine Co., of Jamestown, N. Y., sold in 1928 to the city of Baltimore 50 voting machines. This sale was on a rental-purchase agreement whereby the purchase price was to be amortized over a period of years with the city having the right to cancel the contract at any time, in which case the contract payments were to be considered as rental.

In 1932 the city of Baltimore did notify the company that it was canceling the contract. At this point the company retained Mr. Perlman and, on behalf of the company, he wrote a letter to the city forcefully stating reasons that the contract should not be canceled. The city then rescinded its cancellation of the contract, and continued to make payments under the rental-purchase agreement. This is the only occasion upon which he appeared publicly for the company.

No legal action was contemplated. This was another instance readily carrying the implication that Mr. Perlman conceivably could have used his influence with city officials to obtain a desired result.

The voting machine company was interested in retaining not only the contract for the 50 machines above referred to, but was further interested in installing its voting machines in the entire city of Baltimore, and in the entire State of Maryland. Before those purposes could be realized, however, a complicated gamut had to be run:

A holding of the highest court of Maryland (*Cotton* v. *Supervisors*, 164 Md. 1.) was to the effect that five voting machines must be installed in each and every voting precinct, where machines were to be used, a requirement which made general use of the machines impracticable because of their cost. It was therefore necessary to overcome this court ruling by a legislative act permitting the use of a lesser number of voting machines in each voting precinct. Such an act was passed by the legislature June 1, 1933, providing that not more than two voting machines need be used in any one polling place. On May 17, 1935, the State Legislature of Maryland enacted a provision which permitted the use of voting machines in certain election districts in the State of Maryland, outside the city of Baltimore. Further legislation was under date of March 24, 1937, and it enlarged the authority for the use of the voting machines then in the possession of the city of Baltimore, to elections other than those in which they had

been permitted prior to this time. This act also made certain other changes in the law, reducing the number of machines required to be used and establishing a new board with authority to purchase voting machines for all polling places in the city of Baltimore.

Pursuant to the foregoing statutory authority, which subsequently was sustained in court action, the election board of the city of Baltimore finally purchased, on behalf of the city, 910 voting machines from the Automatic Voting Machine Co. at a price of $752,524.50, later superseded by an amount of $827,144.50.

Mr. Perlman's place in the various legislative machinations, which cleared the way for the installation of the 910 voting machines, is not clearly shown in the record, notwithstanding prolonged examination of Mr. Perlman, although in a letter from Mr. Perlman to the voting machine company on July 5, 1935, he does state the following: "We obtained a special act of the legislature," referring to the legislation of May 17, 1935.

Mr. Perlman has testified that he was in consultation with the voting machine company throughout this period, but when any purely legal representation on behalf of the company was involved, he was conspicuously absent from the foreground.

Shortly after the award of the voting machine contract to the Automatic Voting Machine Co., legal action was instituted in the city of Baltimore wherein the validity of the contract was involved. Many appearances were necessary before courts and city boards in connection with this action. Although it was shown that Mr. Perlman appeared to be the company's general counsel in Baltimore at this time, he never appeared publicly before any board or court at any time, and although he received a larger fee than did the law firm of Armstrong, Machem & Allen, it was that firm which did all of the actual court work, and made all public appearances on behalf of the company. It was even shown that many of the necessary court appearances occurred within one city block of Mr. Perlman's office, yet he was not sufficiently concerned with this phase of the business to appear in these proceedings.

Russell F. Griffen, vice president of the Automatic Voting Machine Co., testified that Mr. Perlman did assist in the preparation of certain briefs which were filed in connection with some of the legal appearances. Mr. Perlman prepared a long brief to be filed with the attorney general of the State of Maryland. It was signed by the vice president of the corporation, it gave no evidence that it was the work of Mr. Perlman as an attorney for the company. Mr. Perlman's name was not attached to the briefs, to sustain his anonymity as far as public association with the company was concerned.

The reasons for this conspicuous attempt to avoid public association with the voting machine company gave rise to considerable speculation on the part of members of the subcommittee, and were never satisfactorily explained, although three reasons set forth by Mr. Griffen's testimony are enlightening either by their patent ostensibility or their implications: (1) The jealousy of Mr. Allen, of the law firm of Armstrong, Mechem & Allen, trial lawyers for the company; (2) the possible confusion of a judge that would result from the names of two parties, a law firm and Mr. Perlman, being attached to a brief; (3) the fact of the known friendship between Mayor Jackson, of Baltimore, and Mr. Perlman, which, it was stated by Mr. Griffen, might cause a rumor of undue influence on the part of Mr. Perlman with Mr. Jackson.

In connection with this latter reason, the exact testimony is as follows:

"Well, there is always this scurrilous propaganda to the effect that Mr. Perlman might use his influence wrongly with the mayor and other city officials."

And Mr. Griffen stated that he had heard such an accusation made frequently.

In all Mr. Perlman received in fees from the Automatic Voting Machine Co. a total of some $44,000. According to the findings of the subcommittee, payments were made as follows:

1.	Oct. 1, 1932	$4,000.00
2.	June 2, 1937	2,500.00
3.	Mar. 31, 1938	6,000.00
4.	Apr. 1, 1939	6,000.00
5.	Apr. 1, 1940	6,000.00
6.	Apr. 1, 1941	6,000.00
7.	Feb. 1, 1942	6,000.00
8.	Mar. 25, 1943	7,338.30

Mr. Perlman's bills to the company and the checks and vouchers from the company for the various payments of fees did not follow a uniform pattern. Statements and vouchers contained such phrases as the following:

"In accordance with our understanding;

"Services in connection with voting-machine contract;

"In connection with the proposed use of voting machines throughout the State of Maryland;

"On account;

"For the 1940 payment."

By reason of this varying method of handling the account, much time and testimony was required to determine the existing facts. Mr. Perlman testified that item 1, for $4,000, was for "services in getting the (1932) contract reinstated," and "to cover any other matters that might arise." Item 2 was, according to his bill, "To fee for services in connection with the voting machine contract, $2,500." In the face of the language of this bill it was Mr. Perlman's statement that the item was for services which included litigation in which he did not appear, and for work on "specifications, the proposed contract, and bond."

Items 3 through 7 represent what Mr. Perlman claimed to be an indefinite retainer "in relation to the installation and operation" of the voting machines. It is my opinion that the facts brought forth in the case do not support this contention.

A dated letter was produced by the subcommittee over the signature of an officer of the company informing Mr. Perlman that the company had received certain instructions from S. C. Hamilton, who was the company's agent in Maryland and who received 25 percent commission on all machines sold in Maryland, from which commission he was to pay all expenses incident to the sale and installation of machines in that State. A portion of this letter follows:

"He has instructed us * * * to withhold from amounts due to him from this company the sum of $24,000 which he has instructed us to pay to you for his credit as follows: On April 1, 1939, $6,000; April 1, 1940, $6,000; April 1, 1941, $6,000; and April 1, 1942, $6,000. His instructions to us specify that in the event of your decease prior to April 1, 1942, we are to pay your estate a lump sum of $17,500 less any of the above specified annual payments theretofore paid to you and less $1,000 paid to you for the account of Mr. Hamilton under date of March 29, 1938. That portion of the $24,000 otherwise payable in four annual installments remaining unpaid after such lump-sum settlement is to revert to the credit of Mr. Hamilton. Accordingly, this letter is notice to you that we will comply with the instructions of Mr. Hamilton by making payment to you for an amount as above specified."

At the bottom of this document was written "Accepted, Philip B. Perlman," in Mr. Perlman's handwriting, a fact which he substantiated although he stated at first that he could not recall such an agreement.

Attention is directed to the peculiar nature of this retainer, in that it constitutes an obligation to pay certain moneys to Mr. Perlman's estate, certainly not within the proper conception of a legal retainer.

It is particularly to be noted, also, that this document demonstrates that Mr. Perlman was not being paid by the company but actually that it was a person working on a commission for the company who was making the payments. A reason for such a roundabout manner of payment to Mr. Perlman, through an agent rather than by the company, was not explained. In the absence of satisfactory explanation it is not difficult for the chairman to deduce that this may have been a device to cloak the real nature of the relationship between Mr. Perlman and the Automatic Voting Machine Co.

The last amount paid, item 7, is of particular interest. The letter referred to states that payments were to cease with the 1942 amount. In 1941 and 1942 the company, as a matter of fact, had gone into war work and in 1943 had ceased to manufacture voting machines. But on March 25, 1943, an additional sum of $7,338.30 is set up by the company on its books for Mr. Perlman.

This figure of $7,338.30 is a total of two separate items appearing in the books, one of $1,579.50 and the other of $5,758.80. Now, two contracts had been entered into for the sale of voting machines in Montgomery County, Md., by the agent, Mr. Hamilton. It appears highly significant that the figure of $1,579.50 is exactly 5 percent of the amount of one of those contracts, and that the amount of $5,758.80 is just $150 more than 5 percent of the other contract. How to account for the $150? There also appears on the books an item for rent in connection with this second contract, amounting to $9,000. The additional $150 happens to be exactly one-third of 5 percent of that item.

The remarkable coincidence of these figures can only lead the chairman to the substantiation of a well-fixed impression that the nature of the annual retainer was really by way of a commission upon the sale of voting machines in Baltimore and the State of Maryland. What services Mr. Perlman rendered in these sales to justify the moneys paid to him have not been revealed.

CONCLUSIONS

The importance of the office to which Mr. Perlman has been nominated cannot be minimized. It is an office requiring the services of an individual whose stature and standing as a legal practitioner are beyond reproach.

The accumulation of evidence before the subcommittee in my opinion casts a serious cloud of reasonable doubt over the qualifications and fitness of Mr. Perlman for this high office. When such a reasonable doubt exists it is the opinion of the chairman that the public interest demands its acknowledgment.

The doubt here raised is of a kind not likely to be resolved by further investigation within the scope of the subcommittee. This subcommittee is charged only with the duty of inquiring into the qualifications of a nominee for public office in the United States Government. An investigation into undisclosed political, social, and contractual relations of the nominee with public and other officials cannot adequately be conducted within the limited powers, jurisdiction, and facilities of the Senate subcommittee.

In such circumstances it is for the members of the subcommittee to state on the facts adduced whether they believe the nominee to be fit for the office for which he has been proposed. In my opinion he is not so qualified and I cannot support the nomination.

APPENDIX I

ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND—FLACK, VOLUME I, ARTICLE 4, SECTIONS 4 THROUGH 13, INCLUSIVE

Employment of legislative counsel and agents and return of legislative expenses

Annotated Code—1924, section 4; 1912, section 4; 1904, section 4, 1900, chapter 328, section 4:

"4. Every person who employs or agrees to employ another to act as counsel or agent to promote or oppose in any manner, directly or indirectly, the passage by the general assembly of any legislation, or to act in any matter as a legislative counsel or agent in connection with any legislation shall within one week of the date of such employment or agreement therefor cause the name of the person so employed or agreed to be employed to be entered upon a legislative docket as herein provided, and it shall also be the duty of the person so employed or agreed to be employed to cause his name to be so entered or see that the same has been so entered upon such docket. Upon the termination of such employment such fact may be entered opposite the name of any person so employed, either by the employer or by the person so employed."

Annotated Code—1924, section 5; 1912, section 5; 1904, section 5; 1900, chapter 328, section 5:

"5. The Secretary of State shall prepare and keep two legislative dockets in conformity with the provisions of this subtitle. One of such dockets shall be known as that of 'legislative counsel,' and the other as that of 'legislative agents.' In that of legislative counsel shall be entered the names of counsel employed to appear at any hearings before the general assembly, or either branch thereof, or any committee thereof, for the purpose of making an argument or examining witnesses, and also the names of any regular counsel of corporations or associations who act or advise in relation to legislation, and in the docket of legislative agents shall be entered the names of all agents employed in connection with any legislation, and of all persons employed for other purposes who render any service as such agents. In such dockets there shall be entered the name and business address of the employer, the name, residence, and occupation of the person employed, the date of the employment or agreement therefor, the length of time that the employment is to continue, if such time can be determined, and the special subject or subjects of legislation to which the employment relates."

Annotated Code—1924, section 6; 1912, section 6; 1904, section 6; 1900, chapter 328, section 6:

"6. Any person employing any legislative counsel or agents shall, from time to time, as fast as subjects of legislation are introduced or arise which such counsel or agent is to promote or oppose, make or cause to be made additional entries under his or its name in the appropriate docket aforesaid, stating such special employment, and specifically referring to the petitions, orders, bills, or other subjects of legislation to which the same relates, and such entries shall also be made opposite to the name of such counsel or agents in such manner that the entries opposite the name of any employer shall show all the subjects of legislation in relation to which any counsel or agent is employed by him, and so that the entries opposite the name of every person employed shall show all the subjects of legislation with reference to which such person is employed. No person shall be allowed to appear as counsel before either branch of the general assembly or any committee thereof, in respect to any legislation, unless his name duly appears upon the docket of legislative counsel as employed in respect to such matters as above provided. No person shall, directly or indirectly, employ another as legislative agent in respect to any legislation, unless the name of the person so employed is duly entered upon the proper legislative docket as provided by this sub-title, and no person shall act in any manner as legislative counsel or agent in any respect to any legislation unless his name duly appears upon the proper legislative docket, as provided by this sub-title, as employed in connection with such legislation. No person shall be employed as a legislative counsel or agent for a compensation dependent, in any manner, upon the passage or defeat of any proposed legislation, or upon any other contingency connected with the action of the general assembly, or of either branch thereof, or of any committee thereof. No person whose name is entered upon the docket of legislative counsel shall render any service as such counsel otherwise than by appearing before the general assembly, or either branch thereof, or some committee thereof, and by doing work properly incident thereto, or by giving legal advice in the case of regular legal counsel of corporations or associations, unless his name is also entered on the docket of legislative agents."

Annotated Code—1924, section 7; 1912, section 7; 1904, section 7; 1900, chapter 328, section 7:

"7. The general assembly may provide by rules or otherwise for further regulating the employment of legislative counsel and agents, for the manner and form of keeping such legislative dockets, and for disbarring any person from employment in the capacity of a legislative counsel or agent: provided, that such person be allowed a hearing before a committee or otherwise, upon the question of such disbarment, and that cause be shown therefor. No person shall employ anyone as legislative attorney or agent within the period of 3 years after his disbarment, as above provided. Any person regularly or professionally employed as a legislative agent may cause his name to be entered upon a list of such agents, which shall be kept by the Secretary of State in connection with said docket. When any person is disbarred from employment as a legislative agent, as above provided, his name shall be stricken from such list and shall not again be placed thereon within the period of 3 years."

Annotated Code—1924, section 8; 1912, section 8; 1904, section 8; 1900, chapter 328, section 8:

"8. The legislative dockets shall be closed biennially upon the adjournment of the general assembly, and the docket for the ensuing 2 years shall then be opened. In the absence of rules made by the general assembly with reference to said dockets the Secretary of State may adopt such rules with reference thereto as may be proper under this subtitle."

Annotated Code—1924, section 9; 1912, section 9; 1904, section 9; 1900, chapter 328, section 9:

"9. Within 30 days of the adjournment of the general assembly every person whose name appears upon the legislative dockets of the previous 2 years as employing any legislative counsel or agent shall render to the Secretary of State a full, complete, and detailed statement sworn to before a proper officer, by the person making the same, or, if a corporation, by both president and treasurer, of all expenses paid or incurred by such person or corporation in connection with such employment of legislative counsel or agents, or in connection with promoting or opposing in any manner, directly or indirectly, the passage or defeat by the general assembly of any legislation within the terms of this subtitle; said reports shall be made in such form as may be indicated and approved by the Secretary of State, and shall be open to public inspection."

Annotated Code—1924, section 10, 1912; section 10; 1904, section 10; 1900, chapter 328, section 10:

"10. Legislative counsel or agents shall within 10 days of the date when their names are entered upon the legislative dockets, as required by this subtitle, file with the Secretary of State a written authorization to act as such counsel or agent, signed by the person for whom they claim to act."

Annotated Code—1924, section 11; 1912, section 11; 1904, section 11; 1900, chapter 328, section 11:

"11. The Governor, whenever any bill is presented for his approval, and he has reason to believe that in connection with the passage thereof by the general assembly improper expenses have been paid or incurred, may require any or all legislative counsel or legislative agents and their employers to render him forthwith a full, complete, and detailed statement duly sworn to, of all expenses paid or incurred by them, or either of them, as aforesaid."

Annoted Code—1924, section 12; 1912, section 12; 1904, section 12; 1900, chapter 328, section 12:

"12. Any person who shall violate any provisions of this subtitle shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and for each offense shall be fined not less than $100 nor more than $1,000, in the discretion of the court. Any person who shall act as legislative counsel or agent contrary to the provisions of this subtitle shall be likewise guilty of misdemeanor, and subject to a like fine, and shall also be disbarred from acting as such counsel or agent for a period of 3 years from the date of such conviction. It shall be the duty of the Attorney General, upon information, to bring prosecutions for the violations of this subtitle."

Annotated Code—1924, section 13; 1912, section 13; 1904, section 13; 1900, chapter 328, section 13:

"13. Nothing in this subtitle contained shall be construed to affect the employment by any municipality of its solicitor to represent it before the general assembly or any of its committees."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, when the Senate went into executive session it was my purpose that we proceed to consider the Perlman nomination first. I knew we would take some time on it by reason of the controversy involved. I believed that all other objected-to nominations should be passed over, but that unobjected-to nominations be confirmed before adjournment. That is the policy which I suggested to the Senate, and I think that policy should be pursued. I think we should vote on the nomination of Mr. Perlman, and I think that after that we should not remain here any longer or try to engage in all the other controversies that might arise over nominations on the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. For the benefit of the Senate, would the Senator from Ohio be willing to give the Senate the names of those to whom objection will be made?

Mr. TAFT. I do not know all. I know some. I do not think there are any objections to the postmasters and to the promotions in the military service or to the diplomatic service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understood that outside the nomination of Mr. Perlman

there were probably six others to whose names objection would be made.

Mr. TAFT. There are six others. The Senator is correct. So far as I know there are only six others.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I shall trespass for but a very few minutes on the time of the Senate. The occasion for my speaking at this moment is this: It has been my pleasure and privilege, as indicated a little while ago, to be a member of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate. I value the experience and the privilege and the opportunity to work with the Senators on that committee.

Mr. President, the nomination of Mr. Perlman was received, as I recall, some time in January. The members of the subcommittee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], were appointed by the chairman of the committee to consider the nomination. It was not my privilege to be on the subcommittee until some time in May, I think it was. There were one or two, or perhaps three, or thereabouts, of the earlier hearings at which it was not my privilege to be present because I was not on the committee. Thereafter I attended, I think, substantially all, and possibly all of them, and the hearings were very voluminous.

I want to take this opportunity of saying a word, if I may, with respect to the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who labored incessantly in the performance of his duties which, as the Senator who occupies the chair and the other Members of the Senate know, extend not only to his work on the Committee on the Judiciary but in various other directions. He works hard and honestly and skillfully. He came to the opinion, which he has now, after the utmost of careful, honest consideration of the issues involved.

Mr. President, I may say that as I see it, the question involved here is the fitness of Mr. Perlman for the office. As to his ability, I was impressed that he is a man of excellent ability. As to his experience, he has had a very considerable experience, although I may say, as did the chairman of the subcommittee, that some of his experience, as shown particularly from the evidence revolving around certain details into which we went, is not of a sort that particularly indicated the type of ability that one might want in the office of Solicitor General. But I believe from the evidence shown that Mr. Perlman, both from the point of ability and the point of experience, is able to perform satisfactorily the duties of Solicitor General.

This left the question of integrity. I want to say that I started out in this matter, when I began to analyze the fitness, with a presumption which I think any man is entitled to, of honesty and integrity, but I am very free to state that as the evidence progressed there were a number of circumstances which were of a nature that might well arouse and did arouse suspicion and question in my mind as we proceeded. But, Mr. President, as I applied the presumption of honesty and integrity, my ability to determine whether or not that presumption was overcome was aided by the fact that we received a considerable number of very strong recommendations, as for illustration from, as I recall, about nine past presidents of the Baltimore Bar Association, together with the commendation of numerous other persons. Those matters, as I say, enabled me to determine whether or not the presumption with which I had started should be relied upon.

I came to the conclusion after considering the evidence that in each of the cases which had aroused my suspicion the presumption, plus the corroboration from various persons whose views we had with respect to Mr. Perlman, enabled me satisfactorily to maintain the view that the man is entitled to the presumption of integrity and honesty.

So, without taking more of the time of the Senate, I may say that I voted in the Judiciary Committee, as a member of the subcommittee, and finally as a member of the full committee, and shall now vote, in favor of the confirmation of Mr. Perlman's nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Philip B. Perlman to be Solicitor General of the United States?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. The Senator from Indiana, if present and voting, would vote "nay," and the Senator from Mississippi, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] has a pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea" and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 21, as follows:

YEAS—58

Aiken	Hill	Myers
Baldwin	Hoey	O'Conor
Ball	Holland	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Ives	Pepper
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Chavez	Kilgore	Russell
Connally	Knowland	Smith
Cooper	Langer	Sparkman
Cordon	Lucas	Stewart
Donnell	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McFarland	Thye
Flanders	McGrath	Tydings
Fulbright	McMahon	Umstead
George	Magnuson	Watkins
Green	Martin	Wiley
Gurney	Maybank	Williams
Hatch	Millikin	
Hayden	Murray	

NAYS—21

Brewster	Ecton	O'Daniel
Bricker	Ferguson	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Hawkes	Taft
Butler	Kem	Vandenberg
Capehart	McCarthy	Wherry
Capper	Malone	White
Dworshak	Moore	Young

NOT VOTING—16

Bridges	Lodge	Taylor
Buck	McKellar	Tobey
Bushfield	Morse	Wagner
Eastland	Overton	Wilson
Hickenlooper	Reed	
Jenner	Saltonstall	

So the nomination was confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I shall take only a minute. First of all, I think I would be very ungracious if I did not thank the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] for his very fine and sportsmanlike remarks, which helped to clear the atmosphere and result in the nomination being considered on a basis devoid of any other consideration than the qualifications of the nominee. I am very grateful to him.

Mr. President, while I did not speak, and shall not now, in support of this nomination, I should like to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Mr. Frank R. Kent, concerning Mr. Perlman, an editorial from the Baltimore Sun urging that Mr. Perlman be confirmed by the United States Senate, and a resolution supporting Mr. Perlman, from the State bar association of Maryland, together with a list of 70 cases in which he has participated. None of them were in the United States district court or the circuit courts of Maryland, but were all in the circuit court of appeals, the Supreme Court of the United States, or the Supreme Court of the State of Maryland, which we call the court of appeals. These 70 cases, I think, will show the remarkable legal success and fitness of this candidate. I have no doubt in the world that when the score is finally written, Philip Perlman, from the standpoint of ability and

integrity, will rank equal with any Solicitor General this country has ever had.

There being no objection, the article, editorial, resolution, and list of cases were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of May 16, 1947]

MR. PERLMAN SHOULD BE CONFIRMED BY THE UNITED STATES SENATE

In an ideal world, perhaps, men who will take part in public affairs would have no interest whatever in private affairs. Specifically, Mr. Philip Perlman, the Baltimore lawyer whose nomination for Solicitor General of the United States is now before the Senate for confirmation, would have had no private clients. His extraordinary legal reputation would have been made solely on the basis of his disinterested and gratuitous advice to mayors, governors, and public officials generally.

But thoughtful people know that, in the real world, the man who devotes himself to the public service still has to have a private source of income. If he is a competent lawyer, his talents will be sought out by important corporate interests. Inevitably such corporate interests will have dealings with officials and legislative bodies. On occasion, such a lawyer will find himself facing a conflict of loyalties. Of course, it is not only lawyers who have such conflicts. Nearly every man who concerns himself, however indirectly, with public affairs, has to face such a conflict at one time or another.

The specific criticism made of Mr. Perlman before the Senate subcommittee now considering his appointment is that, while he was acting as adviser to Governor Lane at the last session of the general assembly, he was also representing the Baltimore Transit Co., which opposed certain measures up for passage. These measures were passed by the assembly but vetoed by Governor Lane. The inference is that Mr. Perlman improperly used his influence with the Governor and that his client, the transit company, thus benefited at the public expense.

The Sun is in a reasonably good position to comment on this criticism because it argued before the legislature in favor of the measures which the transit company opposed and later urged, however unsuccessfully, that Governor Lane sign them.

The important factor here is that there was no secrecy about what was going on. Mr. Perlman was openly representing the transit company in this matter. He and his clients had a case and, to many honest and disinterested citizens of the community, it was a good case. Punitive taxes on our public transport system could well harm all of us. The basic issue was whether the city be given larger taxing powers over the transit company or its powers should be limited. The Sun argued in favor of a greater measure of power for the city. The Governor decided in favor of restriction, presumably because Mr. Perlman and his clients presented a more convincing case.

It so happens that we still regard our position as the sounder one. But it is certainly no reflection on Mr. Perlman, nor on the Baltimore Transit Co., nor on the Governor, that their conclusion was different. Some United States Senators, coming from communities where the public utilities are still in the rapacious stage and where corruption is automatically suspected, may take another view. Undoubtedly some people in Maryland, too, suspect everyone who touches utilities. But our observation is that, in general, the local utilities are straightforward, lay their proposals frankly before the public, and abide by the decision reached. The community is reasonably certain that all concerned have acted in good faith.

Clearly that is the view entertained by the whole Maryland delegation in the Congress, both Democrats and Republicans, all of whom have testified to Mr. Perlman's character, as well as to his professional ability. It is our belief that the Department of Justice will be fortunate to command the services of so distinguished a lawyer.

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS

(By Frank R. Kent)

ANOTHER GOOD MAN

WASHINGTON, February 8.—Mention has been made in this space several times of a favored form of disparaging the Truman administration adopted by the more or less intellectual insiders of the former regime who now find themselves uncomfortably distant from the White House, personally and politically.

Evidence of their discontent is found in the persistent belittlement of Mr. Truman, personally, and the wide circulation given to the theory that he is unable to get good men to accept important posts under him or to keep those good men whom he found in high positions when he became President. They harp on Allen, Hannegan, and Vaughan, but ignore completely Forrestal, Patterson, Symington, Harriman, Gardner (whose sudden death was generally deplored), Wiggin, Brown, Ross, and Clifford.

Secretary of the Navy Forrestal and Secretary of War Patterson were inherited by Mr. Truman, but the others were brought in by him and they by no means sustain the contention that the personnel of the Government service has deteriorated and we are being ruled by a lot of Missouri mediocrities. To make this notion even reasonably plausible it is necessary also to ignore the appointment of General Marshall as Secretary of State and his prompt acceptance thereof. Certainly, all these are good men and it might also be mentioned that all of them are making financial sacrifices to serve in this administration.

And now President Truman has made it more difficult for these critics who insist on the low-level idea by appointing a very good man as Solicitor General of the United States—Mr. Philip B. Perlman, of Maryland. Mr. Perlman is an able and successful lawyer who is making a considerable financial sacrifice to take this position. He is a man of intelligence, character, and experience. He is not a politician, though he has been active in Democratic politics. He has filled a number of appointive public offices, including that of secretary of state of Maryland under the late Governor Ritchie, whose intimate friend he was, but has never sought an elective office for himself.

He is interested in art and early American architecture as well as the law, and rides horses without falling off. He used to play tennis, though not very well. He is a bachelor with no known bad habits. The post to which he has been named, next to the attorney generalship and the Supreme Court, is the highest a lawyer can hold in this country. It has been filled by a long line of distinguished lawyers, some of whom have been promoted to the Supreme Court. It is the most important Federal post to which any Marylander has been appointed in 40 years—since the late Charles J. Bonaparte was made Secretary of the Navy by Theodore Roosevelt. In addition to his other equipment, probably the best reason for believing Mr. Perlman will make a good Solicitor General is that an outstanding characteristic of his nature is industry. He really works.

At any rate, his selection makes the claim that it is impossible to get good men to enter this administration seem even sillier than before. The truth is that considering the natural reaction after the war, Mr. Truman has done exceedingly well in the matter of appointments. He has no more of which to be ashamed than his predecessor, and just as many of which to be proud. Take it all the way through, and the personnel in this administration compares favorably with that of the prewar period of the preceding one. The comparison during the war, when the whole governmental machine was immensely expanded and all a President had to do to bring anyone he wanted to Washington was to ask, is obviously unfair.

RESOLUTION BY THE MARYLAND STATE BAR ASSOCIATION ON THE NOMINATION BY PRESIDENT TRUMAN OF PHILIP B. PERLMAN TO BE SOLICITOR GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Whereas the President of the United States has nominated Philip B. Perlman, a member of the Maryland bar, to be Solicitor General of the United States; and

Whereas the members of this association desire to record their opinion of Mr. Perlman as a distinguished lawyer of wide learning, independent thought, and deep concern for the highest traditions of the legal profession, the fabric of whose life has been woven of a strong sense of civic responsibility and a devotion to the service of his city, his State, and his profession; as one who has been active in his contributions to the cultural world, through an intense interest in the arts; as a highly skilled writer and advocate, who has attained high legal office in Baltimore and in Maryland, and topmost rank in our profession: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Maryland State Bar Association at its midwinter meeting held in Baltimore on the 1st day of February 1947, That we extend to the President of the United States our deep sense of appreciation of the high honor paid to a fellow member of the Maryland bar, and to Mr. Perlman our warm congratulations and felicitations upon this appointment for which he is eminently qualified; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of this association is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, and the chairman and members of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate of the United States.

LIST OF CASES TRIED BY MR. PERLMAN IN APPELLATE COURTS—TRIAL COURT CASES NOT INCLUDED

Howard Travers, Pinkney Wilkinson, John Yake, et al. v. *Raymond C. Fogarty et al.*, (No. 29, October term, 1946, Court of Appeals of Maryland.)

W. L. Brann, Sylvester W. Labrot, Jr., et al. v. *George P. Mahoney, chairman, et al., constituting the Maryland Racing Commission.* (No. 170, October term, 1945, Court of Appeals of Maryland (48 At. 2d 605).)

Continental Miling & Feed Co. v. *Doughnut Corporation of America* (No. 148, October term, 1945, Court of Appeals of Maryland.)

Pearl Heaps, et al., constituting the Board of Trustees of the Employees' Retirement System of the City of Baltimore v. *Caroline C. Cobb* (185 Md. 392).

National Labor Relations Board v. *Baltimore Transit Co. et al.* (No. 5103, U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals, Fourth Circuit (140 Fed. 2d 51).)

Baltimore Transit Co. et al. v. *National Labor Relations Board Petition for writ of certiorari*, Supreme Court of the United States, October term, 1943 (321 U. S. 795).

M. Luther Pittman, Clerk of the Superior Court of Baltimore City v. *Housing Authority of Baltimore City* (180 Md. 457).

J. Millard Tawes, Comptroller of the State of Maryland v. *Home Owners Loan Corporation of Washington, D. C.* (180 Md. 401).

Eva L. Kornmann, Administratrix, etc. v. *Safe Deposit & Trust Co.* (180 Md. 270).

Mayor & City Council of Baltimore v. *Crown Cork & Seal Co.*, Circuit Court of Appeals, Fourth Circuit (122 Fed. 2d 385).

Raymond D. Matthaei v. *Housing Authority of Baltimore City et al.* (177 Md. 506).

Daniel Garner et al. v. *Augusta Garner et al.* (171 Md. 603).

Maryland Cooperative Milk Producers v. *C. Wilbur Miller* (170 Md. 81).

Selwyn W. Marcus v. *Wm. H. Hudgins* (168 Md. 79).

Mayor and City Council of Balto. v. *Hanover Shirt Co.* (168 Md. 174).

Augusta Garner v. *Daniel Garner* (167 Md. 423).

Wilson Line, Inc. v. *Herbert C. Brown* (164 Md. 698).

The Fleischmann Transportation Co. & Standard Brands, Inc. v. *Huldreich Egli* (163 Md. 663).

Mayor & City Council of Baltimore v. *Baltimore Steam Packet Co.* (164 Md. 284).

Sun Cab Co. v. *Wm. W. Cloud* (162 Md. 419).

Claiborne-Annapolis Ferry Co. v. *U. S. of A., Chesapeake Beach Rwy. Co. and Interstate Commerce Commission.* (Supreme Court of the United States; No. 454, October term, 1931 (285 U. S. 382).)

Walter F. Sowers et al. v. *Wm. A. McFarland et al.* (Affirmed by divided court. Court of Appeals of Maryland, No. 89, October term, 1931.)

Laura V. Schneider v. *Adeline Hasson* (Fred Batey) (161 Md. 547).

George A. Fuller Co. et al. v. *Clarence Elderkin* (160 Md. 660).

Bay Bridge Ferry Corp. v. *Co. Commissioners of Queene Anne's County, Maryland* (160 Md. 398).

Milestone System, Inc. v. *Katherine Gasior* (160 Md. 131).

H. W. Webb-Peploe v. *Isaac N. Cooper* (159 Md. 426).

S. J. Van Lill Co. v. *Frederick City Packing Co.* (155 Md. 303).

Henry G. Perring, et al. v. *Grand Jury of May, 1926* (152 Md. 616).

R. Walter Graham, Comptroller, etc. v. *Clay T. Joyce* (151 Md. 298).

Mary G. Tighe v. *Charles H. Osborne, etc.* (150 Md. 452).

State Tax Commission of Md. etc. v. *Eureka Life Ins. Co. of Balto.* (150 Md. 380).

Mayor & City Council of Baltimore v. *Bloecher & Schaff, Inc., et al.* (149 Md. 648).

St. Paul Building Co. v. *Mayor & City Council* (149 Md. 685).

South Balto. Co. v. *W. B. & A. Electric R. R. Co.* (149 Md. 678).

U. S. F. & G. Co., et al. v. *John E. Dempster* (150 Md. 235).

Mary G. Tighe v. *Charles H. Osborne, etc.* (149 Md. 349).

Tobias Linzey v. *Mayor & City Council* (149 Md. 39).

H. M. Rowe Co. v. *State Tax Commission of Md.* (149 Md. 251).

Mary H. Smith, et al. v. *Standard Oil Co. of N. J.* (149 Md. 61).

Edwin M. Wilmer v. *Herbert L. Grymes, etc.* (150 Md. 696) (unreported).

John Block, et al. v. *Mayor & City Council of Balto.* (149 Md. 39).

Morris Grossfield, et al. v. *E. Austin Baughman, etc.* (148 Md. 330).

Mayor & City Council of Balto. v. *Louis Fine* (148 Md. 324).

State Tax Commission of Md. v. *George M. Englar* (148 Md. 246).

Mayor & City Council of Balto. v. *Elmer M. Harper* (148 Md. 234).

Mayor & City Council of Balto. v. *Terio* (147 Md. 330).

Charles D. Gaither, etc. v. *Howard W. Jackson et al.* (147 Md. 655).

Mayor & City Council of Balto. v. *Herbert R. O'Conor, etc.* (147 Md. 639).

Roland R. Marchant et al. v. *Mayor & City Council of Baltimore* (146 Md. 513).

Edward S. Stanley v. *Mayor & City Council of Balto.* (146 Md. 277).

Mayor & City Council of Balto. v. *State of Maryland* (146 Md. 440).

Daniel Goldman v. *J. Frank Crowther, etc.* (147 Md. 282).

Board of Education of Balto. Co. v. *Wm. H. Hartmann et al.* (146 Md. 307).

State of Maryland v. *Isabella Rutherford* (145 Md. 363).

Fairmount Land Corporation v. *Mayor & City Council of Balto.* (145 Md. 391).

Canton Co. of Balto. v. *Daisy M. Seal* (144 Md. 174).

Sarah E. Brown et al. v. *Wm. A. Hogan* (138 Md. 257).

State of Md. v. *J. M. Seney Co* (134 Md. 437).

Industrial Corporation of Balto. City v. *State Tax Commission of Md.* (134 Md. 379).

Walter M. Newkirk v. *State of Maryland* (134 Md. 311).

Jones Hollowware Co. v. *Charles T. Crane, etc.* (134 Md. 103).

State Accident Fund v. *Julie Jacobs* (134 Md. 133).

Roy Ran v. *State of Maryland* (133 Md. 613).

Charles Basta v. *State of Maryland* (133 Md. 568).

Charles A. Morrow et al. v. *Thomas M. Arthur et al.* (134 Md. 182).

A. T. & T. v. *State Roads Commission of Md.* (134 Md. 11).

C. & P. Telephone Co. v. *State Roads Com. of Md.* (131 Md. 589).

W. S. Symington III et al. v. *State of Md.* (133 Md. 452).

Frederick W. Seibert v. *State of Maryland* (133 Md. 309).

Erba Armacost v. *State of Maryland* (133 Md. 289).

American Colonization Society v. *Ferdinand C. Latrobe, Je., et al.* (132 Md. 524).

Paul R. Burkenstine v. *State of Maryland* (131 Md. 691).

State of Md. v. *Dudley R. Hardesty* (132 Md. 172).

Royston W. Jones v. *State of Maryland* (132 Md. 142).

State of Md. v. *Paul Case* (132 Md. 269).

State of Md. v. *Edgar T. Mercer* (132 Md. 263).

State of Md. v. *Jacob S. Shapiro* (131 Md. 168)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I hope that the Senators will read the minority views of the Senator from Michigan on the question.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I omitted one thing which I should like to have printed in the RECORD. That is a report of some 100 cases of documentary evidence, so that those who are on the other side of the controversy may read it, if anyone cares to read it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object. I am sorry; but I think that would be burdening the RECORD. When we come back, if the Senator thinks the RECORD is not sufficiently complete, he can renew the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will resume the reading of nominations on the Executive Calendar.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Burton N. Behling, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. TAFT. I ask that that nomination go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be passed over.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the nominations of sundry postmasters.

Mr. TAFT. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. This morning the committee voted out 29 additional postmasters. We were unable to examine them until last night. I ask unanimous consent that the rule be suspended, that they be treated the same as if the names had been printed on the calendar, and that they be confirmed.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I should like to have the list read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read them.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Joseph John Miskavitch, Poquonock, Conn.; Cecil E. Rawls, Alachua, Fla.; Robert H. Morgan, Fort Ogden, Fla.; Jess Y. Shroyer, New Windsor, Ill.; Anna Belle L. Nuckolls, Blanchard, Iowa; Elvera E. Scott, Chapin, Iowa; Kenneth I. Morrow, Diagonal, Iowa; J. Edward McDermott, Jamaica, Iowe; Albert H. Mohr, Preston, Iowa; Earl E. Shelledy, Spirit Lake, Iowa; Zita L. Humbert, Volga, Iowa; Don J. Meggers, Walker, Iowa; George B. Kook, Wilton Junction, Iowa; Leola M. Many, Geismar, La.; Anna S. Daniel, St. Francisville, La.; Anna M. Lammers, Lismore, Minn.; Orlen C. West, Camdenton, Mo.; Paul W. Sugg, Bowmansville, N. Y.; Derrell B. Hogue, Stuart, Okla.; Fred Henry, Maryville, Tenn.; Lillie Waldine Reeves, Carlton, Tex.; Rosalind O. McFarland, Goldsmith, Tex.; Nellie F. Trask, Rochester, Vt.; Veri E. Barnes, Dixie, Wash.; Lewis E. Willey, Thornton, Wash.; Thomas E. Vinopal, Haugen, Wis.; Alvadore R. Harris, Kendall, Wis.; Joseph W. Szymanski, Marathon, Wis.; Leo E. Kostechka, Mishicot, Wis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the diplomatic and foreign service.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Philip L. Rice, of Hawaii, to be judge of the fifth circuit, Territory of Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles M. Eldridge to be United States marshal for the district of Rhode Island.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the nomination be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is passed over.

BUREAU OF MINES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James Boyd, of Colorado, to be Director of the Bureau of Mines.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the nomination be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I join in the request that the nomination of James Boyd to be Director of the Bureau of Mines be passed over. I do that not for any personal reason whatsoever, but solely on the ground of doubt as to whether this nominee is fitted for the position and whether he has had the training and experience to fill the position.

The position of Director of Mines is becoming an increasingly important one. More and more he is a director of safety in the mines of this country.

At this session we passed a law with respect to continuing mine inspection in the Bureau of Mines. That law did not contain all that I wanted it to contain, but it indicates that there is a continued interest by the Federal Bureau of Mines in mine inspection. There are approximately 820,000 miners in the Nation, and of that number approximately 400,000 are engaged in coal mining. The preservation of safety has become one of the foremost duties of the Bureau of Mines. I find that Mr. Boyd is absolutely devoid of any experience in the coal-mining industry.

I want to read two questions which he very frankly and fairly answered when he was before the committee. This question was asked by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]:

Senator MURRAY. Mr. Boyd, what study have you given to the coal-mining industry?

Mr. BOYD. Senator, I have never worked in the coal-mining industry directly. I have, as a member of the faculty of the Colorado School of Mines, been instrumental in training men who have gone into the coal-mining industry. I have been on inspection trips myself to various coal mines in the West. As I have said, we had direction of coal operations in Europe, and I know something of the operations there. I have never myself been engaged in the coal-mining industry.

And then this question was asked by the Senator from Montana:

Senator MURRAY. You admit that you are not familiar with the conditions in the coal mines in the country, especially here in the eastern section of the country.

Mr. BOYD. Senator, I admit that I have never been employed in coal mines. I have studied the situation for many years, and I know the basic problems in the coal-mining industry.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that more than half of the miners in this country are engaged in the mining of coal, and in view of the fact that the safety of those miners has become the primary duty and interest of the Federal Bureau of Mines, I feel that it is entirely fair to raise the question of the training and competency of Mr. Boyd to fill this position; and I join in the request that the nomination go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next nomination on the calendar.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the nominations of two members and the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the Labor Relations Board nominations go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] has additional nominations.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I submit the nominations of 120 captains, 307 first lieutenants, 123 lieutenant colonels, and also certain nominations in the Navy, and ask that they be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. TAFT. I ask that the President be notified of the confirmations in all of these instances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT
JANUARY 2, 1948

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in accordance with the terms of Senate Concurrent Resolution 33, adopted earlier today, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 50 minutes a. m., Sunday, July 27, 1947) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the provision of Senate Concurrent Resolution 33, to January 2, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 26 (legislative day of July 16), 1947:

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

James V. Forrestal, of New York, to be Secretary of Defense.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

John T. Jarecki, of Chicago, Ill., to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Illinois, in place of Nigel D. Campbell, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 26 (legislative day of July 16), 1947:

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

James V. Forrestal, to be Secretary of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Philip B. Perlman, to be Solicitor General of the United States.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

TO BE ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO RUMANIA

Rudolf E. Schoenfeld

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 6, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

John A. Bovey, Jr.
Ernest E. Ramsaur, Jr.
Miss Louise Schaffner
Richard W. Sterling
James R. Ruchti
Ralph S. Saul
Robert M. Winfree
Robert W. Zimmermann

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 2, CONSULS, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Charles F. Baldwin
John Lammey Stewart
Ben H. Thibodeaux

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 3, CONSULS, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Ralph B. Curren
Jerome T. Gaspard
Oscar E. Heskin
Philip W. Ireland

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 4, CONSULS, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Turner C. Cameron, Jr.
Harry Conover
Robert C. Creel
Ridgway B. Knight
Eric Kocher
William Henry Lawrence
Frank G. Siscoe

TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 5, A VICE CONSUL OF CAREER, AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

James R. Gustin.

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 6, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Robert A. Aylward
Howard L. Boorman
William D. Brewer
Edward West Burgess
Stephen A. Comiskey
William B. Dunn
Seymour M. Finger
Walter P. Houk
Vernon V. Hukee
Joseph E. Jacques
Robert L. James
Edward J. Krache, Jr.
Edward T. Long
Francis N. Magliozzi
Parke D. Massey, Jr.
Everett K. Melby
Alfred E. Moon
Curtis W. Prendergast
Herbert F. Propps
Lowell G. Richardson
Jordan T. Rogers
Howard René Stephenson
Kenneth P. T. Sullivan
Edward J. Trost
Wayland B. Waters

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Hon. Philip L. Rice to be judge of the fifth circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be dental director (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel)

William O. Boss.

To be temporary senior dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel)

George E. Waterman.

To be temporary senior assistant surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of captain)

Martin M. Cummings.

IN THE ARMY

Promotions in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 3 of an act of Congress approved July 31, 1935, as amended by acts of Congress approved June 13, 1940, and December 28, 1945:

(NOTE.—Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law.)

To be colonels

Manly Broadus Gibson, Coast Artillery Corps.
John Harold Keatinge, Field Artillery.
George Allan Miller, Infantry.
Stockbridge Carleton Hilton, Field Artillery.
William Russell Philp, Field Artillery.
George Anthony Horkan, Quartermaster Corps.
Charles Herman Unger, Cavalry.
Vennard Wilson, Cavalry.
Lewis Anderson Page, Infantry.
Alexander Oscar Gorder, Infantry.
Geoffrey Marshall, Chemical Corps.
Edward Maynard Fickett, Cavalry.
John Francis Roehm, Field Artillery.
Milo Victor Buchanan, Infantry.
Wilbur Reece McReynolds, Quartermaster Corps.
×Howell Redd Hanson, Field Artillery.
George Robert Hayman, Field Artillery.
Howard Everett Camp, Field Artillery.
James Couzens Van Ingen, Signal Corps.
Fred Currie Milner, Adjutant General's Department.
Charles Frost Craig, Infantry.
×Lloyd Smith Partridge, Field Artillery.
Karl Eugene Henion, Infantry.
Russell J. Potts, Infantry.
William Hoover Craig, Infantry.
Levi Monroe Bricker, Ordnance Department.
James Goulding Watkins, Field Artillery.
Christopher Columbus Strawn, Quartermaster Corps.
William Fulton Magill, Jr., Infantry.
Alfred Joseph de Lorimier, Cavalry.
Everett Busch, Quartermaster Corps.
James Taylor, Infantry.
Frank Joyce Pearson, Infantry.
Peter J. Lloyd, Infantry.
Theodore Morton Cornell, Infantry.
Paul Vincent Kellogg, Quartermaster Corps.
Herbert Ludwell Earnest, Cavalry.
Charles Spurgeon Harris, Coast Artillery Corps.
Arthur Richard Walk, Infantry.
Leslie Egner Toole, Infantry.
Paul Wolcott Rutledge, Coast Artillery Corps.
Ray Tyson Maddocks, Cavalry.
×Cecil Leland Rutledge, Infantry.
John Orland Lawrence, Cavalry.
John Johnson Albright, Infantry.
Alexander Adair, Infantry.
Harry John Collins, Infantry.
James Van Valkenburgh Shufelt, Cavalry.
Henry Paul Hallowell, Infantry.
Hobart Raymond Gay, Cavalry.
×Col. Thomas Jeffries Betts, Coast Artillery Corps.
Buhl Moore, Field Artillery.
Mordaunt Verne Turner, Cavalry.
Norman E. Waldron, Quartermaster Corps.
Adrian Robert Brian, Infantry.
Burton Loren Lucas, Infantry.
Morris Clinton Handwerk, Coast Artillery Corps.
George Stephen Wear, Infantry.
Walter Throckmorton Scott, Infantry.
John Wilson O'Daniel, Infantry.
×John Gilbert White, Field Artillery.
Stanley Joseph Grogan, Infantry.
Leonard Roscoe Crews, Coast Artillery Corps.
Warner Beardsley Gates, Air Corps.
Thomas Bennett Woodburn, Adjutant General's Department.
Charles William Higgins, Coast Artillery Corps.
Stanley French Griswold, Infantry.
Edmund Jones Lilly, Jr., Infantry.
Charles Edward Dissinger, Cavalry.
Cornelius Edward Ryan, Infantry.
Thomas Francis Bresnahan, Infantry.
Samuel White, Field Artillery.
Gilman Kimball Crockett, Infantry.
Wallace Alan Mead, Infantry.
Evans Read Crowell, Coast Artillery Corps.
Robinson Earl Duff, Infantry.
Irvine Callander Scudder, Infantry.
James Chester Bates, Coast Artillery Corps.
Harry Edmund Pendleton, Coast Artillery Corps.
×Paul Samuel Beard, Finance Department.
Edwin Allan Smith, Infantry.
Floyd C. Harding, Quartermaster Corps.
James Montagu Adamson, Quartermaster Corps.
Frank Albert Allen, Jr., Cavalry.
Bernard Franklin Hurless, Infantry.
Guy Orth Kurtz, Field Artillery.
Louis Joseph Compton, Field Artillery.
×Arthur Breckinridge Wade, Field Artillery.
John Hurst Rodmand, Infantry.
×Thomas Wade Herren, Cavalry.
William Emanuel Goe, Quartermaster Corps.
Alexander Bull MacNabb, Cavalry.
William Leonard Ritter, Infantry.
Kendall Jordan Fielder, Infantry.
Hugh Donald Adair, Infantry.
Joseph Robbins Bibb, Field Artillery.
Russell Conwell Snyder, Field Artillery.
James Tolmie Watson, Jr., Signal Corps.
Eugene Hill Mitchell, Infantry.
×John Wesley Russey, Field Artillery.
James Dennett McIntyre, Ordnance Department.
Bryan Lee Milburn, Coast Artillery Corps.
×Nyal L. Adams, Coast Artillery Corps.
Virgil Norberto Cordero, Infantry.
×Walter Shea Wood, Infantry.
×William Henry Quarterman, Field Artillery.
×Benjamin Brandon Bain, Infantry.
Stanton Louis Bertschey, Field Artillery.
Cheney Litton Bertholf, Adjutant General's Department.
×Ellsworth Young, Coast Artillery Corps.
Edward Reese Roberts, Field Artillery.
Albert Hugh Dumas, Infantry.
Robert Porter Bell, Infantry.
Edwin William Piburn, Infantry.
Kenneth Stoddard Whittemore, Infantry.
Jerry Vrchlicky Matejka, Signal Corps.
Frank Huber Partridge, Infantry.
×Derrill deSaussure Trenholm, Field Artillery.
Michael Edmond Halloran, Infantry.
Carl Julian Dockler, Cavalry.
Milton Heilfron, Coast Artillery Corps.
×Olin Coke Newell, Cavalry.
Paul Steele, Infantry.

(NOTE.—Dates of rank are omitted from this nomination. The nominees will be given dates of rank appropriate to the vacancies they will fill. The dates of rank are omitted in order to assure that the officers may be promoted to fill the vacancies on the proper date. If any of these officers should retire or die prior to promotion it would necessite renominating the remaining officers in order to change their dates of rank to correspond with the vacancies.)

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To Adjutant General's Department

Col. Ralph Parker Eaton
Maj. Herbert Volvenelle Mitchell
Capt. Edward Montague Blight
Capt. Milton Robert Blum
Capt. Lloyd Woodrow Cassell
Capt. William Melville Gold
Capt. Edward Milton Miller
Capt. Frederick Alton Sturm
Capt. James Wells Utterback

To Chemical Corps

Capt. Kenneth William Copeland

To Infantry

Maj. Richard D. Boerem
Maj. Norman Mahlon Winn
First Lt. Fred DeMasse Clarke, Jr.
First Lt. Edward Martin Minion, Jr.

To Air Corps

Maj. Leo Isaac Herman
Capt. Richard Leofric Temple
First Lt. William Paul Fife
First Lt. George Lamar Jones
First Lt. Robert Louis Lansche
First Lt. William Pinkley Riddling
First Lt. George Kitchen Smith
Second Lt. Clyde Barton Smith

APPOINTMENT IN THE OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 37 OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT AS AMENDED

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Edward Sedley Bres
Maj. Gen. Harry Hawkins Vaughan

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Andrew Frank McIntyre
Col. Benjamin Franklin Riter
Brig. Gen. Herbert Norman Schwarzkopf

To be brigadier generals, honorary reserve

Brig. Gen. Carlton Spencer Dargusch
Col. John Thomas Taylor

The following-named persons, under the provisions of an act of Congress approved April 16, 1947 (Pub. Law 36, 80th Cong.) fo. appointment in the Regular Army in the Army Nurse Corps in the grade specified, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of War pursuant to provisions of the mentioned act:

To be captains

Pauline E. Adams, N724078.
Lois H. Alfred, N703039.
Edith A. Aynes, N702750.
Mescal Baker, N702896.
Carrie E. Barrett, N702856.
Mary C. Bateman, N702880.
Martha L. Benston, N703913.
Irene C. Blochberger, N702966.
Ruby G. Bradley, N702770.
Marie E. Bradsher, N726626.
Eileen W. Brady, N702681.
Margaret N. Brannon, N702777.
Minnie L. Breese, N702914.
Margaret M. Bresnahan, N726000.
Kilie E. Bridger, N702758.
Ruby F. Bryant, N702771.
Nora P. Capps, N702430.
Minnie L. Carr, N702899.
Beatrice E. Chambers, N703354.
Margaret C. Creeden, N703851.
Thelma Crowell, N703092.
Mary K. Cuppy, N702845.
Caroline Davis, N703582.
Kathryn L. Dollason, N702897.
Eileen E. Donnelly, N702935.
Fannie C. Easley, N702634.
Alma O. Eidsaa, N736013.
Sara W. Entrikin, N702918.

Claretta Evans, N703808.
Frances Ewing, N702648.
Dorothy B. Fels, N722154.
Catherine M. Flatley, N702785.
Mary M. Flowers, N730314.
Lillian C. Girarde, N703461.
Laura E. Goodale, N702763.
Alice E. Greenawalt, N702865.
Edith S. Grimes, N702837.
Francis C. Gunn, N702741.
Margaret Harper, N736343.
Kathleen Harris, N702842.
Inez Haynes, N702718.
Bernice M. Hill, N702658.
Priscilla C. Hill, N703746.
Lorena Hoffman, N702895.
Luluah Y. Houseknecht, N730175.
Virginia Hughes, N703345.
Rhoda U. Jahr, N703290.
Naomi J. Jensen, N702632.
Elizabeth N. Johnson, N702768.
Katharine V. Jolliffe, N702532.
Doris A. Kenoe, N702816.
Laura C. Kelley, N702540.
Clara M. Kiely, N703302.
Marguerite M. Klein, N703004.
Anna Koltvet, N703472.
Helen A. Kornfeind, N703377.
S. Margaret Kowaleski, N730182.
Marilyn Kroll, N702931.
Agnes E. Kutac, N702686.
Harriet G. Lee, N703313.
Mary G. Lehr, N702907.
Margaret L. Lomen, N703602.
Agatha M. Martin, N702882.
Isabelle A. C. Mason, N703721.
Dorothy L. Matlock, 703561.
Pauline E. Maxwell, N703392.
Zita L. McCloskey, N703123.
Daisy M. McCommons, N702872.
Inez V. McDonald, N702933.
Hortense E. McKay, N702838.
Kathleen L. McNulty, N702800.
Elizabeth E. Mettie, N728218.
Helen E. Miller, N702862.
Anna E. Miser, N732020.
Eileen K. Murphy, N702949.
Ruth S. Murphy, N704101.
Frances L. Nash, N702827.
Esther V. Newkirk, N703731.
Lucile Newton, N703678.
Dorothy J. Odell, N730008.
Lily M. Ogden, N703208.
Marie L. Pace, N700552.
Ida E. Peschon, N702839.
Jeaninne H. Peterson, N736511.
Isa G. Pifer, N702782.
Helen Porter, N703885.
Mary F. Prucha, N702603.
Erma J. Rabou, N702819.
Clara M. Rachuig, N703247.
Ida S. Rider, N703122.
Rowena G. Roach, N703308.
Alice J. Robbe, N702736.
Miron L. Robbins, N702941.
Miriam C. Schaupp, N726364.
Ruth M. Schwing, N702805.
Vera F. Shaw, N702938.
Edith L. Shutt, N703523.
Ada M. Simpson, N702610.
Helene F. Sorensen, N702675.
Pearl Spearnak, N702873.
Helen A. Stack, N703024.
Mary M. Steppan, N703082.
Katrine F. Stone, N703196.
Mabel G. Stott, N702712.
Ruth M. Straub, N702908.
Anna C. Sweeny, N724481.
Edna Treager, N702677.
Mildred Turner, N702925.
Cathern M. Ullom, N702590.
Madeline M. Ullom, N703031.
Artie M. Ussery, N703987.
Audrey Van Zandt, N702932.
Alice N. Waddill, N722326.
Mary M. Wagener, N703620.
Edith M. Wimberly, N703069.
Dora E Witte, N734488.
Kathryn G. Witter, N702716.
Marian York, N702451.
Dorothy N. Zeller, N702879.
Verena M. Zeller, N702847.

To be first lieutenants

Gertrude F. Allen, N703431.
Katherine V. Allen, N703728.
Virginia E. Anderson, N703621.
Myrtle E. Arndt, N703482.
Elizabeth Artz, N703926.
Lillie Avirett, N703991.
Mary C. Axmann, N703672.
Rosalie Bacior, N703829.
Mary E. Baggett, N703206.
Louise Bainbridge, N703389.
Ann B. Bakalar, N704024.
Katherine Ball, N703396.
Grace I. Bender, N728509.
Maude Benedict, N703115.
Anne A. Benton, N703049.
Bonnie J. Best, N704125.
Margaret N. Bishop, N736179.
Edith I. Blennerhassett, N720321.
Catherine G. Boles, N736192.
Mary R. Bonner, N703557.
Betsy Bradford, N720121.
Aileen E. Brimmer, N704070.
Juanita M. Bronson, N703183.
Frances L. Bryant, N703144.
Muriel Burchfield, N703460.
Lottie B. Burk, N703815.
Barbara P. Burnham, N704105.
Grace I. Burrus, N725062.
Ethel Burton, N722437.
Sara C. Butts, N703163.
Laura P. Byrne, N703444.
Helen E. Cameron, N703635.
Lilah M. Cameron, N703282.
Ruth L. Cameron, N704095.
Violet R. Campbell, N703159.
Peggy G. Carbaugh, N722000.
Eva L. M. Carter, N726533.
Eleanor Cassidy, N704137.
Jane C. Chadwick, N730019.
Rebecca Chamberlin, N703707.
Ruth E. Church, N730312.
Elsie M. Clise, N703619.
Barbara A. Clymer, N703770.
Madeleine D. Cochick, N703758.
Ethel Barbara Colahan, N724648.
Florence B. Combs, N703395.
Florence T. Connell, N703305.
Margaret E. Connor, N724079.
Hazel V. Cooley, N703914.
Catherine V. Coyne, N703221.
Ellen G. Crigler, N724018.
Lillie U. Crow, N703228.
Ruth L. Crowell, N704121.
Margaret P. Culbreth, N703440.
Lois B. Cullmann, N730015.
Elizabeth A. Darden, N702992.
Gertrude G. Davidson, N734348.
Kathleen E. Davis, N736753.
Bernice Y. Deason, N703414.
Grace Delaney, N728160.
Jewell Derryberry, N703012.
Lucretia M. de Schweinitz, N704009.
Grova N. Dickson, N734118.
Louise E. Dittmar, N703617.
Helen L. Doll, N704085.
Rhoda E. Donahoe, N730774.
Mary E. Donovan, N703280.
Kathryn M. Doody, N703477.
Annie M. Dorset, N724049.
Anna J. Dorsey, N728192.
Magdalene Drozd, N703109.
Mamie Dumas, N703309.
Claire P. Egan, N720151.
Naidene D. Evans, N703417.
Bessie Facuna, N703291.
Eleanor H. Faulk, N726369.
Ruth A. Fisher, N703420.
Hallie E. Fondren, N734156.
Marie E. Frese, N734259.
Marie C. Gaddis, N704039.
Florine T. Gallagher, N703243.
Mabel Galvin, N703875.
Helen L. Gardner, N703215.
Helen M. Garrison, N703355.
Julia F. Gawarecki, N722258.
Pauline H. Girard, N703489.
Rena M. Godwin, N703886.
Edith A. Graham, N703667.
Barbara A. Grass, N703732.
Pauline W. Grier, N703536.
Hortense S. Groh, N703107.
Revella Guest, N703126.
Estella M. Guilliams, N703566.
Martha C. Habib, N703276.
Louise M. Hackfort, N703137.
Geraldine C. Haglund, N726463.
Ruby M. Hammond, N704126.
Inez Harris, N703071.
Helen M. Heinrich, N703216.
Nellie L. Henley, N704097.
Helen M. Hennessey, N703674.
Elma E. Hennies, N732669.
Leona M. Henry, N703507.
Jane E. Herrin, N703718.
Irene S. Hertsgaard, N703920.
Sue I. Hester, N726232.
Estaiene L. Holloway, N703973.
Sarah B. Holmes, N728056.
Eugenie L. Holzknecht, N728067.
Hallie E. Hoover, N734199.
Frances L. Hubbard, N704083.
Maude A. Hudson, N703467.
Fay J. Hutton, N703517.
Ann T. Hyland, N704023.
Rose A. Iannotta, N703999.
Albert T. Ingram, N703607.
Velma V. Jablunovsky, N704027.
Cecilia P. Jamula, N704093.
Bertha K. Janas, N704089.
Kazmiera A. Jeffer, N703210.
Leda E. Jelinek, N736274.
Bernice C. Johnsen, N736364.
Dorothy M. Johnson, N736820.
Mary E. Jones, N703922.
Florence E. Judd, N730212.
Katherine R. Jump, N724462.
Evelyn A. Kackman, N703888.
Theresa E. Kaufmann, N734427.
Alice E. Keisker, N722312.
Bertha I. Kellogg, N703865.
Evelyn A. Kelly, N703202.
Leila Kemp, N703831.
Josephine C. Kennedy, N720155.
Violet L. Keniston, N720224.
Blanche M. Kiernan, N703174.
Mary C. Kin, N730024.
Helen W. King, N703356.
Mary L. King, N703259.
Olive P. King, N722217.
Ruby L. Kinnaird, N732604.
Lois F. Kinnison, N703725.
Kathryn M. Kirkhoff, N724124.
Elizabeth A. Korn, N732117.
Dorothy E. Kraftschenk, N730460.
Sylvia May Kronemeyer, N730334.
Kathryn J. Kulig, N728134.
Marjorie W. Kydd, N703609.
Phyllis M. La Conte, N720507.
Marion L. Lamoreau, N703686.
Viola H. Laurie, N703869.
Mildred M. La Velle, N728072.
Frances I. Lay, N703161.
Beata M. Lieske, N703469.
Edna J. Linn, N703241.
Wealthy F. Litton, N703928.
Marie L. Lockhart, N704045.
Loretta L. Lokuta, N722137.
Esther M. Long, N734404.
Ruby E. McCain, N734492.
Iola R. McClellan, N703592.
Shirley M. McCorquodale, N703269.
Margaret M. McCray, N703903.
Dorothy R. McDermott, N703193.
Martha A. McFadden, N732133.
Sadie L. McGibboney, N703263.
Barbara R. McGill, N703948.
Mary A. McGill, N703785.
Marguerite M. McGrath, N730356.
Margaret J. McNulty, N720629.
Doris Maness, N703724.
Julia M. Martin, N703297.
Lorraine H. Martin, N703741.
Mary L. Martin, N736388.
Marian E. Martini, N736315.
Louise M. Mateer, N722585.
Helen G. Meikle, N703357.
Edith M. Mercer, N728467.
Elizabeth T. Merscher, N703372.
Dorothy L. Meyer, N703346.
Irene E. Micklick, N703603.
Annie M. Mills, N704111.
Marjorie Mirkin, N720501.
Jane E. Mobley, N703736.

Gladys Moore, N726197.
Lillian E. Moore, N703918.
Elsie Morgan, N704100.
Mary S. Morris, N703459.
Goldie Morrison, N703856.
Helen E. Morrison, N722138.
Doris V. Murchison, N704038.
Martha E. Nash, N703627.
Dorothy M. Newcomb, N703154.
Pearl G. Nicolls, N703081.
Evelyn M. Oberkirch, N722593.
Maureen P. O'Dwyer, N728114.
Lucille J. Orcutt, N703840.
Cora C. Overberger, N730339.
Philomena A. Pagano, N703390.
Jamie F. Palm, N722122.
Eunice P. Panzeri, N703963.
Mildred G. Parish, N732236.
Edna M. Parker, N726118.
Jean L. Parks, N736352.
Josephine C. Parrish, N703399.
Evelyn M. Patterson, N722105.
Macie E. Paul, N726061.
Phoebe M. Paul, N703409.
Florence M. Pecora, N704018.
Barbara H. Pensinger, N703817.
Sally M. Perkins, N703775.
Rosemary L. Perry, N704145.
Elizabeth A. Pesut, N703098.
Pauline F. Peterson, N732351.
Beatrice L. Pilgrim, N703932.
Flora V. Pittman, N703485.
Sarah M. Pollock, N703233.
Vivian R. Pool, N734250.
Katherine M. Powell, N736350.
Ethelyn M. Preecs, N703700.
Gladys E. Prestwood, N726184.
Margaret M. Price, N703325.
Cunegundes J. Przybilla, N703989.
Doris M. Quinn, N703825.
Jean C. Rancolita, N704012.
Berneice B. A. Rappath, N732496.
Katherine C. Reed, N703734.
Mary F. Render, N703883.
Mary J. Rappak, N703227.
Marguerite C. Reutenauer, N703893.
Helen V. Richardson, N703710.
Edith V. Richman, N703541.
Martha Rifkin, N722674.
A. Inez Robinette, N726338.
Roberta M. Robinson, N703862.
Luella Rodenburg, N703651.
Agnes C. Roesle, N724000.
Theda W. Rogers, N703947.
Geraldine Rollins, N726337.
Josephine B. Rosicky, N704077.
Edna E. Ross, N703671.
Ramona M. Saar, N703957.
Wilma K. Sandberg, N703841.
Helen F. Sanderson, N704056.
Anna K. Schelper, N734048.
Elizabeth V. Schnebly, N703692.
Foy M. Scott, N703688.
Frances E. Scott, N734137.
Bernice M. Sebelien, N732618.
Marjorie Seekins, N720094.
Gertrude C. Seibert, N703568.
Azile Self, N703995.
Virginia M. Sessoms, N703162.
Elizabeth E. Shepherd, N703358.
Mary R. Sheppard, N726157.
Helen M. Shivers, N703792.
Gwendolyn M. Sickles, N734021.
Regina M. Sieleni, N703675.
Bernice C. Simmet, N730161.
Itaska Simmons, N734183.
Sophia C. Skiba, N724517.
Emma R. Smart, N703165.
Mildred E. Smith, N703465.
Agnes C. Sokol, N728353.
Grace H. Stakeman, N728577.
Joan M. Steen, N724900.
Mary F. Steuart, N703961.
LaVerne U. Stievenart, N703451.
Harriet A. Stover, N724314.
Kathryne C. Stuwe, N703419.
Marie E. Sutliff, N703649.
Alice O. Swenson, N703933.
Stella M. Sylak, N703535.
Ruth P. Taylor, N703178.
Madge M. Teague, N742092.
Mollie A. Tewell, N703496.
Jean D. Tewksbury, N730138.
Ida M. Thompson, N730080.
Joyce A. Thornton, N703895.
Elizabeth J. Thurness, N728169.
Evelyn F. Tinkle, N703542.
Margaret E. Tollefson, N703274.
Mary P. Toudouze, N734494.
Estelle M. Travers, N703213.
Ruth E. Tregea, N703203.
Marjory E. Truax, N722056.
Anne A. Tyler, N704019.
Eula M. Umbarger, N703866.
Mary T. Votava, N703436.
Joella Wallace, N703404.
Mary A. Ward, N703870.
Lelia H. Watson, N726335.
Ruth V. Watson, N720055.
Kathleen Waugh, N703108.
Betty J. Weddell, N703248.
Irene Wertenberger, N734489.
Ada V. Wester, N704146.
Gertrude E. Wuerdinger, N703590.
Mary H. White, N703427.
Geraldine Whitehurst, N703781.
Dorothy E. Whitsell, N703848.
Virginia M. Wickensheimer, N703511.
Kathryn H. Williams, N703366.
Margaret L. Willis, N703777.
Lucille A. Wilson, N722025.
Doris M. Yeasted, N703257.
Eunice F. Young, N703199.
Mary M. Younger, N703923.

IN THE NAVY

RETIRED LIST

Rear Adm. Thomas L. Gatch, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Juanita A. Dinkel, Georgetown.
Plummer R. Walsh, Oroville.
Frances S. Armstrong, Pala.
Clara E. Coker, Stevinson.
Richard D. Bricker, South Pasadena.
Robert J. Blaney, Weaversville.

CONNECTICUT

Joseph John Miskavitch, Poquonock.
Frederick J. Whelan, Greenwich.

DELAWARE

Albert Bradford Carter, Camden.

FLORIDA

Cecil E. Rales, Alachua.
Robert H. Morgan, Fort Ogden.
Carl C. Mueller, Limona.

GEORGIA

Raymond T. Sills, Brookhaven.
Nell V. Devine, Fort Screven.
Horace V. Wells, Hinesville.
Adrian L. Anglin, Lumpkin.
K. Elwyn Titshaw, Pitts.

GUAM

Thomas R. Santos, Guam.

HAWAII

Eva R. Andrade, Haiku.
Fred S. Abe, Hawaii National Park.

IDAHO

Laura B. Campbell, Anderson Dam.

ILLINOIS

Harry M. Ostrander, Harmon.
Beulah V. O'Donnell, Martinton.
Emileen Grafton, Metcalf.
Jess Y. Shroyer, New Windsor.
C. Edgar Carlson, Wheaton.
Ruth F. Vermillion, Wood Dale.

INDIANA

Dean Wallace Simpson, Glenwood.
William Rollings, Tipton.

IOWA

Sam M. Childs, Atlantic.
Anna Belle L. Nuckolls, Blanchard.
Elvera E. Scott, Chapin.
Kenneth I. Morrow, Diagonal.
Raymond W. Meinert, Durant.
J. Edward McDermott, Jamaica.
Elmer A. Jacobson, Larrabee.
Stella P. Mulholland, Malvern.
Arnold L. Garnass, Manly.
Frederick G. Nicklaus, Parkersburg.
Clara Hamann, Persia.
Clyde M. Maulsby, Plover.
Albert H. Mohr, Preston.
Richard M. Leeper, Redfield.
Earl E. Shelledy, Spirit Lake.
Marvin O. Larson, Thompson.
Zita L. Humbert, Volga.
Don J. Meggers, Walker.
Lowell D. Rothbart, Wheatland.
George B. Kook, Wilton Junction.

KANSAS

Freda M. Stiles, Derby.
Henry B. Schmidt, Elbing.
William C. Edwards, Jewell.
Robert E. Hultgren, Marquette.
Mary E. Babcock, Welda.

KENTUCKY

William A. Rambo, Stanford.
Raymond N. Tackett, Virgie.

LOUISIANA

Leola M. Many, Geismar.
Willard M. Elliott, Grayson.
Roland E. Daigre, Plaquemine.
Clement Steinacker, St. Benedict.
Anna S. Daniel, St. Francisville.

MASSACHUSETTS

Hattie A. Wilson, Bryantville.
Myrtle S. Nickerson, Cotuit.
George F. Swansey, Hyannis.
Robert F. Madsen, Southampton.
John J. Moriarty, Ware.
Dominic J. Kenney, West Medway.

MICHIGAN

Frederick O. Mistell, Baldwin.
Leo L. Corbett, Blissfield.

MINNESOTA

Lillie C. Bodey, Brimson.
Sadie E. Brooker, Gheen.
Anna M. Lammers, Lismore.
Julia S. Perala, Makinen.
Neil E. Stone, Solway.
Leo H. Lorenz, Watkins.
Freda M. Levin, Zim.

MISSISSIPPI

Thomas L. Simpson, Fernwood.
Inez Hiller, Calhoun City.
Oscar W. Thomas, West.

MISSOURI

Orien C. West, Camdenton.
Don D. Graves, Nevada.

MONTANA

Ruby Dunning, Ashland.
Arvilla B. Reed, Coram.
Robert J. Armont, Geyser.
Jessie C. Martin, Harrison.
Olga S. Dahl, Stockett.
John J. Cernik, Trout Creek.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Alice L. Myers, Jaffrey.

NEW JERSEY

Luther Headley, Green Village.
Hanna C. Cochran, Jobstown.
William H. Fraser, Metuchen.

NEW YORK

Paul W. Sugg, Bowmansville.
Hubert I. Raynor, Remsenburg.
Raymond F. Pafunda, Voorheesville.
William V. Colange, West Shokan.

NORTH CAROLINA

Ben S. Houston, Mooresville.
Elsie A. Paisley, Sedalia.
George Isham Henderson, Tryon.
F. Earl Auman, West End.

NORTH DAKOTA

Eleanor M. Ryan, Sterling.

OKLAHOMA

Frank H. Stockton, Bethany.
George R. McConnell, Delaware.

Ernest B. Simpkins, Jennings.
Brownie C. Sparks, Maysville.
Charles C. Nida, Orlando.
Derrell B. Hogue, Stuart.
Sherban H. Fisk, Walters.
Joe Edwin Ewers, Welch.

OREGON

Etta Owens Goudy, Wedderburn.

PENNSYLVANIA

Mary J. Krohn, Andalusia.
Dean F. Wagner, Coalport.
Leonard A. Hampton, Holicong.
Warren B. Benscoter, Ingomar.
Nicholas S. Favo, Jr., Oakmont.
Georgeanna Garbinsky, Smithmill.
Irene Josephson, Tamiment.
John W. Venables, Tarentum.
Charles W. Hess, Three Springs.
Charles O. Barry, Wiliamstown.
Lee E. Roeder, Zionsville.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Lottie O. Thornton, Enoree.
Clarence E. Catterton, Ridgeland.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Pearl P. Beenings, Monroe.

TENNESSEE

Fred Henry, Maryville.

TEXAS

Sal Alvin Armstrong, Bigwells.
Bernice Gates, Flomot.
Mary C. Braden, Nada.
Lillie Waldine Reeves, Carlton.
Rosalind O. McFarland, Goldsmith.
Rebecca Sewell, Wills Point.

VERMONT

Nellie F. Trask, Rochester.

WASHINGTON

Veri W. Jaeger, Dixie.
Lewis E. Willey, Thornton.

WEST VIRGINIA

Clifton George Bowers, Hollidays Cove.
James R. Judge, Pine Grove.

WISCONSIN

Frederick W. Barnes, Black Earth.
Edna M. Reynolds, Cottage Grove.
Ruth E. Score, Elk Mound.
William C. Carroll, Gays Mills.
Florence D. Cychosz, Heafford Junction.
Thomas E. Vinopal, Haugen.
Alvadore R. Harris, Kendall.
Joseph W. Szymanski, Marathon.
Leo E. Kostechka, Mishicot.
Donald B. Prehn, Spencer.
Ann O. Ball, Tomahawk.
Helen P. Ouellette, Townsend.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, JULY 26, 1947

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou infinite and eternal God, through whose mercies we are spared and by whose power we are sustained, on this day of adjournment we would render unto Thee the tribute of our heartfelt gratitude. Hitherto Thou hast blessed us and we have found Thee faithful unto all Thy promises.

We pray that Thou wilt bestow the benediction of Thy peace and the diadem of Thy praise, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant," upon our President, our Speaker, the chosen Representatives of our Republic, and all who have served our beloved country during this session of Congress in whatever capacity.

We commend and commit one another to the guiding and providing spirit of our Heavenly Father, for whom there is no darkness and no distance, with whom there are no setting suns or ebbing tides, and from whom neither time nor space can ever separate us.

May the Lord bless us and keep us; the Lord make His face to shine upon us and be gracious unto us; the Lord lift upon us the light of His countenance and give us peace.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 642. An act for the relief of Frank F. Miles;

H. R. 1648. An act for the relief of Willie P. Goodwin, J. M. Thorud, and W. H. Stokley;

H. R. 1791. An act for the relief of Dr. Theodore A. Geissman;

H. R. 2432. An act for the relief of Harry V. Ball;

H. R. 2534. An act for the relief of James H. Underwood;

H. R. 2776. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 3546. An act to amend section 200 of Public Law 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, June 29, 1936, to permit recognition of officers and enlisted men retired from the military and naval forces of the United States as representatives of certain organizations in the presentation of claims to the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 4075. An act to regulate commerce among the several States, with the Territories and possessions of the United States, and with foreign countries; to protect the welfare of consumers of sugars and of those engaged in the domestic sugar-producing industry; to promote the export trade of the United States; and for other purposes;

H. R. 4257. An act to provide an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses;

H. J. Res. 245. Joint resolution amending Public Law 27, Eightieth Congress; and

H. Con. Res. 110. Concurrent resolution relative to representation of the Congress at a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Bermuda in December 1947.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution relating to surplus buildings and lands for community purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1350. An act to authorize relief of accountable officers of the Government, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 2857) entitled "An act to extend second-class mailing privileges to bulletins issued by State conservation and fish and game agencies or departments," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. LANGER, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. MCKELLAR to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3756) entitled "An act making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 9; further insists upon its amendments in disagreement, asks a further conference with the House, and appointed Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. REED, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. OVERTON, and Mr. RUSSELL as conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 2389) entitled "An act for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MOORE, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. KILGORE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3678) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 11, 16, 21, and 24 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1020) entitled "An act to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended," agrees to a conference asked by the House on the above-entitled bill.

Ordered, That Mr. CORDON, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. MALONE, Mr. DOWNEY, and Mr. MCFARLAND be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 493. An act to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 ed.);

H. R. 4069. An act to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II; and

H. J. Res. 238. Joint resolution to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing

votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to a bill and joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1361. An act to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit loans, capital grants, or annual contributions for low-rent-housing and slum-clearance projects where construction costs exceed present cost limitations upon condition that local housing agencies pay the difference between cost limitations and the actual construction costs; and

S. J. Res. 148. Joint resolution to authorize the temporary continuation of regulation of consumer credit.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

JULY 26, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby submit my resignation as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Respectfully,

R. E. THOMASON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF LIBERIA

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to announce that, at the request of the Committee To Celebrate the One Hundredth Anniversary of Liberia, the Speaker appointed a committee to consist of the Speaker, the gentlewoman from Ohio, Mrs. BOLTON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MCGARVEY, Mr. VAIL, Mr. POULSON, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DAWSON of Illinois, Mr. FALLON, and Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. This committee will meet in room 23, central part of the Capitol, subbasement, at 5:40 Saturday afternoon, July 26. The procession will depart from that room at 6 o'clock to the platform on the Capitol steps. The radio broadcast starts at 6:15.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

JULY 26, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby submit my resignation as a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Armed Services.

Respectfully,

R. E. THOMASON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDREWS of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an outline of a ceremony in honor of the Speaker last night.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a summary of a bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the passing of the late Robert J. Watt.

Mrs. LUSK asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LANDIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of WAC-WAVE legislation and legislation for the benefit of the Office of Chief of Naval Operations.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 132]

Arnold	Hays	Poulson
Barden	Hébert	Powell
Bates, Ky.	Heffernan	Preston
Bell	Jackson, Wash.	Rabin
Bennett, Mich.	Jenkins, Pa.	Rayfiel
Bland	Jones, N. C.	Reed, Ill.
Bloom	Kean	Rizley
Buckley	Kearney	Robsion
Butler	Kee	Sabath
Camp	Keefe	Smith, Ohio
Cannon	Kelley	Smith, Va.
Carroll	Kennedy	Somers
Celler	Keogh	Spence
Chapman	Kersten, Wis.	Stigler
Clark	Kilburn	Taylor
Clements	Klein	Thomas, N. J.
Coudert	Ludlow	Thomason
Dawson, Ill.	Lynch	Tollefson
Dingell	McDowell	Trimble
Doughton	McMillen, Ill.	Vail
Elsaesser	Mason	Vinson
Flannagan	Morgan	West
Fuller	Morrison	Wood
Gathings	Norrell	Zimmerman
Gifford	Norton	
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Patterson	
	Pfeifer	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 348 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS AND INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3756) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, further insist on disagreement to the Senate amendments still in disagreement, and agree to a further conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PLOESER, JENSEN, SCHWABE of Missouri, COUDERT, MAHON, WHITTEN, and GORE.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 344) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Hon. FRANCK R. HAVENNER, of the State of California be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Armed Services.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR FREE IMPORTATION OF SYNTHETIC-RUBBER SCRAP

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2029) to provide for the free importation of synthetic-rubber scrap.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph 1697 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (relating to the free importation of rubber and rubber scrap) is amended by striking out "scrap or refuse india rubber" and inserting in lieu thereof "scrap or refuse india or synthetic rubber."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BULWINKLE, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. PEDEN, Mr. HARLESS of Arizona, Mr. ELLIS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MILLER of Nebraska, Mr. MCDONOUGH, and Mr. CROSSER asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include certain excerpts.

Mr. O'TOOLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by his eminence, Cardinal Spellman.

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article that appeared in the National Broadcasting publication.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement he made before the House Civil Functions Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MCCOWEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

RECORD on Federal aid to education and include a report.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in regard to a bill he is introducing today and include three editorials.

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Robert Hutchinson.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD on several subjects.

Mr. JONES of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the City Council of Seattle, Wash.

Mr. RILEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I received unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD but failed to include in my request that I be permitted to include some extraneous matter. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my remarks and include that article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the situation in China. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost approximately $370, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

ROBERT J. WATT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the late Robert J. Watt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I arise at this time to pay tribute to a man whom I consider one of the most active, most popular and colorful personalities on the American labor scene; a man of unusual ability, sound judgment, a fine citizen, and a great friend.

We learned on yesterday with deepest regret the passing of Robert J. Watt, a noted American labor leader and a former member of our War Labor Board, as he was returning from labor conferences overseas. We remember him as the champion in the labor movement here in the United States, representing us abroad in labor conferences, and for that fact alone, a grateful Nation mourns his passing.

Mr. Watt, an international representative of the American Federation of Labor, was returning with his wife on the liner *Saturnia*, from the International Labor Conferences at Geneva, when the hand of fate reached in and took him from us.

Robert J. Watt, born in Scotland, came to our shores in 1912, and made his home in my city of Lawrence, Mass. Within a few short years he started on his long and successful career as an ardent supporter of labor and legislation beneficial to the laboring class. As a member of the building trades organization, following his occupation as a painter, he was soon elected president of the Lawrence Central Labor Union, of Lawrence, Mass. Within a short period of time due to his close association with the workingman, his sincerity, his ability, and the fact that he was an untiring worker and organizer and student of labor legislation, he was elected secretary-treasurer of the Massachusetts State Federation of Labor. He continued in that capacity and remained with that organization until his appointment as the international representative of the American Federation of Labor in 1936.

Since that time he has been located here in the headquarters in the District of Columbia and has appeared on countless occasions before committees of Congress in the interest of American labor.

He was honored by our late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt on appointment as a member of his Labor Commission to England and Sweden in 1938 and served as delegate to the International Labor Conferences at Paris and Geneva and in that position has represented labor abroad on several occasions.

He was beloved through all of his long and successful career by the humble, hard-working men and women, not only of Massachusetts but the entire United States. He came up from the people and never lost his touch with them.

The loyalty he inspired is measured by the widespread grief that attends his passing. In the hearts of all the members of the American Federation of Labor and other labor organizations there is a feeling of sadness and bereavement. As a member of the War Labor Board and the Wage Stabilization Board, and in the deliberation of those bodies, he served with intelligence, with energy, and devotion.

Bobby Watt will live on, cherished in the hearts of those who knew him, and I know that I join with countless Members of this Congress in extending our sincere and deepest sympathy to Mrs. Robert J. Watt, and the members of her immediate family.

ELECTION CONTESTS

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a resolution (H. R. 345) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the election contest of Harold C. Woodward, contestant, against THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, contestee, Sixth Congressional District of Illinois, be dismissed, and that the said THOMAS J. O'BRIEN is entitled to his seat as a Representative of said district and State; and be it further

Resolved, That the election contest of Frederick M. Roberts, contestant, against HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, contestee, Fourteenth Congressional District of California, be dismissed and that the said HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS is entitled to her seat as a Representative of said district and State; and be it further

Resolved, That the election contest of Lawrence Michael, contestant, against HOWARD W. SMITH, contestee, Eighth Congressional District of the State of Virginia, be dismissed, and that the said HOWARD W. SMITH is entitled to his seat as a Representative of said district and State.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE WOOL BILL

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 1498) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 1498, with Mr. JENKINS of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose yesterday the first section of the bill had been read.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HERTER: Beginning on line 5, page 1, strike out the words "at the price it supported wool in 1946" and insert in lieu thereof the words "at a price not less than 90 percent of parity."

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, in effect, places wool in the same category as all the Steagall amendment commodities on which the Government had established support prices. It does not say that the support price must be 90 percent of parity, but it allows the same discretion as is allowed the Secretary of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation with respect to every other agricultural commodity for which legislation has been passed.

May I point out, Mr. Chairman, that insofar as I know the House has not placed a fixed price during the entire war period or in the postwar period on a single commodity. It has used the parity formula in the case of agricultural commodities. Even in the bill that passed only a few days ago, dealing with certain critical metals, we did not put a fixed price in the bill. We provided for a maximum price and allowed discretion in a special board to put on certain metals and minerals a price up to that maximum. But there was no fixed price set. Here, sir, in this bill we are setting an entirely new precedent from the point of view of the Congress.

We are saying that the Government must put a given fixed price on a commodity and that that fixed price must remain in effect for a period of 2 years, regardless of anything that may happen to our economy. If that precedent is established, I think you will see that in

the years to come we are going to have commodity after commodity coming before us not asking for a price on any given formula in relation to other commoditiess but asking for a price or figure which the manufacturers or producers of that commodity feel will give to them a fair return and profit. We will then be in the business of price-fixing worse than the OPA.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would like to point out to the gentleman that the administration fixed a support-price of $6 a bushel for flax, which is considerably higher, a dollar or more per bushel, than the formula which the gentleman is proposing

Mr. HERTER. I quite agree with the gentleman, but that is not what I am talking about. The administration, under its discretionary power, fixed that price. It was not the Congress that fixed that price. When the Congress begins to fix prices we are doing exactly what we criticized in the OPA, and we are becoming arbiters as to what price will be set. We are not leaving any discretionary power to allow flexibility and we are not setting up criteria.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. HAND. If we do not adopt the gentleman's amendment we will be singling out this one small industry and giving it special benefit.

Mr. HERTER. That is quite true. We will be singling out one particular industry and giving it treatment such as I hope we will never give to any other commodity. It seems to me that when the Congress of the United States, as a board of directors, tries to fix irrevocable prices on commodities, we have bitten off a great deal more than we can chew. We have started a precedent that will be of utmost danger to our future economy.

Finally, may I say this in connection with this amendment: It has been my hope throughout that wool could continue to move in open markets as a free commodity. Today all the better grades are moving and moving rapidly. They are moving at prices considerably above this fixed price. However, the poorer grades, if we do not adopt this fixed price, will begin to move rapidly, and even they may move above this support price. I hope it will be no longer necessary for our Government to remain in the business of purchasing the entire output of a given commodity and selling it at a loss at the taxpayers' expense.

May I say this: There is no question in my mind but what, if this bill is passed, we may see some tariff changes. I am not going to argue the merits or demerits of changes in the tariff, but I do want to point out the economic consequences should the tariff be changed. In this bill we are taking out an unlimited commitment, insofar as the taxpayer is concerned. In the event the Geneva Conference should lower the tariff, it will cost the taxpayer twice the sum that we may expect to be involved. In the first place, we would lose the revenue from the tariff. In the second place, we would have to make up the difference by a subsidy for our producers in this country.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment will be adopted. I realize that the hour is late, but I can assure you I have had no hand in delaying this bill so that it would come to us at the last moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] has expired.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object in this case, but we have a great many bills affecting the armed services and I shall be compelled to object to anyone else asking to proceed additional time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, of course if it is the desire of the Congress to kill this bill, I think the way to do it would be to adopt this amendment. We are in the closing days of this session, and very likely the House would adjourn before a conference could be had on this bill.

I want to express my appreciation to the majority leadership for allowing this bill to come before the Congress at this time.

I think they could have said, with some justification, that we have had our day in court and that we could shift for ourselves from here on. I appreciate their allowing the bill to come up, and I am sure many people feel as I do. In all my experience I have never seen a piece of legislation that has been so misrepresented to the American people. I have read editorials and comments on this legislation but have not seen one yet that really told the facts about this legislation.

In my judgment the original legislation we passed that was vetoed was absolutely consistent with our agricultural policy and was not inconsistent with our foreign policy; but that is water over the dam, and we have a practical situation here today.

If we adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts we will kick the props out from under this legislation for which we have been contending from the very beginning. When this legislation was first introduced it was the desire of the wool growers, and I think they had the support of the Committee on Agriculture, to give wool a fair parity with other farm commodities. It is conceded that it does not. The original bill was intended to establish a comparable price for wool and put wool on a parity with other agricultural commodities. If that had been accomplished, of course, we would agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts that we were entitled to only 90 percent of parity. That is all the other agricultural commodities now have.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Is it not also true that the wool people were frozen, that they did not enjoy the expanded price that many other agricultural commodities enjoy because the price of wool has been frozen all during this period?

Mr. GRANGER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Wool was put under the OPA, and the price we are fixing here is still an OPA price.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. HERTER. Is it not a fact that if my amendment were adopted the administrative branch of the Government as represented by the Commodity Credit Corporation through the Secretary of Agriculture would fix the price of wool at exactly the point the gentleman says it ought to be fixed at in comparison with other commodities?

Mr. GRANGER. I think perhaps so, but the Secretary of Agriculture wanted some affirmative legislation on this subject, and this is what we are trying to do for them.

We have had all kinds of arguments that wool was just a byproduct of the sheep industry. As a matter of fact, about 47 percent of the revenue of the sheep industry comes from the production of wool. It is an essential part of the industry and it is essential to have this industry in our country so that we can meet any emergency that can arise.

Let me say to those people who speak of the consumers, that if the day ever comes that we have to depend entirely upon wool and lambs being brought in from afar then we shall have to pay considerably more than we have ever paid under our own local production.

Despite what has been said, this industry is a sick industry. Never in all my experience has it been a prosperous industry. They have had some good years but most of the time they have been just hanging on through bad years. Most of the years have been bad. I hope this Congress is not going to listen to that group of people who are opposed to this legislation who are on the pricing end of it, the people who have made the money out of the industry, and who have consistently opposed this legislation.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is it not true that the adoption of this particular amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts would in effect kill the bill at this late hour?

Mr. GRANGER. Absolutely; there is no question about it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Is it not also true that about 30 percent of this industry has

already disappeared from the American scene?

Mr. GRANGER. Yes; it has. The sheep industry is lower in number than it has been in the last 50 years.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. In 1870 the population of this country was 40,000,000. Today it is 142,000,000. There are less sheep in the country today than there were then. I can understand why a man who wants to take wool and put the wool into blankets or cloth is against this proposition because he would get his wool 5 cents cheaper if this bill does not pass. We are all human. But instead of having a dead sheep industry I want a live one, an American one that will continue to exist.

Mr. GRANGER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I may say in that connection also that should this amendment be adopted it could readily have the effect, and I believe it would have the effect, of reducing the price of wool at least 4 or 5 cents a pound. We are dealing now with an industry that cannot stand any more price reduction.

In further reply to what the gentleman from Massachusetts said there may be some discussion of a reduction in the tariff. If we pass this amendment, it would have the opposite effect. To reject the amendment and pass this bill would be a warning to those people who are discussing these things at Geneva that we need some protection and that the Congress of the United States has said so. I hope it will have the effect of discouraging a lowering of the tariff at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to state to the Members that Mr. W. H. McGinnis, of route 2, Decatur, Ga., has sent a shipment of splendid Georgia peaches for distribution to the membership of the House. I have had them placed in each of the cloakrooms and invite you to help yourselves.

Mr. McGinnis is a World War II veteran; he is the son-in-law of Rev. W. M. Anderson, of De Kalb County, one of our fine farmers and peach growers. May I say on behalf of Mr. McGinnis, the citizens of the Fifth District of Georgia and myself, that we wish for you on this closing day of the session a safe trip home and a pleasant vacation and express the hope that this fine fruit will enable each Congressman to wind up his stay here with a good taste in his mouth.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. McGinnis sent peaches here so you will have a good bite at lunch time, but if you adopt this wool bill as it is presented to us here today you will be pulling the wool over the eyes of the American people.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts should be adopted for the reason that all other agricultural commodities have been guaranteed by the Federal Government at 90 percent of parity. This bill as it is presented to us without the pending amendment gives the wool growers of this country the highest price that has been paid for wool in 27 years. It guarantees that price, which is the price that we had last year.

The fact of the matter is, the reason we have a shortage of sheep in this country is because of the high price received for lambs that the farmers have been marketing. The high lamb prices is the reason we do not have the great number of sheep. Understand, I want the farmers and the sheep industry of this country to prosper; nobody would be benefited more than the people of this country, and I would not do anything to see them go out of business if I could prevent it; that is the reason I am fighting against this bill, I want to do it in the American way. If we had a tariff of 10 cents more than we do now you would not need this bill, and the sheep growers in this country would not want it. They would not be after this legislation. But the fact of the matter is that today the State Department and the President are interested in cutting the 35-cent duty on scoured import wools down to we know not what, and we are raising the price of wool at the highest price we have had in 27 years, and we expect the Treasury to make up the difference. If there is any sense in that then I do not know anything about business, I do not know anything about how to take care of the American people, and I think it is absolutely the wrong thing to do. We should not pass this legislation. If the President and the State Department cut the tariff down on this commodity, we know who is responsible for it. It is the Chief Executive and the State Department, and if they are going to ruin all the business in this country, as will ultimately come—and I stake anything I have on that in any statement I make—eventually the competition in foreign countries will do away with our high standard of living in America, and that is just what you are faced with, and you are going to see it happen inside of 3 or 4 years. It is a calamity to America when it happens.

The greatest woolen industry outside of the American Woolen Co. in this country is the Forstman Co., in New Jersey. That company started by German people coming over here and building a plant in this country, because we had a tariff that protected the American woolen industry. They made the fabric here and employed American labor. Previous to that they manufactured stuff in foreign countries and employed foreign labor and brought the fabrics over here. The tariff on woolens caused them to come over here and build their woolen mills. It did a great good for our country. We gave employment here to our American people.

Now what will happen? Those people will go back to Germany and employ people there, or in some other foreign country, and the American worker and the American manufacturer will not be in business. I am not talking because I am directly interested in it. I can see the difficulty we are going to have with all American industries—everything. I stand before you and before my people as a protectionist for the American industry, American labor, and the American people, and the only way you are ever going to have a successful America and the thing that made this country great is to keep this tariff. It made America great, it encouraged industry and agriculture, and it raised the standard of living to the highest of any nation of the world. Now you permit the Democratic President and the State Department to tear it down, to wreck our economy. Stop it. Republicans, wake up and protect America from the New Dealers before it is too late.

Vote for the Herter amendment.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, of course, everybody who knows anything about American agriculture and American business knows that our reciprocal trade arrangements saved both of them. Some people are so archaic in their thinking that they still talk in the days of 40 and 50 years ago about world trade and world commerce. I think that 90 percent of the membership of this House believes that the United States of America should have a wool industry, and unless we have support prices in times like these we are not going to have a wool industry. We consume in the United States of America in normal times about 1,000,000,000 pounds of wool. We produce under the circumstances now 300,000,000 pounds. If it were for nothing else at all than for our own self-protection, for our own national defense, we should and must have a wool industry. I want to see this bill pass. I voted against the one that passed the House and was vetoed by the President. I stated then that if we would go along and pass the bill the Senate had passed, we would have wool support. Now, in the closing hours of this session, if this bill is amended and has to go back to the other body for concurrence or for conference, in my opinion we will have no wool-support legislation, which I think is so essential to the wool industry and to the country in general. Therefore, I trust that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts will not be agreed to.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not a fact that if we were to follow the philosophy of the gentleman from Pennsylvania who has just addressed the House, the burden on the taxpayers of America, that is, the consuming public, would be far greater than the burden upon the taxpayers as provided for in this bill?

Mr. RAYBURN. Everybody who is thinking in terms of modern times agrees to that.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, of course I am in favor of this bill. I quite

agree with the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished minority leader [Mr. RAYBURN], that if we adopt this amendment or any other amendment it will have the same effect as voting down the bill.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] made the statement that wool is higher now than it has been in 25 years. That is not true. It has been higher during several years in the twenties than it is now.

Let us take a look at the effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER]. At the outset of the war the Department of Agriculture set up this wool-purchase program. Officials of that Department promised the wool growers of this country that the program would continue during the war and for 2 years thereafter. That is precisely the same way that other farm commodities are treated under the Steagall amendment. Under the program wool was purchased at the ceiling price established by OPA just 2 days after Pearl Harbor. That price has not changed since then, and under this bill the same price will be paid until the end of next year. Because of the fact that the Government was purchasing the domestic wool the price was not increased, although the costs of production increased 66 percent during the war. Now it is true that a good many other farm commodities were supported on the basis of 90 percent of parity or even over 100 percent of parity, but bear in mind that every one of those commodities were granted substantial increases in prices during the war, while wool received no increase whatsoever. The average increase granted 24 principal farm commodities during the war was 94 percent. I might mention a few increases: Rye, 233 percent; corn, 144 percent; cotton, 101 percent; peanuts, 100 percent; and hay, 94 percent.

Now, as I have pointed out, Mr. Chairman, all of these other farm commodities that have been supported on the basis of a percentage of parity enjoyed substantial increases all during the war, while, on the other hand, the price of wool remained fixed, and that is why it is so unfair to change the rules of the game now, as proposed by the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER], and put wool on a percentage of parity. Obviously, the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts is wholly unfair and inequitable to the great wool industry of this country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are here to represent the interests of the people of our States and the Nation as a whole. Wyoming is second in wool production in this country. Texas and the West produce the great bulk of our domestic wool. Our only market for wool is right here in America. Practically all of our wool is sold to dealers in Massachusetts and Pennsylvania. Of course, this country is also the best market for growers in Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and South America. Now bear this in mind—about 70 percent of the wool dealers in Massachusetts and Pennsylvania deal exclusively in foreign wool, and, quite naturally, they are concerned with the interests of the foreign producers. In the final analysis, that is the conflict here today. We in the West are trying to protect the interests of the wool growers of this country as against the foreign producer. Last year, while over a billion pounds of wool were consumed in this country, yet the fact remains that 819,000,000 pounds of foreign wool was imported into this country during the same time. Foreign producers, therefore, got over 81 percent of our market last year.

Now let us see how the wool growers of this country got into this predicament. The fact of the matter is that the wool industry of this country is a war casualty. During the past 5 years, we produced in this country 2,071,762,000 pounds of wool. The production by years is as follows:

1942	459,073,000
1943	449,578,000
1944	418,094,000
1945	387,017,000
1946	358,000,000

The Commodity Credit Corporation purchased all of this wool. The Government owns and holds a stock pile of wool of 460,000,000 pounds and, consequently, during the war years, we were able to sell only 1,600,000,000 pounds of domestic wool. We simply could not compete with the cheap foreign producer and if it were not for the fact that the Army and Navy required domestic wool in the manufacture of military fabrics, we would not have been able to have sold any of our domestic production.

Now, during the same 5 years we consumed 5,398,551,000 pounds of wool in this country. Our consumption during those years was as follows:

1942	1,123,094,000
1943	1,109,140,000
1944	1,050,651,000
1945	1,053,666,000
1946	1,062,000,000

During the last 5 years there were 3,530,989,000 pounds of wool imported into this country. The imports during those years were as follows:

1942	782,647,000
1943	642,887,000
1944	582,168,000
1945	704,034,000
1946	819,253,000

Now then, we consumed over 5,000,000,000 pounds of wool in this country during the last 5 years and we produced 2,000,000,000 pounds of wool but were able to sell in our own market only one billion and a half pounds of wool and that is why we have a stock pile of nearly one-half a billion pounds of wool at the present time, which stock pile represents a distinct threat to the American wool producer and, if this bill is not passed, will mean the eventual liquidation of that great industry. The fact remains that while we consumed 5,000,000,000 pounds of wool in this country during the last 5 years, foreign producers supplied 3,500,000,000 pounds of that wool or 65 percent of the total. With our high cost of production here at home, we simply cannot compete with the low-cost producers abroad and unless we have this bill, the wool industry of this country faces complete liquidation.

Now during the last 5 years the 3,500,000,000 pounds of foreign wool that was brought into this country paid tariff duties into the Treasury amounting to $604,600,000. So the Treasury of the United States has benefited to the extent of over $600,000,000 because of the very imports that are causing all of the difficulties of the American wool producers today. The fact of the matter is that the total tariff paid on all imports of every kind and character including wool during the same 5 years amounted to $1,919,600,000 and therefore the tariff on wool amounts to about one-third of all the duties paid during that time.

Under the law 30 percent of the tariff receipts are used to support farm commodities under section 32 of the AAA Act. And so, during the last 5 years, $181,100,000 of the receipts from the tariff paid on foreign wool imported into this country has been used to support farm commodities. The following is a list of all duties paid during the past 5 years, including the duties on wool imports during that period:

Year	Duties on all dutiable imports	Total sec. 32 funds (30 percent)	Duties on wool imports	Sec. 32 fund from wool (30 percent)
1942	$320,100,000	$97,000,000	$99,400,000	$29,800,000
1943	392,300,000	119,000,000	126,900,000	38,000,000
1944	347,300,000	114,300,000	107,300,000	32,100,000
1945	378,700,000	118,100,000	128,800,000	38,600,000
1946	481,200,000	148,000,000	142,200,000	42,600,000
Total	1,919,600,000	596,400,000	604,600,000	181,100,000
5-year av.	383,920,000	119,280,000	120,920,000	36,220,000

Notwithstanding the fact that during the last 5 years over $181,000,000 from the tariff receipts on imported wool into this country was set over to support agricultural commodities, yet not 1 cent of that fund has been used to support wool in any way, shape, or form. Last year, over $20,000,000 was used for the benefit of the cotton industry. Millions were spent for the support of other agricultural commodities, but none of these funds have been used to support wool. Now, Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the Government received over $600,000,000 from the tariff on wool, it seems strange to me that anyone would object to spending a few million dollars to support the wool industry when it is so clearly shown that it is these tremendous foreign imports that are causing our trouble today.

Now it is true, as was pointed out yesterday, by the gentleman from Kansas, that there is a better demand at the present time for long-staple, fine wools of a high shrink, and that the market on that grade of wool is a cent or two higher than the support price under this bill. That has been occasioned by the fact that England is taking all of that type of wool from its Dominions and, consequently, our own mills are required to purchase our fine wools. The fact remains that the only wools that are being purchased at the present time are the cream of the crop. They are the most desirable wools. These wools represent roughly about 25 percent of our production and so we do have a market for about 75,000,000 out of the 300,000,000

pounds of wool that we produce in this country. These wools are used for worsteds and serge textiles, but the fact remains that we have no market at all for the other 225,000,000 pounds of our domestic wool, most of which is of the coarser grades and goes into woolens.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have pointed out that the Treasury of the United States has benefited because of the predicament of the domestic wool producer and by virtue of the tremendous imports of duty-paid foreign wool. And so, it seems to me, that we have made a good case for the support of our wool industry even though it may cost a few million dollars. But, Mr. Chairman, let there be no mistake about this. The wool growers of the country are not the only ones concerned with this bill. The Government has a stock pile of 460,000,000 pounds of wool. The Government, therefore, is interested in this bill. Under the law, the Commodity Credit Corporation cannot sell that wool at less than parity. They are unable to sell it under the law at the present time and this bill gives them the right to sell that wool at less than parity. At the present time there is a tremendous demand for this wool, but in order to sell it, the law must be changed so they can sell it at less than parity and in competition with foreign wools. And so, I want to impress upon those people who are concerned with losses to the Government with the fact that unless this bill is passed, the United States will be unable to sell its stock pile of wool and they will be required to hold it in storage. If this bill passes, they can sell the wool at a loss of a few million dollars, but if the bill fails to pass, then I venture the prediction that the loss to the Government from its own stock pile will run up from twenty to fifty million dollars.

It seems to me, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the conclusion is irresistible that this bill should be passed without amendment in order to protect, first, the Government of the United States against loss on its stock pile and, second, to give the wool growers of this country the measure of protection that they are justly entitled to. I hope this bill passes.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. I want to protect the Treasury. That is what I am trying to do now.

Mr. BARRETT. Then you had better vote against this amendment and vote in favor of the bill.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am very happy that the record now discloses that the leadership of the Democratic side of the House is in favor of protecting the wool industry of this country providing only they can do it in their own way. They are not in favor of having it done as the majority of both the House and Senate said it should be done, in legislation which passed Congress earlier this session.

Today this body is confronted with a shotgun held by Mr. Will Clayton pointed directly at us, as he says, in effect, "If you want to save this essential industry of the United States, you must do it my way, as the Democratic Party through the State Department directs." Those on the Republican side who are in favor of this bill recognize that the wool industry is essential to the United States. They are willing to make a concession to good business practices in order to save that industry.

Of course, the real issue is whether or not any industry of this country sometime in the future will find itself in a similar position, and be forced to come before a Congress and ask that the Treasury be tapped in order that industry may continue to exist in the United States, in the face of excessive imports from overseas.

Think of it. Here is an American industry having as competition 90 percent of the domestic consumption coming in from overseas. Hence we have today this essential industry here on its knees begging for its life. It is a shotgun procedure, one which I sincerely hope future Congresses will bear in mind by protecting the industry and the jobs of American citizens.

At this moment in Geneva State Department traders are bargaining away this essential industry. They are selling this essential industry down the river. These statesmen are bargaining it away, while the President and Will Clayton cry that if we merely protect with an adequate tariff an essential industry here, if we seek merely to protect our own essential farm industries, they say the great prospective International Trade Organization will collapse. What nonsense it is to suppose that an international organization built upon so flimsy a foundation can be sound, that removing a few sheep and protecting an essential industry here would break down that organization. How foolish to build an international organization so defective that it will not permit this Nation to protect an industry essential to its safety. Such an organization is but a house of cards, and surely will fall.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Not at this time.

Of course, what the Democratic Party wants to do is to make every industry dependent upon the Government, so that every industry in your district and my district will have to come to Congress and get subsidy from the taxpayer to permit that industry to live.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. There is one thing that always seems to have been forgotten in these discussions, and that is that just as soon as you have permitted foreign competition to destroy an essential industry in this country, then they have a monopoly and can charge any price they want to for a product that is essential to the very life of the Nation.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Past experience has proved that beyond question. We know that today there are some 2,000,000,000 pounds of wool lying offshore in some foreign land, simply waiting an opportunity to be shipped in here, to still further depress our market. So we propose to reduce the tariff still further at Geneva, to invite foreigners to import more and more wool, and then under this bill to make up the loss to our American wool growers out of the Treasury.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman agree that the consuming public will have to bear the burden if we are to increase import duties?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I wonder who the gentleman thinks pays taxes into the Treasury. It is the consuming public who are the taxpayers. I have heard that argument repeatedly, the implication being that the Treasury of the United States get its money by merely running a printing press, not realizing that we have no sources of revenue other than through taxes and import duties and by the sale of our securities. I answer the gentleman that we are here to protect the Treasury of the United States. The Republican Party has been fighting as hard as we could all year to reduce expenditures, to eliminate waste. I must say the gentleman's party has not given us the kind of support we had a right to anticipate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on May 22 I urged the passage of a wool bill which was passed but later vetoed by President Truman. As I understand the bill now being considered, the bill is identical with the old one except it omits a provision requiring the President to impose fees on imports if the Tariff Commission makes the finding that foreign wool materially interferes with the domestic wool program. I sincerely felt that this was a fair provision.

Even without this provision, the wool bill up for consideration today merits our support. It protects to a degree our wool growers by insuring them a support price until December 31, 1948, at the 1946 price and authorizes the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell its wool at competitive prices with foreign wool. This support price is absolutely essential. Wool production has dropped 35 percent in recent years because of the lack of profit in raising sheep. An important reason why wool production must be maintained at a high level is that wool is considered a strategic and critical material necessary for the security of the Nation, according to a recent finding by the Army and Navy Munitions Board. This means we must encourage rather than discourage the production of wool in the United States. Without a support price, production will decrease even more rapidly than it has in the past years.

For these important reasons, I shall support the wool bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I want to inject a note into this discussion that I believe has not been touched on yet. A decline in the price of wool will affect adversely some of the wards of this Government whom you wish to protect, the Indians.

Often, when discussions arise on this floor regarding any industry in the West, we are apt to think of big men, and we frequently call them barons; copper barons, lumber barons, or some other kind of baron. That simply attempts to pull the wool over the eyes of those who do not think carefully and to substitute prejudice for argument.

I am here to talk about the small man, white or red, who is engaged in the wool industry. There are plenty of small men thus engaged. They are not all big men. It has already been pointed out that the amendment which the gentleman has just offered, if adopted, will depress the price of wool. I do not want to see the price of wool depressed. It is an essential industry. It is an industry which the welfare of the country demands be kept continuously operating and producing. Therefore, we do not want to crush or harm that industry.

The cost of wool production has been increasing. As I said when the bill was before the House recently, there are hundreds of millions of acres of land in the West that are fit for nothing else but grazing. Some of it is not fit for cattle grazing, but only for sheep production. In the State of Arizona, because of the vast unoccupied stretches of area of hostile nature, the Legislature of Arizona has passed a law that no flock of sheep can be attended by one shepherd or herder. We do not permit one man alone to go out in the vastness into the wilderness to take care of a flock of sheep. No man alone can do that, whether he is the owner or merely a hired man, and regardless of the size of the flock to tend.

The owner of that flock of sheep must provide at least two shepherds, or herders, for every flock of sheep because they are distant most of the time from human habitation and in case one man is alone and has an accident, is bitten by a rattler, or something else happens, some other kind of accident, there must be some companion besides his dog to take care of him. All of these things make it unavoidable that the cost of wool production in our West has increased and must increase, and imperative that we get better prices. We cannot compete with foreign production in any such way as this amendment would require us to.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. I think the gentleman will agree with me that the only thing that the wool growers asked for was a law that would bring them into parity with other agricultural commodities. That is the thing we asked for in the first place. We did not ask for any tariff, we did not ask for anything; that is all we tried to do. They wanted to be put on parity and they wanted legislation to permit the Department to sell this great stockpile of wool. That is what this legislation does and the only thing it does, and does the thing the wool growers wanted in the first place and what the gentleman from Arizona wanted.

Mr. MURDOCK. And with the high cost of production this bill not amended—and it must not be amended or we will have no bill at all, as has already been explained—this bill will give the small producers some aid. I pointed out yesterday that 60,000 Navajo Indians who are right up against their limit of subsistence must depend upon the sheep industry, they must depend upon their wool. They eat their lambs, that is their food supply. Their sale of wool is the only means on their vast reservation they have of existence. If you take it away from them you will throw them onto Federal relief, and they do not want charity.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Is it not true, I will ask my colleague, that there are many many millions of acres of land in the United States that cannot be used efficiently except through the sheep industry?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes. That was the very point of my statement a moment ago. You kill this industry and you turn back to the desert and to savage wild life all of this land which is now being used to support sheep and the sheep industry.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman says he is for a high price. I want a high price for wool so that the men who grow it can receive the benefit of it. But I ask the gentleman if he is in favor of cutting the tariff down now from 34 cents? If the gentleman is interested in the sheep industry does he want to cut the tariff? Yes or no? I would like a yes or no answer.

Mr. MURDOCK. Usually I do not like yes or no questions. I have time after time again appeared before the Committee on Reciprocity Information and expressed myself. It is in the RECORD. I hope this amendment will be defeated

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would expect three categories of Congressmen to oppose this wool bill. These categories are:

First. Congressmen whose districts produce no substantial quantities of wool.

Second. Congressmen who disapprove subsidies.

Third. Congressmen who subscribe to the principles of the Republican Party.

If these three groups vote against this bad bill, as I hope they will, it will receive the fate it deserves. I will support the Herter amendment and vote against the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I think is it well understood now by everyone that the effect of the adoption of the Herter amendment would be to kill this bill. That will inevitably result from the fact that the bill comes up at this late hour in the session and that the time is strictly limited. The result would be that the bill would be killed. The question is, therefore, Do you want to pass a bill providing for a continuation of the program that has been in effect since 1941 with respect to the support of wool? In 1941 it was not the wool growers, but it was the Government of the United States that stepped into this picture and took over wool for security reasons. At that time there were 49,000,000 sheep grazing on the hillsides of America. At that time the American producers were sacking up about 450,000,000 pounds of wool a year. The number of sheep has dwindled down to 32,500,000 and the number of pounds of wool has been decreasing down to the point where it is only 300,000,000 or 325,000,000 pounds per year. So, gradually it has been frozen out, it is going out of business. We hope this program can be dispensed with after next year, after the stock pile has been disposed of. That is what every producer hopes for. This stock pile has been accumulated, not by the growers but by the Government itself. This bill permits that accumulation to be disposed of.

Mr. Chairman, the question then arises on the Herter amendment as to what effect it will have and is it a fair amendment? The gentleman says he only wants to put wool in the same category that all other farm products under the Steagall amendment are in. Now, let us see if that is true. If it is true then that is a fair proposition, but I challenge the correctness of that statement. Of course, I do not challenge the sincerity of the gentleman who presents it.

Let us see what the facts are. Under the parity situation it is the desire and purpose to provide a fair price to the producer. I understand that to be the basic purpose of a parity price. It has always been recognized in this country by all those who are familiar with the subject that the parity base of 1909 to 1914 was unfair because it was during a depressed period so far as the wool industry is concerned as compared with other farm products. That has been universally recognized as a true statement and it is a historic fact.

Let us see what the President said and those who represent the Department of Agriculture. In a letter last year to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] the President made this statement:

> Specifically, in view of the large-scale decline of sheep numbers in the United States during recent years, the large wool surpluses now hanging over foreign and domestic markets, and the present and prospective marketing problems confronting wool growers, it would seem desirable for Congress to enact special wool legislation. Such legislation should provide that—
>
> First. The parity price of wool be revised or established at the so-called comparable level—so that wool parity prices will be on a level equivalent to parity prices for other farm products.

In other words, it is recognized by the President, it is recognized by the Department of Agriculture, it is recognized by all of those who are familiar with this subject and who know something of the historic background of the parity formula as applied to wool that the parity formula which provides a fair price to other farm products does not provide a fair price for the wool producer. I think that is generally recognized. Suppose we should put 90 percent of comparable price in here, what would the price of wool be? Even 90 percent would be about 3 cents above the OPA ceiling price which is provided for in this bill. We are not asking for the same treatment as other farm products. We are taking less. We are taking several cents less. That is exactly what would be provided if the 1941 OPA ceiling price is established, as provided for in this bill.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HERTER. Is it not true that in April of this year the President likewise made the statement he would not approve of any legislation which fixed commodity prices or supported commodity prices at more than 90 percent of parity?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. HERTER. Is it not also true that under the amendment I have offered the administration could fix the price of support on wool at whatever price it thought was a fair price to maintain the industry?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot agree with the gentleman. The gentleman refers to a press statement by the President in which he also said that wool was in a different class from other farm products.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, let us all get firmly in our minds the exact situation that now exists. If the Herter amendment to this bill is adopted, the bill is dead. Then if the representatives of this country at Geneva decide, on the theory that the wool industry and the sheep industry, as Under Secretary of State Will Clayton claims represents less than one-half of 1 percent of the income of those engaged in agriculture and animal industry, then they will throw our sheep and wool industry out the window, the bars will be down, and the markets of this country will be flooded with foreign wool, and the wool growers of this country and the producers of sheep will be put out of business. I can understand why a man who thinks of the American sheep industry in terms of wool in the factory, or lamb chops or a leg of lamb in the hotel or restaurant or on the home table, just thinks of it as so much wool or so much meat, but I think of it as the small farm flocks of my State. We do not raise sheep down there by the thousands, but there are hundreds of farms all over Tennessee that have flocks of sheep ranging from 50 to 200. It is a profitable industry. It is a substantial part of the income of our farmers.

Well, they say that you are going to make the people who buy woolen clothing pay higher prices. If there is any Member on this floor who has paid $80 for a woolen suit of clothes, he has paid, in buying that $80 suit, less than $2 for the wool that is in it. If it is a $40 suit, he has paid for the wool in his suit not more than $2. This price for wool that the consumer pays does not hurt anybody. The high cost of woolen clothing is not caused by the 45 cents per pound that our wool growers will receive under this bill. High prices are caused largely by the cost of manufacturing the clothing.

The trouble is this. We have all got a little bit too much of this thing called human nature in us. I heard a profound student of mankind say once that there is a heap of human nature in a man, and from my observation, there is some in a woman too.

In the olden days two women lived together in the same house. Each was the mother of a baby boy. One of the women overlaid her baby in the night and it died. When she realized her child was dead, she arose and placed it in the bosom of the other woman and took her live child to her own bed, appropriating it as her own. In the morning when the mother of the live child awoke, she realized it had been stolen, and went over and got into a row with the woman who had stolen her baby. They took the controversy to King Solomon. The King said, "Bring me a sword." And, they brought the King a sword and when it was brought in he said to his attendant, "Take the sword and divide the living child and give half to the one and half to the other."

Then said the mother of the living child, "O my lord, give her the living child and in nowise slay it." Then the King said, "Give her the living child for it is hers. She is the mother thereof."

Now, the Members of this House who are interested in a live sheep industry in this country do not want it halved with any country on earth. I do not want the time to come when the American people are dependent upon any country on earth for a strategic material like wool or an edible product like lamb chops or a leg of lamb or even a shoulder of lamb or breast of lamb. It is a wonderful food, and when the wintertime comes I want some wool socks. I remember, as a boy, I always took the precaution to have two pairs of wool socks each winter. I would buy two hanks of wool, take them to Aunt Sarah Phillips, and she would knit them for me, and until spring came and I turned out barefooted, I wore those wool socks interchangeably.

Let us defeat the Herter amendment and save this industry and take care of the wool and the sheep growers in this country. Brother HERTER, it is partly for your benefit that I am making this plea. If the time should come when you are dependent wholly upon the Australian and New Zealand growers of wool, you will have to pay $1 a pound and like it, and I want to save you from yourself.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last eight words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not like this bill in its present form. When there is a protection job to be done, I think we should proceed directly to the job. What should have happened, an adequate tariff, one which would afford protection to the American woolen industry, should have been provided. Because they have not an adequate tariff protection at the present time, the American woolen industry has grown smaller and smaller with the passing of the years to the point where they are today only able to supply a small percentage of the domestic demand.

But the bill under consideration is nevertheless a protection measure. It presents the only opportunity that is open to us to protect this industry which is in such dire straits. Because it is the only method offered to protect the industry, to give it a chance to grow and enlarge until it can supply the American market, I, as a Republican, am supporting the bill.

I do not like the approach to the problem which the bill presents, no Republican likes the method, but it is the only way of achieving the objective we have in mind—protection for an industry that is desperately in need of it.

I want to see the wool industry adequately protected against foreign competition, not only for the benefit of our fellow citizens who are engaged in the production of wool but for the better protection of my country against a possible foreign foe. Wool is a strategic and critical material. We would lose any war in which we became involved if we could not supply the needs of this Nation in wool. Everyone knows that but nobody thinks of that now since we have just won a great war and the dangers from beyond the seas has seemingly passed us by. But there ought to be people in this Hall, if there are none beyond this historic legislative Chamber, who ought to vividly recall that one of the greatest sources of worry we had during the early days of the war emergency arose out of the scarcity of wool and the uncertainty of a sufficient supply.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. It is the duty of that committee and always has been to fix the tariff on imports to this country.

Mr. GEARHART. I wish the gentleman would not consume my time by pointing to the shortcomings of the Ways and Means Committee. We admit them. We have many of them. We want to provide adequate protection for every American industry, and if the bill under consideration provided it the gentleman would be just as opposed to it as he is to the instant bill. I support this bill because I know that it will provide by indirection the protection which a direct tariff would grant otherwise. Ours is a fundamental disagreement. Let us not obscure the issue by discussing distinctions without differences. I am sure that the genial gentleman will forgive me if I return to the discussion of the bill.

In the old days we used to take evidence in respect to every industry and ascertain just what that industry needed in protection in the interest of that particular industry. We have been induced to embark upon another program, on the ground that no American industry will receive any less consideration than that received under the old system. That is, it would be judged in its own interest and not in the interest of another industry. But in the administration of the reciprocal trade agreements program we find a new idea has crept in, an idea of deciding which is the most important industry, this one or that one, and, having reached a decision as to which is the most important in the estimation of the internationally minded, they proceed to protect that industry by gaining for it advances in foreign markets to increase its foreign trade at the expense of the less important one, which they consign to destruction.

Everyone knows, it is an open secret, that in Geneva one of the key commodities upon which dealing is being had is wool. Down south of the Equator are several countries that raise lots of sheep and much wool. Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa are determined to get their wool into this, the only cash dollar market on the face of the earth, and their negotiators at Geneva are working, maneuvering, and scheming night and day in the effort to gain access to this market. What are they hoping to accomplish? They are simply demanding that the American tariff on wool be cut. They will grant no concessions in their markets to us unless they gain this. Wool is the key to the success of the Geneva negotiations, at least from the standpoint of Assistant Secretary of State Will Clayton whose contempt for national boundaries, including our own, is well known to all. If the tariff on wool is cut and we do not pass the cushioning legislation, the wool industry will be sacrificed. In the interest of what industries would the wool industry be sacrificed? What industries would benefit? The answer to that is not difficult. The great metal-fabricating industries, of which the automobile, electrical appliances, agricultural implements, and rail and rail equipment industries are high on the list of favored industries down at the State Department. All the smiles of the State Department are for them. The lowly wool industry has no friends there. The question is: Will these bright boys down behind the silken curtains in the State Department, these open-handed, "striped pantied" boys, be permitted to sacrifice the wool industry in order to get American automobiles, and American electrical appliances into the countries south of the Equator? That question is to be answered in the action of the House on this bill, and, especially, in our attitude toward the amendment we now have under consideration, purposed, as it is, to cut the heart out of the protective provisions of the measure we are now discussing. Let us kill the amendment and pass the bill with a resounding voice vote that will forever put at rest any doubt in respect to where the membership of this House stands on the right of an American industry to adequate protection against unequal and unfair competition from abroad.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, being deeply interested in agriculture, I am interested in your approach to the wool problem and the effort by this amendment and the purpose of this amendment to put all agricultural products in one category as to parity. Being interested in national defense, I have approached the wool problem from quite a different angle, and I cannot agree with the proponents of this amendment that wool must be squeezed into uniform treatment with other agricultural products.

Wool is the only agricultural product which stands in this category. It is the only American agricultural product listed as a strategic material. It cannot be stock piled successfully over a period of time. It must be rotated, and the best stock pile of wool that you can build is a source of production of wool and this production record must be maintained for our own adequate defense needs. That puts wool in an entirely different situation than other agricultural products.

I want to mention one point that was alluded to by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] when he called attention to the wool manufacturers concerning the dilemma they would be in when the time might come that they would be dependent upon foreign sources and foreign price controls for their supply.

I had a very real experience in my own background. I was with the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. back in 1920 when the American rubber industry was dependent on foreign supplies of rubber. If you know the history of the rubber industry in the 1920's you know how deeply it affected us. I was with the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. when the 1920 collapse came and I know what happened to the American rubber manufacturing industry when they found themselves subject to the control of the British-Dutch cartel on rubber. That made a rather deep and lasting impression on me, and I now see the wool manufacturers drifting into exactly the same dilemma that we were in in the twenties on rubber.

This matter of making all agricultural products go in lock step under uniform treatment is just about as logical as an experience I had in the Army one time out in Arizona when I had a lieutenant colonel who called the bandmaster to task. We had a wonderful band in our regiment and we were very proud of it. We had a regimental review one day and the lieutenant colonel in my presence called the bandmaster down because the trombones were not moving in exact unison as the band marched by the reviewing stand. There is just about as much logic in your asking that all agricultural products conform to one formula of parity as there was in that lieutenant colonel's viewpoint as to the trombones.

Wool does not belong in the same category with other agricultural products when it comes to this matter of parity. I am very much interested to see that wool is given enough special treatment to insure us an American source of supply so that the wool manufacturers and the producers of wool in America will not find themselves in the same dilemma that we were in in the 1920's when we had to reorganize the whole automobile-tire industry. You will get into that situation if you make America wholly dependent upon a foreign-price structure. We must treat wool in a different category than any other agricultural product. It just does not fit our needs to have it put in the parity program in exact conformance with other agricultural products.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. HERTER. I think the gentleman will recall that when this matter was first debated I took the position, first, that wool should have a support price and, second, that we should dispose of the surplus held by the Commodity Credit Corporation because it would deteriorate. The principal reason that I feel it should not be set at a fixed price is because we are setting a precedent there regardless of wool or anything else. The administration set that price above 90 percent or at 90 percent of parity, whatever is required to maintain the industry.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. And the gentleman is in agreement on the fixing of that price.

Mr. HERTER. By discretion.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. May I ask the gentleman: Why do you insist on 90 percent of parity?

Mr. HERTER. We do not insist, but I say not less than 90 percent, because that is the standard formula that has been fixed.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Do you think that wool should be made to fit that standard?

Mr. HERTER. I do.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. There is where I disagree with the gentleman. It should not be made to fit that standard. It should be given such special treatment as to enable our wool producers to stay in the business and thereby strengthen our national economy and our national defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, this subject has been pretty thoroughly discussed, and there are other important measures pressing for consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is recognized for one-half minute.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, in one-half minute, let me say just one thing.

It seems to me that if we can avoid amending this proposal we can greatly facilitate the goal for which we strive, because it will not jeopardize the eventual results, since this is the last day of the session. If this bill gets caught up in a conference, we may not get this important wool legislation at all. It seems to me it behooves us to reject the Herter amendment and accept the proposal as it came to us from the Senate so we do not jeopardize this entire wool program at this time. Even the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] agrees we need legislation of this type; he argues that we should adopt his amendment because it is sound in principle; regardless of that contention Mr. Chairman, and without admitting or refuting it in these few seconds it should be crystal clear that the safe, sound, and sensible thing to do on this final day of the current session is to pass this measure as it came to us from the Senate so no conference will be required and so no risk will be incurred about losing the legislation altogether. We must not risk having this measure defeated by default through sending it to committee. I urge you to reject the Herter amendment and to support this measure in its present form.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] is recognized for one-half minute.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I support this bill as it comes from the Senate. I am confident that if we amend the bill in any manner whatsoever we will lose it. This is only temporary legislation. It only extends to January 1, 1949. So we are only trying to provide a bridge over which our sheep industry may be able to travel during the postwar era.

Under the Herter amendment the wool producers would be at the mercy of a changing market which might well lead to a complete destruction of our domestic wool industry.

The Herter amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for one-half minute.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the Herter amendment because it is moderate. I will speak on another section of the bill, on the issue of the high cost of living, as a representative of a city district; a question which I think it is essential Members bear in mind when they go home.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] is recognized for one-half minute.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, this legislation is exceedingly important to my district and to my State, which is the third largest wool-producing State in the Nation. The adoption of the Herter amendment and failure to pass this bill will be a disaster to the economy of my district. I sincerely trust the amendment will be rejected and the bill be passed.

Mr. Chairman, the facts concerning the wool industry are well known to everyone. It is an important industry in peacetime, and it is indispensable in war. We cannot afford to be without a healthy wool industry, yet we are permitting it to diminish steadily by our failure to establish an adequate wool program and to provide any protection against foreign imports. Indeed, there is a very real danger that tariffs on wool will be further reduced in the near future.

In the meantime the wool industry is providing, through the tariff duties, funds for subsidies for cotton and wheat, for school lunches, for relief and distribution of surplus farm products. These are the section 32 funds, 30 percent of our receipts from imports. During the past 6 or 7 years the duties on wool alone have constituted about 30 percent of our tariff receipts. Wool supports these many programs, but there is no support for wool.

Uncertainty about the future has resulted in a constant decrease in the sheep population of this country. In Montana, where the grazing of livestock is the only way to produce wealth from thousands of acres of public lands, the sheep population has diminished from 5,000,000 head to 2,500,000 head. Income from wool, one of our most important commodities, has gone steadily downward.

The legislation we are considering today is vital to the wool industry, and to the same extent it is important to the economy of the entire West. We cannot afford to let the wool industry perish from neglect. We cannot afford to subsidize foreign wool growers at the expense of the American sheepman. For these reasons I believe that it is the clear duty of the Congress to provide the wool program proposed in the legislation under consideration today.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] is recognized for one-half minute.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I am against the Herter amendment and for the bill as it was passed by the Senate.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for S. 1498 known as the Senate wool bill. I voted for the House wool bill that the President vetoed. I am sorry that the President vetoed it. I know that he was misinformed by the State Department or rather by a millionaire in the State Department, Bill Clayton.

I have felt for some time and I feel now that the President should never veto a bill just because some Cabinet officer asks him to do so. The President should be mindful that Congress still writes the Nation's laws. His cabinet is to advise him how to execute, observe, and enforce those laws. It is none of their business the kind of laws that Congress passes.

The Congress, and the Congress alone, is directly responsible to the people of the Nation. They elect the Members. The President should never permit or seriously consider the objections of any of his cabinet as to legislation that Congress passed.

It is true that he should consider the merits of their suggestions, but in order to do that he should invite the author of the bill and the chairmen of the committees of both the House and Senate before whose committee the legislation was considered. Only in this way can he become aware of the merits and demerits of the legislation. Ex-party proceedings and star-chamber proceedings are un-American. The President should abolish that practice. It has been indulged in too long for the good of our Nation by his predecessors.

Therefore, I suggest that it is the sense of Congress that hereafter the President call in before he veto any bill the author of the bill and the chairmen of both the House and Senate of the committees that reported the legislation favorably after full hearings.

I hope that this suggestion will reach the President and I am confident that hereafter he will act upon it. It is only fair and just to Congress.

I am not going to discuss the merits of S. 1498. It is only a half-way measure. Further legislation will be necessary if the wool industry is to survive.

I am informed that Bill Clayton in the State Department says that wool is such a small percentage of our economy that we can afford to let it die, so that the British may supply us with wool. I presume that this millionaire who made his millions in cotton transactions with Great Britain does not know that lamb chops and leg of lamb comes from the same animal that produces the wool.

I state frankly to you that no industry in America should be permitted to die in order to build up foreign industries at the expense of the taxpayers. That un-American doctrine has no place here. I say this without apologies to the blind followers of Bill Clayton.

In closing, may I suggest to the wool growers that they better get busy and help us to get cost of production for agriculture. I suggest that they get a copy of H. R. 794, and read it and study it. If this bill is passed, then the wool industry and the sheep industry together with some forty other agricultural products will be protected from those who would sell our Nation down the river.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this bill and am opposed to the Herter amendment. The Herter amendment is a grave injustice to the industry, if adopted, because it freezes on the industry a parity formula which is unjust and should be revised, but in addition and what is more important—the amendment will kill the bill. We have not a chance of getting a conference and getting this bill through both the Senate and the House if the amendment is adopted. The Herter amendment will mean a difference to the domestic producer of between 42 and 36 cents. The old parity formula will reflect a price of about 36 cents a pound. As stated by some of the previous speakers, there has been a constant effort on the part of the wool industry to get an adjustment of this parity formula. One of the original bills considered by the Committee on Agriculture contained a provision for a revision of the parity formula. It is conceded by everybody that such parity formula should take place. However, the provision was

stricken out because some of the committee members felt that the revision of the parity formula for wool should go along with a general consideration of a revision of all parity formulas, and I understand the Committee on Agriculture intends to make a general study of the whole subject. It will therefore be unfair to adopt the Herter amendment and to fix a parity formula on the wool industry which admittedly is not in line. For that reason, and the further and impelling reason that we cannot possibly as a practical matter get this legislation through on time if we adopt the amendment, I urge that it be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] is recognized.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill has the support of all American wool growers. It has the support of all the great farm organizations. It has the unanimous support of the House Committee on Agriculture. If we do not pass this legislation, it means that the wool industry will not only be crippled but will be put out of business. It is this or nothing, and I trust that the Herter amendment will be voted down and that the legislation will pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE] for one-half minute.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the chairman of the Agriculture Committee how many pounds of raw wool goes into the manufacture of a suit of clothes that costs $75?

Mr. HOPE. I refer the gentleman to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, an expert in that line.

Mr. RICH. Two and one-half pounds.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The reason I ask is because I do not believe the price of wool has much to do with the retail price of a suit of clothes.

Mr. RICH. Two and one-half pounds. The thing here is not how the increased price of wool is reflected in the cost of a finished suit.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I have a feeling that the price of wool does not have much to do with the high cost of a suit of clothes, since only a relatively small amount of wool is required for a suit of woolen clothes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired, all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HERTER) there were—ayes 67, noes 113.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The provisions of sections 385, 386, and 388 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, shall be applicable to the support operations carried out pursuant to the first section of this act.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will not try to detain the Committee very long, but I do feel that what I have to say to the Committee is important enough to take the time of the Members on the last day. I am a new Member, and it is not lightly that I would detain the Committee on the last day.

I am really concerned about what we have done on this wool bill. I represent a city district. In my city district people consume agricultural commodities; they do not create them. The people of my city district need the things the farmers produce, and the farmers need the materials my people produce—clothing, building materials, construction materials, mechanical appliances, automobiles, medicines, machinery, and a host of other goods and services.

The Nation today is interdependent. I say this particularly to my colleagues from the farm districts. It used to be argued that if life on the farm was not made worth while the farmer would not farm and we in the city could not live because he would not produce the things we have to have to eat and live. But it is equally true today that unless you make it worth while for the city dweller to make the machinery, clothes, construction materials, medicines, and all the other things the farmer needs to get along with, the farmer would not be able to live either. We are each dependent upon the other.

I would like to stress this point with respect to the Herter amendment. The Herter amendment was a moderate amendment. It proposed to continue a plan for price support of agricultural commodities which has been going on for a long time, and which will come up for review in the Congress next year. Instead of the moderate approach the choice was made not to adopt the Herter amendment but for a fixed price. I am much disquieted by that as should be every Member representing a city district, and for this reason. Here is what the figures show:

According to the Consumers' Price Index of the Department of Labor the consumers' prices for food between June, 1946, and June, 1947, have gone up from an index number of 145 to an index number of 190, about 30 percent, whereas the average prices for all essentials of family life have gone up only about 20 percent, from an index number of 133 to an index number of 157 (1935–39=100).

This Congress has shown a disposition to call to task any group in the country, no matter how large, when it felt that group to be getting out of balance with the rest. It did that very thing in connection with labor. I beg my friends and colleagues who represent the farm districts to go back this time and to see what you can do to help us city Members, and us city dwellers to bring down the cost of living, and to be sure that you in the agricultural districts do not get out of balance.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman fails to recognize that the high cost of food is largely due to the fact that we have shipped out eighteen and one-half million tons of food to other countries of the world at a cost of $2,300,000,000 to the American people.

Mr. JAVITS. May I point out to the gentleman that the cost of what we ship out is determined by its price. If the gentleman will go into any cafeteria he will find that the American people are not short of food; we are sending our surplus.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. The Commodity Credit Corporation may, until December 31, 1948, dispose of wool owned by it without regard to any restriction imposed upon it by law.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to get our friends from the cities straightened out a little when they go home. They seem to be afraid to go home for some reason or other. When you go home at least tell your people the truth. You know, that is not a bad idea. As the old lady told the boy, "Always tell the truth and you will not have to remember what you said." That is all you have to do about this food situation. The price the farmer receives is not a high price. If some farm products in short supply are high, it is because of governmental action.

This is a rather peculiar thing, you know, if you come from a rural section. Today dairy products are selling at from one-fourth to one-third what they sold a year ago. I can take out of my pocket a letter I received today from a pea farmer who is getting less than 1 cent a pound for his peas. The parity price is 4½ cents. I can take another letter out of my pocket showing where they are putting the fur farmers out of business. Yet we have the Bureau of Labor Statistics every month telling us how much of an increase there is in the cost of living.

Let us get this straight. I do not know whether this has anything to do with the wool bill or not, but I want to say to every one who is here today, and I want it in the RECORD, the reason I am going to support this wool bill is because I have seen these farmers taken to the cleaners more than once before. Now they are going to have their pants taken off, and when they do at least I want them to have on a pair of good

woolen pants to be taken off. This wool bill was around here last session. It is at least on the floor of the House for consideration. I realize we are over a legislative barrel. We are by necessity compelled to accept a legislative act repellent to many of us.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, it was stated here a while ago that the people who are interested in the defeat of this bill are of that opinion for selfish reasons. They say these people want to buy foreign wool. If that reference is made to me, may I say that I want to buy domestic wool. I want to develop the wool industry in this country, I want to see the American people prosper, and I want to keep the American standard of living high. There is no one who will work harder to do that than I. But unless we turn around here and do something different from what has been done by the New Deal in the last 10 or 15 years, we will find we are wrecking our whole economy. You will find that these reciprocal trade agreements are going to undermine the American manufacturer, they are going to undermine American labor, and they are going to undermine American industry. You put that down as coming from me, and I do not care whether they say I am going back 50 years. It seems to me they had lots of sense and were industrious. I am going back to the time when our forefathers made America one of the greatest countries on the face of the earth, and I am not interested in trying to ruin what we discovered.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield for a question.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Along the line the gentleman is talking, I want to read just a sentence from a letter from Boston. It says:

> Right now thousands of woolen textile workers are out of work, and many eastern woolen mills are completely shut down.

Mr. RICH. After we get through following the New Deal you will find out that there will be a whole lot more things shut down. Whenever the time comes that you start in to establish prices and take the money out of the Treasury for subsidies, you are on the wrong foot. You have established a price of 28 cents on copper, you have established a price of 18 cents on lead, you have established an 18-cent price on zinc, you have established a high price on wool and on everything else, and then you go to the Treasury and take the money out. Where are you going to get that money? The first thing you know you are going to run out of money and you are going to wreck yourselves. Another thing you did. You came in here and said, "We want $300,000,000 for Greece, we want $100,000,000 for Turkey, we want $3,750,000,000 for Great Britain, and three or four hundred million for all these other countries," but after a while you will find out that the bubble will burst and you will wish you would all have been sound Republicans like your grandfathers were instead of a lot of New Dealers. Wake up, think, and do it quick. If you do not, you will bust.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JENKINS of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1498) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 315, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HERTER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. HERTER moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Agriculture with instructions to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: Beginning in line 5, page 1, strike out the words "at the price it supported wool in 1946" and insert in lieu thereof the words, "at a price not less than 90 percent of parity."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that it is not in order now to offer a motion to recommit with that provision, for the simple reason that the same provision has just been voted down by the House.

The SPEAKER. In a parliamentary way the House has no knowledge of what happened in the Committee.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

The question is on the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HERTER) there were—ayes 64, noes 128.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. TABER submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4269) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4269) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 11, 14, 46, 68, and 69.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 12, 13, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 39, 44, 45, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62, 66, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, and 101, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$40,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$15,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$4,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That subject to the limitations and requirements of this paragraph this appropriation shall be available for the transportation of voluntary relief supplies shipped by relief agencies licensed for operation in Europe and in Asia including the occupied areas under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$4,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

"Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans: For an additional amount for 'Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans', $5,000,000, to be available for the purposes specified under this head in the Act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 663)."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$40,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree

to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$675,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$10,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$65,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$40,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in line 2 of said amendment insert the following: "$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$7,460,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$71,073,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$75,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$600,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 17, 40, 41, 42, 43, 58, and 64.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOSEPH H. BALL,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
HOMER FERGUSON,
GUY CORDON,
CARL HAYDEN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4269) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DIRECT APPROPRIATIONS

Amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4 make appropriations for the Senate.

Amendment No. 5 appropriates $100,000 for the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6 appropriates $40,000 for the Aviation Policy Board instead of $50,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8 make appropriations for the Senate.

Amendment No. 9 appropriates $400,000 for the Office of Defense Transportation instead of $484,000 as proposed by the Senate and $140,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 10 limits administrative expenses on the appropriation for assistance to Greece and Turkey to $4,500,000 instead of $5,177,900 as proposed by the Senate and $3,800,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 11 limits District of Columbia allocation of administrative expenses to $300,000 as proposed by the House instead of $607,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 12 and 13 make formal changes in language.

Amendment No. 14 limits amount for administrative expenses to $700,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 15 excepts from limitation allocations to the International Children's Emergency Fund.

Amendment No. 16 provides for payment by the Government of transportation charges on relief supplies from voluntary organizations.

Amendment No. 17 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 18 limits rates to be paid per diem experts at $35 as proposed by the Senate instead of $50 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 19 appropriates $500,000 for the Public Health Service as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20 appropriates $8,026,000 for Social Security Administration as proposed by the Senate instead of $12,026,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 21 and 22 provide for payment of damage claims.

Amendment No. 23 limits rates to be paid per diem experts at $35 as proposed by the Senate instead of $50 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 24 appropriates $4,250,000 for Selective Service Records instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House, and $5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25 appropriates $5,000,000 additional for automobiles for veteran amputees as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26 appropriates $17,500 for Animal Husbandry as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27 appropriates $75,000 for the Insecticide Act instead of $100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 28, 29, and 30 appropriate $210,000 for Sugar Rationing Administration as proposed by the Senate instead of $710,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 31 and 32 make formal changes in language.

Amendment No. 33 makes a time limitation 120 days as proposed by the Senate instead of 60 days as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 34 and 35 appropriate $39,520 as proposed by the Senate for Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Amendment No. 36 appropriates $40,000 for air-navigation facilities instead of $70,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount should be sufficient if present equipment in towers to be equipped is fully utilized.

Amendment No. 37 appropriates $675,000 for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce instead of $650,000 as proposed by the House and $700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38 appropriates $10,000 for field-office service instead of $15,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39 requires certain items of terminal leave in the Coal Mines Administration to be paid by the Navy.

Amendments Nos. 40, 41, and 42, and 43 are reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 44 strikes out an appropriation of $375,000 proposed by the House for Alaska Native Service.

Amendment No. 45 strikes out an appropriation of $250,000 proposed by the House for purchase and transportation of Indian supplies.

Amendment No. 46 appropriates $302,300 as proposed by the House for the Indian Service.

Amendment No. 47 appropriates $65,000 for national parks instead of $50,000 as proposed by the House and $89,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 48 appropriates $40,000 for Fish and Wildlife Service instead of $30,000 as proposed by the House and $50,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49 allocates $50,000 for departmental services instead of $98,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50 appropriates $7,460,000 for public employment offices instead of $9,460,000 as proposed by the House and $1,460,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 51, 52, 53, and 54 provide for payment of damage claims as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 55, 56, and 57 make appropriations for Department of State as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 59, 60, 61, and 62 make adjustments in limitations in the Department of State as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 63 appropriates $71,073,900 for International Relief Organization instead of $71,024,900 as proposed by the House and $73,361,400 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 64 reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 65 provides a contract authorization of $75,000,000 instead of $100,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and $50,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 66 limits rates to be paid per diem experts at $35 as proposed by the Senate instead of $50 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 67 and 68 appropriate $600,000,000 for government and relief in occupied areas instead of $550,000,000 as proposed by the House and $625,000,000 plus a contract authorization of $100,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 69 restores language proposed by the House to require payment of travel allowances of military personnel from the "Government and relief" appropriation.

Amendment No. 70 strikes from the bill language authorizing payment of transportation charges on voluntary relief shipments.

Amendment No. 71 to 99, inclusive, provide for payment of damage claims and judgments as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 100 explains the opinion of Congress that expenditures for food stuffs should be for those items which can be purchased with benefit to the national economy.

Amendment No. 101 changes a section number.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The managers on the part of the House have authorized the following motions with respect to the amendments reported in disagreement:

Amendment No. 17: That the House recede and concur with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by the said amendment insert: "and in addition military appropriations may be expended for such purposes, not exceeding $15,000,000, in contemplation of reimbursement if justified."

Amendments Nos. 40, 41, 42, and 43: That the House insist on disagreement.

Amendment No. 58. That the House recede and concur with an amendment limiting the amount of the proposed transfer to $500,000 instead of $600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 64: That the House recede and concur in the said amendment with an amendment limiting the amount available to $15,000 per annum.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 4269 and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. CANNON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, may I ask the gentleman if we will be permitted to have some of the time on this side?

Mr. TABER. I have told the gentleman that I would yield him 30 minutes. That will be all that I will be able to yield. If I do that, I will be unable to yield any time to anyone else.

Mr. CANNON. That will be satisfactory, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill represents as the conference report is presented to you $1,657,000,000. That is $54,000,000 above what it was as it passed the House and $23,000,000 less than it was as it passed the Senate. There are two or three amendments in disagreement which run to perhaps $1,000,000. There are several items of contract authorizations involved, and they have been reduced more than the appropriations. In one particular item there was a reduction of $100,000,000 and in another $25,000,000.

I wish to say with reference to one of these items that the item for relief in occupied territory has been reported back with $600,000,000 in cash available and no contract authorization.

At the present time the pipe lines are loaded so that they will carry through according to the estimates of the War Department in Germany until the 1st of November, and in Japan and Korea until the 1st of December.

It seem absolutely ridiculous that we supply funds to carry as long a term into the fiscal year 1949 as that and the Senate yielded upon the contract authorizations and on $25,000,000 of the appropriation in connection with that.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, on this concluding day of the session, at the close of the fiscal program for the year, may I take advantage of the opportunity to express my appreciation of the privilege of having served under the speakership of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, Speaker MARTIN. When the annals of this Congress are written, he will go down in history as one of the ablest and fairest presiding officers who has occupied that eminent and exalted station.

And may I also express my appreciation, and the appreciation of this side of the aisle, of the kindness and courtesy of the distinguished leader of the majority, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. He has maintained the position of his party militantly, aggressively, sometimes with perhaps exuberant enthusiasm, but nevertheless as befits a great leader of a great party in a great Congress.

I am glad to express appreciation of the attitude of the scholarly chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Chairman EATON, of New Jersey. As I told him recently, he is one of the truly great men of his Nation and his time. He has conducted the affairs of his committee, under the circumstances perhaps the most important committee of the Congress, with disinterested impartiality, and solely with the interest of his country at heart.

And I have been glad to go along with the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, in all of his justified economies. I regret I have not been able to fully agree with him at times in his attitude toward fiscal provisions for agriculture, labor, and social service, but in my opinion he is one of the outstanding men in that long line of able men who, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, have held the purse strings of the Nation.

But while all these gentleman are personally the most amiable gentlemen in the world, collectively they have spearheaded a program ruthless and reactionary in its effect upon domestic policies and grudging and dilatory in its support of our foreign policies.

As a result this Congress has, so far, failed in every announced objective.

They have been particularly unfortunate in their fiscal program. Before the Eightieth Congress met, the veteran Republican Congressmen, whose seniority would place them in positions of leadership, ignoring the progressive element of their party, were announcing fanciful programs, touching appropriations expenditures and taxes. They were employing figures patently absurd. The new budget was then in the making, and there was available no sound basis for their extravagant utterances. That became plainly manifest when the budget was presented shortly after the Congress convened. They were nonplussed. They were confronted with a balanced budget. It was in the black for the first time since it went into the red when the Republican Party was in the saddle, both in the White House and in the Congress. They could not balance it for it was in balance, in consequence of the rigid economy which a Democratic President and Democratic Congress had practiced since the close of the shooting war on August 10, 1945.

When the Congress declared war against Japan, Germany, and Italy back in December 1941, the House of Representatives pledged unanimously all the resources of the country to bring the wars to a successful termination. Military and naval budgets thereafter virtually were written as advocated by the high commands of the armed services. Vast sums were appropriated and when the fighting ceased on VJ-day a very considerable unobligated amount remained to the credit of the War and Navy Departments and other Federal agencies which had been given appropriations for or on account of the war. Less than 3 weeks after VJ-day the Appropriations Committee of the House launched upon an appropriation rescissory hearing which resulted in the cancellation of potential Treasury demands in the amount of $51,700,000,000. All told, up to the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress, appropriations and authority to incur obligations had been canceled to the extent of $64,000,000,000. We had planned to continue with this recovery program if our stewardship was continued. It must be a progressive program because of the involvement of the funds in war transactions. Upward of $20,000,000,000 remained subject to review when our control was ended, and thus far our Republican brethren have canceled but $3,600,000,000, and only a negligible part of that amount, if any, would have been spent had they left it alone. I am advised by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that such amounts as they did "recise" would have reverted to the Treasury automatically by operation of existing law.

By word and not deed, they would have the country believe that they must be looked to for the economical conduct of the Government. Let us do a bit of comparing. The Democratic Seventy-ninth Congress launched, as I have indicated, an economy drive immediately following the capitulation of Japan. That was in the fiscal year 1946. So that fiscal year was partly a war year. Expenditures in that partly war year were $63,000,000,000. For the 1947 fiscal year, just closed, they dropped to $42,500,000,000. For the 1948 fiscal year, which commenced the first of this month, the President last January projected total expenditures of $37,500,000,000, all flowing from new and prior-year appropriations. Considering the untouchable components of the last named amount, the Democratic record for economy since VJ-day must be termed as praiseworthy by any fair-minded observer. Possible Treasury withdrawals have been canceled to the extent of $64,000,000,000, expenditures, despite continued war-occasioned demands, have been reduced

upwards of 40 percent, and there has been applied to public debt reduction upwards of $22,000,000,000, and a balanced budget for the fiscal year 1948 was presented less than 17 months following the cessation of hostilities.

That was the retrenchment record of the Democrats when the Republicans assumed control. The Democrats had well under way a retrenchment program; not a slap-dash affair; not one as a Republican Senator likened to "a man in a darkroom swinging a meat ax," but a considered and consistent program to be pursued after weighing the pros and cons and fully determining the course which would best serve the public good; not a chosen few, but the public generally—people generally in all walks of life.

The Republicans, or at least those who have been directing party strategy, proposed to slash here and there regardless. They were going to reduce taxes, whether there also could be a public debt reduction or not; they were going to run the Government, other than the postal service, with 100,000 employees, which incidentally would not begin to meet the needs of the Veterans' Administration alone. Their budget cuts would aggregate, they announced, $6,000,000,000, which was to come out of a budget of $32,100,000,000, of which $25,000,000,000 were earmarked, as follows:

	Billions
National defense	9.493
Veterans	7.009
Interest on the public debt	5.000
Tax refunds	2.055
Special welfare	1.502
Total	25.069

I do not know how many people were gullible enough to take such irresponsible, proposed accomplishments seriously, however widely advertised, but by now I trust that those who did are aware of how badly they were misled. They have listened to words; they can now see the deeds.

My distinguished successor as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] on January 7, 1947, in a press release, stated:

> We now have nearly 2,300,000 civilian employees; we do not need over 500,000 at the most.

Instead of denying appropriations for the compensation of 1,800,000 employees, the number declared by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the Federal pay roll for the fiscal year 1948, upon the basis of appropriations made available thus far will average around 2,000,000 employees.

As regards appropriations, instead of a reduction of $6,000,000,000, there has been a reduction of $2,900,000,000, and that amount is facial and not actual, as I later shall point out. The following table tells the story in a summary fashion: Most of the figures are final. It has been necessary to approximate some, because the exact amounts will not be known before the final adjournment hour.

Comparison of amounts of direct appropriations carried in appropriation bills, 80th Cong., 1st sess., compared with budget estimates for such bills

Bill	Amount of budget estimate	Amount of appropriations	Increase (+) or decrease (−), appropriations compared with estimates
REGULAR ANNUAL BILLS, 1948			
Department of Agriculture	$805,141,608	$613,046,826	−$192,094,782
District of Columbia	95,793,160	95,504,737	−288,423
Independent offices	8,509,497,759	8,189,122,927	−311,374,832
Interior Department	296,135,420	194,587,859	−101,547,561
Department of Labor, Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies:			
Labor, Department of	103,578,700	75,850,801	−27,727,799
Federal Security Agency	976,370,339	901,670,630	−74,699,709
Related agencies	699,665,000	696,637,100	−3,027,900
Total	1,779,614,039	1,674,158,631	−105,455,408
Legislative branch	76,153,077	55,254,435	−20,898,642
Military	5,716,791,500	5,482,529,633	−234,261,867
Navy	3,513,000,300	3,268,766,100	−244,234,200
State, Justice, and Commerce Departments, and Judiciary:			
State	279,699,268	232,724,703	−46,974,565
Justice	111,470,000	107,488,230	−3,981,770
Commerce	286,989,000	191,914,834	−95,074,166
Judiciary	20,630,320	19,048,165	−1,582,155
Total	698,788,588	551,175,932	−147,612,656
Treasury and Post Office Departments:			
Treasury	2,554,034,250	1,684,848,400	−869,185,850
Post Office	1,545,089,250	1,531,661,050	−13,428,200
Total	4,099,123,500	3,216,509,450	−882,614,050
War Department—civil functions	382,727,100	[1] 440,000,000	+57,272,900
Government corporations	50,137,500	35,040,000	−15,097,500
Total, regular annual bills	26,013,903,551	23,815,696,530	−2,198,207,021
SUPPLEMENTAL, DEFICIENCY, AND MISCELLANEOUS BILLS			
Urgent deficiency, 1947	179,319,100	179,645,668	+326,568
Second urgent deficiency, 1947	61,778,757	72,236,257	+10,457,500
First deficiency, 1947	3,106,566,789	2,835,161,509	−271,405,280
Second deficiency, 1947	139,528,414	117,438,958	−22,089,456
H. J. Res. 159, to supply deficiencies	243,610,987	243,255,607	−355,380
H. J. Res. 154 providing for hoof-and-mouth disease	9,000,000	9,000,000	
H. R. 4031 providing emergency appropriations		6,180,000	+6,180,000
Supplemental, 1948	1,925,683,823	[1] 1,603,199,094	−322,484,729
Second supplemental, 1948	220,870,100	[2] 100,059,200	−120,810,900
Government corporations supplemental	35,500,000	35,500,000	
Total, supplemental, deficiency and miscellaneous	5,921,857,970	5,201,676,293	−720,181,677
Permanent annual appropriations:			
Interest on the public debt	5,000,000,000	5,000,000,000	
Sinking fund	587,560,000	587,560,000	
All other permanent and indefinite	362,269,846	362,269,846	
Total permanent annual appropriations	5,949,829,846	5,949,829,846	
Grand total	37,885,591,367	34,967,202,669	−2,918,388,698

[1] Approximate; bill not through conference when this table was prepared.
[2] As passed by the House; final figures not available when this table was prepared.

It will be seen from the foregoing that the reduction is not $6,000,000,000, but $2,918,000,000, and that only sophistically. Actually, the reductions effected may be said not to exceed at the very outside $2,207,000,000, because the Republicans have made provision in a number of instances obviously inadequate and which will have to be supplemented at a later date. The most flagrant example is the reduction of $800,000,000 in the amount of $2,031,000,000 requested for tax refunds. I have had the original estimate recanvassed by the Bureau of the Budget and am advised by the Director of that Bureau that the best approximation that can be made of the amount that will be needed for expenditure is $1,942,000,000. Clearly, it is misleading to include in the foregoing appropriation summary reduction in excess of $89,000,000 for tax refunds. The fact of the matter is this reduction applying to tax refunds may result in an added and unnecessary expense. Tax refunds bear interest until paid, and if the appropriation for their payment is not adequate, interest charges will pile up until a supplemental appropriation may be processed at the next session of Congress.

Looking ahead, one may well question the wisdom of certain reductions the Republicans have effected. Some Federal appropriations are in the interest of added Federal revenues in the years ahead, more than adequate to compensate for the money now spent. That would be true as regards the reduction in the force of the Bureau of Internal Revenue engaged in tax-evasion work. That work heretofore has resulted in the collection of large sums which otherwise would not have been paid.

Here is what the Washington Evening Star had to say about the matter editorially:

DOUBTFUL ECONOMY

It is a questionable sort of economy which Congress has practiced at the expense of the Internal Revenue Bureau—and of the Nation's honest taxpayers. Judging from President Truman's protest to Congress, it is

economy of the type which saves a dollar today but ignores authoritative warnings that the savings will result in losses far exceeding the amount temporarily gained.

The President's vigorous message criticizing such false thrift echoed previous warnings by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue that any reduction in funds for investigating income tax returns would be costly in the end. Mr. Truman says the $20,000,000 cut from the bureau's appropriation will mean $400,000,000 less in the Treasury in the new fiscal year. This is because a reduction of from four to five thousand income tax employees will be necessitated. Experience has shown that this number of tax investigators annually saves the Government half a billion dollars in taxes recovered.

The extent of dishonesty among taxpayers is indicated by the fact that the bureau's force of 27,000 tax enforcement agents in recent years has recovered an average of two and a half billion dollars a year in evaded taxes and penalties. And this record has been made under a program calling for investigation of only three out of every hundred income-tax returns filed. According to bureau officials, the recoveries would be correspondingly greater if a larger percentage of returns could be checked. To do this would require more—not less—employees. All of this was stressed before the Appropriations Committees. But the urge for an immediate economy showing seems to have been too great. Chairman TABER, of the House Appropriations Committee, has defended the cut on the ground that other than essential employees could be dismissed. Until some evidence is produced to support this view, however, the reduction will remain subject to Mr. Truman's criticism.

The same also would be true as to funds withheld from projects, public works and otherwise, of a nature that would benefit the national economy down through the years. Such matters must be taken into account when appraising the stewardship of the Republicans. They have made a sorry record, considering all the fanfare with which they opened the session.

As regards reducing appropriations, they missed their objective by a matter of about 64 percent. In canceling prior-year appropriations, they have done practically nothing. A very large unexpended balance of prior-year appropriations remains untouched. There has been no exhaustive inquiry at all into the need for continuing the availability of some $24,000,000,000 appropriated prior to the fiscal year 1947. The appropriation program vigorously prosecuted by the Democrats was abandoned. They have some piecemeal cancellations, amounting in all to $3,637,499,906, but, as said before, the entire amount was not available for obligation and would have been automatically covered into the general fund of the Treasury.

Never in my time has a Congress made such a complete debacle. Never have we witnessed such a gap between promise and performance. And never has the Nation seen such procrastination.

The budget was presented on January 7, 1947. It is always the aim to have the appropriation bills passed and signed by the President prior to the commencement of the fiscal year for which made, which is important in order to permit the Federal agencies to discharge their responsibilities in an orderly and businesslike fashion. There have been delays in the past when, for divers reasons, some appropriation measures were not law when the fiscal year to which they applied begun, but this year not a single one of the 12 regular annual appropriation bills became law prior to July 1. Only two bills had become law when two-thirds of the first month of the fiscal year had gone by, and the status of five bills at that late day was such that the agencies they concerned were unable to estimate where they stood. I can conceive of nothing more disruptive to orderly, efficient, economical administration. Picture a modern business establishment operating for a month or the best part of a month without a budget.

Many excuses have been advanced to account for this dilatory procedure, but I have not heard one that would hold water. There is some delay always by reason of completing the organization of a new Congress, but if we turn back to the beginning of the Seventy-ninth Congress, despite the delay attendant upon organizational formalities, every regular annual appropriation bill had passed the House and Senate before the end of June and all had been enacted and were law prior to July 1, except two, which were not signed by the President until July 3. For the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress the record is almost as good. Every regular annual appropriation bill had passed both Houses before the commencement of the new fiscal year. Four had not become law by July 1, but the agencies concerned were not handicapped, because they knew or could closely approximate the provisions of the bills as they would be finally passed and approved.

This year five of the regular annual bills did not pass the Senate until July 1, or later, and one did not pass prior to July 18. What is the answer? Speaker MARTIN in his address to the House on January 3, last, said that the Republicans had study committees at work for 2 years and more, preparing for the time when they would be charged with the responsibility of conducting the legislative branch of the Government. Such foresight and preparation should naturally have facilitated the work.

Certainly, lack of staff is not responsible for the slow-down. The Republicans believe in skeletonizing the staffs of executive agencies, but have not been averse to providing themselves with help of all kinds and qualifications. In the last Congress the Committee on Appropriations, had a committee staff of 12 persons, and in addition, a chief investigator with one stenographer. The chief investigator was an FBI man, personally selected and detailed by Mr. Hoover. When the chief investigator needed assistance, he would request the detail of a man or men from executive agencies possessed of qualifications appropriate to the task to be performed. I am advised that the regular committee staff now numbers 15, augmented by a permanent investigatory staff, numbering with clerical assistants, eight individuals, at an annual expense of $46,800.

The arrangement of one man and a stenographer, and detailed assistants, as and when necessary, has been abandoned. So, even with 2 years and more of preparing for the job, and a sizable staff expansion, Federal agencies have been compelled to sit back for nearly one-twelfth of the fiscal year to learn where they stood financially. Morale has been sabotaged and efficiency has suffered along with it. There seemingly has been no regard for the untoward effects of the dilatory manner in which the appropriation bills have been handled. It is without precedent.

Associated with the discredited program to cut budget estimates to the tune of $6,000,000,000 was the tax-reduction scheme, conceived and twice passed in the interest of the well-to-do. The advertised purpose was to encourage "venture capital" in the interest of wider employment. That might have an appeal were it not for the fact that production and employment are at levels unsurpassed in our entire economy, and no immediate change in that situation now appears imminent.

When the time is opportune to pry loose venture capital, if any prying be necessary; if tax reduction is the method of approach, I have no doubt appropriate legislation will be enacted suited to the accomplishment of that objective, and not drawn primarily in the interest of increasing the wealth of the better circumstanced people, as were the measures twice passed at this session and deservedly rejected by the President.

Investors and capitalists might well follow the Government's example as regards new and enlarged enterprises and take all measures necessary to embark upon them when signs point to a lessened level of prosperity. Business, like Government, should build up a backlog of undertakings to be inaugurated as and when a subsidence looms in the prevailing salutary measure of economy.

Tax reduction at this time, as advocated by the Republicans, disregards elementary principles of providence. In times of plenty common sense prompts us to lay by in anticipation of a rainy day. Successful farmers and merchants and provident people in all walks of life liquidate debts, pay off mortgages, and improve their financial status when times are prosperous. Government should be conducted in the same way. Our Government is saddled with a huge debt. In round numbers, $5,000,000,000 of our taxes annually go to the payment of interest on that debt, which is vastly more money than it took to run the entire Government a few short years ago. Like the foresighted citizen, the Government should employ surplus income flowing from the present high level of prosperity to reduce its debt, and lessen the interest load. No one can foretell what tomorrow may bring forth. A third world war is talked of. Pyramiding the cost of another conflict upon the unpaid cost of the last one, and the one before that, would prove the ruination of our economy and bring about the impoverishment of every family in the land.

There is another reason for applying every dollar possible to debt reduction.

Maturities will come in large blocks which cannot be met from current revenues. There must be recourse to refunding, and it is reasonable to assume that new issues may not be attractive to buyers at the present low rates of interest. Marketing of refunding securities will lack the salability that obtained during the war bond sales drives. The stimulus of patriotic duty will be lacking. Instead of paying around 2 percent interest, we eventually may have to pay 5 or 6 percent, and, consequently, the interest bill in the aggregate may very greatly exceed the five billions now being paid.

As the distinguished former Speaker RAYBURN well said, "The Democratic Party is for the proper kind of tax reduction at the proper time." The bills passed by the Republicans, Mr. RAYBURN said, gave "a great many people too much and a great many more too little." How true that statement was is evidenced by the fact that under the terms of the Republican proposal a man who pays a tax of $95 would be relieved to the extent of $28.50, and a man who pays a tax of $380 would be relieved to the extent of $76. These two examples apply to net incomes before personal exemption of $1,500 and $3,000 respectively.

But when we go into the big income range, a $20,000 man would be relieved to the extent of $1,278; a $50,000 man would be relieved to the extent of $4,959; a $100,000 man would be relieved to the extent of $12,625; a $300,000 man would be relieved to the extent of $39,934; a $500,000 man would be relieved to the extent of $58,266, and the million dollar fellows would benefit to the extent of $103,766. In other words, the man netting $1,000,000, and he would be a man, no doubt possessing a large fortune, would have his taxes reduced by $103,766, while the poor chap in the $1,500 bracket would be benefited the paltry sum of $28.50. Is it any wonder that a Democratic President, exemplifying the principles of democracy, refused to be a party to such discrimination?

Is it small wonder that Dr. Gallup found the weight of sentiment on the side of cutting debt in preference to cutting taxes? It is quite evident from whence came the urge for lowered taxes, and that is what ex-Speaker RAYBURN had in mind when he said the Democratic Party is for the proper kind of tax reduction at the proper time.

The Congress passed in the closing days of the Seventy-ninth Congress a Legislative Reorganization Act. The country was led to believe that Congress conducted its business along horse-and-buggy-day lines and that the new legislation would open the way for modern, efficient, businesslike procedures. One of the salient provisions of the legislation required that there be a legislative budget, to be determined on or prior to February 15 of each year. Pursuantly, long before the November elections of last year, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I took time by the forelock and arranged for as much advance preparation as appeared practicable of accomplishment prior to the meeting of the new Congress in order to avoid any delay in meeting the date line named in the statute. My responsibility ceased with the transfer of party stewardship. To this date the law has not been complied with. The Republican leadership of the House and Senate could come to no agreement among themselves upon the provisions of the first legislative budget. As a consequence, the legislative budget has been written piecemeal, without a predetermined objective, the new law to the contrary notwithstanding. No objective was ever jointly established by the two bodies, and instead of a $6,000,000,000 reduction in appropriations, as the House proposed, or a four-and-one-half-billion-dollar reduction, which the Senate advocated as the maximum reduction, we find by adding up the actual figures, not available until the closing hours of the session, an actual cut of approximately $2,200,000,000.

Another dereliction in complying with the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act concerns permanent annual appropriations. The law requires the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses to make a study of existing permanent appropriations with a view to limiting their number and eliminating any found to be unnecessary. Taking note of the requirement, I gave directions before the November elections for arrangements to be completed for the conduct of such a study. The Republican control has done nothing about it. It very well could be that they thus passed up an opportunity to bolster their disappointing savings, to flow from reduced appropriations.

The much touted Legislative Reorganization Act either should be complied with or amended or repealed. Thus far its effect has been to make available to Congress a superabundance of highly paid employees and to raise the pay of Members and increase exorbitantly all expenses of the two Houses of Congress.

I trust the American people are alive to the situation as it is and aware of the shortcomings of their new Congress, of the broken pledges rashly made, and will not be led astray by the covering-up claims already heralded throughout the land. I repeat, in the first session of the Eightieth Congress, we have been under the most reactionary leadership since the days of Mark Hanna and have witnessed in the failure of its announced program and in the repudiation of its campaign pledges the greatest congressional fiasco in American history.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, there is widespread interest in the amount of money that this Congress has saved. Frankly, I knew when I tackled the job that we would not attain the saving I would have liked to have attained. But I can say to you that I do not believe the Federal Government will be able to maintain an average of over 1,600,000 employees in this fiscal year. I can say to you that the direct savings upon budget estimates, that have been made by the Congress with this bill completed, in reductions in the bills, total $2,806,000,000; that the savings represented by recoveries and rescissions that we know are effected, that were not in the President's budget and that will improve the Treasury position, total $1,617,000,000; and that the Appropriations Committee and the House of Representatives can say to you that as a result of the interest in economy that has been manifested by the House of Representatives this country and its Treasury is $4,423,000,000 better off than it would have been if we had followed the estimates submitted by the President of the United States. I cannot give you the final and complete figures. I believe there are rescissions and recoveries beyond those that I have indicated that mean substantial and effective savings.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Would the chairman of the Appropriations Committee care to tell the House at this time what the total amount of savings were in appropriation bills when they left the House committee and before they reached the Senate, and give us the total of that saving, including the rescissions?

Mr. TABER. I cannot do that at this moment because I do not have the figures complete, but I expect to do it before long. However, it would run over a billion dollars.

Mr. STEFAN. Making a total of approximately $5,000,000,000?

Mr. TABER. $5,500,000,000.

Now, criticism has been made that the Republicans have been slow in getting bills passed. Frankly, we were handicapped by the provisions of the reorganization bill, which instead of expediting our work, delayed and hampered it. Nevertheless, we have every regular bill except two through conference at this minute. I expect that those two will be through before the hour of 6 o'clock shall strike.

There is one more deficiency bill over in the Senate, and it is under consideration on the floor at this time. I expect that to be back and I expect the conference report on that before we get through with the day.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to tell the gentleman that I see nine national defense bills on the calendar I have before me, all of which are very vital. I want to express the hope that we are able to get through all of those bills before we adjourn today. There is one bill, for instance, that passed the House last year.

Mr. TABER. I cannot yield further. I just wish to say that if the gentleman had been really interested in that he probably would have interrupted the 30-minute speech that just preceded me.

At this time I simply want to pay tribute to the gentlemen who have served with me upon the Appropriations Committee. We have had the most searching investigation into all of the activities of Government by the highest caliber of investigators that ever worked for the Government of the United States. Our cuts have not been made with a meat ax but they have been on an intelligent and honest basis designed to improve the structure of Government and put it upon a sound and intelligent business

basis. This is the most forward-looking step in the direction of putting the Federal Government upon that basis, upon a good basis, that has been taken in 20 years. I am in hopes that next year with the cooperation of these fine men who have served with me upon the Appropriations Committee—and I have had no disappointments in my subcommittee chairmen, they have all been most efficient, I am in hopes that next year, with the cooperation of those fine men, the record of the second session of the Eightieth Congress will produce a cutting down of the expenses of the Government that will reflect full credit.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TABER. In just one moment.

I am in hopes that the work we are doing and the efforts we are making to find out the needs and the activities of the Government that can be dispensed with that we will be able to make a record in the next session that will give a little heart to the taxpayers of America.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. There is no sense in kidding curselves. We have not received good cooperation from the Administration in our efforts to cut expenses, nor have the members of the Minority party been very active in offering motions on the floor to reduce appropriations. The responsibility will be up to us to do the job if it is going to be done.

I yield first to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman referred to the staff as provided under the Reorganization Act. May I ask the gentleman if he has used the full complement of staff provided under the Reorganization Act and if these men will be permitted to work during the recess of Congress to help prepare statistics and information so vital to effective and judicious cuts in the expenditures of Government?

Mr. TABER. I may say to the gentleman that we expect to use the full complement of what we are able to use effectively.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 17: Page 12, after "purposes" insert "and in addition military appropriations may be expended for such purposes, in contemplation of reimbursement from an appropriation supplemental hereto, in an amount sufficient to provide reimbursement for such expenditures as are made in excess of the amount appropriated herein."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 17, and concur therein, with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the said amendment, insert the following: "and in addition military appropriations may be expended for such purposes, not exceeding $15,000,000, in contemplation of reimbursement if justified."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 40——

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that that amendment may be passed over until after disposition of Nos. 41 and 42.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 41: Page 27, insert: "Construction, operation, and maintenance, Bonneville power transmission system: For an additional amount 'Construction, operation, and maintenance, Bonneville power transmission system', $1,184,700, and in addition to the contract authorization included in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1948, the Administrator is authorized to contract in the fiscal year 1948 for materials and equipment for power transmission facilities in an amount not in excess of $790,600."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves that the House insist upon its disagreement to amendment No. 41.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion. I move that the House recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ELLSWORTH moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 41.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr Speaker, my motion at this time to recede and concur in the Senate amendment does not represent a motion to uphold the Senate in disagreement with the House of Representatives. This amendment is not one of the amendments like we have sometimes had before us put in by the other body which deals with matters on which the House has not acted or which the House has turned down. The truth of the matter is that the House of Representatives has previously approved the items contained in this Senate amendment. The Senate then approved these items but they were eliminated in conference.

Therefore, I am merely asking the House to restore this item.

Mr. Speaker, this motion refers to appropriations for the Bonneville Power Administration facilities in the Northwest. Let me recite just a brief history of the appropriation this year for Bonneville facilities. The Bureau of the Budget request for those facilities in the Interior bill totalled $20,978,000. The House, as a part of its drive for a reduction in Federal expenses, with which I fully concur and with which I have voted all along, cut this figure from $20,000,000 down to $6,907,000, which represented a very big cut, a cut of 65 percent. Lines for the Oregon part of the Bonneville system included in the budget request were included in the House bill. Then the bill went to the Senate, and the Senate increased the appropriation for the Bonneville Power Administration facilities item to more than double the House figure. The Senate passed the bill including $16,222,000 for Bonneville. I call your attention to the fact that this still represented a cut of 20 percent in the budget request. Then a conference occurred on the bill, and I understand that the Bonneville items were subject to considerable discussion. The conferees reported back to the House, which report was adopted, with a slight increase in the House figures, but only half of the amount of the Senate figures; in other words, the conferees reported a total appropriation of $8,596,400, and this represented a cut of 57 percent from the budget figures.

What the final result of the Interior bill as passed does, it provides, as I have stated, $8,596,400 for the Bonneville Power Administration construction of lines, but it does not provide any funds for the construction of such lines in the State of Oregon, in a vital part of the Bonneville system. So, my motion today is on the amendment put in the first supplemental appropriation bill by the Senate, which does nothing more or less, not one single thing more, than place in the bill the three items of appropriation for Bonneville lines in the State of Oregon. It involves an increase in the total appropriation for the Bonneville system of $1,184,000; that is all that is involved in this, and if this motion prevails the appropriation for the Bonneville Power Administration in this Congress will still be 50 percent less than the Bureau of the Budget estimate.

Now, our objective has been to cut below the Bureau of the Budget estimate in our appropriation bills in this Congress, and I submit to you that a cut of 50 percent in the one series of items is a good, deep cut, and if my motion prevails—which I think is in fairness and justice not only to the State, but in fairness and justice to the Bonneville system, which covers the two States of Oregon and Washington—the cut will still be 50 percent. If my motion prevails lines will be started in the State of Oregon where they are not being constructed at present.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I hope all the Members of the House will give consideration to this amendment. It is of vital importance to the State of Oregon, a portion of which I have the honor to represent. I know many of these amendments come back here after a conference and they are sloughed over and we do not pay much attention to them, or think, "It is all cleaned up, we will just go ahead with the committee and let them go."

This is an unusual case. Oregon has been grossly wronged. I call your attention to the fact that this motion merely asks to restore the items which the House Committee approved and this House passed as follows:

Bonneville Power Administration, $1,184,700

	Appropriation	Contract authorization
Detroit-Eugene: Transmission facilities	$144,400	$422,600
Eugene-Reedsport: Transmission facilities	161,300	368,000
Reedsport-Coos Bay: Transmission facilities	79,600	
Total	1,184,700	790,600

We passed these items in the original bill and the bill went over to the Senate and the Senate passed them. Both the House and Senate passed them, but the conferees have stricken them out. This leaves Oregon without a single transmission line in this bill except one which goes from North Bonneville down to the Portland area. These are backbone transmission lines designed to bring the load of hydro power from Bonneville and Grand Coulee into Oregon. Bonneville is on the north boundary of Oregon, as you know, and Grand Coulee is considerably north of that. These lines bring the power down into the State of Oregon. Without these lines, there is absolutely no way to get the power which is developed at Grand Coulee and Bonneville down into my State of Oregon, into the southern and west central portions of the State. Without them the power will reach just along the northern boundary of Oregon. These lines will not compete with private lines.

I do hope you will go along with the motion offered by my colleague from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] to restore this item, which was passed by the House and passed by the Senate but stricken out by the conferees. Let us right a great injustice that has been done to my State of Oregon.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. This will not take away any construction in the States of Idaho and Washington?

Mr. ANGELL. Not at all. This is not coming in by the back door from the other body, it is an item we put in the bill ourselves after we had cut the bill to the very bone. It is an absolute disgrace, I think, to the State of Oregon to eliminate these items and give us nothing for the transmission of this power down to the great central portion of our State.

Mr. RANKIN. How did they get out of the bill?

Mr. ANGELL. The conferees got in a rumpus in the conference about what they should allow for transmission lines in the Northwest. As a compromise they cut ours all out and put the money some other place after the House committee and the House itself and the Senate had passed the items. I say it is an outrage to our State. I want you to give it your attention and vote for this motion. I know the committee, and the conferees, will make a plausible argument to keep this item the way they compromised on it, because they have agreed on some compromise. I regret we will not have an opportunity to answer these arguments. The result of the compromise is that we in Oregon stand out in the cold on the back porch looking in with nothing. I hope that you will restore this item. As a matter of fact, if a quorum does not vote on this motion, I shall have to insist that we get a quorum to put it back in the bill. I am not going to sit idly by and see my State knocked out of this bill on an item which we in the House voted in ourselves, and which was approved by the House committee after it had cut our State to the bone and after the item was also thereafter passed by the Senate. I urge you to vote for the Ellsworth amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. NORELAD].

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, if the request made here was for a new item, there might be cause for objection. As has been said, this item was in the original bill, and all we ask for is restoration. It just does not make sense to build these dams and then not provide for distributing the power. As I said the other day when this matter was under consideration, to fail to pass this motion of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] is like spending money to build a car and then refusing to build highways on which to operate it. I urge your favorable vote.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I shall certainly support the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon. It is the poorest excuse for economy I ever heard, to build a dam like Bonneville, that generates a vast amount of power, and then refuse to build transmission lines to supply that power to the people within the area.

This small amount invested in transmission lines will reach the towns and cities in that area in the State of Oregon and give them the benefit of the greatest development the West has ever known.

If you are going to begin now to shut off the American people from these dams at the bus bar and go back to the ancient Insull days of turning this power over to the Power Trust, you are going to have a tremendous reaction from the American people who have to pay the bill.

As I said a moment ago, nothing that has ever been done west of the Rocky Mountains means so much to the people of the great Northwest as the construction of these gigantic dams on the Columbia River, provided that power is supplied to the people within the distribution radius at reasonable rates; that is, rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution.

Unless that is done you will have gone down into the pockets of the American people to get money to build these dams for the benefit of private interests.

This same question arose with reference to the Tennesse Valley Authority. I insisted then, and successfully insisted, that the TVA build the transmission lines. So today we have one of the greatest developments of all time in the Tennessee Valley.

The same thing can be done along the Columbia River, but you cannot do it if you merely build these tremendous dams to generate untold billions of kilowatt-hours of electricity every year and then deny this power to the people of the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and the surrounding States.

I shall support the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon in order that we may do for the people of Oregon what we are doing for the people of Washington and Idaho, and what we are doing for the people of California with reference to Boulder Dam, and what we are doing for the people of Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Kentucky, Virginia, North Carolina, and other Southern States in the TVA area.

If we will do this we will add more to the happiness, progress, and prosperity of the people now living in the State of Oregon than any other similar amount that we could possibly spend on anything else in the world, and every dollar of it will be paid back with interest.

But if you shut these people off from this power that we have led them to believe they were going to enjoy, you will be doing them one of the greatest possible injuries.

I hope the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon will be sustained.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this item of the Bonneville Power Administration carries more than would appear on the surface. This amendment not only carries money for the construction of transmission lines that were eliminated from the Interior Department regular supply bill for the fiscal year 1948, but it carries money for operation, maintenance, and administration above the amount allowed by the regular committee handling the bill. This year, the Bonneville Power Administration had some $4,000,000 for operation, maintenance, and administration. The committee, after going through the activities of Dr. Raver, of the Bonneville Power Administration, thoroughly, have come to the conclusion, after examining the reports filed with the Federal Power Commission and the reports filed with the committeee, that $2,500,000 was ample on an annual basis for operation, maintenance, and administration of this agency for the fiscal year 1948.

If the motion of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] is adopted, all of the work of the subcommittee on the Interior appropriations will be in vain and Dr. Raver will keep on doing the same wasteful things that are completely foreign to the efficient operation of the Bonneville Power Administration.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I believe the gentleman is referring to operation and maintenance. Operation and maintenance sums are not involved in this bill or in this motion that I have made.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. The difficulty is that it is even worse than the gentleman suspects because the item reads, "Construction, operation, and maintenance, Bonneville transmission system; for an additional amount, construction, operation, and maintenance." I am not so sure that the fight of the gentlemen in the other body who inserted this amendment is for the transmission lines as much as it is for increasing the operation, maintenance, and administration expenses for Bonneville Power Administration so that Dr. Raver can do everything that he has done in the past and for which he has been criticized by the committee.

I have resigned from the subcommittee. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is chairman of the subcommittee. Mr. STOCKMAN, of Oregon, is now on that subcommittee. He knows full well the operations of Dr. Raver. So I give you this salutary reason against the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH]. Do not upset the study and work that has consumed 6 months' time of the regular Interior Department Subcommittee on Appropriations. Do not adopt the Ellsworth motion which will enable Bonneville Power Administration to spend all of $1,184,700 for operation, maintenance, and administration if Dr. Raver so desires.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that unless this amendment is adopted, transmission lines in the various centers of Oregon cannot be built?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I will come to the construction item next, and tell the situation and background about that, if I may.

In the first place, Dr. Raver can take all of this $1,184,700 and spend it for operation, maintenance, and administration. If he does not choose to do that, if he chooses to spend only a part of it for operation and maintenance, he has perverted the will of the Congress when it passed and adopted the conference report in the regular and annual Interior Department supply bill. Suppose he does not spend any part of it for operation and maintenance, then we come to the question of building lines in Mr. ELLSWORTH's district with the whole $1,184,700. The House on the last day of the session will be approving what it has turned down twice before. On two occasions, once in a regular supply bill it was turned down, and then this same amendment in this supplemental appropriation bill was turned down when it was before the House earlier in the week. Are we going to undo our good judgment expressed twice before under pressure of the final day of the session?

Now, let us get at the merits of the case. The merits of the case are these: The Bonneville Power Administration has $12,000,000 unexpended balance for expenditure this year on the grid. In the regular bill we appropriated $11,000,000 new cash and contract authorizations for BPA for the grid. That is on the loop between Bonneville, Grand Coulee Dams, and the load centers of Portland, and so forth. The loop makes up the backbone transmission lines for the development of the Northwest. I think, from the standpoint of spending Federal money, which all the taxpayers of the Nation have to invest in, we should consider the problem from the standpoint of sound development of the Northwest and not from the standpoint of the wishes of any particular Congressman.

We handled the whole Interior Department bill on the basis of just as near science as it was humanly possible for laymen to do it. If we give a line to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] because we think he is a fine fellow—and he is a grand and spendid gentleman—and give it to the gentlemen from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL, Mr. NORBLAD, and Mr. STOCKMAN] because they are fine and splendid gentleman, we must follow the same precedent with the gentlemen who are interested in the Southwest Power Administration, where likewise we adhere to the backbone grid system. If we give this $1,184,700 to the gentlemen from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. ANGELL, Mr. NORBLAD, and Mr. STOCKMAN], we must adopt the amendment which follows; that is, to provide for another segment of a transmission line in Idaho. That is in Senator HENRY DWORSHAK's State. He is a member of the Interior Department Subcommittee on Appropriations in the Senate. So when you start doing things on the basis of helping individual Congressmen and Senators, who happen to want their territory developed faster than the entire region on a sound basis—on an engineering basis—then we are getting into trouble.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. It is like raising rabbits. We will be asked to put lines to every house where there is an unpressed pair of pants, in order to heat the iron to press them on Saturday afternoon. We will not be able to develop the backbone lines as we should for the sound development of the entire country.

We do not have an amendment before us to give feeder lines in the Southwest Power Administration, or feeder lines from Davis Dam out into every power shortage community in Arizona. We do not have an amendment before us to give feeder lines in Wyoming, California, and the other Western States. If you adopt the Ellsworth motion the Congress will be unfair to some 30 Members of the House and thirty-odd Senators from Western States.

I think that is a sound reason the House should turn down these special-exception amendments.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. Is it not true as shown on page 6 of the report of the Senate numbered 689 that this item of $1,184,700 is set forth designating the particular transmission lines, and those transmission lines were passed and authorized by the House and by the Senate so it is not a case of one Congressman trying to get something for his particular district that the committee did not allow. Every line involved in this amendment, as well as the one that goes down in the northern part of my district were allowed and were in the bill which passed the House and later passed by the Senate. Is not that true?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. In answer to that, sir, I may state that we put in these lines in the House, and when we got to the Senate, it was the considered judgment of the conferees that the backbone load transmission lines were the things to develop this year.

Mr. ANGELL. These are the backbone lines leading to the load centers in southern and western Oregon.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. They are not; they are not the backbone lines. They are segment feeder lines that were turned down in every other item of the Interior Department bill.

I ask that the amendment of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] be voted down.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ELLSWORTH) there were—ayes 40, noes 38.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously no quorum is present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 181, nays 174, not voting 76, as follows:

[Roll No. 133]

YEAS—181

Abernethy	Carroll	Fernandez
Albert	Carson	Fisher
Allen, Calif.	Caller	Fletcher
Allen, La.	Chenoweth	Fogarty
Andersen, H. Carl	Clason	Folger
	Clippinger	Forand
Anderson, Calif.	Cole, Kans.	Garmatz
Andrews, Ala.	Cole, Mo.	Gearhart
Angell	Colmer	Gordon
Arends	Combs	Gore
Battle	Cooley	Gorski
Beckworth	Cooper	Gossett
Bender	Courtney	Grant, Ala.
Bennett, Mo.	Cox	Griffiths
Blatnik	Cravens	Hagen
Bloom	Crawford	Hale
Boggs, La.	Crosser	Harris
Boykin	Curtis	Hart
Bradley	Davis, Ga.	Havenner
Bramblett	Deane	Hedrick
Brehm	D'Ewart	Hendricks
Brooks	Dingell	Hill
Brophy	Donohue	Hinshaw
Brown, Ga.	Dorn	Hoeven
Bryson	Douglas	Holifield
Buchanan	Eberharter	Holmes
Bulwinkle	Ellsworth	Hope
Busbey	Engle, Calif.	Horan
Byrne, N. Y.	Evins	Huber
Camp	Fallon	Hull
Cannon	Feighan	Jackson, Calif.

Jarman	Merrow	Redden
Javits	Miller, Calif.	Reed, Ill.
Johnson, Calif.	Mills	Richards
Johnson, Tex.	Monroney	Riley
Jones, Ala.	Morrison	Rivers
Jones, Wash.	Muhlenberg	Rizley
Jonkman	Murray, Tenn.	Rockwell
Judd	Murray, Wis.	Rohrbough
Karsten, Mo.	Nixon	Rooney
Kefauver	Norblad	Russell
Kilday	O'Brien	Sabath
King	O'Hara	Sadowski
Kirwan	O'Konski	Sikes
Lane	O'Toole	Smathers
Lanham	Pace	Smith, Kans.
Larcade	Passman	Smith, Maine
LeFevre	Patman	Snyder
Lemke	Peden	Spence
Lesinski	Peterson	Stevenson
Lucas	Philbin	Stigler
Lusk	Phillips, Calif.	Stratton
Lyle	Poage	Teague
McCormack	Preston	Thomas, Tex.
McDonough	Price, Fla.	Welch
McMillan, S. C.	Price, Ill.	Wheeler
Mack	Priest	Williams
Madden	Rains	Winstead
Mahon	Ramey	Wood
Mansfield	Rankin	Zimmerman
Marcantonio	Rayburn	

NAYS—174

Allen, Ill.	Grant, Ind.	Owens
Almond	Gross	Patterson
Andresen, August H.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Phillips, Tenn.
	Gwynne, Iowa	Pickett
Auchincloss	Hall,	Ploeser
Bakewell	Leonard W.	Potts
Banta	Halleck	Reed, N. Y.
Bates, Mass.	Hand	Rees
Beall	Hardy	Reeves
Bell	Harness, Ind.	Rich
Bishop	Harrison	Richlman
Blackney	Herter	Robertson
Boggs, Del.	Heselton	Robsion
Bolton	Hobbs	Rogers, Fla.
Bonner	Hoffman	Rogers, Mass.
Brown, Ohio	Howell	Ross
Buck	Jenison	Sadlak
Burke	Jenkins, Ohio	St. George
Burleson	Jenkins, Pa.	Sarbacher
Byrnes, Wis.	Jennings	Sasscer
Canfield	Jensen	Schwabe, Mo.
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Ill.	Schwabe, Okla.
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Ind.	Scoblick
Chadwick	Johnson, Okla.	Scott, Hardie
Chiperfield	Jones, Ohio	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Church	Kearns	
Clevenger	Keating	Scrivner
Coffin	Kerr	Seely-Brown
Cole, N. Y.	Knutson	Shafer
Corbett	Kunkel	Sheppard
Coudert	Landis	Short
Crow	LeCompte	Simpson, Pa.
Cunningham	Lewis	Smith, Wis.
Dague	Lodge	Springer
Davis, Wis	Love	Stanley
Dawson, Utah	McConnell	Stefan
Devitt	McCowen	Stockman
Dirksen	McDowell	Sundstrom
Dolliver	McGarvey	Taber
Domengeaux	McGregor	Talle
Drewry	McMahon	Tibbott
Durham	McMillen, Ill.	Towe
Eaton	MacKinnon	Twyman
Elliott	Macy	Vail
Ellis	Martin, Iowa	Van Zandt
Elston	Mathews	Vorys
Engel, Mich.	Meade, Ky.	Wadsworth
Fellows	Meade, Md.	Weichel
Fenton	Meyer	West
Foote	Michener	Whitten
Fulton	Miller, Conn.	Whittington
Gamble	Miller, Md.	Wigglesworth
Gary	Miller, Nebr.	Wilson, Ind.
Gavin	Mitchell	Wilson, Tex.
Gillette	Morris	Wolcott
Gillie	Morton	Wolverton
Goff	Mundt	Woodruff
Goodwin	Nodar	Worley
Graham	Norrell	Youngblood

NOT VOTING—76

Andrews, N. Y.	Clark	Gathings
Arnold	Clements	Gifford
Barden	Cotton	Granger
Barrett	Davis, Tenn.	Gregory
Bates, Ky.	Dawson, Ill.	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Bennett, Mich.	Delaney	
Bland	Dondero	Harless, Ariz.
Buckley	Doughton	Hartley
Buffett	Elsaesser	Hays
Butler	Flannagan	Hébert
Chapman	Fuller	Heffernan
Chelf	Gallagher	Hess
Jackson, Wash.	Ludlow	Sanborn
Jones, N. C.	Lynch	Simpson, Ill.
Kean	Maloney	Smith, Ohio
Kearney	Manasco	Smith, Va.
Kee	Mason	Somers
Keefe	Morgan	Taylor
Kelley	Murdock	Thomas, N. J.
Kennedy	Norton	Thomason
Keogh	Pfeifer	Tollefson
Kersten, Wis.	Plumley	Trimble
Kilburn	Poulson	Vinson
Klein	Powell	Vursell
Latham	Rabin	Walter
Lea	Rayfiel	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Kean with Mr. Jones of North Carolina.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Chapman.
Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Trimble.
Mr. Brehm with Mr. Hays.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall with Mr. Chelf.
Mr. Tollefson with Mr. Walter.
Mr. Maloney with Mr. Clark.
Mr. Butler with Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Hess with Mr. Gregory.
Mr. Simpson of Illinois with Mr. Clements.
Mr. Elsaesser with Mr. Manasco.
Mr. Gifford with Mr. Smith of Virginia.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Murdock.
Mr. Mason with Mr. Morgan.
Mr. Vursell with Mr. Gathings.
Mr. Andrews of New York with Mr. Harless of Arizona.
Mr. Cotton with Mr. Jackson of Washington.
Mr. Kearney with Mr. Granger.
Mr. Kilburn with Mr. Flannagan.
Mr. Latham with Mr. Bates of Kentucky.
Mr. Fuller with Mr. Barden.

Messrs. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, DAGUE, and HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. SIKES, FLETCHER, COLE of Missouri, PASSMAN, RICHARDS, ABERNETHY, and MURRAY of Wisconsin changed their vote from 'no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 42: Page 27, after line 13, insert:

"In addition to the contract authorization contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1948, and the additional contract authorization contained herein, the Administrator is authorized to contract in the fiscal year 1948 for materials and equipment for the Idaho Panhandle power transmission facilities in an amount not in excess of $489,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GOFF moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 42.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. GOFF].

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, by the action of this House you have concurred in No. 41, which is for one of these smaller outside transmission lines and this entirely contrary to the policy adopted by the committee. It seems to me there is, therefore, no reason why you should not be consistent and give a transmission line to the rest of us out there who did not submit amendments earlier. I therefore offer this motion. It is just as worthy as the one that was considered before it. My amendment is against the committee report. In fairness you should recede and concur right on down the line if that is the policy adopted. The people of my district out in Idaho have a right to expect no less at your hands.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. GOFF].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 74, noes 71.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I want to know, Mr. Speaker, if it is in order for the Democratic Members of Congress to offer amendments to this conference report to restore their transmission line cuts?

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. I will answer that.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, Senate amendment No. 40 should be agreed to since the House has agreed to Senate amendments Nos. 41 and 42.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 40: Page 2, line 27, after line 3, insert "Bonneville Power Administration."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 43: On page 27, after line 20, insert:

"BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

"COLORADO RIVER DAM FUND

"Boulder Canyon project: For payment to the Boulder City School District as reimbursement for instruction during the 1947-48 school year in the schools operated by said district, of each pupil who is a dependent of any employee of the United States, living in or in the immediate vicinity of Boulder City, in the sum of $50 per semester per pupil in average daily attendance at said schools, payable after the term of instruction in any semester has been completed, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary, $33,000, payable from the Colorado River Dam fund."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion:

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RUSSELL moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 43.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. RUSSELL] 3 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, this concerns the schools in Boulder City, Nev. For the past 9 years the Government has been allowing from the Colorado River Dam fund a total of $33,300 as part of the tuition for those children of Federal employees who live in that district. This money includes only a part of the cost for their tuition. At the present time it is costing Boulder City, Nev., a total of $251 for each student. Under this act the Government would continue a tuition of only $50 a semester.

It must be recalled that the land in Boulder City is controlled and owned by the Federal Government, and the only taxes that can be derived are from personal property or improvements that have been made on the land that is leased.

I should like to point out in my limited time that the maintenance of the schools comes out of the cost of the leases on the land occupied by those who work on the dam. The maintenance of the schools is also tied into the power rate by the acquisition of power from Boulder Dam. The money paid to Boulder City Union school district is considered and has been in the past a part of the cost of operation and maintenance of the project, and is recovered back by the United States out of the power rates and charges paid by the Boulder Dam power contractors.

May I also point out, bringing up the power end of it, that I have a telegram from Mr. S. B. Morris, general manager of the Department of Water Power of the City of Los Angeles, who states in part:

> On our behalf we urge most strongly that there be restored to the bill language authorizing payment from the Colorado Dam fund of tuition to Boulder City school district.

He emphasized the intolerable conditions which will result from the action taken by the House if this is not given.

As you probably know, the schools throughout the districts have made their budgets for the next year. The schools of Boulder City have also made their budget and they relied upon this $33,300 to carry them through the next year. I urge upon the House that if it is going to be the policy of the committee that in the future no funds be used for that school, this be not now but in the future. I urge now you consider the critical situation of the Boulder City schools. They are going into a new school year in the fall without sufficient funds, and they are relying on this $33,300 which comes out of the maintenance fund and not out of the Treasury. They need that money to continue school for the children of Federal employees in a reservation where the Federal Government owns every square foot of land.

I further point out that the State of Nevada and Clark County are more than meeting their share of the cost of the schools. Of an estimated budget of $190,800 for the Boulder City schools the State, county, and local sources will provide $149,740 and there is a balance of $14,860 from the previous year, in other words this additional $33,300 has to be had, and was counted on to balance the school budget.

The distinguished Senator from Nevada, Senator PAT MCCARRAN, included this amendment in the bill in the other body without opposition, for the funds are merely an authorization of the $33,300 from the Colorado River Dam fund.

This is no new measure, it is a procedure that has been carried out since 1939. Why now jeopardize the Boulder City schools?

The Government has an obligation it has met, and justly met, for 8 years. The money provides tuition, only in part, for children of Federal employees living on nontaxable lands and in Government controlled and owned houses.

Money for this $33,300 would come from the Colorado River Dam fund, and into that fund goes money from land leases as well as from power rates and charges paid by the Boulder Dam power contractors for that purpose. The power contractors have urged this amendment be adopted.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH].

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion offered by the gentleman from Nevada. I call attention to the fact that this incurs no additional money as far as payment out of the Treasury is concerned, because the money is returned to the United States by the sale of power.

Let me read a statement by the superintendent of schools of Boulder City. He states:

> The money paid to the Boulder City Union school district is considered part of the cost of operation and maintenance of the project, and is recovered back by the United States out of the power rates and charges paid by the Boulder Dam power contractors.

He further states:

> These power contractors have in the past announced themselves in favor of the charges made against the power rates for the purpose of providing instructions for the children of employees of the Bureau of Reclamation.

I urge the adoption of the motion.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, as has been stated, this is not money coming from the Federal Treasury; it is money that is being paid by the city of Los Angeles and 12 other cities in southern California who have a contract and are living up to the contract and paying for Boulder Dam both in principal and interest through the purchase of electric power. It appropriates no funds out of the Treasury whatsoever. I can see no reason for not adopting this motion. This money is paid by our cities in California.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill. If you adopt the motion of the gentleman from Nevada to recede and concur in the Senate amendment, you will be perverting the studied action of the House earlier this week and you will be turning down the considered judgment of the subcommittee that had charge of the regular appropriation bill.

In the first place, the Boulder Canyon project, unlike any other project in the 17 Western States for reclamation, provides for the payment of $300,000 a year to the State of Nevada and $300,000 to the State of Arizona. Is it unfair to ask that out of the $300,000 that they get from the power revenues from this great Boulder Canyon project that the State of Nevada pay this $30,000 for the education of these children in Boulder City which is in Nevada? That is item No. 1.

The next thing, there was an authorization bill making such legislation on this appropriation bill unnecessary. That authorization bill in the Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, last year passed the House and Senate and was vetoed by the President of the United States. After the President vetoed that legislation the committee thought it was jusified in taking the legislation out of the appropriation in the regular supply bill. In justice and in fairness, I think the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the regular supply bill should be upheld and that we should not on the last day of the session foolishly, without any hearings, put in a legislative item that has been turned down by the regular committee after full hearings. I believe we should not legislate on an appropriation bill after the same legislation was vetoed by the President.

I ask that the motion be voted down.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. RUSSELL] that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RUSSELL) there were—ayes 21, noes 84.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 58: Page 33, after line 3 insert:

"FOREIGN SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses, Foreign Service: There is hereby transferred the sum of $500,000 from the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses, Department of State, 1948', and the sum of $100,000 from the appropriation 'Living and quarters allowances, Foreign Service, 1948', in all $600,000, to the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses, Foreign Service, 1948'."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In

lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

"FOREIGN SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses, Foreign Service: There is hereby transferred the sum of $400,000 from the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses, Department of State, 1948', and the sum of $100,000 from the appropriation 'Living and quarters allowances, Foreign Service, 1948,' in all $500,000, to the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses, Foreign Service, 1948'."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 64: Page 34, after line 16, insert:

"United States participation in United Nations: The appropriation 'United States participation in United Nations,' contained in the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1948, is hereby made available for the furnishing of living quarters for the use of the Representative of the United States at the seat of the United Nations and this shall be accomplished by utilizing the authority contained in the second proviso of the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses, Foreign Service' in the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1948, with respect to the furnishing of living quarters for the use of the foreign service; and for making allotments to the United States Mission to the United Nations to defray the unusual expenses incident to the maintenance of an official residence for the United States Representative to the United Nations in the same manner that such allotments are authorized to Foreign Service Posts by section 902 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724)."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64 and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of the said amendment, after the word "available", insert "in an amount not exceeding $15,000 per annum."

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, a motion to reconsider the various votes by which action was taken on the conference report was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 479. An act relating to the income-tax liability of members of the armed forces dying in the service;

H. R. 2181. An act relating to institutional on-farm training for veterans;

H. R. 3690. An act to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act; and

H. J. Res. 232. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1082. An act to credit certain service performed by employees of the postal service who are transferred from one position to another within the service for purposes of determining eligibility for promotion;

S. 1393. An act to increase the permitted rate of allowance and compensation for training on the job under Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended;

S. 1431. An act for the relief of Mrs. Edna Mary Jakimowicz;

S. 1720. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended;

S. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution establishing a joint committee to investigate high prices of consumer goods; and

S. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution establishing the Joint Committee on Government Information Programs.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1070. An act to provide for the cancellation of the capital stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the refund of moneys received for such stock, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1326) entitled "An act to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act," and agrees to a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. STEWART to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 104. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Housing.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing concurrent resolution, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BRICKER, Mr. CAIN, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. MAYBANK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

REFERENCE OF A BILL

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the bill (H. R. 4339) to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, to require all members of the Communist Party to register under such act, to provide that all printed matter distributed by such members shall be clearly labeled, and for other purposes, has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and rightly so. The bill deals with a subject over which the Committee on the Judiciary has unquestioned jurisdiction. However, the Committee on Un-American Activities is considering legislation of the same nature in connection with other aspects of communism. Inasmuch as that committee has held some hearings and contemplates further hearings during the recess, and pursuant to the directions of the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the bill H. R. 4339 and that that bill be re-referred to the Committee on Un-American Activities, but that this shall establish no precedent for future reference of legislation amending the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I dislike very much to object to any unanimous-consent request propounded by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I hold him in high regard. However, the bill that is involved does violence to the Constitution and to every democratic precept. I therefore must resist the progress of this bill, step by step, and consequently I am constrained to object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW (at the request of Mr. SPRINGER) was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table, House Concurrent Resolution 104, a concurrent resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Housing, with a Senate amendment, and disagree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert: "That there is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Housing (hereafter referred to as the committee), and to be composed of seven Members of the Senate who are members of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, and seven Members of the House of Representatives who are members of the House of Representatives Committee on Banking and Currency, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. A vacancy in the membership of the committee shall not affect the powers of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

"SEC. 2. The committee, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, shall conduct a thorough study and investigation of the entire field of housing, including but not limited to—

"(1) the extent of the need for housing in the United States as a whole and in all areas thereof;

"(2) the extent, if any, to which shortages in building materials are contributing to the shortage of housing;

"(3) the reasons for the existing high costs of building materials and housing and the action which may be taken to reduce such costs;

"(4) all factors of whatever kind or nature which contribute to the existing high costs of housing and which prevent the speedy construction of adequate housing to satisfy the needs of the Nation; and the action which may be taken to eliminate such factors;

"(5) the extent to which archaic building codes contribute to the existing shortage and excessive cost of housing;

"(6) the administration and operation of existing Federal laws relating to slum clearance, insurance of mortgages on housing,

home loans, guaranties of veterans' housing loans, construction permits, veterans' preference in the renting and purchase of housing, rent control, and all other matters relating to housing;

"(7) the availability of private capital and of Government loans to finance the construction of housing;

"(8) the organization and operations of Government agencies concerned with housing; and

"(9) such other problems and subjects in the field of housing as the committee deems appropriate.

"SEC. 3. The committee shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than March 15, 1948, the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation and such other recommendations as it may deem advisable, and shall make its final report not later than January 2, 1949.

"SEC. 4. The committee shall have the power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, consultants, and employees as it deems necessary for the performance of its duties, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties. The committee is further authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of all agencies in the executive branch of the Government and may request the governments of the several States, representatives of business, industry, finance, and labor, and such other persons, agencies, organizations, and instrumentalities as it deems appropriate to attend its hearings and to give and present information, advice, and recommendations.

"SEC. 5. The committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings; to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned period of the Eightieth Congress; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take such testimony; to have such printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services in reporting such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by them.

"SEC. 6. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of disbursements so made."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was not agreed to.

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1720) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 603 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by (1) striking out "$2,800,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$4,000,000,000" and (2) striking out "$3,800,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$4,200,000,000."

SEC. 2. Title VI of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 610. Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this title, the Administrator is authorized, upon application by the mortgagee, to insure or to make commitments to insure under section 603 or section 608 of this title any mortgage executed in connection with the sale by the Government, or any agency or official thereof, of any housing acquired or constructed under Public Law 849, Seventy-sixth Congress, as amended; Public Law 781, Seventy-sixth Congress, as amended; or Public Laws 9, 73, or 353, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended (including any property acquired, held or constructed in connection with such housing or to serve the inhabitants thereof), without regard to—

"(1) any limit as to the time when any mortgage may be insured under this title;

"(2) any limit as to the aggregate amount of principal obligations of all mortgages insured under this title, but the aggregate amount of principal obligations of all mortgages insured pursuant to this section shall not exceed $750,000,000;

"(3) any requirement that the obligation be approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction or that the construction be new construction;

"(4) any of the provisions of section 603 (b) (2) or paragraphs (B) and (C) of the first sentence of section 608 (b) (3); *Provided*, That such mortgage shall (1) otherwise be eligible for insurance under section 603 or section 608, as the case may be, (2) have a maturity not exceeding 25 years from the date of insurance, and (3) involve a principal obligation (including such initial service charges, appraisal, inspection, and other fees as the Administrator shall approve) in an amount not exceeding 90 percent of the appraised value of the mortgage property as determined by the Administrator."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to create a National Land Policy. The purpose of my bill is to conserve for ourselves and for posterity the precious soil of America and our many other natural resources.

I ask unanimous consent to include the bill which I have today introduced along with my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

INSTITUTIONAL ON-FARM TRAINING FOR VETERANS

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2181) relating to institutional on-farm training for veterans, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 2, lines 16 and 17, strike out "Administrator which, when taken as a full-time course," and insert "Administrator. Such course shall be considered a full-time course when it."

Page 4, line 19, strike out "and."

Page 4, line 24, after "found", insert "by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs or the State approving agency."

Page 5, line 3, strike out "approval.'" and insert "approval. Where it has been found that a variation in the proportion of hours of group instruction and individual instruction on the farm will better serve the conditions in a certain area, any program acceptable to the State approving agency which meets the total number of training hours called for in this act (including assembled instruction, individual instruction, and assigned and supervised related home study and supervision in operational skills by the farmer trainer under the direction of the institution) shall be recognized as complying with the requirements of this act; and."

Page 5, after line 3, insert:

"'d. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to contract with approved institutions for such courses where the Administrator finds that the agreed cost is reasonable and fair.'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TAX LIABILITY OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES DYING IN THE SERVICE

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 479) relating to the income-tax liability of members of the armed forces dying in the service, with Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, lines 20 and 21, strike out "prevented by the operation of any law or rule of law (other than sec. 3301)" and insert "prevented (except for the provisions of section 3801) by the operation of any law or rule of law."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDUCEMENTS TO PHYSICIANS, SURGEONS, AND DENTISTS TO MAKE A CAREER OF UNITED STATES MILITARY, NAVAL, AND PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1661) to provide additional inducements to physicians, surgeons, and

dentists to make a career of the United States military, naval, and public health service, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947."

TITLE I

PAY OF PHYSICIANS, SURGEONS, AND DENTISTS

SEC. 101. The Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 359), as amended, is hereby further amended by inserting immediately after section 1 thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 1A. (a) The term 'commissioned officers', as used in this section, shall be interpreted to mean only (1) those commissioned officers of the Medical and Dental Corps of the Regular Army and Navy and commissioned medical and dental officers of the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service who are on active duty on the effective date of this section; (2) those officers who are hereafter commissioned in the Medical and Dental Corps of the Regular Army and Navy or as medical and dental officers of the Regular corps of the Public Health Service during the 5-year period immediately following the effective date of this section; (3) such officers, now or hereafter commissioned in the Medical and Dental Corps of the Officers' Reserve Corps, the Naval Reserve, the National Guard, the Army of the United States, or as medical and dental officers of the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service, who may, during the 5-year period immediately following the effective date of this section, volunteer and be accepted for extended active duty of 1 year or longer; (4) general officers appointed from the Medical and Dental Corps of the Regular Army, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard, or the Army of the United States who are on active duty on the effective date of this section; (5) general officers who may hereafter be appointed from those officers of the Medical and Dental Corps of the Regular Army, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard, or the Army of the United States who are included in (1), (2), or (3) above.

"(b) In addition to any pay, allowances, or emoluments that they are otherwise entitled to receive, commissioned officers as defined in subsection (a) of this section shall be entitled to pay at the rate of $100 per month for each month of active service following the date of enactment of this section: *Provided*, That such sum shall not be included in computing the amount of increase in pay authorized by any other provision of law or in computing retired pay: *Provided further*, That the total amount which may be paid to any one officer under the authority contained in this section shall not exceed $36,000: *And provided further*, That the commissioned officers described in subsection (a) (3) of this section shall receive the pay provided by this subsection only during periods of volunteer service."

SEC. 102. This title shall become effective on the first day of the first calendar month following its enactment, and the payments herein provided shall not accrue for any period prior thereto.

TITLE II

ORIGINAL APPOINTMENTS OF MEDICAL AND DENTAL OFFICERS

SEC. 201. Subject to any limitation of the commissioned strength of the Army and Navy prescribed by law the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is hereby authorized to make original appointments to permanent commissioned grades, with rank not above that of colonel in the Medical and Dental Corps of the Army, and not above that of captain in the Medical and Dental Corps of the Navy in such numbers as the needs of the services may require. Such appointments shall be made only from qualified civilian doctors of medicine and dentists who are citizens of the United States, and who shall have such other qualifications as the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe for their respective services. The doctors of medicine and dentists so appointed in the Navy shall be carried as additional numbers in rank, but shall not increase the authorized numbers of commissioned officers of the Medical and Dental Corps of the Regular Navy. The doctors of medicine and dentists so appointed in the Army shall be credited for purposes of promotion with the minimum number of years of service now or hereafter required for promotion of officers of the Medical and Dental Corps to the grade in which appointed.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are authorized to prescribe from time to time such regulations as may be necessary for the administration of this title within their respective departments.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, we are considering today S. 1661, a bill approved by the Armed Services Committee of the House, which provides additional inducements to physicians, surgeons, and dentists to make a career of the United States Military, Naval, and Public Health Service, and for other purposes.

We have had many important bills before the first session of the Eightieth Congress but, in my judgment, this bill is one of the most important for the reason that the preservation and maintenance of our Army, Navy, Air Corps, Marine Corps, Public Health Service, Coast Guard, and other armed auxiliaries are at stake.

Everyone knows that we live in a chaotic age; that the international situation is extremely acute and, therefore, the maintenance of our Army and Navy is a No. 1 problem to our Nation and to the citizens at large. In order to maintain properly such an Army and Navy, it is highly essential that the Medical Corps of the groups should be maintained at the highest degree of efficiency. No father or mother, no Congressman, or no thinking person, wants to send the boys into service unless they are assured in advance that they will have full, complete, and efficient medical attention. That is the reason why this bill becomes so important.

The scarcity of physicians, surgeons, and dentists in our armed forces is alarming. The financial attractions of civilian life to physicians, surgeons, and dentists have induced many professional men, who were formerly in service, to retire to private life and it now becomes apparent that some inducement be offered to those groups in the armed forces in order to secure and retain their services therein.

The hearings before our committee with reference to the civilian physicians' income disclosed the fact that the average civilian physician's income in 1941 was $8,625; in 1942, $11,150; in 1943, $13,713; in 1944, $14,620; and in 1945, $14,392. Compare these incomes with the Veterans' Administration average of $6,123 and the Navy's average of $5,164, which demonstrates clearly that the average civilian physician more than doubles the salary of those employed in the armed services.

General Eisenhower appeared before our committee and stressed the urgent need of increasing the Medical Corps of the Army, and stated that at present we only have 1,100 in the Medical Corps of the Army which is sufficient only to maintain an army of 200,000 men. The general further stated that the postwar peacetime Army would approximate eight hundred fifty thousand to a million men; thus necessitating a Medical Corps of 6,000 physicians.

We are all interested in noting the great degree of efficiency obtained in World War II by our Medical Corps. The highest standard of medical care ever obtained in any Army in the world was reached in our forces in the recent war. Deaths from illness were reduced to an almost infinitesimal percentage, six-tenths per 1,000 men per year—compared with World War I, 16 per 1,000 men per year died from illness. The percentage of deaths among the wounded who reached medical attention was more than cut in half from World War I. This was possible only because we had the services of 47,000 of the ablest civilian doctors who formed, numerically, 97 percent of our Army Medical Corps. After the war, these men, almost without exception, returned to civilian life.

Since then, medical care of the Army has been possible primarily through the service of graduates from the Army specialists training program—ASTP—who received their medical education during the war at Government expense and who are now serving tours of duty in the Army for 2 years. Most of these men desire to return to civilian life as soon as possible, and we can only retain them for 6 months after the war emergency is declared officially over. The Army, therefore, will soon have to rely upon voluntary, not enforced, service for Army doctors.

We have had two integration bills. These provided 1,900 vacancies for commissions in the Regular Army. Of these, it was possible to fill only 218, or about 10 percent. In branches of the Army, other than medicine, there were 5 candidates for every commission; but in medicine there was only 1 applicant for every 3 vacancies. After losses from normal attrition, we had no gain but

actually a net loss, after integration, of 127 officers. This was in spite of the best efforts that the Army could make to attract doctors stimulated by their clear recognition of the acute need which existed.

The seriousness of this situation is vividly portrayed by the fact that a questionnaire conducted by the Information and Education Division of the War Department staff showed that, of 386 graduates of the Army specialists training program selected at random, only 1 was interested in a Regular Army career; yet these ASTP graduates constitute the best and, to a large extent, the only source from which recruits for the Army Medical Corps must come.

I wish you would remember this important statement—that the resignations in the Army Medical Corps constitute 368 percent of the acceptances therein.

Specifically, the deficiency expectation of the Medical Corps was 20 percent as of July 1 and will be more than 40 percent, unless something is done by July 1, 1948.

According to the statement of Brig. Gen. Guy B. Denit, of the Surgeon General's Department, we now have a shortage of more than 1,500 doctors, and by 1949 there will be a shortage of 3,700. The Medical Corps of the Army then, with 1,100 doctors to meet a requirement of 6,000 doctors, leaves a shortage of 4,900 doctors, predicated upon a million-man Army; and 3,900 short, predicated upon an Army of 875,000.

It becomes apparent, therefore, that the problem of securing and retaining physicians, surgeons, and dentists in the Medical Corps is of No. 1 importance.

In the Navy, the situation is equally acute. On the 21st of April of this year, there were 1,672 Regular naval medical officers on active duty. That number will be reduced next month to 1,244, because of resignations and retirements. The Medical Corps of the Navy for the next few months will be able to function only because, as in the case of the Army, there are still on duty over 2,000 Reserve medical officers. Of that total of 2,051, only 176 are being retained on active duty at their own volition; and 70 of that 176 have already requested release by the first of next month. The remaining 1,875, who are graduates of the V–12 program, are being held on inactive service involuntarily, although a substantial number of requests for release have been filed.

All of this group will be eligible for separation from active duty upon the completion of the 2 years of obligated service, which date is rapidly approaching. So that when these Reserve medical officers are released, Secretary of the Navy Forrestal stated that the Navy Medical Corps would have approximately 1,050 medical officers remaining in the Regular Navy. In other words, they will be short 1,950, or a shortage of about 65 percent of the naval requirements.

Up to date, therefore, it is apparent that the Navy was able to function only because of the use of the Government-subsidized V–12 Reserve officers. Now, however, the situation is extremely critical.

The Dental Corps is also experiencing the same difficulty with reference to maintaining an adequate number of dentists in their corps. The requirements for dental officers for the Army for 1947 and 1948 are 2,000. This will be reduced to 1,500 by December 31, 1947; and by September 30, 1948, the total number on duty will be only 550, making a shortage of nearly 1,500, unless some additional inducement is provided to insure a larger number of applicants.

The Navy, although short of dental officers itself, at one time had to loan 800 dentists to the Army.

The history of World War II is replete with examples of the fine services which the more than 23,000 dentists in service gave to their country.

It is well to remember that only about 2,250 dentists graduate each year in the various dental colleges in our country; and only 5,000 physicians are graduated from our medical schools each year.

The bill under discussion today includes, not only the United States Military and Naval Departments, but the Public Health Service as well. That Department needs 1 500 medical officers to carry on its present work, a great number of whom have already been lost to the service and therefore, the maintenance of the requisite number of medical officers for the Public Health Service is increasingly important. The Public Health Service today discloses a deficit of 40 percent in medical officers and 50 percent in dental officers.

The functions of the Public Health Service are not known too clearly by the public at large. Let me call your attention to the fact that the Public Health Service operates 27 hospitals, 1 of which is for the treatment of leprosy, 2 for the treatment of drug addicts, 1 for the special treatment of tuberculosis. They operate hospitals and medical institutions at all Federal prisons. They provide medical and hospital care for the Coast Guard and for the merchant marine. They direct the health and medical care programs for the Indians in the Indian Bureau of the Department of Interior. They provide medical and hospital care for all beneficiaries of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. They operate quarantine stations at all principal ports of entry in this country, both of ships and airplanes, for the purpose of preventing the introduction in this country of disease from abroad. They have medical officers stationed at all of the principal American Embassies and Consulates abroad for purposes of examining and certifying to the health status of prospective immigrants into this country. One of the major activities of the Public Health Service has been in the field of research. The Public Health Service also has medical and dental officers in the Department of Interior, Department of Agriculture, Department of State, and many other departments. They are operating a special health mission in Liberia. They did have medical officers stationed to the Philippine Government.

I cite these many activities to show you the necessity of maintaining the requisite number of doctors and dentists in the Public Health Service. I might state that there are 256,000 beneficiaries under the Public Health Service for dental care; these beneficiaries being in the various departments and agencies to which I have previously referred.

I have presented for your consideration the statistical data connected with the physicians, surgeons, and dentists in the Army, Navy, and Public Health Service which demonstrates clearly that there is an urgent need in those departments for increasing their Medical Corps. S. 1661 provides an inducement to the securing and retaining of medical officers in our services.

Title I thereof applies to all commissioned officers of the Medical and Dental Corps of the Regular Army and Navy and all commissioned Medical and Dental Corps officers of the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service on active duty on the date this bill becomes law. It also applies to those officers of the Regular Medical and Dental Corps of the Army, Navy, and Public Health Service commissioned during the 5-year period immediately following the enactment of this bill. It also applies to those officers now commissioned or hereafter commissioned in the Medical and Dental Corps of the Officers' Reserve Corps, the Naval Reserve, the National Guard, the Army of the United States and the Medical and Dental Officers of the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service, who during the 5-year period immediately following the enactment of this law volunteer and are accepted for extended active duty for 1 year or longer.

It also applies to general officers appointed from the Medical and Dental Corps of the Regular Army, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard, or the Army of the United States, who are on active duty on the effective date of this law, and general officers who may be appointed from those officers of the Medical and Dental Corps of the Regular Army, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard, or the Army of the United States who are included in previous groups mentioned. The last two groups must be specifically provided for since general officers of the Army are not part of the Army Medical Corps as such.

Subsection (b) provides that such officers previously mentioned shall receive in addition to all other pay, an additional $100 per month for each month of active service. This amount, however, is limited by a proviso that it shall not be included in computing the amount of increase in pay authorized by any other provision of law or in computing retirement pay. That means that longevity will not be applied to this increase and that it definitely will not apply to retirement pay. There is a further proviso which limits the amount that any one officer may receive to $36,000. This limitation has the effect of confining the $100 increase to 30 years of active duty—30 times $1,200 equals $36,000. A further proviso states that the Reserve officers mentioned in the act shall only receive the pay increase during the periods of volunteer service. This provision specifically prohibits the pay increase from

applying to those Reserve doctors now on active duty who are obligated to serve for stated periods of time because all or part of their education was paid for by the Government. It must also be noted that the bill provides for a $100-a-month increase for each month of active service and thus would not be prorated for period of 2 weeks of active-duty training.

All of the witnesses who appeared before our committee were asked specifically whether the over-all increase of $100 per month, as provided for in section 1 of the bill, would be an inducement in security and retaining physicians, surgeons, and dentists. In every case, the answer was in the affirmative. An increase of $100 per month for physicians would increase the pay of a lieutenant 50 percent, 41.4 percent for a captain, 30.3 percent for a major, 24 percent for a lieutenant colonel, and 19.5 percent for a colonel.

Title II permits the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make original appointments to permanent commissioned grades not above that of colonel in the Medical and Dental Corps of the Army and captain in the Medical and Dental Corps of the Navy. This authority is subject to existing limitations governing Army and Navy strength, so that it does not involve any increase over totals otherwise established. The appointments may be made only from qualified dentists and doctors of medicine having such qualifications as the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe. The title is not made applicable to the Public Health Service, which already has adequate authority in this regard.

The total expenses of this bill will approximate $13,000,000.

Because of the critical condition existing in the various Medical and Dental Corps and the further fact that we must have an Army and Navy of the highest degree of efficiency, I hope that this bill will receive the unanimous approval of the House.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACKNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Is it not true that many of our most qualified and very best men in the service are resigning every day?

Mr. BLACKNEY. That is correct.

Mr. SHORT. I was told only yesterday by General Vandegrift, Commandant of the Marine Corps, that he is losing about 50,000 men weekly.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BLACKNEY] has explained to us in detail this measure and why the necessity for it at this time. We are faced with a serious situation in carrying out the obligations of the medical department both in the Army and the Navy as to the medical services for the armed forces.

The essential features of this bill in title I provide that commissioned medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, and Public Health Service shall be given extra pay at the rate of $100 per month in addition to their base and longevity pay. There is a proviso that not more than $36,000 may be paid to any one officer during his lifetime under this authority. The increase applies to all grades uniformly, and affects all active Regular officers and all non-Regular officers now on voluntary active duty, or who hereafter come on voluntary active duty during the 5-year period following the enactment of this section.

When we sent the bill to the Senate we provided a 2-year period, and I think probably it is wise procedure to change this to 5 years, because this is a matter of inducement, and I think this provision will probably induce more men to come in than it would if you just extended it over a 2-year period.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. Will the gentleman state whether or not this bill provides identical provisions for the Public Health Service as that of the Army and the Navy for medical and dental officers?

Mr. DURHAM. That is true. We thought it best to include all those officers, because the Public Health at the present time made practically the same claim that there is a scarcity of doctors and dentists.

Title II permits the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make original appointments to permanent commissioned grades not above that of colonel in the Medical and Dental Corps of the Army, and captain in the Medical and Dental Corps of the Navy.

This, I think, is a much better procedure, and I proposed putting this provision in when the House had the bill in subcommittee, but we failed to do so. It is a further incentive, because the young man at the present time in normal practice back home in the local community is faced with a situation of going into the Army and the Navy as first lieutenant. You are not going to get very many good young doctors today to go into the Army or Navy medical service, when the average income for the American doctor is $14,800 per year; so there is no incentive based on that. We can take these boys in and give them a captaincy in the Navy, if it is some specialized service we have to have, or we can take them in the Army as colonels if we have to have them. That will be discretionary, of course, with the personnel bureaus of the Army and Navy. After studying this subject, I personally think this is necessary. There was some objection at first in the committee as to proceeding on this basis of setting up one category and giving its members more money than those in other lines of the service, but I see no alternative.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am in wholehearted accord with the gentleman's argument. Is it not true that the Navy medical ranks have been depleted at least 50 percent since the end of the war through the resignation of regular medical officers?

Mr. DURHAM. I do not remember the exact percentage, but if you happen to visit the Bethesda Medical Center or Walter Reed or any of those places you can see what is going on. The finest laboratory in the world today for scientific work exists at Bethesda, probably, as far as the medical field is concerned. It is pathetic to go through those laboratories today and see how poorly staffed they are. This is serious. We spent millions in putting those facilities there, and all that scientific and research work is not only for our own service forces but it is shared with the civilian research which is highly important today in all fields of medical research.

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time primarily to ask some questions of the chairman of the subcommittee. First, I should like to know the total cost of this legislation.

Mr. BLACKNEY. It would be approximately $13,000,000.

Mr. BUCK. Is it permanent legislation or is it temporary?

Mr. BLACKNEY. It is permanent.

Mr. BUCK. Then am I correct that this will add $13,000,000 a year to the cost of conducting the Army and the Navy until time runs out?

Mr. BLACKNEY. I told the gentleman that prospectively the cost would be $13,000,000. Of course, that cost will not develop until we know just how these appointments are made and how the situation develops. That is the potential maximum.

Mr. BUCK. I thank the gentleman.

May I point out that the medical schools have more students today than they have ever had in their history. In the course of the next 2 or 3 years the country will be deluged with young doctors. I wonder what attempts the Army and the Navy and the Public Health Service have made to recruit eligible doctors and dentists in the medical and dental schools. Can the gentleman tell us what the program of recruitment was before this legislation was proposed?

Mr. BLACKNEY. I know they have made the most strenuous efforts to replenish the various departments in securing dentists and physicians. In the two attempts that were made sometime ago, those that would come into the Medical and Dental Corps were very few indeed. The fact of the matter is that both departments have even considered the feasibility and possibility of establishing dental and medical colleges throughout the country, but that did not prove to be feasible and would be too expensive and too long-winded. This is emergency legislation. The departments need these replenishments now.

Mr. BUCK. Does the gentleman then tell us that the Army and Navy have gone to the medical and dental schools and have advertised in newspapers that these openings are available?

Mr. BLACKNEY. I cannot tell you actually what they did in every detail, but I only know that they have exerted, according to the testimony given before our committee, every reasonable effort to get medical and dental officers into the service.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield briefly.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. May I add that the armed forces have made efforts to secure the services of medical students. They have offered the students in the various medical schools internships after graduation as an inducement to enter the armed services.

Mr. BUCK. I believe the gentleman said that the average earnings of civilian doctors are $14,000 a year. Can he give us the source of that information?

Mr. BLACKNEY. That came from the Statistical Division of the Department of Commerce.

Mr. BUCK. That is a very astounding statement because within 2 years before the war the average earnings of doctors in this country were less than $3,000 per year, according to statistics of the Academy of Medicine of New York. For that figure to have risen from $3,000 to $14,000 during intervening years is a perfectly remarkably occurrence.

Mr. BLACKNEY. It is. Let me call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that for the first time in the history of professional earnings the earnings of doctors exceeded the earnings of attorneys in the professions.

Mr. BUCK. I very much question the $14,000 figure. I believe the present Army rate of $5,100 would be highly desirable to all of these young men getting out of medical school.

Would not the committee be willing to limit this legislation to a couple of years?

Mr. BLACKNEY. Both here and in the other body we realized the fact that this legislation being emergency legislation could not possibly cover everything that we need. The other body has already stated that starting next year they were going into an intense study. That is the purpose of this.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, within the last 2 days I have received hundreds of letters from people everywhere, including letters of protest from the Church Federation of Greater Chicago, from the National Grange, and from many other organizations, protesting that they were promised but were not accorded the privilege of appearing before the Committee on Armed Services on H. R. 4278, the universal military-training bill. I think the committee has acted too hastily. I think it is manifestly unfair to deny citizens the right of being heard on such important matters.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks and include letters from the church council, the National Grange, and a few other letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the people of the country are deeply disturbed at the speed with which H. R. 4278, the universal military training bill, has been rushed through the committee without adequate hearings.

For instance, Mr. Albert Goss, master of the National Grange, and a darling of the Republican Party, wrote this letter, which I received this morning, and which hardly bears out the contention that all witnesses were heard who wished to appear:

NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., July 24, 1947.

Mr. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
Rules Committee, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SABATH: We are disturbed by reports that an effort will be made to act on the conscription bill (H. R. 4278) at this session. We are among many to whom promises were made that we would be heard. When I protested to Subcommittee Chairman TOWE last week, he said they would consider it, but I need not be concerned for no action was possible before adjournment. We trust your committee will not approve any hasty action designed to cut off those entitled to be heard.

Sincerely,

A. S. GOSS,
Master, the National Grange.

Like you, Mr. Speaker, and like other Members on both sides of the aisle, I have had many protests from the churches.

I am inserting here as part of my remarks two letters and a resolution from the Church Federation of Greater Chicago which expresses the grave concern of these responsible citizens lest our democratic processes be stultified in our urgency to impose universal military training upon the country:

CHURCH FEDERATION OF GREATER CHICAGO,
Chicago, July 18, 1947.

Mr. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
Rules Committee, House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SABATH: We urge you to use your influence against the adoption of the proposed legislation regarding universal military training. From the reports we get there are scores of organizations who have not been heard and who will be denied that opportunity if the hearings are curtailed as has been proposed.

We believe that curtailing hearings on this question will be an outrageous denial of democratic rights. Those who are opposed to this legislation ought to have an opportunity to be heard. Any other procedure can properly be interpreted as an effort to stampede this legislation through Congress against the wishes of the people.

You will be interested in the resolution which has been adopted by our executive committee which represents 22 of the denominations of this area. A copy is enclosed.

Very sincerely,

JOHN W. HARMS,
Executive Secretary.

CHURCH FEDERATION OF GREATER CHICAGO,
Chicago, July 22, 1947.

Mr. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
Rules Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SABATH: We have just wired Mr. LEO E. ALLEN, chairman of the House Rules Committee, as follows:

"We urge you as chairman of House Rules Committee to insist upon full hearings on H. R. 4278 before it is reported out by your committee. Many organizations and citizens have not had opportunity to testify against this legislation which in our judgment violates fundamental democratic rights."

You will recall that we wrote you on July 18 about this matter. We are deeply concerned about the reports we are receiving which indicate that there seems to be a determined effort to steam-roller this legislation through without giving those opposed to it a chance to be heard.

We sincerely urge you to insist upon adequate hearings before this bill is released to the House for consideration.

In order that you may have it for convenient reference I am again enclosing a copy of the resolution which was adopted by our executive committee which represents 22 of the denominations in this area.

Very sincerely,

JOHN W. HARMS,
Executive Secretary.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON CONSCRIPTION

Whereas it is our firm conviction that universal military peacetime training, by whatever name—

Is a complete reversal of the traditional policy of the United States;

Is undemocratic both in principle and procedure;

Will tend toward the militarization of America; and

Will fail to accomplish the purpose for which it is ostensibly intended, namely, to give our Nation security—but rather will increase suspicion and distrust among the nations of the world: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Executive Committee of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago hereby expresses its unalterable opposition to such universal peacetime military training; and be it further

Resolved, That we call upon the President and the Congress to use their influence in the direction of the international abolition of national armaments and the universal abolition of conscription; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to the representatives of the State of Illinois in both Houses of Congress.

Respectfully submitted.

HAROLD W. RUOPP,
Chairman, Department of Christian Citizenship.

Mr. Harms' letters speak for organized public opinion, and I have many communications from all parts of the country, from women's groups and church groups and unions, expressing similar alarm.

But of course I also have many such letters from private individuals, such as this one from Howard Bechtolt of Chicago:

CHICAGO, *July 24, 1947.*

Hon. ADOLPH SABATH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Because the negative side of U. M. T. has not been given a fair and adequate hearing, and because most educators who are qualified to know are opposed to it,

I am writing to urge your opposition to H. R. 4278.

Thanking you in advance for this action, I am,

Hopefully yours,

HOWARD BECHTOLT.

The people should be heard. This is not the same bill on which so many testified. Here is a bill of 77 pages which, as the RECORD shows, was introduced last Friday and reported last Saturday, just a week ago.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, in the brief time allotted me, I shall speak of that phase of this bill which deals with my first love—the cause of dentistry in the armed services.

Other Members have told you of the vital need for the procurement of and the maintaining of the remaining physicians and surgeons the armed forces and the Public Health Service must have in order that we properly protect the health of the men within our armed forces. I cannot impress upon you too strongly the great and grave condition confronting the Surgeon General of the Navy, the Surgeon General of the Army, and the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service.

I respectfully call to your attention the alarming and brief summary of the situation which confronts the Navy, the Army, and the Public Health Service.

NAVY

The actual appropriated strength of the Navy Dental Corps, as of July 1, 1947, is approximately 1,200 officers, while 1,320 are authorized. At present, there are about 500 regulars. The balance of the number needed, approximately 700, consists of Reserve officers who are held involuntarily and who must be released within the next year or two. The deficiency is estimated to become 22 percent by July 1, 1948, with a decline now each day by reason of resignation, but if the Corps is allowed to become demoralized by reason of a disparity in pay, a much larger deficiency percentage will undoubtedly result.

The reserves are being lost steadily. All of them will be separated from active duty within the next year or two.

ARMY

An extremely critical situation exists in regard to the Army Dental Corps, which should likewise have attention now. On the basis of the latest estimate of troop strength, requirements for dental officers will range between 1,800 and 2,200 in 1947 and 1948. At present the Dental Corps is short 350 officers. The number of dental officers on active duty with the Army as of December 31, 1947, will be 1,500, making a shortage of from 500 to 700. Projecting the estimate of losses still further, the number on duty as of September 1948 will be 550, making a shortage of 1,200 to 1,500.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Dental officers in the United States Public Health Service have had parity in pay with dental officers in the Army and Navy. They provide clinical dental care and treatment for legal beneficiaries in the United States Marine hospitals, and relief stations, the United States Coast Guard, Federal penal and correctional institutions, and in the hospitals of the Mental Hygiene Division. There are at present 184 commissioned dental officers on active duty, of which 68 are in the Regular Corps. Of the 116 in the Reserve Corps, it is anticipated that 86 percent, or 99, will request their release at an early date unless some further inducement in the way of increased pay is granted. Fifteen such resignations have recently been received and are being processed. It is anticipated that a considerable number of the dental officers in the Regular Corps will also resign, and it is estimated by the United States Public Health Service that 180 vacancies may result, making it impossible for them to give the regular dental service required for the beneficiaries.

Yes; I say to you, if this legislation is not passed, and passed immediately, regardless of how much each of you espouses the cause of adequate armament and adequate preparation, your armed forces will be only a skeleton in protection of the health, the life and limb, of the fine men and women who compose it. Yes; I say to you, if we do not pass this legislation, your Surgeons General of the armed forces will be out of business. It may be so that even this inducement will not retain the adequate number to maintain the health of our boys. Nevertheless, this will demonstrate to them our attitude of trying to reward them for the amazing records they have established during the war years. In spite of the tragic losses attendant with the recent wars in the Atlantic and Pacific, and in spite of the death and misery necessitated by the storming of the beaches by our marines in the annihilation of the imperial Japanese fleets, the Surgeon General of the Navy, with his magnificent assistants, lost fewer than 2 percent of those wounded. In spite of the heroic advances led by General Eisenhower from El Alamein to Berlin, and by General MacArthur from Pearl Harbor to Tokyo, the Surgeon General of the Army lost fewer than 3 percent of those wounded. A comparable record of magnificent medical and dental aid adorns the record of the Public Health Service also. These records of salvation and prevention of loss of life, and restoration of life and limb, stand out as the supreme achievement of physicians, surgeons, and dentists of all time. Why, even in World War I, 11 out of every 100 men wounded died because of inadequate medical assistance. Surely we must retain a healthy condition in the entire make-up of the offices of our Surgeons General.

The rate at which physicians, surgeons, and dentists are leaving today causes them tremendous alarm.

Read, if you please, what Dr. Hugh Morgan, of Vanderbilt University, has to say about the shortage of physicians and doctors:

The Army wants five times more doctors than it had before the war. The Navy wants three or four times more than it had before the war. The United States Public Health Service is in short supply for doctors. It needs them desperately. The local State health services need them desperately. Over a third of the counties of the United States haven't got a full-time public-health officer. There is a vacuum in terms of doctor needs—in terms of supply for doctor needs. The Veterans' Administration is requiring 4,000 more doctors than it did before the war. All that adds up to thousands of doctors in terms of shortage. Dr. Parran, of the United States Public Health Service, estimates that by 1950 there will be a shortage of something like 30,000 doctors in relation to doctor needs, as compared with our situation, I think, in 1940.

Read, if you please, what Dr. Edward J. Churchill, of Harvard University, has to say on the matter:

Now, in title V, we are suggesting that as enabling legislation. General Eisenhower has said that he hopes to carry the officer load of his million-man army by volunteers from the Reserves on extended active duty. With the authorized strength of the Medical Corps up to 2,700, we will still have a gap of 3,000 officers that the War Department is anticipating securing from their Reserve volunteering for periods of extended active duty. I just don't believe we are going to get that many men to drop their practice, particularly the young men who have had their work interrupted by the war—and there are 40,000 of them—leave their families and go in for a period of extended active duty in Army medicine.

Read, if you please, what Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower has to say on this matter:

Our people calculate, for example, at this moment that we need something like 6,000 doctors to keep health and in proper shape the Army for which we are going to have a need during the foreseeable future. We have only 1,100 doctors in the Regular officer corps.

Read, if you please, what the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Forrestal, has to say on this matter:

On the 15th of August 1945, there were 1,949 medical officers in the Regular naval service. Since then there have been 864 applications submitted for resignation from the naval service. Procurement efforts have not been effective, because of our inability to compete with inducements offered by opportunities in civilian medicine. Two hundred and seventeen medical officers have been obtained for the Regular Navy since August of 1945, in spite of the fact that a high percentage of the 12,000 Reserve officers on active duty were eligible for transfer.

Read, if you please, what the former Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson, has to say on this matter:

The highest standard of medical care ever attained in any army in the world was reached in our forces in the recent war. Deaths from illness were reduced to an almost infinitesimal percentage, six-tenths per 1,000 men per year—even compared with World War I, 16 per 1,000 men per year, where our medical care was good.

In summary, all these statements have been backed up by our illustrious Surgeons General. Surely they all cannot be wrong. We have to do something to assist them. This is our answer—if there is an answer at this time.

In closing, let me cite you one instance of which I am personally familiar. Recently the Navy conducted an examination for the procurement of dental officers to fill the growing shortage. For seven-hundred-odd vacancies one man applied, and he was gladly accepted. In the near future they propose to hold another examination. To date no one has applied. By September or October the Navy expects to lose about 600 more dentists.

I say to you that our responsibility cannot be avoided. Our duty is now. Our action must be today.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. I want to congratulate the gentleman for his untiring efforts in behalf of this legislation. He has earned the undying gratitude not only of the American Dental Association, the College of Dental Surgeons, but also the enlisted men in the Army and the Navy, who will benefit most by this legislation.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman explain to the House that the armed forces sooner or later will have to release the Reserves who are now on active duty?

Mr. RIVERS. Of course that is true. In 1948, there will be a 22-percent shortage across the board, both dentists and physicians.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Will the gentleman not agree that the fact of the matter is that if this bill is not passed we will simply not have doctors and dentists and medical workers in the Army and Navy?

Mr. RIVERS. I just got through saying that they would be out of business.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. It was brought out in the testimony that the Army needs 2,000 doctors right now and they have but 218 applications

Mr. RIVERS. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. GAVIN. And they are turning out only 5,000 a year in all the medical schools in the Nation.

Mr. RIVERS. That is correct.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. How could any person reasonably expect doctors to work for half as much in the Army and Navy as they can make in civilian life?

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman's question answers itself.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. I would like to reemphasize this point, that it is the enlisted personnel of the Army and Navy who will benefit most by this bill—not the dentists or physicians, but the enlisted personnel.

Mr. RIVERS. Certainly. The gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] has expired.

Let me say to you this, we can get up here and espouse all we want to about a great Army and a great Navy because they are great and they are great parts of our armed services. But we must help them be adequate parts of the armed service and see that they are properly sustained. I tell you the greatest component part of our armed services is a guaranty that they will be sustained in time of injury and their health protected. Unless you have a sufficient number of doctors and dentists you cannot attain that objective. This is necessary legislation and I commend it to you most respectfully.

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, in my earlier days I practiced dentistry for 10 years. I have been the beneficiary of the Medical Department of the Army in two wars. I have an active interest in both Dental and Medical Departments. I do not know whether the average Member of this House realizes what the situation is back home as far as members of these professions are concerned, but I want to assure you that there is hardly a community in the United States today that is properly supplied with doctors or dentists.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF. I yield.

Mr. MACKINNON. This bill would make it worse back home, would it not?

Mr. WOODRUFF. There is no question but that it will have some effect upon them, but regardless of what the situation is we have got to recognize the fact that our first duty here today is to the armed services of this country. No man in this House knows what is ahead of us. No man knows what minute or day we will be called back into another war. We must be ready; the Army and the Navy must be supplied with a sufficient number of these professional personnel to properly care for the men and women in these services. Without them the situation would be deplorable indeed.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does this mean that the military pay will be the same as pay to the doctors and dentists of the Veterans' Administration or will it be higher?

Mr. WOODRUFF. It will not be higher, because there is no limitation on the pay of those engaged in the Veterans' Administration. The rate of pay is definitely set forth in the bill, and those who are familiar with this situation will confirm it.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman from his military experience knows that no army or navy can be efficient without the Medical Corps, which must include doctors.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Of course; that is a well-known fact.

As I said before, conditions back in the country in every little community are such that there is more work for those engaged in these professions than they can possibly do. Under those circumstances they can charge what they will. I want you to know—I think most of you do know—that the fees for both medical and dental services in civil life are such that the salaries paid in the armed services are entirely unattractive to even the youngest of the professions.

Mr. Speaker, I have more than a passing interest in this question. Being a member of the dental profession, I have made it my business to know what sort of dental departments we have in the Army and in the Navy. We have in those corps the finest men in this country in their respective professions. They are kept up to the minute, and the soldiers and sailors are given the finest service in all the history of this country. I think the least we can do is to pass this bill today, and pass it unanimously. In that way we will contribute much to the welfare of this country and its future.

Mr. Speaker, altogether too little is known of the activities and responsibilities of the Public Health Department. In order that the Members of the Congress can become more familiar with the great department I include the following from the hearings and the statement of Dr. James A. Crabtree, Deputy Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service:

I should like, too, to enumerate briefly some of the functions of the Public Health Service. We operate 27 hospitals, one of which is for the special treatment of leprosy, two for the treatment of drug addiction, one for the special treatment of tuberculosis. We operate hospitals and medical installations at all Federal prisons. We provide medical and hospital care for the Coast Guard. Similarly we provide medical and hospital care for the merchant marine. We direct the health and medical-care programs for the Indians, in the Indian Bureau of the Department of the Interior. We provide medical and hospital care for all beneficiaries of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. We operate quarantine stations at all principal ports of entry in this country, both of ships and airplanes, for the purpose of preventing the introduction in this country of disease from abroad. We have medical officers stationed at all of the principal American embassies and consulates abroad, for purposes of examining and certifying to the health status of prospective immigrants into this country. One of the major activities of the Public Health Service over the last 50 years has been in the field of research. Out at Bethesda, in our National Institute of Health, and in the field laboratories stationed in various parts of the country, we are engaged in a very elaborate and substantial program of research in the various specialties of health and medicine. We are responsible for licensing all manufacturers of biological products—vaccines, serums, and the like—that enter into interstate commerce. Our licensing is for the purpose of certifying to the safety, purity, and potency of all such products. Then, too, we provide special consultation services to the health organizations of State and local governments, not only in the general field of public health but in such special problems as malaria, tuberculosis, venereal disease, cancer, dental health, mental health, hospital construction, communicable-disease control, etc. These are our more traditional and more routine responsibilities.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, there is hardly a department of the Federal Government that does not have, in connection with its major responsibilities, some incidental health problems, health programs that arise incidentally to their major operations. In that connection, it is the rule rather than the exception, when the head of the department so concerned does not request the Public Health Service to manage and operate the health phases of such programs.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, this bill is an excellent one. It bears the endorsement of the armed services. It is recommended by General Eisenhower and many others. It is urged that we do something with this bill at the present time to make it possible for the armed services to maintain a very high medical standard in the services. This bill should be passed.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to this I want to say that this bill is the first one of nine measures which have been reported from the Armed Services Committee and which are in need of some sort of action at this time and before adjournment. I have a list of them before me. I notice down near the bottom of the list, for instance, there is H. R. 2744, which is a bill to provide retirement for the Reserve components of the armed services. I dare say there is not a single Member of the House of Representatives who has not received at some time or other correspondence on this subject. It is vital to the work of building up the strength of our Reserve components.

Every one of these measures on this schedule, in my opinion, is vital to the national-defense program. It is my sincere hope that this Congress will not adjourn tonight without having taken action on every bill that is vital to the national-defense program of this country. We are now going through perilous times. We need all necessary legislation which will properly promote peace in the world and which will properly keep our country safe from attack.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, I sincerely hope the whole program which is set forth on this schedule, and this schedules comes from the Armed Services Committee of the House, will receive action by the Congress before adjournment tonight.

The schedule referred to follows:

SITUATION REPORT ON HOUSE AND COMPANION SENATE BILLS, SATURDAY, JULY 26, 1947—9 A. M.

Suggested actions or required for passage all House bills referred to reported unanimously

Subcommittee chairman, recognition	House bill	Senate bill	Title	Suggested action
Shafer, Michigan	H. R. 3471	S. 1198	Army, Navy lease	Suspend and agree to Senate.
Blackney, Michigan	H. R. 3851	S. 1661	Doctor, dentists	Suspend conferees or agree.
Anderson, California	H. R. 1366	Same (passed House unanimously).	Procurement	Agree to Senate amendments.
Elston, Ohio	H. R. 3051	Same (passed House unanimously).	Amend Vinson-Trammell.	Do.
Towe, New Jersey	H. R. 3227	S. 1174	Inac Pay Reserves	Suspend (House and Senate bills identical).
Bates, Massachusetts	H. R. 4122	S. 1676	Army, Public Works	Suspend.
Do	H. R. 3314	S. 1675	Navy, Public Works	Do.
Johnson, California	H. R. 2744	Equalizing retirement (enlisted and officer personnel, all branches).		Do.
Short, Missouri	H. R. 3830	Same	Promotion bill	For conference.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, as an enlisted man in the late war, I was the recipient of both dental and medical treatment. I am for the pending bill, I think it is the only alternative to a very serious situation and I urgently hope the House will unanimously pass this legislation.

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MACKINNON) there were—ayes 148, noes 6.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and thirty-two Members are present, a quorum.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

GETTING DOCTORS—WRONG APPROACH

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, the House has just adopted, with little or no consideration, Senate bill 1661, to give doctors and dentists in the armed services a salary raise of $100 per month. The hope is that they will be able to recruit more doctors and dentists with $100 a month more in salary increase, but from 4 years' experience in the armed services during the past war, and from the information I have obtained from service personnel here in Washington since January, I am forced to the conclusion that this bill will do more harm than good and will not solve the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this legislation. There is a shortage of doctors and dentists in this Nation, both in the armed services and in civilian life. This bill, if it would work, would only aggravate the civilian shortage by taking civilian doctors and putting them in the armed services. But I am satisfied it will not work to any material degree—it will not bring sufficient doctors and dentists into the armed services, because the main complaint of civilian doctors and dentists who go into the armed services is not the disparity in pay but the general incompetence of the Medical Corps, and particularly the senior officers who have become stale in the service and have not kept up with modern medical developments. These doctors and dentists chafe under incompetent seniors—they are discriminated against in promotions—and they protest doing all the work, while many senior officers do relatively little.

LOWER MORALE

Moreover, this bill will lower the morale of every other officer in the armed services. What can you say to a line officer who asks you, "Do you feel that the man who faces the bullets of the enemy should be discriminated against and receive less pay than a doctor of the same or lower rank with less service in the Army or Navy?"

Gentlemen, there is no answer to that argument, except to equalize the pay, and I object to a general salary increase for the armed services being based upon such emergency considerations for doctors. The precedent here created is going to be embarrassing when the armed services bring in a general salary-increase bill such as we were warned on the floor of this House is going to be presented next session.

I also wish to point out that $100 a month is not any substantial inducement to a doctor in private practice, if he is any good. But this is the standard remedy proposed by those who do not understand doctors. It is the same remedy that the armed services proposed to increase the size of the Army and Navy—and what happened? They are not getting the men, and enlistments are falling off each month. I predict they will not get the doctors and that they will merely use this bill, passed in haste, as a precedent to claim a larger general salary increase.

The only solution to this problem is to educate more doctors, and until sufficient time has elapsed to do this we are going to have a shortage of doctors—civilian and service. This bill is not a solution, but merely a one-sided approach. I insert this after the passage of the legislation so the RECORD will be straight for next session. I predict that the armed forces will not have sufficient competent doctors until they take steps to improve the basic defects that exist and have existed for a long time in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy.

THE LATE MARTHA E. TRUMAN

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 347) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the mother of the President of the United States, Mrs. Martha E. Truman, whose life exemplified in the highest degree the finest qualities of American womanhood.

Resolved, That the House extends to the President and to the members of his family its deepest sympathy in their hour of personal grief.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I think it is altogether fitting and proper that the membership should rise for 30 seconds in silent tribute and respect for the sainted mother of the President of the United States.

(Whereupon the Members rose.)

OFFICE OF THE RECORDER OF DEEDS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3045) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe the processes and procedures for recording instruments of writing in the Office of the Recorder of

Deeds in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3045) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe the processes and procedures for recording instruments of writing in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 2, line 10, of the House engrossed bill, after the word "with" insert the following: "; and all deeds and other instruments of writing entitled by law to be recorded in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds which are recorded by means of such machines or equipment are hereby declared to be legally recorded"; and the Senate agree to the same.

AMENDMENT TO THE TITLE

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title and agree to the same.

JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
GREGORY MCMAHON,
T. G. ABERNETHY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY P. CAIN,
RALPH E. FLANDERS,
J. HOWARD MCGRATH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3045) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe the processes and procedures for recording instruments of writing in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: This amendment strikes out the provisions of the first section of the bill as it passed the House authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe the fees for the services of the Recorder of Deeds of the District and the manner, processes, and procedures by which deeds and other instruments of writing shall be legally recorded. Both under the House bill and the Senate amendment the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia is authorized to purchase certain machines and equipment for the recording of deeds and other instruments of writing. The House recedes with an amendment declaring to be legally recorded all deeds and other instruments of writing which are recorded by such machines or equipment.

Amendment No. 2: This amendment strikes out sections 2 and 3 of the House bill. Section 2 required all receipts and expenditures of appropriations for the Office of the Recorder of Deeds to be preaudited, audited, and disbursed in the same manner as are other receipts and disbursements of the government of the District of Columbia. Section 3 transferred to the Director of Vehicles and Traffic of the District of Columbia the duties and functions vested in the Recorder of Deeds under the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940, as amended. Section 3 also made extensive amendments to such act of July 2, 1940, as amended. The House recedes.

Amendment to the title. This is a technical amendment. The House recedes.

JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
GREGORY MCMAHON,
T. G. ABERNETHY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL TORT CLAIMS ACT

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE], I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3690) to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act, with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 21, after "damages", insert "measured by the pecuniary injuries resulting from such death to the persons, respectively, for whose benefit the action was brought."

Page 3, line 3, after "1946", insert "and notwithstanding the provisions of section 420 of the Federal Tort Claims Act, no claim which accrued on or after January 1, 1945, and prior to the date of enactment of this Act on account of death caused by the negligent or wrongful act or omission of any employee of the Government shall be barred by reason of such provisions if (a) the law of the place where such act or omission occurred provides, or has been construed to provide, only for damages punitive in nature, and (b) suit on such claim is instituted pursuant to part 3 of the Federal Tort Claims Act not later than August 2, 1948."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3173) relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 3, line 17, strike out "this" and insert "the."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Burke, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1551. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell to Anthony P. Miller, Inc., a parcel of unimproved land adjacent to the Anchorage Housing Project at Middletown, R. I.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1326) entitled "An act to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act."

REHABILITATION OF CHRONIC ALCOHOLICS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2659) to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance, and provide for the medical and scientific treatment of persons found to be alcoholics by the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2659) to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance, and provide for the medical and scientific treatment of persons found to be alcoholics by the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

On page 7, line 11, of the House bill strike out "Commissioner" and insert in lieu thereof "Commissioners"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment strike out "Commissioner" and insert in lieu thereof "Commissioners"; and the Senate agree to the same.

A. L. MILLER,
JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
CHARLES B. DEANE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

C. D. BUCK,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate

to the bill (H. R. 2659) to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance, and provide for the medical and scientific treatment of persons found to be alcoholics by the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: Section 3 (a) of the House bill provided for establishment of a clinic for the diagnosis, classification, hospitalization, confinement, treatment, and study of persons found to be chronic alcoholics by any court of the District of Columbia. This amendment requires that such finding be by the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 2: Section 4 of the House bill authorized the judges of any court of the District of Columbia to commit the defendant in any criminal case to the clinic on a finding that such defendant is a chronic alcoholic. This amendment limits this authority to the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 3: In the provision referred to in the explanation of amendment No. 2, the House bill authorized the court to act "after a hearing." This amendment substituted more detailed provisions, including provisions for suspension of the proceedings in the case; for an order for a hearing upon sufficient notice; for conduct of the hearing by the judge without a jury (unless the defendant requests a jury); and for the right of the defendant to be represented by counsel. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 4, 14, and 15: Section 5 of the House bill authorized any court in the District of Columbia having original jurisdiction of the offenses of drunkenness and intoxication to issue a warrant under specified circumstances for any person who has forfeited collateral upon a third arrest for drunkenness or intoxication within any 1 year, to determine whether any such person is a chronic alcoholic and, if he is found to be such, to commit him generally to the clinic for a term not to exceed 90 days. Section 6 of the House bill contained provisions relating to the voluntary submission to the clinic for treatment as a chronic alcoholic of any resident of the District of Columbia. Amendment No. 4 strikes out sections 5 and 6 of the House bill. The House recedes. Except for clarifying changes, amendments Nos. 14 and 15 restore at a different place in the bill the provisions of section 6 of the House bill (which were stricken out by amendment No. 4). The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 16, 18, and 20: These are clerical amendments, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 7: Section 8 (a) of the House bill permitted the director of the clinic, in the case of a person committed to the clinic, to make certain recommendations to the committing judge, including a recommendation that such person be confined in a correctional institution. This is a clarifying amendment except that the director of the clinic, in lieu of recommending that the person be confined in a correctional institution as provided in the House bill, may recommend that the person committed to the clinic be returned to the court from which he was committed for trial upon the original offense charged or for such action as the court may deem proper. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 9: Section 9 of the House bill provided that at the expiration of his term of commitment the chronic alcoholic must be discharged, unless the director of the clinic recommends to the court prior to such expiration that the chronic alcoholic is in need of additional treatment in an appropriate hospital or institution, in which event the court will conduct a second hearing as to his condition and may order him recommitted for an additional period of 90 days or less as his condition requires. This amendment provides that such second hearing shall be conducted in the same manner and upon the same conditions provided for the first hearing by section 4. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 12: This is a clarifying amendment. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 17: Section 12 of the House bill authorized the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to contract with any appropriate agency not under its control for the custody, care, subsistence, treatment, and training of persons committed to the alcoholic clinic directed to be established by the bill. This amendment adds a requirement that any such agency must have proper and adequate treatment facilities and personnel to carry out the purposes of this bill. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 19: Section 13 of the House bill directed the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a director of the alcoholic clinic and required that the director be a "qualified medical man". The Senate amendment strikes out the words "qualified medical man" and inserts in lieu thereof "physician with such training in psychiatry as they may prescribe". The House recedes.

Amendment No. 21: Section 15 of the House bill authorized to be appropriated the sum of $100,000 for the fiscal year 1948 and thereafter such additional sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the bill. This amendment strikes out section 15 of the House bill and inserts a new section increasing by 10 percent the annual fees for licenses for the manufacture or sale of alcoholic beverages (except for retailer's license, class E) imposed by section 11 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act and providing that the revenue resulting from the increase of such fees imposed by the section is permanently appropriated to carry out the purposes of the bill. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 22: This amendment adds a new section to the House bill. It provides that the Commissioners shall appoint a committee of six outstanding residents of the District who will advise and consult with the Commissioners and assist them in carrying out the provisions of the bill. It stipulates that the members of this committee shall serve for 1 year, and until their successors are selected, and that the members shall serve without pay. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

A. L. MILLER,
JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
CHARLES B. DEANE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

LICENSING OF UNDERTAKERS AND EMBALMERS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2173) to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2173) to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes", approved July 1, 1902, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21 and agree to the same.

A. L. MILLER,
JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
CHARLES B. DEANE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2173) to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: The bill as it passed the House provided that "no person shall, in the District of Columbia, discharge any of the duties of an undertaker or embalmer" unless licensed by the District Commissioners. This amendment strikes out the words "or embalmer." Senate amendment No. 21, on which the House recedes, defines an undertaker to include an embalmer, making this amendment clerical. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 2, 4, 5, 7, and 18: Amendments Nos. 2, 4, 5, and 7 strike out the words "or their authorized agent," having reference to the authorized agent of the District Commissioners. Senate amendment No. 18 provides that the Commissioners of the District, for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this act, may designate as their agent the Health Officer of the District. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 3: This amendment strikes out the sentence, "Such license shall entitle the holder thereof to perform the duties of an undertaker or embalmer or both." This sentence was superfluous, and the House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 6 and 8: Amendment No. 6 strikes out the proviso which required that a license be granted to an undertaker doing business in the District at the present time if he is actually engaged in discharging the duties of an undertaker or embalmer "at a fixed place or establishment equipped as a funeral home in the District of Columbia," and if such undertaker meets certain other requirements. Senate amendment No. 8 then inserts substantially the same lan-

guage contained in the proviso stricken out by amendment No. 6, but eliminates the requirement "of a fixed place or establishment equipped as a funeral home in the District." All other requirements originally contained in the proviso are retained. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 9: This is a technical amendment. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 10: The House bill authorized the Commissioners to refuse to issue, to refuse to renew, to suspend, or to revoke an undertaker's license for certain grounds specified in the bill. This amendment requires that such refusal, suspension, or revocation be after notice and open hearing. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 11: This amendment strikes out the word "considered." It is a clerical amendment. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 12: Among the grounds, contained in the House bill, for refusing, suspending, or revoking a license is "any act or practice considered detrimental to the public health, welfare, and safety." This amendment strikes out the words "welfare, and." The House recedes.

Amendment No. 13: This amendment eliminates the authority, contained in the House bill, for the Commissioners of the District to refuse to renew, to suspend, or to revoke a license "for such other cause" as they may deem advisable. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 14: Under the House bill the Commissioners were authorized to "appoint a committee of five persons of good moral character, not more than two of whom shall have been actually and continuously engaged in discharging the duties of an undertaker or embalmer in the District of Columbia for at least five years next preceding the appointment * * *," to conduct the examination of applicants for an undertaker's license. This amendment strikes out the words "not more than". The House recedes.

Amendment No. 15: The House bill provided that members of the examining committee shall serve without compensation for their services. This amendment provides that the members of the examining committee, other than the Health Officer of the District of Columbia or the person designated by him, shall be entitled to a per diem of $10 for each day during which they are actually performing their duties. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 16: The House bill authorized the District Commissioners to issue licenses without examination to persons licensed in other States upon such terms and conditions as they may deem adequate. Under this amendment, the Commissioners are authorized to issue licenses without examination to persons licensed in other States, upon the same terms and conditions as such States grant licenses without examination to persons licensed in the District. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 17, 19, and 20: These are technical amendments. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 21: This amendment defines the term "undertaker", for purposes of this bill, to include a funeral director, mortician, embalmer, and any person who performs services with respect to the care and preparation of dead human bodies for burial or cremation. There was no definition in the bill as it passed the House. The House recedes.

A. L. MILLER,
JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
CHARLES B. DEANE.
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committee:

JULY 26, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I submit herewith my resignation as a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

FRANCK R. HAVENNER.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 107) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Ways and Means be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,000 additional copies of the digest of testimony, index to hearings, and each part of the hearings held before the said committee during the current session relative to tax revision, 1947–48.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SURPLUS LANDS

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 31 relating to surplus buildings and lands for community purposes.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the War Department, the Navy Department, and the War Assets Administration are requested to delay until March 15, 1948, in reporting as surplus, or in disposing of (1) any lands or permanent structures located thereon declared by any State, municipal, or local government, or political subdivision thereof, through its proper authorities, to be suitable and desirable for its use for educational, recreational, medical, or scientific purposes, or for its use as a public park or place of historic interest; or (2) any lands or permanent structures located thereon which would be transferred for, or devoted to, such purposes or uses under the provisions of any bill or joint resolution pending in Congress if such bill or joint resolution should be enacted into law. This concurrent resolution shall not be deemed to prevent or delay the disposition of any such lands or permanent structures to any State or political subdivision thereof under existing provisions of law.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, acting jointly, and the War Assets Administrator, acting individually, are requested to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on or before January 15, 1948, the location, general description, and fair market value of any property described in the first section of this concurrent resolution which has been reported as surplus or which it is contemplated will be reported as surplus or disposed of.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire if I heard aright that the adoption of this resolution would prevent the War Assets Administration from turning over any War Department property even though the transfer was authorized by previous legislation?

Mr. ELSTON. The purpose of the resolution is to protect the bills which have been passed by the House but which have not been passed by the Senate or any bills pending in either body the purpose of which is to authorize the War Department, Navy Department, or the War Assets Administration to turn over to some local subdivision, such as a State, a municipality, or county, lands or structures thereon for educational, recreational, medical, or scientific purposes or for some other public purpose. The bills to which I refer as having passed the House have not passed the Senate. Therefore, if this resolution does not pass, the property described in such bills will go into the hands of the War Assets Administration and may be disposed of by that agency under its general authority. The purpose for which the House passed the bills would thereby be defeated.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I have in mind that we recently passed a bill authorizing the War Assets Administration to transfer certain Air Corps property to States and municipalities. The bill passed the Senate and is on the President's desk. The resolution would not interfere with carrying out the provisions of the bill already passed, would it?

Mr. ELSTON. Not at all. The resolution is only a request.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what about the bills that have received favorable reports from the War Department and Navy Department and on which the committee has not yet acted?

Mr. ELSTON. Those bills are also protected even though they will not be considered until after the first of the year. The resolution includes pending bills, whether they have or have not been passed by the House or by the Senate.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand from the gentleman that this bill is limited in its scope only to lands which have been covered by bills already passed by the House?

Mr. ELSTON. No; it would include property included in any pending bill or property which any local subdivision has declared to be desired for the purposes I have mentioned.

Mr. HAND. Does it hold up the whole program?

Mr. ELSTON. No; it does not prevent the War Assets Administration from going ahead and disposing of other property in accordance with previous laws

passed by Congress. The disposition of any property in which a municipality or other public subdivision may be interested would be delayed to March 15 of next year.

Mr. HAND. In other words, it is limited to land in which local municipalities and other public subdivisions have an interest?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CANADIAN-BUILT DREDGE "AJAX"

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 885) to provide that the Canadian-built dredge *Ajax* and certain other dredging equipment owned by a United States corporation be documented under the laws of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Director of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation is authorized and directed to document under the laws of the United States the Canadian-built dredge *Ajax* and the Canadian-built dump scows *DS 135290, DS 135291, DS 308*, and *DS 310*, which are owned by the Puget Sound Towboat Co., a subsidiary of the Puget Sound Bridge & Dredging Co., in order that such vessels may continue to operate within the United States without violating the restrictions of the navigation laws on dredging operations and coastwise transportation: *Provided*, That the documentation of the *Ajax* as provided in this act shall terminate upon completion of the Wrangell Narrows, Alaska, contract now in force between United States engineers and subject company.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HIGH PRICE OF CONSUMER GOODS

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 19, establishing a joint committee to investigate the high price of consumer goods.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Committee on the Economic Report is hereby authorized and directed through two or more subcommittees of the said committee, each to be composed of three Members of the Senate (not more than two of whom shall be members of the same political party) and three Members of the House of Representatives (not more than two of whom shall be members of the same political party) take the action prescribed in section 2 hereof. Members of said subcommittees may be selected from the membership of said Joint Committee on the Economic Report or from Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives not members of said Committee on the Economic Report. Vacancies in the membership of the subcommittees shall not affect the powers of the remaining members to exercise the functions of the subcommittee and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee through the said subcommittees (1) to make a full and complete study and investigation of the present high prices of consumer goods and (2) to report to the Congress not later than February 1, 1948, the results of the study and investigation of its subcommittees together with such recommendations, as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

SEC. 3. (a) The subcommittees herein established are authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

(b) The Joint Committee on the Economic Report is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties.

(c) The expenses of the subcommittees, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate. Upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Burke, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3601) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 59 to the above-entitled bill.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS ADMINISTERED BY WAR DEPARTMENT, FISCAL YEAR 1948—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill H. R. 4002, an act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, for printing in the RECORD:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4002) making appropriations for the civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 13.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 10, and 11, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,190,387"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$246,072,825"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$246,072,825"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, and 12.

ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
HARVE TIBBOTT,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE H. MAHON,
W. F. NORRELL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAN GURNEY,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
HOMER FERGUSON,
CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
ELMER THOMAS,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4002) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1, pertaining to "Cemeterial expenses": Appropriates $4,190,387 instead of $4,093,369 as proposed by the House and $4,914,924 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 3: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 4: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 5, pertaining to "Flood control, general": Appropriates $246,072,825 instead of $132,041,800 as proposed by the House and $274,601,825 as proposed by the Senate. In making appropriations for the Isabella and Pine Flat Reservoirs in California, included in the total for flood control in the Senate amendment, page 9, line 5, the conferees do so with the understanding that, of course, the disposition of water therefrom for irrigation purposes will be subject to the Federal reclamation laws in accordance with section 8 of the act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), and these reservoirs will be planned and operated in such fashion as will fully protect the integrity of the repayment principles of the reclamation law.

Included in the amount provided above is an amount of $4,500,000 for advance planning of which $850,000 is for Oahe Reservoir, $800,000 for Red Rock Reservoir, $500,000 for Eufaula Reservoir, and $200,000 for Dyberry and Prompton Reservoirs.

Amendment No. 6: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 7: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 8: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 9, pertaining to "Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries": Appropriates $50,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $24,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 10, pertaining to "Flood control, Sacramento River, California": Appropriates $1,750,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 11, pertaining to "United States Soldiers' Home": Appropriates $2,410,100 as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,114,100 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 12: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 13: Eliminates provision of the Senate under "General provisions" which prohibited the employment of aliens under civil service on the Canal Zone.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

Amendment No. 2, pertaining to repairs to the approach road to the Natchez, Miss., National Cemetery, and transfer thereof. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 3, pertaining to the use of power-driven boats or vessels in connection with rivers and harbors and flood control. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 4, pertaining to the maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works. The House bill provides $94,659,700 and the Senate bill provides $125,268,700. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment establishing the amount at $116,718,700.

Amendment No. 6, pertaining to plans for the Dyberry and Prompton Reservoirs in the Lackawaxen River Basin, Pa., and authorizing $200,000 for such purpose. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with a correcting amendment striking out the words "in view of the threat to human life".

Amendment No. 7, pertaining to bank protection on the Missouri River in the vicinity of Aten, Nebr. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment limiting the amount which may be used for this purpose to $500,000.

Amendment No. 8, pertaining to the Garrison (N. Dak.) Reservoir and the relocation of Indians in connection with this project. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment by substitution for the last paragraph of the amendment the following language:

"That said contract shall be submitted to the Congress on or before the first day of June 1948: *Provided, however*, That, notwithstanding said contract or the provisions of this Act, the said Three Affiliated Tribes may bring suit in the Court of Claims as provided in section 24 of the Act of August 13, 1946, on account of additional damages, if any, alleged to have been sustained by said tribes by reason of the taking of the said lands and rights in the said Fort Berthold Indian Reservation on account of any treaty obligation of the Government or any intangible cost of reestablishment or relocation, for which the said tribes are not compensated by the said $5,105,625."

Amendment No. 12, pertaining to plans and specifications for the renovation and enlargement of the United States Soldiers' Homes and providing $296,000 for such purpose. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
HARVE TIBBOTT,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE H. MAHON,
W. F. NORRELL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 4002, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL]?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to make a point of order against certain language in the conference report. Would I waive my right if I permitted this request?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is obliged to make any point of order before the reading of the statement.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. This request provides for the reading of the statement, does it not?

The SPEAKER. The request is to waive the reading of the report and the Clerk read the statement instead. If the gentleman is going to make a point of order, now is the time to make it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I have just been informed, Mr. Speaker, by the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill, that the language to which I objected has been eliminated. There is, therefore, no need for me to press my point of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement as above set out.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include two lists of projects, the first a list of rivers and harbors projects showing the name of each project, the amount in the House bill, the amount in the Senate bill, and the amount agreed to in conference. The other list contains the same information relative to flood control. We just completed this information a few minutes ago and have not had an opportunity to include it in the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will not the gentleman also include a break-down of expenditures from the lump-sum appropriation on the lower Mississippi and its tributaries?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I shall be glad to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. REEVES].

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, there is a desperate urgency about the flood-control problem which admits of no delay. The original of the bill (H. R. 4002) making appropriations for civil functions of the War Department, including flood-control work, was based upon the very limited funds requested for this purpose by the President in his budget message. The bill itself was written before the terrible floods of 1947 had spread their devastation throughout the Midwest. When it was debate at length on the floor of the House the committee and a majority of the Members resisted all amendments and efforts to add funds and projects in order to avoid a variegated patchwork not related to a central plan.

The conference report on the bill reflects acceptance by the House conferees of the large increases in appropriations for flood control made by the Appropriations Committee of the other body. For myself and other Members who are vitally interested in the matter, I want to express the highest commendation of the members of the subcommittee and of their chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] for their recognition of the importance of sufficient funds for flood control and for their constructive action to provide them.

Congressional authority was given the Pick-Sloan plan for the Missouri River and its tributaries in 1944. Those who challenge its effectiveness ignore the fact that at no time have sufficient funds been provided to complete any substantial portion of it. Certainly it has been impossible to proceed with necessary construction in an orderly and economical way.

I have repeatedly called to the attention of the House the tremendous losses and damage which result from a single flood on the Missouri River. This year alone damage in the lower Missouri Basin has exceeded $125,000,000. Hundreds of thousands of acres of farm land have been flooded; crops have been destroyed, cattle drowned, homes ruined, and lives lost. It is intolerable that we should permit continual recurrences of such disasters. There is no economy in withholding money for flood control. On the contrary, it is foolhardly to expose half the country to the hazards and waste of flood damage.

If there is any justification for expenditures abroad for the relief of countries devastated by war, how much greater is the justification for appropriations at home to protect our great Midwest from being devastated by floods.

A large part of the district which I represent lies within Kansas Ctiy, Mo. Kansas City has been characterized as the No. 1 flood hazard in the United

States. A half billion dollars in industrial properties is located in areas adjacent to the Missouri River at Kansas City. If there were another flood of the proportions of the 1903 flood—and it is overdue—the loss at Kansas City alone would exceed $100,000,000.

The conferees have agreed upon the appropriation of $5,000,000 for flood-protection work at Kansas City. This amount will permit orderly and economical progress of the work in that locality in accordance with the Pick-Sloan plan. In addition, the conferees have agreed upon funds for the great reservoirs and other structures upstream from Kansas City, such as the item of $20,000,000 for the dam at Garrison, N. Dak., and other phases of the plan.

Every item for which provision is made is essential to the successful operation of the comprehensive Pick-Sloan plan. It all works together, and we who live in the lower reaches of the Missouri River are vitally interested in the completion of the upriver work as well as in the local work in the immediate area of Kansas City. It is all of importance to us and to the entire valley.

At this point I include part of a newspaper article which appeared in the July 24, 1947, issue of the Kansas City Times. It refers to and quotes in part a resolution adopted by the 600 delegates who attended the Mississippi Valley Association flood conference at Kansas City:

PUSH RIVER PLAN—COMPLETION OF RESERVOIRS BY 1954 IS DEMANDED BY CONFERENCE DELEGATES—PICK PROPOSAL IS ENDORSED—RESOLUTION TO BE SENT TO THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS IS ADOPTED—TASK UP TO THE ARMY—VALLEY GROUP SAYS CONTROL PROGRAM SHOULD BE FINISHED BY 1958

A demand that every reservoir authorized for the Mississippi River basin be completed and operating by 1954 was made yesterday by delegates to the Mississippi Valley Association flood conference in the Music Hall. The basin plan includes Missouri Valley reservoirs.

The 600 delegates endorsed the Pick-Sloan plan for handling Missouri River waters and commended the President and Congress for assigning flood control to the Army Corps of Engineers.

A 9-part resolution, which will be sent to the President and Congress, had unanimous approval of the meeting. There were two attempts from the floor to amend it but neither gathered much support. It was adopted at the close of the afternoon session which ended the 1-day meeting.

The resolution said in part:

"This conference hereby declares its support of the congressionally-approved Pick-Sloan plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin, including multiple purpose reservoirs.

"We believe that every flood control reservoir in the plans approved and authorized by Congress for the Mississippi Basin should be completed and in operation by 1954 and hereby adopt the slogan, 'Every Reservoir by '54.' All agricultural levees and other parts of the flood control program should be completed by not later than 1958.

'We commend Congress for declaring that flood control is a national rather than a local problem. We commend the Corps of Army Engineers, the Soil Conservation Service, the Bureau of Reclamation and other Federal agencies for the coordination of their programs."

BACK ACTION BY TRUMAN

"The conference wholeheartedly endorses the action of the President and Congress in assigning the responsibility for flood control of the Corps of Engineers, and this conference expresses full confidence that the Corps of Engineers and the other Federal agencies concerned are eminently qualified to plan and execute all works necessary for the ultimate control of floods in the Mississippi River Basin."

In commending the Soil Conservation Service on its work in the valley, the conference recognized the integral part that good soil management plays in flood control and in the economic well-being of the watershed.

"Our farm people upon whom the campaign to save the soil falls most heavily," the resolution said, "should be given all possible aid and assistance. We believe that a comprehensive soil conservation program is essential on this account as a supplement to, but not a substitute for, a complete flood control program."

The importance of accomplishing needed irrigation developments in arid and semi-arid parts of the basin, concurrently with the flood control program, was recognized by the conference.

Mr. Speaker, we must not procrastinate further on the flood control program. It is time to appropriate sufficient funds to put its development and progress into high gear. We can do so by our acceptance of the conference report on H. R. 4002. I urge the House to make the most of this opportunity by approving the amendment increasing to $231,000,000 the appropriations for flood control.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this is the War Department civil functions bill. I shall discuss mainly flood-control items because flood control is a subject in which everyone is interested.

The first budget estimate sent down by the President was for $382,727,100. After the House had passed this bill the President sent down a supplemental budget estimate on the 17th of July for $237,000,000 as it pertained to flood control. The first budget estimate contained estimates for 78 projects. The second for $237,600,000 included some 90 additional projects. It came too late for consideration in the House and the Senate took it up in connection with the House bill when it was considering that bill in committee.

The Senate took out 21 of the projects that had been recommended by the President and substituted therefor 50 flood-control projects and 19 rivers and harbors projects. I mention this to show you how difficult it was to handle this bill because we had to consdier some 150 projects after the House had passed the bill and while we were holding hearings on the first 96 submitted by the President in his supplemental budget we learned that the Senate was changing it around and the fact is we had to stop holding hearings, it was impossible to hold hearings on these projects that were placed in the bill by the Senate.

I am not speaking critically. I am showing the difficulties we encountered.

The total of the two budget estimates, the first and second budget estimates, of the President aggregated $619,727,100. The total in the bill as agreed to in conference is $502,123,912, or $117,603,188 below the two budget estimates.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. How much is that amount above the House bill?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I will come to that.

When the first budget estimate came to the House of $382,727,100 the House passed that bill, reducing the amount to $339,186,869, a reduction below the budget estimate of $43,540,231.

The budget when it came to the Senate, as I said, was for $619,000,000 plus.

Senator GURNEY, who is chairman of the Armed Forces Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, and I got together, spent some time and tried to have a sort of a discusison before they passed the bill over there. As a result of that conference I think we had a better understanding and it resulted in a somewhat reduced Senate bill.

The Senate brought in that bill with $539,927,449 or approximately $80,000,000 below the budget partly as a result of this conference. The Senate increased the amount $200,000,000 over the House bill, as it went to the Senate, taking into consideration, of course, the technical nature of the estimates. We agreed in conference, as I stated, to $502,000,000 plus in the entire bill.

On rivers and harbors we sent to the Senate $17,367,700, the Senate added $26,859,000, making their bill $44,226,700 or approximately $26,000,000 above the House bill.

We agreed in conference on rivers and harbors to $37,000,000 approximately or $7,050,000 below the Senate bill.

On flood control the House sent over to the Senate a bill containing $122,269,800. The Senate, after having considered the second Budget estimate which the House did not have in its report, passed a bill providing $258,829,825, or an increase of $136,560,000 over the House bill. We agreed in conference to $231,800,825, a reduction of $27,029,000 below the Senate bill.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke the other day about flood control projects and mentioned the fact that if we are going to get economical construction we are going to have to build those projects at a certain speed.

You will recall I stated a reduction of 50 percent in appropriation, from $20,000,000 to $10,000,000, speaking of dam construction mainly and using shovels with 5 cubic yards capacity instead of 30 cubic yards, will result in certain economies.

I think this conference committee could have cut perhaps another $30,000,000 or $40,000,000 from this bill.

In my judgment it would not have been a saving; it would have been deferring appropriations and would have resulted in more expensive construction of these projects, because it would have slowed them up.

I have before me a statement which covers every project passed by the Senate. This was compiled at my request by the Chief of Engineers office, and gives the entire program. I mention this because I want you to understand why this conference committee and our subcommittee felt they could go so far and no farther in increasing these appropriations.

This statement shows in one column the projects, some 156; in another, the second, the total estimated Federal cost; in the third, the allotments to date; in the fourth, the amount of the Senate bill, and in the fifth, the net amount required to complete after 1948, if the Senate bill were passed. Then I have in there the construction program for the next six fiscal years, the amount of money for each project, and the total that will be required—I want no misunderstanding on this—that will be required to carry each particular project to its conclusion at the most economical rate of construction.

The criticism I have heard of our program heretofore has been the fact that we have been covering too many projects and finished none. When a project is started, I want to finish it just as fast as I can to get the benefits of it and go on to another.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. As I recall it, the Budget estimate on flood control and rivers and harbors allowed $200,000,000 for new construction and $100,000,000, or about that, for maintenance. That was the President's Budget. If we pass this bill, that amount is almost doubled, and if we pass it we better talk about economy with our tongues in our cheeks.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. I want to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee about a couple of items for Oklahoma. I notice that there is an item in there of $200,000,000 for building the Tenkiller Reservoir in Oklahoma, and another $1,000,000 for building something up on Pole Cat Creek. Now, neither one of those items were in the House bill. What are those items, I would like to ask the gentleman?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The Tenkiller item was contained in the President's budget. The Pole Cat Creek item was added by the Senate.

Mr. RIZLEY. How did it happen, Mr. Speaker? What were the additional facts that the subcommittee found to justify putting this amount in?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The subcommittee did not put these amounts in. These amounts were put in by the Senate, one, on the recommendation of the President, and the other was one of the 50 items that I mentioned, and the subcommittee went further and did their best in getting together on these items, and I think they have done a fairly decent job. The total cost of these items will be just a little less than $2,000,000,000; to be exact, $1,956,314,700; in other words, we are taking construction in here totaling $1,956,314,700.

Of this amount, $382,616,600 has been allotted to date. The amount in the Senate bill before the conference was $258,829,825. This leaves $1,314,868,275 to be appropriated to complete these projects which have been begun. Remember, the Senate amount was approximately $258,000,000. If we had adopted this program as it is, and we cut some off, it would require an appropriation next year, for fiscal 1949, of $362,452,900 to carry these projects to conclusion for that one year at the most economical rate of construction, and the next year $358,000,000-plus, and then it drops down. It was for this reason that I objected to putting more of these large projects in until we had some of them finished that were in the budget now. If we add to this $362,000,000 another $65,000,000 or $75,000,000 for the lower Mississippi, for the Sacramento, and other items, you would have had $450,000,000 next year to carry on this program. So I have here an item right straight through on each of these projects.

We cut some of these projects out. We took Oahe Dam out. It is in South Dakota, the State of the chairman of the Senate subcommittee and the home State of my colleague [Mr. CASE], ranking next to me on this committee. So we certainly did not play favorites.

I was more concerned and more alarmed about the appropriations required in 1949 and 1950 than I was about the present appropriation, because of the commitments we were making. I do not want a program where we start a great many big projects and then have a wave of economy—and I am for economy; you know I am—and cut down the amount so low that you will get an uneconomical construction program and get about 50 or 65 cents of construction for the flood-control dollar. That has been the thing I have been aiming at. Once you have committed yourself, a deferment of the amount of the appropriation is not an economy, it is merely a deferment. When you come to complete the project, in the end it is going to cost you more than it would have in the first place if you had followed a more economical program. When I say "a more economical program" I am basing this entire statement upon the engineers' estimate as to what is required to carry on an economical program.

Mr. Speaker, I have criticized the Corps of Engineers very severely in the past, as you know. We have in this bill something we have never had since the beginning of the war, and that is fair and reasonably accurate estimates as to costs on each and every project.

I want to pay tribute to the present Chief of Engineers and the personnel in his office; I think we have the finest group of men in the Chief Engineers' office from the Chief Engineer down that we have ever had since I have been on this subcommittee, and that is 11 years.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have heard the gentleman state this many times, but in view of the statement that he is making in regard to economical construction, I wonder if he would now repeat what he regards as the percentage rate which makes for economical construction.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The percentage rate which makes for economical construction goes up as the cost of your project comes down. For instance, you can take any project in any State. On the larger projects if you have your land and access roads accounted for, the remainder of the appropriation should be expended at the rate of 10 percent the first year, approximately 20 percent the second, third, fourth, and fifth year, and then 10 percent for the sixth year, finishing the project in 6 years and thus getting the benefit of the project within that time. As the cost of the projects go down, naturally a $20,000,000 project can be built faster than a $50,000,000 one, and a $50,000,000 one faster than a $150,000,000 project, until you finally get down to a project costing, let us say, a million dollars. There is no economy, Mr. Speaker, in trying to split up a million-dollar project into two or three contracts, because you will get a lower bid if one contractor knows that he is going to get the entire contract.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. As an example of a large project about which the gentleman has been speaking, the gentleman will recall that the largest item in the bill is the $20,000,000 plus for the Garrison Reservoir.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. That is right.

Mr. MAHON. That is a very important reservoir in North Dakota. The appropriation this year is for $20,000,000. Next year it is estimated that $25,000,000 will be required for economical construction. In the fiscal year 1950, $30,000,000; in the fiscal year 1951, $30,000,000; and in the fiscal year 1952, $30,000,000; and concluding the following year with $16,000,000 plus. That is an example of the largest item we have in the bill.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. At the end of the sixth year you have completed one of the largest flood control projects that you have. You will get the benefit of flood control, navigation, power, and any other betterments that may result because of the construction. I could go on and get down to the Conemaugh Dam, which is a smaller project. The project calls for $7,000,000 in 1948, $9,000,000 in 1949, $9,000,000 in 1950, and $5,950,000 in 1951. That will complete that project and you will get the benefit of it. That project will take approximately 6 feet of water off the streets of Pittsburgh, Pa.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I wonder if the gentleman would be willing to comment on the projects in Los Angeles County which were commenced in 1935 and which are now 12 years old.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Do you mean on the Los Angeles River?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes, sir.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. In Los Angeles the total estimate of Federal cost is $72,496,000, of which $39,352,600 has been expended to date. The amount in the Senate bill was $4,016,000. Under this program on the Los Angeles River you will spend $5,000,000 in 1949, $8,000,000 in 1950, $11,000,000 in 1951, and end up in 1952 with $5,000,000 plus.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I would like to compliment the gentleman and his committee for the work they have done. I have had an opportunity to review some of these projects with them. They have done a very conscientious job and they have devoted a great deal of time and attention to preparing a budget which, in my opinion, will be beneficial in the years to come, and the credit goes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] and his committee for that.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that this subcommittee and the full committee, as every committee, is the servant of the House. We are trying to cut expenditures. The House sets the policy. Once that policy is set, then I think it is up to the committee to follow that policy and try to carry it out.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. As I understand the parliamentary situation, there is now no opportunity to make any amendments to this bill. We have to either vote the conference report up or down?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. That is correct, on anything except the one amendment which is in disagreement.

Mr. MUNDT. In view of that fact, Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan, a question. Is my understanding correct that we have no chance to amend this conference report except on the item reported back in disagreement? Is it correct that we cannot modify, change, or increase items not reported back in disagreement and that our only opportunity to secure changes at this hour would be to reject the entire conference report?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. That is correct. Items not reported back in disagreement cannot now be changed.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, that being the case, I of course realize there is no opportunity on this final day of the preadjournment session of Congress to induce the House to reject the entire conference report. There is too much good legislation in it and too many helpful appropriations for many areas and for many projects to make that possible. Consequently, I shall not make the effort to upset the whole program and jeopardize the entire appropriations act simply because I am grievously and greatly disappointed in the action of the conferees on what I consider the most important flood-control project in the entire Nation. I refer to the great Oahe Reservoir and high dam to be constructed just north of the capital of South Dakota, Pierre, on the Missouri River.

Mr. Speaker, not only the people of South Dakota but the people of the entire Missouri River and Mississippi River Valleys were greatly encouraged and highly gratified by the action of the Senate Subcommittee on Civil Functions of the War Department which I am proud to say is ably headed by Senator GURNEY, of South Dakota. That committee in its wisdom, and after hearing testimony from many Members of Congress, including my own testimony, as well as after considering carefully prepared and documented testimony from Gen. Lewis A. Pick and General Wheeler provided several million dollars to begin the actual construction of the high dam proposed for Oahe. I am shocked and saddened by the failure of the conference committee to retain at least a substantial portion of the funds earmarked for the actual construction of Oahe at the time this bill passed the Senate.

When this bill passed the House, it included $850,000 to complete the planning and preliminary engineering for the Oahe structure. Evidence before the Senate Committee which was presented by the War Department while I was present at the hearings brought out forcefully and convincingly that the planning was already far enough advanced so that preliminary construction could efficiently be started while the final stages of planning were being completed. The testimony of the War Department also proved conclusively that the Oahe reservoir and dam comprise the best and most important single flood-control project on the entire Missouri River. The War Department urged emphatically that construction now be started on the Oahe project. The Senate committee wisely appropriated funds for such construction. The Senate approved this recommendation. Now, unfortunately and, to me, unfathomably, the conferees rejected the entire appropriation for construction at Oahe and left in this bill for that project only the $350,000 included for completing the plans for that structure.

Mr. Speaker, the conference committee meets in closed session. It is a sort of third house of Congress from which not only spectators and the press are barred, but which is also closed to the other Members of Congress. Now, we are confronted with a fait accompli. The move to deny construction funds to Oahe is not brought back in disagreement. It has been approved for omission by the conference committee. There is now nothing the rest of us can do to alter this tragic eventuality at this session of Congress.

Let me say, however, Mr. Speaker, that I serve notice now that when next year's appropriations for flood control are considered, I shall do everything within my power to secure funds to begin construction of the Oahe project. Not only will it provide the best flood-control protection in the valley but it is a multiple-purpose structure providing vast amounts of power and huge potentialities for irrigation. No dispute over the advisability of other projects and no argument about a static formula for building a certain percentage of flood control projects each year in each section of the country should delay action on a project so urgent and so vital as the Oahe project.

Mr. Speaker, we are whipped in our efforts for this session but we are not permanently defeated. The statistics and the sensible arguments are on the side of starting construction on Oahe without delay rather than continuing to pay huge annual flood damages for destruction which could be averted by the building of Oahe. I deeply regret this action of the conference committee and I hope that when the next session of Congress convenes we may put to better use the formula of "placing first things first" and give to Oahe the priority and the appropriations which are required to begin construction on what I honestly believe is today America's most important undeveloped flood-control project.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Will the gentleman tell me the status of the Delaware Dam on the Scioto River?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I do not want to go into individual dams, because if I do I will be here all afternoon. But it will be in the RECORD of today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge KERR.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I do not care to discuss this matter further at this time, as the House has had a full explanation of this bill by the able chairman of the subcommittee. I think that the bill we have here is as fair a bill as we could possibly bring to this House. I hope the committee will be fully sustained in respect to it.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. I would like to ask if any of the copies of this report will be available to the Members this afternoon as so many Members are interested.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. We could not possibly have it printed. We just finished it a few minutes ago. We were in conference last night until midnight. The Clerks worked all night and we were just able to get it. It will be in the RECORD of today.

Mr. MAHON. But the members of the committee do have a list?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. We have a complete list here.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. McDOWELL. I too want to pay my respects and compliments on behalf of the people of southwestern Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, and Kentucky for the very excellent first-rate work this committee has done.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Will the gentleman explain in a few words the dispo-

sition of the items for cemeteries in the Territories, including Hawaii?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Speaking of the cemeteries in Hawaii, the Senate put in $626,920 for three cemeteries, one in Hawaii, one in Puerto Rico, and one in Alaska. This was quite a reduction from the original budget request, but because of lack of justifications the three projects were eliminated.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. There is an item appropriating $5,500,000 for levees between Sioux City, Iowa, and the mouth of the river. Can the Army engineers now allocate that $5,500,000 wherever they see fit? For instance, can they allocate $500,000 in addition to the $500,000 we have already appropriated for L–575, the levee system along the Missouri River?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who is more familiar with that matter.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As I recall that particular item, the appropriation in the House bill, $500,000 for levees in that area, was earmarked by our report for levee L–575 project.

That was placed in the bill on the presentation made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and people from that area. The Senate increased that item, and that, of course, is in that area where they had so much flood trouble in recent weeks. So the conferees agreed to increase that $25,500,000. We did not seek to confine it to any particular levee but left that to the engineers to use where the need seemed greatest; but it did not seem amiss in this particular item in the case of L–575, on the presentation of the gentleman, that more money should be allotted to it, to allow whatever was needed to accomplish the work desired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE].

Mr. LECOMPTE. Is the gentleman yielding me time or just for questions?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Just for questions.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It is not possible, of course, for us to see a copy of the conference report. May I ask what was done about the Red Rock Reservoir?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The Red Rock Reservoir project has a cost of $20,710,000. At the time the amendment was offered on the floor of the House by the gentleman from Iowa, which was rejected, there was no engineers' statement to the chairman of this subcommittee. No planning money had been allotted for this project.

The chairman of the committee found there was considerable opposition to the project. Des Moines, Iowa, is above, and Ottumwa, Iowa, is below. Ottumwa wanted flood control, but I have heard statements made that Des Moines claims it would back the water up to the city hall in Des Moines. I do not know what it will do, but I do feel that here is a $20,000,000 project which is in controversy. One group wants it, the other does not.

There was no attempt to hold any hearings on it whatsoever. There are no plans whatsoever. Only $105,000 was allocated, and that very recently; and the committee felt that we should not put the project in and permit it on a construction basis without giving those who are opposed to it an opportunity to be heard, and it was understood that there are many in Des Moines who are opposed to the project.

Furthermore, there are three small dams farther up the river which I am informed if built will hold some of the water back and lower the dam at Red Rock, hold the water back so it will not do as much damage.

I am frank to say to the gentleman that I am just speaking from hearsay. The conference committee finally felt that we should not begin construction on such an extensive project that is in so much controversy; that first there should be plans and then we could determine what should be done and put it in at a later time if justified. Personally I am in sympathy with any project on the Missouri or its tributaries that will take some of the water off of that river.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Let me ask the gentleman a little further with regard to that project. General Wheeler did recommend the Red Rock Reservoir for the lower part of the Des Moines River. The President of the United States recommended it and the Senate put it in. Then the conferees took it out. Is that it?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. And Colonel Person said they could not possibly let a contract before May of next year and we will go into this whole subject again in February or March. As far as I am concerned, every one of these dams is going to get a square deal and a fair hearing.

Mr. LECOMPTE. If the gentleman will yield for one or two more questions, the gentleman says that the city of Des Moines, 30 miles above the Red Rock Dam, is opposed to the construction of the Red Rock Dam?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I say there is considerable opposition in the city of Des Moines to the construction of this project. All I know is from hearsay, and I can only go by the hearings.

We have many, many items to consider and we heard something like 400 witnesses. We heard 175 Members of Congress appearing either for or against these projects; and those interested in this project pro and con should have the right to appear. I am not going to put in a project, as far as I am concerned, until it has a hearing.

Mr. LECOMPTE. One more question for the information of the House. Did the gentleman put in $850,000 for plans and specifications?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. $800,000.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Is that definitely earmarked?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Absolutely.

Mr. LECOMPTE. That is absolutely earmarked?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Yes. May I say to the gentleman that I am sympathetic with his project. If the gentleman will have a little patience I think we can work this out to his satisfaction.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I may say to the gentleman that there were many millions of dollars of damage this year, away beyond the cost of the Red Rock Dam. The damage to the richest valley in the United States was beyond $20,000,000.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. That is true.

Mr. LECOMPTE. There is not any other valley as rich as the Des Moines Valley, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield to offer an amendment?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. No.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a few questions at this point. I am glad to have the gentleman's assurance as to his determination to proceed with this Red Rock project. I want to call attention also to the fact that I have two rivers out there creating tremendous damage in my district and there is real havoc out there. We are going to have to get very busy on it in January, following up this discussion. I appreciate the gentleman giving us that assurance, however, and I hope he will have an opportunity to visit the district and look over the actual ground.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in the old days we used to call a State hospital an insane asylum. We knew very little about brain diseases. We had old-fashioned tests for sanity. One of these tests consisted of placing a patient in a room, turning the water faucet on and giving the patient a mop and a pail. If the patient turned the water off before he began to mop the floor it was an indication he had some sense; but if the patient kept mopping up the floor with the water faucet wide open we knew he was crazy. Here we have been mopping up the floor all the way down the river and the faucet way up the river has been running wide open. This problem is not going to be solved or settled until you shut off the faucet. I am very sympathetic and if the gentleman will be patient with us and not ask for all the projects at once, I think we can cooperate with him.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. My purpose is not to criticize the committee or the gentleman but to extend him an invitation to go out there and visit our district.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I take it that my friend from Michigan supports the 100-percent Federal contribution for flood-control projects?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I would not want to go that far. There are some projects where flood control and other things are tied in so closely it is rather difficult to determine which is which. Now, California contributes a lot of money toward flood control, yet I would not want to say that all projects out there are flood control.

Mr. McCORMACK. Under the Federal law, flood control means a 100-percent contribution.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. For a question.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to ask the gentleman some questions.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. If this is not on the subject in controversy, I do not yield to the gentleman.

Before closing I wish to insert in the RECORD for the information of members and all interested parties a compilation of the construction projects carried in the bill under Rivers and Harbors and also under Flood Control, general, and other pertinent information concerning the bill as it now comes before the House:

Rivers and harbors

CONSTRUCTION

	Amount
Alabama: Black Warrior, Warrior, and Tombigbee Rivers	
California:	
San Diego Harbor	$50,000
San Diego River and Mission Bay	1,000,000
Connecticut:	
Bridgeport Harbor	855,000
New Haven Harbor	1,200,000
Delaware: Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware	500,000
Florida:	
Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers, Ga. and Fla.	
Caloosahatchee River and Lake Okeechobee drainage areas, Florida	12,700
Hollywood Harbor (Port Everglades), Fla.	410,000
St. Johns River, Fla., Jacksonville to Lake Harney	300,000
St. Lucie Inlet, Fla.	53,000
Lake Worth Inlet, Fla.	106,300
Tampa Harbor, Fla.	200,000
Georgia:	
Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers, Ga. and Fla. (See same project listed under Florida.)	
Savannah Harbor, Ga.	300,000
Illinois:	
Illinois waterway	180,000
Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis. (See same project under Wisconsin.)	
Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers. (See same project under Missouri.)	
Ohio River open channel. (See same project under Ohio.)	
Peoria Harbor	44,000
Indiana: Ohio River open channel. (See same project listed under Ohio.)	
Iowa:	
Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis. (See same project listed under Wisconsin.)	
Missouri River, Kansas City to Sioux City	4,500,000
Kansas: Missouri River, Kansas City to Sioux City. (See same project listed under Iowa.)	
Kentucky: Ohio River open channel. (See same project listed under Ohio.)	
Louisiana:	
Calcasieu River and Pass, La.	550,000
Gulf Intracoastal waterway between Apalachee Bay, Fla., and the Mexican border (New Orleans district)	1,800,000
Empire, La., to the Gulf of Mexico, waterway from	250,000
Maryland:	
Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Md.	400,000
Crisfield Harbor, Md.	45,000
Michigan:	
Keweenaw Waterway, Mich.	145,000
St. Marys River, Mich.	600,000
Minnesota:	
Harbor at Lake City	95,200
Harbor at Red Wing	13,800
Mississippi River at Winona	20,400
Mississippi River at Wabasha	27,300
Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis. (See same project listed under Wisconsin.)	
Two Harbors (Agate Bay)	250,000
Missouri:	
Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis. (See same project listed under Wisconsin.)	
Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers	4,500,000
Missouri River mouth to Kansas City	2,250,000
Missouri River, Kansas City to Sioux City. (See same project listed under Iowa.)	
Montana: Missouri River at Fort Peck	$150,000
Nebraska: Missouri River, Kansas City to Sioux City. (See same project listed under Iowa.)	
New Jersey: Delaware River, Pa., N. J., and Del., Philadelphia to the sea. (See same project listed under Delaware.)	
New York:	
Cape Vincent Harbor, N. Y.	19,200
Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, N. Y.	1,000,000
New York Harbor	400,000
Oswego Harbor	136,000
North Carolina: Cape Fear River, N. C., at and below Wilmington	300,000
Ohio: Ohio River open channel	200,000
Oregon:	
Columbia River, Oreg. and Wash., McNary Dam	4,500,000
Columbia River between Vancouver and The Dalles	201,000
Snake River. (See same project listed under Washington.)	
Umpqua River	127,500
Yaquina Bay and Harbor	495,000
Salmon River	7,000
Columbia River at Bakers Bay	270,000
Coos Bay	500,000
Columbia River at Astoria	500,000
Pennsylvania:	
Delaware River, Pa., N. J., and Del., Philadelphia to the sea. (See same project listed under Delaware.)	
Ohio River open channel. (See same project listed under Ohio.)	
South Carolina: Winyah Bay	800,000
Texas:	
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway between Apalachee Bay, Fla., and the Mexican border (Galveston district)	2,187,000
Neches and Angelina Rivers, Tex.	1,300,000
Sabine-Neches waterway, Tex.	1,000,000
Brazos Island Harbor, Tex.	685,500
Port Aransas-Corpus Christi waterway	150,000
Virginia:	
James River	80,000
Newport News Creek	145,000
Oyster Creek	54,000
Onancock Creek	25,500
Tangier Channel	13,200
Hampton Creek	15,000
Washington:	
Columbia River, Oreg. and Wash., McNary Dam. (See same project listed under Oregon.)	
Columbia River between Vancouver, Wash., and The Dalles, Oreg. (See same project listed under Oregon.)	
West Virginia. Ohio River open channel. (See same project listed under Ohio.)	
Wisconsin: Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis	800,000
Power plant, Fort Peck Dam, Mont. (construction)	657,500
Total, construction	37,176,700

Summary for rivers and harbors

Advance planning	$3,500,000
Maintenance	50,000,000
Operation and care	20,000,000
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies	3,645,000
Other recurring items	2,397,000
Construction (total of projects listed)	37,176,700
Total in bill for rivers and harbors	116,718,700

Flood control, general

CONSTRUCTION

Arkansas:	
Blakely Mountain Reservoir	$2,000,000
Bull Shoals Reservoir	6,700,000
Cardens Bottoms levee district No. 2	300,000
Conway County levee districts Nos. 1, 2, and 8	400,000
Crawford County levee district	400,000
Little Rock to Pine Bluff	500,000
McLean Bottom levee district No. 3	652,000
Narrows Reservoir	2,000,000
Near Dardanelle	221,500
Red River below Denison Dam, Okla., Tex., Ark., and La.	2,500,000
Roland drainage district	150,600
Van Buren	210,000
California:	
Big Dry Creek Reservoir and diversion	771,000
Burbank Western System (lower)	100,000
Isabella Reservoir	1,250,000
Kings River and Tulare Lake Basin, including Pine Flat Reservoir	1,750,000
Los Angeles River	4,016,000
Lower San Joaquin River	
Merced County stream group	300,000
Pajaro River	500,000
Sacramento River levees and tributaries	500,000
San Gabriel River (Canyon to Santa Fe Reservoir)	1,085,000
Santa Fe Reservoir	730,000
Ventura River	500,000
Colorado:	
Cherry Creek Reservoir	4,500,000
John Martin Reservoir	550,000
Connecticut: Hartford	293,000
Georgia:	
Allatoona Reservoir	$8,425,000
Clark Hill Reservoir, Ga. and S. C.	5,000,000
Idaho: Heise-Roberts area, Snake River	500,000
Illinois:	
Chouteau, Namcoki and Venice	130,000
Clear Creek drainage and levee district	200,000
Columbia drainage and levee district	500,000
DeGognia and Fountain Bluff levee and drainage district	1,065,000
East St. Louis and vicinity	750,000
Farm Creek reservoirs	2,000,000
Galena	465,000
Grand Tower drainage and levee district	500,000
Harrisonville and Ivy Landing drainage and levee district	260,000
Henderson County drainage district	47,000
Lacey, Langellier, West Matanzas, and Kerton Valley drainage and levee districts	500,000
Mounds and Mound City	500,000
Mouth of Sangamon River	203,000
Prairie du Rocher	500,000
Preston drainage and levee district and vicinity	323,000
Sny Basin	1,000,000
Stringtown-Fort Chartres and Ivy Landing drainage and levee district	700,000
Wilson and Wenkeland Prairie Du Pont drainage and levee district	478,000
Wood River drainage and levee district	750,000
Indiana:	
Cagles Mill Reservoir	500,000
Cannelton	500,000
Delphi	65,000
Indianapolis, Fall Creek section	750,000
Jeffersonville-Clarksville	209,000
McGinnis levee	300,000
Muncie	60,000
New Albany	400,000
Shufflebarger levee	300,000
Iowa:	
Council Bluffs	500,000
Des Moines	350,000
Dry Run	531,000
Missouri River between Kensler's Bend, Nebr., and the combination bridge at Sioux City, Iowa	800,000
Missouri River levees, Sioux City, Iowa, to the mouth	6,000,000
Red Rock Reservoir (see advance planning)	
Kansas:	
Fall River Reservoir	3,000,000
Kanopolis Reservoir	2,900,000
Kansas Citys, Mo. and Kans.	5,000,000
Wichita and Valley Center	700,000
Kentucky:	
Covington	500,000
Dale Hollow Reservoir, Tenn. and Ky.	800,000
Dewey Reservoir	1,500,000
Louisville	1,650,000
Maysville	
Newport	1,200,000
Taylorsville	240,000
Uniontown	504,000
Wolf Creek Reservoir	8,000,000
Louisiana:	
Bayou Bodcau, Red Chute, and Loggy Bayou	86,500
Bayou Bodcau Reservoir	800,000
Bayou Pierre in vicinity of Shreveport	129,000
Red River below Denison Dam, Okla., Tex., Ark., and La. (See Arkansas.)	
Shreveport	1,000,000
Massachusetts:	
Holyoke and Springdale	70,000
Tully Reservoir	726,000
Michigan:	
Mount Clemens	250,000
Sebewaing	100,000
Minnesota: Red Lake and Clearwater Rivers	400,000
Missouri:	
Chariton River	300,000
Clearwater Reservoir	2,000,000
Kansas Citys, Mo. and Kans. (See Kansas.)	
Montana: Forsyth	171,000
Nebraska:	
Aten (bank protection)	500,000
Harlan County Reservoir	9,000,000
Indianola	75,000
Missouri River between Kensler's Bend, Nebr., and the combination bridge at Sioux City, Iowa. (See Iowa.)	
Omaha	1,500,000
New Hampshire: West Peterboro	500,000
New York:	
Almond Reservoir	1,600,000
East Sidney Reservoir	900,000
Elmira	1,900,000
Lancaster	230,000
Montour Falls	829,000
Mount Morris Reservoir	2,000,000
Olean	500,000
Owasco Inlet and Outlet and tributaries	255,500
Syracuse	500,000
North Carolina:	
Buggs Island Reservoir, Va. and N. C.	4,800,000
Goldsboro	85,200
North Dakota:	
Baldhill Reservoir	900,000
Garrison Reservoir	20,105,625
Park River Reservoir	300,000

Flood control, general—Continued

	Amount
Ohio:	
Burr Oak Reservoir	$400,000
Cincinnati	1,000,000
Delaware Reservoir	3,200,000
Dillon Reservoir	2,000,000
Portsmouth-New Boston	2,000,000
West Fork Mill Creek Reservoir	500,000
Oklahoma:	
Canton Reservoir	2,200,000
Fort Gibson Reservoir	5,000,000
Hulah Reservoir	1,000,000
Jenks	107,000
Polecat Creek	1,000,000
Red River below Denison Dam, Okla., Tex., Ark., and La. (See Arkansas.)	
Tenkiller Ferry Reservoir	2,000,000
Wister Reservoir	2,950,000
Oregon:	
Arlington	156,000
Coquille River	131,000
Detroit Reservoir	1,250,000
Dorena Reservoir	3,750,000
Amazon Creek	305,000
Fern Ridge Reservoir	20,000
Lookout Point Reservoir	4,000,000
Mill Four district	116,000
Nehalem River	23,000
Fudding River	110,000
Umpqua River and tributaries	194,000
Willamette River (bank protection)	500,000
Pennsylvania:	
Conemaugh River Reservoir	5,200,000
East Branch, Clarion River Reservoir	1,000,000
Punxsutawney	400,000
Sunbury	1,369,000
Williamsport	2,236,000
South Carolina: Clark Hill Reservoir, Ga. and S. C. (See Georgia.)	
South Dakota:	
Fort Randall Reservoir	9,000,000
Hot Springs	200,000
Oahe Reservoir. (See Advance Planning.)	
Tennessee:	
Center Hill Reservoir	6,500,000
Dale Hollow Reservoir, Tenn. and Ky. (See Kentucky.)	
Memphis	1,052,000
Texas:	
Buffalo Bayou	1,854,700
Hords Creek Reservoir	1,303,800
Red River below Denison Dam, Okla., Tex., Ark., and La. (See Arkansas.)	
San Angelo Reservoir and floodway	1,000,000
Trinity River:	
Benbrook Reservoir	1,600,000
Lavon Reservoir	593,000
Grapevine Reservoir	800,000
Whitney Reservoir	5,230,000
Utah: Redmond and vicinity	583,000
Vermont: Union Village Reservoir	100,000
Virginia:	
Buggs Island Reservoir. (See North Carolina.)	
Philpott Reservoir	250,000
Washington:	
Mud Mountain Reservoir	448,000
Tacoma	1,350,000
Yakima	202,000
West Virginia:	
Bluestone Reservoir	5,700,000
Elkins	628,000
Parkersburg	1,500,000
Point Pleasant	600,000
Total, construction	231,800,825

[1] Of this amount, the House committee in its report earmarked $850,000 for planning on the Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. The Senate committee in allowing a total of $6,000,000 for the Oahe Reservoir has included funds for planning within that total for this project. The full amount of $9,000,000 recommended by the committee for the Fort Randall Reservoir, S. Dak., will be available for that project.

[2] The House report shows $122,269,800 for construction, which includes $500,000 for snagging and clearing and $500,000 for emergency bank protection.

[3] Net increase. $100,000 decrease having been made in Dale Hollow Reservoir, Tenn. and Ky.

ADVANCE PLANNING

Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak	$850,000
Dyberry and Prompton Reservoirs, Lackawaxen River Basin, Pa	200,000
Eufaula Reservoir, Okla	500,000
Red Rock Reservoir, Iowa	800,000
Total earmarked for advance planning out of $4,500,000 in bill	2,350,000

Summary for flood control, general

Advance planning	$4,500,000
Preliminary examinations, surveys, and contingencies	5,000,000
Salaries, Office, Chief of Engineers	497,000
Emergency repairs pursuant to sec. 5, Flood Control Act of 1941	1,000,000
Transfer to Geological Survey	375,000
Maintenance of completed works	2,400,000
Emergency bank protection	500,000
Construction (total of projects listed)	231,800,825
Total in bill for flood control, general	246,072,825

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 3, line 13, after the colon, insert ": *Provided further*, That upon completion of repairs to the approach road to the Natchez, Miss., National Cemetery, provided for in this act, the Secretary of War is authorized to convey title thereto to the State of Mississippi or any county, municipality, or proper agency thereof in accordance with the provisions of section 1 of the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1942 (55 Stat. 191)."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: On page 6, line 5 after the colon, insert ": *Provided further*, That no appropriation under the Corps of Engineers for the fiscal year 1948 shall be available for any expenses incident to operating any power-driven boat or vessel on other than Government business" and insert in lieu thereof the following: ": *Provided further*, That hereafter no appropriation under the Corps of Engineers shall be available for any expenses incident to operating any power-driven boat or vessel on other than Government business, and that Government business shall be construed to include transportation, lodging, and subsistence on inspection trips of Federal and State officials, having a public interest in authorized or proposed improvements for river and harbor and flood control, and any expenses incurred therefor shall be chargeable to river and harbor and flood control appropriations heretofore or hereafter made under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Chief of Engineers: *Provided further*, That such expenditures shall be certified by the division engineer as necessary and proper expenditures."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 4: Page 8, line 16, strike out "$94,659,700" and insert "$125,268,700."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 4, and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$116,718,700."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me to offer an amendment to this section?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I refuse to yield, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RANKIN. Then I will offer the amendment. I think I have a right to offer it under the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. Not unless the gentleman from Michigan yields for that purpose.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield me some time? I would like to rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan has full control of the time.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield some time?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. For what purpose?

Mr. RANKIN. I want to discuss this proposition.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. No; I will not yield any time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 6:

Page 9, line 23, after the figure, insert "of which, in view of the threat to human life, $200,000 shall be made available for the preparation of detailed plans for the Dyberry and Prompton Reservoirs in the Lackawaxen River Basin, Pennsylvania, recommended for construction in the report of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, in House Document No. 113, of the Eightieth Congress and the preparation of such plans is hereby authorized."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: In the first line of said amendment after the word "which" strike out the following, "in view of the threat to human life" and after the amount "$200,000" strike out the comma.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 7: Page 10, line 8, after "law", insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That funds appropriated herein may be used for necessary bank protection on the Missouri River in the vicinity of Aten, Nebr."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: On the second line of said amendment and after the word "herein" insert the following: ", not to exceed $500,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 8: Page 11, line 9, insert the following:

"Garrison (N. Dak.) Reservoir: For acquisition of the lands and rights therein within the taking line of Garrison Reservoir, which lands lie within the area now established as the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, N. Dak., including all elements of value above or below

the surface thereof and including all improvements, severance damages, and reestablishment and relocation costs the sum of $5,105,625, which said sum is included in the total allocated under this act for the said Garrison Reservoir and which shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Three Affiliated Tribes of Fort Berthold Reservation, to be subject to withdrawal and disbursement as herein provided. This amount is made available subject to the following conditions subsequent, and in the event the said conditions are not complied with then this amount shall lapse and be thereby null and void. Said conditions subsequent are:

"That a contract between the United States and the said Three Affiliated Tribes shall be negotiated and approved by a majority of the adult members of said tribes and enacted into law by the Congress, providing for the conveyance of said lands and interests and the use of and distribution of said fund and that disbursements from said fund shall be made forthwith in accordance with said approved contract and act of Congress.

"That said contract shall be submitted to the Congress on or before the 1st day of June 1948: *Provided, however*, That notwithstanding said contract or the provisions of this act, the said Three Affiliated Tribes may bring suit in the Court of Claims as provided in section 24 of the act of August 13, 1946, on account of additional damages, if any, alleged to have been sustained by said tribes by reason of the taking of the said lands and rights in the said Fort Berthold Indian Reservation on account of any treaty obligation of the Government, any intangible cost of reestablishment or relocation or any other basis of claim cognizable under said act of August 13, 1946, and for which the said tribes are not compensated by the said $5,105,625."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the last paragraph of the Senate amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That said contract shall be submitted to the Congress on or before the 1st day of June 1948: *Provided, however*, That, notwithstanding said contract or the provisions of this act, the said Three Affiliated Tribes may bring suit in the Court of Claims as provided in section 24 of the act of August 13, 1946, on account of additional damages, if any, alleged to have been sustained by said tribes by reason of the taking of the said lands and rights in the said Fort Berthold Indian Reservation on account of any treaty obligation of the Government or any intangible cost of reestablishment or relocation, for which the said tribes are not compensated by the said $5,105,625."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 12: Page 14, line 6, insert the following: ", of which $296,000 shall be immediately and continuously available until expended for the preparation of plans and specifications for the renovation and enlargement of the United States Soldiers' Home."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Burke, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 218. Joint resolution providing for the representation of the Government and people of the United States in the observance of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Reading, Pa.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 907. An act to provide for the orderly transaction of the public business in the event of the death, resignation, or separation from office of regional disbursement officers of the Treasury Department.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4347. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BALL, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. TYDINGS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ROBERT F. PARKS

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1181) for the relief of Robert F. Parks.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert F. Parks, of Stanley, Va., the sum of $1,800, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement for personal funds deposited with the finance officer, Visayan-Mindanao force, on June 16, 1942, at Malaybalay, Bukidnon, Philippine Islands, for use in purchasing food necessary to supplement the ration provided to prisoners of war by the Japanese Army: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. EDNA MARY JAKIMOWICZ

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1431) for the relief of Mrs. Edna Mary Jakimowicz.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of the tenth category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136 (e)), Edna Mary Jakimowicz, the wife of a citizen of the United States who served honorably in the armed forces of the United States during World War II, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence under the act approved December 28, 1945 (Public Law 271, 79th Cong.), if she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $213, but that I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Hon. J. Strom Thurmond, Governor of South Carolina. I am informed by the Public Printer that the extension will cost $177.50.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and statement from the State Department.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter which appeared in a recent issue of the Washington Post.

Mr. WORLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KNUTSON (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances in the RECORD.

REDUCING THE AREA OF THE PARKER RIVER NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 4108) to reduce in area the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge in Essex County, Mass., and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge in Essex County, Mass., administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior is hereby reduced in area by eliminating therefrom so much of such refuge as lies westerly of the east bank of the Plum

Island River and Broad Sound at the mean high-tide level on the marshes of Plum Island (as shown on the map of the Plum Island Division of the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge as heretofore filed in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, entitled "United States versus 12,367.47 Acres More or Less, of Land Situate in Essex County, Mass., Defendant, Miscellaneous Civil No. 7010").

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior shall dispose, in the manner provided in section 3, of the land described in section 1, and formerly comprising the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge, originally consisting of approximately twelve thousand three hundred and sixty-seven and forty-seven one-hundredths acres, and more particularly described in, and acquired by the United States through, two declarations of taking (on which judgments have been entered) executed by an Assistant Secretary of the Interior and filed, respectively, on July 31, 1943, and December 30, 1944, in proceedings in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts entitled, respectively "United States of America, Petitioner, Against 1,689 Acres of Land, More or Less, Situate in the County of Essex, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, et al., Defendant, Miscellaneous Civil No. 6771," and "United States of America, Petitioner, against 12,367.47 Acres, More or Less, of Land Situate in Essex County, Mass., Defendant, Miscellaneous Civil No. 7010."

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior shall, within 60 days after the date of enactment of this act, mail to each person whose title to a tract of land within the area eliminated from the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge by section 1 was acquired by the United States a notice stating that such tract will be reconveyed to him if, within 60 days after the date of the mailing of such notice, such former owner pays to the United States an amount equal to the purchase price paid by the United States with respect to such tract of land. Upon the payment of such amount, within the time stipulated in such notice, the Secretary shall execute a deed reconveying all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to such tract of land to such former owner.

(b) All amounts paid to the United States under subsection (a) shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the migratory bird conservation fund provided for in section 4 of the act entitled "An act to supplement and support the Migratory Bird Conservation Act by providing funds for the acquisition of areas for use as migratory-bird sanctuaries, refuges, and breeding grounds, for developing and administering such areas, for the protection of certain migratory birds, for the enforcement of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and regulations thereunder, and for other purposes," approved March 16, 1934, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 16, sec. 718d).

(c) In the event that any funds of the United States Government, whether funds of the migratory bird conservation fund or otherwise, prior to the filing of this act with the Congress, have been expended upon any tract of land or for the construction, improvement, or repair of any building thereon, the Secretary of the Interior may require that the former owner of such land who desires such tract reconveyed to him repay to the United States an amount equal to the fair value of such construction, improvement, or repair with respect to such tract of land and any buildings thereon. In the event that within 60 days after the date of mailing of such notice such former owner tenders to the United States an amount equal to the purchase price, plus the amount specified by the Secretary of the Interior as the fair value of such construction, improvement, and repair, such former owner shall be entitled to a trial by jury as to the fair value, if any, of such construction, improvement, and repair upon a petition brought in the United States District Court in the District of Massachusetts within 6 months from the date of such tender.

(d) In the event the former owner of any such tract of land fails to pay such amount within the time stipulated in such notice, the Secretary is hereby authorized and directed to dispose of such tract in such manner as he may deem to be in the best interests of the United States.

(e) In the event that the former owner of any tract of land referred to in subsection (a) has either received no payment from the United States or is unknown, the Secretary of the Interior shall, within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this act, proceed as to each such tract to dismiss in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts the proceedings entitled, respectively, "United States of America, Petitioner, Against 1,689 Acres of Land, More or Less, Situate in the County of Essex, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, et al., Defendant, Miscellaneous Civil No. 6771," and "United States of America, Petitioner, Against 12,367.47 Acres, More or Less, of Land Situate in Essex County, Mass., Defendant, Miscellaneous Civil No. 7010." The Secretary of the Interior shall thereupon record at the Essex County South District Registry of Deeds at Salem in Essex County, Mass., a certified copy of the judgment of the court dismissing the above-entitled proceedings as to each such tract and reconveying to the former owner all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to each such tract of land.

(f) All funds heretofore deposited with the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts in contemplated payment of the proposed purchase price of tracts of land within the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge acquired by the United States in proceedings in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts entitled, respectively, "United States of America, Petitioner, Against 1,689 Acres of Land, More or Less, Situate in the County of Essex, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, et al., Defendant, Miscellaneous Civil No. 6771," and "United States of America, Petitioner, Against 12,367.47 Acres, More or Less, of Land Situate in Essex County, Mass., Defendant, Miscellaneous Civil No. 7010," and remaining in the hands of said district court shall upon the expiration of 150 days after the enactment of this act be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the migratory bird conservation fund provided for in section 4 of the act entitled "An act to supplement and support the Migratory Bird Conservation Act by providing funds for the acquisition of areas for use as migratory-bird sanctuaries, refuges, and breeding grounds, for developing and administering such areas, for the protection of certain migratory birds, for the enforcement of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and regulations thereunder, and for other purposes," approved March 16, 1934, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 16, sec. 718d).

(g) As used in this section, (1) the term "former owner" shall include (A) the heir or heirs of a former owner, and (B) former owners or their heirs, if title to any tract of land coming within the provisions of this section was vested in more than one person at the time of its acquisition by the United States; and (2) the term "person" shall include corporations and associations.

SEC. 4. Management and administration of the propagation and taking of clams within the boundaries of the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge shall continue to be exercised in accordance with State and local laws and ordinances, but subject to the provisions of section 10 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act of February 18, 1929 (45 Stat. 1222), as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill.

Mr. BONNER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H. R. 4108, was very studiously considered by a subcommittee of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. It was reported from the committee with only one objection and there was only one person on the committee who did not agree.

This bill covers game refuge areas in the State of Massachusetts. The testimony shows that all Members from the State of Massachusetts are in favor of this bill. The Senators from the State of Massachusetts are in favor of the bill, and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries reported it with the recommendation that it do pass. It was on the Consent Calendar some time back and there was only one objection to it. The committee believes that it should pass.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, it is with reluctance that I, the one member on the Subcommittee on Wildlife of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, rise in objection to this bill. I gave note when the bill was reported from the subcommittee and full committee that I would oppose this bill. This is not a local bill, it is a national bill, Mr. Speaker. This is a bill which affects the three channels of flying of migratory wildlife from the Canadian hatching areas. There is the Atlantic flight, the Mississippi Valley flight, and the Pacific flight. This bill tends to abolish the first wildlife refuge on the Atlantic flight. The birds that use this refuge are the birds that come from Canada. The birds that are hatched in the area of this refuge then proceed southward as the winter advances to New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, and on down to the Gulf.

Mr. Speaker, when this bill was passed last year in the last Congress it was vetoed by the President. It was reintroduced in this Congress. At the time there were two bills introduced. There was a compromise bill and this bill.

The compromise bill would have taken from the refuge three sections of the existing refuge. There is no objection on my part as well as on the part of many others to taking sections 1, 2, and 3 from the existing refuge. There is objection, Mr. Speaker, to taking sections 4, 5, and 6 from the refuge. This bill provides leaving section 6, which is only a sand bar, on the Atlantic Coast and taking out sections 4 and 5. These two sections are the ones most desired for on the sections more birds congregate than all the rest put together. These two sections 4 and 5 are naturals on which birds desire to feed and rest.

If we are going to abolish this refuge, Mr. Speaker, then there are other refuges in the United States that will come

along from time to time at the request of those desiring to kill all the birds that yet exist.

I have not consulted with anyone in Massachusetts about this bill. I am glad this bill is brought to the attention of the House for a full discussion. I have hunted all my life, and yet I believe in conservation. Unless steps are taken to preserve these birds that yet exist in the country, when your grandchildren come along they will never know what a redhead, a canvasback, a butterball, a paddywhack, or a teal, a sprigtail, a black duck, or any other kind of duck that God gave us, because those people who call themselves sportsmen will have killed them all.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. McDOWELL. I approve the gentleman's opposition to this bill. I feel that most of the Members of Congress on the Republican side in Pennsylvania agree with the gentleman. You have a good argument.

Mr. BONNER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I would be inconsistent if I did not rise in opposition to the abolition of this game refuge, because on the same day this bill was reported from the committee I voted to report out a bill to create a game refuge in the State of Illinois, to which there was great opposition. But in consistency with my view and my thought of conserving wildlife, I believe in creating these refuges.

There are in my district in North Carolina two refuges, one known as Mattamuskeet, the other Pea Island. On the Mattamuskeet refuge there was great opposition to its creation. It is the largest concentration of Canadian geese on the Atlantic coast south of the Canadian border. At the other refuge there is a great concentration of brant. The brant is a cross between a duck and a goose and was almost extinct until this refuge was created. The hunters in my State objected to the creation of these two refuges and we have had a hard time winning them over. The sportsmen of my State now desire these refuges retained as well as all others throughout the country.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Can the gentleman explain the position of the large sportsmen's organizations on this question? Do you know if they have considered the matter and taken any position?

Mr. BONNER. I have not advertised for any assistance in this. This is personal with me. I can read letters from the Audubon Society, from the people of Massachusetts, Boston, and other cities of Massachusetts. I have a number of telegrams from people that I do not even know. However, they have wired me. I did not ask them to wire me about this matter but they have asked that it be carefully considered by this House.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. MITCHELL. In the consideration of this matter by the subcommittee, was this organization Ducks Unlimited, asked about this situation? Were they taken into consideration? I, too, am a hunter.

Mr. BONNER. Well, it so happens that I was attending another subcommittee of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, of which I was a member, at the time the subcommittee was hearing delegations that appeared, pro and con, on this subject. I, too, know about "Ducks Unlimited." I think they have spent thousands and thousands of dollars in Canada to buy areas for the protection of eggs, in order that ducks may be hatched to come down into this territory. Ducks Unlimited have rendered a great service, to my own knowledge. This elimination would practically nullify the efforts which Ducks Unlimited are making to preserve these birds.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is this area under consideration a breeding ground?

Mr. BONNER. To some extent black duck do breed in the northern part of this area.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. McDOWELL. Would the gentleman from North Carolina agree that any careless operation of this kind, doing away with this refuge might set back the duck production on the North American continent for 25 years?

Mr. BONNER. It would serve as a bad precedent and would lead to eliminating the preserves we have already acquired in this country.

Understand now, Mr. Speaker, this preserve was acquired by an enabling act passed by the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts giving the Fish and Wildlife Service the privilege of coming in there and buying this property for this specific purpose; and the money used was the duck-stamp money that you and I and any other hunter pays when he goes out to hunt birds.

Mr. McDOWELL. Would the gentleman agree that every hunter, every lover of birds, every person interested in the natural resources of this Nation look to us today to stop this action, at least until such time as the proposition can be given adequate consideration?

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, what is the purpose of the resolution?

Mr. BONNER. The purpose of the resolution is to do away with this refuge and let the hunters go in on Nos. 4 and 5 and kill the birds.

It is said that the refuge interferes with clamming. They say the ducks are eating the clams; but I would like to know what happened before man came along. There were more ducks then than there are now. If their statement that the ducks are cleaning out the clams is correct, then the birds being there before man ever came to America and began shooting the ducks there never would have been any clams in the area when man arrived in Massachusetts.

They say the ducks pollute the area. The fact of the matter is that the pollution comes from other sources than the ducks.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. I agree with the gentleman 100 percent. For 8 years I have served on the Committee on Wildlife Conservation. Those of us who have been interested in this question know that the duck population of the United States has been seriously depleted. If we do away with these reserves we will do away with the entire duck population. I think we should not at this late hour in the session bring up a controversial measure such as this. Dr. Ira Gabrielson, the outstanding authority on wildlife in the United States, is absolutely opposed to this. All who have studied the question are opposed to it.

Mr. BONNER. The Fish and Wildlife Service is opposed to it. Mr. Day, the Director, is opposed to it. I have a letter here from Dr. Gabrielson, from which I read one paragraph:

> This refuge is of benefit to every seaboard State, both north and south of Massachusetts.
>
> It is furthermore imperative that this refuge should be maintained, for, if sportsmen's organizations and others are successful in doing away with this wildlife refuge area they will immediately start in to do away with others.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. SHAFER. I agree 100 percent with what the gentleman has said, and I urge the Members of the House to support him.

Mr. BONNER. I appreciate it, because it has been a hard fight. I am very fond of the gentleman who introduced this bill. I even went so far as to tell him that I would not object to the bill if he would take out 1, 2, and 3, and leave in 4, 5, and 6, but that conscientiously I could not stand here and stultify my own feeling about this matter and let the refuge be done away with and leave in just No. 6, which is only a sand bar on the coast of Massachusetts.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to congratulate the gentleman on the splendid fight he is putting up here to save American wildlife.

Mr. BONNER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I would like also to congratulate the gentleman on the splendid fight he has made, although I disagree with him——

Mr. BONNER. I merely yielded to the gentleman for a question, not a speech.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. HUBER. I want to compliment the gentleman for the fight he has made to preserve our dwindling wildlife.

Mr. BONNER. I thank the gentleman from Ohio very much for his contribution.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. As a member of the Select Committee on the Conservation of Wildlife Resources, I concur in everything the gentleman has said.

Mr. BONNER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the only two people with whom I have communicated about this matter are Mr. Seth Gordon, executive director of the Pennsylvania Game Commission, and Mr. John H. Baker, president of the National Audubon Society, 1000 Fifth Avenue, New York.

My letter to Mr. Gordon and his reply are set forth as follows:

JULY 16, 1947.

Mr. SETH GORDON,
Executive Director,
Pennsylvania Game Commission,
Harrisburg, Pa.:

What is your idea as to the proposed legislation abolishing Parker River National Wildlife Refuge in Essex County, Mass.?

HERBERT C. BONNER,
Member of Congress.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF GAME, FISH AND CONSERVATION COMMISSIONERS,
Harrisburg, Pa., July 3, 1947.

Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BONNER: I want to thank you most sincerely for the sympathetic manner in which you helped us to bring out the salient features of H. R. 2472 and H. R. 3802 during the hearing yesterday.

I was particularly pleased to have you raise the question you did concerning the Mattamuskeet and other similar areas purchased by the Federal Government. There is no good reason whatever why the Department of the Interior should not be trusted to use good judgment in connection with that clause in H. R. 3802, which would allow that Department to permit the States to use up to 25 percent of a given area for hunting purposes when conditions justify. I hope you will do your best to see to it that this provision is included in the bill as reported from your committee.

In making the above comment, I voice the sentiment of wildlife administrators from one end of this country to the other. Those of us who have been in wildlife administrative work for a considerable number of years (better than a quarter of a century in my own case) know that the Fish and Wildlife Service can be trusted to give the migratory birds the benefit in every case where there is any doubt whatever. In view of this, no harm will come through such provision and it will do much to alleviate local feeling and assure the right kind of public cooperation in many sections of the country.

Very cordially yours,

SETH GORDON,
Member, Executive Committee,
Also Executive Director of
Pennsylvania Game Commission.

I also have a letter from Mr. Baker, president of the National Audubon Society, opposing this proposal, and I have also received hundreds of other telegrams and letters from people to whom I have not written, nor have I replied to their communications. All of them protest the abolishment of this refuge.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 4347, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, ENGEL of Michigan, STEFAN, CASE of South Dakota, CANNON, KERR, and MAHON.

REDUCING AREA OF PARKER RIVER NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes on the floor this afternoon only because unanimous consent for its consideration was not received heretofore when it was on the Consent Calendar. The gentleman who just preceded me objected to it at that time.

This wildlife refuge has been of tremendous interest to the people of Massachusetts. Last year when the bill was before the Committee on Agriculture the entire Massachusetts delegation, excepting one who was in Europe, signed the petition to have this wildlife refuge abolished altogether because of the conditions that existed in that district. Two former governors of the State of Massachusetts took a similar position. Two United States Senators, Senator SALTONSTALL and Senator LODGE, this year also petitioned the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to abolish this refuge altogether because it was a very unwise determination on the part of the Fish and Wildlife Service to establish this refuge, not permitting the State Department of Massachusetts or any of the State departments to know what they were doing. The Legislature of Massachusetts sent a special committee to Washington this year to protest this refuge. That also occurred last year. The State Board of Health of Massachusetts was opposed to this refuge. The State department of conservation was opposed to this refuge.

Mr. Speaker, there is no partisanship in this matter at all. It is a matter that has aroused the people of Massachusetts to a point where I have never seen them aroused before to express themselves through their various Representatives. The Speaker of the House of Representatives signed this petition last year, the majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] signed this petition. The delegation from Massachusetts knows what this is all about and we have brought in a bill this year. We feel it is a compromise of this issue and will answer many of the complaints of the people of that district.

The Committee on Agriculture last year reported out a bill to abolish this refuge entirely. May I say also that ex-Secretary Ickes when he wanted to find out what the facts were appointed one of his subordinates, the Assistant Solicitor of the Department, Mr. Spector, to make a special report. He made a report in which he said, among other things, that he could cite many instances of land seizures that would involve hardships unless this land is returned. Then in the final recommendation to Mr. Ickes he said:

> In the light of my observation and interviews, I feel that a reexamination would find the part of Plum Island acquired from the Audubon Society, plus 700 to 1,000 acres in Groveland Clane Pond area, would adequately meet the needs of the project. All other lands should be returned.

That was signed by Theodore Spector, Assistant Solicitor of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. Speaker, the entire Massachusetts delegation favored the abolition of this project last year, with the exception of one member who was in Europe at that time.

This is a compromise in order that we may try to work out the difficulties in one of the most congested areas of the State of Massachusetts in which this project is located. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, they have taken over the so-called clam beds. You go down into the city of Washington here and you will observe signs in the restaurant reading "Fresh clams." It is this area that the clams come from, and they are positively taking over this area as a refuge. They are destroying the clam industry in that State. They are taking the farms, they are taking the woodland, they are taking the pastures and they have, Mr. Chairman, not followed the recommendations of the Committee on Agriculture a year ago in recommending the entire abolition. We are recommending a partial reduction of the area and we feel that that is the result of hard work on the part of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and if adopted by the House, will solve this problem.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the statement made by the gentleman from Massachusetts covers the situation. This land is not located in my district. It is located some distance from my district. Massachusetts is not opposed to land being taken for this purpose, but this particular site taken, from the angle of the Commonwealth, the interest of the people, and public opinion, is undesirable. The very fact that my dear friend from North Carolina admits that three of the parts taken were undesirable certainly makes out a case, at least, in part, and a case that runs against the whole original taking.

Now, we have compromised. There are five sections. Section 6 is permitted to remain. The Massachusetts delegation is united on this measure. We supported the bill last year. This is really not a Democratic problem, because there was not a Democratic Governor in control in Massachusetts when this situation arose. But that does not enter into

it. I speak of it here simply to show that the realm of politics does not enter into it at all. My thought is that here is a delegation united. Certainly, if the Pennsylvania delegation was united on a similar matter, I would not object; I would not be butting in. I respect the gentleman from North Carolina, because it is a matter of conscience with him. I am not saying it is not so with some others. He knows the facts, but I think he is wrong. I honestly disagree with my friend.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I am wrong about what?

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the gentleman is wrong in his position.

Mr. BONNER. I wish the gentleman would explain that.

Mr. McCORMACK. I disagree with my friend, let me put it that way.

Mr. BONNER. Let me ask the gentleman this: Does the gentleman not believe in the preservation of migratory wildlife?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts did not say that. I am referring to this particular site. I said previously that Massachusetts does not object to some place being taken up there, but not this site. We are opposed to the whole site being taken, but we are willing to compromise now on section 6 and let it be utilized.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. May I ask with all due respect to the delegation from Massachusetts, does not the gentleman feel that the Fish and Wildlife Service is perhaps as well posted on the conservation needs of wildlife resources as the Massachusetts delegation and to add that as a member of the Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources to state that the Fish and Wildlife Service is opposed to this resolution.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a fair question, but the answer to that is that there was an admission along the line now that the first three sections originally taken should never have been taken.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I merely want to ask the gentleman who selected the site? Who is responsible for determining this particular location?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is my understanding it is the Federal Government or an agency of the Federal Government and in turn, they confer with the State government under the Federal laws.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the Department of Conservation for the State of Massachusetts opposed this site and an enabling act was passed by the State Legislature.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is aware of the situation up there. The gentleman is aware of the confusion that exists. The gentleman is aware of the action on the part of the Federal agency. The gentleman is aware that the original taking was wrong in the beginning, and here out of six sections this bill permits one section to be utilized to remain, which can be utilized effectively. It simply gives back two of the remaining three sections in addition to the three sections the gentleman from North Carolina said should never have been taken.

The whole Massachusetts delegation is united on this matter, without regard to party. This matter passed the House unanimously last year. This year this bill provides for the reduction of one of the sections in a manner adequate to meet the purpose. It seems to me the committee acted wisely in reporting out this bill practically unanimously.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Pennsylvania and I have difficulty in getting along on almost anything, and I do not see where Pennsylvania belongs in here except for extraneous reasons.

Mr. Speaker, for all the reasons I have expressed, it seems to me the bill should pass.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDOWELL].

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, this is the reason Pennsylvania is in this argument. More than a million people in Pennsylvania every year buy a license to hunt. A lot of them hunt, a lot of them just go to the woods. But most people in Pennsylvania realize the terrific, tremendous value of the natural wildlife resources of America.

Some asked a while ago how this location was chosen, by whom it was chosen, what legislature, what authorities, what politicians. I will tell you how it was chosen; it was chosen by the ducks, by the brant, and by the geese.

Mr. GAVIN. Who did the gentleman say chose this spot?

Mr. McDOWELL. I said the ducks, the brant, and the geese chose the spot. It was not the Legislature of Massachusetts, it was not the Governor of Massachusetts, it was not the townspeople up there or the selectmen or anything of the kind, it was the birds that fly down from the north on their way south.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDOWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I think the gentleman brought out a very good point. May I add that the place the ducks first chose is the place that is being left in the bill, and that is the place we are trying to keep. That is the one spot we are trying to keep.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman knows as well as I know that this section 6 is only a sand bar. He knows that; he has lived on the coast.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will yield, perhaps if we put up more lights and some directional signs the birds might follow those signs.

Mr. McDOWELL. I submit to my colleague from Pennsylvania that ducks cannot read, and they cannot vote.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested earlier in the afternoon by my good friend, the minority whip, that where a delegation of Republicans and Democrats is united that very fact should have some significance on the legislation before us. I have had some unhappy experiences in that connection and know that this argument, however reasonable, in this body does not control legislation. Nor, I submit, should it, except perhaps where a State question alone is involved. However, in this instance, I know that while the Members from Massachusetts are united, I must express the interest that Pennsylvania and other States have, with reference to wildlife preservation. Pennsylvania has a million-odd hunters, all of whom pay a license to hunt and many of whom are interested in getting the birds as they fly south.

I want to see the game refuges preserved in the north, where the birds stop and rest and get food. I want, for the licensed sportsmen of other States in the Union, the privilege of sharing them with our fellow sportsmen in Massachusetts.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. I hope those who favor this bill would give us some reasons why they are in favor of it. All we have heard about are some Ipswich clams.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman. We really should have had more time to debate this bill.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I am having difficulty in getting time used on the other side, but, nevertheless, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] has made such a clear presentation of this matter that I think it unnecessary for me to discuss it at length. As he has pointed out, the preservation of this refuge is not a matter of concern solely to the people of Massachusetts. The people in my district, as well as others all along our seaboard, are concerned. If we eliminate this refuge, we shall have taken one of the initial steps in eliminating our migratory waterfowl.

In my district the area around Back Bay along our coast and adjoining North Carolina has long been a sportsman's paradise, and, as I see it, the protection of this refuge in Massachusetts may have a serious effect upon the future of Back Bay and the duck population which it accommodates.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] says his proposal is a compromise. He proposes to let the ducks continue to use section 6 and to evict them from sections 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. That, truly, is a generous compromise, especially in view of the information presented by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] to the effect that area 6 is little more than a sand bar.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, would have been acceptable if it had left within the refuge areas 4, 5, and 6.

In his remarks the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] indicated that valuable farm land has been taken over in the refuge. According to my in-

formation, there certainly is none in area 6, and the only semblance of habitation in areas 4 and 5 consists of three camper shacks.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that this bill be defeated.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MITCHELL].

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I have had the pleasure of shooting ducks on the east coast and the west coast and in the middle flight down the central corridor in Arkansas. I am a member of Ducks Unlimited. I subscribe wholeheartedly to the opposition to this resolution.

I like clams as well as anybody else, but I am very fond of mallard duck and I am just afraid that if this resolution is adopted that the frog-eaters up in the areas where we have our sanctuaries will want to run the ducks out of there so that they can get some more frogs. I am for ducks at 100 miles an hour, and I am going to vote with the gentleman from North Carolina. I think every sportsman who has a child growing up and who has had the thrill and pleasure and relaxation of hunting ducks will certainly do everything in his power to preserve wildlife for himself and his children.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I hope the rules will be suspended and that this bill, H. R. 4108, will pass. This bill was considered by another Congress in another session.

I recall last year, as has already been stated here, but I wish to repeat it, we had two bills of a similar nature to completely abolish this bird refuge in Massachusetts. Both of those bills were considered by the full Committee on Agriculture, and without a dissenting vote the House passed the bill, and the other body took the same action.

After the adjournment of Congress last year the bill was vetoed. Bear in mind, this refuge is not in my district, but I know something about it because it has been brought to my attention by so many persons who are desirous of having the refuge eliminated completely. This bill offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] is a compromise bill. It comes here with the recommendation of that person who was appointed by the former Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Spector, who was appointed as Assistant Solicitor by the Department of the Interior to go up to Massachusetts last year and to find out something about this controversial matter.

It has not been taken over completely as a refuge. It is only in the making. It was only started in 1940. I understand the attorneys are still searching the titles on this property.

This bill which comes before us through the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] is a compromise bill. It reduces the area from 12,000 acres to 2,500 acres.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] has expired.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 4108.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the rules were not suspended.

SUBSTITUTION OF CONFEREES, SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL DEFICIENCY BILL

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], may be substituted in place of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] on the conference on the second supplemental deficiency bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the change.

LEASE OF REAL OR PERSONAL PROPERTY BY THE WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1198) to authorize leases of real or personal property by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy shall deem it to be advantageous to the Government he is authorized to lease such real or personal property under the control of his Department as is not surplus to the needs of the Department within the meaning of the act of October 3, 1944 (58 Stat. 765), and is not for the time required for public use, to such lessee or lessees and upon such terms and conditions as in his judgment will promote the national defense or will be in the public interest. Each such lease shall be for a period not exceeding 5 years unless the Secretary of the Department concerned shall determine that a longer period will promote the national defense or will be in the public interest. The Secretary of the Department concerned may include, among other terms and conditions in the lease, a right of first refusal in the lessee to purchase the property in the event of the revocation of the lease in order to permit sale thereof by the Government, but this section shall not be construed as authorizing the sale of any property unless the sale thereof is otherwise authorized by law. Each such lease shall contain a provision permitting the Secretary of the Department concerned to revoke the lease at any time, unless the Secretary shall determine that the omission of such provision from the lease will promote the national defense or will be in the public interest. In any event each such lease shall be revocable by the Secretary of the Department concerned during a national emergency declared by the President. Notwithstanding section 321 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412; U. S. C., title 40, sec. 303b), or any other provision of law, any such lease may provide for the maintenance, protection, repair, or restoration by the lessee, of the property leased or of the entire unit or installation where a substantial part thereof is leased, as a part or all of the consideration for the lease of such property. In the event utilities or services shall be furnished by the Department concerned to the lessee in connection with any lease, payments for utilities or services so furnished may be covered into the Treasury to the credit of the appropriation or appropriations from which the costs of furnishing any such utilities or services to the lessee was paid. Except as otherwise hereinabove provided, any money rentals received by the Government directly under any such lease shall be deposited and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. The authority herein granted shall not apply to oil, mineral, or phosphate lands. The Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, shall submit to the Congress on the 1st day of January and the 1st day of July of each year, following the enactment of this law, a report of all leases entered into in accordance with the provisions of this act.

SEC. 2. The act of July 28, 1892, as amended (27 Stat. 321; 45 Stat. 988; U. S. C., title 40, sec. 303), is hereby repealed. So much of the Naval Appropriation Act of August 29, 1916, as is contained under the heading "Lease of Naval Lands," as amended (39 Stat. 559; 45 Stat. 990; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 522), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all right, title, and interest of Reconstruction Finance Corporation in any plants or facilities, and the machinery, equipment, and other personal property accessory thereto, acquired by Defense Plant Corporation or Reconstruction Finance Corporation in accordance with authority contained in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act (U. S. C., title 15, secs. 601–617) pursuant to undertakings by the War Department or the Navy Department to reimburse Defense Plant Corporation or Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the extent of the unrecovered cost thereof in the event Congress authorizes such reimbursement by making appropriations therefor, shall be transferred by Reconstruction Finance Corporation (or by War Assets Administration, if such property has been declared surplus) to the War Department or the Navy Department upon certification by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy made within 6 months after the enactment hereof, that the retention of such plants or facilities, and the machinery, equipment, and other personal property accessory thereto, by the War Department or the Navy Department, as the case may be, is necessary for the maintenance of an adequate Military or Naval Establishment including industrial reserve.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all right, title, and interest of Reconstruction Finance Corporation or War Assets Administration in any machinery or equipment shall be transferred by the agency having control thereof to the War Department or the Navy Department upon certification by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy made within 6 months after the enactment hereof, that the retention of such machinery or equipment by the War Department or the Navy Department, is necessary for the maintenance of an adequate Military or Naval Establishment, including industrial reserve.

SEC. 4. Any transfer made pursuant to section 3 of this act shall be approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to the extent and in the manner determined by him and shall be made without charge or reimbursement from the funds available to the War Department or the Navy Department, except for costs of packing, handling, and transportation of machinery and equipment transferred under section 3 (b) hereof.

SEC. 5. (a) Whenever in the opinion of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, the interests of national defense require assurance of the continued availability for war-production purposes of the industrial capacity of shipyards, plants, and equipment which are surplus to the needs of their respective Departments or of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation within the meaning of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, they are authorized to direct the imposition of such terms, conditions, restrictions, and reservations in the disposition of such property by the disposal agency under said act as will in the opinion of the Secretary concerned be adequate to assure such continued availability.

(b) In the event the disposal agency is unable to dispose of any such industrial plants and equipment subject to such terms, conditions, restrictions, or reservations as have been imposed, within a reasonable time and after such property shall have been offered for sale and reasonable efforts made to dispose of the same, the Department imposing such terms, conditions, restrictions, or reservations shall (1) modify them to the extent necessary to permit the sale or lease of such property, (2) withdraw the property from surplus, or, in the case of Reconstruction Finance Corporation property, request a transfer thereof in the manner provided in sections 3 (a) and 4 of this act, or (3) eliminate and waive the requirement for the imposition of any terms, conditions, restrictions, or reservations made under the authority of this section.

SEC. 6. The lessee's interest, made or created pursuant to the provisions of this act, shall be made subject to State or local taxation. Any lease of property authorized under the provisions of this act shall contain a provision that if and to the extent that such property is made taxable by State and local governments by act of Congress, in such event the terms of such lease shall be renegotiated.

SEC. 7. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 3851) was laid on the table.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I understood this bill was being taken up under suspension of the rules, and I was on my feet. This bill involves over a billion dollars and I certainly would not have given my consent that it be passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may ask unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings by which the bill was passed.

Mr. BUCK. I make such a request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings by which the bill was passed and return to the bill. Is there objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] may extend his remarks or may be given 5 minutes in which to address the House.

The SPEAKER. The bill is passed unless the consent request to vacate the proceedings and return to the bill is granted.

Mr. SHAFER. I have no objection to returning to a consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] is in favor of this bill. I think the gentleman from New York believes there should be a full explanation of it. There is quite a bit of property involved in this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York had reserved the right to object.

Mr. SHAFER. I will yield the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has no time to yield. The gentleman from New York has the floor in his own right on a reservation of objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I have not particularly enjoyed coming down into the well today and acting as Devil's Advocate on a number of bills. This bill, however, involves $1,290,000,000, and I think it most unfortunate and bad legislative procedure to attempt, on the last day of the session, to put through a measure of this sort.

What does the bill involve? It involves 92,000 items of machine tools which I am told are worth about $9,000 apiece, a total of $828,000,000. It involves 77 industrial plants which, at a value of $6,000,000 each, amount to some $462,000,000.

I do not know how advantageous it is to this country's economy to take out of civilian use these 92,000 items of machine tools. I do know that many machine tools are in great scarcity, that manufacturers attempting to increase their production are unable to obtain them. I hope the members of the subcommittee, or the chairman of the subcommittee, my esteemed friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] will tell the House what sort of machines these are, what the War Department intends to do with them, what kind of plants are included in the 77, and what the plans are for their disposition.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the answer that the gentleman from New York requested, because I think it is important.

Mr. SHAFER. The gentleman from New York has brought up a very pertinent question and I should like to answer it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I too, reserve the right to object.

Mr. SHAFER. In the first place this legislation does not take away from the Government 92,000 pieces of machine tools, as the gentleman from New York stated. This legislation permits the War and the Navy Departments to lease 77 plants which the War and Navy Departments feel should remain in their title and in condition to use for the next emergency if we have one. At the same time it permits the War and Navy Departments to have full control over some 92,000 pieces of machine tools which are in the hands of the War Assets Corporation and which can be disposed of at any time. As every Member knows, machine tools was one of the great bottlenecks in World War II.

I have in my hand a clipping from the Washington News of this week which states that the War Assets Corporation is now preparing to funnel these 92,000 pieces of machine tools, or as many as may be required, to Europe.

The War Assets Administration does not want to take that responsibility.

Mr. BUCK. Is it the understanding that the War Department will lease out this machinery or grease it up, put it away, and take it off the market?

Mr. SHAFER. It is not understood they will do that, but they may lease some of this machinery to be recalled at any time in case of an emergency. This also provides for leasing of 77 plants that the War Department and Navy Department want to keep under their thumb. It provides for the leasing of these plants over a period of 5 or more years until such time as the War and Navy Departments again require the use of those plants. If they are not leased they will be dumped on the market. The War Assets Corporation will take over and War Assets will sell them for anything they can get, possibly for as low as 10, 20, or 30 cents on the dollar, or even selling them for scrap.

It is true there is considerable money involved. But these plants now belong to the Government of the United States. These machine tools belong to the Government of the United States and the War and Navy Departments want to keep these plants and these machine tools. There is no objection on the part of War Assets.

Mr. McCORMACK. This is really a defense measure?

Mr. SHAFER. It is a part of our future defense program.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. May I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that this bill is a part of the national defense program. The War Department and Navy Department have a good many plants throughout the country that they are anxious to use or to maintain in a stand-by condition. This bill will permit that to be done by allowing these departments to lease those plants. One of the great difficulties in the past has been that these departments have not been permitted to give a long-time lease on these plants because they have to keep them in shape where they can be used in any emergency. This legislation would allow a longer lease on the plants with the proviso always that in the event of an emergency the plant can be taken back and used by the Government for national defense purposes.

Mr. SHAFER. I may add to the gentleman's statement that the lease also provides that the property shall be subject to State and local taxation and in order that unfair competition may be prevented for anything manufactured in these plants by private industry.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. What is the status of this property now? Is it real property that has been declared surplus and is now a part of the inventory of the War Assets Corporation?

Mr. SHAFER. Yes, it has not been declared surplus but will be unless this bill passes.

Mr. RIZLEY. That is my point.

Mr. SHAFER. The real property has not been. The machine tools have been.

Mr. RIZLEY. What amount of real estate is involved here that will be held onto by the Army and Navy or whoever it may be, if this bill goes through?

Mr. SHAFER. It is not to be held onto by the Army and Navy. There are 77 pieces of real property, including factory buildings and some shipyards that unless this bill passes will be placed on the block by the War Assets Corporation or other disposal agencies for disposal. These 77 pieces of property the War Department and Navy Department feel it is necessary to keep in their possession and merely lease, not sell.

Mr. RIZLEY. I want to say to the gentleman from Michigan that the same attitude by the Army and Navy Departments now prevails as to over $22,000,000,000 worth of real estate either under lease or owned. My committee is getting ready during the summer months to go into this huge amount of real estate that was accumulated during the war by the Army and the Navy, that they are still holding onto. As a matter of fact, in this country today over one-eighth of the real estate is owned by some department of the Government, and we are acquiring more all the time. Here is a huge amount of real estate, as I understand from the gentleman, that the Army and the Navy say they need. They want to keep it. They do not want to declare it surplus.

Mr. SHAFER. They desire to lease, pending further usage in case of emergency.

Mr. RIZLEY. How long do they want to use it; what length of time?

Mr. SHAFER. Five years or more up to 20 years or more.

Mr. RIZLEY. Up to 90 years.

Mr. SHAFER. That is inconceivable.

Mr. RIZLEY. And during that time title will still remain in the Government.

Mr. SHAFER. Yes.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I am sure that the distinguished and able gentleman from Massachusetts has no desire to interfere with our national-defense program.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am just reserving the right to object to expedite action. I am for it.

Mr. SHORT. I know the gentleman is, and I am glad that he made the reservation of objection in order to clear this matter up. Let me say to my friend from Oklahoma that Camp Crowder, with more than 60,000 acres, is in my district. I am naturally anxious, since that camp has been declared surplus, to see those farms returned to their original owners, and am as anxious about it as the gentleman from Oklahoma. But this bill takes care particularly of synthetic-rubber plants, chemical plants, and machine-tool plants, of which we had such an acute shortage during the war. I hope the gentleman does not register any objection to it, knowing the fine American that he is. I know he would not object if he had studied this bill, as the able chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] has done.

Mr. RIZLEY. Let me say to the gentleman from Missouri——

Mr. BROOKS. I demand the regular order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. RIZLEY. If I cannot make a statement on it, I will object. I want to know what is going on here.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman making the demand for regular order will withdraw it, because we want to expedite the matter.

Mr. BROOKS. I withdraw it for the present, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. RIZLEY. I want to say to the House that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department has been going into some of these things. There are 280,000 acres of land now down in one of the districts of Georgia—and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] can verify this—that the Army and the Navy are insisting on holding onto. It takes in over half of one county and a large slice out of five other counties. They say they need it to maintain the National Guard from May to August of each year. Out in the State of California alone there is project after project that our committee started to look into. We have not had the time to complete the work. The Army and the Navy want to hold onto these large acquisitions of real estate that they obtained during the war.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. Those projects have nothing to do with this bill whatever.

Mr. RIZLEY. They may have nothing to do with this bill, but here in the eleventh hour it should not be brought up without full discussion.

Mr. SHAFER. That is all extraneous matter, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BROOKS. I demand the regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy shall deem it to be advantageous to the Government he is authorized to lease such real or personal property under the control of his Department as is not surplus to the needs of the Department within the meaning of the act of October 3, 1944 (58 State. 765), and is not for the time required for public use, to such lessee or lessees and upon such terms and conditions as in his judgment will promote the national defense or will be in the public interest. Each such lease shall be for a period not exceeding 5 years unless the Secretary of the Department concerned shall determine that a longer period will promote the national defense or will be in the public interest. The secretary of the Department concerned may include, among other terms and conditions in the lease, a right of first refusal in the lessee to purchase the property in the event of the revocation of the lease in order to permit sale thereof by the Government, but this section shall not be construed as authorizing the sale of any property unless the sale thereof is otherwise authorized by law. Each such lease shall contain a provision permitting the Secretary of the Department concerned to revoke the lease at any time, unless the Secretary shall determine that the omission of such provision from the lease will promote the national defense or will be in the public interest. In any event each such lease shall be revocable by the Secretary of the Department concerned during a national emergency declared by the President. Notwithstanding section 321 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412; U. S. C., title 40, sec. 303b), or any other provision of law, any such lease may provide for the maintenance, protection, repair, or restoration by the lessee, of the property leased or of the entire unit or installation where a substantial part thereof is leased, as a part or all of the consideration for the lease of such property. In the event utilities or services shall be furnished by the Department concerned to the lessee in connection with any lease, payments for utilities or services so furnished may be covered into the Treasury to the credit of the appropriation or appropriations from which the costs of furnishing any such utilities or services to the lessee was paid. Except as otherwise hereinabove provided, any money rentals received by the Government directly under any such lease shall be deposited and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. The authority herein granted shall not apply to oil, mineral, or phosphate lands. The Secretary of War or the Secretary of Navy, as the case may be, shall submit to the Congress on the 1st day of January and the 1st day of July of each year, following the enactment of this law, a report of all leases entered into in accordance with the provisions of this act.

SEC. 2. The Act of July 28, 1892, as amended (27 Stat. 321; 45 Stat. 988; U. S. C., title 40, sec. 303), is hereby repealed. So much of the Naval Appropriation Act of August 29, 1916, as is contained under the heading "Lease of Naval Lands", as amended (39 Stat. 559; 45 Stat. 990; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 522), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all right, title, and interest of Reconstruction Finance Corporation in any plants of facilities, and the machinery, equipment, and other personal property accessory thereto, acquired by Defense Plant Corporation or Reconstruction Finance Corporation in accordance with authority contained in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act (U. S. C., title 15, secs. 601–617) pursuant to undertakings by the War Department or the Navy Department to reimburse Defense Plant Corporation or Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the extent of the unrecovered cost thereof in the event Congress authorizes such reimbursement by making appropriations therefor, shall be transferred by Reconstruction Finance Corporation (or by War Assets Administration, if such property has been declared surplus) to the War Department or the Navy Department upon certification by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy made within 6 months after the enactment hereof, that the retention of such plants or facilities, and the machinery, equipment, and other personal property accessory thereto, by the War Department or the Navy Department, as the case may be, is necessary

for the maintenance of any adequate Military or Naval Establishment, including industrial reserve.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all right, title, and interest of Reconstruction Finance Corporation or War Assets Administration in any machinery or equipment shall be transferred by the agency having control thereof to the War Department or the Navy Department upon certification by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy made within 6 months after the enactment hereof, that the retention of such machinery or equipment by the War Department or the Navy Department, is necessary for the maintenance of an adequate Military or Navy Establishment, including industrial reserve.

SEC. 4. Any transfer made pursuant to section 3 of this act shall be approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to the extent and in the manner determined by him and shall be made without charge or reimbursement from the funds available to the War Department or the Navy Department, except for costs of packing, handling, and transportation of machinery and equipment transferred under section 3 (b) hereof.

SEC. 5. (a) Whenever in the opinion of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, the interests of national defense require assurance of the continued availability for war-production purposes of the industrial capacity of shipyards, plants, and equipment which are surplus to the needs of their respective Departments or of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation within the meaning of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, they are authorized to direct the imposition of such terms, conditions, restrictions, and reservations in the disposition of such property by the disposal agency under said act as will in the opinion of the Secretary concerned be adequate to assure such continued availability.

(b) In the event the disposal agency is unable to dispose of any such industrial plants and equipment subject to such terms, conditions, restrictions, or reservations as have been imposed, within a reasonable time and after such property shall have been offered for sale and reasonable efforts made to dispose of the same, the Department imposing such terms, conditions, restrictions, or reservations shall (1) modify them to the extent necessary to permit the sale or lease of such property, (2) withdraw the property from surplus, or, in the case of Reconstruction Finance Corporation property, request a transfer thereof in the manner provided in sections 3 (a) and 4 of this act, or (3) eliminate and waive the requirement for the imposition of any terms, conditions, restrictions, or reservations made under the authority of this section.

SEC. 6. The lessee's interest, made or created pursuant to the provisions of this act, shall be made subject to State or local taxation. Any lease of property authorized under the provisions of this act shall contain a provision that if and to the extent that such property is made taxable by State and local governments by act of Congress, in such event the terms of such lease shall be renegotiated.

SEC. 7. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MINIMUM ALLOWANCE PAYABLE FOR REHABILITATION IN SERVICE-CONNECTED CASES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 3308) to increase the minimum allowance payable for rehabilitation in service-connected cases, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, effective on the first day of the first calendar month subsequent to the date of enactment of this act, paragraph 3 of part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"3. While pursuing training prescribed herein, and for 2 months after his employability is determined, each veteran shall be paid the amount of subsistence allowance specified in paragraph 6 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended: *Provided*, That the minimum payment of such allowance, plus any compensation or other benefit shall be (A) where the service-connected disability is rated less than 30 percent, for a person without a dependent, $105 per month; and for a person with a dependent, $115, plus the following amounts for additional dependents: (1) $10 for one child and $7 additional for each additional child, and (2) $15 for a dependent parent; (B) where the service-connected disability is rated 30 percent or more, for a person without a dependent, $115 per month; and for a person with a dependent, $135, plus the following amounts for additional dependents: (1) $20 for one child and $15 additional for each additional child, and (2) $15 for a dependent parent: *Provided further*, That the rates set out herein shall not be subject to the increases authorized by Public Law No. 312, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved May 27, 1944: *And provided further*, That when the course of vocational rehabilitation furnished to any person as herein provided consists of training on the job by an employer, such employer shall be required to submit monthly to the Administrator a statement in writing showing any wage, compensation, or other income paid by him to such person during the month, directly or indirectly, and based upon such written statements, the Administrator is authorized to reduce the subsistence allowance of such person to an amount considered equitable and just."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? If not, the question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to increase the minimum allowance payable for rehabilitation in certain service-connected cases."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE ACT TO CONTROL DANGEROUS WEAPONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 493) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia, approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 ed.).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 493) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 edition), having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That section 4 of the Act entitled 'An Act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia, to provide penalties, to prescribe rules of evidence, and for other purposes', approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 edition), be amended by changing the last period to a colon and adding the following language: "*Provided*, That arrests, without a warrant, and searches and seizures pursuant thereto, may be made for violation of this section, by police officers, as in the case of a felony, upon probable cause that the person arrested is violating this section at the time of the arrest; but no evidence discovered in the course of any arrest, search, or seizure authorized by this proviso shall be admissible in any criminal proceeding against the person arrested unless at the time of such arrest he was carrying a pistol or other dangerous weapon on or about his person."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend section 4 of the act entitled 'An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia, to provide penalties, to prescribe rules of evidence, and for other purposes', approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 edition)."

JOS. P. O'HARA,
JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
T. G. ABERNETHY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JAMES P. KEM,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 493) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 ed.), submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia, to provide penalties, to prescribe rules of evidence, and for other purposes," approved July 8, 1932, makes it unlawful for any person to carry a pistol or other dangerous weapon on or about his person in any place in the District of Columbia other than in his dwelling place or place of business or on other land possessed by him, unless he has a license for such carrying. Section 15 of the same act contains a general penalty provision under the terms of which any violation of section 4 is punishable by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

The bill as it passed the House proposed to amend section 4 of such act of July 8, 1932, by adding at the end thereof a proviso to the effect that with respect to violations of such section police officers may make arrests, and searches and seizures pursuant to such arrests, in a manner commonly prescribed for arrests of persons committing felonies, without warrant but upon probable cause that

the person arrested is committing the unlawful act at the time of the arrest.

The Senate struck out all after the enacting clause and inserted language designed to amend section 4 of such act of July 8, 1932, by adding at the end thereof a new sentence providing specific penalty provisions for violation of such section. By the terms of the Senate amendment to the bill a violation of section 4 would be a felony punishable by a fine of not less than $500 and not more than $2,000 or by imprisonment for not less than 1 year and not more than 3 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

The substitute agreed to in conference is similar to the bill as it passed the House with the exception that there has been added to the proviso proposed by the House language designed to safeguard the rights of individuals, by providing that any evidence discovered in the course of any arrest, search, or seizure authorized by the bill shall be admissible in any criminal proceeding against the person arrested only if at the time of the arrest such person was carrying a pistol or other dangerous weapon.

The amendment to the title merely corrects a clerical inaccuracy.

JOS. P. O'HARA,
JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.,
T. G. ABERNETHY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, this bill is substantially in the same form as it passed the House, with an additional amendment which is a greater safeguard and protection to the individual.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Burke, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4070. An act to carry into effect certain parts relating to patents of the treaties of peace with Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania, ratified by the Senate on June 5, 1947, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendments to House Concurrent Resolution 104, Concurrent Resolution entitled "Concurrent resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Housing."

SELECT COMMITTEE TO CONDUCT A STUDY AND INVESTIGATION OF THE PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee to Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Problems of Small Business may be permitted to file reports with the Clerk of the House during the recess or adjournment of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS AND INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. PLOESER submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3756) making appropriations for the Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3756) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 17, 19, 24, and 26.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 11, 12, 16, 23, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31, and 33, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$18,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "one hundred and sixty-one"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided*, That of said unexpended balance, not less than $12,000,000 is to be available for the construction of the Watauga and South Holston Dams"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 13 of said amendment strike out the figure "$4,714,397" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$4,125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Tennessee Valley Authority: Not later than June 30, 1948, and not later than June 30 of each calendar year thereafter, until a total of $348,239,240 has been paid as herein provided, the board of directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority shall pay from net income derived the immediately preceding fiscal year from power operations (such net income to be determined by deducting power operating expenses, allocated common expense, and interest on funded debt from total power operating revenues) not less than $2,500,000 of its outstanding bonded indebtedness to the Treasury of the United States exclusive of interest, and such a portion of the remainder of such net income into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts as will, in the ten-year period ending June 30, 1958, and in each succeeding ten-year period until the aforesaid total of $348,239,240 shall have been paid, equal not less than a total of $87,059,810, including payment of bonded indebtedness exclusive of interest on such bonded indebtedness. Total payments of not less than $10,500,000 shall be made not later than June 30, 1948.

"Amounts equal to the total of all appropriations herein and hereafter made to the Tennessee Valley Authority for power facilities shall be paid by the board of directors thereof, in addition to the total of $348,239,240 specified in the foregoing paragraph, to the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, such payments to be amortized over a period of not to exceed forty years after the year in which such facilities go into operation."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided*, That $175,000 shall be available only for the audit and revision of past accounting records"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of said amendment strike out the figure "$290,600" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 307. Section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act (Public Law 248, 79th Congress) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 104. The Budget programs transmitted by the President to the Congress shall be considered and legislation shall be enacted making necessary appropriations, as may be authorized by law, making available for expenditure for operating and administrative expenses such corporate funds or other financial resources or limiting the use thereof as the Congress may determine and providing for repayment of capital funds and the payment of dividends. The provisions of this section shall not be construed as preventing Government corporations from

carrying out and financing their activities as authorized by existing law, nor as affecting the provisions of section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended. The provisions of this section shall not be construed as affecting the existing authority of any Government corporation to make contracts or other commitments without reference to fiscal year limitations.' "

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the figure stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "308"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment No. 29.

WALTER C. PLOESER,
BEN F. JENSEN,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
F. R. COUDERT, Jr.,
GEORGE MAHON,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
ALBERT GORE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HOMER FERGUSON,
CLYDE M. REED,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3756) making appropriations for Government Corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments namely:

TITLE I—DIRECT APPROPRIATIONS

Amendment No. 1 appropriates $18,700,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority, instead of $22,143,500 as proposed by the House and $13,117,521 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2 restores the House language making available not to exceed $3,253,979 of the appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority for the construction of South Holston and Watauga Dams.

Amendments Nos. 3 and 4 earmark not to exceed $5,000,000 of the appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority for chemical plant, instead of $6,686,000 as proposed by the House and $3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; and deletes language proposed by the House and language proposed by the Senate which would have imposed unworkable restrictions upon the use of the funds so earmarked.

Amendment No. 5 strikes out the authority for the Tennessee Valley Authority to purchase aircraft as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6 authorizes the Tennessee Valley Authority to purchase 161 automobiles, instead of 221 as proposed by the House and 100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7 inserts the provision of the Senate earmarking $12,000,000 of the 1947 reappropriated balance of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the construction of the Watauga and South Holston Dams, amended to provide that "not less than" $12,000,000 of such balance shall be available for such construction.

Amendment No. 8 appropriates for the Office of the Housing Expediter $4,125,000, instead of $3,539,080 as proposed by the House and $4,714,397 as proposed by the Senate. The amount proposed by the House was earmarked for liquidation of this Office, and the increased amount is to enable the Housing Expediter to perform his functions pursuant to title I of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 prior to completion of such liquidation.

Amendment No. 10 appropriates $4,000,000 for the payment of contributions to public housing agencies, instead of $2,200,000 as proposed by the House and $5,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11 strikes out the provision that no part of the appropriation for the payment of annual contributions to public housing agencies shall be used to pay such contributions unless the amount otherwise due is reduced by one-half the outstanding reserves on the books of such agency. It is the intention of the managers on the part of the two Houses that the reserves on hand be utilized by the respective agencies for the purposes for which such reserves were created. It is further intended by the managers that the Federal Public Housing Authority shall so exercise its authority with respect to local housing agencies as to effect and maintain a reduction in the amount of the reserves maintained by individual housing agencies as may be excessive.

TITLE II

Amendment No. 12 corrects an error in printing.

Amendment No. 13 restores the proposal of the House whereby the Tennessee Valley Authority is required to pay to the Treasury over a period of 40 years the amount of $348,239,240 representing the Federal investment in its power facilities, and requiring that one-fourth of such amount be paid in each 10-year period of such 40 years; but amends such proposal by striking out the requirement that not less than 40 percent of its net power income be paid into the Treasury each year.

Amendment No. 14 provides that not to exceed $1,400,000 of the funds available to the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration may be used for administrative expenses, instead of not to exceed $1,250,000 as proposed by the House and not to exceed $1,550,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15 provides that not to exceed $3,250,000 of the funds available to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation may be used for administrative expenses, instead of not to exceed $3,000,000 as proposed by the House and not to exceed $3,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16 provides that not to exceed $20,000,000 of the funds of the Federal Housing Administration may be used for administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate, instead of not to exceed $17,624,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17 provides that the amounts available to the Federal Public Housing Authority for administrative expenses shall include not to exceed $2,200,000 of the funds available for administrative expenses for the United States Housing Act program as proposed by the House, instead of not to exceed $2,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18 provides that not to exceed $11,500,000 of the funds available to the Federal Public Housing Authority may be used for administrative expenses, instead of not to exceed $10,400,000 as proposed by the House and not to exceed $13,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19 restores the House provision whereby the number of officers and employees of the Federal Public Housing Authority receiving compensation in excess of $4,500 per annum shall not exceed 20 percent of the total number of employees of the Authority.

Amendment No. 20 provides that $175,000 of the funds available to the Federal Public Housing Authority shall be available for the audit and revision of past accounting records as proposed by the Senate; and, as amended, "only" for such audit and revision.

Amendments No. 22 inserts the provision of the Senate for costs of penalty mail for the National Housing Agency by transfer from funds available for administrative expenses of the Office of the Administrator and the constituent units of the Agency, amended to provide for such transfers in an amount not exceeding $250,000 instead of $290,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23 provides that not to exceed $400,000 of the administrative expense funds of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation shall be available for payment to the Farm Credit Administration for supervisory or other services rendered as proposed by the Senate, instead of $275,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 24 restores the House provision permitting the Federal intermediate credit banks to purchase not to exceed 10 automobiles.

Amendment No. 25 provides that not to exceed $181,250 of the administrative expense funds of the Federal intermediate credit banks shall be available for payment to the Farm Credit Administration for supervisory or other services rendered as proposed by the Senate, instead of $125,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 26 provides that the production credit corporations may purchase not to exceed 15 automobiles as proposed by the House instead of not to exceed 5 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27 provides that not to exceed $232,000 of the administrative expense funds of the production credit corporations shall be available for payment to the Farm Credit Administration for supervisory or other services rendered as proposed by the Senate, instead of $160,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 28 provides that not to exceed $29,000 of the administrative expense funds of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., shall be available for payment to the Farm Credit Administration for supervisory or other services rendered as proposed by the Senate, instead of $20,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 29 is reported in disagreement.

TITLE III

Amendment No. 30 strikes out the provision proposed by the House whereby no funds of any corporation or agency included in the accompanying bill may be used to pay other than a Government agency for an independent audit unless approved by the Comptroller General.

Amendment No. 31 provides that with respect to the transfer of title to office buildings at the seat of government to the United States, as required by section 306 of the accompanying bill, the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency shall make a final determination of the value of the property in case of disagreement by the Secretary of the Treasury and the head of the transferor corporation, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32 restores the language proposed by the House amending section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945; but with amendments thereto changing the words "making available for use such corporate funds or other financial resources or limiting the use thereof as the Congress may determine" to read "making available for expenditure for operating and administrative expenses such corporate funds or other financial resources" etc.; and striking out the words "Except as provided in such legislation" which preceded the words "the provisions of this section shall not be construed as preventing" etc.

Amendment No. 33 strikes out the amendment to section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as proposed by the House, whereby certain mixed ownership Government corporations would have been

subject to the same budgetary control as wholly owned Government corporations.

Section 308 of this bill, which included the following mixed ownership Government Corporations: (1) The Central Bank for Cooperatives and the regional banks for cooperatives, (2) Federal home loan banks, and (3) Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, has been eliminated.

It is the opinion of the conferees that it is for the best interests of our country to have these banking institutions privately owned and that the mixed ownership of such corporations be terminated at the earliest opportunity that is practicable by their buying out the Government's interest. It is our belief that this will in no way affect the proper operation of such institutions.

Legislation to accomplish this purpose is now before the Eightieth Congress in the case of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Eleven of the twelve Federal land banks have already followed the suggested procedure.

Amendment No. 34 changes a section number.

AMENDMENT IN DISAGREEMENT

The managers on the part of the House have authorized the following motion with respect to amendment No. 29: That the House recede and concur with an amendment making the amount of the proposed loan not to exceed $250,000 instead of $500,000 and prohibiting its use for repayment of outstanding indebtedness to banks.

WALTER C. PLOESER,
BEN F. JENSEN,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
F. R. COUDERT, JR.,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
ALBERT GORE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 3756, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. What are you going to do with the 161 automobiles for the TVA? We have had joy riding long enough. It is time for the joy rides to be stopped and we ought to put a stop to it.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 29: Page 21, after line 15, insert:

"The Virgin Islands Company is authorized to borrow from the Treasury of the United States, for the purpose of carrying out any of the programs of the Company set forth in the budget for the fiscal year 1948, sums of money not to exceed a total of $500,000. For this purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to make loans to the Company, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, on such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Treasury shall determine. Such loans shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the making of the loan to the Company."

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PLOESER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"The Virgin Islands Company is authorized to borrow from the Treasury of the United States, for the purpose of carrying out any of the programs of the Company set forth in the budget for the fiscal year 1948, sums of money not to exceed a total of $250,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds borrowed under this authority shall be available for repayment of bank loans outstanding at the date of enactment of this act. For this purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to make loans to the Company, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, on such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Treasury shall determine. Such loans shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the making of the loan to the Company."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS OF INDIAN WARS

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H. R. 4055, to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to veterans of Indian wars and the dependents of such veterans.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all monthly rates of pension payable to veterans of the Indian wars and dependents of such veterans which are payable under any laws administered by the Veterans' Administration are hereby increased by 20 percent.

The increases provided by this section shall be effective from the first day of the second calendar month following the date of enactment of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, this bill is designed to do for the veterans of the Indian wars what the House did a short time ago for Civil War and Spanish War veterans, that is, to increase the compensation 20 percent for both veterans and their dependents. As a matter of fact, according to our figures as of July 1, there were only 790 of these veterans left and about 2,200 dependents. The veterans are of an average age of 85 years, and the dependents of an average age of 80 years. The veterans themselves have a life expectancy of only 2.77 years, and the dependents a life expectancy of 4.39 years.

I do not see, Mr. Speaker, how we can fail to do for these veterans of the Indian wars what the House did in a bill passed here a short time ago on a roll call without a dissenting vote. The bill ought to be passed.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, several days ago the House by an overwhelming vote passed H. R. 4051, a bill which I introduced to amend the Natural Gas Act. The bill is now pending in the other body. Since that time the Federal Power Commission has carried on one of the most intense, dishonest, and vicious lobbies imaginable against the bill. Title 18 of United States Code, section 201, provides:

No part of the money appropriated by any act shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designated to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation.

Information has come to me today that the Federal Power Commission, by the use of public funds, has carried on their vicious, unfair, unscrupluous, and dishonest propaganda by use of the mails, telephone and telegram, letters, and other printed matter.

Mr. Speaker, If my information just received today is correct, and I have every reason to believe it is, certain members of the FPC have violated the above statute in every respect, attempting to influence Members of Congress against H. R. 4051, or any similar legislation. I just received the information today. I will investigate between now and January 1, and if the facts are as I believe them to be, I am serving notice now that I will on the 1st day of January file charges on this floor to impeach certain members of the Federal Power Commission for violation of a criminal statute.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. KUNKEL. Why do not these bureaucrats have to register under our lobby registration law, the same as anybody else who comes up here?

Mr. RIZLEY. May I say to my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania I think under the reorganization bill we might quite well provide that these bureaus be required to register so that we can make them amenable to the lobbying provisions of that act, the same as representatives of business.

Mr. KUNKEL. If they are registered, then we would have them.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MATHEWS. Well, I want to get through with this bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. MATHEWS. Is it on this bill?

Mr. RANKIN. I want to answer the gentleman. It sounds a little funny, with enough power trust and gas trust lobbyists in Washington to whip Japan, to jump on the members of the Federal Power Commission when we are discussing a pension bill. I will be glad to discuss the matter.

Mr. MATHEWS. I cannot yield to the gentleman. I am sorry, but I want this bill discussed on its merits.

I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made on the Parker-refuge bill and include certain letters and communications I have received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H. R. 4055?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

TO AMEND THE FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HOPE, from the Committee on Agriculture, submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1326) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1326) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That subsection (a) of section 508 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Commencing with crops planted for harvest in 1948, for the purpose of determining the most practical plan, terms, and conditions of insurance for agricultural commodities, if sufficient actuarial data are available, as determined by the Board, to insure, or to reinsure insurers of, producers of such agricultural commodities under any plan or plans of insurance determined by the Board to be adapted to any such commodity: *Provided*, That reinsurance for private insurance companies shall be limited to contracts covering farms in not to exceed twenty counties selected by the Board. Such insurance shall be against loss of the insured commodity while in the field due to unavoidable causes, including drought, flood, hail, wind, frost, winter-kill, lightning, fire, excessive rains, snow, wildlife, hurricane, tornado, insect infestation, plant disease, and such other unavoidable causes as may be determined by the Board. Any insurance offered against loss in yield shall not cover in excess of 75 per centum of the recorded or appraised average yield of the commodity on the insured farm, for a representative period subject to such adjustments as the Board may prescribe to the end that the average yields fixed for farms in the same area, which are subject to the same conditions, may be fair and just: *Provided*, That, if 75 per centum of the average yield represents generally more protection than the investment in the crop in any area, taking into consideration recognized farming practices, the Board shall reduce such maximum percentage so as more nearly to reflect the investment in the crop in such area. Insurance provided under this subsection shall not cover losses due to the neglect or malfeasance of the producer, or to the failure of the producer to reseed to the same crop in areas and under circumstances where it is customary to so reseed, or to the failure of the producer to follow established good farming practices. In 1948 insurance shall be limited to not more than seven crops (including wheat, cotton, flax, corn, and tobacco) and to not more than three additional crops in each year thereafter. Insurance provided for any agricultural commodity, except wheat, cotton, flax, corn, and tobacco, shall be limited to producers in not to exceed twenty counties. Insurance for wheat, cotton, corn, flax, and tobacco shall be limited to producers in not to exceed two hundred counties in the case of wheat, fifty-six counties in the case of cotton, fifty counties each in the case of corn and flax, and thirty-five counties in the case of tobacco. Counties selected by the Board shall be representative of the several areas where the agricultural commodity insured is normally produced. Insurance shall not be provided in any county unless written applications therefor are filed covering at least two hundred farms or one-third of the farms normally producing the agricultural commodity; nor shall insurance of any agricultural commodity be provided in any county in which the Board determines that the income from such commodity constitutes an unimportant part of the total agricultural income of the county. The Board may limit or refuse insurance in any county or area, or on any farm, on the basis of the insurance risk involved. The Corporation shall report annually to the Congress the results of its operations as to each commodity insured.'

"SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 508 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: '*Provided*, That such premiums may be established on the basis of the parity or comparable price for the commodity as determined and published by the Secretary of Agriculture, or on the basis of an average market price designated by the Board.'

"SEC. 3. Subsection (c) of section 508 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by striking out in the first sentence 'however,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'That indemnities may be determined on the same price basis as premiums are determined for the crop with respect to which such indemnities are paid: *Provided, further,*'.

"SEC. 4. Section 502 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 502. It is the purpose of this title to promote the national welfare by improving the economic stability of agriculture through a sound system of crop insurance and providing the means for the research and experience helpful in devising and establishing such insurance.'

"SEC. 5. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect the validity of any insurance contract entered into prior to the enactment of this Act insofar as such contract covers the 1947 crop year. Any such contract which purports to cover a crop in the 1948 or any subsequent crop year in any county in which insurance on such crop will be discontinued pursuant to this Act is hereby terminated at the end of the 1947 crop year.

"SEC. 6. Subsection (d) of section 507 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end of the subsection and inserting a comma and the following: 'except that employees or agencies responsible for administering this Act in each county shall be selected and designated by the Corporation and shall be responsible directly to the Corporation without the intervention of any intermediate office or agency.'

"SEC. 7. Subsection (d) of section 506 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(d) Subject to the provisions of section 508 (c), may sue and be sued in its corporate name in any court of record of a State having general jurisdiction, or in any United States district court, and jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon such district court to determine such controversies without regard to the amount in controversy: *Provided*, That no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Corporation or its property.'

"SEC. 8. Section 505 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 505. (a) The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a Board of Directors (hereinafter called the "Board") subject to the general supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture. The Board shall consist of the manager of the Corporation, two other persons employed in the Department of Agriculture, and two persons experienced in the insurance business who are not otherwise employed by the Government. The Board shall be appointed by, and hold office at the pleasure of the Secretary of Agriculture, who shall not, himself, be a member of the Board.

"'(b) Vacancies in the Board so long as there shall be three members in office shall not impair the powers of the Board to execute the functions of the Corporation, and three of the members in office shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of the business of the Board.

"'(c) The Directors of the Corporation who are employed in the Department of Agriculture shall receive no additional compensation for their services as such Directors but may be allowed necessary traveling and subsistence expenses when engaged in business of the Corporation, outside of the District of Columbia. The members of the Board who are not employed by the Government shall be paid such compensation for their services as Directors as the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine, but such compensation shall not exceed $100 per day each when actually employed and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses when engaged in business of the Corporation away from their homes or regular places of business.

"'(d) The manager of the Corporation shall be its chief executive officer, with such power and authority as may be conferred upon him by the Board. He shall be appointed by, and hold office at the pleasure of, the Secretary of Agriculture.'"

And the House agree to the same.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.,
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
WILLIAM HILL,
HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1326) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The amendment of the House struck out all after the enacting clause in the Senate bill and substituted the language of H. R. 3465. The conference agreement is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment and is identical with the House amendment except as hereafter explained.

In the matter of the number of counties in which crop insurance is to be offered, the Senate bill provided for wheat in 633 counties, for flax in 87 counties, for cotton in 56 counties, and 50 counties each for corn and tobacco. The House amendment provided for insurance in not to exceed 50 counties in the case of wheat, corn, and cotton and not to exceed 25 in the case of flax and tobacco. The agreement reached by the conference would authorize wheat insurance in 200 counties, cotton insurance in 56 counties, corn and flax insurance in 50 counties each, and tobacco insurance in 35 counties.

The Senate bill proposed to increase the Board of Directors from three to five members by the addition of two persons not employed in the Department of Agriculture who are experienced in the insurance business. The House amendment contained no such provision. The conference substitute includes the Senate provision.

The Senate bill contained an authorization for the Corporation to sue and be sued in its corporate name in any court of record of a State having general jurisdiction or in any United States district court, without regard to the amount in controversy. No corresponding provision was contained in the House amendment. The conference substitute includes this provision.

In the matter of reinsurance, the Senate bill contained a provision limiting reinsurance to not more than 20 counties for all commodities. The House amendment did not contain this provision. The conference substitute includes this provision of the Senate bill.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
WILLIAM HILL,
JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.,
HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1326) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement as above set out.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the conference report fully explains the changes that were made by the conferees. Unless there are some questions, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

MRS. M. LACY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following request, which was read by the Clerk:

REQUEST TO WITHDRAW PAPERS

JULY 25, 1947.

Mr. REES requests, pursuant to rule 38, leave to withdraw from the files of the House papers in the case of Mrs. M. Lacy, H. R. 7237, Seventy-ninth Congress, no adverse report having been filed thereon.

EDWARD H. REES.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request will be granted.

There was no objection.

MRS. E. L. HAMILTON

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following request, which was read by the Clerk:

REQUEST TO WITHDRAW PAPERS

JULY 26, 1947.

Mr. REES requests, pursuant to rule 33, leave to withdraw from the files of the House, papers in the case of Mrs. E. L. Hamilton, H. R. 7238, Seventy-ninth Congress, no adverse report having been filed thereon.

EDWARD H. REES.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request will be granted.

There was no objection.

TO PROTECT AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 597) to protect American agriculture, horticulture, livestock, and the public health by prohibiting the unauthorized importation into, or the depositing in the territorial waters of the United States of garbage derived from products originating outside of the continental United States, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 4, line 16, after "vehicle", insert "entering the United States."

Page 4, line 21, after "vehicle", insert "entering the United States."

Page 5, lines 4 and 5, strike out "on vessels, railway cars, aircraft, or other vehicles within" and insert "within the United States on vessels, railway cars, aircraft, or other vehicles entering."

Page 5, strike out lines 9 to 23, inclusive.

Page 5, line 24, strike out "4" and insert "3."

Page 6, strike out lines 3 to 14, inclusive.

Page 6, line 15, strike out "6" and insert "4."

Page 7, line 18, strike out "7" and insert "5."

Page 8, line 3, strike out "8" and insert "6."

Page 8, line 7, strike out "9" and insert "7."

Page 8, line 18, strike out "10" and insert "8."

Page 9, line 1, strike out "11" and insert "9."

Page 9, after line 4, insert:

"SEC. 10. Nothing in this act shall be construed as in any way affecting the authority of the Surgeon General under part G of title III of the Public Health Service Act, as amend (42 U. S. C. 264–272)."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DELANEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

HON. EVAN HOWELL

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to pay tribute to my good friend, the Honorable EVAN E. HOWELL, of the Twenty-first Congressional District of Illinois, who soon will be leaving this body to take up his new work as judge on the United States Court of Claims, which appointment was confirmed by the Senate day before yesterday. EV HOWELL is now serving his fourth term in Congress and during such period has rendered outstanding service to his district and the Nation. He has been an active and influential member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on which committee he is now the third ranking Republican member. Of course many of us who have been privileged to serve with Congressman HOWELL, regret to see him leave this body yet each and everyone realizes that he is stepping into a new position of importance for which he is so eminently qualified. There is no question in my mind but that Ev will make an outstanding judge.

Mr. Speaker, the privilege to serve in the Congress of the United States, does not come to too many people. The friendships made here are of lifetime duration and such a friendship has grown up between Ev and myself. I know Judge HOWELL will not forget his associations in the House of Representatitives nor will we forget him.

I am glad to have had the chance to serve with you, Ev, sorry that you are going, but wish you all good luck in your new work and trust that you will be supremely happy. My congratulations to you and your splendid family and we will enjoy seeing you from time to time even though it may not be in daily contact such as has been our pleasure during the past 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I know of no one in my service in the House of Representatives who has brought to his legislative duties, diligence and devotion exceeded by that of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL]. While we regret that he leaves this great legislative body, not only is he to be congratulated but the Court of Claims of the United States is to be congratulated on inheriting a fine lawyer and a great citizen.

So we bid Brother HOWELL Godspeed and wish him well in this new endeavor. He has endeared himself to every Member of the House, particularly to the Members of the Illinois delegation. So our best wishes go with you in this new venture.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCMILLEN].

Mr. MCMILLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my gratitude for the honor that has been conferred on my distinguished colleague from Illinois, Congressman HOWELL, who represents a district adjoining mine. I have known him for many years as a citizen and lawyer at Springfield, Ill. I practiced before him as a referee in bankruptcy.

Mr. Speaker, there are others who should share in this honor with Mr. HOWELL. I have in mind particularly his splendid wife, his three children, and his very highly esteemed father and mother who live in my district at Champaign, Ill. EVAN HOWELL spent his childhood, his young manhood, went to the grade schools, the high school, and finally graduated from the University of Illinois all in my district. He has many friends throughout that district. I wish him every possible continued success.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, may I say that that committee likewise feels honored in the fact that its distinguished member from Illinois has been selected for this high position in the Judicial Department of the Government. I have had the privilege of serving with EVAN HOWELL now for 7 years.

He has exhibited a high degree of statesmanship, intelligence, and industry in his approach to the complicated problems of that committee. I am sure that we are all delighted that he will not leave the vicinity of Washington so that we may have the privilege of his very delightful company in years to come. He is one who most completely fills the bill as a gentleman and a scholar. He is our good friend and fine companion—our teammate and a leader among us. We will miss him in the Congress and as a stanch member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I cannot say in a short time all the good things I would like to about EVAN HOWELL, nor could anyone else. He has been a distinct asset to the membership of this House ever since he first came here.

He is a Member who has taken the work very seriously; he has made a good Member of Congress from the State of Illinois. The State of Illinois certainly will miss him as a legislator in the House of Representatives. But the United States Court of Claims is going to gain because of the fact that he has had experience here and because of the fact he has been able to get a slant on congressional work which will so greatly benefit him in his work on the court of claims.

I realize that it is a matter of judicial mind, and he has that. He is a friend and has been a friend of the Members of this House, and it has been a grand thing to be associated with him and his family. EVAN HOWELL is a fine fellow. He has one of the finest wives and a lot of little children that are just growing up that make for him the greatest asset of his life in the fact that his family coming on will certainly be a joy and a pleasure for him. Then, again, he is leaving a salary here of $15,000 and he is going to get $17,500. That is going to help that family a lot, and I am glad he is going to get it, because he is worth every dollar of it. I do not begrudge him 1 cent of that money.

I wish EVAN HOWELL Godspeed wherever he goes and in whatever he does, and I am sure he will do a good job as a member of the claims court.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE].

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, the association that one forms in this body and in the committees that we are on is very strong among the Members. For years EVAN HOWELL has been a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He has rendered to the Congress and to the country a great service in the time that he has been in this House. I congratulate him upon his appointment. I wish him well. I wish him success and happiness in the new position that he is now taking.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BISHOP].

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [EVAN HOWELL] was born in the Twenty-fifth District of Illinois, a district I have the honor to represent. He comes from a humble family, from a family that knows the hardships of life, a family that has worked hard to make possible his standing in this country today. The gentleman from Illinois [EVAN HOWELL], with myself and three other Members, came to the Seventy-seventh Congress together. We have served together for 6½ years, and I am sure that I, as an individual, will miss him a great deal, because his advice and counsel along legal lines has been of great advantage to me. I am sure that he and his family will prosper in the program which lies ahead of him. I certainly wish him and his family the best of life.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. One of the finest associations of my career in this body has been with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL]. He has been of great assistance to me, and I shall greatly miss him.

Our loss is the gain of the Court of Claims, to which he has been appointed by the President. It is a well deserved recognition of his ability. It is a well deserved recognition of the quiet, fair and impartial manner in which he always views public issues.

I served with the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL] on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and he made an important contribution to the work of that committee, as he has to every important issue that has come before us.

We shall miss EVAN HOWELL. We shall miss his services. But some satisfaction is to be gained from the fact that he will have his office here in Washington and from time to time we will have the privilege of seeing him.

Evan, you take with you our very best wishes and affectionate regards. We wish you every success. We wish you the best of luck.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, for more than 5 years EVAN HOWELL and I have been next-door neighbors on the seventh floor of the New House Office Building. Therefore, I have had an opportunity of knowing and being with him a great deal during these years. That relationship has always been cordial and pleasant. I consider EVAN HOWELL a Member of the House of unusual capacity. He is always patient and fair in his consideration of and dealings with legislation and with other Members of Congress. I have also served as a member of the Small Business Committee with him and have been present many times when he has conducted hearings. I think he truly has a judicial temperament. While we dislike very much to lose him and his fine ability in the House, I predict for him a long and splendid career as a member of the judiciary on the Court of Claims. We will miss him on the Hill but we are glad that he will continue to serve the Nation in a most important capacity.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I know of no one in the Illinois delegation whose appointment would be received with so much popularity as that of our distinguished colleague, EVAN HOWELL. I have known him for a great many years, both in and out of public office.

In addition to his talents as a lawyer and as a public servant, Evan has the rare faculty of making friends wherever he goes. As a teacher in northern Illinois, as a student at the university, having been raised in southern Illinois and later moving to Springfield, which district he has represented, he has made friends throughout the State of Illinois. He is a worthy successor in the district of Abraham Lincoln. I am sure he will continue to make the same splendid record as a judge of the United States Court of Claims that he has in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY].

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, in January of 1941, in the Seventy-seventh Congress, I took the oath of office. In that Congress was the gentleman who has been appointed as an asscciate justice of the Court of Claims, Mr. HOWELL, whom I have come to know and admire and like very much over these years. He is modest, unassuming, with a profound capacity for work and ability to perform his chores. I know the House of Representatives has been a good influence on the gentleman from Illinois. I know the environment here

has been excellent, as it is to any Member. I have no fear but that his environment on the Court of Claims will be equally as good, because my distinguished predecessor, the Honorable Marvin Jones, is now Chief Justice of that great court. So, Evan, we wish you the very best of luck, and will remember you for years to come. Here is wishing you and yours the very best of everything.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I feel that not only the Illinois delegation but all the Members of this House are losing a very loyal, active, and capable colleague, who has made a splendid record as a legislator. I know he will make an equal record in the new high position to which he has been appointed. I am obliged to express to the Republicans the sympathy to which they are entitled in losing such an outstanding and capable member as Mr. HOWELL, and equally to congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the others in expressing regret because EVAN HOWELL is leaving us. We are sad, at the same time we are glad, because he is receiving an appointment which he covets. He has earned his spurs as a legislator and he will make good as a judge. These tributes of today will be more appreciated tomorrow. Evan, there must be much satisfaction in this House for you. What your colleagues think of you will be of interest to your family. In the years to come your small children will read with pride the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 26, 1947. May you live long and enjoy every day of every year.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, it has been truly said that all members of a great family rejoice over the success of any one of its members. We all rejoice with you, Evan, on the success that you have had in being selected as judge of the Court of Claims. I, too, came here in 1941 with EVAN HOWELL. It has been my privilege to come to know him rather intimately during these years. It has also been my privilege to serve with him on our great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I had the privilege and opportunity of observing his work, his actions, his sincerity, honesty, and integrity. Evan, I wish you Godspeed and that you may continue to be happy in your new work which I know you will perform with the same diligence that you applied to your work here in the Halls of Congress.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce as well as my other colleagues of the House in congratulating EVAN HOWELL on his appointment to the Court of Claims. For the 5 years that I have known EVAN HOWELL I have come to recognize that he is highly qualified in a professional way as a lawyer and is a man of the very highest integrity. The gain of the bench in this instance is a loss to the House of Representatives. I am sure his great capacity for public service of the highest kind will continue to be exercised to the fullest extent in his future endeavor.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a mingling of happiness and regret that I rise to speak at this time. I am happy in the thought that the President of the United States has seen fit to recognize the character and ability of our esteemed colleague EVAN HOWELL, and appoint him a Judge of the Court of Claims. On the other hand, there is a deep sense of regret in the knowledge that we will lose his help and guidance in the important matters that come before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as well as in the House itself. While the time that it has been my privilege to be associated with him has in a sense been short, it being only 6 years, it has been sufficiently long for me to understand the underlying character and sense of justice that is so dominant in him. He is an individual who not only has ability but character as well. He is logical in arriving at conclusions. His judgment is good. He has served his district and country faithfully and well. I regret exceedingly that our Committee and the House will lose his services. In conclusion, may I be permitted merely to say that he also possesses that rare quality which is as necessary for a judge to have as the quality of ability. He has a judicial temperament and I know of nothing that can more truly attest to his future success than the knowledge that he approaches all questions with an open mind and with a judicial temperament so necessary in the administration of law. He goes from the House of Representatives and from our committee with a feeling of deep regret not only upon the part of myself, as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, but also of all his colleages in the House and on the Committee of Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I agree with everything that has been said about this very personable individual, but I requested that I be given this opportunity to say a word, because I am moved perhaps from a different impulse than the average Member of Congress from Illinois, who knows this man so intimately. I am moved from the impulse of a lawyer. It has been my good fortune in the days when I was young and happy to try hundreds of lawsuits before many judges. I never found a judge that was dishonest, but I found some that were very disagreeable. But this man has the qualities of a real judge. I predict for him great success. I know he will grace his position with honor and dignity. I hope the time will come when he is promoted to some other bench which he can grace more forcefully and successfully and probably will be a great improvement over some who are there now. But anyway, I look for you to be a great judge, EVAN HOWELL, regardless of the fact that you have been a Congressman.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, came to Congress in 1941, along with EVAN HOWELL. I have never had the privilege of serving on a committee with him, but the two of us, along with other Members, lived in the same community, and we got to know each other real well. I came to love him a great deal. His friendly disposition, his ability to get along with people and endear himself to friends, make him more than qualified for this position. His temperament to be a judge, his will to succeed, I know, will go along with him and make him one of the outstanding men to grace the bench.

We will miss you, "Ev," but we know you will be thinking of us, and certainly we will be thinking of you. God bless you.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, one of the most precious things that comes to any of us during our brief sojourn on this planet is the friendship of the friends that we make along the way. That is peculiarly true, Mr. Speaker, of our brief service as Members of the House of Representatives.

During the years I have been in Congress I have been in a neighboring office with EVAN HOWELL. His has been one of those priceless friendships that has grown up over the years. An able, outstanding member of the Illinois bar, he distinguishes himself equally as well as a Member of the House. The legislative branch of our Government is losing one of its outstanding legislators while at the same time the judicial branch of the Government is inheriting from us a man who promises a distinguished public career on the Federal bench. The people of America are to be congratulated that we have a man like this to become a member of the United States Court of Claims. We wish for Evan in this new assignment that very distinguished public career that we know will be his.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.].

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, the record which we make today for our friend and colleague, EVAN HOWELL, will not be bound up in a black book with gold letters to be presented to his descendants, but is rather in the form of much more desired tributes from the living to the living.

In the full vigor and enthusiasm and zeal which all of us feel at the beginning

of the session, few of us regard the transfer to any other position than that of Member of Congress as a promotion, because I believe all of us share in the mutual high regard for the responsibilities which attend all of us in membership in this House. But toward the end of the session, when we are all weary and ready to go home, I suppose there is a great deal of envy on the part of us as we think of our friend, EVAN HOWELL, moving on to a lifetime of judicial service. While those of us here who make the laws are losing a beloved colleague, those who are to continue to interpret the body of the law are gaining an eminent, able, and valuable addition to their ranks.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, EVAN HOWELL has not been known on this floor to be a man of many words. He has been a man of great work and much activity.

Somebody has fittingly said that for any man to be successful in the practice of the law or on the bench he must "work like a horse and live like a hermit." I believe EVAN HOWELL typifies all that is expressed in that line.

He leaves this Chamber with the respect, and the regret, of all of us. As he goes to his new assignment on the bench he carries with him, I am sure, the good wishes of the membership of the House of Representatives.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say a sentence, and that is that it has been a great pleasure to know this fine, friendly, able gentleman, EVAN HOWELL, and I wish him and his well for all the years to come.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, after several years of pleasurable association with Mr. HOWELL, I have learned to appreciate him as a fine friend and fine man. I know he is a good Congressman. He has that studious, considerate, conscientious quality that makes a good Congressman. I can without hesitation predict that he will make a fine judge. I know one thing for a certainty, he is just naturally a gentleman. On the bench he will typify the just judge. Lawyers will appear before him with confidence of fair treatment and an honest judgment. The hearty good will of the Members of this House and particularly of those of us who have served with him on committees, will go with him in the high position with which he has been honored. I regret he is leaving Congress but I know he will be a credit to the bench of our country.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, before yielding the last 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, I ask unanimous consent that all members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues from Illinois in wishing well to an able and distinguished member of our State delegation who at the close of the first session of this Eightieth Congress will terminate his fine service in the House to don the judicial robes on the Court of Claims under appointment of President Truman.

We Illinoisans are happy to see this great honor come to our State and we are pleased that our friend and coworker from Springfield, the Honorable EVAN HOWELL, has thus been recognized. We know that EV HOWELL will serve with great honor in his new position and we feel that the court has gained an able jurist.

I have known Congressman HOWELL almost since his first day as a Member of this House. He has been a fine friend, an honest and able legislator, sincere in his efforts in behalf of the people he represented. I am truly happy that his wonderful ability has been recognized by the President.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday opportunity was given the Members to express their gratification over the selection of one of their associates to serve on the Federal Communications Commission. Our highly respected colleague, the Honorable ROBERT JONES, of Ohio, was thus honored. Once again opportunity is given us to voice our delight with the appointment of another of our associates to a position of great responsibility. Many fine things have been spoken regarding our colleague, EVAN HOWELL, all of which have been richly deserved by him and all of which have been approved by those who have not had an opportunity to speak.

As each of these selections of Members of the House to serve in positions of greater responsibility in the affairs of Government occur, I feel that all of us can well feel qualified to bask in reflected glory. In honoring those individuals, the President has thus honored us. Being so highly respected by us as those individuals are we are permitted the opportunity to share their pride and gratification on thus having their talents and capabilities recognized by the Chief Executive of the Nation.

I personally shall always treasure the privilege of having been able to know and to serve with these gentlemen. They are the kind of people which makes safe the future of America. To them both go the deep affection and best wishes which an understanding and appreciative Congress can give to devoted, loyal, capable, and sincere public servants.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to extend my personal congratulations to my colleague from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL] on his appointment to the United States Court of Claims. He has served with distinction in this House and he will serve with distinction on the bench. Indeed, we should congratulate the President of the United States on the wisdom of his choice.

I consider EVAN HOWELL one of the finest men I have been privileged to know. He has served his district well and he has made a real contribution to the work of Congress. He will be greatly missed. Throughout his service in Congress, he exhibited real statesmanship and unusual ability. He is by professional attainment and by temperament eminently qualified for a place on the Federal bench.

I join with the entire delegation from Illinois in wishing our distinguished colleague continued success. He takes with him our highest regards, best wishes, and genuine affection.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as the first session of the Eightieth Congress is drawing rapidly to a close, we of the Illinois delegation realize that the congressional career of one of our esteemed and able colleagues is likewise coming to an end. Congressman EVAN HOWELL has for 7 years represented the great State of Illinois in this body with honor and distinction. His record as a legislator is one in which he and the voters of the Twenty-first Congressional District of Illinois will ever be mutually proud. The standard he has set for thoughtful consideration of public affairs is one which will be difficult to equal and is a lofty objective for those who succeed him. While we regret the severing of his service in the House of Representatives we rejoice in his elevation to the Court of Claims of the United States. An excellent lawyer, an experienced legislator, he will be an asset to the Federal bench. As he leaves to assume his new responsibilities, he takes with him the implicit confidence and sincere wishes of his colleagues from his own State, and the heartiest congratulations of the entire membership of this House.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure to know Mr. HOWELL for a number of years. As a matter of fact, we were acquainted before either of us stood for election to Congress. We were both elected to the same Congress—the Seventy-seventh. We live a little over 100 miles apart—he in Illinois and I in Missouri, and our friendship has been most enjoyable. It has been my privilege to know his capabilities and for the past several years, I served with him as a member of the House Small Business Committee.

Save that it meets with his satisfaction, I would much prefer to see him remain as a Member of the House of Representatives, where he has so ably served his people, and where his capabilities are known to other Members. It is my humble belief that it is in this House, or in this Congress, that a man has his greatest opportunity to serve his Nation in this critical reconstruction period in America.

But, then, there are other posts of great importance, and it is noticeable and valued that the distinguished gentleman from Illinois is of a judicious nature and temperament, with a deep understanding and appreciation of the law—so it is most natural that he would have an inclination and desire to serve in the judicial branch of the Government. The President selected extremely well in this instance. While it is a Congressional loss, it will be, in my opinion, a distinct gain for the bench when my good friend, Evan, begins his new career as judge of the Court of Claims.

My every wish is for his distinction in that service and for his happiness. I re-

gret exceedingly his loss to the Congress, and particularly to the House Small Business Committee, over which it is my responsibility to preside.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL].

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues of the House of Representatives, certainly one would be inhuman indeed were he not to appreciate the many fine and generous expressions that have been made by the Members of this great body here today. I say at the same time that it is almost beyond human capacity to be able to respond in a proper manner.

Certainly I have enjoyed my years in the House of Representatives, the friendship, and the acquaintance of every single Member with whom it has been my privilege to serve beginning with the Seventy-seventh Congress in January of 1941.

I remember the first day it was my privilege to sit in this Chamber, when I looked about the room, the paintings, the various appointments, I meditated: "Well, this is the Seventy-seventh Congress that has met. Think of the 76 Congresses that have gone before and the contributions the men and women of those Congresses have made in shaping, molding, and preserving this the greatest republic on the face of the earth, the United States of America." And I was impressed that there would be Congresses in the future; that the Seventy-seventh would pass into the Seventy-eighth, and that into the Seventy-ninth, and so on; and, Mr. Speaker, while I have been here only during seven sessions, I have been impressed each time a Congress adjourned and each time a new Congress convened. So next January when the second session of the Eightieth Congress convenes, and I will be amongst the missing you may be sure my thoughts will be here with the men and women who represent the 435 congressional districts in the 48 States of the United States of America.

The richness of the friendships that come to a man in a body like this cannot be found anywhere else in the world. In what other body is it possible for men and women to meet, become acquainted with, and enjoy the friendship of men and women from every single one of the 48 States of America? Someone has referred to the other body as the most exclusive club in the world. Certainly, if it is that, this is the greatest fraternity in the world because, regardless of politics, regardless of the section of the country from which one comes, there is still that underlying foundation for firm and lasting friendship which I have enjoyed as much as anyone who has been privileged to serve here.

Over and above that is the ideal of this representative form of government. This body, which is most responsible for the preservation of our form of government and the contributions we make here as we do, exercising the very best of our ability in the interest of the people we are sent here to represent, gives us an understanding and I think a closeness of bond that we would not find in any other than such a capacity. In leaving my capacity as a Representative here and assuming a judicial post in one of the finest courts of the United States of America, under one of the finest Chief Justices, I want you to know I look forward to that service as I did to this service in the representative branch of the Government.

In this, my final speech on the floor of Congress, I want to thank the fine people of the Twenty-first Congressional District of Illinois for all the good things they have done for me in sending me here for four consecutive terms. Let me assure them that it has been a great pleasure and high honor to be their representative in this body, where exactly 100 years ago their representative was the immortal Abraham Lincoln.

Again I want to express my appreciation to every single Member of the House of Representatives on both sides of the aisle for the kindness and the friendship shown to me during my years of service here, not to say farewell today, but to say in the most appropriate terms in the English language, "I will be seeing you."

AUTHORIZING CONVERSIONS OF CERTAIN VESSELS

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1215) to authorize conversions of certain naval vessels.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of improving the military characteristics of combatant and auxiliary vessels of the United States Navy, the President of the United States is hereby authorized to convert such vessels as he may consider best suited for the purposes of national defense without limitation on expenditures for any one vessel within the total sum appropriated for the purpose.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week the House passed a similar bill which required the Secretary of the Navy to submit to Congress certain reports and also prohibited the conversion of vessels from one type to another. My understanding is that the Navy Department has no objection to those amendments; however, the Senate bill does not contain them. Those in the House interested in the bill are satisfied to have the Senate bill adopted with the understanding that the Navy Department will respect the House amendments.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE HONORABLE JOHN TABER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am impelled by a rather deep conviction to say something in behalf of a member who is not leaving this House but who has carried a monumental burden since the Eightieth Congress convened. Sometimes I feel there is a strange destiny that brings the right man at the right time to the right job. There appears to me a very singular fitness about the fact that JOHN TABER who has served so long in this House should become the chairman of the Appropriations Committee at a time when there was so much fever and tumult in the air, when the transition from war to peace was so difficult, when everyone knew that the burden of piloting and supervising the many appropriations bills involving billions of dollars would be a tremendous chore. That has been the task to which he has addressed himself. The work begins early in the year and it continues right up to the hour of adjournment. I say this today in his behalf because he has been the target of very considerable abuse in the press. Ungracious commentators and columnists who, in my judgment, are uninformed about his labors and about his contributions have often taken his name in vain. Uninformed editorial writers have so frequently resorted to names and to epithets, but JOHN TABER has never faltered in his responsibility as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. He had the courage to sit on an appropriation until a Cabinet member or some agency head came and answered the question as to what they were going to do with the money; how it was to be expended, and whether the request was justified. There was no timidity about him, and he has never for one moment faltered in his responsibility. So, may it be said to his everlasting credit, that when the score of the first session of the Eightieth Congress is written, there will stand for all time a great monument, if you please, in the form of billions of dollars saved or rescinded, and that is language that the people of this country can understand. It has been no easy task. First, there was the effort of the bureaucracy to keep appropriations high; secondly, there was the sustained effort on the part of hundreds of thousands to remain on the pay roll, if they could, and which is a very natural desire; and, third, there were the difficulties of persuading the Members of this Congress on both sides of the aisle on many occasions that economy was one of the keystones in our program. So, we must march forward under that banner. I have a great affection for JOHN TABER. I know the prodigious effort, the incredible effort and energy since the first of the year that he has devoted to the legislative budget and to this great concourse of appropriation bills that have gone across this floor aggregating billions of dollars, and I think the Congress and the people owe him a great debt of gratitude. That will be the answer for the vilification, for the abuse, and for the castigations that we have so often seen in the press and heard over the air.

THE LATE MARTHA E. TRUMAN

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay a brief tribute to a very brave and gallant little lady. Mrs. Martha Truman, the mother of our President, who passed away today in Jackson County, Mo., will long be remembered by a host of friends in that community. She had an unfaltering faith in the goodness of her God. She believed in the fine and noble things of life. She loved her country and its institutions. Her life and her character were an inspiration, not only to the President and his family, but to all who knew her. It was fitting and proper that today, this House, by resolution, expressed its sincere sympathy to the President and his family.

ARCHBISHOP ALOYSIUS STEPINAC

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on the day of the opening of this Congress, January 3, 1947, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution No. 4 protesting the trial and imprisonment of Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac and other clergymen, as well as the denial of religious freedom in Communist Yugoslavia. My resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and when the committee failed to take any definite action in regard to this legislation, I filed Discharge Petition No. 5 on May 14, 1947. There has been a great deal of interest manifested in this petition by an aroused public and I have received letters and postcards by the score from every section of the country and from people representing every faith and denomination. The interest shown by these people has been most gratifying to me as it demonstrates that they are anxious to have this shocking injustice rectified.

I deplore the fact that Congress has not taken definite action in connection with this legislation during the present session. I do hope that Members of the House who have not already signed Discharge Petition No. 5 will consider affixing their signatures before the final adjournment of the House today. I do hope that when we reconvene my petition will have the required number of signatures needed to bring this humanitarian legislation to the floor of the House for debate and action.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Burke, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bill of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2173. An act to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 2659. An act to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance, and provide for the medical and scientific treatment of persons found to be alcoholics by the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3045. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe the processes and procedures for recording instruments of writing in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include a resolution.

Mr. GWINN of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on Federal aid to education.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of serving on the Committee on Agriculture through this session of Congress. A good many people have asked me, "What have you done? What have you accomplished?" This is my answer:

During the session of Congress just closing, the Committee on Agriculture has taken action which is important to every farmer in the country and to the Nation as a whole.

During the session the committee has considered more than 125 bills and resolutions. It has reported and recommended action on 24 of these proposed measures. Included among them are some of vital interest to every farmer.

Shortly after the session started, the committee was called upon to take immediate action to protect American livestock against foot and mouth disease, which broke out in Mexico last December. Acting promptly, the committee recommended passage of a measure authorizing the United States Department of Agriculture to go into Mexico and carry on there a fight against this most dreaded livestock disease. That bill became Public Law No. 8 of the Eightieth Congress and the campaign against foot and mouth disease has been going on in Mexico for the past several months.

The national policy of the country calls for the protection of a part of our sugar supplies in the United States. During this session the Committee on Agriculture reported to the Congress a carefully drawn bill which will provide the basis for orderly production of sugar for the next 5 years.

Insecticides have become increasingly a part of the farmers equipment. Not the least of the committee's accomplishment during the year was to thoroughly overhaul and revise the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act in order to bring it up to date, compel accurate labelling, and assure farmers that when they buy one of these chemicals, they will be able to tell plainly from the labels exactly what they are paying their money for.

In the same vein, the committee has thoroughly overhauled the law for protection of forest lands against insects and diseases, bringing it up to date and providing for the most modern defenses of our forest resources.

Further protection to American agriculture, horticulture, and forestry was provided by the committee in its revision of the Plant Quarantine Act of 1912, in order to bring that act up to date and provide additional protection for American farmers against the inroads of foreign insects, pests, and plant diseases.

After considering the farm-labor program which was enacted during the war in order to spur production, the committee provided for a continuation of the program until the end of this year and for the disposal of housing facilities constructed for labor camps to States and local associations of farmers who want to purchase them for their own farm-labor programs.

One of the most important actions of the committee was to thoroughly revise the Federal crop-insurance law. Since its inception in 1938, crop insurance has lost money in every year. The committee believes that farmers are entitled to crop insurance if they want it, but that this insurance must be businesslike, actuarially sound, and not a continual drain on the public Treasury. It, therefore, reduced the crop-insurance program to an experimental basis, with instructions to the Department of Agriculture to experiment with various kinds and types of insurance and to work out a sound system of crop insurance if one can be devised.

Not the least of the committee's action on behalf of American farmers in this session of Congress was its refusal to stampede into taking action on a number of proposals which were urged upon the committee, but which are of such major importance that they can be considered only as part of an over-all, long-range agricultural program. Among these was the extension of the Marketing Agreements Act so that it would include all agricultural commodities, further liberalization of the Federal Land Bank loaning authority, the revision of parity, and similar basic programs. Such legislation is logically a part of the long-range agricultural program upon which the committee is now at work and to which it will devote almost the entire recess between now and the reconvening of Congress in January 1948.

LETTER FROM APPOINTEE TO NAVAL ACADEMY

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in all the years of my service in the House I have of course received correspondence that was stimulating and pleasing, but seldom if ever have I received a letter that was more pleasant, more stimulating, and more edifying than one I received recently from a fine young lad whom I have never met, but whom I was privileged to designate for appointment to the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis. He is the son of a merchant tailor. If you want to find out how some of these splendid future officers of the line really feel, how deserving they are of your confidence, I suggest that you read this letter:

UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY,
Annapolis, Md., July 14, 1947.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: I would like to say thank you, as sincerely and as simply as it is possible. Yet, I'm afraid you or anybody else for that matter couldn't fully comprehend the depth of my gratitude to you. It is indeed a high tribute to the American way of life that a humble tailor's son, such as I, could be and was given the opportunity to make something of himself in a paradise such as Annapolis. It's really great the way an unknown fellow without political or financial pull of any kind can be given the chance that I was given. I don't think it is necessary for me to flounder about in a sea of words when it is probably quite apparent to you just what I'm trying to say. My folks are very happy folks now that their son has made the initial grade at Annapolis. When I stop to think, as I often do, that all this pride, prestige, honor, and glory could not have been possible without you and your sincere help and interest, I just don't know quite what to do or say. Through you, I have been able to partly repay my wonderful mom and dad for all that they have done for me. Mr. DINGELL, I thank you from the bottom of my heart.

My stay here at Annapolis is going to be doubly sweet, for just the other night I ran into Jim Foley while at the movie at MacDonough Hall. Jim is also one of your appointees from the fifteenth district. Jim and I grew up together, went to school together, won a first alternate appointment from you last year together, we both didn't make it in 1946, we both were appointed as principals by you this year, and we both passed. Jim's dad works in the Post Office in Detroit. Neither of us knew that the other had made the grade until we met in the movie hall. Just imagine the rumpus we made. This whole series of events, leading up to my initial success here, thanks to you, is something I'll never forget.

Very sincerely and gratefully yours,
Midshipman JOHNNY N. MEHELAS,
Fourth Class.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman will state it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will there be more suspensions and unanimous-consent requests today?

The SPEAKER. The Chair may say that very shortly he is going to exercise the authority that has been given him to declare a recess. The bells will ring 20 minutes prior to the reconvening of the House.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will there be opportunity for suspensions at the conclusion of the recess?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not making any statement with reference to that at this time. There is always such an opportunity, of course, until the House has adjourned.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On July 24, 1947:

H. R. 1609. An act to authorize the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska to provide for the exercise of zoning power in town sites on the public lands of the United States;

H. R. 1882. An act for expenditure of funds for cooperating with the public-school board at Walker, Minn., for the extension of public-school facilities to be available to all Indian children in the district;

H. R. 2151. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Erle E. Howe;

H. R. 3343. An act to amend the Alaska game law;

H. R. 3513. An act to transfer the Panama Railroad pension fund to the civil-service retirement and disability fund;

H. R. 4011. An act to amend section 1602 of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act;

H. R. 734. An act to amend the act of February 12, 1925, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1337. An act authorizing a per capita payment of $50 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 1486. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Alice Scott White a patent in fee to certain land;

H. R. 1554. An act to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the transfer of the duties authorized and authority conferred by law upon the board of road commissioners in the Territory of Alaska to the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1932;

H. R. 2097. An act to declare the ownership of the timber on the allotments on the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, and to authorize the sale thereof;

H. R. 2825. An act to provide additional funds for cooperation with public-school districts (organized and unorganized) in Mahnomen, Itasca, Pine, Becker, and Cass Counties, Minn., in the construction, improvement, and extension of school facilities to be available to both Indian and white children;

H. R. 2885. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Becker Little Light;

H. R. 2886. An act authorizing the sale, under supervision, of land of Richard Little Light; and

H. R. 3598. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Pacific coast and creating the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission.

On July 25, 1947:

H. R. 187. An act to amend Public Law 304, Seventy-seventh Congress;

H. R. 1162. An act for the relief of Persis M. Nichols;

H. R. 2225. An act authorizing the transfer to the United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, by the War Assets Administration of a portion of Fort McIntosh at Laredo, Tex., and certain personal property in connection therewith, without exchange of funds or reimbursement;

H. R. 2314. An act to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942, as amended, and to amend section 2 of the act of June 16, 1936, as amended, so as to authorize lump-sum payments under the said acts to the survivors of deceased officers without administration of estates;

H. R. 4106. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2484. An act to authorize the payment of certain sums to jobbers in connection with their logging of timber for the Menominee Indians on the Menominee Reservation during the logging season 1934–35, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3191. An act to amend Public Law 301, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved February 18, 1946, so as to extend the benefits of the Missing Persons Act, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, to certain members of the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines;

H. R. 175. An act to confer upon the Governor of Alaska the power to pardon and remit fines and forfeitures for offenses against laws of the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 2956. An act to amend the Natural Gas Act, approved June 21, 1938;

H. R. 3243. An act for the relief of Roman Toporow;

H. R. 3323. An act to enable the Osage Tribal Council to determine the bonus value of tracts offered for lease for oil, gas, and other mining purposes, Osage Mineral Reservation, Okla; and

H. R. 3123. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

On July 26, 1947:

H. J. Res. 250. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of Robert V. Fleming as a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution;

H. R. 3864. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act with respect to contribution rates after termination of military service; and

H. R. 4017. An act to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide that bonds issued under such act shall be redeemable at any time after September 1, 1947, to permit settlement and compensation under such act to be made in cash, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. COMBS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include some excerpts.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. STIGLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include an article.

Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. O'HARA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 8 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1602. An act to stimulate exploration, development, and production from domestic mines by private enterprise, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4269) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes," and agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 17, 53, and 64, to the above-entitled bill, and recedes from amendment No. 43.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3756) entitled "An act making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes," and agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 29 to the above-entitled bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may make two extensions of remarks in the RECORD between now and the time of the printing of the last RECORD, and that in connection therewith I may be permitted to insert tables that I myself have prepared.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. TABER submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4347) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4347) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5 and 31,

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 15, 16, 17, 18, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 32, 33, 35, and 40, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

"Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper: For the compensation of fifteen additional privates, Capitol Police Force, at the basic rate of $2,000 each per annum, from October 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948, $24,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert the following: "$2,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,650,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert the following: "$5,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "preliminary examinations and surveys (in an amount not exceeding $100,000) and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert the following: "$275,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

"Management, protection, and disposal of public lands: For an additional amount, for 'Management, protection, and disposal of public lands', $300,000, and the limitation on the amount for carrying out the provisions of the act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U. S. C. 8A), is hereby increased from $398,000 to $698,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert $100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed insert:

"BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

"Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $100,000, and the limitation for personal services in the District of Columbia is hereby increased from $2,202,700 to $2,327,700."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$6,050,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$76,836,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 9, 11, 12, 13, 21, 27, and 39.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
GORDON CANFIELD,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOSEPH H. BALL,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
HOMER FERGUSON,
GUY CORDON,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
CARL HAYDEN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4347) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments namely:

Amendments Nos. 1–4 relate to the Senate.

Amendment No. 5 strikes out a proposed appropriation of $35,000 for a revised edition of the Annotated Constitution.

Amendment No. 6 appropriates $50,000 for the American Battle Monuments Commission.

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8 adjust limitations on Civil Service Commission appropriations.

Amendment No. 9 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 10 appropriates $750,000 for the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government instead of $500,000 as proposed by the House and $1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 11, 12, and 13 are reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 14 limits administrative expenses to $4,650,000 instead of $4,250,000 as proposed by the House and $5,750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15 increases the amount for vessel operation from $90,000,000 as proposed by the House to $100,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16 strikes out language proposed by the House authorizing chartering of tankers.

Amendment No. 17, makes a formal change in language.

Amendment No. 18 appropriates $12,000 for the Office of Recorder of Deeds, District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19 appropriates $5,000 for the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine instead of $15,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20 makes $100,000 available for preliminary examinations and surveys.

Amendment No. 21 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 22 appropriates $275,000 for the Weather Bureau instead of $350,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23 appropriates $300,000 for the Bureau of Land Management as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24 appropriates $88,000 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25 makes a formal change in language.

Amendment No. 26 includes the Dickinson Dam among projects in Missouri River Basin under Bureau of Reclamation.

Amendment No. 27 appropriates $250,000 for the Bureau of Mines instead of $500,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 28 to 34 make additional appropriations for the Department of Labor in the amount of $210,500 instead of $339,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the amount allowed for the Bureau of Labor Statistics $25,000 is for newspaper clipping service.

Amendment No. 35 authorizes the Navy to procure temporary services.

Amendments Nos. 36 and 37 appropriates $6,050,000 for the Coast Guard instead of $4,050,000 as proposed by the House and $8,050,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38 appropriates $350,000 for the Remount Service, War Department, instead of $500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 40 corrects a section number.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The managers on the part of the House have authorized the following motions to be made with respect to amendments in disagreement:

Amendment No. 9. That the House insist on its disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 11, 12, 21, and 39. That the House recede and concur.

Amendment No. 13. That the House recede and concur with an amendment reducing the amount to $2,500,000.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
GORDON CANFIELD,
FRANCIS CASE,
KARL STEFAN,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4347) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill totals over all in appropriations out of the Treasury about $105,000,000. I cannot give you the exact figures because we have not taken the time to add them up. The Senate added a number of items, a good many of them coming as the result of estimates that the budget submitted subsequent to our closing the receipt of budget estimates.

I want to call attention to one or two small items that the membership should bear in mind. In the last session of the Seventy-ninth Congress the total appropriations and permanent appropriations ran approximately $39,500,000,000 and were $180,000,000 above the budget. The appropriations for this fiscal year that we are now in run approximately $30,200,000,000, and are approximately $3,000,000,000 below the budget. In addition to that we can claim savings that are unquestionable, that were not allowed by the President and the budget of $1,955,000,000, leaving a total of almost $5,000,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, with the reduction that has been made in this year's appropriations below what we had before, I think it is safe to say that the Eightieth Congress will carry on and will make a record of which we will be proud when we get through with the next session.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. I do not wish to hinder the passage of this conference report, but I cannot allow to go unanswered the claims of the distinguished chairman of this committee. I have followed the gentleman's tracks very closely during this session, and before I say Merry Christmas to him I would like to follow him through this bill. The actual reduction of the President's budget, excluding the amounts in this bill, is $1,199,825,946. Now, the gentleman from New York claims quite a reduction in this bill; something like $100,000,000 reduction. Let me show you where $66,000,000 of it is. You will find it on page 6 of the report. The Post Office Department requested a supplemental appropriation for various activities, and here is what the report says. Even though they denied the appropriation and show a reduction in the President's budget of $66,000,000—listen to this sentence:

> This provision will enable the Department to expend at a more rapid rate than the apportionments would otherwise permit and has the effect of lessening the severity of the Antideficiency Act, while at the same time retaining a measure of control in the Congress. To the extent that the Department, in the exercise of this authority, expends funds in excess of the apportionment, deficiency estimates may be submitted during the next session of the Congress.

So, here is an open invitation for a deficiency; an acknowledgment, in fact, that a deficiency will be necessary. Here a supplemental request is before us, and instead of appropriating the money, we make a show of economy, pretend to be reducing the President's budget $66,000,000. Yet they say in the report, "Come in in January, and we will give you more money." Mind you, by the time June 30 of next year rolls around and all the deficiencies are appropriated to pay for the postal service, to make tax refunds, to supplement the inadequate appropriations that have been made, this $1,199,000,000 will fade, and our good Republican friends will be lucky, indeed, if on June 30, 1948, they are within the President's budget.

Where is that budget resolution to cut $6,000,000,000 from the budget? It is now dead in the pigeonhole. It served only one purpose, and that was to serve as an excuse for the abortive attempt to reduce taxes in a thoroughly unsound, unfair, and inequitable manner.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

TRUMAN AND THE CONGRESS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on H. R. 4347, now before the House, will conclude the work of this session of Congress on all the appropriation bills. And I wish to take this occasion to pay tribute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. He has had one of the most difficult assignments in the Congress. He has labored from early morning to late at night in a courageous determination to reduce Government expenditures without impairing any essential function of Government. I am proud to have been able to serve on his committee.

And I am proud of the record of this session of Congress in carrying out our promise to the people that we would eliminate waste and extravagance. It is never easy to economize. It is always easy to spend. It is particularly hard to economize when one has gotten into the habit of spending. For 14 years the Federal Government has been following the practice of spending and spending; and, quite naturally, the immediate beneficiaries of that policy have vigorously, sometimes bitterly, opposed its discontinuance.

The extent to which the spend-and-spend habit has developed is evidenced by comparing the expenditures of the Federal Government before the war with those proposed for the fiscal year 1948, 3 years after the war ended, insofar as actual fighting is concerned. In 1933, the Federal expenditures amounted to $5,413,000,000 and in 1939 they amounted to $9,027,000,000. But the budget submitted to the Congress by the President amounted to $37,500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1948. It was the largest peacetime budget in history.

I have no doubt but that the people are somewhat confused as to the exact amount of economies accomplished by this session of Congress. I do not know how many different compilations I have seen. Some include the recoveries for the Treasury; some do not. Some include the rescissions; some do not. In any event, the fact is that during this session of Congress we cut the Federal budget by $2,766,000,000. There can be no dispute about that.

As to whether rescissions should be included in computing our savings I am perfectly sure that the people will decide to do so. A rescission is the revocation of a previous appropriation, which

means that the particular department or agency cannot spend the money. That to me is a saving. The rescissions amount to $442,500,000, which brings the total economy figure to $3,208,500,000.

And what about the recoveries which we brought the Treasury. They amount to $911,700,000, and which, if added to the total, bring the figure to $4,120,200,000.

Here again I am sure that the people will include this item, which I have classified as recoveries in the total of savings. It is largely due to our revised budget estimate for the Veterans' Administration and the Maritime Commission caused by an investigation of their records by our committee investigators.

The Congress also reduced the requested deficiency appropriations covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947, by $363,174,000, which means that for the last fiscal year the Government had that much less money to spend. To be sure, the item relates to a previous fiscal year. Nonetheless, it is a "saving" for the people. I shall leave it to the people themselves to decide whether it should be included in the total. If it is, the total figure becomes $4,483,374,000 as to the extent to which the Congress economized.

Whatever compilation one uses or however he may set up his figures, the people clearly recognize that this is the first economy Congress in 14 years. We have made it clear that the era of blank-check appropriations and reckless Government spending has ended.

When we entered upon this economy program, we determined that the cost of government could and would be reduced without in any way impairing any essential function of government. We determined that we would insist upon a clear justification for each and every proposed expenditure. We determined that we would carry out all the necessary functions of government but would eliminate those operations and activities that were not necessary.

That the Committee on Appropriations has diligently, carefully, and thoroughly applied itself to this monumental task, involving billions of dollars and hundreds of different operations, and all manner of projects, is evidenced by the voluminosity of our hearings. They constitute 57,618 transcript pages—33 volumes of 26,969 printed pages of testimony. Our committee has been constantly in session. Although a member of the committee, I think I can justly say that it is the hardest-working committee of the House. It had to be in order to do this job.

Our job would have been much easier if we had had the cooperation from the President that he promised the people he would give the Congress after the last election. Following the election of the Republican Congress, the President issued a formal public statement in which he said that he accepted this verdict "as all good citizens accept the result of any election." When he made that statement, he knew that a reduction of Government expenditures was a major plank in the Republican platform.

But, unfortunately, the President has not seen fit to "accept" the election verdict. At the Jefferson Day dinner held in Washington, he stated that his budget could not be reduced and indicated his opposition to our economy program. That was the signal to every bureau and agency, to every bureaucrat and to every Democrat, to oppose the Republican economy efforts. Instead of recommending to the committee places where savings might be made, the bureaus and agencies vigorously fought—and employed every possible vehicle of propaganda at taxpayers' expense—against any reductions whatsoever in their proposed expenditures.

Notwithstanding the opposition of the spendthrift bureaucrats and notwithstanding also the opposition of the "spenders" here in Congress, who, for political reasons, are unwilling to make the sacrifice involved in any economy program, the Republican Congress has proceeded with real courage to carry out the pledge to save. And I am convinced that the people we represent, who, after all, bear the costs of Government in taxes, will overwhelmingly approve our work.

Aside from the actual amount that has been saved in connection with the expenditures for the fiscal year 1948, it is in itself encouraging to the taxpayers to know that they now, at long last, have a Congress that intends to retain control over the purse strings. When we assemble for the next session, we shall again examine each and every item of expenditure, and we shall again seek justification for each and every item. We passed a resolution to set up a special committee to make a thorough and detailed study of the executive branch of the Government: four members appointed by the President of the United States, four members appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate and four members appointed by the Speaker of the House.

For the first time in 14 years, the people have a Congress that is responsive to their will. Representative government has been restored in the United States. This has not been a "rubber stamp" Congress. We have fulfilled our pledges.

A second major plank in our program is to give our people relief from burdensome taxes. We passed two tax reduction bills, but the President twice vetoed our proposals. It was a flagrant abuse of the veto power.

By vetoing our tax-reduction bills, the President has invaded a special province of Congress. The Constitution provides that all revenue measures must originate in this House, which is elected every 2 years and is closest to the people. Likewise, all appropriation bills originate in this House. It is thus clear that under our Constitutional system of government, it was intended that the representatives of the people control the purse. But by opposing reductions in the Federal budget and by vetoing the proposed tax reductions, the President seeks to establish the principle that the Executive, and not the Congress, shall control the nation's purse. That is the repudiated New Deal philosophy of government, which we do not accept.

By virtue of the savings made by the Congress, our people could be given tax relief. The President took the position that to allow the people to have this extra money would be inflationary. In other words, he contends that it is inflationary for the people to be able to spend their own money; but it is not inflationary for the Government to spend it for them. Such reasoning simply does not make sense.

We also promised the people we would improve labor-management relations. To this end, the Congress passed long overdue remedial labor legislation. The bill was the result of long and extensive hearings, and exhaustive debate on the floor of the House and Senate. It was a fair and just bill. But again, yielding to political expediency, the President vetoed that bill, notwithstanding the fact that it was passed by the votes of the majority of both the Democrats and Republicans.

The bill was passed over his veto, and it is now the law of the land.

The vast majority of the workingmen favor this law. It gives the individual workingman the protection he has not heretofore had. He is now protected, not only from the abuses of employers, but also from the abuses of labor racketeers. I predict that under this law the labor unions, which are an important part of the collective bargaining processes, will have a healthy growth. The act strengthens the collective bargaining machinery by establishing, in the field of labor-management relations, the principles of law and order and of equal justice under the law.

For 14 years the New Deal Congress made broad delegations of power to the Executive. Our Government gradually became one of men. We Republicans promised the people that we would restore their Government to them and bring an end to rule by proclamations, directives, and Executive orders.

We have kept this promise. At this session of Congress we have passed two decontrol acts relinquishing Government controls over innumerable products and abbreviating controls over certain others. It is only where controls have been found essential either to implement our foreign policy or expand the production abroad of materials critically needed in this country that we have permitted their continuance.

In addition, this Congress has passed a bill which immediately repeals 57 temporary statutory provisions enacted since the beginning of the war and amends 12 different statutory provisions so as to effect their repeal at a fixed date. This same bill immediately terminates operations under 102 permanent statutory provisions. We are thus keeping our pledge that we would eliminate at the earliest possible date the wartime restrictions, limitations, and controls which have been imposed upon our people.

There are other accomplishments of this Congress that I would like at this time at least to mention.

This Congress has also carefully examined the operations of the various Government agencies and has passed amendatory legislation to terminate those portions which have stifled private enterprise. Our objective has been to establish again an economy of abundance where our people can obtain the things they need and want at lower prices.

Supply and demand are factors in the price equation. This Congress has emphasized ways and means to increase supply.

In this Eightieth Congress, we also recognized our stupendous and continuing debt to the men and women who so courageously and sacrificially served in the armed forces. We owe a great obligation to them and their dependents. We are fulfilling that obligation.

The Congress has passed a bill to provide for the cash payment of the terminal-leave bonds held by our veterans. This measure corrects a great injustice. It was unfair to require the enlisted man to wait 5 years to receive his terminal leave, while officers were entitled to receive their terminal leave in cash.

There are some 9,000,000 of these bonds presently in the hands of the veterans. The cost of them approximates $1,800,000,000. Payment of the bonds at the option of the veteran will give him funds to assist in his readjustment to civilian life. The average bond is worth about $240. This sum will help many veterans in establishing themselves in business, in paying for their homes, or in defraying their college expenses.

The Congress has appropriated approximately $7,000,000,000 for the fiscal year 1948 for the Veterans' Administration. This is the largest single item in our budget. It represents one of the most costly and far-reaching programs ever conceived by any nation to assist our young men and women who gallantly served in defense of our country. They are not being forgotten. They will not be.

Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned only some of the accomplishments of this session of Congress. There are many others. This has been one of the most constructive Congress in our history. It is refreshing to know that after 14 years of "rubber stamp" Congresses, the people now have a Congress which has discharged—not delegated—its legislative responsibilities, and it is refreshing to know that the people now have a Congress which is fulfilling its pledges.

Representative government has thus been restored in the United States. We have accomplished much and much remains to be done. We have not failed and will not fail in carrying out the will of the people whom we are privileged to represent.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES AND THE COUNTRY ARE ENTITLED TO A REAL CIVIL-SERVICE MERIT SYSTEM

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, in these closing hours of the first session of the Eightieth Congress I hestitate to burden my colleagues with further problems. I would not do it now except that as chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, we are confronted with a condition which I regard as important to all advocates of a sound merit civil-service system in Government.

The particular thing to which I direct your attention is that thousands of loyal and efficient career employees, many of them veterans, have been and are now being dismissed or furloughed from the agencies where they are employed while favored war-service employees are being retained in the jobs for which these career employees are qualified and from which they are being dismissed.

Congress has been endeavoring to reduce the swollen Federal pay rolls. The Civil Service Act and the Veterans' Preference Act, among others, are expressions of congressional policy. The reduction-in-force regulations issued by the Civil Service Commission are intended to implement that policy. Yet, today, many of the departments and agencies are violating both the law and the regulations. In too many cases, administrators and personnel officials are substituting personal patronage and preference for the civil-service system and veterans' preference.

My attention has just been called to one branch of an agency wherein a large group of employees were dismissed because their jobs were eliminated. Following that, new jobs with a slightly different classification were created so that other persons could be employed to do practically the same kind of work. There are many instances of this kind of practice in various places in the Federal Government.

It is my opinion that the United States Civil Service Commission has not been alert to safeguarding the career service people. I realize the problem is not an easy one, but the Commission should discharge its full responsibility with respect to this matter. My criticism lies in the fact that the Commission has proclaimed many times its good intentions and has launched one program after another, but the Commission has not handled the situation as I feel it should.

The Commission has further added to the confusion by announcing Nationwide examination to bring into Federal service additional thousands of new and inexperienced employees. I have no objection to these examinations where employees are needed, but I find in too many cases where agencies have taken advantage of these examinations to practically blanket into the service many war appointees who should have been separated in order that qualified career employees and veterans could have the job.

I call your attention to one example that came to my attention within the last few days. In one department a veteran career employee, an expert photographer, who came into the service 8 or 9 years ago, was forced to take a reduction in grade to that of a clerk. It was insisted that no photographer vacancies could be found for him. He spent several days trying to find a place in Government where he could be employed as a photographer. The only help he received was a note from the Civil Service Commission that they knew of no place for him, but would ask the agency from which he was dismissed to find a place if they could. Yet, at that same moment the Civil Service Commission was conducting a new examination to qualify photographers for alleged vacancies in the Federal service in Washington and vicinity.

This case can be multiplied many times, as you know.

Employee and veteran organizations are deeply concerned with respect to these matters. Your own offices have been besieged by displaced career employees. You have referred many of them to our committee and we are doing what we can in correcting the situation.

We all understand that there must be reductions in force. That is expected. Furthermore, there should not be any more people employed in Government than absolutely necessary.

Incidentally, I would like to say here that I had considerable complaint that in a good many agencies where appropriations have been cut down there has been a tendency to dismiss a number of those who receive lower salaries, but to be extremely careful with respect to those in high-salary brackets.

Recently the Civil Service Commission announced still another program for the enforcement of the reduction in force regulations. It contains a sort of broad statement with regard to dismissal of war-service employees. Let it be understood that I am not in favor of mass dismissals of Federal employees. One of the things that has caused a great deal of chaos is that agencies fail to make their plan so that employees being dismissed could have sufficient notice before they were separated from the Government.

Under House Resolution 176 our committee is empowered to make constructive study and investigation of the civil service. Our committee staff has been requested to constantly check the progress of the plan of the Commission, as well as the agencies, with a view of determining whether the intent and spirit of the law and regulations are being complied with.

The particular reason for making this statement is to tell you that you can be helpful in dealing with this problem. May I suggest that while in your respective districts you visit the Federal offices in your district; that you talk to the employees, particularly in the middle and lower salary levels, and then give the committee the benefit of your findings and counsel.

I know the committee will appreciate any suggestions you have to offer that you believe will be helpful in bringing about a real civil-service merit system that we all want and to which the country is entitled.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I feel quite proud of the economy record of the first session of the Eightieth Congress. It was achieved under the greatest of difficulties. The first difficulty was the immense amount of cooperation we received over on this side, with some exceptions. The second difficulty was the obstruction of the bureaucracy. I need review for you only the letters that piled in upon this Congress when the first reductions were made in the Treasury bill and the Post Office bill. I need refresh you only upon the great pressure and the inundation of mail and telephone calls, the mass effort when we

undertook to provide some economies in the agricultural appropriation bill. The assistance and cooperation over on this side in the main, with some exceptions, consisted of a motion to recommit and put back $220,000,000. But notwithstanding those difficulties, when the die is finally cast the economies will be well in excess of $2,000,000,000 and in addition thereto there will be rescissions amounting to some $1,600,000,000.

What difference does it make whether a dollar is retrieved or recaptured in 1947 or 1948? It still scores as far as the taxpayer is concerned and as far as the people of the United States are concerned. When we count all the economies and all the rescissions, it will probably be a score well in excess of $4,000,000,000, and that is not hay even down in Tennessee.

It has been a difficult operation, I can assure you. This afternoon I paid my tribute of affection to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], who has labored so hard. What we have been wrestling with in the first session of the Eightieth Congress is a tradition nearly 15 years old, this open-handed tradition of Harry Hopkins. It is the open-handed tradition of spending and more spending. When you have indoctrinated a people and when you have indoctrinated a political party that for a generation has not known anything else, it was necessary to reverse the whole course of history before economies could even be written, but that has been finally achieved. But, Mr. Speaker, we have achieved something infinitely bigger than that. We have set the stage for the fiscal year 1949. That is more important than anything else.

The first months of the Congress were necessarily given over to the question of organization and reorganization. It became necessary to go through these appropriations estimates with a fine-tooth comb. We had to make some concessions, of course, but already you can see out on the horizon of 1949 even more substantial economies, and then it will be our turn to raise our voices in triumph and rejoicing for the job that will have been done for the people of the United States.

If we need an example, what we have written into the Agriculture bill for 1948 for soil-conservation payments, in which the Senate concurred this afternoon, will be $151,000,000 below the budget estimate for the crop year 1947.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. You have taken that out of the hides of the farmers of this Nation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have heard that before. As a matter of fact, that is a reflection upon the patriotism and the devotion of every farmer in the land to economy and to sound fiscal government.

I was at home the other day. It was an extremely brief visit. It was the second time I have been home since January. A 9-hour visit at home for 1,600 miles of traveling is not much of a visit. But in the course of that brief sojourn back there I met with a great many people, including hundreds of farm leaders in central Illinois. Were they shocked at what the House did in the agricultural field? Indeed not. Were they astonished and were they filled with bile and umbrage at the economies that were effected. Indeed not.

The sporadic letters that may have come in upon Congress from time to time with respect to economies did not represent the viewpoint of the people back home. They applauded the economies that were made, and the President of the Illinois Agricultural Association presiding over an organization of farmers, probably 10 times as large as they have in the State of North Carolina, said, "We were not too much shocked about what the House did in cutting $340,000,000 out of the appropriation bill because we came down and represented to you that we did want economy," and that is what we have done.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. With the greatest of pleasure.

Mr. COOLEY. Was his name Earl Smith?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman, for the information of my good friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, is a very distinguished farmer in his own right who farms many hundreds of acres of land and who is a graduate of the School of Agronomy of the University of Illinois. He is the father of a fine family, and his name is Mr. Schuman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I listened when the gentleman from Illinois was discussing soil conservation a few weeks ago, as well as more recently. In my district, I am sorry to say, I have a few Republican chambers of commerce.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the gentleman will permit me to interrupt him, I did not know we were going to discuss chambers of commerce tonight.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I just wanted to make a statement in answer to what the gentleman said once before. They sent telegrams to me asking me to vote for a $6,000,000,000 budget cut. Wall Street contributed to that same Republican chamber of commerce, and that same combination in my district is now being abolished and they moved away. I told you back here about 2 months ago not to worry about Oklahoma next year being a border State, because Oklahoma next year is going Democratic, and it will go Democratic with a lot of Republican votes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make no criticism of my friend, but the people want economy because they sense now that the future of the country is involved. If you carry on the Harry Hopkins technique of spending and spending year in and year out, disaster will ultimately befall us and then some day a man on horseback will appear to ride over the wreckage and devastation. Then, what would happen to this priceless and blessed thing we call freedom and free enterprise and the great American tradition? Say this, my friends here and some on that side, although I make some exceptions—I see my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] to whom I have taken off my hat at times—he is a member of my subcommittee—but, say this, we made an effort, a determined effort, and the fact that we did not reach a $6,000,000,000 target is not so important. The fact that we did not agree with the Senate on a $4,500,000,000 goal is not so important. That was a target. We are moving in the direction of economy and we have moved further than you have moved not only in the last 15 years but probably in the last 50 years. So, I say, it constitutes something of a phenomena in the financial history of the United States.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, on the 30th day of June the efficiency of the Republican majority in the House of Representatives was demonstrated when by that date we had not laid on the President's desk a single regular appropriation bill. We spent 2½ months trying to come to a conclusion on how many billions of dollars we could save, and our Republican brethren came to the conclusion they were going to cut the President's budget by $6,000,000,000.

I said here some time ago that we could not understand why the judgment of some people was so short.

If they had said, "We are going to cut to the bone," and you might have saved $2,000,000,000 if some of your Republicans had not offered motions to recede and concur and cut it even below $2,000,000,000, you could have saved a billion and a half dollars and the American people would have thought that was a lot of money. But since you are saving in the neighborhood of $1,000,000,000 below the President's budget, the American people are going to say to you, "Where are my other $5,000,000,000?" They have got a right to say that, because that is the fact.

Now, you can call up the ghost of Harry Hopkins just as much as you please, but the last Republican administration, the last real Republican administration, from 1921 to 1923, took this country from the highest point of prosperity it had ever known to the lowest dregs of poverty and lack of income the United States has ever seen.

Now, what have you done this time? The Democratic administration last year had rescissions of $64,000,000,000. How much have you got this year? Well, just the things that came naturally. So you had better be pretty careful when you go out to tell the people of the United States what a great record of economy you have made. This has been a spending Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. RAYBURN. There has been four times as much money appropriated this year as there was in 1935 when Harry Hopkins was riding high. We wanted to investigate a few things, and we were criticized because we gave some committees ten or fifteen or twenty thou-

sand dollars to make investigations. We were "globetrotters." We were "junketers." Already, the Committee on House Administration has appropriated $1,043,000,000 for investigations and junkets. And, add to that $500,000 that the gentleman from New York had to give up to the gentleman from Ohio, $500,000 added to that—$500,000 or a million in this bill——

Mr. TABER. Oh, this was $750,000.

Mr. RAYBURN. That makes $1,793,000,000 that you are spending on investigations and junkets. Your record is not so hot.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I would think the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], had a rather weak cause to plead when he compares rescissions with a year ago, and speaks of $64,000,000,000 worth of rescissions, when they had the lush appropriations of the war years to recede on. Anyone who knows the slightest thing about appropriations knows that the rescissions that were made last year were made on the appropriations that were made for the prosecution of the war.

Anyone who knows at all about the appropriations for the Army and Navy during the war knows that we had to make appropriations 18 months to 2 years in advance in order that the materials and munitions wanted would be forthcoming at the time they might be needed on a battlefield thousands of miles away; and the American soldier, as the gentleman from Iowa says over my shoulder, made those rescissions possible by beating the war schedule. That is why we had larger rescissions last year, because they were made out of appropriations that ran into hundreds of billions of dollars.

If the gentleman wants to make a comparison between the record of 1947 and the record of 1946, both postwar years, let him compare the appropriations of new money. Last year the appropriations of new money, in a fiscal year after the war was over, were around $40,000,000,000. The appropriations in this second postwar fiscal year are in the neighborhood of $30,000,000,000—$10,000,000,000 less in new money than the appropriations of the postwar fiscal year of the Congress to which the gentleman from Texas has referred. That is the record that should be compared—the appropriations of new money.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. And does not the gentleman believe that had the Democrats been in power in Congress during this session, instead of spending $37,500,000,000 which the President asked for, it is quite possible and I am quite sure as almost everyone else is, that they would possibly have spent $47,500,000,000?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That became a Democratic habit under the New Deal. As a matter of fact, of course, the actual appropriations this year ran far under the President's budget, and the leadership on the Republican side are entitled to take credit for it.

If rescissions are to be compared, the final audit will show close to $2,000,000,000 of actual recoveries over and beyond the funds that would have lapsed without action. In the conference report on the military appropriation bill adopted 2 days ago there were $338,000,000 worth of rescissions beyond the $1,600,000,000 to which the gentleman from Illinois referred. This $2,000,000,000 is a saving of money that could have been spent and may well be added to the reductions in the budget.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, deserves recognition as the outstanding legislator of the session for his industry and ability in pursuit of his objective to restore fiscal soundness to the Nation's finances.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this session opened with our Republican friends militantly on the offensive. It closes with them on the defensive, and the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from South Dakota have made as good an apology as could be expected, under the circumstances.

But no amount of apologetic explanation, however adroit, can obscure the fact that this is a spending Congress. It is spending four times as much as was spent in any peacetime year before the war. With the largest income ever received in any previous year or ever enjoyed by any nation, ancient or modern, its huge appropriations are reducing the balance to such a narrow margin as to incur a deficit under any one of half a dozen contingencies which could very reasonably develop at any time.

In the session closing tonight it has been particularly unmindful of its pledges of economy and retrenchment.

Earlier today I included as a part of my remarks a summation of the appropriation record, contrasted with Budget estimates. Owing to the fact that final figures on a number of measures were not at the time available it was necessary to make approximations in such instances.

Since then, the staff of the Committee on Appropriations has arrived at a final total, which indicates a smaller over-all reduction than my first estimate. Using the committee figures the apparent reduction is $2,777,110,195. Included in that amount, as I have previously pointed out, is $711,000,000 for tax refunds, which a restudy by the Budget Bureau shows will have to be appropriated before the end of the fiscal year. There are other instances where supplemental appropriations will have to be made, though none of the magnitude of the reduction applying to tax refunds. Hence, it is more than fair to point out that the reductions effected in appropriations requested during the first session of the Eightieth Congress cannot be more than $2,066,110,195.

In my earlier remarks I warned of claims which would be forthcoming in an effort to build up this amount of $2,066,110,195 more nearly to approach the aggregate of cuts promised and prophesied before and immediately after the commencement of the session. Already we are witnessing that very situation. Our Republican friends list as reductions amounts which they know will have to be appropriated later and eventually expended in the fiscal year 1948. They class as reductions certain rescinded amounts, despite the authoritative statement from the Budget Bureau printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD showing that the rescissions effected are meaningless, because the balances involved would have lapsed automatically. They have substituted contract authority for appropriations and claimed as retrenchments money which must inevitably be voted when the contracts are completed. They have provided funds on a part-year basis with instructions to return for any further funds which may be necessary and listed as economies amounts which will be larger when it becomes necessary to provide them in the future than if they were appropriated in this session. They have "saved" money by giving blank checks, as in the authorization to the Department of Agriculture for foot-and-mouth expenditures. But we must pay the fiddler in hard cash when the bills come in.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] reminds us that when we reclaimed $64,000,000,000 in the last Congress we had the "lush appropriations of the war years to recede from." But he does not refer to the $20,000,000,000 additional lush appropriations of those same war years which he and his party failed to reclaim in this session. Our rescission totaled $64,000,000,000, all that was available at the time. But with the progressive liquidation of the war agencies, another $20,000,000,000 of war appropriations became available for rescission by the opening of this session of Congress. We had already planned hearings for the recovery of this additional $20,000,000,000 in anticipation of the continuance of our stewardship. If we had been in charge this session, our total rescissions would have amounted to $84,000,000,000 by this time.

The gentleman from South Dakota makes a significant confession. He concedes that after subtracting the rescission of appropriations which would automatically have expired and which could not have been spent before expiration, the total amount of rescissions of money which could have been spent is approximately $2,000,000,000. But where is the other $18,000,000,000 of these lush wartime appropriations which could have been saved? The country is much more interested in the answer to that question than in the deceptive shifts in the appropriation structure which effect to save billions but which do not actually save a red penny.

The country is not interested in fictitious savings. It wants dependable

figures. It wants the truth, and I have no doubt will be more interested in the effect of many of the actual reductions upon the efficient conduct of the Government than in the efforts of some Members of Congress to cover up the failure to keep their economy pledges and make promised retrenchments. The country will not condone cuts made for the mere sake of affecting a showing of economy, cuts which reflect policies of sabotage rather than economy for economy's sake. And it especially will not approve so-called economies which in the end will lose more than they save, as in the loss of revenues through tax evasion. Nor will it countenance the elimination of funds which if provided would add to the Nation's wealth in future years.

The truth of the matter is, that because of ill-considered reductions in appropriations which must be restored in later bills, the actual appropriation record for the fiscal year 1948 will not be known until the next session of Congress. We must expect repair bills in the next session in the form of supplemental appropriations to augment reduced appropriations provided at this session. Without such augmentation essential functions of Government must stop or must cease to perform efficiently and economically, or lawful obligations of the Government must go unpaid. Only when such matters shall finally have been taken care of can the actual total of the 1948 fiscal year appropriations be known.

When Congress meets in January further expenditures must undoubtedly be made through the medium of deficiency and supplementary bills. In this session there have been seven such bills providing extra money in addition to that carried by the annual bills. When all such items are totaled—and particularly when cuts are restored and contractual authorizations are redeemed—Federal spending for the year 1948 will be at or over the Presidential budget estimates.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, there may be differences on the part of those occupying the different sides of the aisle on questions of economy and other matters, but on the fact that the present occupant of the Speaker's chair has presided over this House with dignity and complete impartiality and that he enjoys the respect and affection of his fellows and the confidence of the country as a whole, there can be no difference of opinion.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER].

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, the controversy in regard to the enactment of labor relations laws has made one fact very apparent. The champions of restrictive legislation make it perfectly clear in their discussions that they are eager to provide means which will make it possible to coerce workmen into the acceptance of the viewpoint of management's extremists. A feeling of vindictiveness is evidenced on the part of some employers. Even if such laws were not enforced to the last degree, there is, nevertheless, inevitably aroused a feeling of antagonism, the baneful results of which are beyond calculation. Those actuated by a spirit of vengeance invariably find that they are not ultimately benefited by laws providing punitive measures and arbitrary power.

A great writer has said "That which is unjust can really profit no one. That which is just can really harm no one." That brief quotation states a very great truth. There is no need for unreasonable arbitrary power or the oppression of anyone in order to establish justice in the distribution of wealth. A proper understanding of the fundamental principles of political economy and their application to the problems which confront society today would result in the establishment of economic justice. With the proper adjustment of men's conduct and actions to the laws of life there would soon be established the reign of justice.

There are three factors engaged in all production. The three factors are natural resources (i. e., land), labor, and capital. The apportionment to each of its just share in such product of the three factors must be the aim of true statesmanship.

The first problem to be considered in determining the just portion of each of the three factors is the ascertainment of what are the rights of man in reference to the earth, that is, to the natural resources.

The human race is the creation of one power. That power is the sole cause of the existence of the earth's population. It is reasonable to conclude also that the power which is responsible for the existence of the earth's inhabitants is also the causal power which created the earth. Certainly no finite being, no human being, ever created or could create a single atom of what constitutes the earth. It is certainly proper, also, to regard the one power as having the relation of Father to the human inhabitants of the earth. Now considering the relation of the Creator to His creation, it is contrary to all reason and logic to assume that the Creator, the Father, would or could fail to be absolutely just to all of the creatures and to provide for the equal rights of all in the bounty provided by Him.

What then, having due regard for justice to all, is the true nature of man's rights in the earth? Surely no one can be given exclusive ownership of the earth, or any part of it, without injustice to all of his fellow beings. The bounty of the Creator is the common heritage of all mankind, and must be shared in accordance with the principle of equal rights to all and special privilege to none.

In order to illustrate the true nature of the rights of men in the Creator's bounty, let us assume that it is the beginning of all civilization, the time when but one man is present. Whether you call that first man "John" or "Adam," it is certain that in deciding what he will do he will try to satisfy his desires with the least exertion necessary. He would, therefore, naturally select for his use that part of the earth which would yield the largest quantity of commodities as the result of the application of a certain amount of labor. In other words, he would choose the best part of the known earth, and his labor would certainly produce more from such part than any other part of equal size.

After our first man had taken possession of the choice parcel of land, however, the second man comes along and demands possession of the same tract of land, and is told by the first man that he will not give it up. The second man then asks on what ground the first man claims to have the complete and exclusive ownership of the land under discussion; that is, the best piece of land. The first man replies: "It is mine because I saw it first." The second man then answers: "Do you mean to say that because of the mere fact the rays of light were reflected from this piece of land to your eyes instead of to my eyes or those of someone else that gives you the absolute and exclusive title?" Man No. 1, being a reasonable person, says: "Well, I must admit that is not a good reason, but nevertheless I have as good a right to this land as have you." The second man admits that that is true also. So, in order to assure justice to both, it is proposed that whatever the first tract of land produces, by a certain application of labor in excess of what man No. 2 can produce from the next-best piece of land by exactly the same amount and quality of labor, is evidently due to the superior advantage provided by the Creator or by nature in the first parcel of land. In other words, the first parcel of land has superior productive power either because of its location, its inherent fertility, or some other advantage bestowed by the creative power. Certainly the increased productivity is not due to the labor, either mental or physical, bestowed by any human being, and, that being true, surely both men are entitled to an equal share in the amount produced by tract No. 1 in excess of what is produced from tract No. 2.

It is agreed, therefore, that the first man will go on with his year's work on parcel No. 1, and man No. 2 will apply the same amount and quality of labor on the next-best piece of land of like area, and then whatever the first parcel of land produces during the year in excess of that produced by parcel No. 2, as a result of the labor of the second man, is to be divided equally at the end of the year between the two persons. This assures each person of the full product of his toil and at the same time assures him of his just share of what is due solely to the beneficence of nature, or the Creator.

Now, whether we have 2 or 10,000,000,000 persons occupied on the earth, the principle here explained would apply in like manner. In other words, whatever portion of production is due to superior and natural advantage, or to the beneficence of the Creator, belongs in common to all the inhabitants and not to any one. Every person, of course, must be assured of possession of the land occupied by him as long as he returns to society, from this total production, the amount by which his total production exceeds the amount

which a like application of labor will produce from the least productive parcel of land held by anyone. In other words, the economic rent of the natural resources, whether it be urban, industrial, or agricultural land, is that amount of wealth which a parcel of land will produce, by a certain application of labor in excess of what the least productive part of land of similar area owned by another, will produce by a similar application of labor. It should be clear, then, that the economic rent of land is the proper source from which government should derive the revenues necessary to pay all its expenses.

Heretofore the cost of government has been paid from the proceeds of taxes levied on the products of commerce and labor. It should be clear to anyone that all taxes levied upon commodities, whether they be produced by industry, or by agriculture, are in the true sense penalties levied on the productive process. Surely everyone must realize also upon reflection that such taxes increase the price of goods and therefore help to retard sales, because the higher the price the smaller is the quantity of goods that can be sold.

It is well to note, therefore, that every tax in the nature of an excise tax, sales tax, or other similar tax, on the sale of any kind of goods or commodities, positively retards the progress of business. On the other hand, if the revenue required by government were secured by taxing the economic rent of all land, business would be stimulated in every way. More important than this, however, this method would prevent the private monopoly of the natural resources, and no other method will prevent monopoly in an efficient, just manner. The reason why this method would prevent private monopoly is, that if the possessor of valuable resources is required to pay toward the expense of government even approximately the full economic rent of land, or natural resources in his possession, he must either use it efficiently or let someone else do so. If he did not he could not pay the tax and he would suffer great loss by merely holding such land out of use without receiving any income which would enable him to pay the economic rent. This would be collected whether or not he used the land because its proper use would enable the owner to pay it.

If, for example, all the known oil land were located, as at one time was the case, in western Pennsylvania, eastern Ohio, and in part of West Virginia, and one or a few men were able to secure title to the same, and could hold it out of use as formerly by paying taxes amounting to a little more than farm land taxes, the holders of such oil lands would be able to utilize whatever suited them for the moment for the purpose of supplying kerosene to those desiring the new kind of light made possible when kerosene was invented. They could charge for that product whatever price suited them up to the point where it might cause the public to again use candles for lighting. Moreover, since they would be the only employers of expert oil workers, it would enable them to constantly reduce the wages of such workers so long as the reduction did not force the workers to seek employment at a less skilled trade. By collecting the revenue needed for government from what properly belongs to society, namely, the economic rent of land, it would be impossible for anybody to monopolize the natural resources and to hold them for speculative purposes. If they were compelled to use the natural resources, in order to pay the levy on the economic rent of the land, then that would create a demand for labor, and as this demand would continue throughout the country, all industry, commerce, and agriculture would flourish. Involuntary unemployment would soon be unknown, and the so-called wage question would settle itself, because if men were not paid fair wages and were dissatisfied because of unfair working conditions they could go to fair-minded employers who would be glad to employ them under just conditions. Such would be the effect of the operation of what may rightly be called the true law of life.

This would be the proper observance of the natural law, and justice would prevail. Right would then reign supreme, not because of the use of any complicated governmental machinery contrived to harass either workmen or employers, but because the free play of the natural law would result in the manifestation of justice which would be realized by worker and employer alike.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, it might be well to point out, as we are closing, that the Democratic Party opened the Eightieth Congress with a filibuster to save BILBO and they close the Congress with a filibuster to save the Pendergast machine at Kansas City.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. CANNON. Does the gentleman exclude the Republican judges of election indicted by the grand jury for election frauds on the occasion referred to?

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 9: Page 4, line 5, insert "*Provided further*, That nothing in sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code (18 U. S. C. 198 and 203) or in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99) shall be deemed to apply to any person because of his appointment for part-time service as a member of the Loyalty Review Board in the Civil Service Commission."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments numbered 11, 12, 21, and 39 be considered en bloc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments en bloc.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 11: Page 4, line 16, insert "Federal Works Agency."

Senate amendment No. 12: Page 4, line 17, insert:

"PUBLIC BUILDINGS ADMINISTRATION

"Costs of maintenance, upkeep, and repair paid by Government corporations pursuant to section 306 of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1948, shall be credited to the appropriations of the Public Buildings Administration bearing such costs."

Senate amendment No. 21: Page 8, line 20, insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"Materials distribution and liquidation of Office of Temporary Controls: For an additional amount for 'Materials distribution and liquidation of Office of Temporary Controls,' $300,000, and the total amount appropriated under this head shall be available for carrying out the purposes specified under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, and for necessary expenses of carrying out the purposes of H. R. 1602, Eightieth Congress, if said bill is enacted into law: *Provided*, That the amounts specified in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, for transfer from the appropriation under this head to the appropriations of the Department of Commerce for 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce,' and 'Printing and binding, Department of Commerce,' are hereby increased by $295,000 and $5,000, respectively: *Provided further*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of H. R. 1602, Eightieth Congress, during the first session of that Congress."

Senate amendment No. 39: On page 20, line 9, insert:

"SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be transferred from any appropriations for the War Department for the Military Establishment, and from any appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service, to the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense such amounts as may be determined by the President to be necessary until such time as the Congress shall have made appropriations therefor, and the amounts so transferred shall be available, without regard to the purposes of the appropriation from which such transfers shall be made, for expenses of the agencies to which such funds are transferred, including personal services at the seat of government; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600), at rates not to exceed $35 per diem for individuals; printing and binding; and health-service programs as authorized by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 658): *Provided*, That the War and Navy Departments may transfer such equipment (including motor vehicles) and furniture as may be necessary to the National Security Council, the National Resources Board, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense: *Provided further*, That the foregoing authority is contingent upon the establishment by law of said agencies to which transfers may be made hereunder: *Provided further*, That transfers authorized hereunder shall not exceed $2,000,000 in the aggregate."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 13: On page 4, line 23, insert:

"BUREAU OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES

"Maintenance and operation of schools: For carrying out the act entitled "An act to extend the period for providing assistance for

certain war-incurred school enrollments" (H. R. 3682), $5,000,000, of which amount not to exceed $200,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, including the objects specified under the head "Defense public works (community facilities)" in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941, and the joint resolution approved December 23, 1941 (Public Law 371): *Provided*, That the availability of this appropriation is contingent upon the enactment into law of said H. R. 3682."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 13 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lines 5 and 6 of said amendment strike out "$5,000,000 of which amount not to exceed $200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,500,000 of which amount not to exceed $50,000."

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. As the Clerk has read this bill authorizing the appropriation of $5,000,000 for this purpose, that bill passed the House 2 days ago and, as I understand, it passed the Senate today. It is fresh in the minds of both bodies, therefore, and I am just wondering why the appropriation was cut from $5,000,000 to $2,500,000, and if the gentleman can give us any light on that it would be very much appreciated.

Mr. TABER. I will be glad to do so. It was cut because a review of the situation indicated that $2,500,000 would take care of the real needs involved. That survey was made by different Members, and was very carefully done.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. I did not get on what grounds the reduction was made, and I am seeking information.

Mr. TABER. It was based upon information that came from people who had these things in their districts and upon what it looked like to me it should be. It was a unanimous report.

Mr. COLMER. Will the gentleman tell us whether there was any report previously from the department that would administer this bill suggesting that it would take $5,000,000?

Mr. TABER. There was not before the conference began. There was before the Senate some information but the information before the Senate was not as full as it was before the conference.

Mr. COLMER. Does the gentleman feel that the information that was had, of such a nature as he has explained, was comprehensive enough to justify such a drastic cut?

Mr. TABER. I think it was. I believe that it was a very careful cut. I believe we have allowed plenty of money to cover the activity that is contemplated.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COMBS. The bill passed 2 days ago authorized $5,000,000 to meet this problem. The committee that reported out that bill has studied 4 months on it, and thought that much might be required. The committee of conference apparently has decided in a few minutes that that may not be correct. These funds are to be administered on a fixed basis. If we authorize $5,000,000 and it is not needed, it will not be spent. If we fail to authorize it and it is needed, then a bunch of children in this Nation are going uneducated as a result of it this coming year. I think we ought to authorize the $5,000,000.

Mr. TABER. That would not follow at all.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLMER. If the previous question is voted down, would it not then be in order to move to concur in the Senate amendment?

The SPEAKER. If the motion offered by the gentleman from New York to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment is voted down, then the gentleman can offer his motion.

The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 163, noes 86.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 27: Page 11, line 14, insert:

"BUREAU OF MINES

"Coal-mine inspections and investigations: For an additional amount for 'Coal-mine inspections and investigations,' including, in addition to the objects specified under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1948, printing and binding, and the purchase of 50 passenger motor vehicles, $500,000, and the limitation upon the amount that may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia is increased to $150,000. This appropriation is contingent upon the enactment into law of Senate Joint Resolution 130 or House Joint Resolution 244."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27 and concur therein with an amendment as follows: Insert the matter proposed by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"BUREAU OF MINES

"Coal-mine inspections and investigations: For an additional amount for 'Coal-mine inspections and investigations,' including, in addition to the objects specified under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1948, printing and binding, and the purchase of 25-passenger motor vehicles, $250,000, and the limitation upon the amount that may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia is increased to $150,000. This appropriation is contingent upon the enactment into law of Senate Joint Resolution 130 or House Joint Resolution 244."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement. I have an estimate from the Public Printer that the extension will cost $177.50.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

YUMA ARMY AIR BASE

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, on July 21, when the conference report on the Interior Department appropriations bill for 1948 was before the House, I called attention to amendment No. 104, relating to the Yuma Army Air Base at Yuma, Ariz. At that time I commented on the release of this property to the Bureau of Reclamation for the benefit of veterans, in connection with the Gila project, but also commented on the fact that the city of Yuma would probably like to have and should have the use of a part of that field for municipal airport purposes. Since that time, I have inquired further into the plan and wish to make a further statement as to my understanding of the arrangement which has been considered and now made possible by the law.

In connection with the amendment transferring the Yuma Air Base property, buildings, equipment, material, and acquired lands to the Bureau of Reclamation, it is the understanding that the Bureau of Reclamation will work out with the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the War Department, and the War Assets Administration, any necessary details for the operation of the hangars, runways, and immediate related facilities, for an approved airport for the city of Yuma. Arrangements to this effect were under consideration when this amendment was passed and everything should be done to make available to the people of Yuma and other agencies the constructed airport facilities at the air base. The city of Yuma and other agencies will, of course, be expected to cooperate with the Bureau of Reclamation in the operation and maintenance of these facilities so that the activities on the Gila project can be carried on effectively and economically.

At the hearings before the Senate Appropriations Committee it was explained that the transfer of the Yuma air base would be handled along the same lines

as were the transfers of the War Relocation Authority camps in the 1947 Interior Department appropriation bill. The amendment to the 1947 bill provided that the War Assets Administration is authorized and directed to transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation funds required for maintenance and protection of the transferred property pending its final disposition. It is my understanding that a similar arrangement will be made for handling the Yuma air base as is being carried out in connection with the War Relocation Authority camps. The funds required for this purpose are limited and would have to be expended by the War Assets Administration if the property were not turned over to the Bureau of Reclamation.

It is also the understanding that the regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior for the disposal of lands, improvements, buildings, furnishings and equipment to veteran settlers and nonprofit organizations including municipalities, school districts, and so forth, in connection with the War Relocation Centers are to be used by the Bureau of Reclamation in connection with the Yuma air base in the most simplified form possible. The airport facilities, of course, may be leased to the city of Yuma or any other qualified agency.

This statement is made at this time in order that all concerned may understand that the amendment was intended primarily for the benefit of veterans in settlement, operation and construction activities of the Bureau of Reclamation, for the general activities of the Bureau, and for the communities it serves in the order named including especially the city of Yuma, for airport and other public purposes. The Secretary of the Interior may in his discretion delegate to the Commissioner of Reclamation any of the authority vested in him in connection with the handling of the air-base transactions. Further, this amendment is considered supplementary to the Reclamation laws, since it affects so closely the activity of the Bureau of Reclamation on the Yuma and Gila projects and the general operations of the Bureau of Reclamation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include one editorial and an article.

UNITED NATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass Senate Joint Resolution 144, authorizing the President to bring into effect an agreement between the United States and the United Nations for the purpose of establishing the permanent headquarters of the United Nations in the United States and authorizing the taking of measures necessary to facilitate compliance with the provisions of such agreement, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the Charter of the United Nations was signed on behalf of the United States on June 26, 1945, and was ratified on August 8, 1945, by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and the instrument of ratification of the said Charter was deposited on August 8, 1945; and

Whereas the said Charter of the United Nations came into force with respect to the United States on October 24, 1945; and

Whereas article 104 of the Charter provides that "The Organization shall enjoy in the territory of each of its members such legal capacity as may be necessary for the exercise of its functions and the fulfillment of its purposes"; and

Whereas article 105 of the Charter provides that:

"1. The Organization shall enjoy in the territory of each of its members such privileges and immunities as are necessary for the fulfillment of its purposes.

"2. Representatives of the members of the United Nations and officials of the Organization shall similarly enjoy such privileges and immunities as are necessary for the independent exercise of their functions in connection with the Organization.

"3. The General Assembly may make recommendations with a view to determining the details of the application of paragraphs 1 and 2 of this article or may propose conventions to the members of the United Nations for this purpose."; and

Whereas article 28 and other articles of the Charter of the United Nations contemplate the establishment of a seat for the permanent headquarters of the Organization; and

Whereas the interim arrangements concluded on June 26, 1945, by the governments represented at the United Nations Conference on International Organization instructed the Preparatory Commission established in pursuance of the arrangements to "make studies and prepare recommendations concerning the location of the permanent headquarters of the Organization"; and

Whereas during the labors of the said Preparatory Commission the Congress of the United States in House Concurrent Resolution 75, passed unanimously by the House of Representatives December 10, 1945, and agreed to unanimously by the Senate December 11, 1945, invited the United States "to locate the seat of the United Nations Organization within the United States"; and

Whereas the General Assembly on December 14, 1946, resolved "that the permanent headquarters of the United Nations shall be established in New York City in the area bounded by First Avenue, East Forty-eighth Street, the East River, and East Forty-second Street"; and

Whereas the General Assembly resolved on December 14, 1946, "that the Secretary-General be authorized to negotiate and conclude with the appropriate authorities of the United States of America an agreement concerning the arrangements required as a result of the establishment of the permanent headquarters of the United Nations in the city of New York" and to be guided in these negotiations by the provisions of a preliminary draft agreement which had been negotiated by the Secretary-General and the Secretary of State of the United States; and

Whereas the General Assembly resolved on December 14, 1946, that pending the coming into force of the agreement referred to above "the Secretary-General be authorized to negotiate and conclude arrangements with the appropriate authorities of the United States of America to determine on a provisional basis the privileges, immunities, and facilities needed in connection with the temporary headquarters of the United Nations"; and

Whereas the Secretary of State of the United States, after consultation with the appropriate authorities of the State and city of New York, signed at Lake Success, N. Y., on June 26, 1947, on behalf of the United States an agreement with the United Nations regarding the headquarters of the United Nations, which agreement is incorporated herein; and

Whereas the aforesaid agreement provides that it shall be brought into effect by an exchange of notes between the United States and the Secretary-General of the United Nations: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby authorized to bring into effect on the part of the United States the agreement between the United States of America and the United Nations regarding the headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success, N. Y., on June 26, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as the "agreement"), with such changes therein not contrary to the general tenor thereof and not imposing any additional obligations on the United States as the President may deem necessary and appropriate, and at his discretion, after consultation with the appropriate State and local authorities, to enter into such supplemental agreements with the United Nations as may be necessary to fulfill the purposes of the said agreement: *Provided*, That any supplemental agreement entered into pursuant to section 5 of the agreement incorporated herein shall be submitted to the Congress for approval. The agreement follows:

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA REGARDING THE HEADQUARTERS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The United Nations and the United States of America, desiring to conclude an agreement adopted by the General Assembly on December 14, 1946, to establish the seat of the United Nations in the city of New York and to regulate questions arising as a result thereof:

Have appointed as their representatives for this purpose:

The United Nations: Trygve Lie, Secretary-General, and the United States of America: George C. Marshall, Secretary of State, who have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I—DEFINITIONS

Section 1

In this agreement:

(a) The expression "headquarters district" means (1) the area defined as such in annex 1, (2) any other lands or buildings which from time to time may be included therein by supplemental agreement with the appropriate American authorities;

(b) the expression "appropriate American authorities" means such Federal, State, or local authorities in the United States as may be appropriate in the context and in accordance with the laws and customs of the United States, including the laws and customs of the State and local government involved;

(c) the expression "General Convention" means the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations approved by the General Assembly of the United Nation February 13, 1946, as acceded to by the United States;

(d) the expression "United Nations" means the international organization established by the Charter of the United Nations, hereinafter referred to as the "Charter";

(e) the expression "Secretary-General" means the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

ARTICLE II—THE HEADQUARTERS DISTRICT

Section 2

The seat of the United Nations shall be the headquarters district.

Section 3

The appropriate American authorities shall take whatever action may be necessary to assure that the United Nations shall not be dispossessed of its property in the headquarters district, except as provided in section 22 in the event that the United Nations ceases to use the same; provided that the United Nations shall reimburse the appropriate American authorities for any costs incurred, after consultation with the United Nations, in liquidating by eminent domain proceeding or otherwise any adverse claims.

Section 4

(a) The United Nations may establish and operate in the headquarters district:

(1) its own short-wave sending and receiving radio broadcasting facilities (including emergency link equipment) which may be used on the same frequencies (within the tolerances prescribed for the broadcasting service by applicable United States regulations) for radiotelegraph, radioteletype, radiotelephone, radiotelephoto, and similar services;

(2) one point-to-point circuit between the headquarters district and the office of the United Nations in Geneva (using single sideband equipment) to be used exclusively for the exchange of broadcasting programs and interoffice communications;

(3) low power micro-wave, low or medium frequency facilities for communication within headquarters buildings only, or such other buildings as may temporarily be used by the United Nations;

(4) facilities for point-to-point communication to the same extent and subject to the same conditions as permitted under applicable rules and regulations for amateur operation in the United States, except that such rules and regulations shall not be applied in a manner inconsistent with the inviolability of the headquarters district provided by section 9 (a);

(5) such other radio facilities as may be specified by supplemental agreement between the United Nations and the appropriate American authorities.

(b) The United Nations shall make arrangements for the operation of the services referred to in this section with the International Telecommunication Union, the appropriate agencies of the Government of the United States and the appropriate agencies of other affected governments with regard to all frequencies and similar matters.

(c) The facilities provided for in this section may, to the extent necessary for efficient operation, be established and operated outside the headquarters district. The appropriate American authorities will, on request of the United Nations, make arrangements, on such terms and in such manner as may be agreed upon by supplemental agreement, for the acquisition or use by the United Nations of appropriate premises for such purposes and the inclusion of such premises in the headquarters district.

Section 5

In the event that the United Nations should find it necessary and desirable to establish and operate an aerodrome, the conditions for the location, use, and operation of such an aerodrome and the conditions under which there shall be entry into and exit therefrom shall be the subject of a supplemental agreement.

Section 6

In the event that the United Nations should propose to organize its own postal service, the conditions under which such service shall be set up shall be the subject of a supplemental agreement.

ARTICLE III—LAW AND AUTHORITY IN THE HEADQUARTERS DISTRICT

Section 7

(a) The headquarters district shall be under the control and authority of the United Nations as provided in this agreement.

(b) Except as otherwise provided in this agreement or in the General Convention, the Federal, State, and local law of the United States shall apply within the headquarters district.

(c) Except as otherwise provided in this agreement or in the General Convention, the Federal, State, and local courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction over acts done and transactions taking place in the headquarters district as provided in applicable Federal, State, and local laws.

(d) The Federal, State, and local courts of the United States, when dealing with cases arising out of or relating to acts done or transactions taking place in the headquarters district, shall take into account the regulations enacted by the United Nations under section 8.

Section 8

The United Nations shall have the power to make regulations, operative within the headquarters district, for the purpose of establishing therein conditions in all respects necessary for the full execution of its functions. No Federal, State, or local law or regulation of the United States which is inconsistent with a regulation of the United Nations authorized by this section shall, to the extent of such inconsistency, be applicable within the headquarters district. Any dispute, between the United Nations and the United States, as to whether a regulation of the United Nations is authorized by this section or as to whether a Federal, State, or local law or regulation is inconsistent with any regulation of the United Nations authorized by this section, shall be promptly settled as provided in section 21. Pending such settlement, the regulation of the United Nations shall apply, and the Federal, State, or local law or regulation shall be inapplicable in the headquarters district to the extent that the United Nations claims it to be inconsistent with the regulation of the United Nations. This section shall not prevent the reasonable application of fire protection regulations of the appropriate American authorities.

Section 9

(a) The headquarters district shall be inviolable. Federal, State, or local officers or officials of the United States, whether administrative, judicial, military, or police, shall not enter the headquarters district to perform any official duties therein except with the consent of and under conditions agreed to by the Secretary-General. The service of legal process, including the seizure of private property, may take place within the headquarters district only with the consent of and under conditions approved by the Secretary-General.

(b) Without prejudice to the provisions of the General Convention or article IV of this agreement, the United Nations shall prevent the headquarters district from becoming a refuge either for persons who are avoiding arrest under the Federal, State, or local law of the United States or are required by the Government of the United States for extradition to another country, or for persons who are endeavoring to avoid service of legal process.

Section 10

The United Nations may expel or exclude persons from the headquarters district for violation of its regulations adopted under section 8 or for other cause. Persons who violate such regulations shall be subject to other penalties or to detention under arrest only in accordance with the provisions of such laws or regulations as may be adopted by the appropriate American authorities.

ARTICLE IV—COMMUNICATIONS AND TRANSIT

Section 11

The Federal, State, or local authorities of the United States shall not impose any impediments to transit to or from the headquarters district of (1) representtives of members or officials of the United Nations, or of specialized agencies as defined in article 57, paragraph 2, of the Charter, or the families of such representatives or officials, (2) experts performing missions for the United Nations or for such specialized agencies, (3) representatives of the press, or of radio, film, or other information agencies, who have been accredited by the United Nations (or by such a specialized agency) in its discretion after consultation with the United States, (4) representatives of nongovernmental organizations recognized by the United Nations for the purpose of consultation under article 71 of the Charter, or (5) other persons invited to the headquarters district by the United Nations or by such specialized agency on official business. The appropriate American authorities shall afford any necessary protection to such persons while in transit to or from the headquarters district. This section does not apply to general interruptions of transportation which are to be dealt with as provided in section 17, and does not impair the effectiveness of generally applicable laws and regulations as to the operation of means of transportation.

Section 12

The provisions of section 11 shall be applicable irrespective of the relations existing between the Governments of the persons referred to in that section and the Government of the United States.

Section 13

(a) Laws and regulations in force in the United States regarding the entry of aliens shall not be applied in such manner as to interfere with the privileges referred to in section 11. When visas are required for persons referred to in that section, they shall be granted without charge and as promptly as possible.

(b) Laws and regulations in force in the United States regarding the residence of aliens shall not be applied in such manner as to interfere with the privileges referred to in section 11 and, specifically, shall not be applied in such manner as to require any such person to leave the United States on account of any activities performed by him in his official capacity. In case of abuse of such privileges of residence by any such person in activities in the United States outside his official capacity, it is understood that the privileges referred to in section 11 shall not be construed to grant him exemption from the laws and regulations of the United States regarding the continued residence of aliens, provided that:

(1) No proceedings shall be instituted under such laws or regulations to require any such person to leave the United States except with the prior approval of the Secretary of State of the United States. Such approval shall be given only after consultation with the appropriate Member in the case of representative of a Member (or a member of his family) or with the Secretary-General or the principal executive officer of the appropriate specialized agency in the case of any other person referred to in section 11;

(2) A representative of the member concerned, the Secretary-General, or the principal executive officer of the appropriate specialized agency, as the case may be, shall have the right to appear in any such proceedings on behalf of the person against whom they are instituted;

(3) Persons who are entitled to diplomatic privileges and immunities under section 15 or under the General Convention shall not be required to leave the United States otherwise than in accordance with the customary procedure applicable to diplomatic envoys accredited to the United States.

(c) This section does not prevent the requirement of reasonable evidence to establish

that persons claiming the rights granted by section 11 come within the classes described in that section, or the reasonable application of quarantine and health regulations.

(d) Except as provided above in this section and in the General Convention, the United States retains full control and authority over the entry of persons or property into the territory of the United States and the conditions under which persons may remain or reside there.

(e) The Secretary-General shall, at the request of the appropriate American authorities, enter into discussions with such authorities, with a view to making arrangements for registering the arrival and departure of persons who have been granted visas valid only for transit to and from the headquarters district and sojourn therein and in its immediate vicinity.

(f) The United Nations shall, subject to the foregoing provisions of this section, have the exclusive right to authorize or prohibit entry of persons and property into the headquarters district and to prescribe the conditions under which persons may remain or reside there.

Section 14

The Secretary-General and the appropriate American authorities shall, at the request of either of them, consult as to methods of facilitating entrance into the United States, and the use of available means of transportation, by persons coming from abroad who wish to visit the headquarters district and do not enjoy the rights referred to in this article.

ARTICLE V—RESIDENT REPRESENTATIVES TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Section 15

(1) Every person designated by a member as the principal resident representative to the United Nations of such member or as a resident representative with the rank of ambassador or minister plenipotentiary,

(2) such resident members of their staffs as may be agreed upon between the Secretary-General, the Government of the United States and the government of the member concerned,

(3) every person designated by a member of a specialized agency, as defined in article 57, paragraph 2, of the Charter, as its principal resident representative, with the rank of ambassador or minister plenipotentiary, at the headquarters of such agency in the United States, and

(4) such other principal resident representatives of members to a specialized agency and such resident members of the staffs of representatives to a specialized agency as may be agreed upon between the principal executive officer of the specialized agency, the Government of the United States and the Government of the member concerned, shall, whether residing inside or outside the headquarters district, be entitled in the territory of the United States to the same privileges and immunities, subject to corresponding conditions and obligations, as it accords to diplomatic envoys accredited to it. In the case of members whose governments are not recognized by the United States, such privileges and immunities need be extended to such representatives, or persons on the staffs of such representatives, only within the headquarters district, at their residences and offices outside the district, in transit between the district and such residences and offices, and in transit on official business to or from foreign countries.

ARTICLE VI—POLICE PROTECTION OF THE HEADQUARTERS DISTRICT

Section 16

(a) The appropriate American authorities shall exercise due diligence to insure that the tranquility of the headquarters district is not disturbed by the unauthorized entry of groups of persons from outside or by disturbances in its immediate vicinity and shall cause to be provided on the boundaries of the headquarters district such police protection as is required for these purposes.

(b) If so requested by the Secretary-General, the appropriate American authorities shall provide a sufficient number of police for the preservation of law and order in the headquarters district, and for the removal therefrom of persons as requested under the authority of the United Nations. The United Nations shall, if requested, enter into arrangements with the appropriate American authorities to reimburse them for the reasonable cost of such services.

ARTICLE VII—PUBLIC SERVICES AND PROTECTION OF THE HEADQUARTERS DISTRICT

Section 17

(a) The appropriate American authorities will exercise to the extent requested by the Secretary-General the powers which they possess with respect to the supplying of public services to insure that the headquarters district shall be supplied on equitable terms with the necessary public services, including electricity, water, gas, post, telephone, telegraph, transportation, drainage, collection of refuse, fire protection, snow removal, et cetera. In case of any interruption or threatened interruption of any such services, the appropriate American authorities will consider the needs of the United Nations as being of equal importance with the similar needs of essential agencies of the Government of the United States, and will take steps accordingly, to insure that the work of the United Nations is not prejudiced.

(b) Special provisions with reference to maintenance of utilities and underground construction are contained in Annex 2.

Section 18

The appropriate American authorities shall take all reasonable steps to ensure that the amenities of the headquarters district are not prejudiced and the purposes for which the district is required are not obstructed by any use made of the land in the vicinity of the district. The United Nations shall on its part take all reasonable steps to ensure that the amenities of the land in the vicinity of the headquarters district are not prejudiced by any use made of the land in the headquarters district by the United Nations.

Section 19

It is agreed that no form of racial or religious discrimination shall be permitted within the headquarters district.

ARTICLE VIII—MATTERS RELATING TO THE OPERATION OF THIS AGREEMENT

Section 20

The Secretary-General and the appropriate American authorities shall settle by agreement the channels through which they will communicate regarding the application of the provisions of this agreement and other questions affecting the headquarters district, and may enter into such supplemental agreements as may be necessary to fulfill the purposes of this agreement. In making supplemental agreements with the Secretary-General, the United States shall consult with the appropriate State and local authorities. If the Secretary-General so requests, the Secretary of State of the United States shall appoint a special representative for the purpose of liaison with the Secretary-General.

Section 21

(a) Any dispute between the United Nations and the United States concerning the interpretation or application of this agreement or of any supplemental agreement, which is not settled by negotiation or other agreed mode of settlement shall be referred for final decision to a tribunal of three arbitrators, one to be named by the Secretary-General, one to be named by the Secretary of State of the United States, and the third to be chosen by the two, or, if they should fail to agree upon a third, then by the President of the International Court of Justice.

(b) The Secretary-General or the United States may ask the General Assembly to request of the International Court of Justice an advisory opinion on any legal question arising in the course of such proceedings. Pending the receipt of the opinion of the Court, an interim decision of the arbitral tribunal shall be observed on both parties. Thereafter, the arbitral tribunal shall render a final decision, having regard to the opinion of the Court.

ARTICLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Section 22

(a) The United Nations shall not dispose of all or any part of the land owned by it in the headquarters district without the consent of the United States. If the United States is unwilling to consent to a disposition which the United Nations wishes to make of all or any part of such land, the United States shall buy the same from the United Nations at a price to be determined as provided in paragraph (d) of this section.

(b) If the seat of the United Nations is removed from the headquarters district, all right, title and interest of the United Nations in and to real property in the headquarters district or any part of it shall, on request of either the United Nations or the United States, be assigned and conveyed to the United States. In the absence of such request, the same shall be assigned and conveyed to the subdivision of a State in which it is located or, if such subdivision shall not desire it, then to the State in which it is located. If none of the foregoing desires the same, it may be disposed of as provided in paragraph (a) of this section.

(c) If the United Nations disposes of all or any part of the headquarters district, the provisions of other sections of this agreement which apply to the headquarters district shall immediately cease to apply to the land and buildings so disposed of.

(d) The price to be paid for any conveyance under this section shall, in default of agreement, be the then fair value of the land, buildings and installations, to be determined under the procedure provided in section 21.

Section 23

The seat of the United Nations shall not be removed from the headquarters district unless the United Nations should so decide.

Section 24

This agreement shall cease to be in force if the seat of the United Nations is removed from the territory of the United States, except for such provisions as may be applicable in connection with the orderly termination of the operations of the United Nations at its seat in the United States and the disposition of its property therein.

Section 25

Wherever this agreement imposes obligations on the appropriate American authorities, the Government of the United States shall have the ultimate responsibility for the fulfillment of such obligations by the appropriate American authorities.

Section 26

The provisions of this agreement shall be complementary to the provisions of the General Convention. Insofar as any provision of this agreement and any provisions of the General Convention relate to the same subject matter, the two provisions shall, wherever possible, be treated as complementary, so that both provisions shall be applicable and neither shall narrow the effect of the other; but in any case of absolute conflict, the provisions of this agreement shall prevail.

Section 27

This agreement shall be construed in the light of its primary purpose to enable the United Nations at its headquarters in the

United States, fully and efficiently to discharge its responsibilities and fulfill its purposes.

Section 28

This agreement shall be brought into effect by an exchange of notes between the Secretary-General, duly authorized pursuant to a resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations, and the appropriate executive officer of the United States, duly authorized pursuant to appropriate action of the Congress.

In witness whereof the respective representatives have signed this agreement and have affixed their seals hereto.

Done in duplicate, in the English and French languages, both authentic, at Lake Success the 26th day of June 1947.

For the Government of the United States of America:

G. C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State,

For the United Nations:

TRYGVE LIE,
Secretary-General.

ANNEX 1

The area referred to in section 1 (a) (1) consists of (a) the premises bounded on the east by the westerly side of Franklin D. Roosevelt Drive, on the west by the easterly side of First Avenue, on the north by the southerly side of East Forty-Eighth Street, and on the south by the northerly side of East Forty-Second Street, all as proposed to be widened, in the Borough of Manhattan, city and State of New York, and (b) an easement over Franklin D. Roosevelt Drive, above a lower limiting plane to be fixed for the construction and maintenance of an esplanade, together with the structures thereon and foundations and columns to support the same in locations below such limiting plane, the entire area to be more definitely defined by supplemental agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America.

ANNEX 2—MAINTENANCE OF UTILITIES AND UNDERGROUND CONSTRUCTION

Section 1

The Secretary-General agrees to provide passes to duly authorized employees of the city of New York, the State of New York, or any of their agencies or subdivisions, for the purpose of enabling them to inspect repair, maintain, reconstruct, and relocate utilities, conduits, mains, and sewers within the headquarters' district.

Section 2

Underground constructions may be undertaken by the city of New York, or the State of New York, or any of their agencies or subdivisions, within the headquarters district only after consultation with the Secretary-General, and under conditions which shall not disturb the carrying out of the functions of the United Nations.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the obligations of the United States under said agreement and supplemental agreements with respect to United States assurances that the United Nations shall not be dispossessed of its property in the headquarters district, and with respect to the establishment of radio facilities and the possible establishment of an airport.

(a) The President of the United States, or any official or governmental agency authorized by the President, may acquire in the name of the United States any property or interest therein by purchase, donation, or other means of transfer, or may cause proceedings to be instituted for the acquisition of the same by condemnation.

(b) Upon the request of the President, or such officer as the President may designate, the Attorney General of the United States shall cause such condemnation or other proceedings to be instituted in the name of the United States in the district court of the United States for the district in which the propery is situated and such court shall have full jurisdiction of such proceedings, and any condemnation proceedings shall be conducted in accordance with the act of August 1, 1888 (25 Stat. 357), as amended, and the act of February 26, 1931 (46 Stat. 1421), as amended.

(c) After the institution of any such condemnation proceedings, possession of the property may be taken at any time the President, or such officer as he may designate, determines is necessary, and the court shall enter such orders as may be necessary to effect entry and occupancy of the property.

(d) The President of the United States, or any officer or governmental agency duly authorized by the President, may, in the name of the United States, transfer or convey possession of and title to any interest in any property acquired or held by the United States pursuant to paragraph (a) above, to the United Nations on the terms provided in the agreement or in any supplemental agreement, and shall execute and deliver such conveyances and other instruments and perform such other acts in connection therewith as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the agreement.

(e) There are authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required to enable the United States to carry out the undertakings hereby authorized: *Provided*, That any money appropriated under this authorization shall be spent only on a basis of reimbursement by the United Nations in accordance with section 3 of the agreement, and that the money thus reimbursed shall be deposited and covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 3. The President, or the Secretary of State under his direction, is authorized to enter into agreements with the State of New York or any other State of the United States and to the extent not inconsistent with State law, with any one or more of the political subdivisions thereof in aid of effectuating the provisions of the agreement.

SEC. 4. Any States, or, to the extent not inconsistent with State law any political subdivisions thereof, affected by the establishment of the headquarters of the United Nations in the United States are authorized to enter into agreements with the United Nations or with each other consistent with the agreement and for the purpose of facilitating compliance with the same: *Provided*, That, except in cases of emergency and agreements of a routine contractual character, a representative of the United States, to be appointed by the Secretary of State, may, at the discretion of the Secretary of State, participate in the negotiations, and that any such agreement entered into by such State or States or political subdivisions thereof shall be subject to approval by the Secretary of State.

SEC. 5. The President is authorized to make effective with respect to the temporary headquarters of the United Nations in the State of New York, on a provisional basis, such of the provisions of the agreement as he may deem appropriate, having due regard for the needs of the United Nations at its temporary headquarters.

SEC. 6. Nothing in the agreement shall be construed as in any way diminishing, abridging, or weakening the right of the United States to safeguard its own security and completely to control the entrance of aliens into any territory of the United States other than the headquarters district and its immediate vicinity, as to be defined and fixed in a supplementary agreement between the Government of the United States and the United Nations in pursuance of section 13 (3) (e) of the agreement, and such areas as it is reasonably necessary to traverse in transit between the same and foreign countries. Moreover, nothing in section 14 of the agreement with respect to facilitating entrance into the United States by persons who wish to visit the headquarters district and do not enjoy the right of entry provided in section 11 of the agreement shall be construed to amend or suspend in any way the immigration laws of the United States or to commit the United States in any way to effect any amendment or suspension of such laws.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

The Chair hears none.

The question is on suspending the rules and passing the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING CLERK OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 351) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That in order that the duties of his office may be discharged in case of his absence or disability or in case his office should become vacant, the Clerk of the House of Representatives on or before July 26, 1947, shall designate a subordinate in his office to perform the duties thereof in any such contingencies until the commencement of the second session of the Eightieth Congress. Such designee when acting under this authorization, shall subscribe himself as Acting Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The Clerk of the House shall promptly communicate to the Speaker the name of the employee designated hereunder for the information of the House.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

JULY 26, 1947.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 351 adopted by the House today, I have designated Mr. Harry Newlin Megill, an official in my office, to discharge the duties contemplated by said resolution.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

REPORTS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 352) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the reports of the Comptroller General of the United States made to Congress, pursuant to section 5 of the act of February 24, 1945 (59 Stat. 6), and the Government Corporation Control Act (59 Stat. 597), during the recesses of the Eightieth Congress, shall be printed during such recesses as House Documents of the next succeeding session of the Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include the minutes of an address de-

livered in connection with the unveiling ceremonies in commemoration of the founding of the Republic of Liberia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to take any part in this row that has been going on here tonight, and I would not take the floor at this time had it not been for the slurring remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] against Senator BILBO, a man who is unable to defend himself. Because of his health he is confined to a hospital, and because of what happened at the other end of the Capitol he was unable to defend himself there.

Instead of our filibustering in the interest of Senator BILBO, as the gentleman from New York said, Senator BILBO was lynched at the other end of the Capitol. They were not trying him for any misconduct with reference to his "dream" house. If they had been, there would have been an honest trial on the floor of the other body.

But because he had the courage to stand on the floor of the Senate when he was a Member of that body and fight against the passage of vicious legislation of which decent men should be ashamed—legislation that was striking at the very life of this Republic—because of that action the Communists decreed Senator BILBO's lynching and fought to have him denied his seat in the United States Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. In just a minute.

I was there. I saw those special trainloads of Communists pouring in here from Chicago and New York to demand that he be not seated because of the fact that in his sickness, when he was in physical pain and misery, he had had the courage to stand on the floor of the Senate and fight against the vicious legislation that mob was trying to get shoved through.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to my colleague from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. May I say that the lynching of the man BILBO to which the gentleman refers was not the only lynching that occurred through the same action. One of our sovereign States was denied its constitutional right to representation in this Congress and not only BILBO but the entire State of Mississippi has suffered for something of which it was not guilty, nor was BILBO.

Mr. RANKIN. If that is all you have to be proud of, let me say to the gentleman from New York, you certainly will not have anything to brag about when you go home. I thought every man in this House was ashamed of what had happened, and I still think that every one, when he knows what happened, will be ashamed of it.

This country is literally honeycombed with Communists who are turning heaven and earth to undermine and destroy this Government. The Committee on Un-American Activities, for the creation of which I was responsible, because I introduced the resolution that created it, has exposed the Communist scheme to overthrow this Government and set up soviets throughout this country.

Here is a picture of the Negro Soviet the Communists propose to set up in the Southern States. We got testimony to that effect from a Negro who had been taken to Moscow to be trained how to carry on a revolution in this country.

Senator BILBO was denied the right to speak on the floor of the Senate in his own defense. There is not a man in this House, or in the Senate, who would care to cross swords with him on that subject if he were well and able to speak for himself.

As I said, I did not mean to get into this row, but after all the insults that have been hurled at my State, after all the insults that have been hurled at the sick Senator from our State, I could not sit silent and let go unnoticed such expressions as that uttered by the gentleman from New York.

Since Senator BILBO is unable to speak for himself, he should not be subjected to such aspersions.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made earlier today and insert extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in regard to the presentation of a portrait of Judge Hatton W. Sumners to the Committee of this House on the Judiciary, and in another respect.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

THE HONORABLE JAMES W. WADSWORTH

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, Harvard University is not only a great university, but also the oldest in the Nation, or certainly one of the oldest. It is prideful of its degrees and we honor that characteristic. No man is given a degree by Harvard University who has not earned it by rich desert. He is bound to have not only a good education but a mind capable of comprehending its challenge. So when that great institution not only confers a degree upon a man who has earned it in that institution but esteems a man so highly, who was graduated from another great American university, its competitor—Yale—and that man is an honored Member of this body, it seems to me it is worthy of note and in the Congress in which it happens.

So, when Harvard University honored itself, this House, the Senate, and the great State of New York by conferring the degree of Doctor of Laws upon our esteemed colleague, JAMES W. WADSWORTH, I think that it is highly fitting that we should make recognition of it and let that institution know that we appreciate it and feel the honor that has come so well deserved and earned by one of our most distinguished Members.

Not only is he a great son of a great sire, not only a member of a family that has made America a better place in which to live, not only great because of his service to his native State, and an example to those who would till the soil and, hand in hand with Almighty God, increase its fertility and bring forth the fruits of the soil for the enrichment of our common life, but a man who has honored his State and his Nation by service in the United States Senate, and more especially in his ripening years has brought that same distinction upon this House. I believe that one whom we would love to think of as typical of the best of our citizenship is to be congratulated by the House in which he now serves so ably. His service has been outstanding in every line, but transcendent in the field of national defense.

We are glad to pay this tribute from our hearts to our esteemed colleague. We glory in the opportunity of praising truthfully a man we love—a great American.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an article.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House to be in recess.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker, at 11 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3830. An act to provide for the promotion and elimination of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R.

4347) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes," and agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 13 and 27 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2857) entitled "An act to extend second-class mailing privileges to bulletins issued by State conservation and fish and game agencies or departments."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by Dr. Maximiano Marmito Villareal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

SECOND-CLASS MAILING PRIVILEGE EXTENDED TO CERTAIN STATE AGENCIES

Mr. REES submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2857) to extend second-class mailing privileges to bulletins issued by State conservation and fish and game agencies or departments;

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2857) to extend second-class mailing privileges to bulletins issued by State conservation and fish and game agencies or departments, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

EDWARD H. REES,
ROBERT J. TWYMAN,
JOHN E. LYLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WILLIAM LANGER,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2857) to extend second-class mailing privileges to bulletins issued by State conservation and fish and game agencies or departments, submit the following statements in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment inserted language which had the effect of extending second-class mailing privileges to any adjutant general of a State. The Senate recedes.

EDWARD H. REES,
ROBERT J. TWYMAN,
JOHN E. LYLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2857) to extend second-class mailing privileges to bulletins issued by State conservation and fish and game agencies or departments, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROMOTION AND ELIMINATION OF OFFICERS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3830) to provide for the promotion and elimination of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Senate amendments be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think the amendments should be read. This is the bill that promotes officers in the Army?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. It has to do with the promotion of officers in the Army. We will explain the two amendments in which the gentleman is interested. All of the amendments practically are clarifying ones.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact the gentleman says he will explain the two amendments in which I am interested, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, aside from two amendments, all amendments of the Senate are merely clarification in language. The two amendments adopted which are of importance and in which I know there is great interest on the part of the Members of the House at this time and when the bill unanimously passed the House, have to do, one, with the War Department Engineers. At this time for an explanation of that Senate amendment I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, this is in substantially the form it passed the House. There are, as the Chairman has said, a number of clarifying amendments. It does increase over the number of four-star generals and admirals that the House has provided each service by one. It assures the Engineering Corps of the Army continuation of the present chiefs and assistant chiefs of those branches. That was a subject that was discussed at some length when we had the bill before the House. That is now assured under the amendment adopted by the Senate.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. It also assures continuation of the Engineers Corps as we have it today?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct, and permits the appointment as chiefs of branches down to the rank of lieutenant colonel. We worked on this bill, Mr. Speaker, for some 8 weeks before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Armed Services. I believe that we understand the situation involved in the bill, and those of us who worked on the bill in the subcommittee are satisfied with the Senate amendments, and I agree with the motion made by the chairman that we concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. CRAVENS. Does the gentleman from Texas agree with this bill?

Mr. KILDAY. I do.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REEVES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess at this time subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.), the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 11:50 o'clock p. m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Burke, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4168. An act to provide for reincorporation of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3309. An act to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4002) entitled "An act making appropri-

ations for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 6, 7, and 8 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed concurrent resolutions and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution providing for the adjournment of the two Houses of Congress until January 2, 1948.

S. Con. Res. 34. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Presiding Officers of the two Houses to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions after adjournment on July 26, 1947; and

S. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution providing for the time of meeting of the second regular session of the Eightieth Congress.

ADJOURNMENT RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 33), which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Saturday, July 26, 1947, they shall stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Friday, January 2, 1948, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the third day after the respective Members are notified to reassemble in accordance with section 2 of this resolution, whichever event first occurs.

SEC. 2. The President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the majority leader of the Senate, and the majority leader of the House of Representatives, all acting jointly, shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a resolution (S. Con Res. 34), which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That notwithstanding the adjournment of the two Houses until January 2, 1948, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate be, and they are hereby authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions, duly passed by the two Houses and found duly enrolled.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DATE OF COMMENCEMENT OF THE SECOND SESSION OF THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate Joint Resolution 156, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution fixing the date of the meeting of the second regular session of the Eightieth Congress

Resolved, etc., That the second regular session of the Eightieth Congress shall begin at noon on Tuesday, January 6, 1948.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until January 2, 1948, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the two Houses until January 2, 1948, the Speaker be authorized to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House shall have the privilege, until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published, to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on more than one subject, if they so desire, and may also include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extension of remarks. This order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the recess by Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, may I proceed for 10 seconds?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious matter. I wish to ask the majority leader, what will be the program on January 2, 1948?

Mr. HALLECK. I think that the program will be a motion to adjourn sine die.

Mr. RAYBURN. Will we get our mileage?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the last RECORD printed for this session, and to include therein a short address of greeting delivered by Senator Jose Gomez Esparaza, of the Mexican Congress, on the occasion of the visit to Mexico City of your committee on the hoof-and-mouth disease headed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT RESOLUTION

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings by which the House concurred in Senate Concurrent Resolution 33.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to Senate Concurrent Resolution 33 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALLECK: On page 1 of the amendment strike out "Saturday, July 26, 1947" and insert "Sunday, July 27, 1947."

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, at 12 o'clock and 5 minutes a m., the House was called to order by the Speaker.

AMENDING ORGANIC ACT OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3309) to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico, with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 4, strike out lines 12 to 20, inclusive.

Page 4, line 21, strike out "6" and insert "5."

Page 5, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 6. Section 49b is hereby added to the Organic Act to read as follows:

"'SEC. 49b. (1) There shall be an administrative officer whose official title shall be the "Coordinator of Federal Agencies in Puerto Rico," who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, and who shall hold office at the pleasure of the President for the purpose of coordinating the administration of all Federal civilian functions and activities in Puerto Rico. He shall receive as compensation for his services an annual salary of $7,500.

"'(2) The Coordinator of Federal Agencies shall coordinate the administration of all Federal civilian functions and activities in Puerto Rico. The administrative heads of all Federal civilian agencies in Puerto Rico shall make such reports to the Coordinator of Federal Agencies as he shall require and he shall through the Secretary of the Interior make recommendations to the heads of such agencies with respect to their personnel, functions, and activities in Puerto Rico: the President may, however, by Executive order exempt any Federal agency from making such reports to the Coordinator of Federal Agencies. The Coordinator of Federal Agencies shall make recommendations for the better coordination of the Federal civilian functions and activities and may make recommendations for the elimination or reduction

of those which duplicate or conflict with each other or with activities carried on by the Government of Puerto Rico. He shall report through the Secretary of the Interior to the President and to Congress concerning the administration of all Federal civilian functions and activities in Puerto Rico, specifying the recommendations made by him to the Federal agencies and the results of such recommendations. He shall advise the Secretary of the Interior, who shall advise the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress with respect to all appropriation estimates submitted by any civilian department or agency of the Federal Government to be expended in or for the benefit of Puerto Rico. He shall confer with the Governor of Puerto Rico with respect to the correlation of activities of Federal and insular agencies and all plans and programs and other matters of mutual interest.

"'(3) The President of the United States may, from time to time, after hearing, promulgate Executive orders expressly excepting Puerto Rico from the application of any Federal law, not expressly declared by Congress to be applicable to Puerto Rico, which as contemplated by section 9 of this act is inapplicable by reason of local conditions. The Coordinator of Federal Agencies may, from time to time, make recommendations to the President for such purpose. Any such recommendation shall show the concurrence or dissent of the Governor of Puerto Rico.

"'(4) The Coordinator of Federal Agencies, in the name of the President of the United States, shall have authority to request from the Governor of Puerto Rico, and the Governor shall furnish to him all such reports pertaining to the affairs, conditions, and government of Puerto Rico as the Coordinator of Federal Agencies shall from time to time request for transmission to the President through the Secretary of the Interior.

"'(5) The President of the United States shall prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.'

"SEC. 7. Section 2 of said Organic Act (48 U. S. C., sec. 737) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'The rights, privileges, and immunities of citizens of the United States shall be respected in Puerto Rico to the same extent as though Puerto Rico were a State of the Union and subject to the provisions of paragraph 1 of section 2 of article IV of the Constitution of the United States.'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess at this time subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes a. m.), the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 31 minutes a. m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution providing for the adjournment of the two Houses of Congress until January 2, 1948.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 609. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claims arising out of the deaths of Norman Ray Pedron and Carl Franklin Morris;

S. 758. An act to promote the national security by providing for a Secretary of Defense; for a National Military Establishment; for a Department of the Army, a Department of the Navy, and a Department of the Air Force; and for the coordination of the activities of the National Military Establishment with other departments of the Government concerned with the national security;

S. 794. An act to authorize the sale of a small tract of land on the Cherokee Indian Reservation, N. C.;

S. 892. An act for the payment of claims of one Fidelity Trust Co., of Baltimore, Md., and others, covered by findings of fact made by the United States Court of Claims, dated June 5, 1944, and contained in Senate Document No. 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session;

S. 907. An act to provide for the orderly transaction of the public business in the event of the death, resignation, or separation from office of regional disbursing officers of the Treasury Department;

S. 1070. An act to provide for the cancellation of the capital stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the refund of moneys received for such stock, and for other purposes;

S. 1181. An act for the relief of Robert F. Parks;

S. 1350. An act to authorize relief of accountable officers of the Government, and for other purposes;

S. 1361. An act to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit loans, capital grants, or annual contributions for low-rent housing and slum-clearance projects where construction costs exceed present cost limitations upon condition that local housing agencies pay the difference between cost limitations and the actual construction costs;

S. 1463. An act to amend section 12 of the Immigration Act of 1917;

S. 1480. An act authorizing the conveyance to the State of Delaware of a portion of Pea Patch Island;

S. 1494. An act to amend section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944;

S. 1505. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Boise, Idaho, to the Boise Chamber of Commerce;

S. 1582. An act relating to the sale of Paxon Field, Duval County, Fla.;

S. 1590. An act to amend the District of Columbia rent-control law so as to provide that schools and universities may recover possession of housing accommodations in certain cases;

S. 1633. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the National Convention of the American Legion to be held in New York, N. Y., August 28 to 31, 1947, and the National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, September 4 to 9, 1947;

S. 1661. An act to provide additional inducements to physicians, surgeons, and dentists to make a career of the United States military, naval, and public-health services, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to establish a commission to formulate plans for the erection, in Grant Park, Chicago, Ill., of a Marine Corps memorial.

S. J. Res. 130. Joint resolution relating to safety in bitumious-coal and lignite mines of the United States;

S. J. Res. 138. Joint resolution to provide for return of Italian property in the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 148. Joint resolution to authorize the temporary continuation of regulation of consumer credit.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 32 minutes a. m.), pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 33, the House adjourned until Friday, January 2, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

993. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting request for withdrawal of the case of Juan Hernandez Ayala from those 139 cases involving suspension of deportation referred to in letter of June 15, 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

994. A letter from the Clerk, House of Representatives, transmitting the motion to dismiss of the contestee in the contested election case of Lawrence Michael against Howard W. Smith for a seat in the House of Representatives from the Eighth Congressional District of the State of Virginia (H. Doc. No. 418); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

995. A letter from the Executive Secretary, Air Coordinating Committee, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to encourage the development of a safe United States flag international air transportation system properly adapted to the present and future needs of foreign commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense, and to meet certain of the obligations incumbent upon the United States by virtue of its membership in the International Civil Aviation Organization, by providing for the transfer, establishment, operation, administration, and maintenance of airport and airway property located outside the continental United States, for the training of foreign nationals in aviation activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

996. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

997. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide basic authority for certain functions and activities of the Weather Bureau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

998. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting interim report on the status of investigations of potential water resource developments in the Colorado River Basin in Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming (H. Doc. No. 419); to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

999. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 5, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Bransons Cove, lower Machodoc River, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 420); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1000. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 29, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on inland waterway from Beaufort to Jacksonville, N. C., and New River to Jacksonville, N. C., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 7, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 421); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1001. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 23, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on channel in Pamlico Sound, N. C., to Stumpy Point, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on April 12, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 422); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GAMBLE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 345. Resolution relative to the contested-election cases of Woodward against O'Brien, Sixth Congressional District of Illinois; Roberts against Douglas, Fourteenth Congressional District of California; and Michael against Smith, Eighth Congressional District of Virginia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1106).

Mr. TOWE: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4278. A bill to enact the National Security Training Act of 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 1107). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 107. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means to have printed for its use additional copies of the digest of testimony, index to hearings, and each part of the hearings held during the current session relative to tax revision, 1947-48; without amendment (Rept. No. 1109).

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4404. A bill to provide for the withdrawal of the sovereignty of the United States over the island of Puerto Rico and for the recognition of its independence; to provide for notification thereof to foreign governments; to provide for the assumption by the government of Puerto Rico of obligations under the treaty with Spain of December 10, 1898; to define trade and other relations between the United States and Puerto Rico; to provide for the calling of a convention to frame a constitution for the government of the island of Puerto Rico; to provide for certain mandatory provisions of the proposed constitution; to provide for the submission of the constitution to the people of Puerto Rico and its submission to the President of the United States for his approval; to provide for the adjustment of property rights between the United States and Puerto Rico; to provide for the maintenance of military, coaling, and naval stations by the United States on the island of Puerto Rico; to continue in force certain statutes until independence has been granted; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 4405. A bill to reduce Federal income and excise tax rates, to equalize Federal income taxes upon married persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 4406. A bill to grant to persons serving under the command of Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo in the campaign against the city of Manila, Philippine Islands, the right to wear the Spanish campaign ribbon and badge; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. R. 4407. A bill to amend sections 3400 and 3443 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 4408. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WOODRUFF:

H. R. 4409. A bill to provide a preliminary examination and survey of the Au Gres River in the State of Michigan with a view to control of its floods; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 4410. A bill to amend the Criminal Code to permit retired members of the armed forces and members of the Reserve components thereof to act as agents or attorneys for prosecuting claims against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 4411. A bill to amend an act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii, approved April 30, 1900, as amended, known as the Hawaiian Organic Act, by amending section 73 thereof; to approve amendments of chapter 78 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 4412. A bill for the more economical operation of the general supply fund of the Bureau of Federal Supply, Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 4413. A bill to provide for a per capita payment from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. COMBS:

H. R. 4414. A bill to name the dam and reservoir in the Neches-Angelina Rivers project at Town Bluff, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GAMBLE (by request):

H. R. 4415. A bill to amend section 403, subsection (b) of the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 4416. A bill relating to community property agreements and to equalize Federal income, estate, and gift taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 4417. A bill to provide for a national land policy based on the conservation of our soil and water resources, the orderly development and protection of the Nation's agricultural lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 4418. A bill to provide for the naturalization of persons legally in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 4419. A bill to amend section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act to permit expenditures by a corporation or labor organization in connection with the publication or distribution of newspapers or news magazines; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MICHENER (by request):

H. R. 4420. A bill to amend the act relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the national interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 4421. A bill to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 4422. A bill to provide that all members of the Communist Party and organizations controlled by it must register as agents of a foreign principal and that all printed matter distributed by such members and organizations shall be clearly labeled as being in compliance with the terms of this legislation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 4423. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to design and construct a new Federal office building at Chicago, Ill., on land now owned or hereafter acquired by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. YOUNGBLOOD:

H. R. 4424. A bill to establish the methods of advancement for post-office employees in the field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 4425. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 784), so as to extend the jurisdiction of the United States District Court, Territory of Hawaii, over Canton and Enderbury Islands; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 4426. A bill to provide basic authority for certain functions and activities of the Weather Bureau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4427. A bill to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4428. A bill to encourage the development of a safe United States flag international air transportation system properly adapted to the present and future needs of foreign commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense, and to meet certain of the obligations incumbent upon the United States by virtue of its membership in the International Civil Aviation Organization, by providing for the transfer, establishment, operation, administration, and maintenance of airport and airway property located outside the continental United States, for the training of foreign nationals in aviation activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 4429. A bill to extend the time for construction of the port, port facilities, and access roads in Monrovia, Liberia, under the

agreement dated December 31, 1943; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 4430. A bill to provide hospitalization for members of the reserve components of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 4431. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by providing for the delegation of certain authority of the Administrator, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4432. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by providing for certain penalties for unlawful use of examination papers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4433. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by providing for the delegation of certain powers of the Civil Aeronautics Board to the Administrator, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4434. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by clarifying the authority of the Administrator with respect to air traffic control regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4435. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by redefining certain powers of the Administrator, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 4436. A bill to establish a Federal commission for the physically handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. J. Res. 254. Joint resolution for universal disarmament; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 116. Concurrent resolution requesting a general conference on the subject of amending the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 117. Concurrent resolution recommending amendment of United Nations Charter relating to the veto; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. Res. 346. Resolution relative to Members' incomes and voting records; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Res. 348. Resolution to create a select committee to conduct a continuing study with respect to executive agreements made by the United States with foreign nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. Res. 349. Resolution expressing appreciation to Mrs. Carr B. McClenny for her presentation of the banner known as the Miracle Quilt of Democracy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. Res. 350. Resolution to authorize and direct the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct an investigation of the action of the Department of State with respect to the claim of George B. Soto against the Government of Guatemala; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 4437. A bill for the relief of James C. Smith, Charles A. Marlin, Andrew J. Perlik, and Albert N. James; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 4438. A bill for the relief of Seiki Arakaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4439. A bill for the relief of Kenji Takumi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4440. A bill for the relief of Sannosuke Onishi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 4441. A bill for the relief of the William J. Burns International Detective Agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 4442. A bill for the relief of Narasingh Chandar Rao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4443. A bill for the relief of Jacob Cohen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 4444. A bill for the relief of Ralph Morgan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHENER (by request):

H. R. 4445. A bill to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States with respect to counsel in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 4446. A bill to permit the naturalization of Raymando Gonzales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4447. A bill for the relief of Robert Marshall and Mrs. Myrtle I. Marshall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4448. A bill for the relief of Lewis M. Burford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4449. A bill for the relief of the American Legion Building Auditorium, Orange, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4450. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence Mayfield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4451. A bill for the relief of Mary W. Wertz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4452. A bill for the relief of Douglas L. Craig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4453. A bill for the relief of Ellis C. Wagner and Barbara P. Wagner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTS:

H. R. 4454. A bill for the relief of Margaret A. Callahan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 4455. A bill to authorize the conveyance by the Secretary of the Interior to the Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac Railroad Co., of certain lands lying in the bed of Roaches Run, Arlington County, Va., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 4456. A bill for relief of Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Hann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4457. A bill for relief of the estate of Kenneth N. Peel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4458. A bill for relief of Mr. and Mrs. Richard E. Deane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received for the second calendar quarter, 1947.

To carry out the provisions of the Lobbying Act three forms were printed and used in making detailed statements (Form A), registrations (Form B), and filing quarterly reports (Form C).

Section 308 (b) requires the printing of information received and filed. Forms B and C, upon which this information was submitted, are reproduced as follows:

FORM B

REGISTRATION (IN DUPLICATE) WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SECRETARY OF THE SENATE UNDER THE LOBBYING ACT

(Public Law 601, 79th Cong.)

Name ----------

Business address ----------

INFORMATION REQUIRED FROM PERSON REGISTERING

(1) The name and address of the person by whom employed:

(1) ----------

(2) In whose interest he appears or works:

(2) ----------

(3) The duration of such employment:

(3) ----------

(4) How much he is paid and is to receive:

(4) ----------

(5) By whom he is paid or is to be paid:

(5) ----------

(6) How much he is to be paid for expenses:

(6) ----------

(7) What expenses are to be included:

(7) ----------

See Form C for quarterly report to be filed.

OATH OF REGISTRANT

[Omitted in printing]

FORM C

QUARTERLY REPORT OF PERSONS REGISTERING UNDER LOBBYING ACT TO BE FILED IN DUPLICATE, WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

(Public Law 601, 79th Cong.)

Name ----------

Business address ----------

INFORMATION REQUIRED IN QUARTERLY REPORT

Each such person so registering shall, between the 1st and 10th day of each calendar quarter, so long as his activity continues, file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and Secretary of the Senate—

(1) A detailed report under oath of all money received and expended by him during the preceding calendar quarter:

(1) ----------

(2) To whom paid:

(2) ----------

(3) For what purposes:

(3) ----------

(4) The names of any papers, periodicals, magazines, or other publications in which he has caused to be published any articles or editorials:

(4) ----------

(5) The proposed legislation he is employed to support or oppose:

(5) ----------

OATH OF REGISTRANT FILING QUARTERLY REPORT

[Omitted in printing]

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were received for the second calendar quarter 1947, and filed, using Form B, with the

Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate:

(NOTE.—In order to reduce space, the questions in Form B (see above) are not repeated. Only the answers to questions are printed and are indicated by numbers in parentheses.)

Abram, Richard, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (3) Indefinite. (4) $14.75 per day and $11.80 per diem. (5) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (6) $11.80 per day. (7) Hotel, meals, etc.

Allen, E. G., 2419 California Street NW. (1) Long Beach, Calif., Chamber of Commerce. (2) See (1). (3) Tentatively 1 year. (4) Not settled. (5) Chamber of Commerce of Long Beach, Calif. (6) Received $800 for expenses of setting up office. (7) Office rental, equipment, supplies, clerk hire, telephone, and telegraph.

American Booksellers Association, Inc., 31 Madison Avenue, New York 10, N. Y., by Gilbert E. Goodkind. (1) American Booksellers Association, Inc., 31 Madison Avenue, New York 10, N. Y., by Gilbert E. Goodkind, executive secretary. (2) The Retail Booksellers of the United States. (3) Indefinite. (4) Necessary expenses. (5) Treasury of the American Booksellers Association and contributions from retail booksellers. (6) No fixed sum. (7) Traveling expenses only.

Aring, Hector M., 826 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Johns-Manville Corp. (3) Permanent, full-time official; however, little, if any, of my duties might be construed as devoted to the influencing of legislation. I am, therefore, listing one-third of my remuneration and expenses which far exceed the maximum which could conceivably be considered as coming within the purview of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (4) One-third of annual remuneration, $3,333.33. (5) Johns-Manville Corp. (6) One-third entertainment expenses, $1,600; and one-third of one-third of apartment expenses maintained for general company use, $2,232, total, $3,832. Only one-third of above apartment expenses are chargeable to me. (7) Entertainment and maintenance of Washington apartment.

Arnold, W. C., 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash. (1) Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash. (2) Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash. (3) Permanent. (4) I am employed on a permanent basis by the Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., in the capacity of managing director, and receive an annual salary of $19,500. I receive no additional compensation for my services in connection with legislative matters. Only a very small fraction of my time is devoted to legislative matters. (5) See 4. (6) Traveling expenses. (7) Traveling expenses, telephone and telegraph expenses.

Bailey, C. Lloyd, 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington 8, D. C. (1) Friends Committee on National Legislation, 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington 8, D. C. (2) Friends Committee on National Legislation. (3) July 1, 1947, to July 1, 1948. (4) $3,600 annually. (5) Friends Committee on National Legislation. (6) Refund of actual expenses incurred. (7) Railroad and other transportation together with lodging and meals when on field trips or committee business, telephone calls, taxis. Field trips are for keeping members of Society of Friends aware of developments in legislation and national policy, participating in forums and institutes, and meetings of the executive and general committees.

Bailey,[1] Frazer A., 1809 G Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) National Federation of American Shipping, Inc. (3) At the pleasure of board of directors. (4) $15,000. (5) National Federation of American Shipping, Inc. (6) Actual disbursements. (7) Travel and entertainment.

Baker, L. Gibbs, Butler, Baker & Tausig, 1011 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Puget Sound Pulp & Timber Co., Bellingham, Wash. (2) Puget Sound Pulp & Timber Co. (3) Indefinite. (4) Undetermined. (5) Puget Sound Pulp & Timber Co. (6) Out-of-pocket disbursements such as they may be. (7) Telephone, telegram, postage, transportation, business entertainment, transcripts, photostats, notary fees, travel per diem and the like.

Baldwin and Mermey, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York 17, N. Y. (1) The American Chamber of Commerce of Cuba, Habana, Cuba. (2) The American Chamber of Commerce of Cuba, Habana, Cuba. (3) One month. (4) $1,500. (5) The American Chamber of Commerce of Cuba, Habana, Cuba. (6) Reimbursement at cost for out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Printing and distribution of booklet and news release, postage, telephone, and traveling.

Ball, George W., Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant, a member of the law firm of Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Cox, is retained by the woven woolen felt industry. (2) Woven woolen felt industry. (3) Indefinite. (4) Activities are incidental to regular legal representation and are compensated for from time to time by fees for legal services performed. (5) Woven woolen felt industry. (6) Applicant's firm is to be reimbursed for actual expenses. (7) Ordinary expenses of the kind normally incurred in the course of legal representation.

Bannell, Marshall F., 1 Maiden Lane, North Haven, Conn. (1) Tool Owners Union, 1802 Massachusetts Avenue, Lexington, Mass. (2) Tool Owners Union. (3) Indefinite. (4) To be established at later date. (5) Tool Owners Union. (6) Indefinite amount. (7) General, travel, etc.

Beall, J. Ninian, Brashears, Beall & Beasley, attorneys at law, Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Holland Bulb Exporters Association, Inc., 38 Pearl Street, New York N. Y. (2) Holland bulb industry. (3) Monthly until terminated by either party. (4) $100 per month retainer. Additional compensation to be agreed upon if warranted if unusual time is required. (5) Holland Bulb Exporters Association, Inc. (6) No expense allowance; actual, if any. (7) No expense allowance; actual, if any, taxi fares, printing, etc.

Bennett, William F., 416 Fifth Street NW., suite 602, Washington, D. C. (1) F. W. McKenney and Associates, 416 Fifth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Trailercoach Dealers National Association, trailercoach industry. (3) Permanently; however, only a small portion of his time is devoted to legislative work. (4) $9,000 annually. (5) F. W. McKenney & Associates. (6) Petty cash items, no set amount. (7) Petty cash expenses, such as taxis, entertainment.

Bledsoe, Samuel B., 1730 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) I am a Washington partner of the firm of Selvage & Lee, public relations, 16 East Forty-eighth Street, New York City. (2) The Chicago Corp., Chicago, Ill. (3) Indefinite. (4) The firm's actitivies in connection with legislation amount to approximately $5,000, on an annual basis. (5) The Chicago Corp. (6) Actual out-of-pocket expenses incurred in connection with work done. (7) Taxis, meals, phone calls, and travel expenses.

Bloch, Charles J., 614-18 Persons Building, Macon, Ga. (1) Georgia Southern & Florida Railway Co., Macon, Ga. (2) Georgia Southern & Florida Railway Co., Southern Railway Co., Southern Railway Co. and allied lines of Southern Railway Co. in Southern railway system. (3) Annual. (4) The firm of Hall & Bloch, attorneys, Macon, Ga., of which registrant is a member, is division counsel for Georgia Southern & Florida Railway Co. As such, they are paid an annual salary of $3,600, and furnished a clerk whose salary is $2,364 per annum. There is no agreement as to any additional compensation. (5) Georgia Southern & Florida Railway Co. (6) An amount sufficient to defray actual expenses while traveling to and from Washington and while in Washington on business of the company. (7) Meals, lodging, taxicab fares while traveling to and from Washington, and while in Washington on business of the company.

Blumberg, Emanuel, 137 Chesapeake Street SW. (1) Washington Highlands Citizens Association (2) Washington Highlands Citizens Association. (3) Until terminated. (4) Nothing. (5) [Blank.] (6) Nothing. (7) None

Blunt, Joseph R., 1604 K Street NW, Washington, D. C. (1) West Coast Lumbermen's Association, 1410 Southwest Morrison Street, Portland, Oreg. (2) Same as (1). (3) Indefinite. (4) Total salary $10,000 per year is remuneration for all services of which legislative activities are not expected to be more than 10 percent. (5) Same as (1). (6) Reimbursement of necessary and proper expenses, only a small portion of which have any relation to legislation. (7) See (6).

Bockovac, Joseph L., 199 Chesapeake Street SW, Washington 20, D. C. (1) Self, 199 Chesapeake Street SW, Washington 20, D. C. (2) Self. (3) Eightieth Congress, second session. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.] (6) [Blank.] (7) [Blank.]

Brickman, Paul, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago 4, Ill. (1) Vernon Scott and Loring Schuler, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago 4, Ill. (2) Tax equality. (3) Indefinite. (4) $10,000 per annum. (5) Same. (6) Reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Rent, food, travel, entertainment.

Bronson, Ruth Muskrat, 1426 Thirty-fifth Street NW, Washington 7, D. C. (1) National Congress of American Indians, Claremore, Okla. (2) The American Indians. (3) Indefinite. (4) Nothing. (5) [Blank.] (6) Out-of-pocket expenses incurred. As secretary of the National Congress of American Indians receives $60 a month. (7) Taxicabs, etc. Allowed maid service to permit registrant to give time to duties as secretary of the organization.

Brooks, William F., 604 Hibbs Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) National Grain Trade Council, 604 Hibbs Building, Washington 5, D. C. (2) Same as (1) above. (3) Permanent. (4) $6,000, not all of which is attributable to activities covered by Lobbying Act. (5) Same as (1) above. (6) Actual reimbursement of expenses. (7) Transportation costs, telephone calls, newspapers and periodicals, limited amount of entertainment—luncheons, etc.

Brown, C. Edgar, 2716 Ordway Street NW, Washington, D. C. (1) Associated Railroads of New York State, 466 Lexington Avenue, New York 17, N. Y. (2) Associated Railroads of New York State, 466 Lexington Avenue, New York 17, N. Y. (3) Indefinite. (4) $125 per week. (5) Associated Railroads of New York State, 466 Lexington Avenue, New York 17, N. Y. (6) Actual disbursements. (7) Taxi, telephone, telegraph, postage, and meals.

Brownell, Don Carlos, Seward, Alaska. (1) City of Seward, Alaska. (2) City of Seward, Alaska. (3) Indefinite. (4) Actual expenses only. (5) City of Seward, Alaska. (6) Only those necessarily incurred. (7) Transportation and personal subsistence.

Buck, Mrs. J. L. Blair, 1734 N Street NW, Washington 6, D. C. (1) Not employed for pay. Elected to office of president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, June 1947. (2) A volunteer worker for the General Federation of Women's Clubs. This organization supports legislation which pertains to the welfare of the home and to the general welfare, after given authority through

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.

the adoption of resolution by the delegate body. (3) Elected to office for 3 years—June 1947–50. (4) No salary. (5) No salary. (6) Yearly appropriation of $4,200. This amount used primarily for travel and entertainment in connection with activities of the organization. Travel expense to board meetings and conventions of the organization allowed. (7) See question 6.

Bulow, William J., Jr., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York 14, N. Y. (2) National Postal Committee for Books. (3) Indefinite. (4) Fee based upon services rendered and time expended. (5) National Postal Committee for Books. (6) Reimbursement of actual expenses listed in item 7. (7) Incidental expenses such as telephone, telegraph, transportation, etc.

Burke, Thomas F., care of Pennsylvania Railroad, Harismus Cove, Jersey City, N. J. (1) Pennsylvania Railroad, Jersey City, N. J. (2) The Employees' Committee for Low Cost Retirement Benefits. (3) Until the committee has achieved its purpose in reducing the cost to employees under the Railroad Retirement Act and the amendment thereof known as the Crosser bill which became the law July 31, 1946. (4) $300 per month. (5) From the funds of the committee, which committee will raise its funds by contribution from railroad employees, payment to be made when the committee has sufficient funds. (6) No definite amount, except what is required for traveling, hotel, and other necessary living expenses. (7) See (6) above.

Burrows, Orrin A., 1200 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, A. F. of L., 1200 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (2) International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers of of American Federation of Labor, 1200 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (3) Indefinite. Appointment made by president of International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, A. F. of L. (4) $90 weekly minus withholding and railroad-retirement taxes. (5) International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, A. F. of L. (6) Undetermined. Actual expenses. (7) Actual cash expenditures for organizational purposes. Includes transportation, telephones, and incidental expenses. None for lobbying purposes.

Busha, C. T., Jr., 1006 Hill Building, Seventeenth and I Streets NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Montana State Chamber of Commerce, Helena, Mont., James J. Flaherty, president, Great Falls, Mont.; William G. Ferguson, manager, Helena, Mont. (2) Montana State Chamber of Commerce. (3) Yearly. (4) $50 per month. (5) Montana State Chamber of Commerce. (6) None. (7) None.

Caffey, John W., 800 Southeastern Building, Greensboro, N. C. (1) Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (2) Wine Institute. (3) For the past 6 years and for an indeterminate time. (4) My compensation is and has been on a fixed annual basis for the purpose of rendering legal services and conducting market surveys and industry research work. The matter of lobbying is only incidental and I receive no extra compensation for same. (5) Wine Institute. (6) Only actual travel and subsistence expense. (7) Travel and subsistence.

Capian, Gloria, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (2) The above committee. (3) At will. (4) Salary at $295 per month plus reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket expenses. (5) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. (6) Actual amount of out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Air and railroad fares, taxi, bus and car fares, hotels, meals, telegraph, telephone, and postage.

Carpenter, James W., 704 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) F. E. D. C. B. & Co., B. R. and James W. Carpenter, proprietors, 704 Third Street NW., Washington 1, D. C. (2) In the personal interest of the owners. (3) Four years. (4) $1,000, annual. (5) By the owners. (6) $500, annual. (7) Room, board, transportation, advertising, publicity, printing, postage, communications, sugar, sirup, tobacco.

Cates, Lawrence, 1185 National Press Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Air Line Pilots Association, 3145 West Sixty-third Street, Chicago 29, Ill. (2) All air-line transport pilots. (3) Permanent employee. (4) $7,000 per annum. (5) Air Line Pilots Association. (6) No definite amount; reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses incident to duties for Air Line Pilots Association. (7) Travel and all expenses in connection therewith, taxi, telephone, telegraph, etc.

Chace, W. E., 616 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (2) Employer as indicated in (1) above. (2) Employed on a year-to-year basis (4) W. E. Chace is paid a salary as public relations officer of the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., and he is informed and believes that when he shall do anything as such public relations officer to influence legislation by Congress an allocable part of his salary may be said to be paid as consideration for such activity, and in such event he intends to report the same in his quarterly report. (5) By the employer as indicated in (1) above. (6) See answer to (4) above. In addition, W. E. Chace is not to be paid any sum specifically for expenses in attempting to influence legislation. Any expense actually to be incurred in attempting to influence legislation will be paid by him subject to reimbursement by the National Fertilizer Association, Inc. (7) Any such expenses as travel, hotels, meals, taxes, tips, and entertainment are to be included and will be reported when actually incurred by the registrant..

Chase, Paul, 15 E Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Pension Committee, Inc., 15 E Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) American Pension Committee, Inc. (3) Indefinite. (4) No appropriation or arrangement has been made. (5) See (4). (6) See (4). (7) See (4).

Columbus, Frank S., 10 Independence Avenue, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland 15, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. (3) Casual, as the interests of the brotherhood may require. (4) $10 per day salary. (5) Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. (6) $10 per day. (7) Personal expenses.

Condon, Arthur D., attorney at law, Suite 513, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Morton Salt Co., 310 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago 4, Ill. (2) Morton Salt Co. (3) Reasonable compensation to be agreed upon. (4) Reasonable compensation to be agreed upon. (5) [Blank.] (6) [Blank.] (7) [Blank.]

Connaughton, John H., attorney, 316 Metropolitan Bank Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Mrs. Cecil N. Broy, 524 North Monroe Street, Arlington Va. (2) Mrs. Cecil N. Broy. (3) During first session, Eightieth Congress. (4) Has been paid $250. (5) Mrs. Cecil N. Broy. (6) None. (7) None.

Corbin, George A., room 3137 ICC Building, Twelfth and Constitution Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) Members of Manor Park Citizens' Association. Prepares resolution, drafts proposed laws for presentation to Committees on the District of Columbia and appears before such committees without compensation. (2) Members of the Manor Park Citizens' Association. (3) Until successor is appointed by president of Manor Park Citizens' Association. (4) Nothing. Serves association without compensation. (5) No one. (6) Nothing. (7) None.

Crawford, James M., 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia 1, Pa. (1) Indemnity Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia 1, Pa. (2) Indemnity Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia 1, Pa. (3) Indefinite. Deponent is vice president of the above company. His office is elective, but his general employment by the company is anticipated to continue indefinitely. (4) Deponent receives no special compensation for any attempts to influence legislation by Congress. His activities in this respect are merely an incidental phase of his regular duties as an executive officer of the above company. (5) Indemnity Insurance Co. of North America. (6) No special sum or limits are specified. (See 7). (7) Out-of-pocket expenditures for transportation and subsistence.

Crowley, Leo J., 922 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo. (1) Colorado Railroad Association (2) Colorado Railroad Association. (3) Indefinite. The registrant is engaged in the private practice of law in Denver, Colo., and as an incident thereto has since 1944 represented the Colorado Railroad Association in legislative matters before the Colorado General Assembly for which he receives a retainer fee each month. On infrequent occasions some of his time is devoted to Federal legislation. The total time used by him in this effort would not be 10 percent and no break-down of his fees or expenses can be made whereby any particular portion could be allocated to services involving Federal legislation. (4) No determinable amount of compensation is paid or received on account of Federal legislation (see (3)). (5) Railroads operating in Colorado: Union Pacific; Chicago, Burlington & Quincy; Denver & Rio Grande Western; Rock Island; Colorado & Southern; Santa Fe; Missouri Pacific; and Denver & Salt Lake. (6) No stated or determinable amount for expenses incurred in connection with Federal legislation (see (3)). (7) Actual expenses for hotel bills, traveling expenses, etc. (see (3)).

Curry, James E., 1212 Tower Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) National Congress of American Indians, Claremore, Okla.; Tlingit and Haida Indians of southeastern Alaska; Indian villages and business associations in southeastern Alaska. (See attached list.[2]) (2) American Indians. (3) Indefinite. (4) Paid nothing. To receive up to 10 percent of all recovery in claims plus reasonable fees for other work. (5) Organizations above mentioned. (6) Amount disbursed. (7) If work entails collection of a claim against the United States, expenses to be paid from the recovery.

Daley, William L., Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Editorial Association, 188 West Randolph Street, Chicago 1, Ill. (2) National Editorial Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) For part-time handling of legislative matters, $3,300. Registrant retained as Washington representative for above organization, a national association of publishers and editors. Duties and activities devoted largely to departmental and other nonlegislative work for the membership including interpretative reporting service on all governmental affairs affecting the press. (5) Naticnal Editorial Association. (6) Reimbursement for cut-of-pocket expenses. (7) Actual expenses.

Dawson, Clarence E., 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York 5, N. Y. (2) New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York 5, N. Y. (3) Annual retainer. (4) Registrant is an associate of the law firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, which firm receives an annual retainer from the New York Stock Exchange for professional services. Registrant will receive no compensation in addition to his regular salary from that firm for legislative activities covered by the act, which activities comprise only an incidental and minor part of the registrant's duties. (5) New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York 5, N. Y.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

(6) The firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley will be reimbursed for actual out-of-pocket expenses incurred by any member or associate of the firm. (7) See (6) above. Usual disbursements customary in legal work.

Day, Mary R., 741 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C., lawyer. (1) Massman Construction Co., 20 West Ninth Street, Kansas City, Mo. (2) Massman Construction Co., 20 West Ninth Street, Kansas City, Mo. (3) Indefinite. (4) Registrant and Morelock & Seay who handled the case in the Court of Claims have a contract with the Massman Construction Co., on a 25-percent contingent-fee basis; registrant to receive 12½ percent less $1,000 paid to her in July 1945, by the Massman Construction Co. (5) Massman Construction Co. (same address as given above). (6) Nothing. (7) None.

Denning, William I., 1518 K Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) National Publishers Association, 232 Madison Avenue, New York 16, N. Y. (2) National Publishers Association, 232 Madison Avenue, New York 16, N. Y. (3) Indefinite. (4) Quarterly retainer of $1,170, plus additional compensation as may be mutually agreed upon for services rendered. (5) National Publishers Association. (6) Not yet determined. (7) Usual disbursements customary in legal work.

Dickerman, John M., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., suite 1116, Washington, D. C. (1) National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., suite 1116. (2) The home-building industry and in particular the members of the National Association of Home Builders of the United States. (3) Permanent (employment started May 15, 1947). (4) $833.33 per month salary. (5) National Association of Home Builders of the United States. (6) No stated amount. Reimbursement for actual money expended for type of items listed below. (7) Transportation, meals, telephone calls, and other miscellaneous small items.

Douglas, Proctor, MacIntyre & Gates,[1] a law partnership composed of James H. Douglas, Jr., Robert Proctor, Malcolm A. MacIntyre, and Samuel E. Gates, with whom are associated Carl McGowan, John F. Meck, Jr., Maurice Winger, Jr., John S. Hancock, and Roy B. Kelly, 730 Southern Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Western Cemetery Alliance, 417 South Hill Street, Los Angeles 13, Calif. (2) Western Cemetery Alliance, 417 South Hill Street, Los Angeles 13, Calif. (3) Indefinite. (4) Attorney and client relationship. Reasonable fees for services rendered, plus expenses actually incurred. (5) Western Cemetery Alliance, 417 South Hill Street, Los Angeles 13, Calif. (6) Necessary expenses incurred. (7) Those customarily incurred in connection with legal work, such as traveling, telephone, and telegraph.

Dow, Wilbur E., Jr., 70 Pine Street, New York City, N. Y. (1) Registrant is a member of the firm of Dow & Symmers, 70 Pine Street, New York City, N. Y. (2) American Tramp Shipowners Institute. (3) Indefinite. (4) Quantum meruit, plus traveling and subsistance expenses. (5) American Tramp Shipowners Institute. (6) Amount actually paid out. (7) Subsistence, traveling, and stenographic.

Dowd, Munson J., Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif. (1) Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif. (2) Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif., Colorado River Board of California, 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif. (3) Indefinite. (4) $939 per month. (This salary is for consulting services in connection with Imperial Irrigation District's irrigation and power systems. Services in connection with legislation are incidental thereto.) (5) Imperial Irrigation District. (6) Actual personal expenses when away from El Centro. (7) Hotel, transportation, meals, and incidentals thereto.

Dunford, Edward B.,[2] 131 B Street SE., Washington 3, D. C. (1) The Anti-Saloon League of America, 131 B Street SE., Washington 3, D. C. (2) The Anti-Saloon League of America. (3) Two years from November 18, 1946. (4) $5,500 per annum. This represents annual salary for all services rendered as attorney for the organization. The responsibility for the enactment of liquor legislation under the twenty-first amendment to the Federal Constitution rests upon the States primarily. Only a small proportion of registrant's time is concerned with Federal legislation. (5) The Anti-Saloon League of America. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Office expenses, clerical help, postage, telephone, and telegraph.

Ellison, Newell W., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) St. Joe Paper Co. and affiliated and asscciated companies, including Florida National Group of Banks. (2) St. Joe Paper Co. and affiliated and associated companies, including Florida National Group of Banks. (3) Indefinite. (4) Compensation to be fixed with regard to time spent on the normal attorney-client basis. (5) St. Joe Paper Co. and affiliated and associated companies, including Florida National Group of Banks. (6) To be reimbursed for amount actually spent. (7) Telephone calls, taxicab fares, and other similar miscellaneous expenses of a routine nature.

Ervin, S. J., Jr., Morganton, N. C. (1) Southern Railway Co., Fifteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D C. (2) Southern Railway Co., in connection with legislation affecting the Southern Railway Co. (3) Registrant is employed on an annual basis by the Southern Railway Co. at a yearly salary of $2,400 as trial attorney in Avery, Burke, Caldwell, Cleveland, and Lincoln Counties, N. C. Employment in work in connection with legislation is also on an annual basis, and for an indefinite period of time. (4) No agreement has been made for any additional compensation above aforesaid salary as trial counsel. (5) No agreement has been made for any additional compensation above salary as trial counsel as set forth above. If any additional compensation should be paid, it will be paid by the Southern Railway Co. (6) Transportation, lodging, and meals while engaged in work favoring or opposing legislation affecting the Southern Railway Co. (7) Transportation, lodging, and meals while engaged in work favoring or opposing legislation affecting Southern Railway Co.

Eubanks, Raymond C., 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Brotherhood Railroad Trainmen, 130 Third Street SE. (2) Brotherhood Railroad Trainmen. (3) Unknown. (4) $14.75 per day. (5) Brotherhood Railroad Trainmen. (6) Personal expenses only, $11.80 per day. (7) Personal expenses only.

Farquharson, James A., 729 Fifteenth Street NW., care of Tom J. McGrath, Washington, D. C. (1) Tom J. McGrath. (2) Dependent upon requirements and for such periods as may be deemed necessary undersigned will work in the interests of several clients by whom Mr. McGrath is employed and for whom he is registered under the Lobbying Act, to assist Mr. McGrath in such work. (3) Indefinite. (4) At the rate of $40 per day for all time consumed in such work. (5) Tom J. McGrath. (6) No fixed amount. (7) Necessary traveling, taxicab, telephone, and similar expenses.

Ferguson, Abner H., 1139 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Associated Third Class Mail Users, Twenty-fourth and Burlington Streets, Kansas City, Mo. (2) In the interest of employer and its members. (3) Indefinite. (4) Compensation has not yet been fixed. (5) By the employer. (6) Reimbursement for actual expenses for travel, telephone, telegraph, and other such incidental expenses actually incurred. (7) As described under (6).

Finkel, William H., care Pennsylvania Railroad, Harismus Cove, Jersey City, N. J. (1) Pennsylvania Railroad, Jersey City, N. J. (2) The Employees Committee for Low-Cost Retirement Benefits. (3) Until the committee has achieved its purpose in reducing the cost to employees under the Railroad Retirement Act and the amendment thereof known as the Crosser bill which became the law in July 31, 1946. (4) $300 per month. (5) From the funds of the committee, which committee will raise its funds by contribution from railroad employees, payment to be made when committee has sufficient funds. (6) No definite amount, except what is required for traveling, hotel, and other necessary living expenses. (7) See (6) above.

Fish, Frederick, 70 Pine Street, New York City, N. Y. (1) Registrant is a member of the firm of Dow & Cymmers, 70 Pine Street, New York City, N. Y. (2) American Tramp Shipowners Institute. (3) Indefinite. (4) Quantum meruit, plus traveling and subsistence expenses. (5) American Tramp Shipowners Institute. (6) Amount actual paid out. (7) Subsistence, traveling and stenographic.

Fleming, Charles Henry, 1124 Earle Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Coast Guard League, 1300 "E" Street NW., Washington 25, D. C. (2) Coast Guard League. (3) Until election of new national service officer at annual convention. (4) Nothing. (5) No one. (6) Any out-of-pocket expense. (7) Clerical expense and preparation of any exhibits.

Francis, Joseph H., 212 Utah Oil Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) National Board of Fur Farm Organizations, 212 Utah Oil Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (2) National Fur Farming Industry. (3) Employed on a yearly basis, from August to August of each year. (4) Yearly salary of $12,000. This salary is for acting as secretary of the organization, of which attending to legislative matters is only part of the duties. (5) National Board of Fur Farm Organizations. (6) Necessary traveling expenses. (7) Travel and lodging.

Geary, Paul M., 633 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) National Electrical Contractors Association. A national nonprofit membership association of firms engaged in electrical contracting, 633 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (2) The registrant works in the interest of the National Electrical Contractors Association, which was organized in 1901, to promote the interests of electrical contractors in the installing, servicing, and maintenance of electric wiring, appliances, and equipment; also, to further ethical business practices and to improve products and services. (3) The registrant is permanently employed by the National Electrical Contractors Association. (4) The registrant is paid at the rate of $15,000 per year as executive vice president of the National Electrical Contractors Association. This position includes many duties and activities not covered by the terms of this act. (5) The registrant is paid exclusively by the National Electrical Contractors Association. (6) The registrant is furnished an office, secretarial, telephone, and telegraph services, but no fixed expense allowance. Out-of-pocket expenses are reimbursed on itemized vouchers. (7) The holding of meetings, meals, taxis, hotel, and travel for activities covered and also those not covered by the terms of this act.

Gebhard, Mrs. Paul, 1751 N Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Division of Social Education and Action, Board of Christian Education, Presbyterian Church, United States of America, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa. (2) Same. (3) Temporary. (4) Volunteer. (5) See (4) above. (6) All expenses. (7) Maintenance and office.

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.

[2] Registration with the Secretary only.

Goodbee,[2] Ann Dodge, Union Trust Building. (1) Roosevelt Realty Corp. and Hotel 2100, 2400 Sixteenth Street, Washington, D. C. (2) Above. (3) They are my clients and I shall represent them as long as they remain such. (4) I haven't estimated my fee yet and am working in connection with only one bill before Congress—to amend District of Columbia unemployment tax law. (5) See (1) above. (6) Nothing. (7) None.

Gray, Harding F., 6092 Nogles Street, Riverside, Calif. (1) The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3673 West Pine Blvd., St. Louis 8, Mo. (2) The Order of Railroad Telegraphers. (3) Indefinite. (4) $325 per month. (5) The Order of Railroad Telegraphers. (6) $10 per diem. (7) Hotel, meals, transportation, and miscellaneous.

Greenwood, Joseph Richard, room 1102, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Sea-Air Legislative Committee. (3) Indefinite. (4) Undetermined, dependent upon services rendered and time spent on legislative activities. (5) Sea-Air Legislative Committee. (6) Actual expenses as incurred. (7) Administrative, clerical, travel, subsistence, and any other expenses properly attributable to legislative activities.

Haas, Herbert A., care of Pennsylvania Rail Road, Harismus Cove, Jersey City, N. J. (1) Pennsylvania Railroad, Jersey City, N. J. (2) The Employees Committee for Low Cost Retirement Benefits. (2) Until the committee has achieved its purpose in reducing the cost to employees under the Railroad Retirement Act and the amendment thereof known as the Crosser bill which became the law in July 31, 1946. (4) $300 per month. (5) From the funds of the committee, which committee will raise its funds by contribution from railroad employees, payment to be made when the committee has sufficient funds. (6) No definite amount, except what is required for traveling, hotel, and other necessary living expenses. (7) See (6) above.

Hadley, Harlan V., 830 Transportation Building, Washington 6, D. C. (1) Taxation Committee, Automobile Manufacturers Association, 320 New Center Building, Detroit 2, Mich. (2) Taxation Committee, Automobile Manufacturers Association. (3) From May 1947 until terminated. (4) At annual rate of $3,000. (5) Taxation Committee, Automobile Manufacturers Association. (6) As expended, but not to exceed rate of $500 a year. (7) Transportation and traveling.

Heiney, Robert B., 1739 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Canners Association, 1739 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Canners Association, 1739 H Street NW. (3) Indefinite. (4) Full salary is $6,500 per year for duties as assistant to secretary of National Canners Association. Much less than one-third of time is spent on keeping informed on legislation matters affecting canning industry. (5) National Canners Association. (6) Necessary disbursements incurred. (7) Taxicab fares and miscellaneous minor routine expenses.

Henderson, Elmer W., 930 F Street NW., Room 901, Washington, D. C. (1) National Council for a Permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission, 930 F Street NW., Room 901, Washington, D. C. (2) National Council for a Permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission. (3) Unknown. (4) $466 per month. (5) National Council for a Permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission. (6) Not yet determined. (7) [Blank.]

Hensel, Eugene L., 8 East Long Street, Columbus 15, Ohio. (1) National Association of Cooperatives, 407 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (2) National Association of Cooperatives, 407 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (3) Indefinite. (4) Monthly retainer of $200 per month, plus per diem of $100 for each day actually spent in rendition of services to National Association of Cooperatives. (5) National Association of Cooperatives. (6) Reimbursement for actual out-of-pocket traveling expenses. (7) Travel expenses only.

Hensel, Robert E., 25 Broadway, New York 4, N. Y. (1) The American Tobacco Co., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York 3, N. Y. (2) The American Tobacco Co., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York 3, N. Y. (3) Annual retainer. (4) Registrant is an associate of the law firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, which firm receives an annual retainer from the American Tobacco Co. for professional services. Registrant will receive no compensation in addition to his regular salary from that firm for legislative activities covered by the act, which activities comprise only an incidental and minor part of the registrant's duties. (5) The American Tobacco Co., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York 3, N. Y. (6) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside will be reimbursed for actual out-of-pocket expenses incurred by any member or associate of the firm. (7) See (6) above. The usual disbursements customary in legal work.

Higgons, J. A., Jr., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington 6, D. C. (1) National Association of Commodity Exchanges and Allied Trades, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington 6, D. C. (2) National Association of Commodity Exchanges and Allied Trades, Inc. (3) Indefinite. (4) See attached statement.[2] (5) National Association of Commodity Exchanges and Allied Trades, Inc. (6) Routine travel expenses, telephones, cab fares, etc., are to be reimbursed. (7) Routine travel expenses, telephones, cab fares, etc.

Higinbotham, William A., 1749 L Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Federation of American Scientists, 1749 L Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) The interests of society, as determined by the Federation of American Scientists.[2] (3) Indefinite. (4) $6,000 per year. (5) Federation of American Scientists as authorized by its duly elected officers. (6) Actual expenses incurred in course of official duties (paid by Federation of American Scientists). (7) Transportation and other expenses incidential to travel; communication expenses.

Hobbs, Lawrence W., 727 Pittock Block, Portland 5, Oreg. (1) Union Pacific Railroad Co., Pittock Block, Portland 5, Oreg. (2) Union Pacific Railroad Co. (3) Indefinite. The registrant has been an officer or employee of Union Pacific Railroad Co. or its lessor, continuously since 1912, is an attorney at law and since June 1941 has been employed as general attorney of the company at Portland, Oreg. He receives an annual salary for his work as general attorney which involves principally regular and usual law work, but when occasion arises some of his time is devoted to Federal legislation; such occasions are very infrequent and his work on Federal legislation consumes less than 1 percent of his time. No break-down of his salary or expenses has been or can be made whereby any particular portion thereof could be allocated to work involving Federal legislation. (4) No determinable amount of compensation is paid or received on account of Federal legislation. (5) Union Pacific Railroad Co. (6) No stated or determinable amount for expenses incurred in connection with Federal legislation. (7) Only actual expenditures for hotel bills, traveling expenses, etc.

Holloway, William J., attorney at law, 2816 First National Building, Oklahoma City, Okla. (1) Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., principal offices at Oklahoma City, Okla. (2) Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. (3) Am engaged in general practice of law at Oklahoma City. Since 1931, Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. has been continuously one of my regular clients. I shall appear before committees of Congress or discuss legislation with Congressmen only as required by the interests of my client, the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. (4) Attorney's fee of $75 per day for each day so engaged at Washington, D. C., on legislative matters for Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. (5) Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., principal offices at Oklahoma City, Okla. (6) Only actual necessary expenses. (7) Transportation fares, hotel bills, meals, telephone, and telegraph expense, and incidentals.

Horan,[1] Francis H., 15 Broad Street, New York 5, N. Y. (1) Webster, Sheffield & Horan, 15 Broad Street, New York 5, N. Y. This is a law firm of which registrant is a partner. (2) Clients. (3) Indeterminate. (4) Undetermined amount of earnings of law firm. (5) By law firm. (6) Will be reimbursed for expenses in amount incurred. (7) Hotel, railroad, and general traveling expense.

Jackson, Charles E., National Fisheries Institute, Inc., 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington 1, D. C. (1) National Fisheries Institute, Inc., 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington 1, D. C. This statement is submitted as a matter of information to the Congress, although it is believed that registrant does not come within the purview of the act. (2) National Fisheries Institute, Inc. (3) Indefinite. (4) Legislation is an incidental part of the functions of the National Fisheries Institute, Inc., a trade association. No funds are provided for the specific purpose of influencing legislation and no assessments are made for this purpose. Annual salary of registrant is remuneration for all services, of which representation before Congress constitutes less than 10 percent. (5) National Fisheries Institute, Inc. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Actual expenses.

Jackson, Thomas J., 732 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C. (1) (Not employed but represent.) Elected vice president and public relations officer of Retired Officers League, 732 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C., 438 E. French Place, San Antonio, Tex., and Post Office Box 14, Islamorada, Fla. (2) Retired Officers' League. (3) Term expires this year unless reelected. (4) Nothing. (5) No one. (6) No allowance (it is assumed if I had some small expense it would be reimbursed). (7) It is assumed any reasonable and necessary, if incurred, no allowance and not known.

Jernagin, Rev. W. H., 1934 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Washington Bureau, National Fraternal Council of Negro Churches in America. (2) The 11 denominations and 7,000,000 members that make up the National Fraternal Council, as well as other minority groups. (3) For indefinite period. (4) Position is honorary. (5) Frequently in the past honorarium was received. (6) Nothing definite. (7) None. Because our program interests are not exclusively lobbying. General betterment is our scope and interest.

Johnson, Clare A., 231 South LaSalle Street, room 1027, Chicago 4, Ill.. (1) National Tax Equality Association, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago 4, Ill. (2) The responsibilities of my position are to disseminate information and research to trade associations, chambers of commerce, and other interested organizations. Do not anticipate any appearances or work falling under the provisions of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. The undersigned does not contemplate activities falling under the specific language or apparent intent of Public Law 601. Authoritative interpretations of that statute, however, are lacking, and this registration is filed solely as a precaution against the possibility of future interpretations beyond the apparent scope of the act. (3) As a permanent staff member, the duration of employment is indefinite. (4) Entire salary is paid for services not falling within Public Law 601. The undersigned does not contemplate

[1] Registration with Secretary only.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.

activities falling under the specific language or apparent intent of Public Law 601. Authoritative interpretations of that statute, however, are lacking, and this registration is filed solely as a precaution against the possibility of future interpretations beyond the apparent scope of the act. (5) National Tax Equality Association. (6) Actual travel expenses, if any. (7) Hotels, meals, travel, and incidental miscellaneous.

Kane, John E., 1625 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Same as (1) above. (3) Indefinite. (4) $4,200 annually for all services rendered American Petroleum Institute, which includes many duties other than those related to legislation. (5) Same as (1) above. (6) Reimbursed for actual out-of-pocket expenses of character set forth in (7) below. (7) Traveling expenses, meals, entertainment, taxis, and other miscellaneous items.

Ketchum, MacLeod & Grove, Inc.,[1] 411 Seventh Avenue, Pittsburgh 19, Pa. (1) Main & Co., First National Bank Building, Pittsburgh 22, Pa. (2) Main & Co., First National Bank Building, Pittsburgh 22, Pa. (3) No term stated. Terminable at any time at option of either Main & Co. or Ketchum, MacLeod & Grove, Inc. (4) At rate of $8 per hour of time spent by employees of Ketchum, MacLeod & Grove, Inc., in rendering specified services to Main & Co. (5) Main & Co., First National Bank Building, Pittsburgh 22, Pa. (6) Amount not predeterminable; covers only reimbursement to Ketchum, MacLeod & Grove, Inc., for out-of-pocket expenses incurred in rendering service to Main & Co. (7) Typing, multigraphing, postage, and other mailing expenses; printing and engraving; travel and living expenses when outside of Pittsburgh, Pa.

Krooth, David L., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Association of Housing Manufacturers, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., suite 409. (2) I am not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing any particular legislation, but to act as general counsel to the association by rendering legal and informational service for its members. Only a small part of my time is devoted to keeping members informed on pending legislation with a view to advising and assisting them on any such legislation that may be helpful or harmful to them in accomplishing their objective of producing sound, attractive, low-cost housing through modern methods and improved building materials and techniques. (3) Temporary retainer arrangement. (4) $600 per month during period of temporary retainer arrangement. Only small part of my work is concerned with legislation, most of it being legal and informational service for the members of the association. (5) National Association of Housing Manufacturers. (6) Out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Cost of communications, stenographic services, and mimeographing.

Kruse, Herman C., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (2) Above-named company. (3) Employed at principal office of company in San Francisco as representative on industrial development; on occasional and brief visits in Washington spends part time on legislative matters. (4) Salary ($625 per month) and expenses. (5) Above-named company. (6) Necessary traveling, hotel, and incidental expense. (7) As stated in (6) above.

Kyne, Martin C., 100 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (1) Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Union, 100 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (2) Membership of Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Union. (3) Indefinite (election, triennial convention). (4) $5,750 plus expenses. (5) Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Union. (6) Reimbursement of expenses incurred. (7) Travel, hotels, meals, taxis, rail and air fares, etc.

Lanham, Fritz G., Woodley Park Towers, Washington 8, D. C. (1) A. E. Brooks, 2202 Fort Worth National Bank Building, Fort Worth, Tex. (2) A. E. Brooks as representative of nonresident United States citizens engaged in business abroad. (3) Indefinite. (4) Tentative arrangement, $1,000 retainer. (5) A. E. Brooks. (6) Such amount as may become necessary for reasonable expenses of travel, clerical help, stationery, and postage. (7) Those recited under (6).

Lanham, Fritz G., Woodley Park Towers, Washington, D. C. (1) State Rights Association, Houston, Tex. (2) Same as (1) above. (3) Indefinite. (4) Not to exceed $5,000 per annum. (5) Same as (1) above. (6) Such amounts as may be necessary incidental to service. (7) Same as (6) above.

L'Ecluse, Esther, post-office box 1628, Washington 13, D. C. (1) Japanese-American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, post-office box 1628, Washington, 13, D. C. (2) Japanese-American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, post-office box 1628, Washington 13, D. C. (3) Until end of first session of the Eightieth Congress. (4) $250 per month. (5) Japanese-American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee. (6) Only what is legitimately incurred. (7) Transportation and other expenses directly incurred in legislative activity.

Lewis, George J., Union Station, Lexington, Ky. (1) Kentucky Railroad Association, 908 West Broadway, Louisville, Ky. In addition to my employment by the Kentucky Railroad Association as hereinbefore set out, I am employed as assistant general attorney for the Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., whose headquarters is located at 908 West Broadway, Louisville, Ky. My duties as assistant general attorney are for general legal work and have no connection with national legislative work. (2) Kentucky Railroad Association and its member roads. (See appendix.[2]) (3) Continuing. Only a small portion of time devoted to national legislation. (4) $2,000 per annum, which is paid for all services rendered to the Kentucky Railroad Association, and only a small portion of which has to do with national legislation. (See appendix.[2]) (5) Kentucky Railroad Association. (6) Amount actually and necessarily expended on behalf of the Kentucky Railroad Association, in connection with the entire employment, only a part of which concerns national legislation. (7) Actual expenses incurred on business of the Kentucky Railroad Association, including that part which concerns national legislation.

Lewitt,[1] Albert W., Continental Hotel, room 617, Washington, D. C. (1) Self. (2) Luggage and Leather Goods Manufacturers of America, Inc., 220 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (3) 1 year, June 1, 1947, to June 1, 1948. (4) $5,000 a year. (5) Luggage and Leather Goods Manufacturers of America, Inc. (6) Indefinite, expenses will be determined by amount of travel necessary. (7) Railroad transportation and stenographic help.

Lloyd, David D., Americans for Democratic Action, 1740 K Street, Washington, D. C. (1) Americans for Democratic Action, 1740 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Americans for Democratic Action. (3) Indefinite. (4) $8,000 per annum. (5) Actual expenses incurred. (6) For travel, if any. (7) [Blank.]

Lord, Day & Lord, a partnership engaged in the practice of law, 25 Broadway, New York City; 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broad Street, New York City, and any other holders of awards of the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, World War I. (2) Same as (1). (3) Indefinite. (4) Reasonable compensation for services rendered. (5) Agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd. (6) Reimbursed for reasonable and necessary out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Travel, phone, and similar items.

Lovelady, Rufus M., 1429 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Lodge No. 14, American Federation of Government Employees, Balboa, C. Z. (2) All employees occupying positions subject to the Civil Service Act and in the service of the Panama Canal and Panama Railroad Company. (3) Approximately 1 month. (4) Expenses only, estimated to amount to about $500. (5) Lodge No. 14, American Federation of Government Employees, Balboa, C. Z. (6) All expenses incurred for transportation to the United States and return to Canal Zone, board and lodging, and all other expenses incidental to the performance of the mission. (7) None, other than those listed in (6).

McCrory, Samuel H., 6811 Sixth Street NW., Washington 12, D. C. (1) Hemp Producers Association, Juneau, Wis., Paul A. Hemmy, Jr., secretary, Juneau, Wis. (2) Hemp Producers Association. (3) Indefinite, either party can terminate the arrangement by giving notice 30 days before the end of the quarterly period. (4) $500 per quarter year or 3 months. (5) Hemp Producers Association. (6) No amount set. (7) Necessary stenographic expenses, meals, and entertainment.

McGowan, Lewis A., post-office box 37, Rancho Santa Fe, Calif. (1) American Internees Committee, San Francisco, Calif. (2) American Internees Committee, San Francisco, Calif. (3) Since January 1, 1947. (4) Has been paid from January 1 to March 31, 1947, $800; and from April 1 to June 30, 1947, $2,932. (5) American Internees Committee, San Francisco, Calif. (6) To be determined later. (7) Travel, telephone, telegraph, clerical hire, printing.

McIsaac,[1] John R., 96 Brooks Street, Brighton, Mass. (1) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (3) Indefinite. (4) $14.75 per day. (5) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (6) Receive a per diem of $11.80 a day. (7) Hotel, meals, etc.

McKeehan, Merrick, Arter & Stewart, a partnership, 2800 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) The Holstein-Friesian Association of America, Brattleboro, Vt. (2) It is anticipated that Mr. C. M. Horn and Mr. Kingsley A. Taft, partners of this firm, will appear on behalf of The Holstein-Friesian Association of America in connection with proposed legislation in which that association is interested. (3) Mr. Horn, a partner, is employed on an annual basis as counsel for The Holstein-Friesian Association of America. (4) Mr. Horn as counsel of The Holstein-Friesian Association of America receives approximately $5,000 annually. (5) The Holstein-Friesian Association of America. (6) Traveling expenses only. (7) Traveling expenses only.

McKeehan, Merrick, Arter & Stewart, 2800 Terminal Tower, Cleveland 13, Ohio. (1) The Lincoln Electric Co., 12818 Coit Road, Cleveland 1, Ohio. (2) The Lincoln Electric Co. (3) Indefinite. (4) The law firm of McKeehan, Merrick, Arter & Stewart, which for many years has handled legal matters for the Lincoln Electric Co., will be paid, as on other matters, on a quantum meruit basis. Mr. Thomas V. Koykka, a partner of this firm, will handle the matters here involved. (5) The Lincoln Electric Co. (6) Actual expenses only. (7) Traveling expenses only.

McKercher, Miles C., 1405 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco 9, Calif. (1) The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3673 West Pine Boulevard, St. Louis 8, Mo. (2) The Order of Railroad Telegraphers. (3) Indefinite. (4) $325 per month. (5) The Order of Railroad Telegraphers. (6) $10 per diem. (7) Hotel, meals, transportation, and miscellaneous.

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[1] Registration with the Secretary only.

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.

Madaris, James B., 220 South Alfred Street, Alexandria, Va. (1) Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 107 West Linwood Boulevard, Kansas City 2, Mo. (2) Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America. (3) Indefinite. (4) $350 per month. (5) Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America. (6) $3 per day. (7) Transportation, meals, and miscellaneous expenses.

Magee, Elizabeth S., 348 Engineers Building, Cleveland 14, Ohio. (1) National Consumers' League, 348 Engineers Building, Cleveland 14, Ohio. (2) National Consumers' League, 348 Engineers Building, Cleveland 14, Ohio. (3) Permanent. (4) At rate of $4,000 per annum. (5) National Consumers' League, 348 Engineers Building, Cleveland 14, Ohio. (6) Actual expenses of travel and living. (7) Travel and living.

Manbeck,[1] Jesse B., 514 Tenth Street NW. (1) Columbia Typographical Union No. 101, 514 Tenth Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (2) Members of Columbia Typographical Union. (3) Two-year term. (4) $107 per week for full-time service to the union. (5) Columbia Typographical Union No. 101. (6) $360 per year. (7) Transportation, telephone, telegraph only.

Marran, Donald J., 25 Broadway, New York 4, N. Y. (1) The American Tobacco Co., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York 3, N. Y. (2) The American Tobacco Co., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York 3, N. Y. (3) Annual retainer. Registrant is an associate of the law firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, which firm receives an annual retainer from the American Tobacco Co. for professional services. (4) Registrant will receive no compensation in addition to his regular salary from that firm for legislative activities covered by the act, which activities comprise only an incidental and minor part of the registrant's duties. (5) The American Tobacco Co., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York 3, N. Y. (6) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside will be reimbursed for actual out-of-pocket expenses incurred by any member or associate of the firm. (7) See (6) above. The usual disbursements customary in legal work.

Marshall, J. Paull, 528 Union Trust Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Railroad Security Owners Association, Inc., 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (2) See (1). (3) Indefinite. (4) No fee has yet been determined. (5) See (1). (6) Not yet determined, but see (7). (7) Reimbursement for travel, telephone, telegraph, printing, and such expenses incurred in work of the client, the amount of which is not expected to be substantial.

Mathews, P. H., 179 Summer Street, Boston, Mass. (1) Howard S. Palmer, James Lee Loomis, and Henry B. Sawyer, trustees, the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 71 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn. (2) Howard S. Palmer, James Lee Loomis, and Henry B. Sawyer, trustees, the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. (3) Continuing. (4) See schedule A.[2] (5) Howard S. Palmer, James Lee Loomis, and Henry B. Sawyer, trustees, the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. (6) Reimbursement of actual expenses in connection with entire employment, only a part of which concerns Federal legislation. (7) Actual expenses while away from headquarters, such as traveling expenses, hotel bills, taxicab fares, etc.

May, Robert G.,[2] room 1, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Security Bank Building, Sioux Falls, S. Dak. (1) Midwest Operators Association, Inc., 2395 University Avenue, St. Paul 4, Minn. (2) Midwest Operators Association, Inc. (3) Permanent. (4) Retainer $1,500 per month. Additional compensation to be agreed upon at a later date. (5) Midwest Operators Association, Inc. (6) Necessary expenses not to exceed $15,000. (7) Necessary living expenses, office rent, legal, stenographic, clerical and statistical assistance, transportation and other expenses necessary to the full development and explanation of facts required by Congress for adequate consideration of legislation in connection with Government seizure of properties of client's members.

Megrath, Violet, 1740 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Americans for Democratic Action, 1740 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Americans for Democratic Action. (3) Indefinite. (4) $100 per week. (5) Americans for Democratic Action. (6) Actual expenses incurred. (7) Travel.

Miles, Vincent M.,[2] 1312 South Twenty-second Street, Arlington, Va. (1) Fraternal Order of Eagles, Commerce Building, Kansas City, Mo. (2) Fraternal Order of Eagles. (3) Indefinite. (4) Personal expenses while attending to business of order. (5) M. L. Brown, managing organizer, Kansas City, Mo. (6) No more than $20 per diem and 5 cents a mile when traveling. (7) Per diem for actual time.

Miller, Dale, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C. (1) State Rights Association, Houston, Tex. (2) Same as (1) above. (3) Indefinite. (4) Not to exceed $5,000 per annum. (5) Same as (1) above. (6) Such amounts as may be necessary incidental to service. (7) Same as (6) above.

Miller, Warren E., 910 Seventeenth Street, NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) (*a*) Jacob Goldberg, attorney, 1950 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (*b*) Joseph Morris Bowles, 323 East Ashby Place, San Antonio, Tex. (*c*) Richard Reynolds Shoaf, Hankins Building, Lexington, N. C. (*d*) Walter Wright, Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (2) Respectively to (1) supra: (*a*) William R. Dohnt, Margaret E. Dohnt, Joseph A. Hauser, Richard Adams, William P. Novotny, Grace Swiadek, and Joseph F. Krotz; (*b*) Joseph Morris Bowles; (*c*) Richard Reynolds Shoaf; and (*d*) Ern Wright. (3) Indefinite. (4) Not to exceed 10 percent and fees are entirely contingent upon passage of legislation and none has been received. (5) To be paid by persons in whose interests he appears (2) supra, through persons who employ him (1) supra. (6) Nothing. (7) None.

Milton, Charles J., 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N. J. (1) The Prudential Insurance Co., of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (2) The Prudential Insurance Co., of America. (3) No fixed period. (4) No established method of compensation. (5) The Prudential Insurance Co. of America. (6) Actual. (7) Traveling.

Molnar, Joseph,[1] 229 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Not employed. (2) The taxpayers and the unemployed. (3) [Blank]. (4) Nothing. (5) [Blank]. (6) Nothing. (7) None.

Montague, Joe G., Petroleum Building, Fort Worth, Tex. (1) (*a*) Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers' Association, eleventh floor, Burkburnett Building, Fort Worth, Tex. (*b*) The Joint Live Stock Committee, 7 Dexter Park Avenue, Chicago 9, Ill. (2) Livestock producers of the United States. Also, in the Joint Live Stock Committee there are livestock feeders, livestock marketing agencies, and stockyards. (3) One year. (4) (*a*) By Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers' Association, $8,000. (*b*) By Joint Live Stock Committee, $8,000. (5) (*a*) By Henry Bell, secretary, general manager, Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers' Association. (*b*) By Clinton K. Tomson, secretary-treasurer, Joint Live Stock Committee. (6) No fixed amount. All expenses incident to the work are to be paid equally by the two named employers. (7) All expenses incident to the work.

Monteith, Galloway, box 247, Hamlet, N. C. (1) Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati 2, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati 2, Ohio. (3) This session of Congress. (4) $15 per day. (5) Brotherhood of Railway Clerks. (6) Actual. (7) Hotel, meals, and transportation.

Moore, Chester B., 606 South Hill Street, Los Angeles 14, Calif. (1) Western Growers Association, 606 South Hill Street, Los Angeles 14, Calif. (2) The members of the Western Growers Association. (3) Have been in employ of Western Growers Association continuously since May 1928 as secretary. (4) Yearly salary as secretary to cover all activities of the association. No moneys paid me or set aside for lobbying. (5) By Western Growers Association. (6) Association pays all traveling, hotel, and incidental expenses when I am away from Los Angeles on association business. (7) See (6).

Moore, Clayton, care of R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N. C. (1) R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Fourth and Main Streets, Winston-Salem, N. C. (2) R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. (3) As full-time associate counsel of R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. since November 16, 1936. (4) At present, annual salary of $18,000 for all services rendered. See attached.[2] (5) R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. (6) Actual expenses incurred. (7) All expenses when out of Winston-Salem, N. C., on company business, such as transportation, hotels, meals, telephone calls, and telegraph messages.

Morelock & Seay, 902 Bowen Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Massman Construction Co., 20 West Ninth Street, Kansas City 6, Mo. (2) Massman Construction Co., 20 West Ninth Street, Kansas City 6, Mo. (3) Until claim is finally acted upon. (4) The undersigned firm prosecuted the claim of Massman Construction Co. through the Court of Claims and filed petition for certiorari to the Supreme Court, which was denied. It received a retainer fee of $500 for services performed to date. The existing agreement with the claimant is a contingent fee of 25 percent of any amount recovered for all services performed, both in the courts and before the Congress, to be divided one-half to the registrant and one-half to associate counsel, Mary R. Day, 741 Investment Building, Washington, D. C., less $1,000 heretofore paid to her by the company as a retainer. (5) Massman Construction Co., 20 West Ninth Street, Kansas City 6, Mo. (6) No agreement for the payment of expenses. (7) None.

Morgan, Gerald D., and Leonard J. Calhoun, constituting the partnership of Morgan & Calhoun, attorneys, Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) National Tax Equality Association, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago 4, Ill. (2) National Tax Equality Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) Firm retained as Washington counsel to prepare and present to congressional committee legal aspects of tax advantages enjoyed by cooperatives. Receives compensation for all such work at rate of $100 per man-day. (5) National Tax Equality Association. (6) Not paid anything for expenses, but receives reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses incurred in connection with employment, such as telephone calls, telegrams, travel, etc. (7) See (6) above.

Myrup, Andrew William, 932 Bowen Building, 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Bakery and Confectionery Workers' International Union of America, 2719 North Wilton Avenue, Chicago 14, Ill. (2) Membership of Bakery and Confectionery Workers' International Union. (3) Month to month, as long as work is satisfactory. (4) Salary, $108 per week. (5) Same as (1). (6) No expenses for legislative work. Will make no contributions to anyone. (7) [Blank.]

Nelson, Jepson L., 3927 Pine Street, Philadelphia 4, Pa. (1) Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia, Pa. (2) Federal Employees Veterans Association, 311 North Sixteenth Street, Philadelphia 2, Pa. (3) October 7, 1946, to October 1947. (4) $11.52 per

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.
[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[3] Registration with the Secretary only.

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.
[3] Registration with the Secretary only.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

day. (5) Federal Employees Veterans Association. (6) Actual living expenses, transportation, and communication. (7) Actual living expenses, transportation, and communication.

Newcomb, Elliott H., Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) To promote proper care and assistance for veterans of World War II, consistent with the best interests of the country. (3) Indefinite. (4) $5,000 per annum. Legislative duties part time. (5) National headquarters, AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II). (6) See (7). (7) Actual transportation expenses.

Niebell, Paul M., 1829 M Street NW. (1) Creek Nation of Indians of the State of Oklahoma. (2) Creek Nation of Indians. (3) Period of 5 years under contract as Creek tribal attorney, submitted to the Interior Department for approval of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior—not as yet approved. (4) As set forth in said contract I am to be paid for my services as tribal attorney $2,500 per annum, and $500 for traveling expenses. (5) Payment for services will be made through the Department of the Interior from Creek tribal funds on deposit to the credit of the Creek Nation in the United States Treasury. (6) $500 is provided in said contract for traveling expenses in going from Washington, D. C., to Oklahoma. (7) Traveling expenses while away from Washington, D. C.

Noble, John, Jr., 30 State Street, Boston, Mass. (1) Charles W. Mulcahy, trustee, Boston & Providence Railroad Corp., room 425, South Station, Boston, Mass. (2) Estate of Boston & Providence Railroad Corp., in reorganization in United States district court for the District of Massachusetts. (3) Until termination of reorganization proceedings or earlier order of the court. (4) Compensation to be fixed by United States district court within maximum limit to be set by the Interstate Commerce Commission. (5) Estate of Boston & Providence Railroad Corp. (6) Actual expenses allowed by United States district court and Interstate Commerce Commission. (7) Actual expenses of travel and subsistence.

Nyce, Peter Q., 1266 National Press Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) The registrant is engaged in the general practice of law and is employed by numerous individuals, out-of-town attorneys, and companies to represent them in departmental and administrative matters before the executive departments and commissions in Washington, D. C., and in particular, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior. Registrant's interest in legislation is only incidental to such legal services and is mainly for the purpose of and is confined largely to keeping clients advised of the status of pending and proposed measures involved acquired and public lands of the United States. (2) See (1). (3) Indefinite. (4) Indefinite, no fee yet determined. (5) See (1). (6) No set amount. Only reimbursement for telephonic and telegraphic expenses. (7) See (6).

O'Brien, John, 1 Wall Street, New York 5, N. Y. (1) Riegel Textile Corp., 342 Madison Avenue, New York 17, N. Y. (2) Same. (3) Indefinite. (4) A reasonable amount for services rendered. No dollar amount or basis for payment agreed upon. (5) Riegel Textile Corp. (6) No amount fixed. (7) Ordinary and necessary expenses for travel, telephone and telegraph, meals, and lodging actually incurred.

O'Connor, Edward H.,[1] 176 West Adams Street, Chicago 3, Ill. (1) Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago 3, Ill. (2) Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago 3, Ill. (3) Have been in the employ of the society since November 1, 1942. (4) Yearly salary $8,500. (5) Insurance Economics Society of America. (6) Traveling expenses only. (7) None other than above stated.

O'Connor, J. J., Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Society of Marine Inspectors, Washington, D. C. (2) Same as (1). (3) Indefinite. (4) $300 per month. (5) Same as (1). (6) Indefinite. (7) Extraordinary.

Pierson, A. T., 71 Meadow Street, New Haven 6, Conn. (1) Howard S. Palmer, James Lee Loomis, and Henry B. Sawyer, trustees, the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 71 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn. (2) Howard S. Palmer, James Lee Loomis, and Henry B. Sawyer, trustees, the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. (3) Continuing. (4) See schedule A attached.[2] (5) Howard S. Palmer, James Lee Loomis, and Henry B. Sawyer, trustees, the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. (6) Reimbursement of actual expenses in connection with entire employment only a part of which concerns Federal legislation. (7) Actual expenses while away from headquarters such as traveling expenses, hotel bills, taxicab fares, etc.

Place, Henry C. (member of the following law firm), care of Townsend, Elliott & Munson, Provident Trust Building, room 1100, Seventeenth and Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) National Association of Electric Companies, 1336 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) The above association. The activities to date of counsel are not believed to be within the purview of the act but counsel is registering, at this time, in case future duties may possibly involve an activity within the scope of section 308 (a) of the act. (3) Indeterminate, subject to the control of the president and board of directors of the association. (4) The undersigned receives a share of the net income of the above law firm (after all office and other expenses), which firm is engaged in the general practice of the law in Philadelphia, Pa. It is expected that the law firm will, on or about May 1, 1947, receive $4,150 from the association for its legal services as general counsel for the period from March 1 to April 30, 1947, which is the same as previously received by it from the association for legal services. (5) See answer under item (4) above. (6) Reimbursement of actual expenses (including traveling and subsistence expenses when away from residence) incurred in the performance of duties as counsel to the association. (7) See answer under item (6) above.

Poston, Robert R., 1608 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) The American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis 6, Ind. (2) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations, the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion. (3) Permament. (4) $5,600. (5) The American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (6) Average of $25 per month. (7) Travel and such items as taxi fare, meals, phone calls.

Powell, W. Royce,[1] 1527 Thirty-first Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Magothy River Association, Annapolis, Md. (2) Magothy River Association (200 home owners). (3) One month. (4) $1,000. (5) Magothy River Association. (6) Nominal. (7) Those pertaining to actual costs of press releases.

Pressman, Lee, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Membership of the CIO. (3) Indefinite. (4) Expenses while traveling away from Washington. (5) Such expenses paid by CIO. Salary paid by United Steelworkers of America for whom registrant does not perform any activity which falls under the Lobbying Act. (6) Actual expenses while traveling away from Washington. (7) Transportation, hotel, meals, telephone.

Pyke, John S., 1759 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland 14, Ohio. (1) Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (2) Wine Institute and the Ohio Wholesale Wine Dealers Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) Per diem rate to be determined after future conference with employer. (5) Wine Institute. (6) Actual out-of-pocket expense. (7) Travel, telephone, and telegraph.

Rankin, J. Lee, 714 Stuart Building, Lincoln, Nebr. (1) Nebraska Tax Equality Committee, Inc., a voluntary nonprofit corporation composed of businessmen throughout the State of Nebraska. (2) Working on behalf of Nebraska Tax Equality Committee, Inc., in the interest of promoting equality of taxation as between cooperatives and private business. (3) Indefinite. (4) Receives no remuneration for this work. (5) Not applicable. (6) Receives only necessary travel expenses. (7) Meals, lodging, and transportation.

Rapp, Leslie M., 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Simpson Thacher & Bartlett, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (2) The law firm of Simpson Thacher & Bartlett was of counsel for Wabash Railroad Co. in connection with its reorganization following receivership proceedings, and since that time has been retained in connection with various legal matters. An officer of such railroad is chairman of a voluntary committee, known as the special tax committee of reorganization railroads, representing sundry railroads (including the above-mentioned railroad) which have been, or are, in bankruptcy or receivership, and which are interested in securing remedial legislation eliminating the present discrimination against such railroads of the use of the carry-over and carry-back provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. In addition to working in the direct interest of such above-mentioned railroad, registrant is to assist in the work of such committee. However, neither registrant nor the firm of Simpson Thacher & Bartlett, by which he is employed, will receive any compensation for services, or any reimbursement for expenses, from such committee or from any railroad (other than the Wabash Railroad Co.) which the committee represents. (3) Indefinite. (4) The law firm of Simpson Thacher & Bartlett (by which registrant is employed as a full-time associate attorney on an annual salary basis) will receive compensation from Wabash Railroad Co. at the customary rate for professional services charged by that firm. Registrant will devote only a minor portion of his time to the legislative matter in which Wabash Railroad Co. is interested and will receive no special or additional compensation therefor either from the firm of Simpson Thacher & Bartlett or any other source. (5)

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.

See the answer to question (4) above. (6) Registrant is to be reimbursed by the firm of Simpson Thacher & Bartlett for necessary expenses. The firm of Simpson Thacher & Bartlett is in turn to be reimbursed by Wabash Railroad Co. (7) Ordinary and necessary expenses actually incurred, such as hotel, meals, transportation, telephone, telegraph, etc.

Reid, Hollis V., 10 Independence Avenue, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland 15, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. (3) Until further notice. (4) At the rate of $7,000 per year, plus necessary personal expenses. (5) Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. (6) All necessary personal expenses. (7) Hotel room, meals, transportation, telephone, telegraph.

Rhoden, Joseph R., Sr.,[2] Bellevue Hotel, Washington, D. C. (only while in Washington). (1) Chicago Daily News, Chicago, Ill., printer. (2) Typographical Union chapel, Chicago Daily News. (3) Not longer than final disposition of Taft-Hartley bill. (4) $18.20 per day. The amount I lose while away from my job on the Chicago Daily News. (5) Typographical Union chapel, Chicago Daily News. (6) Only actual necessary personal expenses; no specific amount authorized. Probably will not exceed $10 per day. (7) Only necessary personal expenses.

Rivers, T. E., National Recreation Association, 315 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y. (1) National Recreation Association, 315 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y. (2) The National Recreation Association is a nonprofit voluntary organization interested in developing playgrounds and recreation for all the people. (3) Permanent. (4) No definite amount for lobbying. Only a very small proportion of his time in the past has been devoted to legislation. If and when any of his time is so spent, it will be reported as required. (5) National Recreation Association. (6) To be reimbursed for actual expenses incurred. (7) The usual travel expenses incurred, such as room, board, transportation, tips, telephones, busses.

Rogers, Watson, 843 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) National Food Brokers Association, 843 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C. (2) Members of the National Food Brokers Association. (3) Watson Rogers is employed by the National Food Brokers Association on a yearly basis. (4) Since August 2, 1946, Watson Rogers has done nothing for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by Congress, and he has not received any pay or consideration for such purpose. He is paid a salary as president of the association, and he is informed and believes that when he shall do anything as such officer to influence legislation by Congress, an allocable part of his salary may be considered to be pay or consideration for such activity, and in such event he intends to report the same in his quarterly report. (5) National Food Brokers Association. (6) See answer to (4). In addition, Watson Rogers has not received any payment for expenses and is not to be paid any sum specifically for expenses in attempting to influence legislation. Any expense if and when actually incurred in attempting to influence legislation will be paid by him, subject to reimbursement by the association, and reported as required by law. (7) See answer to (6). Expenses may actually be incurred for travel, hotels, meals, taxis, tips, and entertainment in attempting to influence legislation.

Rule, Gordon W., Union Trust Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) American Institute of Accountants, 13 East Forty-first Street, New York 17, N. Y. (2) American Institute of Accountants and its members. (3) During the pendency of any proposed legislation tending to restrict the right of accountants to appear before Government agencies, such as H. R. 2657. (4) Reasonable compensation to be determined by agreement. (5) American Institute of Accountants. (6) Actual expenditures. (7) Telegrams, long-distance telephone calls, taxicabs, etc.

Rule, Gordon W., Union Trust Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Gillette Safety Razor Co., Boston, Mass. (2) Gillette Safety Razor Co., Boston, Mass. (3) Indefinite. Retained in connection with a proposed amendment to the Revenue Code relating to the foreign tax credit. (4) Amount undetermined. Normal attorney and client relationship with fee dependent upon time spent. (5) Gillette Safety Razor Co. (6) Only actual out-of-pocket expense. (7) Taxicabs, long-distance phone calls, and necessary travel, if any.

Rundquist, George E., 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (2) The above committee. (3) At will. (4) Salary at $500 per month plus reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket expenses. (5) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. (6) Actual amount of out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Air and railroad fares, taxi, bus, and car fares, hotels, meals, telegraph, telephone, and postage.

Russell, Richard M., 30 State Street, Boston, Mass. (1) Estate of Charles W. Taintor (administrator, Merchants National Bank and Alexander Whiteside), care Alexander Whiteside, 30 State Street, Boston, Mass. (2) Estate of Charles W. Taintor. (3) At will of the administrators of the estate of Charles W. Taintor. (4) To be determined. (5) Administrators of the estate of Charles W. Taintor. (6) Actual out-of-pocket disbursements (amount of). (7) Necessary hotel accommodations, travel, and food.

Scott, John W., attorney, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The following practitioners before the United States Patent Office: Victor J. Evans & Co., 1503 Twenty-first Street NW., Washington, D. C.; McMorrow, Berman & Davidson, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Clarence A. O'Brien & Harvey B. Jacobson, 1333 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Randolph & Beavers, 416 Fifth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) In interest of the firms named in (1) above, who are practitioners before the United States Patent Office. (3) Five years commencing May 10, 1947. (4) First year, $12,000; second year, $12,000; third year, $11,000; fourth year, $10,000; fifth year, $10,000 (such retainer fees cover legal services, including representation in protection of clients' interests before the United States Patent Office, as well as such services as may be required in connection with legislation affecting their interests). (5) By the firms named in (1) above. (6) Necessary out-of-pocket expenses of travel, printing, court costs, etc., if any, incurred in connection with said employment. (7) See (6) above.

Shorb, Paul E., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Railroad Security Owners Association, Inc., 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (2) See (1). (3) Indefinite. (4) No fee has yet been determined. (5) See (1). (6) Not yet determined, but see (7). (7) Reimbursements for travel, telephone, telegraph, printing, and such expenses incurred in work of the client, the amount of which is not expected to be substantial.

Shouse, Jouett, 1066 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Thornhill Broome estate, Oxnard, Calif. (2) Estate as above mentioned. (3) Indefinite. (4) No agreement. (5) Estate. (6) Nothing. (7) None.

Skinner, W. E., 130 Third Street SE., Washington 3, D. C. (1) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (3) Indefinite. (4) $14.75 per day. (5) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (6) $11.50 per day. (7) Living expenses.

Slayman, Charles H., Jr., 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (2) The above committee. (3) At will. (4) Salary at $520 per month plus reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket expenses. (5) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. (6) Actual amount of out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Air and railroad fares, taxi, bus and car fares, hotels, meals, telephone, telegraph, and postage.

Smith, Allen L., post-office box 1526, Baton Rouge, La. (1) Louisiana Tax Equality Association, Inc., post-office box 1526, Baton Rouge, La. (2) Louisiana Tax Equality Association, Inc., post-office box 1526, Baton Rouge, La. (3) Not specific; present office until next election in November 1947. (4) Nothing. Gratuitous. (5) [Blank.] (6) Reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenditures only. None to date. (7) Will cover reimbursement of travel, food, lodging, and miscellaneous items relative thereto.

Smith, Harold O., Jr., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) National Confectioners' Association of the United States, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) The confectionery manufacturers of the continental United States and its possessions. (3) Annual full-time basis of employment as office manager, in which capacity it is sometimes necessary to call on one or more Members of Congress for the industry. (4) Fixed salary. (5) National Confectioners' Association of the United States, Inc. (6) No budget is provided for legislative work as this is only incidental to the assignment. The principal responsibilities are trade-association activities and contacts with Government agencies. (7) The entire amount expended in connection with legislative activities consists of occasional taxi fares and telephone calls.

Smith, Howard J., 507 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz. (1) Central Arizona Project Association, Wayne M. Akin, president, 507 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz. (2) Central Arizona Project Association, 507 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz. (3) Indefinite, employment subject to pleasure of association. (4) $750 per month. (5) Central Arizona Project Association, Phoenix, Ariz. (6) Actual and necessary expenses, car mileage, room and board when engaged in travel in interest of association. (7) All expenses listed above and any additional expenses which may occur in connection with the association.

Smith, Sidney P., Livingston, Ala. (1) Southern Railway Co. (2) Southern Railway Co. (3) Indefinite. (4) Expenses. (5) Southern Railway Co. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Travel and living expenses on trip.

Spinks, Mrs. Dorothy Matthews, 144 B Street NE., Washington, D. C. (1) Alpha Iota Sorority, Grand Avenue at Tenth, Des Moines 9, Iowa; Mrs. Elsie M. Fenton, grand president. (2) Equal-rights amendment. (3) Indefinite. (4) Expenses of which a record will be kept and paid at end of each fiscal year ending December 31. (5) President and secretary-treasurer of Alpha Iota Sorority. (6) Between five and ten dollars annually; whatever expenses incurred for postage and carfare. (7) Postage and carfare (carfare includes moneys spent to do actual lobbying within Greater Washington, D. C.)

Steele, Raymond E., National Fisheries Institute, Inc., 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington 1, D. C. (1) National Fisheries Institute, Inc., 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington 1, D. C. This statement is submitted as a matter of information to the Congress, although it is believed that registrant does not come within the purview of the act. (2) National Fisheries Institute, Inc. (3) Indefinite. (4) Legislation is an incidental part of the func-

[2] Registration with the Secretary only.

tions of the National Fisheries Institute, Inc., a trade association. No funds are provided for the specific purpose of influencing legislation, and no assessments are made for this purpose. Annual salary of registrant is remuneration for all services, of which representation before Congress constitutes less than 10 percent. (5) National Fisheries Institute, Inc. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Actual expenses.

Steffan, Arthur A., 1616 I Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Petrol Corp., Philadelphia, Pa. (2) Petrol Corp., Philadelphia, Pa. (3) No stated term. (4) $700 per month and expenses—covers all services as Washington counsel. (5) Petrol Corp., Philadelphia, Pa. (6) Actual amounts expended. (7) Actual and necessary office, secretarial, and travel costs.

Stellwagen, Herbert P., 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Indemnity Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (2) Indemnity Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (3) Indefinite. Deponent is executive vice president of the above company. His office is elective, but his general employment by the company is anticipated to continue indefinitely. (4) Deponent receives no special compensation for any attempts to influence legislation by Congress. His activities in this respect are merely an incidental phase of his regular duties as an executive officer of the above company. (5) Indemnity Insurance Co. of North America. (6) No special sum or limits are specified. See (7). (7) Out-of-pocket expenditures for transportation and subsistence.

Strong, George Eugene, 226 Woodward Building; after August 1, 1947, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Holland Plant Exporters Association, by Mr. H. G. Dekens, 84 Zeestraat, The Hague, the Netherlands. (2) Holland Plant Exporters Association. (3) Only since July 9, 1947; as a lawyer representing association before courts and departments on a year-to-year basis. In matters of legislation it will depend upon whether there is any legislation proposed affecting its interests. So far as can be foreseen, representation in legislation will be limited to the present session of Congress. (4) No special arrangement exists as to legislation, but for all services a retainer of $1,000 is to be paid and the final fee will be determined by the association yearly on the basis of $100 a day for his time, the expectation being that the $1,000 retainer fee will cover all services other than hearings before administrative tribunals and Congress. (5) Holland Plant Exporters Association. (6) Actual expenses, but not office overhead, including taxis, travel, meals and lodging away from Washington, telephone, postage, etc. No articles or other than the customary telephone calls and telegrams between an attorney and his client are contemplated. (7) See answers to (6); usual expenses of an attorney; no expenses are contemplated, such as the sending of telegrams or numerous letters in an attempt to influence Congress, although an occasional letter may be written to the chairman of a committee. None contemplated unless there should be a departure from the above, as the legislation (S. 338) has passed the Senate and should be in final form before August 15, 1947.

Swanson, Walter S. J., 938 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Highway Users Conference, 938 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (2) National Highway Users Conference. See exhibit A.[2] (3) My position as legislative reporter and staff correspondent is continuing in character and not limited as to duration. See exhibit A.[2] (4) See exhibit A.[2] (5) National Highway Users Conference. (6) None. May be reimbursed for transportation, telephone calls, etc. (7) Only actual out-of-pocket expense, such as taxi fares and other transportation and hotel expense when out of town.

Tobin, Fred A., 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers Union of America, 222 East Michigan Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (2) Appears in the interest of the membership of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers Union of America. (3) Month to month. (4) $1,000 per month. (5) International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers Union of America. (6) I do not incur any expenses in performance of legislative work. (7) Only my salary.

Vogt, Joseph F., in care of Pennsylvania Railroad, Harismus Cove, Jersey City, N. J. (1) Pennsylvania Railroad, Jersey City, N. J. (2) The Employees Committee for Low-Cost Retirement Benefits. (3) Until the committee has achieved its purpose in reducing the cost to employees under the Railroad Retirement Act and the amendment thereof known as the Crosser bill, which became the law July 31, 1946. (4) $300 per month. (5) From the funds of the committee, which committee will raise its funds by contribution from railroad employees, payment to be made when the committee has sufficient funds. (6) No definite amount, except what is required for traveling, hotel, and other necessary living expenses. (7) See (6) above.

Voorhis,[1] H. Jerry, 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) The Cooperative League of the United States of America, 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (2) Consumers, farmers, general public, cooperatives of all sorts, as well as the Cooperative League of the United States of America. (3) Since April 1, 1947, continuing. (4) $7,500 as executive secretary of the Cooperative League of the United States of America for directing all of its activities, only a minor and incidental part of which relate to legislation. (See attached letter.) (5) Cooperative League of the United States of America. (6) Actual traveling and incidental expenses. (7) See (6) above.

Warfield, Ethelbert, Esq., 49 Wall Street, New York 5, N. Y. (1) American General Corp., 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N. J. (2) American General Corp., 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N. J. (3) Indefinite. (4) Is paid legal fees based upon duration and nature of employment. (5) American General Corp. (6) Reimbursement for actual expenses. (7) Traveling and hotel expenses, postal, and other incidental expenses.

Watson, J. R., room 1, Illinois Central Railroad passenger station, Jackson, Miss. (1) Mississippi Railroad Association, room 1, Illinois Central Railroad passenger station, post-office box 2534, Jackson, Miss. (2) Mississippi Railroad Association. (3) Employed as secretary of the association on an annual basis, primarily for services not related to Federal legislation. Matters of Federal legislation are other and different from and only incidental to my principal employment and purpose. (4) $4,500 per annum for all services rendered. No segregation as between principal employment and incidental concern with matters of Federal legislation. (5) Mississippi Railroad Association. (6) No fixed amount. (7) To be reimbursed for expenses incurred, including hotel, traveling expenses, meals, and all other expenses incurred in connection with my employment.

Welch, Don, post-office box 231, Madill, Okla. (1) The clients named in the attached statement No. 1.[2] (2) The clients named above. (3) Intermittent. (See attached statement No. 2.)[2] (4) At the rate of $58.33 per day for about 15 days in each year. (See attached statement No. 2.)[2] (5) The clients named above. (See attached statement No. 2.)[2] (6) Actual traveling expenses only. Impossible to state exact amount. (7) Actual traveling expenses only.

Wescott, James B., 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago 2, Ill. (1) Salt Producers Association, Book Building, Detroit 26, Mich. (2) Salt Producers Association. (3) Until such time as H. R. 2717, or proposed legislation similar thereto, is disposed of. (4) Registrant is retained as legal counsel for Salt Producers Association on an annual retainer of $3,600, said retainer being based upon a normal amount of time put in. No arrangement for additional compensation in connection with legislation has been made, but if the total amount of time exceeds the normal for the year, additional compensation will be billed at the rate of $200 per day. (5) Salt Producers Association. (6) Only actual out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Traveling and hotel bills, and miscellaneous out-of-pocket expenses.

Wicklein, Louis M., general vice president, Sheet Metal Workers' International Association, 642 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Sheet Metal Workers' International Association, 642 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (2) In the interest of railroad membership of our association when legislation is pending which would affect their interest. (3) Spasmodic and incidental to my work as general vice president of the Sheet Metal Workers' International Association. The only time I do any legislative work is when any legislation is pending which would affect the railroad membership of our organization. (4) $9,000 per year as general vice president of the Sheet Metal Workers' International Association. (5) Sheet Metal Workers' International Association. (6) I receive no expenses for legislative work. (7) None.

Wideman, Frank J., 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) St. Joe Paper Co. and affiliated and associated companies, including Florida National Group of Banks. (2) St. Joe Paper Co. and affiliated and associated companies, including Florida National Group of Banks. (3) Indefinite. (4) Compensation to be fixed with regard to time spent on the normal attorney-client basis. (5) St. Joe Paper Co. and affiliated and associated companies, including Florida National Group of Banks. (6) To be reimbursed for amount actually spent. (7) Telephone calls, taxicab fares, and other similar miscellaneous expenses of a routine nature.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., and Glen A. Wilkinson, doing business in the name of Ernest L. Wilkinson, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Menominee Tribe of Indians, Keshena, Wis. (2) Menominee Tribe of Indians. (3) June 30, 1948, under a contract approved by the Secretary of the Interior. (4) $2,600 annually for legal services. No amount is paid for supporting or opposing legislation, but when desired by the tribe we state their views on pending legislation to Members of Congress. (5) Menominee Tribe of Indians, from funds belonging to the tribe and on deposit in the United States Treasury. (6) The expenses actually incurred. Amounts are small and are ordinarily confined to travel and communication. (7) Local transportation, visits to Menominee Reservation when and if necessary, and telephone and telegraph charges.

Wilson, E. E., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., Shoreham Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington 5, D. C. (2) Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc. (3) Chairman of the board of governors, elected to serve for a period of 1 year until his successor is elected

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

and qualified. In the opinion of the registrant none of his activities nor any contemplated for the future fall within the terms of Public Law 601 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. (4) Nothing for activities covered by Public Law 601 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. (5) Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc. (6) Actual traveling expenses, if called upon to undertake activities in connection with legislative questions with which Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., is legitimately concerned. (7) Actual traveling expenses, if called upon to undertake activities in connection with legislative questions with which Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., is legitimately concerned.

Withers, Hamilton E.,[1] 417 North Main Street, Salisbury, N. C. (1) Brotherhood Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood Railroad Trainmen. (3) Indefinite. (4) $14.75 per day. (5) Brotherhood Railroad Trainmen. (6) $11.80 per day. (7) Hotel, meals, etc.

Zock, Anthony N., 70 Pine Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant is a member of the firm of Dow & Symmers, 70 Pine Street, New York, N. Y. (2) American Tramp Shipowners Institute. (3) Indefinite. (4) Quantum meruit, plus traveling, and subsistence expenses. (5) American Tramp Shipowners Institute. (6) Amount actually paid out. (7) Subsistence, traveling, and stenographic.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were received for the second calendar quarter, 1947, and filed, using Form C, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate:

(NOTE.—In order to reduce space the questions in Form C (see p. 10524) are not repeated. Only the answers are printed and are indicated by numbers in parentheses.)

Abbott, Charlotte E., 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [None.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admission Act.

Addi-, Mrs. Rhoena I., post-office box 1804, Lincoln, Nebr., Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Gross $1,106, social-security tax $11, withholding tax $164.90, expenses total $437.06; net $483.04. (2) To undersigned. (3) For acting as State representative and organizer of Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., in Nebraska and Iowa. (4) None. (5) Legislation to effectuate the recovery plan and better the conditions of the aged.

Adkerson, J. Carson, 975 National Press Building, Washington 4, D. C., self. (1) $16.85. (2) Various expenses. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) Interested in any legislation having to do with manganese or strategic minerals.

Albers,[4] Wayne B., 7 McGinley Building, West Palm Beach, Fla., Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (1) Commission, approximately $30 per week. (2) None paid out. (3) No purpose. (4) None. (5) Supporting Townsend Plan, known as H. R. 16, before the Eightieth Congress.

Alifas, Nels Peter, room 303, Machinists Building, International Association of Machinists. (1) Salary $1,999.98; $30 legislative expenses during quarter. (2) Taxi drivers and operators of eating and refreshment places. (3) Lobbying, i. e. supporting or opposing as the case may be, legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees, and incidentally organized labor in general. Not more than 25 percent of time spent on this work. (4) The Federal Machinist, a monthly periodical, of which he is editor, suspended during quarter but resumed publication July 1. (5) All legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees, and occasionally organized labor in general.

Allen, William, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis 1, Mo. (1) None for legislative purposes. (2) None for legislative purposes. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at the present time.

American Booksellers Association, Gilbert E. Goodkind, executive secretary, 31 Madison Avenue, New York 10, N. Y.; American Booksellers Association, Inc., 31 Madison Avenue, New York 10, N. Y. (1) See attached schedules.[2] (2) See attached schedules.[2] (3) See attached schedules.[2] (4) None. (5) Legislation designed to increase the book postage rate.

American Nurses' Association,[3] 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) None during last quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) See item No. 1. (4) The American Journal of Nursing is the official publication of the American Nurses' Association. Through the medium of the American Journal of Nursing, the membership is kept informed of pending legislation affecting nurses, nursing, or health by means of editorials or signed articles. (5) Legislation pertaining to health, nurses, or nursing.

American Nurses' Association,[4] 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) None during last quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) See item No. 1. (4) The American Journal of Nursing is the official publication of the American Nurses' Association. Through the medium of the American Journal of Nursing, the membership is kept informed of pending legislation affecting nurses, nursing, or health by means of editorials or signed articles. (5) Legislation pertaining to health, nurses, or nursing.

Aring, Hector M., 826 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See original registration form for complete explanation. No other contributions received. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Opposed to appropriation for cotton subsidy under section 32 of the Agriculture Appropriations Act, 1947—tax legislation.

Atkinson, Arthur K., 1618 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis 1, Mo.; Wabash Railroad Co., 1618 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis 1, Mo. (1) None. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) None. (5) The enactment of legislation granting or confirming the right of reorganization railroads to avail themselves of the so-called carry-over and carry-back provisions of the Internal Revenue Code as contained in section 122 and as were contained in section 710 (c) during the period it was in effect.

Avent, I. M.,[4] 1413 Wenonah Avenue, Berwyn, Ill. (1) Quarter total $1,040.20. (2) Public services, garage, hotel, restaurant, rent, goods and services, routine living expenses of self and family. (3) Travel, living, and routine activity. (4) Townsend National Weekly, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (5) Support of H. R. 16.

Ayer, N. W., & Son, Inc.,[5] a New York corporation, and J. Vance Babb and James H. Crowell, employees thereof (collectively herein called registrant), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York 20, N. Y. (1) N. W. Ayer & Son, Inc. (Ayer) received from National Association of Electrical Companies $7,252.45, of which $6,313.54 represented compensation to Ayer and $938.91 was for out-of-pocket expenses (see item (2) below). The only money received or spent by Registrants J. Vance Babb and James R. Crowell was for out-of-pocket expenses noted in item (2) below. (2) James R. Crowell and T. F. Collison, employees of Ayer, for traveling expenses $684.23; James R. Crowell, J. Vance Babb, B. J. Kelly, and Mary Blackford, employees of Ayer, for miscellaneous expenses $109.69; materials, postage, messengers, clippings, telephone and telegrams, etc., $144.99. (3) The amounts described in items (1) and (2) above were received or expended by Ayer in the performance of its services in advising on public relations and in connection with publicity affecting the electrical industry as described in registration dated March 3, 1947. Neither the services nor the expenditures involved lobbying within the meaning of the Lobbying Act. (4) [None.] (5) [None.] This quarterly report is filed subject to the reservations contained in the registration dated March 3, 1947.

Ayer, N. W. & Son, Inc.,[6] a New York corporation, and J. Vance Babb and James R. Crowell, employees thereof (collectively herein called registrant), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York 20, N. Y.; (National Association of Electric Companies). (1) N. W. Ayer & Son, Inc. (Ayer), received from National Association of Electric Companies $6,422.89, of which $6,304.59 represented compensation to Ayer and $118.30 was for out-of-pocket expenses (see item 2 below). The only money received or spent by registrants, J. Vance Babb and James R. Crowell, was for out-of-pocket expenses noted in item 2 below. (2) J. Vance Babb and Mary Blackford, employees of Ayer, for miscellaneous expenses, $71.14; materials, postage, messengers, clippings, telephone and telegrams, etc., $47.16. (3) The amounts described in items 1 and 2 above were received or expended by Ayer in the performance of its services in advising on public relations and in connection with publicity affecting the electric industry as described in registration dated March 3, 1947. Neither the services nor the expenditures involved lobbying within the meaning of the Lobbying Act. (4) [None.] (5) [None.] This quarterly report is filed subject to the reservations contained in the registration dated March 3, 1947.

Babcock,[4 5] Charles E., route 3, box 418, Vienna, Va.; National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics of the United States, 3029 North Broad Street, Philadelphia 32, Pa. (1) Expenses only. No salary whatever paid to me as chairman of the national legislative committee of the National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics. (2) To filling stations for gas, oil, etc., as I average at least two trips from my home in Vienna, Va., to the Capitol, Washington, D. C., weekly—a minimum of 60 miles or 10 cents a mile equals $6 a week, or $27 a month. This leaves $23 a month for telegrams, long-distance telephoning, meals, and room rent when I have to stay in Washington overnight. (3) Transportation for self, meals, hotel expenses, etc., as set forth in item (2). (4) The Junior American. The official organ of the National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics of the United States; address above. (5) Immigration, deportation, and naturalization laws; and free public-school measures.

Babcock,[4 6] Charles E., route 3, box 418, Vienna, Va.; National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, 3029 North Broad Street, Philadelphia 32, Pa. (1) Received an allowance of $50 per month for out-of-pocket expenses. No salary whatever paid to me as chairman of the national legislative committee of the National Council, Junior Order

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.
[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[3] Filed for first quarter.
[4] Filed with the Clerk only.
[5] Filed for second quarter.
[6] Filed for second quarter.

United American Mechanics. (2) Various, see below. (3) Services at gasoline stations, gasoline, oil, etc., postage, telephone, telegrams, meals, and hotel rooms. All personal. Transportation to and from my home in Vienna, Va., to Washington. (4) The Junior American, official organ of the Junior Order United American Mechanics; address, Philadelphia, as above. (5) Immigration, deportation, and naturalization matters, and public-school measures. Occasionally other bills which our order believes for the good of the United States.

Baldinger, Mary Alice, 4607 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington; American Civil Liberties Union, 170 Fifth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y. (1) Received payment of $207.50, at $10 per working day and $39.75 expenses. (2) Paid for carfare, taxis, office supplies, etc. (3) Same as (2). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the basic principles of civil liberties and rights, freedom of speech, opinion and religion, and the welfare of racial and other minorities.

Baldridge,[3] H. Malcolm, United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 408 American Building, 1317 F Street, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for 3 months at $1,500 per month equals $4,500. No expenses received or expended on any legislative activity. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Baldridge,[4] H. M., United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C., and 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.; United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C., and 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $1,500 per month, or $4,500 for the quarter. No money expended on any legislative activity. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) In support of H. R. 4075 and S. 1584.

Baldwin & Mermey, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York 17, N. Y., Hershey Corp., Hershey, Pa. (1) Received $6,750, expended $461.81. (2) Western Union Telegraph Co., New York Telephone Co., post office, Jelinek Letter Service Co., Pennsylvania Railroad, Baldwin & Mermey. (3) Telephone and telegraph service, postage, travel, carfares, messenger service, mimeographing, and miscellaneous. (4) [Blank.] (5) Sugar legislation.

Bannister, L. Ward, 804 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo., California Electric Power Co., Riverside, Calif. (1) Received $300.08 whereof $298 for professional services and $2.08 to reimburse for telegram charge. (2) The $2.08 to Western Union. (3) As per (5) below. (4) None. (5) Support bills for development of water resources of river basins in West by Bureau of Reclamation and Army engineers and oppose development under regional authority bills.

Barber, Hartman, room 301, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 4, D. C., Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati 2, Ohio. (1) See statement attached.[2] (2) See statement attached.[2] (3) See statement attached.[2] (4) None. (5) All legislation directly or indirectly affecting labor in any manner whatsoever, especially railroad labor.

Barker, Richard B., 306 Southern Building, Washington 5, D. C., Eastman Kodak Co.; Rochester 4, N. Y. (1) No funds received. Expended for telephones, $11.34. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) Not applicable. (5) Excise tax on photographic materials.

Barker, Richard B., 306 Southern Building, Washington 5, D. C., The Haloid Co., Rochester 3, N. Y. (1) No funds received. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) Not applicable. (5) Excise tax on photographic materials.

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for first quarter.
[6] Filed for second quarter.

Barnett, Arthur R., 1336 New York Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C., National Association of Electric Cos., 1336 New York Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Received salary of $2,750.01 as an officer and employee of the National Association of Electric Cos., and reimbursement of $476.75 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all duties and assignments, only a part of which salary and expenses were for those purposes described in section 308 (a) or otherwise within the scope of Public Law No. 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, railroads, air lines, telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs, book stores, and stationers. (3) Railroad and transportation, $60.45; hotel and restaurants, $267.35; bookstores and stationers, $30.55; telephone and telegraph, $16.70; and gratuities and miscellaneous, $101.70. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Cos., of which I am an officer and employee, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association therefore is interested in legislation that might affect its members as going business concerns.

Beecroft, Tom Taylor,[4 5] 1359 Goodbar, Memphis, Tenn., Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barlum Tower, Detroit, Mich. (1) $290.90, actual expenses incurred for lobbying in Washington, D. C. (2) Various. (3) Actual expenses incurred for lobbying in Washington, D. C. (4) None. (5) H. R. 8, a bill in the House of Representatives; S. 55, a bill in the United States Senate.

Beecroft, Tom Taylor,[4 6] 515 Barlum Tower, Detroit, Mich., Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barlum Tower, Detroit, Mich. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None.. (4) None. (5) None.

Beirne, Joseph A., 917 G Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary and expenses, $3,082.68. (2) Normal living expenses plus railroads, air lines, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, and other incidental and related expenses. (3) To perform the normal functions of my position with the National Federation of Telephone Workers, none of which were related to legislative activities. (4) None. (5) Any proposed legislation which would affect the National Federation of Telephone Workers or its affiliates.

Bell, John Dickinson, editor and publisher, Unveiling the Universe (trade-mark registered U. S. Patent Office), post office box 3214, Washington, D. C., and post office box 943, Scranton, Pa. True Order P. M. A. for U. T. U., post office box 3214, Washington, D. C., and post office box 943, Scranton, Pa. (1) Received $10; expended $7.25. (2) Various. (3) Various. (4) Unveiling the Universe (trade-mark registered U. S. Patent Office).

Bennett, Harry L., Jr., 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. Employment terminated May 31, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Bennett, Hugh M., 17 South High Street, Columbus 15, Ohio. Jewelers Vigilance Committee, Inc., 17 West Forty-fifth Street, New York 19, N. Y. (1) Attached exhibit[3] shows amount of money expended by me and not yet reimbursed for. See attached exhibit.[3] (3) To attend meetings of the industry tax committee of the Jewelers Vigilance Committee, Inc. (4) None. (5) Jewelry excise tax elimination or revision.

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed with the Clerk only.
[5] Filed for first quarter.
[6] Filed for second quarter.

Benson, Ernest H., 105 Chaddock Avenue, Hornell, N. Y. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit 2, Mich. (1) Received salary, April 1 to June 30, $1,012.50, and expenses, $751.57. No money expended in connection with legislative work. (2) Hamilton Hotel, various restaurants, phone, telegrams, postage, laundry, pullman, and taxi fare. (3) Necessary living and transportation expenses. (4) None. (5) Work in connection with opposing S. 670 and H. R. 3150.

Bergin, Preston B., 1627 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) $400 salary; $71.25 expenses. (2) Taxi drivers, streetcars, Senate and House restaurants. (3) Taxi, streetcar travel, and lunches. (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor law revision, social-security law revision, inflammable fabric legislation.

Berckes, Herbert C., secretary,[7] Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 Canal Building, New Orleans 12, La. (1) Received for services as secretary, $750; expended for travel expenses, $1,283.39 (includes transportation and per diem). (2) Various. (3) Legislation. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation affecting the southern pine lumber industry.

Bernard, William S., 39 East Fifty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expense received as stated on registration statement. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Common Ground, volume VII, No. 4, summer 1947. (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Berns, Karl H., National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary: $1,593.84, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities. Estimated for legislative service, $318.75; expenses. (2) Self (salary); expenses: hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), information articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Beverage, Albion P., associate secretary, National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, April 1 to May 31, 1947, $900; expenses, $62.69. (2) Various. (3) Used in attending conferences and meetings out of town, speaking, expenses in trips to Capitol Hill, etc. (4) [Blank.] (5) I support, in pursuance of the purposes of our organization, legislation that promotes peace and oppose legislation which, in our judgment, leads to war.

Biorn, Norman E., 407-408 Commerce Building, St. Paul 1, Minn.; Minnesota Small Business, Inc., 407-408 Commerce Building, St. Paul 1, Minn. (1) Salary, none; received for actual expenses, $54.39; spent for legislative activities, none. (2) Various. (3) Postage, phone calls, telegrams. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting taxation of businesses and especially inequalities in such legislation.

Bloch, Charles J., 614-618 Persons Building, Macon, Ga.; Georgia Southern Florida Railway Co., Macon, Ga. (1) Only money received by registrant was six semimonthly

[7] Filed with the Secretary only.

payments of $150 to his firm on annual salary as stated in paragraph 4 of registration. Salary for clerk paid by Georgia Southern Florida Railway Co. directly to Miss Gertrude Thorner, there being six semimonthly payments of $98.50 less deductions for withholding tax and railroad retirement fund. (2) Salary paid to registrant's firm was retained by it and salary paid clerk was retained by her. No money was expended by registrant "in carrying on his work." (3) No money was paid out by registrant during last quarter for any purpose "in carrying on his work." (4) None. (5) The primary purpose of registrant's employment is not to support or oppose any legislation. As counsel for Georgia Southern Florida Railway Co., as stated in paragraph 4 of registration sworn to June 25, 1947, and filed June 26, 1947, he has been requested to and will support the passage of Senate bill 110 (Reed-Bulwinkle bill) and H. R. 1639 (amendment to venue provisions of Judiciary Act—Jennings bill).

Blohm, George C., 435 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago 11, Ill.; News Publishers Association To Amend the Anti-Trust Laws, 435 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago 11, Ill. (1) News Publishers Association To Amend the Anti-Trust Laws has received $25 in dues during the preceding calendar quarter, and has expended $3,943.60. (2) See rider attached.[3] (3) See rider attached.[3] (4) None. (5) To support H. R. 110 or such other or amended proposed legislation as shall be similar to or designed to effect the same purpose as said H. R. 110.

Blumberg,[4] Emanuel, 137 Chesapeake Street SW.; Washington Highlands Citizens Association. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the citizens in the Washington Highlands area in Washington, D. C.

Blunt, Joseph R., 1004 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; West Coast Lumbermen's Association, 1410 Southwest Morrison Street, Portland, Oreg. (1) No money received or expended during calendar quarter for lobbying purposes. (2) Same as (1). (3) Same as (1). (4) None. (5) Legislation directly affecting the west coast lumber manufacturing industry.

Bodfish, Morton, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago 1, Ill. (United Savings and Loan League). (1) See attached statement.[3] (2) See attached statement.[3] (3) For travel, hotel, and maintenance in Washington, D. C. (4) None (other than the customary materials found in our trade papers, in our trade association periodicals, and in our trade association bulletins). (5) Support all legislation favorable to thrift and home ownership and particularly helpful to savings and loan associations and cooperative banks in carrying out their thrift and home-financing objectives and oppose legislation detrimental to home ownership and these institutions.

Boehne, John W., Jr., 1058 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (National Association of Employees of Collectors of Internal Revenue, post office box 1034, Milwaukee, Wis.). (1) ($900 and postage and printing, $103.75) $1,003.75. (2) John W. Boehne, Jr. (3) Counsel for above association. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting employees of collectors' offices.

Bohannon, John N., Asheville, N. C. (1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.) (Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.). (1) Personal remuneration, including expenses during the preceding calendar quarter, $4,500. Money expended see (3) below. (2) See (3) below. (3) Personal subsistence, transportation, routine, and other customary expenses only. Also see (6) form B heretofore filed. (4) None. (5) Any legislation that might affect producing, gathering, transportation, distribution, or sale of natural gas.

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed with the Clerk only.

Bonamarte,[5] Robert F., 429 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (Fleet Reserve Association). (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Bonamarte,[6] Robert F., 429 Investment Building, Fifteenth and K Streets NW, Washington, D. C. (Fleet Reserve Association, 429 Investment Building, Fifteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.). (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Booth, Herman M., Jr., 515 Barium Tower, Detroit 26, Mich. (Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barium Tower, Detroit 26, Mich.). (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) No participation in lobbying during second quarter, and I shall not be lobbying on labor legislation as set forth in first-quarter report.

Bourg, Clarence J., 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (American Sugar Cane League). (1) $155.71 has been received and expended in connection with legislation and other contacts with Government, of which not more than one-fourth has been expended in connection with legislation, such as taxicab fares about Washington and an occasional lunch. (2) Various. (3) Various. (4) Sugar Bulletin of New Orleans, La., Sugar Beet Journal of Saginaw, Mich. (5) Any legislation affecting the domestic sugar producer.

Bouello,[4] Charles J., 5 East Hamilton Avenue, Silver Spring, Md. Bowers Union Local 229, 5 East Hamilton Avenue, Silver Spring, Md. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Support.

Bowden, Ray B., 604 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Statement attached.[3] (2) Shown in attached statement.[3] (3) For general trade association work. Total of less than $10 spent for taxi service in Washington, D. C. Few items on Western Union bill for late June but bill not yet received in office; estimated wire total less than $50. (4) None so far as know. (5) Supported extension of export allocation in S. 1461 but asked that amendment be introduced to return actual export of grain (to claimant nations) to the private export trade.

Boyd, H. B., 1001 Tower Building, Washington 5, D. C. United States Beet Sugar Association. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Interested in legislation affecting sugar but not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing any legislation.

Boyle, James J., 410 Hill Building, Seventeenth and Eye Streets NW., Washington, D. C. United Public Health League, Room 2004 450 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Received from employer, United Public Health League, $2,873.87. (2) To the undersigned: salary, $2,098.89; postage, $12; rent and secretarial service, $300; Ralph L. Torreyson and L. A. Cooley; printing and mimeographing, Ruth Torr, $39; travel, $77.12; subscriptions, $20; telephone and telegraph, $91.84; conference, lunches, dinners, $385. (3) All moneys received were expended for salary, rent, secretary, travel, conferences, lunches, dinners, printing, telephone, and telegraph. (4) Bulletins issued occasionally by United Public Health League. (5) To support any and all legislation calculated to aid the public health and to oppose such legislation as might injure public health—S. 1320, S. 515, S. 140.

Boyle, Samuel E., 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans. The Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America for service with the Christian Amendment Movement, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans; Reformed Presbyterian Church Headquarters, 309 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh 22, Pa. (1) Three months salary (April, May, June 1947) paid by Treasurer James S. Tibby, the Reformed Presbyterian Church in North America, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh 22, Pa., total, $624.99. Other sources—fees, etc.; Total travel expenses paid by Mr. Tibby, $225; other sources, total, $101.49; total receipts, $326.49. (2) Salary to personal and family use; no accounting given here. Travel expenses taken from above income as indicated on attached [3] itemized accounts of trips taken in service of the Christian Amendment Movement. Paid to railways, hotels, restaurants, etc. (3) For traveling expenses only or living costs while on trips for employer. (4) The Covenanter Witness, editor, Dr. D. R. Taggart, 1121 Buchanan Street, Topeka, Kans.; the Christian Patriot, Samuel E. Boyle, editor, 1121 Buchanan Street, Tokeka, Kans.; the Pilot, Catholic archdiocese weekly of Boston, Roman Catholic Church, Boston, Mass.; United Evangelical Action, J. DeForest Murch, editor, Cincinnati, Ohio; news releases and news stories appeared which were not solicited. (5) The Christian Amendment Movement is an association of citizens who are seeking to secure the following amendment to the preamble of the United States Constitution; "We the people of the United States, devoutly recognizing the authority and law of Jesus Christ, the saviour and King of nations * * * do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States, etc."

Brewbaker, James W., 623 Investment Building. National Association of Manufacturers. (1) Receipts: Salary, $1,875; expenses reimbursed by employers, $1,095.20. Expenditures, $1,095.20. (2) Expenses paid to various restaurants, hotels, and taxicabs. (3) Attending meetings to discuss general conditions in Washington of interest to business and industry in particular. (4) [Blank.] (5) All bills affecting the following subjects: National labor policy, portal-to-portal wage claims, tax laws, reduction of Federal expenditures, control of atomic energy, Federal subsidization of research, patents and trademarks, wartime control powers, and revision of the SEC and RFC Acts.

Brickman, Paul, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. Vernon Scott and Loring Schuler, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money received or expended by me for lobbying purposes. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Tax equality.

Bright, O. O., 1302 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. Southern Pine Industry Committees. (1) Salary, $1,050; expenses, $306.80. (2) To various hotels, restaurants, cab drivers, and for incidental expense. (3) See No. 2 above. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the lumber manufacturing industry.

Brightman, Melvin H., 1112 Barr Building, Washington, D. C. (Dairy Industry Committee). (1) $2,500 salary as executive secretary of Dairy Industry Committee. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To observe legislation possibly affecting dairy industry.

Brooks, A. E., 2202 Fort Worth National Bank Building, Fort Worth 2, Tex. (The American Chamber of Commerce). (1) American Chamber of Commerce of Mexico, Cooke Building, Mexico, Federal District, $5,658.54. (2) American Airlines, $157.87; Raleigh Hotel, $241.63; CCH Tax Service, $43; other, $211.04. (3) Fee, $5,000; air travel, $157.87; hotel room, $241.63; books, $48; meals and tips, $93.55; stationary and public stenographer, $43.65; stamps, $9.75; taxi, $23.55; translation, $10.65; miscellaneous, $10.50; express, $16.89; telephone, $2.54. (4) None. (5) To exempt from income taxes income derived from sources abroad by nonresident United States citizens actively engaged in a trade or business abroad.

Brooks, William F., 607 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C.; National Grain Trade Council, 607 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary and expense received during period amounted to $1,299.98, of which only

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed with the Clerk only.
[5] Filed for first quarter.
[6] Filed for second quarter.

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

$14.70 was spent for any purpose covered by the act. (2) Taxicab fares, none of which was in excess of $1.50. (3) Transportation. (4) None other than weekly newsletter published by employer. (5) Legislation affecting agriculture in general and the grain trade in particular.

Brown, Earle Palmer, 1737 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (Public Relations Department, National Association of Real Estate Boards). (1) See A attached.[2] (2) See A attached.[2] (3) See A attached.[2] (4) See B attached.[2] (5) Any and all legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Brown, Frederick E., Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C.; National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1127 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Clark & La Roe, law firm, received from the National Independent Meat Packers Association, $4,500, total of monthly payments for general legal services, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payment made to any other person. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) I have not supported or opposed any legislation during the past quarter.

Brown, Frederick E., Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C.; Seatrain Lines, Inc., 39 Broadway, New York 6, N. Y. (1) Clark & La Roe, law firm, received from Seatrain Lines, Inc., $1,875, monthly payments on annual retainer, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payments made to any other person. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) I have not supported or opposed any legislation during the past quarter.

Brown, Robert E., secretary, The Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc., room 315, 38 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis 4, Ind. (1) Money received for salary, none; money received for reimbursement of actual expenses, $82.67. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to promote tax equality between competing businesses.

Brown, Russell B., 500 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C.; Independent Petroleum Association of America, 500 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Salary previously reported plus the following expenses which might be considered within the scope of the act. (2) See (3) below. (3) Taxi fare, $36. (4) My normal duties include periodic reporting to members of the association on pending legislation. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. My duties include that of maintaining surveillance of legislation which might affect the petroleum industry and taking such action with respect to such legislation as directed by the association.

Brylawski, A. Julian, 702 Earle Building, Washington, D. C.; Motion Picture Theater Owners, Metropolitan District of Columbia., 702 Earle Building, Washington D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

Bryson, Jack, 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary received (net after withholding tax) $5,535; expense reimbursement, $1,160; expended, $6,695. (2) To self, $5,535; to Hotel Statler, $1,160. (3) To self for personal and family needs. To Hotel Statler for general reception May 22, 1947. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the motion-picture industry.

Buck, Elizabeth, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y.; Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Bugbee, George, 18 East Division Street, Chicago 10, Ill.; American Hospital Association. (1) Quarterly salary, $4,249.98; reimbursement of travel expense, $577.37. (2) Various air lines, railroads, hotels, and recipients of miscellaneous amounts for taxicabs, meals, and similar necessary expenses. (3) Necessary traveling expenses as indicated. (4) Hospitals, the official journal of the American Hospital Association. (5) Legislation which might affect the quality of hospital service to the people of this country.

Bulow, William J., Jr., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received, none; money expended, $221.40. (2) Various transportation, hotel, telephone and telegraph companies and United States Post Office. (3) Customary business expense for transportation, hotel, telephone calls, telegrams, and postage. (4) None. (5) Postage-rate legislation.

Bunje, Ralph B.,[4] 2044 Mariposa Street, Fresno, Calif.; Agricultural Labor Bureau of the San Joaquin Valley, 2044 Mariposa Street, Fresno, Calif. (1) See attached statement.[2] (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Burger, George J., 250 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York 19, N. Y.; Self. (1) Received $6,675.31 from operating Burger Tire Consultant Service, publishing National Independent and acting as director in charge of Washington Office of National Federation of Small Business. Expended $5,195.10 for general operating expenses. (2) General office expenses. (3) Publications, weekly bulletins, travel expenses. (4) National Independent, Burger Tire Consultant Service weekly bulletin. (5) Tire bill; all legislation pertaining to small business.

Harold Burke,[5] 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.; United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary for 3 months at $625 per month equals $1,875. No expenses received or expended on any legislative activity. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Harold Burke,[6] 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.; United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $625 per month equals $1,875 salary for 3 months. No money expended on any legislative activity. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) The support of H. R. 4075 and S. 1534.

Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 Fifteenth Street, NW., Washington 5, D. C.; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL, 1200 Fifteenth Street, NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Salary $1,378.71; Expenses $470.60, minus withholding and railroad retirement deductions. Expenses include transportation, hotel rooms and meals including incidental expenses but none for lobbying purposes. (2) Railroad, bus, steamship, taxis, for transportation, hotels and restaurants for meals and lodging, incidental expenses, and providing nothing for lobbying purposes. (3) Transportation, meals, lodging, telephone, telegrams and postage stamps. (4) The Journal of Electrical Workers and Operators is available to me. (5) All legislation effecting the electrical worker in particular and labor in general.

Eugene J. Butler, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C.; National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,758.96 Salary for 3 months. (2) Eugene J. Butler. (3) Salary. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting religious, charitable, and educational institutions and organizations.

Joseph G. Butts, Jr., 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; law offices of Gall and Lane, Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received: $3,000; Expended, $40.62. (2) Retainer paid to Gall and Lane. Expenses: Western Union for telegrams $27.26; Taxi fares $5.48; C & P. Telephone Co., $5.83; miscellaneous $2, total $40.62. (3) See item (2) above. (4) None. (5) To support legislation to prevent Federal expenditures in competition with private enterprise.

Calhoun, Leonard J., Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building., Washington 5, D. C., National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., care of Voyle C. Scurlock, president, 703 Midwest Building, Oklahoma City 2, Okla. (1) $450 received by firm of Morgan & Calhoun from National Rehabilitation Association for all services as Washington counsel for the association. While $950 was received for the quarter ending March 31, 1947, this was for services involving no legislative activities. (2) No expenditures. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None, but during quarter assisted association in preparing statements as to Federal grants for vocational rehabilitation.

Calhoun, Leonard J., Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc., 229 East Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis. (1) $3,000 received by Morgan & Calhoun for all services as Washington counsel for Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc. Allocation between legislative and nonlegislative activities is not feasible. While $2,250 was received for the quarter ending March 31, 1947, this was for services involving no legislative activities. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. At irregular intervals UBA publishes and distributes to its members, public officials who administer social-security programs, and a few others mimeographed material related to current social-security problems, including legislation. I usually prepare this material. (5) All legislation affecting social-security benefits and contributions.

Caplan, Gloria, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y.; Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses as stated on registration statement. Employment terminated June 6, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Carter, Albert E., 1026 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Received $3,000 as compensation; reimbursed $379.15 for expenses advanced. Expended $365.01, which will be reimbursed, as follows: Munsey Real Estate Co., $300; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $47.90; Western Union Telegraph Co., $9.86; incidentals, $7.25. (2) Munsey Real Estate Co.; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.; Western Union Telegraph Co.; incidentals. (3) Rent; telephone service; telegraph service. (4) [Blank.] (5) Retained to represent the company before administrative agencies and commissions and on legislative matters affecting company's interest.

Carter, Asa L., 325 Ashland Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.; petitioners and their due successors at War Department, file No. 7040-7, April 7, 1933 (287 U. S. 627) (supra), extended to all abutters on B-lines duly and precisely mapped herein. (1) I received and expended only $118.50, costs and disbursements herein divided: Petty cash, clerical work, searching records, and addressing mail, etc., $61.50; and for postage, printing, telephoning, carfares, etc., $57. (2) It was paid to postmasters, printers, public-service companies, and standard clerical help at Pittsburgh, Pa. (3) For the purpose of furthering sentiment for a Rain Hill prize for the best B-line electric pipe train locomotive for major heavy freight: Maximum ton-miles and minimum time and space for passageway, rolling stock, labor per ton-mile, etc., ocean power costs. (4) I publish nowhere except by first-class mail direct to abutters and contributors. (5) Everything for or against

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[4] Filed with the Clerk only.

[5] Filed for first quarter.

[6] Filed for second quarter.

B-line; I include details four books (4 pounds 2 ounces), Pittsburgh, old post-office, register mail No. 63561 and 63560, January 8, 1947, $4.60 postage. All of which I repeat herein (93 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 5085: 2). (NOTE.—Facts are acts (actualities) and acts are facts. Specific: Clumsy crooked Roman chariot gage railroads cannot compete with 1 to 5 miles per hour reduced gage pipe lines (Roman aqueducts), old tunnels only 6 feet D. Argument: You can no more give Europe relief without B-line than you can patch up an old machine and expect it to do a new machine's work. It is physical fact, judicial notice impossible.)

Carver, Leslie G., 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C., National Paint, Varnish and Lacquer Association, Inc., 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) No money received except regular salary as shown in registration form. Expended 80 cents for two taxicabs from office to House Office Building and return. (2) Taxicabs. (3) Taxicabs. (4) None. (5) No special legislation. We are interested in the Census of Manufacturers bill, H. R. 1821, and hearing in relation to which this registrant attended on June 9. This is the only activity pursuant to the registration of this act performed during this quarter.

Case, Ralph H., Southern Building, Washington, D. C., Quinaielt Tribe of Indians, Taholah, Wash., Taholah, Wash. (1) Compensation received none. Disbursements none. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 734.

Case, Ralph H., Southern Building, Washington, D. C., Three Affiliated Tribes, Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., Elbowoods, N. Dak. (1) Compensation as general counsel for above client; first quarter 1947, $1,000. Reimbursement of expense in part $186.39. (2) Byron S. Adams, printing brief $158.50; Western Union telegrams to Tribal Council and Superintendent $4.20; A. Norton, stenographer, $50. (3) Purpose stated above. (4) None. (5) Legislation in regard to construction of Garrison Dam, N. Dak. H. R. 4002, civil functions, War Department.

Casey, D. E.,[5] Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C., (American Taxpayers Association, Inc.) (1) Received as salary $2,649.99. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None specified.

Casey, D. E.,[6] 339 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C., American Taxpayers Association, Inc., 339 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Received as salary $2,649.99. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None specified.

Castiglioni, Paul M., 112 C Street NW., Washington, D. C. National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees, 112 C Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $838.98, less withholding and social-security taxes; expenses for quarter, $532.25. (2) Paul M. Castiglioni. (3) To promote the welfare of the motor vehicle employees of the Post Office Department; covering both legislative and nonlegislative work. (4) Rotor and bulletins called Motor Vehicle News. (5) Supporting all legislation of benefit to motor vehicle employees.

Chace, W. E., 610 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. Hill & Knowlton. (1) $2,100 salary received from Hill & Knowlton and applied to personal uses; none to lobbying activities. Reimbursed by Hill & Knowlton for out-of-pocket expenses for cab fares and phone calls totaling approximately $20. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any specified legislation. During preceding quarter worked in general on public relations as to several matters affecting agriculture.

Chamblin, Walter, Jr., 623 Investment Building. The National Association of Manufacturers. (1) Receipts: Salary, $6,250; expenses reimbursed by employer, $1,590.18. Expenditures: $1,590.18 (see detailed report attached[7]). (2) Expenses paid to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone company, trade associations, and clubs. (3) Attending meetings and making speeches to discuss general conditions in Washington of interest to business and industry in particular. (4) [Blank.] (5) All bills affecting the following subjects: National labor policy, portal-to-portal wage claims, tax laws, reduction of Federal expenditures, control of atomic energy, Federal subsidization of research, patents and trademarks, wartime control powers, and revision of the SEC and RFC Acts.

Chandler, E. L., 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Room 703, Washington, D. C. American Society of Civil Engineers, 33 West Thirty-ninth Street, New York 18, N. Y. (1) From American Society of Civil Engineers, $39.90. (2) Taxicabs, postage. (3) Taxicab fares, $30; postage, $9.90. (4) None. (5) Revision of labor laws, international interchange of information and education, advance planning of public works, stream pollution control, National Science Foundation.

Clements, J. C., Carroll Arms Hotel, Washington, D. C. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $2,499.99. (2) Above sum quarterly compensation received from National Council on Business Mail, Inc. (3) No money paid out. (4) None. (5) Postal rate legislation.

Clott, Herman, 930 F Street NW., room 521, Washington, D. C. International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, CIO, 222 West Adams Street, suite 1299, Chicago, Ill. (1) $1,040, Salary; $110, taxi fares. (2) Herman Clott. (3) Paid as salary and taxi expenses around Washington. (4) The Union (official organ of the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, CIO). (5) Support all legislation in favor of membership of above-mentioned union and to oppose all legislation detrimental to said membership and to the welfare of the American people.

Cohn, Marcus, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (American Jewish Committee.) (1) See exhibit A.[8] (2) Marcus Cohn. (3) See exhibit A.[8] (4) I have supplied information to the general press on immigration and other matters in which the American Jewish Committee is interested. (5) No specific legislation with the exception of immigration. See original legislation statement and exhibit A.

Colborn, (Miss) Fern M., 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia 7, Pa. Division of Social Education and Action, Board of Christian Education, Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia 7, Pa. (1) Personal expenses refunded—i. e., travel, lodging, food—$80.25; salary, $300 quarterly. (2) [Blank.] (3) Lobbying in the interest of social legislation on which the Presbyterian General Assembly has taken action. (4) Social Progress Magazine, Special Bulletins. (5) Same as No. 3.

Colgan, Howard O., Jr., 15 Broad Street, New York 5, N. Y. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Broad Street, New York 5, N. Y. (1) The only money received by registrant was his regular salary as an associate of the law firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, which firm receives an annual retainer from the New York Stock Exchange for professional services. That portion of such annual retainer attributable to attention to Federal tax legislative matters based on an allocation of time was $375 during the second quarter of 1947, plus disbursements of $93.84. (2) Expense payments were made to firm for hotel, meals, transportation, postage, telephone, and miscellaneous expenses of registrant and of others associated with Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley. (3) See answers to (1) and (2). (4) None. (5) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

Collett, F. G., box 1476, main post office, Washington, D. C. Indians of California, Inc., 2619 Regent Street, Berkeley, Calif. (1) The required report of money received is attached hereto.[8] (2) To various persons and concerns for miscellaneous services, such as stenographic, typing, and mimeographing services, stationery and supplies, rooms and meals, telephone and telegraph services, postage, transportation, printing and photostating, and expenses and maintenance of delegates representing Indians of California (see attached report of expenditures[8]). (3) To secure remedial legislation. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to the Indians of California.

Columbus, Frank S., 10 Independence Avenue, Washington 4, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland 15, Ohio. (1) Salary, $210; expense, $210. (2) Frank S. Columbus. (3) For salary and personal expenses working in behalf of legislation in which the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen is interested. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting the interest of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

Coman, Ellis S., 701 Architects Building, 816 West Fifth Street, Los Angeles 13, Calif.; Agricultural Producers Labor Committee, 701 Architects Building, Los Angeles 13, Calif. (1) Regular salary of $650 per month as manager of Agricultural Producers Labor Committee. In addition actual traveling and living expenses while in Washington, D. C., (and traveling) 17 days during past quarter. (2) Ellis S. Coman by the Agricultural Producers Labor Committee. (3) See No. 1. (4) None. (5) Passage of permanent farm labor legislation.

Compton, R. T., 623 Investment Building NW., Washington 5, D. C. (National Association of Manufacturers). (1) Receipts: Salary, $3,750; expenses reimbursed by employer, $411.09; expenditures, $411.09. (2) Expenses paid to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone company. (3) For expenses incurred in course of business, such as travel, meals and hotel accommodations and expenses of conducting conferences for discussion of business matters. (4) [blank.] (5) All legislation affecting industry, such as legislation relating to national labor policy, taxation, public expenditures, industrial controls, social security, research, patents and investments.

Comstock, Boyd, legislative assistant, legislative-Federal relations division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary: $1,175.04 which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $235, expenses. (2) Self (salary); expenses: hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein); informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Condon, Arthur D.,[5] attorney, suite 513, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C., as attorney for the Military and Naval Distributors Association, Inc., 295 Madison Ave., New York 17, N. Y. (1) Received $1,700 as compensation, including expenses, in the first quarter of 1947, as follows: January 12, February 12, March 12. The portion of this intended for expenses was not specified in the contract of employment. Other than travel expenses to attend conferences

[5] Filed for first quarter.
[6] Filed for second quarter.
[7] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[8] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

with clients, expenditures would include a pro rata share in maintaining law office, which have not been computed for purposes of this report. (2) [Blank.]. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.]. (5) None at this time.

Condon, Arthur D.,[6] attorney, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C.; Military and Naval Distributors Association, Inc., 295 Madison Avenue, New York 17, N. Y. (1) Received $1,700 per month as follows: April 12, May 12, and June 12, 1947; no expenditures other than office routine. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) None.

Condon, Arthur D., attorney, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C.; Morton Salt Co., Chicago, Ill. (1) None received and only routine office expenditures. Reasonable compensation to be paid, but none yet received. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2717.

Cone, D. C., room 307, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America. (1) Annual compensation for 1947, $5,250. (2) D. C. Cone. (3) As vice president and part-time national legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America covering all service rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor generally, employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act and particularly the interests of the employees represented by the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America.

Connaughton, John H., 316 Metropolitan Bank Building, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. Cecil N. Broy, 524 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va. (1) No money received during preceding calendar quarter. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to subject German assets to payment of civilian claims against old German Government.

Connett, William C. IV, 1630 Boatmen's Bank Building, St. Louis 2, Mo., American Cross Arm and Conduit Co. (1) No moneys received this quarter. (2) Expenses of trip to Washington, March 31 to April 2, $47; notary fees, $2; long-distance telephone call, $2.62. (3) Living expenses going to Washington, in Washington, and returning from Washington. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2422.

Conover, Julian D., American Mining Congress, 309 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Received no compensation other than regular salary as previously reported; expended $8.80. (2) Sundry payees. (3) Taxicab fares, $7.95; telephone calls, 85 cents. (4) An editorial director of Mining Congress Journal, a monthly magazine for the mining industry. (5) Measures affecting the mining industry.

Conroy, Fugene J., 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.; the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J.. (1) None; no activities during this quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Cooley, Thomas M., II, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW, Washington 5, D. C.; Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None (compensation and reimbursement of expenses received as stated on registration statement). (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 2910.

Cooperstock, John, 30 Bellingham Avenue, Revere, Mass.; Veterans Association of Federal Employees, New York Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, N. Y. (1) Two weeks' expenses appearing before Senate Civil Service Committee and other matters on June 16 and 17, $400. (2) Self. (3) For appearing before Senate Civil Service Committee and testifying regarding veterans' conditions and need for changes, also Civil Service Commission. (4) None. (5) Need for making Civil Service Commission decision binding on agencies; also pay for time lost; also need for clarification of Veterans' Preference Act.

[6] Filed for second quarter.

Corbett,[5] John T., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 4, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1118 Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $2,681.70 as wages, $200.01 for office rental. (2) $200.01 to Labor for office rental. (3) As assistant grand chief engineer and national legislative representative, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, covering all services rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislation and legislative matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor.

Corbett,[6] John T., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 4, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1118 Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $200.01 office rental, $2,722.22 as wages. (2) $200.01 to Labor for office rental in Labor Building. (3) As assistant grand chief engineer and national legislative representative, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, covering all services rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislation and legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor, generally, employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act, and particularly the interests of various classes and crafts of railway employees represented by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

Courtney, Paul Lawrence, room 2187, 233 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; the National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago 4, Ill. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Wrote one letter to the editor, New York World-Telegram. (5) Any legislation that supports the principle of tax equality.

Covington, J. Harry, 3d, 701 Union Trust Building; Aluminum Research Institute. (1) Received none; expended in connection with all matters for client, $27.06 (2) Telephone company, $20.26; taxicab drivers, $6.80. (3) Long-distance telephone calls and transportation within the District of Columbia. (4) None. (5) Legislation to secure continuation of duty-free status on nonferrous scrap.

Covington, J. Harry, 3d, 701 Union Trust Building; American Smelting & Refining Co. (1) Received none; expended in connection with all matters for client, $45.63. (2) Transportation and New York hotel expenses, $29.41; telephone company, $11.78; Western Union Telegraph Co., $4.44. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, traveling expense to New York, and telegrams. (4) None. (5) Appropriation for continuation of drainage tunnel by Bureau of Mines at Leadville, Colo.

Cowan, Nathan E., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; United Steelworkers of America, CIO, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Salary, $1,354.98; expenses, $935. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) Union News Service and CIO News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare, oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Cowling,[4] W. C., National St. Lawrence Association, 1728 Buhl Building, Detroit 26, Mich. (1) $1,050.28 gross back wages due previous to October 1946; $219.20 expenses; $1,269.48 total. (2) Expenses, $219.20: train fare to and from Washington, hotel expenses, meals, taxis. (3) Consulting with association officials on seaway program and subcommittee hearings. (4) None. (5) St. Lawrence seaway legislation.

Cox, Langford, Stoddard & Cutler, 1210 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. Agnes E. Meyer, 1624 Crescent Place NW., Washington 9, D. C. (1) None. (2) None paid. (3) None paid. (4) None. (5) Bill to create a new executive department to be known as the Department of Health, Education, and Security.

[4] Filed with the Clerk only.
[5] Filed for first quarter.
[6] Filed for second quarter.

Crampton, C. J., attorney, 700 Insurance Building, San Antonio 5, Tex. State Rights Association, post-office box 2371, Houston, Tex. (1) See attached statement.[2] (2) See attached statement.[2] (3) See attached statement.[2] (4) None. (5) See attached statement.[2]

Crawford, James M., 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia 1, Pa. Indemnity Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia 1, Pa. (1) Deponent has neither received nor expended any money for attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress. He has merely been reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses in traveling to and from the District of Columbia. (2) No payments have been made except, as stated, for deponent's own transportation and subsistence. (3) As stated in (2). (4) None. (5) That relative to the regulation of insurance rates in the District of Columbia.

Crowley, Leo J., 922 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.; Colorado Railroad Association, Equitable Building, Denver, Colo. (1) Received attorney fee of $575 for period from date of registration on or about June 1 to June 30, 1947, only part of which had to do with Federal legislation. $237 expended by me as expense money during the period aforesaid for pullman fares, hotel expenses, restaurants, taxicab fares, and incidentals. (2) Various restaurants, the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., railroad companies, taxicab companies, and incidentals. (3) $237 was expended by me during the period of this report on or about June 1 to June 30, 1947, for hotel expenses, meals, pullman fares, taxicabs, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting all railroads operating in and having trackage in the State of Colorado as set forth on Registration Form B heretofore filed.

Cruse, Donald, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.; the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J. (1) None; no activities during this quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Cuneo, John C., post-office box 1054, Modesto, Calif.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6275 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Received from Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio, $2,164.86 total, less deductions of $397.46, $1,767.40 deposited for operations in California; salary drawn by J. C. Cuneo, $540, leaving $1,227.40 to be used for operations. (2) Total disbursements, $1,709.16. See detailed schedule attached.[2] (3) See attached detail.[2] (4) None. (5) Support of the Townsend plan.

Curran, Roland, box 15, Bakersfield, Calif.; Central Valley Project Association, box 15, Bakersfield, Calif. (1) Received from Central Valley Project Association, April 1 to June 30, 1947, $10,600. (2) See attached.[2] (3) Salary and to maintain office and activities in California and to defray my personal expenses from and in Washington in connection with my work. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting Central Valley project and flood-control projects in same area.

Curry, James E., 1212 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; National Congress of American Indians et al. (1) None, except ordinary office and traveling expenses and personel expenses. (2) Miscellaneous persons. (3) In order to live and operate my business. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting rights of American Indians.

Curtiss, Ralph E., 1422 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C.; retained by Associated Tavern Owners of America, Inc., 215 Sixth Street, Racine, Wis. (1) Received $300; expended $19.88. (2) Ace Letter Service, $15.50; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $4.38. (3)

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Mimeographing, long-distance phone call. (4) ATOA News (monthly publication of the association. (5) Any legislation affecting the tavern industry, i. e., House Joint Resolution 213, S. 265, H. R. 1269, H. R. 1270, H. R. 2570.

Daley, William L., Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Editorial Association, 188 West Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Receipts and expenditures on behalf of National Editorial Association: $825 compensation and $338.08 reimbursement for expenditures. These follow: Supplies, $123.25; travel expenses, $95.85; luncheons for visiting members, $68.50; telephone and telegraph, $50.49. (2) Railroads, telegraph and telephone companies, taxicabs, office supply companies. (3) Reimbursement for expenses, transportation, and communications. (4) Analytical articles in bulletins and official publications of National and State publishers associations; also trade papers of publishing industry. (5) Measures affecting the press.

Dameron, William V., grand lodge representative, Machinist Building, Washington, D. C. (International Association of Machinist). (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Danaher, John A., 406 Southern Building, Washington, D. C., and 50 State Street, Hartford, Conn.; Revere Copper & Brass, Inc., 230 Park Avenue, New York City. (1) For legal services as company counsel in Washington, including advice and appearances in re H. R. 2404, to suspend the import tax on copper, $25,000; total expenses, $115.71. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $27.98; Fullman Co. for travel, $57.69; Biltmore Hotel, $30.04. (3) See answers in paragraph 2. (4) None. (5) As an incident to legal services, I supported H. R. 2404, a bill to suspend the import tax on copper, which became law on April 29, 1947, as of which date the aforesaid status under Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, was terminated.

Danielian, N. R., National St. Lawrence Association, 1830 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $3,000 received from National St. Lawrence Association (retainer); $120.13 for travel and subsistence and other incidental expenses. (2) Railroad for fares, hotel in New York, taxis. (3) Official travel. (4) None. (5) The principal purpose of engagement by the National St. Lawrence Association is to foster and increase trade for the products of manufacture, agriculture, natural resources, and any and all other forms of commerce between the ports of the Great Lakes, its tributaries and waterways of the world. In connection with this object, respondent supports the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin for the development of navigation and power.

Daugherty, Paul J., 820 Huntington Bank Building, 17 South High Street, Columbus, Ohio; Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio. (1) Expended, $199.88. (2) Various. (3) Actual and necessary traveling expenses on employer's business includes convention of United States Chamber of Commerce, April 28–May 2. (4) None. (5) Legislation dealing with taxation, social security, labor relations, and other matters of interest to our organization.

Davidson, John B., Michigan Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 902 Olds Tower Building, Lansing, Mich. (1) No money received or expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) None.

D'Avila, Sarah H., National Committee To Abolish the Poll Tax, 127 B Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $583.32. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation to abolish the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in Federal elections.

Davis,[4][5] Hugh P., 3030 East Ninety-second Street, Chicago, Ill.; Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barlum Tower, Detroit, Mich. (1) $265.95 actual expense incurred for lobbying in Washington, D. C. (2) Various. (3) Actual expenses incurred for lobbying in Washington, D. C. (4) None. (5) H. R. 8, a bill in the United States House of Representatives; S. 55, a bill in the United States Senate.

Davis,[4][6] Hugh P., 3030 East Ninety-second Street, Chicago, Ill.; Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barlum Tower, Detroit, Mich. (1) $1,251.74, actual expense incurred for lobbying in Washington D. C. (2) Various. (3) Actual expense incurred for lobbying in Washington D. C. (4) None. (5) S. 1126, a bill in the United States Senate.

Davis, John H., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for April, May, and June 1947, $2,748 (before withholding taxes were deducted). Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Washington Situation, a weekly mimeographed newsletter of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Davis,[4] Laurence W., National Electrical Contractors Association, 633 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. I am no longer handling any matters which might have to do with attempting to influence passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States, and therefore desire to have my name removed from your records as a person so engaged in lobbying activities. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Dawson, Clarence E., 621 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) See answers to (1) and (2). (4) None. (5) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

Day, Mary R. (lawyer), 741 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; Massman Construction Co., 20 West Ninth Street, Kansas City, Mo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Bill for the relief of the Massman Construction Co., H. R. 2192.

Denning, William I., 1518 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Publishers Association, Inc., 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Regular quarterly retainer of $1,170 was received on April 16, 1947, for the quarter ended March 31, 1947, from National Publishers Association, Inc. (2) William I. Denning, 1518 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) For general legal representation in Washington, D. C., a very insignificant portion of which included representation in matters affecting legislation. (4) None. (5) Postal rates.

Dickerman, John M., National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1116, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, from May 15 to July 1, 1947, at $833.33 per month, $1,277.76; expenses, May 15 to June 1, 1947, $18.35; expenses, June 1 to July 1, 1947, $8.60; total, $1,304.71. The salary and expenses listed are charged against that portion of the association's budget allocated to the legislative department, of which I am in charge, which allocation is $18,000 for 1947. Only some of the functions of this department might be deemed as coming within the purview of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. (2) Paid out in cash to taxis, restaurants, telephone companies. (3) Transportation, phone calls, lunches. (4) News releases are sent to the Associated Press, INS, UP, and other national newspaper wire services by the association for publication in subscriber papers and magazines, some of which releases may contain material deemed to affect legislation directly or indirectly. Neither the association nor I have any means of ascertaining a complete list of the publications utilizing such releases. (5) All legislation affecting the home-building industry.

Dickinson, A. W., American Mining Congress, 309 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received no compensation other than regular salary as previously reported expended, $24.70. (2) Sundry payees. (3) Taxicab fares, $21.90; luncheon, June 11, $2.80. (4) An associate editor of Mining Congress Journal, a monthly magazine for the mining industry. (5) Measures affecting the mining industry.

Dickinson, Mrs. LaFell (Lucy J.), president, General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N. Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) President's allotment for 3 months, $1,050; Additional travel expense (speaking for general federation), $259.95; convention expense, approximately, $150; total $1,459.95. Mrs. Dickinson's term of office as president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs expired June 1947. This statement is being filed to comply with the law. Mrs. Dickinson is not in Washington at this time. She has returned to her home in Keene, N. H. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Not employed for pay. The president of the general federation supports or opposes legislation, and asks the organization membership to do likewise, when authority for such action has been provided through the adoption of a resolution in national convention.

Disbrow, Walter L., Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., room 314, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, April, May, and June 1947, $1,018.20. (2) Walter L. Disbrow. (3) To represent members of the Retirement Federation on legislation affecting their welfare. (4) Quarterly Retirement News Bulletin. (5) Any and all legislation affecting the civil-service retirement laws.

Disney, Wesley E., 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) For the quarter ending June 30, 1947, my total compensation for all services, including work related to legislation, was $8,500. This amount is reported for the reason that it is impossible to determine from the language of Public Law 601 what part, if any, of this compensation is in consideration of services within the scope of the Regulation of Lobbying Act. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Amendments to Natural Gas Act, percentage depletion tax relief.

Dodge, Homer, 1244 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City. (1) $600 salary and $150 expenses. (2) The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., the postmaster, the Superintendent of Documents and others. (3) Telephone service, postage stamps, Government documents, and minor offices expenses. (4) None. (5) None.

Dougherty, John E., the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary: $587.50 per month, which is paid for all the services rendered to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., only a part of which have to do with legislation; $149.75 was expended by me as expense money, during the second quarter of 1947, for taxicabs, meals, vehicle fares, and incidentals. In addition to this amount, I also received $170.05 for expenses incurred in connection with other duties performed for the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., which have no relation to the purposes covered by this act. (2) Various transportation companies, restaurants, garages, communication companies, etc. (3) $149.75 was expended by me as expense money, during the second quarter of 1947, for taxicabs, meals, vehicle fares, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

[4] Filed with the Clerk only.
[5] Filed for first quarter.
[6] Filed for second quarter.

Doyle, E. L., Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received except regular salary paid me as Brotherhood representative. No money expended in connection with legislative activities. Personal travel expense and office expense paid by Brotherhood. (2) See No. 1. (3) See No. 1. (4) Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees Railway Journal. (5) That directly and indirectly affecting labor.

Dresie, Grey, 202 Bitting Building, Wichita, Kans.; Kansas Independent Business Men's Association, 205 Orpheum Building, Wichita, Kans. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Tax equality.

Dryden, Mrs. Mildred L., Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for this quarter as heretofore reported on Form B, expenses $26.50. (2) Taxicab fare, $26.50 from office to Capitol and return. (3) Visiting House and Senate offices. (4) [Blank.] (5) Am interested in legislation proposing amendments to the Natural Gas Act.

DuBois, Ben, Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn. (1) Membership dues collected between March 31 and June 30, 1947, $440. Expended, $271.71. (2) Various hotels, railways, etc. (3) Expenses incurred in attending a hearing before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on S. 829. Papers and periodicals, circular letters to bankers urging support of S. 829 but these letters also contain other matters and it is impossible to make a division of expense. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation supported was the holding company bill, S. 829.

Dunbar,[5] Charles E., Jr., care Phelps, Dunbar, Marks & Claverie, tenth floor, United Fruit Building, New Orleans, La., Louisiana Community Property Taxpayers Committee, care Mr. Joseph W. Montgomery, chairman, United Fruit Building, New Orleans, La. (1) $9,100, covering: balance due as attorneys' fees in connection with the case of *Fernandez* v. *Weiner* (326 U. S. 340, 66 S. Ct. 178), $3,000 retainer for January, February, and March 1947; and, $100 necessary expenses, such as, costs of printing briefs, court costs, traveling expenses, and telegrams. (2) Self. (3) As stated, the sum of $6,000 was the balance due for professional services in handling the case of *Fernandez* v. *Weiner* (326 U. S. 340, 66 S. Ct. 178). For an explanatory statement of the purposes of registrant's retainer see statement attached to Form A filed March 6, 1947. (4) None. (5) See explanatory statement attached to Form A filed March 6, 1947.

Dunbar,[6] Charles E., Jr., care Phelps, Dunbar, Marks & Claverie, tenth floor, United Fruit Building, New Orleans, La. Louisiana Community Property Taxpayers Committee. (1) Retainer fees, as attorney, received $2,900. Received as reimbursement $413.64 for traveling expenses for three trips to Washington, stenographic expense, mimeographing, and telegrams, itemized in statement attached.[3] (2) Self. (3) Retainer for April, May, June 1947. See explanatory statement attached to Form A filed March 6, 1947. (4) None. (5) See explanatory statement attached to Form A filed March 6, 1947, and supplemental statement attached hereto.

Dunford, Edward B., attorney at law, Anti-Saloon League of America, 131 B Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received from the Anti-Saloon League of America during the quarter April 1 through June 30, 1947, the sum of $885.75. (2) National Temperance and Prohibition Council, $253; Edward B. Dunford, attorney fee, $250; Laura Lindley, secretarial service, $150; Capitol Hill Press and James C. Wood, printing, $102.75; District of Columbia postmaster, postage, $30; Western Union Telegraph Co. and Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., telegraph and telephone service, $97; Joseph A. Rafferty, executor, rent, $103; total expenditures, $885.75. (3) To promote passage of S. 265, Eightieth Congress, to prohibit interstate advertising of alcoholic beverages. (4) None. (5) See answer to question No. 3.

Dunn, William M., 917 G Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary and expenses, $1,900.20. (2) Normal living expenses plus railroads, air lines, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, and other incidental and related expenses. (3) To perform to the normal functions of my position with the National Federation of Telephone Workers, none of which were related to legislative activities. (4) None. (5) Any proposed legislation which would affect the National Federation of Telephone Workers or its affiliates.

Dunton,[4] Arthur C., 407 Westview Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Western Defense Housing Co. and Altadena Housing Co., 1041 East Green Street, Pasadena, Calif. (1) $1,300 for services rendered Western Defense Housing Co., $260 for services rendered Altadena Housing Co., $1,058.41 expenses. (2) Hotel, traveling expenses, personal maintenance and incidentals. (3) Above. (4) None. (5) General housing legislation.

Dwier, Joseph L., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary $2,500; expenses reimbursed by employer $1,120.25. (2) Various railroads, hotels, restaurants, grocery stores, taxicabs, telephone companies, Government Printing Office, Hickey Bros. (3) Administrative, traveling and incidental expenses, newspapers, periodicals, cigars, cigarettes, etc., meals and entertainment. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting petroleum or its products, or natural gas.

Edelman, John W., 1031 Earle Building, Washington, D. C.; Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, 15 Union Square, New York, N. Y. (1) $1,300 salary; $428.42 to reimburse actual expenses incurred; $88.05 of this amount for expenses incurred in Washington; remainder for expenses outside of Washington. (2) Railroads, hotels, restaurants, cab drivers, bus companies, air lines. (3) Personal expense and travel. (4) Textile Labor, CIO News, Labor Press Associates. (5) Support legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Elliott, Francis Leo, 18719 Greenview Road, Detroit, Mich. (Foreman's Association of America). (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) I am not with Foreman's Association of America any longer and will not do any more lobbying.

Elliott, Frank L., care of Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barlum Tower, Detroit, Mich. (1) $466.11 actual expenses incurred for lobbying in Washington, D. C. (2) As per list attached.[3] (3) Actual expenses incurred for lobbying in Washington, D. C. (4) The Supervisor, official publication of the Foreman's Association of America. (5) H. R. 8, a bill in the United States House of Representatives; S. 55, a bill in the United States Senate.

Elliott, John Doyle, 333 East Genesee Street, Syracuse, N. Y.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Received advances on commissions at 25 percent of Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., gross income from New York State, $1,027.49; subrenting office at 333 East Genesee Street, Syracuse, N. Y., $42; contributions to office expense by Townsend Clubs, $52; total, $1,121.49. Expenses, $977.48. For expenditures see attached sheet. (2) To H. A. Solomon, 517 Townsend Street, Syracuse, N. Y., for rent of office at Syracuse, for traveling expenses (motorcar costs, fares, hotels, and meals while on road, and postage). (3) Contacting Townsend Clubs, other organizations and citizens and maintaining and operating New York State Townsend plan headquarters. (4) None. (5) Support of H. R. 16, Eightieth Congress, first session, known as the Townsend plan.

Ellison, Newell W., 701 Union Trust Building; Arabian-American Oil Co., 200 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Re Arabian-American Oil Co. None received and none expended during previous quarter; except incidental expenses for long distance telephone calls, telegrams, and for taxis. (2) Telephone companies, telegraph companies, and taxicabs. (3) See (1). (4) [Blank.] (5) Proposal to amend provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to United States corporations doing business abroad.

Ely, Myron R., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. Employment terminated June 15, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Ely, Northcutt, report as legal representative of Colorado River Board of California and Six Agency Committee, 730 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received during quarter ending June 30, 1947. Bills in the amount of $6,260 have been submitted to the Colorado River Board and the Six Agency Committee and are awaiting clearance. Of the above amount $2,600 is payable by the Colorado River Board and $3,660 by the Six Agency Committee. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Conferences and reports to clients on H. R. 1349, 1597, 1598, 1615, 1772, 1848, 1886, 1977, 2001, 2583, 2873, 2874, 3123; S. 432, 433, 483, 539, 693, 912, 972, 1175.

Ely, Northcutt, report as attorney for Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, Calif., 730 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,445.15, of which $45.15 represents reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses and $2,400 represents legal fees for services of this office and in California in connection with power and water contracts, conference with Government departments and legislative matters incidental thereto. Part of this amount represents payment for services rendered for periods prior to April 1, 1947. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telephone and telegraph companies, suppliers of office materials. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice, it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Conferences and reports to clients on H. R. 63, 727, 728, 1833, 1896, 1977, 2583, 2873, 2874, 3036, 3123, 3562; S. 36, 37, 39, 433, 539, 554.

Ely, Northcutt, report as attorney for Imperial Irrigation District, 730 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,230.58, of which $130.58 represents reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses and $2,100 represents legal fees for services of this office and in California in negotiations with other water and power users, the Government departments, litigation, and legislative matters relating thereto. Part of this amount represents payment for services rendered for periods prior to April 1, 1947. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telegraph and telephone companies, suppliers of office materials. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice, it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices.

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed for first quarter.
[5] Filed for second quarter.
[6] Filed with the Clerk only.

(4) None. (5) Conferences and reports to clients on H. R. 1615, 1848, 2001, 3123; S. 483, 693, 912.

Ely, Northcutt, report as attorney for Salt River Valley Water Users' Association, 730 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,200, of which $100 represents reimbursement of travel expenses, and $2,100 represents legal fees for services in connection with power contracts, tax matters and departmental business, and such incidental legislative questions, as arose in connection therewith. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telephone and telegraph companies, suppliers of office materials. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice, it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Conferences and reports to client on H. R. 3123, H. R. 1886, and related bills; S. 539.

Ely, Northcutt, report as attorney for Water Project Authority of the State of California, 730 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,500, the entire amount of which represents legal fees for services of this office and in California in connection with Central Valley power and water questions, and legislative matters incidental thereto. Part of this amount represents payment for services rendered prior to April 1, 1947. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telephone and telegraph companies, suppliers of office materials. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice, it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Conferences and reports to clients on H. R. 655, 656, 2052, 2334, 3123, 3143; Senate Resolution 21; S. 66, 912, 972.

Englar, George M.,[7] 504 American Building, Baltimore, Md. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Western housing, united action by apartment owners is necessary to end rent control. Western Housing, 257 South Spring Street, Los Angeles 12, Calif. (5) Chairman, executive committee, National Apartment Owners' Association sponsoring reasonable extension rent control.

Ervin, S. J., Jr., Morganton, N. C.; the Southern Railway System, Washington, D. C. (1) I have received no money whatever for any lobbying. I spent 3 days in Washington in connection with my work, and expended $48.46 of my own money in the time mentioned. I have not been reimbursed therefor by the Southern Railway System down to this date and, in fact, have not submitted any statement to it therefor. (See statement supplied.)[3] (2) This $48.46 of my own funds was expended as follows: $20.90 to the Raleigh Hotel, Washington, D. C., for lodging and telephone charges; $8.06 to the Southern Railway for pullman berths in going to and returning from Washington; $12.50 for meals for myself at various cafes in Washington; $6 for taxicabs in Washington; and $1 for tips to redcaps at Union Station in Washington for helping to transport my personal baggage to and from trains. (3) The aforesaid sum of $48.46 was paid out by me to the persons named above for the purposes set forth above. (4) None. (5) Bill offered by Congressman JOHN J. JENNINGS in House to amend venue provisions of Federal Employers Liability Act, and bill offered in Senate by Senator REED to exempt railroads from prosecution under antitrust laws upon agreements approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Farquharson, James A.; Tom J. McGrath, 729 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,160 received for services. (2) No payments. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Resolution relating to Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin waterway and power project.

Farrington, Charles J., National Coal Association, 604 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $2,835.30 salary and out-of-pocket expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) Telephone, postage, lunch, taxicabs, printing, and miscellaneous out-of-pocket expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) All bills affecting the coal industry.

Farshing, Donald D., Management Planning of Washington, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,300 gross salary received; $223.75 expenses. (2) Transportation, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Transportation and other out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Fenning,[5] Karl, care of Ralph D. Pittman, National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received, $865.49; expended, $34.46. (2) Railway company and restaurant. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Bill to protect textile designs.

Fenning,[6] Karl, National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Ralph D. Pittman, Bowen Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $681.68; expended $53.13. (2) Telephone and telegraph company, stenographers, railway. (3) Travel, printing, etc. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2860.

Ferguson, John A., Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for this quarter as heretofore reported on Form B; expenses, $75.20. (2) Taxicab fare, $75.20; from office to Capitol and return. (3) For the purpose of visiting House and Senate committees and Members of Congress on legislative matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 4051, H. R. 2235, H. R. 2292, H. R. 2569, S. 734.

Fernbach, Frank L., United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Salary, $1,175; expenses, $1,030. (2) The salary was paid to the undersigned and the expenses to railroads and air lines, to hotels and restaurants. (3) Expenses were paid for transportation, hotels, and meals. (4) I have distributed printed material on the nature of the proposed bill to editors of the labor press generally. (5) In support of a proposed Labor Extension Service bill which will establish a Labor Extension Service in the United States Department of Labor.

Ferris, Muriel, League of Women Voters of the United States, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $172.92 salary every 2 weeks; received and expended, carfare to and from the Capitol and travel, $40.27. (2) None expended in carrying on work except for carfare and travel. (3) Carfare and travel only. (4) Trends in Government and Action, publications of the League of Women Voters, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (5) I am employed principally to inform league members on legislative matters; secondarily to influence legislation. For legislation, see league program adopted by national convention, 1946, attached.[2]

Filer, H. L., 71 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.; Howard S. Palmer, James Lee Loomis, and Henry B. Sawyer, trustees, New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. (1) $4,675 salary received, and expenses $798.10. (2) Hotels, restaurants, taxis, telephone, etc. (3) Expenses for traveling and as shown in item 2. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting employer.

Fillius, Maurice W., Puerto Rico Rum Institute, 703 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: Retaining fee, $2,500; reimbursement of $50.78, representing expenditures made in connection with activities designed to influence legislation. (2) Baldwin Letter Service, $24.98; Bates Duplicating, $8.25; Frank's Duplicating, $6.20; postage stamps, $2.25; and taxis, $9.10. (3) Mimeographing letters, planographing charts, postage, transportation. (4) Furnished material to United Press, Associated Press, and International News Service for newspapers in Puerto Rico. (5) H. R. 3282 and H. R. 3283 providing for shipment of Puerto Rican rum to customs bonded warehouses in the United States and payment of Federal internal revenue taxes on such rum in the United States instead of in Puerto Rico.

Fisher,[5] Lewis H., 1416 F Street NW., Kellogg Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Retired Civil Employees, Washington, D. C.; Canal Construction Committee, Balboa Heights, C. Z. (1) Receipts, $300 during calendar quarter from National Association of Retired Civil Employees, Washington, D. C.; expenditures, $127.60; (no receipts from Canal Construction Committee. (2) Restaurants, taxicab companies, telephone company, various individuals, etc.; meals, $7.15; stationery, $10; taxicab, $1.45; postage, $9; office assistants, $65; telegraph and telephone, $35. (3) As stated in (2) and for services. (4) The Annuitant. (5) Support of legislation in the interest of a sound retirement system.

Fisher,[6] Lewis H., National Association of Retired Federal Employees, 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts during calendar quarter ended June 30, 1947, National Association of Retired Civil Employees, Washington, D. C., $300; no receipts from the Canal Construction Service Committee; expenditures, $168.85. (2) Various individuals and companies. (3) Meals, $9.10; taxicabs, $5.25; postage, $9.50, telephone, $40; stationery, $15; office help, $90—total, $168.85. (4) Annuitant. (5) Support of legislation in the interest of annuitants and potential annuitants.

Floyd, William M., Regular Veterans Association, 1115 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Only salary received. See form A for money received and expended by Regular Veterans Association. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) The Regular, 1115 Fifteenth Street NW. (5) Legislation in behalf of veterans.

Flinn, W. G., grand lodge representative, International Association of Machinists, Machinist Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Forbes,[4] E. F., Western States Meat Packers Association, 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) January, $471.33; February, $696.89; March, $279.50. (2) Various. (3) Transportation, meals, hotels, telephone and telegraphs, incidentals, expended in the regular routine work of the association. (4) None. (5) Am not employed as a lobbyist on legislation but as president and general manager of the association and our only interest is in legislation that directly affects the meat-packing industry.

Ford, Mrs. J. A., 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., national headquarters, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) In carrying on his work; average, approximately less than $30 per week. (2) Hotel, meals when away from my home, and traveling expenses. (3) Above. (4) Townsend National Weekly. (5) H. R. 16 and H. R. 2476, S. 57, S. 1510—identical bills—to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age of 60 and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[7] Filed with the Secretary only.
[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for first quarter.
[6] Filed for second quarter.
[4] Filed with the Clerk only.
[5] Filed for first quarter.
[6] Filed for second quarter.

benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys.

Ford, Tirey L., Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C., received, $1,290; expended, none. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Foreman, Clark, 127 B Street SE.; Southern Conference for Human Welfare, 808 Perdido Street, New Orleans, La. (1) Salary, $2,000; money expended, $643.69; speaking engagement in Minneapolis, $200; total, $2,843.69. No portion of this total amount was used for lobbying purposes during this quarter. Above amount due me but all of it has not been paid me as of this date. (2) Public carriers, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Actual travel and food. (4) None. (5) All legislation to increase the suffrage and improve economic, health, and educational conditions in the South.

Fort, J. Carter, Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) In addition to salary, as shown on registration form B, filed December 27, 1946, received no money except $196.54 as reimbursement for traveling and business expenses when away from Washington and taxi fares in Washington. Both salary and expenses covered not only services in connection with legislation but all services rendered the AAR as set forth in registration. (2) Palmer House, Chicago Club, and various restaurants, taxi drivers, etc., Chicago; also railroad dining cars, porters, etc., en route between Washington and Chicago, and taxi drivers in Washington. (3) Actual traveling and business expenses while out of Washington and for taxicabs in Washington. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting railroad interest.

Fox, O. J., Welfare Federation Act Committee of One Thousand, Inc., 701 Majestic Building, Oklahoma City, Okla. (1) No expenditures involved during this quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Welfare News, an old-age-pension advocate in Oklahoma. (5) Old-age-pension legislation.

Franklin, L. S., director, National Tax Relief Coalition, box 184, route 7, Greensboro, N. C. (1) No contributions or money received during calendar quarter of April, May, June 1947. (2) Expenses auto upkeep and operation, 6 cents per mile, 500 miles per week, $30 per week, or 13 weeks, $390; hotel, meals, etc., $8.65 per day, 13 weeks, $519; salary for L. S. Franklin, 13 weeks, $375; total, $1,284. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Tax reform.

Franzen, John T. D., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Frederickson, Fred J., Lafayette Hotel, Washington, D. C. (home address, Valley City, N. Dak.); North Dakota Resources Board, Fargo, N. Dak., and North Dakota State Water Commission, Bismarck, N. Dak. (1) Quarterly salary for April, May, and June 1947, $1,250, and $1,542.97 reimbursement for expenses. Only a small part of those items are for legislative work, the greater portion thereof being for nonlegislative work. (2) Lafayette Hotel, various eating establishments, telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs, mimeographers, office suppliers, and post office; only a small part of which was for legislative work. (3) Lodging and office space, meals, transportation, communications, mimeographing, office supplies, and postage. (4) None. (5) Various bills affecting irrigation, reclamation, water conservation, flood control and development of water, land, and other natural resources in North Dakota, among them H. R. 1886, H. R. 2873, H. R. 2453, H. R. 3123, H. R. 4002.

Fuller, George M., National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received and expended: April, $115.78; May, $96.65; June, $44.50. (2) Various. (3) Taxis and entertainment. (4) None. (5) Oppose any legislation inimical to the interests of the lumber industry and support any legislation which would be helpful to it.

Gall, John C., (firm of Gall & Lane), Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., Youngstown, Ohio. (1) Received during the preceding calendar quarter, in payment for all legal services rendered, $9,330.31. Total expenses, as listed under item (2), $246.98. The full amount received for all legal services is reported for the reason that it is impossible to determine what part, if any, of this compensation is allocable to services within the scope of Public Law 601. (2) Expenses: Travel, telephone, telegraph, and miscellaneous, $246.98. (3) See item (2) above. (4) None. (5) Legislational relating to labor, taxes, and business practices. Primary function in connection with most legislation is to advise client as to status and progress.

Gann, Glenn,[5] 1286 Fairview Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Actual expenses incurred for lobbying in Washington, D. C., $197.48. (2) Hotels, plane trip, etc. (3) For lobbying in Washington, D. C. (4) None. (5) H. R. 8, a bill in the House; S. 55, a bill in the Senate.

Gann, Glenn,[6] United States Rubber Co., 1286 Fairview Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) None; do not intend to lobby in third quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Gannon, Peter J., American Shore and Beach Preservation Association, 1060 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (1) No funds extended or received. (2) No funds extended. (3) No funds extended. (4) Shore and Beach (magazine). (5) Prevention of shore erosion.

Gardiner, Elizabeth, Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Gary, Barham R., 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Anne Arundel Anti-Airport Association, Annapolis, Md. (1) $200. (2) Barham R. Gary. (3) Legal services. (4) None. (5) In opposition to H. R. 1364.

Geary, Paul M., National Electrical Contractors Association, 633 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) None. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation under consideration.

Geaslin, Bon, 1740 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Waterman Steamship Corp., Mobile, Ala. (1) $1,768.75 for professional services—publicity; $62.07 for expenses covering long-distance calls, telegrams, and miscellaneous. (2) Marshall F. Bannell. (3) Press relations and publicity services. (4) None. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation, but as an incident to my position as general counsel of Waterman Steamship Corp., we are interested in all legislation affecting the merchant marine and civil aeronautics.

George, Leo E., National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, April, May, and June 1947, $2,499.99; travel and organization expenses not connected with the enactment of legislation, $1,108.62. (2) The travel and organization expenses referred to above were a reimbursement for actual expenses for transportation, hotels, meals, and incidental expenses. (3) See above. (4) The Union Postal Clerk, the Federation News Service Bulletin, Federation Press Service. (5) Support of measures designed to improve the civil-service retirement system; improve and strengthen the civil service; improve the hours, wages, and conditions of post-office clerks; and to improve the postal service.

Giddings, Ernest, legislative assistant, legislative-Federal relations division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary: $1,135, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $227; expenses. (2) Self (salary); expenses: Hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative-News Flash, NEA Journal (article therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designated to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Glazier, William, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, CIO, suite 1, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary approximately $1,104. Expenses in Washington, $195. All out-of-pocket expenses while traveling. (2) Expenses paid out in form of taxi fares, phone calls, subscriptions to publications, etc. (3) Taxis, telephone calls, periodicals, etc. (4) Dispatcher, newspaper published by the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, CIO. (5) Support all legislation of interest to American workers and longshoremen and warehousemen specifically; oppose undemocratic legislation.

Glodowski, Agnes, Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., General Delivery, Mitchell, S. Dak. (1) Commission; no expense account. (2) Received from Townsend national headquarters. Nothing expended by me for others to work. (3) For organizational work, in Townsend movement. (4) [Blank.] (5) Townsend bills, H. R. 2229 and 2230.

Gordon, Spencer, Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; American Institute of Accountants, 13 East Forty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None received or expended. (2) None paid. (3) None paid. (4) The Journal of Accountancy and the Certified Public Accountant. (5) H. R. 2657.

Goss, Albert S., The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,875. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Goss,[4] Bert C., 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Hill & Knowlton, Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) Indefinite; compensation received from Hill & Knowlton as a partner, and such compensation applied to personal uses; none to lobbying activities. Reimbursed by Hill & Knowlton for out-of-pocket expenses for telephone calls, cab fares, and the like in a total amount of approximately $150. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Did not directly cause articles or editorials to be published in any paper, periodicals, etc., but prepared and submitted material to the writers and press associations registered with the press galleries. (5) Not employed to support any specific legislation. Engaged in public-relations work. Activities during preceding quarter related to interests of aircraft industry and fertilizer.

Gourley, Lawrence L., 902 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; American Osteopathic Association, 139 North Clark Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Retainer, $3,000. (2) [Blank]. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Bills affecting the public health.

Gradel, John G., 7149 Ditman Street, Tacony, Philadelphia, Pa.; Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Salary at the rate reported on Form B, and actual out-of-pocket expenses for hotel, meals, and transportation; no other money received or

[5] Filed for first quarter.

[6] Filed for second quarter.

[4] Filed with the Clerk only.

expended. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Opposing changes in the Railroad Retirement Act and Unemployment Insurance Act, S. 670 and H. R. 3150.

Green, Abner, American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, 23 West Twenty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $25 from the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born in January 1947, which $25 was expended for train fare, hotel, taxicabs, telephone, in Washington, D. C., in January 1947. (2) Train fare, hotel, taxicabs, telephone. (3) Consulting and meeting with individuals in Washington concerning the legislative work of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born for the coming year. (4) None. (5) Immigration, naturalization, and deportation legislation.

Greene, Ernest W., 731 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, post office box 2450, Honolulu, T. H. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any legislation, but during the second quarter I have supported H. R. 4075 and H. R. 49.

Greenway,[5] J. Cole, 30 Vesey Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) No expenses incurred in connection with work done for New York State Conference in Opposition to St. Lawrence Project. No active bill pending.

Greenway,[6] J. Cole, New York State Conference in Opposition to the St. Lawrence Project, 30 Vesey Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) No expenses incurred in connection with work done for New York State Conference in Opposition to the St. Lawrence Project.

Greenwood, Joseph R., 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received from Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C., $500; expended, none. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Grimes, Weston B., Cargill, Inc., 436 Bowen Building, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received (includes travel, office, and general expenses totaling $2,467.88), $5,792.88; expended for purposes designated in the Lobbying Act, $15.67. (2) Taxicabs and restaurants. (3) Taxicabs to and from Capitol; meals, entertainment for purposes designated in the Lobbying Act. (4) None. (5) Export-import-controls laws, tax laws.

Grinberg,[4] P. Irving, Jewelers Vigilance Committee, Inc., 17 West Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Jewelers Vigilance Committee, Inc.; expenses, $230. (2) Pennsylvania Railroad (stub attached), $20.81; Carlton Hotel (receipt attached), $167.41; sundry, telephones, taxi fares, and meals, no item over $10, $41.78; total, $230. (3) See (2) above. (4) National Jeweler, Jewelers' Circular-Keystone, Jewelry, Jewelers' Outlook, Jewelers' Newsletter, Executive Jeweler, ANRJA Bulletin, NACJ Bulletin, Midcontinent Jeweler, Northwestern Jeweler, Southern Jeweler, Pacific Goldsmith, Trader and Canadian Jeweler, Manufacturing Jeweler. (5) Interested in securing relief from excise taxes as applying to jewelry.

Groom, B. E., North Dakota Tax Equality Committee, 11½ Broadway, Fargo, N. Dak. (1) Collections for April, May, June, 1947, $1,032; expenditures for April, May, June 1947, $2,557.21. (2) Baker Insurance Co. $1250; Ridley Printing Co., $119.88; Mrs. Wilbur, office work, $20; Hannaher Printing Co., $43.40; telephone company, $59.71; Taxpayers Association, rent and office help, $382.50; B. E. Groom, secretary, auto travel and expenses, $469.11; Dick Mailer Co. machine, $46.25; postmaster, stamped envelopes, $183.20; Miss Swensgaard, letter service, $38; rail and bus travel, $184; dinners for groups contacted on program and miscellaneous expense in office. (3) Organization of groups in State to support more equitable tax laws. (4) none. (5) Support legislation for more equitable tax laws.

Grosscup, Ambler & Stephan,[4] 711 Central Building, Seattle, Wash. (Alaska Transportation Co.). (1) Firm received fee of $300 for period ended June 30, 1947, for legal work in presenting to Members of the House and Senate the views of Alaska Transportation Co. with respect to a contract entered into between the United States Maritime Commission and Alaska Steamship Co., Alaska Transportation Co. and Northland Transportation Co., under Public Law No. 12, Eightieth Congress. (2) Expense payments totaling $391.98 were not segregated because they were billed with separate charges made for other legal work in Washington, D. C., before the United States Maritime Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board. (3) Expense payments covered rail and plane transportation, hotel, meals, taxi, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) House Joint Resolution 122, now Public Law No. 12, Eightieth Congress.

Haas, Frank E., Western Association of Railway Executives, 204 South Canal Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary as per registration, and reimbursement of expenses in the amount of $1,206.87. (2) To Raleigh Hotel, Washington, D. C., Congress Hotel, Chicago, Ill., and various restaurants, taxicab companies and individuals. (3) Meals, $478.40; lodging, $277.50; pullman fare, $135.18; taxicab and local transportation, $114.05; local and long-distance telephone calls, telegraph, postage, stenographic service, stationery and supplies and miscellaneous incidental expenses, $201.74. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting railroads in western district.

Haas, John A., National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended, $8.55. (2) Taxicabs. (3) Taxi fares. (4) None. (5) Any legislation which may affect milk producers.

Haddock, Hoyt S., CIO Maritime Committee, suite 1, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,560 in salary; $130 for expenses; about one-tenth of time devoted to legislative activities. (2) Taxicabs, telephone calls, etc. (3) Taxis, phone calls, etc. (4) The Pilot, published by National Maritime Union. (5) Support any legislation in interest of membership of maritime unions affiliated to committee.

Hadley, Harlan V., Taxation Committee, Automobile Manufacturers Association, 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich., 830 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary (month of June 1947), $250; expenses $8, as secretary of taxation committee, Automobile Manufacturers Association. (2) Expenses as above consisted of taxi fares, local phone calls, paid to taxi drivers and call boxes. (3) See 2. (4) [Blank.] (5) Federal automotive excise taxes, miscellaneous Federal taxes affecting motor industry and motorists.

Hallbeck, E. C., National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 1510 H Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, April, May, and June 1947, $1,999.98; legislative expenses, April, May, and June 1947, $292.90; travel and organization expenses not connected with the enactment of legislation, $382.17. (2) Incidental expenses, street-car, taxi, etc., $75.10; United Typewriter Co., 813 Fourteenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C., $5.68; Ransdell, Inc., 810 Rhode Island Avenue, NE., Washington, D. C.; $198.50; Sound Studio, Inc., 1124 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C., $13.62. (3) The travel and organization expenses referred to in (1) above are a reimbursement of actual expenditures for transportation, meals, and incidental expenses; United Typewriter Co., supplies; Ransdell, Inc., printing (copies attached); Sound Studios, Inc., transcription for radio broadcast relative to S. 637-H, R. 3232. (4) The Federation News Service Bulletin, Federation Press Service, the Union Postal Clerk. (5) Support of measures designed to improve the Civil Service Retirement system; improve and strengthen the Civil Service; improve the hours, wages, and conditions of post office clerks, and to improve the Postal Service.

Hamlet, Harry G., Retired Officers Association, Inc., 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $600. No part of this sum was received specifically for the purpose of attempting to influence legislative action. Expended: Nothing. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) Retired Officers Association Bulletin. (5) Legislation affecting retired officers, warrant officers, and nurses of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

Hanscom, William A., 1118 Twenty-fifth Street, NW., Washington, D. C.; Oil Workers International Union, CIO, 301 East Fifth Street, Fort Worth, Tex. (1) Received: Salary, $1,080; expenses, $300. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) Union News Service and the International Oil Worker. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to those objectives.

Harper, Elsie Dorothy,[5] National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $375; expenses, $269. (2) Elsie Dorothy Harper. (3) Presenting to the President, the Cabinet, and both Houses of Congress (a) the opinion on subjects related to (5) below of the convention of the Young Women's Christian Associations held triennially and (b) the opinion of the National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations in line with actions taken by the convention. (4) None. (5) Legislation related to international security, social and economic justice, education, health, and civil liberties.

Harper, Elsie Dorothy,[6] National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $375; expenses, $269. (2) Elsie Dorothy Harper. (3) Presenting to the President, the Cabinet, and both Houses of Congress (a) the opinion on subjects related to (5) below, of the convention of the Young Women's Christian Associations held triennially; and (b) the opinion of the National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations in line with actions taken by the convention. (4) None. (5) Legislation related to international security, social and economic justice, education, health, and civil liberties.

Harper, Ford C., Oklahoma Tax Equality League, 135 Northwest Second Street, Oklahoma City, Okla. (1) None. No money was received or expended by me for lobbying purposes. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Harris, Peggy, Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admission Act.

Harris, Ronald B., 602 T. W. Patterson Building, Fresno, Calif.; Irrigation Districts Association of California, Hotel Sacramento, Sacramento, Calif., formerly 932 Pacific Building, Fourth and Market Streets, San Francisco, Calif.. (1) Expenses of trip to

[4] Filed with the Clerk only.
[5] Filed for first quarter.
[6] Filed for second quarter.

[4] Filed with the Clerk only.

[5] Filed for first quarter.
[6] Filed for second quarter.

Washington, D. C., April 12, 1947, to May 23, 1947, inclusive: Railroad fare, $259.66; living expenses, including phone calls, meals, tips, telegrams, and incidentals, $673.54. (2) The foregoing amounts cover entire expenditures and nothing paid to anyone except for own personal living expenses. (3) See (1) and (2). (4) None. (5) Bills amending reclamation laws.

Harris, Winder R., 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., room 203, Washington, D. C.; Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, suite 2501, New York, N. Y. (1) Received: Office expenses, $106.93; personal expenses, $149.50; total, $256.43; expended: Office, $106.93; personal, $149.50; total, $256.43. (2) See attached list.[2] (3) See attached list.[2] (4) None. (5) None.

Hart, Merwin K., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y., National Economic Council, Inc. (1) See attached statement.[2] (2) See attached statement.[2] (3) See attached statement.[2] (4) National Economic Council Letter, published semimonthly; reprint of brief on labor legislation as economic council paper, volume IV, No. 4. (5) Labor legislation; bills to provide Federal aid to education; bills to permit increased immigration.

Harter, Dow W., 412–14 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; the B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio. (1) Receive annual retainer from the B. F. Goodrich Co. for all services as its Washington counsel. Allocation of amount paid for my services between legal and legislative activities is not feasible. Amount received during second quarter 1947, $1,875. (Same amount received during quarter ended March 31, 1947.) In addition receive reimbursement for long distance telephone, travel, taxicab fare, and out-of-pocket expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) The B. F. Goodrich Co. is interested in legislation relating to the maintenance of facilities for the production of an ample supply of synthetic rubber in the United States for commercial and national defense purposes. It has been interested in House Joint Resolution 77 and House Joint Resolution 113 and proposals now being studied for a long-range rubber program for this country.

Hawkins, Paul M., 1401 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received: $1,650 salary, only a small fraction of which was for lobbying activities; $362.15 expenses, only a small fraction of which was expended for lobbying activities. (2) Taxicabs, railroads, restaurants, hotels, air lines. (3) Transportation, meals, rooms. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation affecting the hotel industry.

Hayden, Harry Vere, Jr., 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) $233.34 salary semimonthly, less withholding and social-security taxes; $46.65 incidental expenses for months of April, May, and June 1947; $133.92 reimbursement for traveling expenses, round trips to Indianapolis, Ind., and Jackson Mills, W. Va. (2) Harry Vere Hayden, Jr. (3) $133.92 reimbursement for traveling expenses, round trips to Indianapolis, Ind., and Jackson Mills, W. Va.; $46.65 incidental expenses for months of April, May, and June 1947, taxi, car fare, phone calls, meals. (4) The American Legion Magazine, New York City, the National Legionnaire, Indianapolis, Ind. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations, the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the National Convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

Hayes, William E., executive representative, Rock Island Lines, 601 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., LaSalle Street Station, Chicago, Ill. (1) In accordance with the statement in his registration relating to the duties of the undersigned as an officer in the executive department of his company, the undersigned estimates that the part of his time allocable to legislative activities during the period April 1 to June 30, 1947, would not exceed a sum of $200. (2) Paid out in out-of-pocket expenses a sum not exceeding $50 in connection with legislative activities. (3) Hotel, taxicab, and incidental expenses. (4) None. (5) Matters affecting the interests of his company.

Hays, Joseph H., Western Association of Railway Executives, 204 South Canal Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary as per registration and reimbursement by employer of expense incurred in total amount of $1,937.84. (2) To Mayflower and Shoreham Hotels, Washington, D. C., to Pullman Co., to Pennsylvania Railroad, to various restaurants, hotels, taxicab companies, to postage, and to various individuals in nominal amounts. (3) To Mayflower Hotel, including phone calls, meals, and miscellaneous charges, $640.53; to Shoreham Hotel for meals, $209.60; to various restaurants for meals, $692.15; to Pullman Co. and Pennsylvania Railroad and various individuals for traveling expenses, $42.91; to various taxicabs, busses, etc., for transportation, $127.54; to postage, stationery, and supplies, $81.11; to miscellaneous, including stenographic services, telephone calls, etc., $144. None. (5) Any legislation affecting railroads in western district.

Hays, William J., 4863 Potomac Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; United Public Workers of America, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $572.75 compensation exclusively. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in behalf of Government workers in the Panama Canal Zone.

Hazen, John C., 1008 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., National Retail Dry Goods Association. (1) Meals, $191.30; rail and plane transportation, $59.90; hotel, $56.58; taxis, $42.45; miscellaneous, $11.94. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 1111.

Heberton, K. W., 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary of $800 per month, which is paid for all services rendered, only a part of which concerns legislation. Out-of-pocket travel and incidental expenses, $150.95. (2) Taxi drivers and restaurants. (3) Transportation and luncheons. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the interests of the Western Union Telegraph Co.

Hecht, George J., 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y., representing American Parents' Association, 300 B Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) No moneys received. (2) No expenditures. [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) National School Health Services Act.

Heckendorn, William, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for April, May, and June 1947, $1,875 (before withholding taxes were deducted); less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Heiney,[3] Robert B., National Canners Association, 1739 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,375 as one-quarter year's salary as assistant to secretary of association for all work performed; less than one-third of time is spent on following legislative matters; $39.48 has been received as reimbursement for expenses incurred. (2) Taxi fares and miscellaneous expenses, $39.48. (3) See above. (4) National Canners Information Letter. (5) Routine following through CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and newspapers, and otherwise keeping informed of legislation affecting the canning industry.

Heiney,[4] Robert B., National Canners Association, 1739 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,625 as one-quarter year's salary as assistant to secretary of association for all work performed; less than one-third of time is spent on following legislative matters; $61.53 has been received as reimbursement for expenses incurred. (2) Taxi fares and miscellaneous expenses, $61.53. (3) See above. (4) National Canners Information Letter. (5) Routine following through CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and newspapers, and otherwise keeping informed of legislation affecting the canning industry.

Henderson, Elmer W., National Council for a Permanent FEPC, 930 F Street NW., room 901, Washington, D. C. (1) Maintenance and travel from April 1, 1947, to June 30, 1947, $193.04; salary after tax deductions, $1,156.20. (2) [Blank.] (3) For travel and living purposes while traveling, $193.04; salary after tax deductions, $1,156.20. (4) None. (5) Permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission, S. 984 and H. R. 2824.

Hensel, Robert E., 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y., the American Tobacco Co. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of the above address, of which registrant is an associate, expended $8.29 in connection with the proposed legislation described in item (5) hereof, for which it was or will be reimbursed by the American Tobacco Co. (2) New York Telephone Co., $7.69; United States Post Office Department, 60 cents; total, $8.29. (3) Telephone toll calls and postage stamps. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation extending the 85-percent dividend received credit to dividends received from resident foreign corporations to the extent that such resident foreign corporations derive income from United States sources.

Herndon, Maurice G., 1001–1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Ninth and F Streets, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Insurance Agents, 80 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y. (1) No money received or expended during preceding calendar quarter. Status of registrant the same as stated in original Form B and accompanying letter of explanation, filed March 6, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Harrington, A. B., 917 G Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary and expenses, $1,658.15. (2) Normal living expenses plus railroads, air lines, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, and other incidental and related expenses. (3) To perform the normal functions of my position with the National Federation of Telephone Workers, none of which were related to legislative activities. (4) The Telephone Worker, Weekly News Letter, the Call. (5) Any proposed legislation which would affect the National Federation of Telephone Workers or its affiliates.

Herrmann, Louis F., 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (1) Expended, $2.75. (2) Taxicabs. (3) Taxi fares. (4) None. (5) Any legislation which may affect milk producers.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[3] Filed for first quarter.

[4] Filed for second quarter.

Hester, Ewart A., 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Boston Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass. (1) April, salary, $416.67; office rent, stenographic service, $100; telephone, transportation, etc., $67.50; May, salary, $416.67; office rent, stenographic service, $100; telephone, transportation, etc., $251.05; June, salary, $416.67; office rent, stenographic service, $100; telephone, transportation, etc., $96.38. (2) Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (3) Office rent, stenographic service, telephone, transportation, etc. (4) None. (5) Wool legislation.

Hewes and Awalt, a law partnership, consisting of the following partners: Thomas Hewes, F. G. Awalt, Samuel O. Clark, Jr., Harold E. Mitchell, Raymond Sparks, Henry L. Shepherd, John S. Murtha, and Maxwell M. Merritt, 93 Elm Street, Hartford, Conn., 822 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Life Insurance Association of America, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) See attached detailed statement.[3] (2) See attached detailed statement.[3] (3) Expenses for transportation, communication, copy of court decision, and copy of conference report, as listed in the attached statement. (4) None. (5) Any revision of Internal Revenue Code, affecting life insurance and annuities.

Hibbard, Lorin F.,[4] RFD No. 1, Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio; Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barium Tower, Detroit, Mich. (1) Actual expenses, $324.12. (2) Various. (3) Actual expenses incurred for lobbying in Washington, D. C. (4) None. (5) S. 1126, a bill in the Senate.

Higinbotham, William A., 1749 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Federation of American Scientists, 1749 L Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received no money from the Federation of American Scientists during April, May, or June 1947; salary and traveling expenses still owed me. (2) No payments made in connection with Federation business or legislative matters, except traveling expenses. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) I am not employed primarily to influence legislation. I have talked to a few Congressmen, informed the members of the Federation, and recommended action with reference to the confirmation of the nominees to the Atomic Energy Commission, National Science Foundation, and the Mundt bill, H. R. 3342.

Hines, Lewis G., American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW. (1) $102. (2) Lewis G. Hines. (3) National legislative representative, taxis and phone calls. (5) Affecting labor.

Hinman, Ray C., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y., Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. (1) Salary, $1,250 (this represents one-quarter of the amount of registrant's annual remuneration which is attributable to the performance of duties which are subject to the Lobbying Act); reimbursement for traveling, $130.81; expenses, total, $1,380.81. (2) Railroads, air lines, taxis, hotels, restaurants, telephones, and tips. (3) Normal traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Hiss, Donald, 701 Union Trust Building, Aluminum Research Institute. (1) Received: None; expended in connection with all matters for client, $27.06. (2) Telephone company, $20.26; taxicab drivers, $6.80 (3) Long-distance telephone calls and transportation within the District of Columbia. (4) None. (5) Legislation to secure continuation of duty-free status on nonferrous scrap.

Hofherr,[4 5] Milton, 90 Wilrey Street, Woodbridge, N. J.; Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barium Tower, Detroit, Mich. (1) Reimbursed $115 for loss of wages from my regular work as a foreman with the General Ceramics & Steatite Corp.; expenses $84, as follows: Hotel, $22.75; train fare, $11; meals, $40.25; cab service, $10. (2) Lobbying from January 19 to January 25, 1947; railroad fare from Newark, N. J., to Washington and return; hotel, meals, and cab service. (3) To lobby on legislation proposed by the Eightieth Congress, bills H. R. 8 and S. 55. (4) Monthly publication called the Supervisor. (5) Bill H. R. 8, proposed by the House of Representatives; bill S. 55, proposed by the Senate.

Hofherr,[4 6] Milton, General Ceramics & Steatite Co., Keasbey, N. J. (1) April 8 to April 11, inclusive, hotel, meals, cab, $48; railroad fare, Newark to Washington and return, $11; salary $90; total, $149. (2) Milton Hofherr, 90 Wilrey Street, Woodbridge, N. J. (3) Lobbying in opposition to bill H. R. 8, labor legislation. (4) None. (5) H. R. 8.

Hollister, R. F., 802 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg., Independent Bankers Association. (1) Money received: Salary, $1,80[illegible]; money expended: None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Federal legislation controlling bank holding companies.

Holman, Charles W., 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (1) Expended, $22.45. (2) Taxicabs. (3) Taxi fares. (4) None. (5) Any legislation which may affect milk producers.

Holmes, George T., Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 429 West Jefferson Street, Louisville, Ky. (1) No money was received or expended for lobbying. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Holste, Oscar W., room 305, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) Salary, $1,200; expenses, $572.36; no expenses other than personal maintenance. (2) Hotel Hamilton, taxicabs, telephone, postage, laundry, pullman fare, and various eating places. (3) All living expenses and transportation and telephone expense. (4) None. (5) All legislation pertaining to railroad labor, particularly opposing all bills affecting the now existing railroad retirement and railroad unemployment insurance system.

Horsky, Charles A., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; P. E. Harris & Co., Dexter Horton Building, Seattle, Wash.; Libby, McNeil & Libby, food products, Chicago, Ill.; New England Fish Co., Smith Tower, Seattle, Wash.; Kadiak Fisheries Co., Lowman Building, Seattle, Wash.; Pacific American Fisheries, Inc., South Bellingham, Wash. (1) Received: none; expended: $34.65. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $29.26; Western Union, $4.64; cab drivers, 75 cents; total, $34.65. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, and transportation within the District of Columbia. (4) None. (5) This employment is an ordinary attorney-client retainer on a per diem basis for the purpose of assisting in the formulation and presentation of a proposed legislative program, being developed jointly for presentation to Congress by various interested salmon-canning companies and the Department of Interior relative to stabilizing certain phases of the Alaska salmon industry. The per diem is computed at $250 a day for each day of legal services rendered.

Howard, Paul, 1709 M Street NW., Washington, D. C., American Library Association. (1) $2,782.31 from American Library Association. (2) See attached.[3] (3) Operation of office; not more than one-third of expenditures applicable to legislative activity. (4) None. (5) None.

Howard, S. H., 1328 Evergreen Avenue, Millvale, Pa.; Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 4849 North Western Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary $1,087.50 for the second quarter of 1947 and had expenses of $549.70 for this quarter. (2) Hamilton Hotel. (3) Lodging, meals, and transportation. (4) None. (5) All legislative proposals of concern to labor and railway labor in particular. Working in opposition to bills to amend the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Insurance Acts.

Howe, Harold K., 2480 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill. (1) Received $1,500 as salary and $498.05 as reimbursement for general expenses. (2) Various; see answer to question (3). (3) Miscellaneous and incidental, including local transportation, lunches, gratuities, committee meeting expenses, and other incidental expenses of Washington office, American Institute of Laundering. (4) Not applicable under section 308 (a). (5) I am interested in all legislation affecting the laundry industry and the members thereof. My primary function as to legislation is to report status, prospects, and so forth, to my employer, the American Institute of Laundering. See also letter attached to Registration Form B, which is made a part hereof.

Howe, Robert E. Jr., 900 Fifteenth Street NW., and 907 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., United Mine Workers of America, 900 Fifteenth Street NW. (1) Since April 1, 1947, there has been received by affiant as salary the sum of $1,875 and as per diem for personal living expenses the sum of $546, a total of $2,421. (2) No sums in any amount have been paid by affiant to any person other than affiant's expenditures for normal, everyday living expenses such as transportation, meals, etc., in the regular discharge of his duties. (3) Answered in (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.

Howrey, Edward F., 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Peanut and Nut Salters Association, 133 Watts Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Peanut and Nut Salters Association, 133 Watts Street, New York, N. Y. Fee, none this quarter; expenses, $55.12. (2) Various. (3) Telephone, taxis, etc. (4) None. (5) Proposals affecting peanuts and tree nuts, particularly those placing limitations and restrictions on importation of nuts.

Hudson, Minor, 1726 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. Reserve Officers of the Naval Services. (1) Salary of $2,500 received during 3 months period ending June 30, 1947, used only for personal living expenses. (2) Minor Hudson. (3) Personal living expenses. (4) The Voice of the Reserve, the regular monthly publication of Reserve Officers of the Naval Services, which is distributed to the membership of the association. (5) Any legislation affecting the national security, the Navy, or the Reserve which Reserve Officers of the Naval Services may decide to support or oppose.

Huntress, Carroll B.,[5] 1209 Whitehall Building, 17 Battery Place, New York City. (1) Received from Norman Patton, treasurer, New York State Conference in Opposition to the St. Lawrence Project, $56.85, for telephone and postage expenses in January and February 1947, which represented reimbursement; March telephone bill not yet received. (2) New York Telephone Co. and United States Post Office. (3) Informational. (4) None. (5) Opposition to proposed St. Lawrence project.

Huntress Carroll B.,[4] 1209 Whitehall Building, 17 Battery Place, New York City, New York State Conference in Opposition to the St. Lawrence Project. (1) Received from Norman Patton, treasurer, New York State Conference in Opposition to the St. Lawrence Project, $361.81, for telephone, postage, and traveling expenses, and for printing, which represented reimbursement. (2) New York Telephone Co., United States Post Office,

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed with the Clerk only.
[5] Filed for first quarter.
[6] Filed for second quarter.

Hudson Blue & Photo Print Co. (3) Informational. (4) The Empire Statesman (5) Opposition to proposed St. Lawrence project.

Hushing, W. C., American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for 3 months, $2,080; expenses for April 1947, $71.50; May, $72; June, $104; total for 3 months, $247.50. (2) Taxi drivers, phone company (away from office), messengers, and incidentals at Senate or House restaurant. (3) As shown in No. 2. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting workers.

Ingles, William, 717 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. et al. (1) See schedule attached.[2] (2) See schedule.[2] (3) Normal office operating expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting industry.

Institute of Public Relations, Inc., John W. Darr, president, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) See attached.[2] (2) See attached.[2] (3) See attached.[2] (4) We did not cause the publication of any articles or editorials. General publicity releases of an informative character, and publicity releases containing some of the testimony of hearing witnesses were distributed to the daily newspapers of the United States and to a considerable number of weekly newspapers. It is physically impossible for us to learn which of these used material similar to that we distributed, or based on that which we distributed. (5) Amendments to Natural Gas Act, H. R. 2185.

Jackson,[4] Boyd J., Klamath Agency, Oregon, Klamath Indian Tribes. (1) Received $624 from date of filing through March 31, 1947, as salary and per diem as delegate for Klamath Tribes; only part of time devoted to legislative matters; no expenditures except local transportation. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Supporting H. R. 2501, H. R. 2502, and H. R. 2778.

Jackson, Robert C., 1406 G Street NW., National Cotton Council of America. (1) In addition to regular salary from National Cotton Council as reported on form B received expense reimbursements from National Cotton Council amounting to $107.37, that might be construed as relating to legislative activity. (2) Phone tolls, $4.10; travel expense, $13.87; cab fares, $59.20; and meals for guests, $30.20. (3) Communication, transportation, and luncheon conferences. (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation, except as it relates directly or indirectly to consumption of cotton. During last quarter have supported certain principles regarding restrictions on labor unions; supported certain appropriation increases for USDA; supported farm labor legislation; supported H. R. 3895, extending coverage of oil seeds statistics.

Jhung, Walter, Hotel Pennsylvania, 20 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Korean-American Trading Co., 105 East Houston Street, New York, N. Y. (1) April, May, and June 1947. Cash received from Korean Civic Association, Honolulu, Hawaii, April 25, 1947, $1,000; May 31, 1947, $1,000; 3 months' salary, at $333.33, total, $999.99. (2) See attached.[2] (3) See attached.[2] (4) New York Herald Tribune, New York. (5) To support S. 152 and H. R. 860, first session, Eightieth Congress.

Jobe, William T., 1706 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Ice Industries, 1706 L Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Employed on a full-time annual basis as general counsel for the National Association of Ice Industries at a salary of $10,000 per annum. I have received my regular monthly salary for the second calendar quarter of 1947 and nothing more. Pursuant to the requirements of Public Law 601, I have expended no money. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Johnson,[5] Clare A., National Tax Equality Association, 231 South LaSalle Street, room 1027, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money was received and expended for work within the scope of Public Law 601. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) The responsibilities of my position are to disseminate information and research to Trade Associations, Chambers of Commerce, and other interested organizations. Do not anticipate any appearances or work falling under the provisions of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. See registration Form B, dated April 16, 1947.

Johnson,[6] Clare A., National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money received or spent for lobbying purposes. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation designed to effect tax equality between competing businesses.

Johnson, Curtis, Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None; compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admission Act.

Johnson,[5] Elmer, National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The sum of $250 was received during the first quarter of 1947. (2) None. (3) Salary of $100 per month; $50 to cover transportation and purchase of meals (January and February only). (4) The Annuitant. (5) In support of any measure designed to improve the Federal retirement system.

Johnson,[6] Elmer, president, National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Retired Civil Employees. (1) The sum of $350 was received during the second quarter of 1947. (2) None. (3) Salary of $100 per month; $50 to cover transportation by taxi and purchase of meals. (4) The Annuitant. (5) In support of any measure designed to improve the Federal retirement system.

Johnson, Gilbert R., 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio, Lake Carriers' Association. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Johnson, W. D., room 312, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Order of Railway Conductors of America. (1) January 1947 annual compensation of $8,500. (2) W. D. Johnson. (3) As vice president and national legislative representative of the Order of Railway Conductors of America, covering all services rendered, including services entirley unrelated to legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor generally, employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act, and particularly the interests of various classes and crafts of railway employees represented by the Order of Railway Conductors of America.

Jones, Bascom F., 930 Broadway, Knoxville, Tenn., Tennessee Railroad Association. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Jones, J. M., National Wool Growers Association, 509 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) Salary, $1,500; expense, $2,758.05; total, $4,258.05. (2) See attached statement.[2] (3) The above paid to J. M. Jones as secretary of the National Wool Growers Association for duties in connection with association work. All expenses included for all work in Washington and elsewhere whether in connection with legislative work or not. (4) The National Wool Grower, co-editor, J. M. Jones. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any legislation only as legislation affects the sheep industry. Supporting wool bill and various land bills.

Jones, L. Dan, Independent Petroleum Association of America, 500 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary previously reported; plus the following expenses which might be considered within the scope of the act, $28.95. (2) See (3) below. (3) Taxi fares. (4) None. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. My duties include that of maintaining surveillance of legislation which might affect the petroleum industry and taking such action with respect to such legislation as directed by the association.

Kane, John E., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received regular salary as previously reported in Form B, heretofore filed pursuant to act; expenses reimbursed by employer, $289.60. (2) Various taxicab companies, restaurants, hotels, and other service establishments, Government Printing Office, and Post Office Department. (3) Administrative expenses, travel, meals, tobacco, and candy, documents, and postage. (4) None. (5) Matters affecting the petroleum industry and its customers.

Keehn, Thomas B., 1751 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Council for Social Action, Congregational Christian Churches. (1) $1,033.32 salary; $200 expense. (2) Money paid to self for salary and expense. (3) To cover living expenses and special expenses allowable within expense account. (4) Washington Report, Social Action. (5) Same as material filed October 1946 indicates.

Keller, Joseph E., secretary, District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee, 930 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $2,129.33 as treasurer of District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee; $724.55 has been expended on behalf of the committee during preceding calendar quarter. See schedule A attached for details of expenditures of committee.[2] (2) See schedule attached.[2] (3) See schedule attached.[2] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the sale and distribution of petroleum products in the District of Columbia.

Kennedy, Harold L., 912 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 308 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla. (1) Received monthly salary; amount of salary previously reported in Form B heretofore filed with Clerk of the House and Secretary of the Senate; expended, $27.50. (2) See No. (3) below. (3) Expended $20 for 50 taxi fares at 40 cents each to and from the Capitol; 5 meals at $1.50 each, comprising a total of $7.50. (4) None. (5) All proposed legislation that might affect the oil and gas industry.

Ketchum, MacLeod & Grove, Inc., 411 Seventh Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Main & Co., First National Bank Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Received from Main & Co.: April 9, 1947, $261; May 13, 1947, $869.10; June 13, 1947, $980.80; total, $2,110.90. (2) (a) Mono-Lino Typesetting Co., $232.60; (b) Riegers Duplicating Service, $128.68; (c) Duplicating Supply Co., $50.63; (d) R. L. Forsythe Co., $132; (e) Romeike Press Clipping Bureau, $14; (f) Ketchum, MacLeod & Grove, Inc., $3.99; (g) Ketchum, MacLeod & Grove, Inc., $1,554.00; total, $2,110.90. (3) (a) Type composition for folders descriptive of tax plan; (b) Mimeographing and mailing charges; (c) Letter shop service; (d) Printing of folders; (e) Clipping service; (f) Postage, telephone and telegraph; (g) Services. (4) News release sent to Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, Wall Street Journal, Associated Press, United Press, International

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed with the Clerk only.
[5] Filed for first quarter.
[6] Filed for second quarter.

News Service, and general distribution to Washington news and radio correspondents. (5) The incentive income tax plan, a program of income-tax revision prepared by Frank Wilbur Main and other partners in Main & Co., certified public accountants, with headquarters office in Pittsburgh.

Ketchum, Omar B., Veterans of Foreign Wars, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $833 per month as salary minus social-security and withholding taxes; $68.55 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW National News, VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities, and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

Keys,[4] Robert H., care of Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barlum Tower, Detroit, Mich. (1) $334.23 actual expenses incurred for lobbying in Washington, D. C. (2) Hotels, railroads, telephone, etc. (3) Actual expenses incurred for lobbying in Washington, D. C. (4) The Supervisor, official publication of the Foreman's Association of America. (5) H. R. 8, a bill in the United States House of Representatives; S. 55, a bill in the United States Senate.

Keys,[5] Robert H., Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barlum Tower, Detroit, Mich. (1) No longer engaged in lobbying activities. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Kimball, Arthur W., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; National Small Business Men's Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $325 salary semimonthly, less withholding tax and security tax; $397.66 expenses during April, May, and June 1947. (2) Arthur W. Kimball, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (3) Travel, luncheons, taxis, etc. (4) Pulling Together, monthly bulletin, National Small Business Men's Association. (5) [Blank.]

King, Joseph T., 1713 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; National Retail Lumber Dealers Association. (1) $1,800 salary and $155.60 expenses. (2) Hotels, restaurants, cab drivers, porters. (3) Meals, cab fares, tips. (4) National Affairs Report. (5) Wage and hour, labor, portal-to-portal, Second War Powers Act, housing, tax and export, or other legislation affecting the retail building supply industry.

King, Willford I., room 300, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City, Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc. (1) I have received $150 per week salary during the quarter. (2) I am not a disbursing officer, and have made no payments for the Committee for Constitutional Government, by whom I am employed. (3) [Blank.] (4) The committee has sent copies of some of my writings to numerous editors, giving permission to quote. What publication has resulted, I do not know. (5) Not employed for this purpose, but, incidentally, I occasionally oppose legislation which I believe to be antisocial and favor that which I believe to be socially beneficial.

Kitchen, C. W., United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 2017 S Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Various articles have been prepared and published in trade perodicals and association yearbooks on marketing subjects, none dealing specifically with legislative matters. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation.

Kline, Robert E., Jr., 703 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Sea-Air Legislative Committe, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From the Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C., received, $2,000; expended, none. (2) Expended, none. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Knowles, Miles H., and Dean, Allen, doing business as Washington Business Services, 602 Medical Science Building, Washington, D. C.; Nonbasic Steel Coordinating Committee, 602 Medical Science Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received from the Nonbasic Steel Coordinating Committee, 602 Medical Science Building, Washington, D. C., $13,400. (2) Stenographic and clerical hire, postage, telephone, telegraph, travel, office stationery and printing, newspapers and periodicals. (3) For the purpose of research into labor problems. (4) None. (5) Support legislation to obtain true collective bargaining rights for employers in the light of local conditions and oppose industry- and union-wide bargaining.

Koch, Robert M., National Agricultural Limestone Association, Inc., 1426 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) It is estimated that, as secretary of the National Agricultural Limestone Association, Inc., $1,000 of my salary represents that part of my time covered by Public Law 601 during the second quarter of 1947. This was all disbursed for personal living expenses. In addition, I received $45 for reimbursement for taxis and carfare in connection with legislation of interest to members of the association. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Any legislation directly or indirectly affecting the agricultural limestone industry.

Kocher, Eric, Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Kreutz,[5] Oscar R., executive manager, National Savings & Loan League, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $3,750 salary and $795.95 for expenses. Paid like amount for travel expenses, entertaining, etc., on league business not connected with legislation. (2) Statler Hotel, Congressional Country Club, travel expenses, etc. (3) Routine league business not connected with legislation. (4) National Savings and Loan Journal. (5) Supporting S. 601, S. 802, S. 803, S. 804, S. 913, S. 1149; opposing some provisions of S. 866.

Kreutz,[6] Oscar R., executive manager, National Savings & Loan League, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $3,750 salary and $1,665 for expenses. I paid out $1,804.48 for travel expenses, entertaining, etc., on league business not connected with legislation. (2) Travel expenses, hotels, club, etc. (3) Routine league business not connected with legislation. (4) National Savings and Loan Journal. (5) Supporting S. 601, S. 802, S. 803, S. 804, S. 913, S. 1149; and President's Reorganization Plan No. 3; opposing some provisions of S. 866 and H. R. 3756.

Lacques, Paul H., Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received various sums during the quarterly period (April, May, June) at various times, a total of $639.10 from Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, one of which receipts exceeded $100. (2) Railroad companies, hotels, and club. (3) Transportation, accommodations, meals, telephones, and telegraph charges. (4) None. (5) H. R. 669, H. R. 4043.

Lamb, Robert K., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) $2,150 salary, $612.92 expenses. (2) Hotels, railroads, air lines, restaurants, cab drivers, etc., for expenses. (3) Personal expenses and travel away from Washington, cab fares in Washington. (4) CIO News, Steel Labor. (5) Support legislation authorized by the convention and executive board of the United Steelworkers, and by the convention and executive board of the national CIO; oppose legislation contrary to the stand of these organizations.

Lanham, Fritz G., Woodley Park Towers, 2737 Devonshire Place, Washington, D. C.; National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West Eleventh Street, Gary, Ind.; American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 11 East Forty-fourth Street, New York City; Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 1308 Commercial Standard Building, Fort Worth, Tex. (1) From National Patent Council as retainer $1,419.60 (old-age benefit and income tax withheld for April); from American Fair Trade Council as retainer $864.58 (old-age benefit and income-tax withheld); from Trinity River Improvement Association for rental and other expenses and clerical help $750. There have been no expenditures except small sums for postage. (2) $125 to Miss Marion D. Greer for clerical help with deduction withheld for old-age benefit and income tax) for month of April. Service discontinued temporarily because of illness of Miss Greer. $681 paid to Woodley Park Towers, Washington, D. C. (3) Clerical help, rental, garage. (4) None. (5) Those I represent are all nonprofit organizations, and I serve in an advisory capacity and not for the purposes of supporting or opposing legislation in Congress. Their purposes are principally educational with reference to the objectives of their organizations.

Larkin, Frederick, Jr., Reserve Officers of the Naval Services, 1726 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. (1) Salary of $900 received during the 3-month period ending June 30, 1947, used only for personal living expenses. (2) Frederick Larkin, Jr. (3) Personal living expenses. (4) The Voice of the Reserve, the regular monthly publication of Reserve Officers of the Naval Services, which is distributed to the membership of the association. (5) Any legislation affecting the national security, the Navy, or the Reserve which Reserve Officers of the Naval Services may decide to support or oppose.

La Roe, Wilbur, Jr., Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Independent Meat Packers Association, 112 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Clark & La Roe, law firm, received from the National Independent Meat Packers Association $4,500, total of monthly payments for general legal services, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payment made to any other person. (3) [Blank.] (4) Bulletin, National Independent Meat Packers Association. (5) Restoration of appropriation for Federal inspection, meat packing plants, H. R. 3601.

La Roe, Wilbur, Jr., Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; Seatrain Lines, Inc., 39 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Clark & La Roe, law firm, received from Seatrain Lines, Inc., $1,875, monthly payments on annual retainer, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payment made to any other person. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) H. R. 3237, railroad reorganizations; transportation survey being conducted by House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Laugherty, R. R., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Railway Employees Department, A. F. of L., room 1309, 608 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (new address). (1) Salary, $1,500; expenses, $750. No money expended only for personal maintenance. (2) Annapolis Hotel, taxi fare, postage, telephone

[4] Filed for first quarter.
[5] Filed for second quarter.
[5] Filed for first quarter.
[6] Filed for second quarter.

and telegraph, cleaning, and food. (3) Necessary living, transportation, and communication expense. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting and detrimental to railroad employees.

Lawrence, John V., American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration. He expended a total of $41.75. (2) The money was paid to various taxi drivers employed in taking registrant between his office and the Capitol or House or Senate Office Buildings, and to clerks and cashiers for lunches at restaurants. (3) The money paid taxi drivers was for transportation to and from my office as indicated in (2). (4) None. (5) Within my general responsibilities I am required, among other duties, to testify on bills affecting the trucking industry and to exercise control over testimony given on other bills by our staff. Thus far, testimony has been given by us on S. 49, S. 70, S. 110, H. R. 2157, H. R. 1467, H. R. 2109, H. R. 8, and H. R. 725; S. 55, H. R. 3140, H. R. 221, H. R. 2759, H. R. 3885, S. 987 and companion bills on sea-air and chosen-instrument bills covering overseas air transportation.

Lawrence, Joseph S., M. D., American Medical Association, suite 301, 1302 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received, $4,203.70; expended, $266.37. (2) Pennsylvania Railroad, Capital Airlines, Traymore Hotel. (3) Travel, local transportation, hotels, conference, incidental expenses, meals. (4) None. (5) Bills relating to public health endorsed or opposed by the action of the house of delegates of the American Medical Association or the principles espoused by that body.

Laylin, John G., Aluminum Research Institute, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received none; expended in connection with all matters for client, $27.06. (2) Telephone company, $20.26; taxicab drivers, $6.80. (3) Long-distance telephone calls and transportation within the District of Columbia. (4) None. (5) Legislation to secure continuation of duty-free status on nonferrous scrap.

Laylin, John G., American Smelting & Refining Co., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received none; expended in connection with all matters for client, $15.63. (2) Transportation and New York hotel expenses, $29.41; telephone company, $11.78; Western Union Telegraph Co., $4.44. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, traveling expense to New York, and telegrams. (4) None. (5) Appropriation for continuation of drainage tunnel by Bureau of Mines at Leadville, Colo.

Lee, Ivy, and Ross, T. J., United States Cuban Sugar Council, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) See appended statement.[2] (2) See appended statement.[2] (3) See appended statement.[2] (4) See appended statement.[2] (5) Registrant advises the United States Cuban Sugar Council on public relations matters pertaining to legislation relating to the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended.

Leiser, Clara, Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Leonard, Richard T., International Union, UAW, CIO, 411 West Milwaukee Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Salary, $1,750.06; expenses, $1,546.61. (2) Hotels, restaurants, railroads, cab drivers, laundry, etc. (3) For living expenses incident to his work and travel expenses. (4) UAW, CIO publications. (5) All legislation supported or opposed by the CIO and UAW-CIO supporting bills of aid to the general welfare and opposing bills harmful to the general welfare.

Leopold, Joseph F., 936 Liberty Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.; National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received only my salary at the rate of $8,500 per annum and reimbursement of actual travel expenses, hotel, transportation, etc. Travel incurred in connection with convention and business audience addresses. (2) Paid nothing to anyone, neither money nor anything of value. (3) Nothing as above. (4) Various newspaper stories reported locally following addresses before luncheon clubs, conventions, etc., also various trade publications of which I have no record. (5) No specific legislation. Am only interested in tax equality.

Letts, David S., American Transit Association, 901 Tower Building, Fourteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $1,200 compensation as attorney for the American Transit Association. Received $172.56 reimbursement for actual business expenses. (2) Transportation by railroad, taxicab, etc.; various hotels and restaurants for lodging and meals; entertainment and miscellaneous. (3) Actual traveling and living expenses away from Washington. Expenses in Washington for taxicabs, fees, entertainment, etc. (4) None. (5) Proposed legislation affecting the transit industry. As attorney for the American Transit Association, I am, at times, called upon to explain the import of pending legislation to members of the association. At the same time I may point out the views of other members of the association on pending legislative matters. Within the past quarter I have written letters to certain of our members who are subject to the Interstate Commerce Act. In these letters I discussed bills S. 290, H. R. 2297, and H. R. 2338, which are bills to amend the Interstate Commerce Act.

Levine, Seth, CIO Maritime Committee, suite 1, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,365 in salary and $130 for expenses. About one-third of time devoted to legislative activities; remaining two-thirds to economic research. (2) Expenses paid to taxi companies, telephone companies, dispensers of periodicals. (3) Taxis, telephone calls, periodicals. (4) CIO News, ACA News NMU Pilot, ILWU Dispatcher, IFAWA Fishermen, the American Marine Engineers MCS Voice, and CIO Maritime Committee Newsletter. (5) Support legislation in the interest of seamen, longshoremen, fishermen, and allied maritime workers and oppose legislation detrimental to them.

Lewis, George J., Kentucky Railroad Association, Union Station, Lexington, Ky. (1) No money received; amount expended, $375. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, dining cars, railways, Pullman, taxis, telephone, etc. (3) For living and traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Employed to support legislation favorable to the railroad industry, and to oppose legislation detrimental to that industry.

Libby, Frederick J., executive secretary, National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,125; expenses, $337.41. (2) Expenses are for railroad tickets, hotels, taxis, porters, telegraph service, miscellaneous. (3) For attending meetings and conferences out of town, also speaking trips. (4) Peace Action, monthly news bulletin of National Council for Prevention of War. (5) Supports, in pursuance of the purposes of the organization, legislation that promotes peace and opposes legislation which, in our judgment, leads to war.

Liljenquist, L. Blaine,[5] Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1415 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) January $139.74, for expenses incurred December 16, 1946 to January 15, 1947; February $374.92, for expenses incurred January 16, 1947, to February 15, 1947; March $320.81, for expenses incurred February 16, 1947 to March 15, 1947. (2) Transportation, meals, hotels, telephone and telegraph, teletype, and incidental office expense in regular routine work of the association. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Am not employed as a lobbyist on legislation but as Washington representative of the association and our only interest is in legislation affecting directly the meat-packing industry.

Liljenquist, L. Blaine,[6] Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1415 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; E. F. Forbes, president, Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) April, $116.80, for expenses incurred March 16 to April 15, 1947; May, $299, for expenses incurred April 16 to May 15, 1947; June, $226.31, for expenses incurred May 16 to June 30, 1947. (2) Various. (3) Transportation, meals, telephone, telegraph, teletype, office supplies, and other office expense in regular routine work of the Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc. (4) None. (5) I am not employed as a lobbyist but as the Washington representative of the association. My only interest in legislation would be that which directly affects the meat-packing industry.

Linton, Donald H., Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates, 250 Stuart Street, Boston, Mass. (1) $3,328.48 ($1,500 compensation and $1,828.48 expenses). (2) Carleton Hotel, Washington, D. C., $461.16; railroads, $518.07; air lines, $241.92; food, taxis, telephone, telegrams, tips, and miscellaneous, $607.33. (3) Traveling and incidentals. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2185, H. R. 2569, H. R. 2956, H. R. 4051, H. R. 4099, H. R. 2235, H. R. 2292, S. 734.

Little, Charles R., Kenwood Road, box 153-M, route 508, Cincinnati, Ohio; executive secretary, Ohio Valley Conservation and Flood Control Congress, Dr. Charles E. Holzer, president, Holzer Hospital, Gallipolis, Ohio. (1) Received for expenses, $600; expenses, $691.62. (2) Various railroads, hotels, restaurants, etc. (3) Transportation, $124.22; lodging, $286; meals, $160.20; tips, $44.72; office expense (periodicals, communication, postage, stationery, supplies), $76.48. (4) None. (5) Any dealing with conservation and flood control in the Ohio Valley including appropriation bills.

Little, Walter J., 315 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.; Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, Southern Pacific, Union Pacific, Northwestern Pacific, and Western Pacific Railroads, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Received from Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, Southern Pacific, Union Pacific, Northwestern Pacific, and Western Pacific Railroads for expenses, $1,535.96. (2) Railroads, $587.27; hotels, $473.69; incidental, $475. (3) Transportation and living costs. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting the railroads.

Lloyd,[4] Joanne, United Automobile Workers, CIO, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $720; expenses, $40. (2) [Blank.] (3) Taxis, miscellaneous expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation supported or opposed by CIO and UAW, CIO, supporting bills to aid the general welfare and opposing bills harmful to general welfare.

Lockwood, Maurice H., The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $2,000 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Fertilizer News and Fertilizer Review, both published by the National Fertilizer Association,

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[4] Filed with the Clerk only.

[5] Filed for first quarter.

[6] Filed for second quarter.

Inc., Washington, D. C. I issued and distributed, in the customary manner, a press release on H. R. 3421 and S. 1251, but do not know what publications may have published it in whole or in part. (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 2494, H. R. 3421, S. 1251, and H. R. 869.

Lodge, F. S., the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $150 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 2494, H. R. 3421, S. 1251, and H. R. 869.

Louchheim, Joseph H., Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary received, $1,500; expenses received, $160.23; total, $1,660.23. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) National health insurance.

Lucas, James G., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $200; expenses, $29.60. (2) Taxi drivers, streetcars. (3) Taxi, streetcar travel. (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor law revision, social security law revision, inflammable fabric legislation.

Lyon, A. E., executive secretary, Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received except regular salary and expenses. No money expended for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation. Total salary for quarter, $2,250; total expenses for quarter, $635.48. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Incidental to other and varied duties which comprise the major part of work, all legislative proposals of concern to labor and railway labor in particular.

Lyon, Richard K., 701 Evans Building, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None received; approximately $6 expended. (2) Local taxicabs. (3) Fares. (4) None. (5) In support of H. R. 3383 for the relief of the Fidelity Trust Co. of Baltimore, Md., and others.

McBride,[7] Don, secretary-manager, National Reclamation Association, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Total receipts for period, $18,685.23; total expenditures for period, $13,954.73. (2) See attached schedules.[8] (3) See attached schedules.[8] (4) National Reclamation Association Bulletin (see bulletin attached).[8] (5) Amendment to the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 and any other legislation affecting water resources of the 17 Western States (see sec. 3, Purposes, first page, our constitution, enclosed in last quarterly report).

McBride, Jonas A., 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) See attached.[3] (2) See attached.[3] (3) For maintenance of office of vice president, national legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. (4) Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen's Magazine, July 1947. (5) All legislation affecting the interests of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

McCarthy, Frank J., the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,232.50 per month, which is paid for all the services rendered to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., only a part of which have to do with legislation; $316.50 was expended by me as expense money during the second quarter of 1947, for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. In addition to this amount, I also received $360.40 for expenses incurred in connection with other duties performed for the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., which have no relation to the purposes covered by this act. (2) Various transportation companies, restaurants, garages, communication companies, etc. (3) $316.50 was expended by me as expense money during the second quarter of 1947 for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

McCaskill, J. L., assistant director, legislative-Federal relations division of National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,516, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities—estimated for legislative services, $303; expenses, hotels, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (2) Self, salary; expenses, hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

McClure, Warren C., box 207, Camden, Ark.; Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) None for legislative purposes. (2) None for legislative purposes. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at the present time.

McCrory, Samuel H., 6811 Sixth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Hemp Producers Association, Juneau, Wis. (1) $500. (2) Lola McElroy, public stenographer, Morrison Hotel, Chicago, Ill., $2.85. (3) Typing. (4) None. (5) None.

McElhoes,[5] S. I., Chickasha, Okla.; Public Service Co., of Oklahoma, 600 Main Street, Tulsa, Okla. (1) Meals, $37.15; taxis, $36.70; fares, $183.42; hotels, $516.86; incidentals, $12.52. (2) Meals were paid to various hotels, restaurants, and railroads; taxis were almost all in Washington, D. C., fares covered railroad and airplane fares; hotel bill, with the exception of one small amount, was incurred at Raleigh Hotel, Washington, D. C. (3) These are all just ordinary traveling expenses from Chickasha, Okla., to Washington, D. C., and hotel expenses while in Washington, D. C. (4) [Blank.] (5) Opposing Southwestern Power Administration appropriation.

McElhoes,[6] S. I., Chickasha, Okla.; Public Service Co. of Oklahoma, 600 South Main Street, Tulsa, Okla. (1) $157.25; hotel, fares, stenographic help, taxis, and other minor incidentals. (2) Outside of Raleigh Hotel, Washington, D. C., the others were all minor items, and I did not keep or learn the name of the parties. (3) Regular expenses. (4) None. (5) To oppose appropriations to Southwestern Power Administration.

McFarland, Rev. A. J., 914 Clay Street, Topeka Kans. (1) Salary, $625; expenses, $275; total, $900. (2) Salary to self for expenses at home; expenses on road (travel, hotel, board, etc.). (3) Answered above. (4) The Christian Patriot, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans.; the Covenanter Witness, 1131 Buchanan Street, Topeka, Kans. (5) Supporting a proposed Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States, acknowledging the Lord Jesus Christ as King and Saviour of our Nation.

McGlue, Arthur F., Lynn, Mass.; National Association of Post Office Custodial Employees, post-office box 1611, Washington, D. C. (1) Expenses, $750, train fare, hotels, taxis, postage, stationery, and entertainment. (2) [Blank.] (3) In support of all beneficial legislation for all postal employees. (4) Post Office Custodial News, published by the National Association of Post Office Custodial Employees. (5) All beneficial legislation for postal employees.

McGough, Richard, 515 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash., Northern Pacific Railway Co., Union Pacific Railroad Co., Great Northern Railway Co., the Milwaukee Road, Seattle, Wash. (1) Salary as stated in original registration. Expenditures for meals $338; hotel accommodations, $289.88; taxi and baggage, $43.70; postage and telegrams, $8.80; pullman fares, $61.99. (2) Restaurants, hotels, taxi companies, railroad companies, etc. (3) Living and traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting transcontinental railroads operating in the State of Washington.

McGowan,[5] Lewis A., post-office box 37, Rancho Santa Fe, Calif.; American Internees Committee, San Francisco, Calif. (1) $800, all expended for travel, telephone-telegraph, printing, and clerical hire, between January 1, 1947, and March 31, 1947. (2) To various persons. (3) In carrying on the work for which he was employed. (4) None. (5) Compensating American civilian citizens interned by the enemy in recent war.

McGowan,[6] Lewis A., post-office box 37, Rancho Santa Fe, Calif.; American Internees Committee, San Francisco, Calif. (1) $2,932, all expended for travel, telephone-telegraph, printing, and clerical hire, between April 1, 1947, to June 30, 1947. (2) To various persons. (3) In carrying on the work for which he was employed. (4) None. (5) Compensating American civilian citizens interned by the enemy in recent war.

McGrath, Tom J., 729 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates, Boston, Mass.; Chesapeake & Ohio Railway, Richmond, Va.; National Coal Association, Washington, D. C. (1) Received from Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates, $1,015; Chesapeake & Ohio Railway, $966.65; National Coal Asscciation, $966.65. (2) No payments. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 2569; also oppose other natural-gas legislation.

McGrath, Tom J.; National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 729 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,112.50 for services; $79.72 for petty cash expenses. (2) United States post office, Western Union, restaurants, railroads. (3) Postage, telegrams, meals, travel expense. (4) None. (5) Resolution relating to Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin waterway and power project.

McGrath, Thomas Edward, 626 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; taxpayers of the United States of America. (1) Approximately $165. (2) Thomas Edward McGrath. (3) To expend as I see fit. (4) None. (5) None.

McKee,[4] Jerome B., executive director, District of Columbia Retail Liquor Dealers Association, 321 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) [Blank.]

McKeehan, Merrick, Arter & Stewart, a partnership, 2800 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio; the Holstein-Friesian Association of America, Brattleboro, Vt. (1) None received; expended $118.20 (see par. (3)). (2) Miscellaneous telegraph companies, railroad companies and their employees, taxi drivers, hotels, and restaurants. (3) $5.82 for telegrams; balance for traveling expenses on trips to Washington. (4) None. (5) To support H. R. 3884.

McLaughlin, Robert E., AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), Victor Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No expense money drawn or expended except petty cash for taxi fares. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) National AMVET. (5) Legislation providing care and assistance for veterans of World War II and their dependents.

McLaurin, Joseph H., United States Wholesale Grocers Association, Inc., 837 Invest-

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed with the Clerk only.
[5] Filed for first quarter.
[6] Filed for second quarter.
[7] Filed with the Secretary only.
[8] Not printed. Filed in the Secretary's office.

ment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) See attached.[3] (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) Bulletin Service of the United States Wholesale Grocers Association. (5) No legislation in particular, any legislation in general affecting the interests of wholesale grocers. He was later specifically authorized by the executive committee of the United States Wholesale Grocers Association to support or oppose general labor legislation and fair employment practice legislation.

McMahon, John A., president, National Association of Postal Supervisors, 171 Milton Street, Dorchester Center Station, Boston, Mass. (1) $1,382.07 received from M. C. Nave, treasurer, National Association of Postal Supervisors, room 326, Main Post Office, Chicago, Ill. (2) John A. McMahon, president, Boston, Mass.; Pennsylvania Railroad; New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad; Hotel Continental, Washington, D. C. (3) For loss of salary, for railroad transportation, and hotel rooms. (4) The Postal Supervisor, official magazine of the National Association of Postal Supervisors. (5) S. 637, H. R. 4127, retirement legislation for postal supervisors; H. R. 3075, S. 697, compensatory time for postal supervisors.

McMahon, W. E., the Mayflower, Washington, D. C.; West Virginia Oil & Natural Gas Association, P. O. Box 48, Fairmont, W. Va. (1) $4,500 received from the West Virginia Oil & Natural Gas Association. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Amendments to Natural Gas Act of 1938.

McMains, W. H., Distilled Spirits Institute, Inc., 1135 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary $2,500, which is in payment for all services rendered, only a part of which deal with legislation. No expenses have been authorized or incurred for purposes listed under this act. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) No specific legislation. Any legislation affecting the interests of the industry represented is reported to members.

McMillan, Robert W., Management Planning of Washington, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,100, with no more than one-fifth of the time and services for which such compensation was paid being for activities which might conceivably be construed as coming within the purview of any of the provisions of title III of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; $84.35, reimbursement of expenses allocable to foregoing activities. (2) Taxi drivers and operators of eating and refreshment places. (3) Transportation and other normal out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

McNaughton, Donald J.,[4] 98 Bloomfield Avenue, Buffalo, N. Y. (1) $1,200, salary as regional director of Foreman's Association of America (January, February, March 1947); $282.12, actual expense incurred while lobbying during first quarter 1947. (2) Hotel Continental, Washington, D. C., $59.34; Pennsylvania-Central Airlines, $120.78; restaurants (various), $84; local transportation (cabs, etc.), $18. (3) Hotel room, transportation, meals, tips (to waiters, cab drivers, etc.). (4) None. (5) H. R. 8, S. 55, and any other legislation designed to remove supervisory employees from the protection of the National Labor Relations Act.

McQuatters, Geneva F., 1917 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $999.96; expenses, $136.53. (2) Railroad, post office, office supplies, telephone, and telegraph. (3) Travel, postage, office supplies, telephone, and telegraph. (4) The Independent Woman. (5) The equal-rights amendment, Federal aid to education, extension and improvement of the merit system, Women's Bureau appropriations, opposition to discrimination against women, jury service for women, regulation of child labor, retention of the women's units of the military services, support of participation by the United States in the United Nations, and support of a foreign policy embracing international social development, economic and financial stability, and the peaceful settlement of international disputes.

MacCracken, William P., Jr., American Optometric Association, 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money received; money expended, $78.55 (all for the account of the American Optometric Association). (2) Telephone tolls, $13.10; Army Register, $2; Washington expense, $23.40; telegraph tolls, $8.54; taxis, etc., $4.20. (3) See answer in (2) above. (4) None. (5) See statement attached.[3]

Mack, James Edward, National Home and Property Owners Foundation, 1773 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Since April 1, 1947, and up to July 1, 1947, I have received the proportionate part of my salary as reported in registration filed October 3, 1946. In addition I have received $18.20, being the amount of expense incurred by me. My expenditures have been only the said amount. (2) Restaurant cashiers, parking lot, and filling-station attendants, and the like. (3) Luncheons, gasoline, parking fees, etc. (4) The Property Owner, regular publication of the National Home and Property Owners Foundation. (5) Any legislation vitally affecting the owners of homes, the owners of other real property, and those interested in the private ownership of property.

Macleay, Lachlan, Mississipoi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) Total reimbursable expenses in connection with general work done for the Mississippi Valley Association, all reimbursed by association, $705.21. (2) Railroads, etc., $297.05; hotels and miscellaneous, $408.16. (3) Travel, subsistence, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) A portion of Mr. Macleay's time was used in regard to legislation relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement, the American merchant marine, soil conservation, flood control, regulation of domestic transportation.

Macnamee, W. Bruce, Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C., received, $565.72; expended, none. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Magee, Miss Elizabeth S., the National Consumers League, 348 Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, part time, January 29 through May 29, 1947, $999.96; travel, Washington, D. C., $58.83. (2) [Blank.] (3) Travel and living expenses. (4) National Consumers League Bulletin. (5) Supporting minimum-wage legislation, extension of social security.

Manly,[5] Milo A. National Council for a Permanent FEPC, room 901, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Maintenance and travel from January 1, 1947, to March 21, 1947, $500.73. (2) [Blank.] (3) For travel and living purposes. (4) None. (5) Permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission.

Manly,[6] Milo A., National Council for a Permanent FEPC, room. 901, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Maintenance and travel from April 1 to June 30, 1947, $407.57; salary, April 1 to June 30, 1947, $1,011.44. (2) [Blank.] (3) For travel and living purposes, $407.57; salary after tax deductions, $1,011.44. (4) None. (5) Permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission, S. 984, H. R. 2824.

Margolin, Leo Jay, Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None except as filed with certificate of registration. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2910; emergency temporary legislation on displaced persons.

Margolin, Mrs. Olya, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) $875 in salary received from National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y., none of which was spent in connection with work; $21.62, received from above, spent for postage and carfare. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Not employed specifically to support or oppose any legislation, but for the purpose of securing information to be transmitted to headquarters for the preparation of educational and other material.

Mark, James, Jr., United Mine Workers of America, 900–907 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Since April 1, 1947, there has been received by affiant as salary the sum of $1,750 and as per diem for personal living expenses the sum of $546, a total of $2,296. (2) No sums in any amount have been paid by affiant to any person other than affiant's expenditures for normal, everyday living expenses such as transportation, meals, etc., in the regular discharge of his duties. (3) Answered in (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.

Marks, Raymond E., Southern Pacific Co., 139 North Virginia Street, Reno, Nev. (1) Expended and was reimbursed $1,054.60, which was expended as follows: Meals, $533.24; hotel, $195; pullman accommodations, $173.45; streetcar, taxicab, and bus fares or gasoline, $49.05; tips, $74.50; miscellaneous expenditures, including telephone tolls, postage, incidentals, $29.36. (2) Hotel Statler, Washington, various restaurants, pullman and railroad companies, taxi drivers, porters, bellboys, waiters, telephone companies, etc. (3) Meals and lodging, pullman accommodations, taxi and bus service, telephone calls, postage, porter, bellboy, water, and other services. (4) None. (5) Federal legislation affecting Nevada railroads (Southern Pacific, Union Pacific, Western Pacific), for example, S. 110, Reed-Bulwinkle; S. 670, Hawkes; H. R. 1639, Jennings; H. R. 3150, Howell; and any other affecting the interests of those railroads.

Marran, Donald J., the American Tobacco Co., 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of the above address, of which registrant is an associate, expended $3.29 in connection with the proposed legislation described in item (5) hereof, for which it was or will be reimbursed by the American Tobacco Co. (2) New York Telephone Co., $7.69; United States Post Office Department, 60 cents. (3) Telephone toll calls and postage stamps. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation extending the 85-percent dividend-received credit to dividends received from resident foreign corporations to the extent that such resident foreign corporations derive income from United States sources.

Marsh, Benjamin C., People's Lobby, Inc., 810 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Total receipts (largest contribution $75), $2,280.55; salaries and wages, $1,242.30; printing and bulletin, $1,208.95; postage, $430.34; rent, $165; Andrew Walker, supplies, $30.97; conference expenses, $76.10; Andrew Paper Co., $12.70; incidentals, $62.04. (2) Various. (3) Salaries and wages for publicity and clerical work, other for maintaining office and getting out material. (4) Have sent and distributed material to hundreds of papers, magazines, etc., but have not caused any to be published; it was intelligence on their part. (5) None.

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed with the Clerk only.
[5] Filed for first quarter.
[6] Filed for second quarter.

Marshall, J. Paull, 528 Union Trust Building, Washington D. C.; Railroad Security Owners Association, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) No money received; $16.55 expended for taxicab fares. (2) Taxi drivers. (3) For transportation to Capitol and return. (4) None. (5) Support H. R. 2298 and S. 249 as originally introduced and oppose H. R. 3237 and H. R. 3980 and the Reed-Myers amendments to S. 249.

Marston, R. B., director, legislative-Federal relations division, National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,970.84, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $294.16 expenses. (2) Self (salary); expenses: hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein). Informative articles in State education magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Masaoka, Mike M., national legislative director, P. O. Box 1628; Washington, D. C.; Japanese American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, Inc., 403 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) All moneys received include only monthly salary and expenses as explained in form B, filed, January 22, 1947. Expended, $446.02. (2) Telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs. (3) Information, contacts, transportation. (4) News stories in Japanese-language and Japanese-American newspapers relating to work here are only articles known to have been published because of our contacts with them. See accompanying list. (5) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States.

Maslow, Will, American Jewish Congress, Inc., 1834 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received salary, $112.50; expended approximately $20. (2) Telephone company, taxicabs, and restaurant owners. (3) Telephone calls, taxicabs, lunches. (4) Signed letter to New York Times, May 6, 1947. (5) Ives antidiscrimination bill, S. 984; Stratton bill to admit 400,000 DP's, H. R. 2910; Rees bill, Federal employee loyalty bill, H. R. 3813; Taft-Hartley labor-relations bill, H. R. 3020; Case antilynching bill, H. R. 3488; Taft Federal-aid-to-education bill, S. 472; Fellows deportation bill, H. R. 2933; Klein bill, amendments to GI bill of rights, H. R. 867.

Mason, Water J., American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $103. (2) Walter J. Mason. (3) National legislative representative; taxis and phone calls. (4) [Blank.] (5) Affecting labor.

Mathews, P. H., 179 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.; Howard S. Palmer, James Lee Loomis, Henry B. Sawyer, trustees, New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 71 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn. (1) Total expenses, $1,517.24; salary (net), $1,935.98; total, $3,453.22. It is to be noted that the registrant's principal employment is legislative work in Massachusetts and most of April was spent in Massachusetts and had no relationship to Federal legislative work; however, all moneys received by registrant are reported herewith. (2) Expenses paid to various sources for living expenses, transportation, other incidentals to living away from registrant's home. (3) As noted in item 2. (4) None. (5) Various legislation pertaining to the railroad industry.

Mecartney, Malcolm, 10 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.; employed as associate counsel by Protective Committee for C. R. I. & P. Railway, 7- and 6-percent preferred stock, 209 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received from above-named protective committee $1,300 to apply on account of fees (see note below), and $1,867.18 for expenses, of which $1,752.49 was expended during the quarter. (Payment of $75 per week on account of fees under conditions stated in item 4 of registration Form B was subsequently modified by the committee to $100 per week under same conditions, retroactive to January 1, 1947.) (2) Various. (3) Hotels, meals, telephone, etc. (4) None. (5) I was not employed to support or oppose any legislation. I was employed in 1935 as associate counsel for said committee to represent the interests of the preferred stockholders of the Rock Island Railway in the pending reorganization proceedings, and incident to such general employment, I was asked by the committee to urge the support of legislation (such as S. 1253, 79th Cong.) designed to prevent the unwarranted forfeiture of railroad securities, including Rock Island preferred stock, now imminently threatened in pending reorganization proceedings.

Mechem, Frank L., P. E. Harris & Co. et al., 603 Central Building, Seattle, Wash. (1) As stated in answer to question (4) on Form B, the only money received by registrant is (a) legal fee on per-diem basis for services performed and (b) reimbursement for traveling expenses. No money was received during the preceding calendar quarter by way of legal fees and the total amount of reimbursement for traveling expenses was $1,396.62. (2) See (3). (3) The only expenditures during the preceding calendar quarter consisted of traveling expenses covering air and railroad transportation, hotel, meals, telephone and telegraph tolls. (4) None. (5) The formulation and presentation of proposed legislative program designed to stabilize certain phases of the Alaska salmon industry.

Meeks, E. A., National League of District Postmasters of the U. S. A., 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,500 salary for quarter ending June 30, 1947. (2) E. A. Meeks. (3) Salary. (4) The Postmasters' Advocate, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (5) Postal legislation affecting postmasters.

Messer, Ross A., National Association of Post Office Custodial Employees, post-office box 1611, 525 New Jersey Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,000; expenses, $435.23. (2) [Blank.] (3) Expenses include telephone, telegraph, post-office-box rent, taxi, office supplies, etc., necessary for operating Washington office. (4) Post Office Custodial News, published by the National Association of Post Office Custodial Employees. (5) All beneficial legislation for all postal employees.

Middleton, P. Harvey, Railway Business Association, Room 814, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) The only money received by me during the period from April 1 to June 30, 1947, was $4,000 in salary, gross. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) I have not, during this period, engaged in any efforts to support or oppose any particular legislation.

Miles, Clarence R., United States Chamber of Commerce, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received: Salary, $3,750; expenses, $129.82. Expended: Transportation, $4,615; meals, $19.90; telephone, $63.77. (2) Taxi companies, telephone company, and restaurants. (3) Transportation to and from, and communication with, the Capitol; other normal and necessary expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation of interest to business, such as bills on taxes, budget control, portal-to-portal pay suits, general labor, census, etc.

Miller, Charles C., 428 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; the Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) I received from my employer, the Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., during the past quarter a total of $1,262.50, covering my salary for time spent in legislative activities, and reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses, such as transportation, luncheons, office and secretarial expenses, printing, etc., an additional sum of $395.56. (2) During this quarter, with no single expenditure exceeding $10, the total outlay included: $124.83 for transportation, meals, tips; and $270.73 for office expenses, including office supplies, secretarial services, mimeographing, phone, and office rental prorated on the basis of time devoted to legislative activities as indicated in the registrant's letter of February 17, 1947, which was attached to my registration forms filed at that time. (3) [Blank.] (4) Press coverage consisted of general news reports covering the testimony of rubber-manufacturing industry witnesses before congressional committees and of general news releases on the production and consumption statistics of the rubber-manufacturing industry. (5) Bills pertaining to long-term legislation on national rubber policy, on the transportation of flammable materials, and on proposed revisions of the excise taxes.

Miller, Dale, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.; Dallas Chamber of Commerce, Dallas, Tex.; Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, Houston, Tex.; Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N. Y. (1) Received $1,500, plus $750 expenses, from Dallas Chamber of Commerce; $1,500 from Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas; $1,500, plus $527.09 expenses, from Texas Gulf Sulphur Co. Expended $1,277.09. This sum includes all business expenses in Washington, only a small portion of which would apply to activities within the purview of the act. (2) Carlyn Apartments, Mayflower Hotel, United States post office, telephone and telegraph companies, local transportation facilities, stationers, food, and beverage establishments. (3) Apartment rent, $438; office rent, $375; taxi fares, etc., $132; telephone and telegraph, $84.45; stamps, stationery, other usual office expenses, $98.64; entertainment and miscellaneous, $149. (4) Monthly article in Dallas magazine, official publication of Dallas Chamber of Commerce. (5) Presently legislation affecting flood control, water transportation, river and harbor improvement, and taxes.

Milton, Charles J., 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N. J.; Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3237 and S. 249.

Miskimins,[4] Scott A., 103 Pendleton Street, Independence, Mo., Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc. (1) January 1, 1947, to April 1, 1947, financed by commissions received, $629.94; expenses while away from home, $279.58. (2) The usual expense incurred when traveling about the State of Missouri. (3) To educate our citizens in regards to the need of a broad social-security plan, to preserve free enterprise, to promote the Townsend national recovery plan legislation, to protect the dignity of the whole of our people. (4) None. (5) The Townsend national recovery plan, to support it.

Mollin, F. E., American National Live Stock Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo. (1) Have had no special contributions for lobbying purposes. The association finances handled in normal fashion. (2) No payments to any one in connection with lobbying activities. Only part of the expense of myself as executive secretary of the association on trips to Washington in past quarter could be chargeable to such. Total expense for this purpose: $286.15; telephone and telegraph, $11.24; Washington stenographer, $37.04. (4) Our own official publication, the American Cattle Producer. (5) Legislation to authorize and finance participation of our Bureau of Animal Industry in Mexican campaign against foot-and-mouth disease. Most of the above expense actually was in March, but not rendered until I returned home in April.

Molnar,[4] Joseph, 229 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $42 received. (2) None. (3) Used for living expenses. (4) None. (5) Supporting legislation for the unemployed.

[4] Filed with the Clerk only.

Montague, Joe G., Petroleum Building, Fort Worth, Tex.; Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers' Association. (1) $946.13. (2) Traveling expenses, American Airlines, Braniff Airways, hotels, other bills not yet paid will be included in next report. (3) Trips from Fort Worth to Chicago and Washington and return. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting livestock.

Monteith, Galloway, box 247, Hamlet, N. C.; Brotherhood of Railway Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) Expenses $193.87. (2) Galloway Monteith. (3) Expenses and salary. (4) None. (5) Crosser amendments—Railroad Retirement Act in support in opposition to Taft-Hartley bill, H. R. 2030.

Mooney, William W., 505 South Eleventh Street, Tacoma, Wash., Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Total intake as per commissions on contributions made to Townsend National Recovery Plan Headquarters for 3-month period coming from State of Washington, total $978.66; tax deductions, $140.35; net $838.31. (2) William W. Mooney, Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., representative in State of Washington. (3) Personal use, office and travel expense over State of Washington. (4) Townsend National Weekly. Notices and articles at different times are mailed to Townsend National Weekly, located at 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan bill (H. R. 16) now in Ways and Means Committee of Congress.

Moore, Chester B., Western Growers Association, 606 South Hill Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Regular salary as managing director of Western Growers Association, plus traveling expenses. (2) By me, to all regular accounts of my personal and business life. (3) [Blank.] (4) Western Grower and Shipper. (5) Am paid regular salary. Not directly employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. I do from time to time support or oppose any legislation of interest to our members.

Moore, Clayton, R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N. C. (1) Actual expenses incurred, $90.22. No receipts other than annual salary as set forth in registration form. (2) Eastern & Capital Airlines, $33.12; taxi fares, $9.50; hotel and telephone, $25.10; meals, $22.50. (3) Travel, taxi fares, hotel, telephone, and meals. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation affecting R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.

Moran, Raymond H., 46 Burnside Avenue, Cranford, N. J., International Association of Machinists. (1) Salary, $1,200. Expenses, $483.90. No other expenditures except living expenses. (2) Hotel Hamilton, and Ambassador, taxicabs, meals in restaurants, laundry, postage, telephone, etc. (3) All living, transportation, and telephone expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation pertaining to railroad labor, particularly opposing all bills affecting the now existing Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Acts.

Morelock, Phil D., Commerce Trust Building, Kansas City, Mo.; Massman Construction Co., Kansas City, Mo. (1) None with respect to this or any other matters before the Legislature. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2192 for the relief of Massman Construction Co., Kansas City, Mo.

Morgan, Gerald D., Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; Alaska Transportation Co. (1) Engaged in legislative activity, all in connection with House Joint Resolution 122, for 4½ days, for which firm of Morgan & Calhoun received $450 from Grosscup, Ambler & Stephan, Seattle, Wash., general counsel for Alaska Transportation Co. Expended in connection with such legislative activity not more than $171.58 for telephone and teletype messages to Seattle, for which firm of Morgan & Calhoun received reimbursement from Grosscup, Ambler & Stephan, Seattle, Wash. This sum includes expenses in connection with nonlegislative matters, but an allocation is impossible. (2) $171.58 paid to Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., for telephone and teletype service. (3) (See above.) (4) None. (5) Only legislative activity was appearance before Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on House Joint Resolution 122 in behalf of Alaska Transportation Co.; preparation of proposed amendment to such resolution and conferences with members of Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and members of staff of Maritime Commission with respect thereto; and preparing and delivering to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce a letter suggesting the adoption of the amendment.

Morrow, Giles, Freight Forwarders Institute, 225 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary as set forth in Form B, previously filed plus $131.95 as reimbursement for traveling expenses, taxi fares and other incidental expenses incurred on office business. Salary and reimbursement of expenses covered all services rendered Freight Forwarders Institute, only a small part of which related to legislation. (2) Hotel New Yorker, Pennsylvania Railroad, and various taxi drivers in Washington and New York. (3) For actual expenses while away from Washington and for transportation on office business in Washington. (4) Articles in I. C. C. Practitioners' Journal regarding matters of interest to practitioners before the Interstate Commerce Commission. (5) Any legislation directly affecting the interests of freight forwarders subject to Part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act. Testified before House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in favor of bill S. 110.

Morse, Henry Hoyt, 142 Central Street, Gardner, Mass.; Institute of Cooking and Heating Appliance Manufacturers, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C. (1) No money received. (2) No money paid. (3) No work undertaken. (4) Stove builder. (5) None.

Mosier, Harold G., Hotel Shoreham, Washington, D. C.; The Glenn L. Martin Co., Middle River, Baltimore, Md. (1) See attached sheet.[2] (2) See attached sheet.[2] (3) See attached sheet.[2] (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting aviation.

Mullin,[4] Pat, Foreman's Association of America, Ford Chapter No. 1, 5746 Schaefer Road, Dearborn, Mich.; (1) $1,500 salary as chapter president. $136.90 actual expenses incurred for lobbying in Washington. (2) Various. (3) Salary as chapter president. Actual expenses incurred for lobbying in Washington. (4) The Ford Foreman, official publication of the Ford chapter of the Foreman's Association of America. (5) H. R. 8, a bill in the House of Representatives; S. 55, a bill in the Senate.

Murph, Daniel S., The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $500 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 2494, H. R. 3421, H. R. 869, and S. 1251.

Murphy, Dr. Emmett J., 5737 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., National Chiropractic Insurance Co. (1) None received. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) National Chiropractic Journal. (5) None specified. At present time supporting S. 1428, the Langer bill.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed with the Clerk only.

Murray,[5] Donald, United Public Workers of America, CIO, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, 3 months, $1,000. Reimbursement for expenses, 3 months, $23.30. (2) Salary paid to merchants and tradesmen for personal living expenses of self and family and to Liberty Building Association for monthly installments on home mortgage. Expenses paid to taxi drivers and operators of parking lots for taxi fares and parking fees. (3) For personal living expenses and housing for self and family and for personal transportation in connection with work. (4) Council Newsletters and Legislative Guide, mimeographed bulletins issued by the United Public Workers of America to its members. The Public Record, official monthly publication of the United Public Workers of America. (5) Employed to support all legislation favorable to employees of the Federal Government or the employees of States, counties, and municipalities, or favorable to labor generally. To oppose all legislation unfavorable to the above-named groups.

Murray,[6] Donald, United Public Workers of America, CIO, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, 3 months, $1,000. Reimbursement for expenses, 3 months, $25.25. (2) Salary paid to merchants and tradesmen for personal living expenses of self and family and to Liberty Building Association for monthly installments on home mortgage. Expenses paid to taxi drivers and operators of parking lots for taxi fares and parking fees. (3) For personal living expenses and housing for self and family and for personal transportation in connection with work. (4) Council Newsletters and Legislative Guide, mimeographed bulletins issued by the United Public Workers of America to its members. The Public Record, official monthly publication of the United Public Workers of America. (5) Employed to support all legislation favorable to employees of the Federal Government or the employees of States, counties, and municipalities, or favorable to labor generally. To oppose all legislation unfavorable to the above-named groups.

Myrup, Andrew William, 932 Bowen Building, 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Bakery and Confectionery Workers' International Union, 2719 North Wilton Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary of $103 per week, $1,404 a quarter. (2) To the registrant. (3) Salary for conducting the research department of the International Union with the following duties in the interest of our membership; to collect statistical data and compile same for use of the member locals in negotiations, such surveys to cover hours and earnings, contract clauses, economic data on the industries in which our members work. Also to act as liaison between our organization and various Government agencies, such as NLRB, Labor, Commerce, Agriculture, Social Security, etc., and to watch the progress of legislation both Federal and State in nature. (4) None. (5) None.

Nagel, Jacob, National Association of Post Office Mechanics and Maintenance Employees, 238 First Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) January 1, 1947, to March 31, 1947, $89.85; April 1, 1947, to June 30, 1947, $37.07; total for year, $176.92. (2) Hotels, restaurants, cab fare, travel, entertainment, etc. (3) Meals, entertainment, cab fare, travel, etc. (4) The Postal Mechanic (magazine). (5) To legislate benefits for the members and oppose any legislation that is destructive to the organization and the members.

National Postal Committee for Books, room 305, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. See registration for statement of membership of committee. (1) Contributions from publishing companies were received from 42 publishers, book dealers, or associations of publishers or book dealers and one individual, $36,427. Expenditures: Traveling

[5] Filed for first quarter.
[6] Filed for second quarter.

expenses of representatives, $101.75; Conway Printing Co., Inc., 416 West Thirty-third Street, New York City, for processing letters, $2,575; Educational List Co., Inc., 110 West Fortieth Street, New York City, for addressing envelopes, $136.35; Macmillan Co., 60 Fifth Avenue, New York City, for sealing and mailing envelopes, $2,907.39. (2) Traveling expenses to Prof. Norman Pearson, Yale University, New Haven, Conn., and to Mr. Norman D. Donaldson, Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn. (See answer to question 1 for other expenses.) (3) See answers to questions 1 and 2, above. (4) Publishers Weekly, New York, N. Y. (5) The committee opposes unfair increases in postage rates and discrimination in postage rates as contained in H. R. 2408 and H. R. 3519.

Nau, Carlton L., general manager, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., American Public Power Association; same. (1) See attached.[2] (2) See attached.[2] (3) See attached.[2] (4) None. (5) See attached.[2]

Neal, William S., 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C., National Association of Manufacturers. (1) $1,171.65 of which $1,000 is salary and $171.65 is expense money for expenditures such as taxicabs, luncheons, telephone communication, received from National Association of Manufacturers. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislative program of National Association of Manufacturers, which includes labor legislation, tax reduction, economy on government, opposition to unnecessary expansion of bureaus.

Neel, Samuel E., 407 Chandler Building, 1427 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; retained by Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) From April 1 to June 30, 1947: Received, April, $350; May, $916.66; June, $916.66; total, $2,683.32. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Washington News letter, published biweekly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America; letter to members, published irregularly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America; the Mortgage Banker, published irregularly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America. (5) Matters affecting the mortgage-banking industry.

Nelson, G. W., 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) None received. (2) None (3) None. (4) None. (5) Opposing antilabor legislation and favoring legislation of benefit to labor.

Nelson, George R., Grand Lodge Representative, Machinist Building, Washington, D. C.; International Association of Machinists. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Nelson,[4] Jepson L., 3927 Pine Street, Philadelphia, Pa., Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Train, $19.50; taxi, $4.95; hotel, $7.50; meals, $14.80; Phone $2.85; salary, $57.60; total expenditures, $107. (2) Pennsylvania Railroad, Continental Hotel, taxicabs, restaurant, and communications. (3) Transportation, communications, and living expenses. (4) None. (5) The Veterans' Preference Act of 1944.

Nelson, W. Allen, 23708 Warner Street, Farmington, Mich.; Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barium Tower, Detroit, Mich. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None. I have engaged in no lobbying activity during the second quarter of 1947.

Newcomb, Elliott H., AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), Victor Building, Washington D. C. (1) No expense money drawn or expended, except petty cash for taxi fares. (2) See (1). (3) See (2). (4) National AMVET. (5) Legislation providing care and assistance for veterans of World War II and their dependents.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Newton, R. Wayne, National Association of Cooperatives, 407 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $2,120; expenses, $457.57. (2) R. Wayne Newton. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Employed to counteract the antifarmer-co-op lobbying activities of (1) the National Tax Equality Association, (2) Vernon Scott and Loring Schuler, whether lobbying individually, as officers and employees of the National Tax Equality Association or as a firm of organization and industry counsellors claiming the National Tax Equality Association as a client, (3) all State and local "tax equality" associations and all national, State, and local small business or other associations however known which are subsidized from, or contributors to the lobbying funds of the National Tax Equality Association.

Neibell, Paul M., 1829 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Creek Nation of Indians of Oklahoma, Oklahoma. (1) No money received or expended during preceding calendar quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the Creek Nation of Indians of Oklahoma.

Nixon, Russ, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, CIO, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,040; expenses, $500. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers, etc. (3) Personal expenses in Washington and travel. These expenses covered both legislative and nonlegislative work. (4) UE News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy and prosperity, and the general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Noble, William R., National Retail Farm Equipment Association and National Retail Hardware Association, 1024 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Out-of-pocket expenses, $50.95. (2) Public transportation, telephone company, restaurants, and hotels. (3) Taxi fares, phone calls, and luncheons. (4) Farm Equipment Retailing, Hardware Retailer. (5) No specific legislation. Have taken a position on wage-and-hour legislation, taxation matters, and several minor bills.

Noffsinger,[4] J. S., National Home Study Council, National Council of Business Schools and National Council of Technical Schools, 839 Seventeenth Street NW. (1) Regular compensation of $——— per ———, from the National Council of Business Schools. (2) None for legislation under act. Did write one letter to chairman, Post Office and Civil Service Committee protesting H. R. 2408 on behalf of the National Home Study Council. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation in the Congress is a very small part of my duties. If legislation should arise as to affect either or all of the above associations I would act in the proper interest as I may be advised.

Nyce, Peter Q., 1266 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; self, general practice of law, employed by numerous individuals. (1) No money received and none expended. (2) None paid. (3) None paid. (4) None. (5 Legislation involving lands acquired by the United States.

O'Brien, John, 1 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; Riegel Textile Corp., 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) None received. Expenditures for transportation, meals, and lodging, total, $43.43. (2) Railroad company, taxi fares, and porters, hotels and restaurants. (3) Same as (1). (4) None. (5) Proposals for relief of work-glove manufacturers on account of payments made in settlement of controversy with Office of Price Administration.

O'Connor,[4] Edward H., 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.; Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary received during quarter, $2,125.02; reimbursement for traveling expenses, $822.93. (2) Paid out $822.93 in traveling expenses to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, and miscellaneous items of personal expense. (3) For personal traveling expenses of the undersigned incurred in carrying out my work for the Insurance Economics Society of America. Only $175.92 of such travel expenses is attributable to travel necessitated by my lobbying activities. (4) Two releases to all Chicago daily newspapers, press associations, principal insurance periodicals, trade journals, and 1,200 rural weeklies. Both releases covered the Howell bill, H. R. 3150, and the Hawkes bill, S. 670. Unable to estimate number actually published. (5) The Howell bill, H. R. 3150, and its companion Senate bill, S. 670, by HAWKES, and S. 1320 and its companion H. R. 3548.

O'Connor,[4] John J., Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; Society of Marine Inspectors, Washington, D. C. (1) $900 received, nothing expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 3494.

O'Dunne, Eugene, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) $2,500, compensation; $53.93, expenditures; $2,553.93, total. (2) [Blank.] (3) $53.93 for taxicab fares, telephone tolls, and telegrams. (4) None. (5) S. 814, amendment to section 4 as reported by House Agricultural Committee; H. R. 2860, amendment to section 1 (b).

Ogg, William Raymond, 857 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 58 East Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $91.75 expended. (See item (6) of Form B, filed December 1946.) (2) Taxis, restaurants. (3) Transportation, luncheon conferences. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Extension of a temporary farm-labor program; establishment of a permanent farm-labor program; amendments to Federal Farm Loan Act and Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act; extension of Commodity Credit Corporation; establishment of a national soil fertility policy and program; extension of Sugar Act; wool price support; marketing agreement amendments; housing; Federal aid to education; amendments to Reclamation Act; taxation; amendments to National Labor Relations Act; St. Lawrence waterway; foreign trade; international trade organization; Inland Waterways Corporation; library service demonstration; abolishment of Jackson Hole Monument; agricultural appropriations; crop insurance; appropriation for Hospital Survey and Construction Act; Insecticide Act; plant quarantine; foreign relief; statute of limitations; displaced persons; appropriations for agricultural program of Tennessee Valley Authority; transfer of Crab Orchard project in Illinois to Department of the Interior; Parker River Wildlife Refuge in Massachusetts.

O'Hara, Bart W., 450 Equitable Building; secretary to treasurer, Colorado Tax & Equality Commission, Inc., 450 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Oliver, John P., 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Reserve Officers Association of the United States. (1) April 1947, $625 salary, plus $10.90 taxi fares; May 1947, $625 salary, plus $12.40 taxi fares; June 1947, $625 salary, plus $16.50 taxi fares. (2) The grocer, the baker, the landlord, taxi drivers, etc. (3) Living expenses for self and family; transportation, taxes of various kinds. (4) The Reserve Officer, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (5) Legislation for the development and execution of a military policy for the United States which will provide adequate national security.

[4] Filed with the Clerk only.

O'Neal, Edw. A., American Farm Bureau Federation, 58 East Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $1,069.80 expended. (See item (6) of Form B filed December 1946.) (2) Taxi fares, train fares, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Transportation, lodging, and luncheon conferences. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Extension of a temporary farm-labor program; establishment of a permanent farm-labor program; amendments to Federal Farm Loan Act and Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act; extension of Commodity Credit Corporation; establishment of a national soil-fertility policy and program; extension of Sugar Act; wool-price support; marketing agreement amendments; housing; Federal aid to education; amendments to Reclamation Act; taxation; amendments to National Labor Relations Act; St. Lawrence waterway; foreign trade; International Trade Organization; Inland Waterways Corporation; library-service demonstration; abolishment of Jackson Hole Monument; agricultural appropriations; crop insurance; appropriation for Hospital Survey and Construction Act; Insecticide Act; plant quarantine; foreign relief; statute of limitations; displaced persons; appropriations for agricultural program of Tennessee Valley Authority; transfer of Crab Orchard project in Illinois to Department of the Interior; Parker River Wildlife Refuge in Massachusetts.

O'Neil,[7] Thomas G., 83 Main Street, Sidney, N. Y. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) No particular legislation; interested in legislation tending toward tax equality.

Owens, T. R., 718 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.; United Rubber Workers of America, High at Mill Street, Akron, Ohio. (1) Salary, $1,040; expenses, $902.63. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Oxholm, Mrs. Theodor, Volunteer Worker for Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) $18.15. (2) Mrs. Theodor Oxholm. (3) Railroad fare, taxis, and meals on trip from New York to Washington, D. C., and return, May 27, 1947, for meeting with directors of Spokesmen for Children. (4) [Blank.] (5) Federal legislation specifically affecting children and child welfare.

Parel, James Donald, 857 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 58 East Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $55 expended. (See item (6) of Form B filed December 1946.) (2) Taxis. (3) Transportation. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting, resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Extension of a temporary farm-labor program; establishment of a permanent farm-labor program; amendments to Federal Farm Loan Act and Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act; extension of Commodity Credit Corporation; establishment of a national soil-fertility policy and program; extension of Sugar Act; wool price support; marketing-agreement amendments; housing; Federal aid to education; amendments to Reclamation Act; taxation; amendments to National Labor Relations Act; St. Lawrence waterway; foreign trade; International Trade Organization; Inland Waterways Corporation; library service demonstration; abolishment of Jackson Hole Monument; agricultural appropriations; crop insurance; appropriation for Hospital Survey and Construction Act; Insecticide Act; plant quarantine; foreign relief; statute of limitations; displaced persons; appropriations for agricultural program of Tennessee Valley Authority; transfer of Crab Orchard project in Illinois to Department of the Interior; Parker River Wildlife Refuge in Massachusetts.

Paterson, Chat, 206 Barr Building, 910 Seventeenth Street, Washington, D. C.; American Veterans Committee, Inc., 1860 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary at rate of $6,500 per annum; approximately $50 per month expenses. (2) Chat Paterson. (3) To implement veterans, national and international platforms of the American Veterans Committee. (4) AVC Bulletin. (5) Legislation affecting veterans, national and international platforms of AVC.

Paulson, Nathan J., 1536 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Investors League, Inc. (1) $355.40. (2) Railroad companies, telephone company, taxicab drivers, public stenographers, stationers. (3) Transportation, $92.45; telephone, $12.55; office and stenographer, $192.25; miscellaneous, $58.15. (4) None, except that I write a monthly column for the League Bulletin. (5) All legislation affecting the investor.

Payne, Albert Alford, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards. (1) See attached.[7] (2) See attached.[7] (3) See attached.[7] (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Pearson, Robert W., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Perry, Leslie S., National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW. (1) Salary at rate of $4,200 per year; expended $16.26. (2) Various. (3) Taxi fares, telephone calls, etc. (4) NAACP Bulletin. (5) FEPC, antipoll tax, antilynch, minimum wage, Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing, Murray-Dingell health, Wagner-Murray-Dingell social security, and similar social welfare legislation.

Petersen, William J., 704 Insurance Building, Madison, Wis., Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce. (1) Received my regular salary as executive secretary for the Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, for which I performed my regular duties as chief administrative officer of the chamber, which said duties were related only incidentally to Federal legislation. Aside from my regular salary nothing was received nor spent for the purpose of influencing Federal legislation. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Such legislation affecting business and industry generally as I may be instructed to give attention to from time to time.

Peterson, Esther, 1034 Earle Building, Washington, D. C.; Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 15 Union Square, New York, N. Y. (1) Received salary of $1,105; received $426.69 to reimburse actual expenses incurred; $269.75 of this amount was for expenses incurred in Washington; remainder for expenses outside of Washington. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) CIO News and the Advance. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Place, Henry C., care of Townsend, Elliott & Munson, 1100 Provident Trust Building, Seventeenth and Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pa., National Association of Electric Companies. (1) The firm received from the National Association of Electric Companies $6,225 for legal services for the quarter and reimbursement of $672.26 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all legal services to the association, only a part of which fee and expenses was for those purposes described in section 308 (a) or otherwise within the scope of Public Law No. 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, railroads, taxicabs, telephone, and telegraph companies. (3) Railroad and transportation, $155.89; hotel and meals, $197.46; telephone and telegraph, $266.46; photostating of documents, postage, and miscellaneous, $52.45. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which our firm is counsel, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on all problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association, therefore, is interested in any and all legislation that might affect its members directly or indirectly as going business concerns.

Pollitzer,[7] Miss Anita, 144 B Street NE., Washington, D. C., National Woman's Party. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Pope Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., California Fruit Growers Exchange and others. (1) Receipts, $850; expenditures, $5.40. (2) Taxi drivers. (3) Taxi fares. (4) None. (5) H. R. 452, S. 306, H. R. 1825, H. R. 2160.

Poston,[8] Robert R., 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) $201.40 salary semimonthly, less withholding and social-security taxes. (2) Robert R. Poston. (3) [Blank.] (4) The American Legion Magazine, New York City; the National Legionnaire, Indianapolis, Ind. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations; the development of sound civil-aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee, which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

Poston,[6] Robert R., 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) $199.30 salary semimonthly, less withholding and social-security taxes; $17.50 incidental expenses for April, May, and June, 1947; $27.54 for traveling expenses during April, May, and June, 1947. (2) Robert R. Poston. (3) $17.50 incidental expenses for April, May, and June, 1947, carfare, luncheons; $27.54 reimbursement for traveling expenses, trip, one way from Louisville, Ky. (4) The American Legion Magazine, New York City; the National Legionnaire, Indianapolis, Ind. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents

[7] Filed with the Secretary only.

[8] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[6] Filed with the Clerk only.

[8] Filed for first quarter.

[6] Filed for second quarter.

on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations, the development of sound civil-aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

Poulton, J. E., Grand Lodge representative, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C., International Association of Machinists. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Pratt, Edith C., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) $960 salary; $19.35 expenses. (2) To restaurants and cab drivers, etc., for expenses. (3) Expenses connected with work in Washington. (4) [Blank.] (5) Support legislation authorized by the convention and executive board of the United Steelworkers and by the convention and executive board of the National CIO; oppose legislation contrary to the stand of these organizations.

Pratt, Foster J., International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects and Draftsmen's Unions, AFL, room 908, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) As president he received a monthly salary ($600), minus withholding and social-security taxes; expended for personal living expenses. (2) Foster J. Pratt. (3) Salary received and expended for personal services as administrative and executive head of the International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects and Draftsmen's Unions, AFL (lobbying is minor and incidental). (4) International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects and Draftsmen's Unions, AFL, Weekly Federal News Letter; Railroad Bulletin and Monthly Outlook for the dissemination of organization news, including legislation. (5) Beneficial to the employees in the engineering and architectural professions.

Press, William H., Washington Board of Trade, 204 Star Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,500; expenses, $215.87. (2) Miscellaneous travel expenses, taxi and transportation, dinners, lunches, etc. (3) Normal operating expenses. (4) Releases sent to Washington newspapers—Evening Star, Washington Post, Times-Herald, and Washington Daily News. (5) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia.

Proctor, Harry E.,[5] 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; Oliver & Donnally, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $2,600 paid the registrant as salary by Oliver & Donnally; no expenditures. (2) No expenditures. (3) None. (4) The registrant contributed articles for the January, February, and March issues of Mutual Savings Banking, a trade publication of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks. (5) The registrant studied and analyzed a number of bills pertaining to banks, savings and loan associations, taxes, railroads, veterans, and housing. The registrant's duties do not call for support or opposition of legislation.

[5] Filed for first quarter.

Proctor,[6] Harry E., 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; Oliver & Donnally, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $2,000 paid the registrant as salary by Oliver & Donnally; no expenditures. (2) No expenditures. (3) None. (4) The registrant contributed articles for the April, May, and June issues of Mutual Savings Banking, a trade publication of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks. (5) The registrant studied and analyzed a number of bills pertaining to banks, saving and loan associations, taxes, railroads, veterans, and housing.

Publicity Associates, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) From National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, $3,840.47; for professional services, $2,250; for out-of-pocket expenses, $1,590.47. (2) Publicity Associates, Inc., for professional services, $2,250; see exhibit A[2] for detail of out-of-pocket expenses totaling $1,590.47. (3) Compiling and distributing information. (4) See exhibit B.[2] (5) To support legislation designed to free margarine from unfair taxes and other unfair trade barriers, and to oppose legislation creating such taxes and other trade barriers.

Purves, Edmund R., director of public and professional relations of the American Institute of Architects, 1741 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None except salary for this period, which amounted to $2,500. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation in relation to the architectural profession.

Pyke, John S., Jones, Day, Cockley & Reavis, 1759 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) None for second calendar quarter 1947. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) None. (5) H. R. 1945 and H. R. 1946.

Pyle,[5] Schuyler S., Fleet Reserve Asscciation, 429 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Pyle,[6] Schuyler S., Fleet Reserve Association, 429 Investment Building, Fifteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Quigley, Frank, 725 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York City. (1) $575. (2) Taxicabs, hotels, meals, incidental expenses; Wardman Park and other Washington hotels and clubs. (3) Out-of-pocket business expenses, costs of publications, stenographic services, and generally keeping informed on current events. (4) None. (5) None. Have furnished facts and figures and arranged for witnesses in connection with House Ways and Means Committee consideration of taxes, omnibus labor bill, and District of Columbia income-tax measure.

Raebeck, Helen, National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) $975 pro rata salary received from the National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Spotlight, a house organ of the National Council of Jewish Women, a small part of which is devoted to asking membership support of certain legislative measures. (5) None. My job is to keep the membership informed of legislative developments and indicate action they can take in support of certain bills.

Ramspeck, Robert, Air Transport Association of America, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Have received no compensation other than my regular salary as previously reported. (2) None. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation for the proper advancement of the air-line industry in the public interest. For specific legislation supported and opposed during this quarter, see exhibit A attached.[2]

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for first quarter.
[6] Filed for second quarter.

Rankin,[7] J. Lee, 714 Stuart Building, Lincoln, Nebr. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation designed to bring about equality of taxation between private business and cooperatives.

Rapp, Leslie M., Wabash Railroad Co., 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) $352.15, representing reimbursement from the law firm of Simpson Thacher & Bartlett for out-of-pocket expenses incurred in behalf of Wabash Railroad Co. Simpson Thacher & Bartlett has not been reimbursed by said railroad for any expenses nor has it yet received any fee for registrant's services on behalf of said railroad. (2) Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., Pennsylvania Railroad, and various taxi drivers. (3) Meals, lodging, and transportation. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3861, legislative action on which has been completed as of the date of this report.

Ray, L. S., 2015 Lanier Drive, Silver Spring, Md.; Disabled Emergency Officers of World Wars, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $100 per month. (2) [Blank.] (3) Salary. (4) None. (5) Legislation pertaining to emergency officers retired for physical disability.

Read, James M., Friends Committee on National Legislation, 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary, April, May, June 1947, $1,100; travel expense, $282.17. (2) Carfare, $152.66; meals, $18.50; telephone and telegraph, $44.56; Miscellaneous, $66.45; total, $282.17. (3) Travel is for the purpose of attending yearly meetings, quarterly meetings, or conferences of Friends and other groups to interpret developments in national and international policy with special reference to legislation, and for other committee business. (4) The organization sends a news letter to a limited number of subscribers and Friends about once a month. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization and world economic stability, world disarmament, foreign relief, aid to refugees, protection for racial minorities; support for the rights of conscience, opposition to conscription and the militarization of America.

Reck, Jacob, 1023 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers Association, 270 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) None for lobbying purposes. (2) None. (3) None. (4) National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers Association Bulletin which is issued by registrant in his capacity as counsel and Washington representative of National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers Association. (5) In my capacity as counsel of the National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers Association I appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee and urged the elimination of the excise tax on cosmetics used in beauty and barber shops. I am employed to urge support of H. R. 3825. This activity is an infinitesimally small portion of my other duties as counsel of National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers Association.

Reinhold, James P., the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary for calendar quarter as reported in registration Form B; also reimbursement in amount of $988.39 expended during calendar quarter, of which $691.89 was expended for purposes other than covered in the act. (2) Paid to hotel, various restaurants, taxicabs and automobile, telephones, and postage. (3) In furtherance of duties described in registration Form B, of which personal legislative activity is not my principal purpose but is occasional and incidental. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interest of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railroad Co.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[7] Filed with the Secretary only.

Reno,[4] Elmer, care of Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barlum Tower, Detroit, Mich. (1) $145.14 actual expenses incurred for lobbying in Washington, D. C. (2) Various. (3) Actual expenses incurred for lobbying in Washington, D. C. (4) The Supervisor, official publication of the Foreman's Association of America. (5) H. R. 8, a bill in the United States House of Representatives; S. 55, a bill in the United States Senate.

Rhodes, Hubert M., room 209, 3308 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Credit Union National Association, Inc., Madison, Wis. (1) Registrant is a regular employee of the Credit Union National Association, and receives no additional compensation for service on legislative work. The amount received and expended by him was $4.78. (2) Notary public, 50 cents; taxi fares to various taxicabs, $4.18; telephone tolls, 10 cents. (3) Notarizing reports required to be filed under the Lobbying Act for the quarter ended March 31, 1947; trips to House and Senate Office Buildings; and telephone calls. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting credit unions.

Rice, Richard M., Wisconsin Tax Equality Association, 231 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis. (1) Money received for salary, none; money received as reimbursement for actual expense, ———; money expended in carrying out legislative activities, ———. (2) Postoffice, ———; Jack's Letter Service, ———; telegraph, ———; O'Connell Printing Co., ———. (3) Post office for stamps; Jack's Letter Service, mailing, O'Connell Printing Co., printing. (4) None. (5) All legislation designed to effect tax equality between similar businesses.

Rice, Roland, American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration. He expended a total of $8.40. (2) The money was paid to various taxi drivers employed in taking registrant between his office and the Capitol or House or Senate Office Buildings. (3) The money paid taxi drivers was for transportation to and from my office as indicated in (2). (4) None. (5) Within the general responsibility of my office I am required, among other duties, to testify on bills affecting the trucking industry. Thus far testimony has been given by me on S. 49, S. 70, S. 110, H. R. 2157, H. R. 1467, H. R. 2109, H. R. 8, H. R. 725, S. 55, H. R. 3140, and H. R. 221.

Richardson, Mrs. Pearl, Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Riggle, John J., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for April, May, and June, 1947, $1,875 (before withholding taxes were deducted). Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Legislative Digest, a mimeographed résumé of legislation introduced which is of interest to agriculture. Distributed to national council members. (5) [Blank.]

Rising, E. W., Western Beet Growers Association, suite 3, 1215 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From Water Conservation Conference, continuing committee, none; Western Beet Growers Association, $533.38, less than 10 percent of which is for activities requiring to be reported under Lobbying Act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation affecting water rights established under laws of various States, legislation affecting domestic sugar-beet growers.

Ritter,[5] Patricia, Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Ritter,[6] Mrs. Patricia K., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statements. Employment terminated June 20, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Rivers,[5] T. E., National Recreation Association, 315 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) No specific bill but to make available information and experience on various proposals that might affect the extent and quality of recreation services for the people.

Rivers,[6] T. E., National Recreation Association, 315 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) During the quarter ending July 1, 1947, I have received and expended $40.29. (2) Railroad company, telephone company, restaurants, taxis. (3) Railroad fare, telephone calls, meals, transportation. (4) [Blank.] (5) S. 1229.

Robb, George Mackay, the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America, 942 Church Lane, Yeadon, Pa. (1) Salary received from J. S. Tibby, treasurer, April 1–June 30, 1947, $624.99; receipts as indicated on enclosed sheet,[2] $255.60. (2) Expenditure of $624.99 salary received from J. S. Tibby, as of item 1, was for personal living expenses, hence not accounted here. Expenditures for travel and other expenses as itemized on enclosed sheet,[2] $224.79. (3) Expenditures of $224.79, as itemized on enclosed sheet, were incurred in interviewing several Senators and Representatives or their secretaries; interviewing religious and civic leaders; lecturing on the Christian amendment; and advertising the Christian amendment movement. (4) The Covenanter Witness, D. R. Taggart, editor, 1209 Boswell Avenue, Topeka, Kans.; the Christian Patriot, S. E. Boyle, editor, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans. (5) An amendment to the Constitution of the United States that will provide for insertion in the preamble of the following words: "Devoutly recognizing the authority and law of Jesus Christ, the Saviour and king of nations" (full text of proposed legislation will be found in attached leaflet).

Robbins, Paul H., National Society of Professional Engineers, 1359 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary $437.50 and expenses $50 for April, May, and June 1947 for attention to legislative matters. (2) Regular office and travel expenses. (3) As executive director, National Society of Professional Engineers. (4) American Engineer; Legislative Bulletin, National Society of Professional Engineers. (5) All legislation affecting the welfare of professional engineers.

Roemer, Ruth, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, CIO, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $920; expenses, $154.33. (2) Hotels, restaurants, railroads, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses in Washington and travel. These expenses covered both legislative and nonlegislative work. (4) UE News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Rogers, James P., Western Woods Employers, 710 Lewis Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) Salary, $2,500; expenses, $1,915.05; only a part of the foregoing amounts concerns legislation. (2) (a) Statler Hotel, (b) Lafayette Hotel, (c) Shoreham Hotel, (d) miscellaneous. (3) In (2) above, respectively, (a) living expenses, $190.88; (b) living expenses, $113.45; (c) living expenses, $914.32; ((a), (b), and (c) include room, meals, telegraph, phone, stenographic services, and entertainment); (d) taxis, tips, meals, car rental, and miscellaneous, $696.40; only a part of the foregoing amounts concerns legislation. (4) Southern Lumberman. (5) General labor bills and Fair Labor Standards Act amendments.

Rogers, Watson, National Food Brokers Association, 843 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Root, Ballantine, Harlan, Bushby & Palmer, 31 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y., 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Greenwich Country Day School, Inc., Old Church Road, Greenwich, Conn. (1) No receipts or expenditures. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Legislation to extend old-age and survivors' insurance benefits on a permissive basis to school teachers.

Ross, John H., Oil Transfer Corp., 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y. (1) None received. (2) None paid. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at present.

Rowe, Roland H., United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 837 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) See attachment.[2] (2) See answer to (1) attached.[2] (3) See answer to (1) attached.[2] (4) Washington news letter service of United States Wholesale Grocers' Association and bulletin service of that association. (5) No legislation in particular; any legislation in general affecting the interests of wholesale grocers. He was later specifically authorized by the executive committee of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association to support or oppose general labor legislation and fair employment practice legislation.

Rule, Gordon W., Lyon & Lyon, Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) In support of H. R. 3383 for the relief of the Fidelity Trust Co. of Baltimore, Md., and others.

Rumely, Edward A., Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City. (1) I received only my salary, commissions, and expenses as reported on earlier Form B. The corporation has reported its disbursements separately, on Form A. (2) Disbursements were corporation disbursements and are reported separately on Form A. (3) [Blank.] (4) We never pay to have news articles printed but issue press releases, some of which are reprinted, and of these I have no record. (5) I am not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing legislation. Sometimes the committee trustees take a stand for or against an issue (on legislation) where they think a constitutional principle is involved. Then, I distribute educational material on the question.

Rundquist, George E., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Rush, Charles J., Washington Real Estate Board, 1417 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $666.66 per month as salary as executive secretary. (2) None paid out.

[4] Filed with the Clerk only.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[5] Filed for first quarter.

[6] Filed for second quarter.

(3) None. (4) Washington Real Estate Board News, of which I am editor. (5) Measures affecting the ownership and operation of real estate.

Russell, Horace, United States Savings & Loan League, 7 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) See attached memoranda 1, 2, and 3.[2] (2) See attached memoranda 1, 2, and 3.[2] (3) See attached memoranda 1, 2, and 3.[2] (4) The Mortgage Banker article The Cost of Servicing Mortgages and contents of Legal Bulletin of United States Savings and Loan League. (5) Legislation affecting the savings and loan business.

Ryan, M. O., 1401 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary for quarter, $3,000; April 1 to June 30, 1947, inclusive, total personal expenses for taxis, lunches, and dinners, phones, etc., in Washington, D. C., were $567.55, of which insignificant amount were for activities related in any way to lobbying. (2) Taxis, Washington restaurants, and hotels. (3) Transportation, lunches, and dinners. (4) Organizational bulletins for American Hotel Association. (5) Any legislation affecting hotel industry.

Sabin, L. C., Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

St. Clair, Labert, 2633 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Automobile Dealers Association, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The National Automobile Dealers Association, which I represent as public contacts counsel, estimates that one-third of my monthly fee is properly chargeable to my congressional contact duties. This would be a total for the second quarter of $1,250. I spent nothing. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) All proposed legislation affecting the interests of retail automobile dealers.

Saltzman, Charles E., New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y. (1) That portion of registrant's annual salary from the New York Stock Exchange attributable to attention to Federal tax legislative matters based on an allocation of time was $54.50 during the second quarter of 1947, plus reimbursement for disbursements of $117.46. (2) Expense payments for which registrant was reimbursed were for hotel, meals, transportation, and miscellaneous expenses of registrant. (3) See answers to (1) and (2). (4) None. (5) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

Sanders,[4] J. T., the National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington. D. C. (1) Transportation, $17.95; meals, $23.35. (2) Transportation agencies and restaurants. (3) Transportation, food, etc. (4) Speech before Peoples Lobby. (5) General agricultural legislation, labor legislation, and other bills related to agriculture.

Sands, Charles E., 4211 Second Street NW., Washington, D. C. Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders Union, 528 Walnut Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) $50. (2) Western Union and C. & P. Telephone Co. (3) Telegrams and telephone calls. (4) None. (5) Support Labor legislation; oppose $5,000 appropriation to W. C. T. U. for convention.

Sanger, Charles D., Jr., Hill Building, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Compensation of $300 per month. No money expended for legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None for legislative purposes. (5) None pending at present to my knowledge.

Sasuly,[4] Elizabeth, Food, Tobacco, Agricultural and Allied Workers of America, CIO, 1307 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,125; expenses, $190. (2) Hotels, restaurants, railroads, air lines, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) FTA News, FTA Washington Newsletter. (5) My organization supports all legislation to advance the interest of peace, security, democracy, and the general welfare of the working people. We oppose legislation which would defeat these objectives.

Saville,[4] Russell, American Pension Committee, Inc., 15 E Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary beginning as of the first week ending in February and continuing through the quarter, $75 per week for 8 weeks aggregating a total of $600. (2) Paid by American Pension Committee to Russell Saville as salary. (3) Salary as a legislative representative in behalf of improved pension and social security legislation. (4) American Pension Committee, Inc., publishes a weekly Washington pension report called Comet. (5) Old age pensions and social security improvement legislation.

Saville,[5] Russell, American Pension Committee, Inc., 15 E Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Pension Committee, Inc., $75 per week. (2) [Blank.] (3) Salary. (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 781.

Schoen,[4] Paul W., Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post-office box 692, Valdosta, Ga. (1) Salary, $1,290 (this is full salary and only about half time was spent on legislative work); expense, printing, and postage. (2) No payments made to anyone, all salary and expense personal. (3) Half salary and full expenses in Washington on behalf of forestry appropriations, United States Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. (4) The Forest Farmer, also press releases, no record of publication available; brochure. (5) Forestry items, United States Department of Agriculture appropriation bill.

Schoene, Freehill, Kramer & Fanelli, a law partnership composed of Lester P. Schoene, Joseph H. Freehill, Milton Kramer, and Joseph A. Fanelli, 1744 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None (compensation and reimbursement of expenses received as stated on registration statement). (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 2910.

Schoene, Freehill, Kramer & Fanelli, a law partnership composed of Lester P. Schoene, Joseph H. Freehill, Milton Kramer, and Joseph A. Fanelli, 1744 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) None received or expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) All written materials are delivered to the client and dissemination is entirely in the client's control. (5) Railroad retirement and unemployment insurance matters.

Scott,[4] C. H., C. H. Scott and associates, Raleigh Hotel, Washington, D. C. (1) $46.50 stenographic, and stamps incurred in mailing letters to approximately 165 producers of strategic minerals; received no money for expenses and salary. (2) A. B. A. Electric Typed Letter Co., 1013 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; approximately $10 for taxi fares altogether. (3) Mailing approximately 165 first-class letters to producers of minerals suggesting they write their Senators and Congressmen to support bill when introduced. (4) None. (5) To reimburse producers of strategic minerals who sustained losses during period 1939 to 1945. Bill has not been introduced.

Scott, John R., Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $375 per month as salary, minus social-security and withholding taxes; $48.53 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW National News, VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combatting of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the National Council of Administration.

Scott, John W., attorney, Victor J. Evans & Co., et al., 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) Does not apply. (3) Does not apply. (4) None. (5) As previously stated in my registration statement.

Scott, William C., 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) No money received during said period. Expenditures: Transportation, rooms, and meals, $85.13; taxicab fares, $2.40. (A portion of said money was expended during the last 10 days of March 1947.) (2) To various railroad companies, hotels, restaurants, and taxicabs. (3) For transportation, hotel rooms, and meals. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to postage rates on books.

Seay, Temple W., 902 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.; Massman Construction Co., Kansas City, Mo. (1) None with respect to this or any other matters before the legislature. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2192, for the relief of Massman Construction Co., Kansas City, Mo.

See, Harry, 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C., Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $29.55. (2) Restaurants. (3) Luncheons. (4) None. (5) Opposing antilabor legislation and favoring legislation of benefit to labor.

Selby,[4] Meredith, Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Shandros, Geraldine, American Communications Association, CIO, 5 Beekman Street, New York City, and 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $280 (this constitutes one-half of salary received and is so reported since time spent in activities covered by the act constitute about half of working time); travel expense, $18.50; miscellaneous, $51; total, $349.50. (2) Travel expense to railroad, hotel; miscellaneous, taxis, telephones, postage, newspapers. (3) Explained above. (4) ACA News. (5) Legislation affecting workers in the communications industry and American working men and women generally.

Shaw, Mark R., National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., and Melrose, Mass. (1) Salary, $800; traveling expenses, refund of actual amounts paid, $200.42, for train, bus, hotel, restaurant meals, phone calls, etc. (2) Railroads, hotels, restaurants, etc. (3) Traveling and living expense while on road away from home. (4) Peace Action, bulletin of the NCPW. (5) Oppose, peacetime military training; oppose, military aid to Greece and Turkey; favor, relief measures for Europe and Asia, other bills related to question of war and peace.

Shealey, R. Preston, 503 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.; National Retail Credit Association, 218 Shell Building, St. Louis, Mo. (1) From April 1 to June 30, 1947, $1,050 (retainer); $165.97 expense account); $100 (annual NRCA Convention, St. Louis, Mo., June 14–20, 1947, inclusive). (2) Stenographer, $364; transportation, subsistence, etc., annual convention, NRCA, June 14–20, 1947, inclusive.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed with the Clerk only.
[4] Filed with the Clerk only.
[5] Filed for first quarter.
[6] Filed for second quarter.
[4] Filed with the Clerk only.

$149.78; rent, Colorado Building, $51; C & P Telephone Co., $35; stamps, $16.73; trips, $18.50; cabs, $5; office supplies, $4.93; express company, $3.50; telegram $1.09; lunches, $12.57. (3) Legal services, information, releases. (4) See (3). (5) The National Retail Credit Association has not sponsored nor opposed, nor has affiant, legislation in Congress during the period covered by this quarterly report, other than testifying before the Senate and House Post Office Committees on mail rates.

Shields, Robert H., United States Beet Sugar Association, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.. (1) $13, report subject to the qualifications stated in my registration of February 7, 1947. (2) Taxicab drivers and restaurants. (3) Transportation and food. (4) None. (5) Interested in legislation affecting sugar but not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing any legislation.

Shorb, Paul E., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Railroad Security Owners Association, Inc. New York, N. Y. (1) None received and only small sums expended for few long-distance phone calls and one trip to New York City. (2) Telephone company and railroad company. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) Support legislation as proposed in H. R. 2298 and S. 249, as originally introduced, and to oppose H. R. 3237 and H. R. 3980 and S. 249 with Reed-Myers amendments.

Shuford, Helen Alcott, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None (compensation and reimbursement of expenses received as stated on registration statement). (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 2910.

Sifton, Paul, National Council for a Permanent FEPC 930 F Street NW, room 901, Washington, D. C. (1) Travel, telephone calls, from April 1 to June 30, 1947, $152.81; salary, $1,285.20. (2) [Blank.] (3) For travel and telephone calls, $152.81; salary after tax deductions, $1,285.20. (4) [Blank.] (5) Permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission, S. 984 and H. R. 2824.

Skinner, Wellington E., Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, 130 Third Street, S. E., Washington, D. C. (1) Received none. (2) Paid none. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Oppose H. R. 1639.

Slayman,[5] Charles H., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary at $520 per month, from April 14 to June 10, 1947, $1,001.33; advance on traveling expenses, April 22, 1947, $200; actual out-of-pocket expenses for which I have been reimbursed, $161, for details of which see attached expense statements Nos. 1 and 2[2]; actual out-of-pocket expenses for which I have not yet been reimbursed; $314.80, for details of which see attached expense statements Nos. 3, 4, and 5[2]. (2) no money was paid except in ordinary daily expenses. (3) No money was paid except in ordinary daily expenses. (4) I did not cause any articles or editorials to be published in any papers, periodicals, magazines, or other publications. (5) To support H. R. 2910. I am not employed to oppose any legislation.

Slayman,[6] Charles H., Jr., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None except salary and actual out-of-pocket expenses as stated in registration under this act. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) The Stratton bill, H. R. 2910.

Smart, Miss Elizabeth A., 100 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.; National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill. (1) Received salary, $649.01. Received and paid out $96.91 expenses. (2) Post office, Washington Times-Herald, Western Union, T. E. Morrison Paper Co., Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Government Printing Office, taxis, E. P. Hinkel & Co., Washington College Press, Blaydes Safe & Lock Co. (3) Postage, subscription, telegrams, office supplies, telephone, Internal Revenue Report 1946, taxi fare, repairing 2 rugs, printing leaflets, office keys. (4) The Union Signal. (5) Legislation dealing with alcoholic beverages, motion pictures, radio, children, women in industry, peace and international relations, narcotics, gambling, social hygiene, interracial relations.

Smith, Allen L., Louisiana Tax Equality Association, Inc., P. O. Box 1526, 1212 Louisiana National Bank Building, Baton Rouge, La. (1) No money received nor expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Employed to support any legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to improve basic taxation principles providing for removal of tax disparities between business competitors.

Smith, Anthony W., Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Portion of salary allocable to legislative employment for period since filing registration statement, $75. This is computed as stated in registration statement at $300 a year. No expenditures. (2) None. (3) Compensation as above received for legislative work. (4) CIO News, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (5) Forestry legislation; river valley developments.

Smith, Dudley, Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,000 a month from the Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, but not for principal purpose of influencing legislation, which is a minor part of my activities. (2) None for purpose of influencing legislation. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Smith, Hilda W., Committee for the Extension of Labor Education, 2117 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $799 98 (from May 15 to June 30, 1947); $35 per month allowed for taxi, telephone, etc. No expense money received or expended this quarter. (2) Paid to self. (3) Living expenses for self. (4) Mimeographed news bulletin, occasional articles sent out through Labor Press Associates, press release to labor press and other newspapers. (5) Bill for a labor extension service in the Department of Labor.

Smith,[5] Howard J., Central Arizona Project Association, 507 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz. (1) January salary, $750; February salary, $750 plus travel expense, $90.03; March salary, $750 plus travel expense, $50.85. (2) Howard J. Smith executive secretary, Central Arizona Project Association, Phoenix, Ariz. (3) Salary, travel expenses. (4) Pamphlets prepared under the jurisdiction of Howard J. Smith, entitled "The Case for Water in Central Arizona," "California's Stake in Arizona's Share of the Colorado River," "Work for Water." (5) Employed to support Senate bill 1175.

Smith,[6] Howard J., Central Arizona Project Association, 507 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz. (1) April salary, $750 plus travel expense, $57.30; May salary, $750; June salary, $750. (2) Howard J. Smith, executive secretary, Central Arizona Project Association, 507 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz. (3) Salary, travel expense (board and room when engaged in travel). (4) The case for water in central Arizona, Work for water, California's stake in Arizona's share of the Colorado River. (5) Employed to support Senate bill 1175.

Smith, Lloyd W., Room 425, Shoreham Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary as reported on registration form B, for services as special representative of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. during period April 1 to June 30, 1947, as well as reimbursement for routing expenses of $444.80 in April, $285.10 in May, and $276.30 in June 1947. (2) Various restaurants, hotels, taxicabs, telephone, telegraph, stationers, etc. (3) In furtherance of duties described in registration form B, which involve legislation only incidentally and to a limited extent. Affiant states upon information and belief that none of his activity during the period covered by this report was within the scope of section 307 of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting interests of Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. Other duties for said company comprise the major part of his work.

Smith, Purcell L., National Association of Electric Companies, 1336 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary of $16,260 as president of the National Association of Electric Companies and reimbursements of $177.11 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all official duties, only a part of which salary and expenses were for those purposes described in the act. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, railroads, air lines, taxicabs, telephone and telegraph companies. (3) Railroad and transportation, $33.15; hotel and restaurant, $91.01; miscellaneous and gratuities, $52.95. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which I am President, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association therefore is interested in legislation that might affect its members as going business concerns.

Smith, Robert E., Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Total receipts previously reported, $593.12; total receipts for current period, per statement attached hereto and marked "Exhibit A,"[2] $4,423.42; total receipts as of June 30, 1947, $5,016.54; total expenditures previously reported, $1,693.12; total expenditures for current period, per statement attached hereto and marked "Exhibit B."[2] $423.42; total expenditures as of June 30, 1947, $2,116.54. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) To support legislation which directly or indirectly is believed to be beneficial to holders of life insurance and their beneficiaries; and to oppose such legislation as is believed to be unfavorable to same.

Smith, Robert E., National Conference of Railroad Investors, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Total receipts previously reported, $440.40; total receipts for current period, per statement attached hereto and marked "Exhibit A,"[2] $1,745.18; total receipts as of June 30, 1947, $2,185.58; total expenditures previously reported, $1,680.25; total expenditures for current period, per statement attached hereto and marked "Exhibit B,"[2] $544.91; total expenditures as of June 30, 1947, $2,225.16. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) To support legislation which directly or indirectly is believed to favorably affect the earnings and/or integrity of railroad securities; and to oppose such legislation as is believed to adversely affect the same.

Smith, Sidney P., P. O. Box 82, Livingston, Ala.; Southern Railway Co., Washington, D. C. (1) $74.32. (2) Pullman Co., hotel, taxicabs, cafes, bellboys, porters. (3) Actual travel expenses on one trip to Washington. (4) None. (5) The Bulwinkle bill and the Jennings bill.

Smith, Sylvester C., Jr., The Prudential Insurance Co. of America., 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (1) Reimbursement for

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for first quarter.
[6] Filed for second quarter.

[5] Filed for first quarter.
[6] Filed for second quarter.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

expenses. (2) New Jersey Bell Telephone Co. (3) Miscellaneous telephone calls, $14.85, 20 percent tax, $2.97, total, $17.82. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the business of the company.

Snow,[4] William S., room 514 Rupley Building, 815 King St., Alexandria, Va. (1) California Fish Canners Association, $375; National Renderers Association, $300. (2) William S. Snow. (3) Fee and retainer. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting the Fish Canners Association and Rendering Industry.

Snyder, Calvin K., Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NE., Washington, D. C. (1) See attached.[2] (2) See attached.[2] (3) See attached.[2] (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Spencer, Lyndon, Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockfeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Spinks, Mrs. Dorothy Matthews, 144 B Street NE., Washington, D. C.; Alpha Iota Sorority, Grand Avenue at Tenth, Des Moines, Iowa. (1) Postage, 17 cents; carefare, $1.20. (2) Will be paid after December 31, 1947. (3) Writing letters to executive offices on the status of lobbying; carfare for purpose of representing Alpha Iota Sorority at Women's Joint Legislative Committee for Equal Rights meetings. (4) [Blank.] (5) To support the equal rights amendment.

Spofford, Charles M., Davis Polk, Wardwell, Sunderland & Kiendl, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) S. 591, amendment of the congressional charter of the American National Red Cross (act of Jan. 5, 1905).

Steffan, Arthur A., Petrol Corp., 1616 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received for fees, $700; expended, $676.46. (2) Railroads, hotels, employees, restaurants, etc. (3) Secretarial, travel, and office expenses. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3499 for relief of Petrol Corp.

Stein, Margaret I., 914 G Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Committee for the Nation's Health, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received salary, $1,000.02; received expenses, none. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) National health insurance.

Steinert Blossom, Citizens' Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons' Admissions Act.

Stellwagen, Herbert P., Indemnity Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Deponent has neither received nor expended any money for attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress. He has merely been reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses in traveling to and from the District of Columbia. (2) No payments have been made except as stated for deponent's own transportation and subsistence. (3) As stated in (2). (4) None. (5) That relative to the regulation of insurance rates in the District of Columbia.

Stengle, Charles I., American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $36.60. (2) Taxicab drivers. (3) Taxi rides to and from Capitol. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting Federal employees.

Stewart, Charles T., public relations department, National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washton, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,500 (half time). (2) No expenditures. (3) [Blank.] (4) Attached list[2] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by those publications is not available. (5) Legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Stoll, Edwin L., public relations department, National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) April 1–June 30, 1947, see attached form.[2] (2) See attached form.[2] (3) See attached form.[2] (4) Attached list[2] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Stringer, Harry R., Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C., received, $500; expended, none. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Strong, Arthur D., Upper Mississippi Waterway Association, 1045 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn. (1) Salary, April 1 to June 30, 1947, $825; reimbursement for expenses, $362.44; total, $1,187.44. (2) Arthur D. Strong. (3) Salary and reimbursement for traveling, hotels, entertaining, attending meetings, hearings, and conventions. (4) None. (5) Registrant is employed to support legislation relating to the improvement and development of navigable waterways in the upper Mississippi River, together with legislation relating to flood control, conservation, pollution, recreation, fish, and wildlife, including all legislation that has to do with the development of water resources of the upper Mississippi River and its tributaries as this legislation relates to all types of public benefits. He is employed to oppose legislation detrimental to the above.

Sturgis, Arthur, Jr., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $200; expenses, $16.55. (2) Taxi drivers, streetcars. (3) Taxi, streetcar travel. (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor-law revision, social-security-law revision, inflammable-fabric legislation.

Sturrock, J. E., Texas Water Conservation Association, 607–609 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex. (1) Salary for April, May, and June, 1947, $1,500, less income and social-security taxes; traveling expenses for April, May, and June 1947, $410.76. (2) $410.76 traveling expenses paid to various railroads, air lines, taxi companies, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Cover transportation, meals, lodging, and entertainment. (4) Texas Water Conservation Association bulletins and various analyses of bills pending in Congress and Texas Legislature. (5) Employed to support all legislation, both State and National, having to do with the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of Texas water resources, through existing State and Federal agencies; to oppose all legislation creating Federal valley authorities and all legislation which seeks to superimpose Federal control over State control in the distribution of the State's water resources.

Sullivan, Francis M., Disabled American Veterans, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) For period April 16–July 1, 1947, salary, $1,393.88; expenses, $10.45. (2) Francis M. Sullivan. (3) Salary and expenses. (4) DAV Semi-Monthly. (5) All proposed legislation affecting disabled veterans, their families, and dependents of deceased disabled veterans.

Sutlive, Carey R., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts, salary, $2,000; expenses reimbursed by employer, $563.85; expenditures, $563.85. (2) Expenses paid to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, etc. (3) For expenses incurred in course of business, such as travel, meals, and hotel accommodations, and expenses of conducting conferences for discussion of business matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting industry, such as legislation relating to national labor policy, taxation, public expenditures, industrial controls, social security, research, patents, and investments.

Swomley,[1] John M., Jr., 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Travel expenses between Washington and New York plus out-of-pocket expenses in Washington, $94.23. (2) John M. Swomley, Jr., for personal expenses indicated above. (3) Indicated above. (4) Conscription News, weekly; The Progressive, weekly. (5) I serve as acting director of the National Council Against Conscription on a volunteer basis to promote the achieving of the international abolition of conscription, world-wide disarmament, and the defeat of conscription.

Tarver, Malcom C., Committee on Taxation, Barytes Industries of the United States, Dalton, Ga. (1) $500 for railroad fare, meals, and hotel bills. (2) Malcolm C. Tarver. (3) For the purposes stated in answering paragraph (1). (4) None. (5) Legislation to restore depletion credit for barytes provided in section 124, Revenue Act of 1943, and which expired December 31, 1946.

Taylor, Col. John Thomas, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) $417.77 salary semimonthly, less withholding and social-security taxes; $172.77 reimbursement for traveling expenses during April, May, and June 1947; $65.45 incidental expenses for April, May, and June 1947. (2) Col. John Thomas Taylor. (3) $172.77 reimbursement for traveling expenses, two round trips to Indianapolis, Ind., and one round trip to New York City; $65.45 incidental expenses for April, May, and June 1947, taxi, carfare, luncheons. (4) The American Legion Magazine, New York City; The National Legionnaire, Indianapolis, Ind. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations, the development of sound civil-aviation programs, and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

Taylor, Margaret K., National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $21.20. (2) Various. (3) Taxi fares. (4) None. (5) Any legislation which may affect milk producers.

Taylor, Russell J., United Shoe Workers of America of the CIO, 917 Fifteenth Street NW., room 608, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary,

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed with the Clerk only.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[1] Filed with the Secretary only.

$80 per week; expenses, $21 per week; hotel, $12 per week. (2) Russell J. Taylor. (3) Personal expenses and travel as legislative representative for the United Shoe Workers of America, CIO. (4) [Blank.] (5) Support all legislation favorable to the security, democracy, and general welfare of our country and oppose all legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Thompson, Chester C., American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary from the American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., $4,500, covering April, May, June, 1947. (2) Miscellaneous expenses, $58.50. (3) Taxicab and streetcar fares. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting domestic water carrier and operator industry of the United States.

Thomson, Mrs. Dorothy W., 2300 B Street SE., Washington, D. C.; American Parents' Association, 305 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received from American Parents' Association, $88.01. (2) Various. (3) Telephone calls, cab fares, lunches, and other miscellaneous expenses. (4) The Parents' Magazine. (5) National School Health Services Act.

Tinney, William H., the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $487.74 per month, which is paid for all the services rendered to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., only a part of which have to do with legislation; $133.75 was expended by me as expense money during the second quarter of 1947 for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals; in addition to this amount, I also received $169.25 for expenses incurred in connection with other duties performed for the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. which have no relation to the purposes covered by this act. (2) Various transportation companies, restaurants, garages, communication companies, etc. (3) $133.75 was expended by me as expense money during the second quarter of 1947 for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Tobin, Fred A., 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) My salary is $1,000 per month or $3,000 for quarter year. I do not incur any expenses in performance of legislative work. (2) Fred A. Tobin. (3) I am an attorney representing the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers Union and its affiliated locals before the Interstate Commerce Commission and the National Labor Relations Board. Am the liaison representative between various Government agencies and International Union and the affiliated locals. The above includes general services of a nonlegislative nature pertaining to business and operation of International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals; also for part-time services in connection with legislation both Federal and State for the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals. (4) I do not have any connection with any newspaper. (5) Legislation Federal and State which may affect the interests of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals particularly in the field of labor law.

Tobler, H. Willis, 657 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., American Farm Bureau Federation, 58 East Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $89.90 expended. See item No. 6 of Form B, filed December 1946. (2) Taxis. (3) Transportation. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Extension of a temporary farm labor program; establishment of a permanent farm labor program; amendments to Federal Farm Loan Act and Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act; extension of Commodity Credit Corporation; establishment of a national soil fertility policy and program; extension of Sugar Act; wool price support; marketing agreement amendments; housing; Federal aid to education; amendments to Reclamation Act; taxation; amendments to National Labor Relations Act; St. Lawrence waterway; foreign trade; International Trade Organization; Inland Waterways Corporation; library service demonstration; abolishment of Jackson Hole Monument; agricultural appropriations; crop insurance; appropriation for Hospital Survey and Construction Act; Insecticide Act; plant quarantine; foreign relief; statute of limitations; displaced persons; appropriations for agricultural program of Tennessee Valley Authority; transfer of Crab Orchard Project in Illinois to Department of Interior; Parker River Wildlife Refuge in Massachusetts.

Tolbert,[5] William H., executive secretary, Oregon State Farmers' Association, 237 Terminal Sales Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) Expenses paid by Oregon State Farmers' Association, $1,372.34. (This includes air travel, hotel, meals, etc., for period January, February, and March, 1947.) Salary paid by Oregon State Farmers' Association, $900. (2) United Airlines, Statler Hotel, miscellaneous cafes, etc. (3) To influence legislation on farm labor. (4) None. (5) House bill 2102; House bill 1388; House bill 2773; Senate bill 724; Senate bill 1338.

Tolbert,[6] William H., executive secretary, Oregon State Farmers' Association, 237 Terminal Sales Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) Expenses paid by Oregon State Farmers' Association, $776.08. (This includes air travel, hotel, meals, etc., for period April, May, and June, 1947.) Salary paid by Oregon State Farmers' Association, $750. (2) United Airlines, Statler Hotel, miscellaneous cafes, etc. (3) To influence legislation on farm labor. (4) None. (5) House bill 2102, House bill 1388, House bill 2773; Senate bill 724, Senate bill 338.

Tone, Joseph M., legislative representative, International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,675; expenses, $5 per day, excluding Sundays and holidays. (2) Personal. (3) Personal. (4) None. (5) None.

Truitt, Paul T., National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any margarine legislation.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia; The Insurance Co. of the State of Pennsylvania, 308 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation for the just payment of French spoliation claims.

Turnbull,[5] Robert, care of Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barlum Tower, Detroit, Mich. (1) $126.46 actual expenses incurred for lobbying in Washington, D. C. (2) Various. (3) Actual expenses incurred for lobbying in Washington, D. C. (4) The Supervisor, official publication of the Foreman's Association of America. (5) H. R. 8, a bill in the United States House of Representatives; S. 55, a bill in the United States Senate.

Turnbull,[6] Robert, Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barlum Tower, Detroit, Mich. (1) My activities in connection with lobbying on behalf of the Foreman's Association of America are discontinued. I have nothing further to report as of this date. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Vance, C. W., room 312, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Order of Railway Conductors of America, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. (1) Salary, $1,374; expenses, $840.10; no money expended except for personal maintenance. (2) Hamilton Hotel, taxicabs, telephone, telegraph, postage, laundry, cleaning, pullman fare, and various restaurants. (3) Necessary living, transportation, communication, and living expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting railway labor and particularly to oppose bills detrimentally affecting the existing railroad retirement and railroad unemployment-insurance system.

Vernon, Weston, Jr., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y. (1) The only money received by registrant was his aliquot share of income of the law firm of Millbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, which firm receives an annual retainer from the New York Stock Exchange for professional services. That portion of such annual retainer attributable to attention to Federal tax legislative matters based on an allocation of time was $375 during the second quarter of 1947, plus disbursement of $93.84. (2) Expense payments were made to firm for hotel, meals, transportation, postage, telephone, and miscellaneous expenses of registrant, and of employees of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley. (3) See answers to (1) and (2). (4) None. (5) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

Voorhis,[4] H. Jerry, 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill., the Cooperative League of the United States of America. (1) $75.58, report subject to the qualifications stated in my registration of June 20, 1947. (2) Baltimore & Ohio Railroad and Capital Air Lines. (3) Transportation and food. (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose legislation but interested in legislation affecting farm and city cooperatives and agriculture in general.

Walsh, George, 1 Gardner Street, Newton, Mass.; World War Veterans of the United States merchant marine, 148 Hanover Street, Boston, Mass. (1) $35.50 received from World War Veterans of the United States merchant marine. (2) Telephone calls, mailing, stationery, fares. (3) To support H. R. 476 and S. 429. (4) None. (5) H. R. 476 and S. 429.

Walter, Stephen M., 1317 F Street N. W.; National Association of Electric Companies et al. (1) See exhibit I.[2] (2) See exhibit II.[2] (3) See exhibit II.[2] (4) None. (5) All pending or proposed Federal legislation affecting the interests of the electric utility industry.

Ward, D. J., 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., imported nut section, Association of Food Distributors, 100 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y. (1) From imported nut section, Association of Food Distributors: fee, $1,500; expenses, $182.26. (2) Telephone, telegraph, cabs, travel, entertaining, business publications, duplicating, etc., $182.26. (3) See No. 2. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting imports of tree nuts.

Warfield, Ethelbert, Esq. (report as attorney for American General Corp.), 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; American General Corp.; 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N. J. (1) Receipts: None (bill for legal services rendered and expenses incurred has not yet been submitted). Expenditures: $208.36, consisting of $159.26 for client's pro rata share of expenses for transportation, hotel, and meals, and $49.10 for stenographic services. (2) Various stenographers, airlines, railroads, taxicab drivers, hotel, and restaurants. (3) For transportation to and from Washington, D. C., and for hotel rooms and meals while there in connection with hearings of Senate Committee on Currency and Banking, and for stenographic services in connection with preparation of testimony before said committee. (4) None. (5) To oppose S. 829 and H. R. 3351.

Warfield, Ethelbert, 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New

[5] Filed for first quarter.
[6] Filed for second quarter.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed with the Clerk only.

York, N. Y. (1) No money received during said period. Expenditures: Transportation, hotel rooms, and meals, $329.51; stenographer, $50.74; telegrams, $2.45; telephone calls, $77.23; postage, $1.02; carfare, 45 cents. (A portion of said money was expended during the last week of March 1947.) (2) To various railroad companies, hotels, restaurants, stenographers, telegraph, and telephone companies, United States Post Office, and various transportation companies. (3) For transportation, hotel rooms, meals, stenographic services, telegrams, telephone calls, postage, and carfare. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to postage rates on books.

Warner, Milo J., 1631 Nicholas Building, Toledo, Ohio; the Prudential Insurance Co. of America. (1) See Exhibit No. 1 attached.[2] (2) See exhibit No. 1 attached.[2] (3) See exhibit No. 1 attached.[2] (4) None. (5) See exhibit No. 2 attached.[2]

Wasserman, Jack, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (Compensation and reimbursement of expenses received as stated on registration statement.) (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 2910.

Waterfield, Maynard H., Citizens National Committee, Inc., 2844 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,808.04; expense (taxi fare), $100.70. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Washington Close-Up; 'Round Washington; miscellaneous research reports. (5) None.

Watson, J. R., room 1, Illinois Central Railroad passenger station, Jackson, Miss.; Mississippi Railroad Association, P. O. box 2534, Jackson, Miss. (1) Salary monthly, without segregation, as stated in registration; and reimbursement of expenses incurred in the total sum of $220. (2) Hotel Raleigh, for room and other charges, $51.28; Pullman Co., for pullman tickets, $20.02; Telephone Co., $4.50; Telegraph Co., $3.27; and various restaurants, dining cars, taxicabs and nominal sums, including tips to individuals, postage, and other incidental travel and subsistence expenses in the aggregate sum of $140.93. (3) For hotel, travel, meals, and other expenses incident to my employment, as stated above. (4) None. (5) As stated in my registration my employment is primarily for purposes not related to Federal legislation, but as an incident thereto, any such legislation pertaining to railroads in Mississippi.

Waybur, Bruce, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, CIO, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,040; expenses, $130. (2) Restaurants, cab drivers, etc. (3) Personal expenses in Washington. These expenses covered both legislative and nonlegislative work. (4) UE News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Weathersby,[5] Newton Patrick, room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.; International Association of Machinists, District Lodge No. 44. (1) Salary, $1,000; $20 legislative expenses during quarter. (2) Taxi drivers and operators of eating and refreshment places. (3) Lobbying, i. e., supporting or opposing, as the case may be, legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and, incidentally, organized labor in general. Not more than 15 percent of time spent on this work. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and occasionally organized labor in general.

Weathersby,[6] Newton Patrick, District No. 44, I. A. of M., room 303 Machinists Building. (1) Salary, $1,000; $25 legislative expenses during quarter. (2) Taxi drivers and operators of eating and refreshment places. (3) Lobbying—i. e., supporting or opposing, as the case may be, legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and, incidentally, organized labor in general. Not more than 15 percent of time spent on this work. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and occasionally organized labor in general.

Webb, William H., National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See attached schedule.[2] (2) See attached schedule.[2] (3) As indicated in attached schedule [2] and for miscellaneous office, personal, and traveling expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) All laws and regulations needed to promote the maintenance and improvement of waterways, the development and protection of water transportation, etc.

Welch, Don, Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., P. O. box 231, Madill, Okla. (1) Receipts consist of salary as reported in original declaration and the traveling expenses itemized below,[2] totaling $650.90. (2) Traveling expenses, trips to Washington, D. C., May 17 to 24, 1947, and June 16 to 30, 1947, as itemized on attached sheets.[2] (3) Traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) S. 110, H. R. 221, H. R. 3150, H. R. 1639, and S. 670.

Welliver, Edward M., American Trucking Association, Inc., 1624 Sixteenth Street NW. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration. He expended a total of $16. (2) The money was paid primarily to various taxi drivers employed in taking registrant between his office and the Capitol or House or Senate Office Buildings and to clerks or cashiers in lunchrooms. (3) The money paid taxi drivers was for transportation to and from my office as indicated in (2) and the money paid to clerks or cashiers was for lunches. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the trucking industry.

Werkau, C. W., 917 G Place, NW., Washington, D. (1) Salary and expenses, $2,610.41. (2) Normal living expenses plus railroads, airlines, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, and other incidental and related expenses. (3) To perform the normal functions of my position with the National Federation of Telephone Workers, none of which were related to legislative activities. (4) None. (5) Any proposed legislation which would affect the National Federation of Telephone Workers or its affiliates.

Wescott, James B., 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.; Salt Producers Association, Book Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) See statement attached.[2] (2) See statement [2] in answer to question (1). (3) The expenses incurred, as shown in answer to question (1), were in connection with H. R. 2717. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2717.

West, Oscar H., 1001-2 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Ninth and F Streets, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Insurance Agents, 80 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y. (1) No money received or expended during preceding calendar quarter. Status of registrant the same as stated in original form B and accompanying letter of explanation, filed March 6, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank].

Westfall, Mrs. Edna, 1800 Sigma Chi Road, Albuquerque, N. Mex. (1) $374.84 actual expenses. (3) Hotel, transportation, taxi, phone, restaurant, telegrams. (3) Same as No. 2. (4) None. (5) In support of bills S. 172, H. R. 1000, and H. R. 2823, for purpose of claims against Japanese Government.

White, Richard P., American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 636 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipt of salary, $2,500 expenses reimbursed by employers, $196.82. (2) Expenses paid to various railroads, hotels, clubs, restaurants, taxis, associations, etc. (3) Attending meetings of the national and central plant boards, association committee meetings, local associations, and payment for miscellaneous publications. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation affecting the nursery industry.

Whitehall, Albert V., 1834 K. Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Hospital Association. (1) Quarterly salary, $1,812.48; reimbursement of travel expense, $62.10. (2) Various air lines, railroads, hotels, and recipients of miscellaneous amounts for taxicabs, meals, and similar necessary expenses. (3) Necessary traveling expenses as indicated. (4) Hospitals, the official journal of the American Hospital Association. (5) Legislation which might affect the quality of hospital service to the people of this country.

Whitlock, Douglas, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Building Products Institute, 1756 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From Building Products Institute, Washington, D. C.: Fee, $1,500; expenses, $260.85. (3) Telephone and telegraph, $43.05; traveling, $161.05; restaurant, $55.25; notary fee, $1.50; total, $260.85. (3) As indicated by items above. (4) None. (5) All legislation which may affect the producers of building materials.

Whyte, Louis, Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, as reported on Form B; expenses, $127.69. (2) New York and return for press conference, hotel, taxis, meals, $121.69; taxicabs, office to Capitol and return, $6. (3) [Blank.] (4) Natural Gas News Letter. (5) Am interested in legislation proposing amendments to the Natural Gas Act.

Wickenden, Elizabeth, 522 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.; American Public Welfare Association, 1313 East Sixtieth Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $300 (half time) salary received. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) APWA letter to members. (5) Any legislation affecting public welfare administration.

Widmar,[5] Rudolph J., 1173 Norwood Road, Cleveland Ohio; Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barlum Tower, Detroit, Mich. (1) $270 actual expenses incurred for lobbying in Washington, D. C. (2) Various. (3) Actual expenses incurred for lobbying in Washington, D. C. (4) None. (5) H. R. 8, a bill in the United States House of Representatives; S. 55, a bill in the United States Senate.

Widmar,[6] Rudolph J., 1173 Norwood Road, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) None. No longer engaged in lobbying. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Wiley, Mrs. Harvey W., chairman of legislation, General Federation of Women's Clubs, 2345 Ashmead Place, Washington, D. C. (1) For April, May, and June 1947: $4.50 postage, $71.50 convention expense. (2) See answer No. 1. (3) See answer No. 1. (4) See attached material [2] (report of the Department of Legislation 1944–47) Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, chairman. (5) Not employed for pay. A volunteer worker for the General Federation of Women's Clubs. (Term of chairmanship expired June 30, 1947.) The General Federation supports legislation which pertains to the welfare of the home and to the general welfare, after given authority through the adoption of resolution by the delegate body.

Wilkinson,[5] Ernest L., Goodwin, Francis M., Wilkinson, Glen, A., Deem, Woodruff J., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Klamath, Modoc, and Yahooskin Bands of Snake Indians, known as the Klamath Tribe of Indians of Klamath Indian Agency, Oreg. (1) Received $1,125 quarterly payment for legal services of which legislative matters constitute only a part. Expenditures amounted to $9.85. (2) Taxicabs and tele-

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for first quarter.
[6] Filed for second quarter.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the clerk's office.
[5] Filed for first quarter.
[6] Filed for second quarter.

graphic expenses. (3) Transportation to and from Capitol and telegrams to Klamath Agency, Oreg. (4) None. (5) Supporting H. R. 2501, H. R. 2502, and H. R. 2775.

Wilkinson,[6] Ernest L., Goodwin, Francis M., Wilkinson, Glen A., Deem, Woodruff J., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Klamath, Modoc, and Yahooskin Bands of Snake Indians, known as the Klamath Tribe of Indians of Klamath Indian Agency, Oreg. (1) Received $1,125 quarterly payment for legal services of which legislative matters constitute only a part. Expenditures amounted to $44.55. (2) For taxicab, telephone, telegram, and delivery charges and postage. (3) Transportation to and from Capitol and telegrams to Klamath Agency, Oreg., and telephone call to Chicago, Ill. (4) None. (5) Supporting H. R. 2501, H. R. 2502, and H. R. 2775.

Willard, Charles H., Davis, Polk, Wardwell, Sunderland & Kiendl, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) S. 591, amendment of the Congressional Charter of the American National Red Cross (act of Jan. 5, 1905).

Willenbucher, Franz Otto, Retired Officers Association, Inc., 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received, $300. No part of this sum was received specifically for the purpose of attempting to influence legislative action. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) Retired Officers Association Bulletin. (5) Legislation affecting retired officers, warrant officers, and nurses of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

Williamson, C. J. S., 901 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No activities performed January 1 to March 31, 1947, that fell within the regulations of title III. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Willig, Peter,[5] 1060 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (1) Salary, $400 monthly, as regional director; expenses $50 monthly, as regional director; actual expenses while in Washington, D. C., lobbying. (2) As per list attached.[3] (3) To lobby on legislation proposed by Eightieth Congress. (4) The monthly publication called the Supervisor. (5) Bill H. R. 8, proposed by the House of Representatives; bill S. 55, proposed by the Senate.

Willig, Peter,[6] 1060 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (room 420); Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barlum Tower, Detroit, Mich. (1) No money received besides my regular salary as regional director. Lobbying in opposition to bill H. R. 8; $24 expenses paid by the national office, Detroit, Mich. (2) Railroad and hotel. (3) Lobbying in opposition to bill H. R. 8, labor legislation. (4) None. (5) Bill H. R. 761 in the House of Representatives.

Wilson, E. Raymond, Friends Committee on National Legislation, 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary, April, May, June 1947, $1,375; travel expense, $280.72. (2) Various. (3) Travel is for the purpose of attending yearly meetings, quarterly meetings, or conferences of Friends and other groups to interpret developments in national and international policy, with special reference to legislation, and for other committee business. (4) We send a newsletter to a limited number of subscribers and Friends about once a month. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization and world economic stability, world disarmament, foreign relief, aid to refugees, protection for racial minorities; support for the rights of conscience; opposition to conscription and the militarization of America.

Wilson, Eugene E., Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

Wilson, Jr., Everett B., 728 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico., 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $750 monthly from Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, but not for principal purpose of influencing legislation, which is a minor part of my activities. (2) None for purpose of influencing legislation. (3) None. (4) Newspapers in Puerto Rico only. (5) None.

Wilson, J. B., McKinley, Wyo.; Wyoming Wool Growers Association. Expense by National Wool Growers Association, McKinley, Wyo., and 509 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) Salary, $1,500; expense, $1,365.09; total, $2,865.09. (2) See statement attached.[2] (3) The expense of $1,365.09 paid J. B. Wilson as legislative chairman of the National Wool Growers Association is for all work done for the association, including work with departments and the serving on advisory committees of the Government. (4) The Wyoming Wool Grower, editor. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any legislation only as legislation affects the sheep industry. Supporting wool legislation and various land bills at the present time.

Wilson, Lacey C., 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, $910; expenses, $910. (2) To Lacey C. Wilson. (3) For salary and expenses while working in behalf of legislation in which the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen is interested. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting the interests of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

Wingert, E. L., 1 West Main Street, Madison, Wis., Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce. (1) Received my share of retainer fee paid my firm for general services as legal counsel for Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, involving mainly services unrelated to Federal legislation. Aside from that, received nothing for use in influencing Federal legislation and expended nothing for that purpose. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Such legislation affecting business and industry generally as I may be instructed to give attention to from time to time.

Winn, Arthur L., Jr., Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1127 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Clark & La Roe, law firm, received from the National Independent Meat Packers Association, $4,500, total of monthly payments for general legal services, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payment made to any other person. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) I have not supported or opposed any legislation during the past quarter.

Winn, Arthur L., Jr., Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; Seatrain Lines, Inc., 39 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Clark & La Roe, law firm, received from Seatrain Lines, Inc., $1,875, monthly payments on annual retainer, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payments made to any other person. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) I have not supported or opposed any legislation during the past quarter.

Winter, Everett T., 705 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.; Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) Total reimbursable expenses in connection with legislative matters, $984.11; all reimbursed by Mississippi Valley Association. One one-way trip Washington, D. C., to Omaha; three round trips, Omaha to Washington, D. C. (2) Railroads, etc., $387.17; hotels and miscellaneous, $501.14; radio station WOW, $75; Hotel Washington, $20.80. (3) Travel, subsistence, and incidentals. Expenses in connection showing of motion picture Operation Big Muddy. Expense meeting of witnesses in connection with Missouri River flood-control appropriations. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement; the American merchant marine; soil conservation; flood control; regulation of domestic transportation.

Wisdom, John Minor,[5] care of Wisdom & Stone, 312 Whitney Building, New Orleans, La.; Louisiana Community Property Taxpayers Committee, care of Mr. Joseph W. Montgomery, chairman, United Fruit Building, New Orleans, La. (1) $1,249.98. (2) Self. (3) Retainer for January, February, and March 1947. See explanatory statement attached to form A filed March 6, 1947. (4) None. (5) See explanatory statement attached to form A filed March 6, 1947.

Wisdom, John Minor,[6] care of Wisdom & Stone, 312 Whitney Building, New Orleans, La.; Louisiana Community Property Taxpayers Committee. (1) Retainer fees, as attorney, $1,249.48; received as reimbursement for traveling expenses to Washington, stenographic expenses, and postage, $231.42. (2) Self. (3) Retainer for April, May, June 1947. See explanatory statement attached to Form A, filed March 6, 1947. (4) None. (5) The committee's explanatory statement attached to Form A, filed March 16, 1947, is supplemented by the addition of the following paragraph:

The Louisiana Community Property Taxpayers Committee approves equalization of income, estate, and gift tax between community-property and noncommunity-property States, and approves the principles generally embodied in the Gearhart equalization bill (H. R. 3842). The committee is opposed to the discriminatory and confiscatory 1942 Federal estate, gift, and insurance tax amendments affecting community property, and has presented oral arguments and briefs to the House Ways and Means Committee in support of the repeal of these amendments.

Woodman, Russell John, 12 Liberty Place, Weehawken, N. J.; the Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 5673 West Pine Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo. (1) Received a salary of $100 and actual expenses as follows: Hotel, $18; meals, $25.75; telephone and telegraph, $2.33; transportation, $11.92. No money expended for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislative proposals of concern to labor and railway labor in particular. Working in opposition to bills to amend the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Acts.

Woodrum, Clifton A., president, American Plant Food Council, Inc., 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) There was expended during the preceding quarter approximately the sum of $2,018.70, as set out below. Said funds were received from the general operating funds of the American Plant Food Council. (2) Thad E. Ragsdale, for transcript of hearings, $518.70; miscellaneous mimeographing and letter writing, $300; for telephone and telegraph communications, approximately $450; postage and stenographic services, approximately $250; Darby Printing Co., reproduction of part of hearings, $500; total, approximately $2,018.70. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Senate bill 1251 (Hickenlooper fertilizer bill) and companion House bill (H. R. 3421). Hearings on S. 1251 were held during this quarter.

Woodson,[7] George W., Roosevelt Hotel, Lansing, Mich. (1) I have received 25 percent of the gross income from Michigan, and I pay all my expense out of this amount. (2) I have no one employed except a girl only part-time doing secretarial work in my office. (3) I work in the interest of the Townsend organization and the Townsend plan. (4) None. (5) Townsend bill (H. R. 16).

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's Office.

[5] Filed for first quarter.

[6] Filed for second quarter.

[7] Filed with the Secretary only.

Woodul, Walter F., 818 Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.; see list of 24 railroads attached.[2] (1) Salary as per registration, and reimbursement by employers, Texas railroads, of expenses incurred for months of March, April, and May in total sum of $925. Expenses incurred during April, May, and June in sum of $1,580.52. Clients billed last of each month for expenses incurred and payment made succeeding month. (2) Hotel Washington, $83.58; Hotel Shoreham, $451.75; Hotel Carleton, $494.75; Pullman Co., $130.09; and various restaurants, taxicabs, and others in minor amounts. (3) Pullman transportation, $130.09; hotels, $535.33; meals, $204.30; taxis, $39.25; entertaining, $644.30; tips and incidentals, $27.25. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting Texas railroads.

Woodul, Walter F., 818 Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.; Imperial Sugar Co., Sugar Land, Tex. (1) Salary from employer as per registration. Incurred $297.29 expenses in June which amount will be refunded in July. (2) Braniff Airways, $84.76; Washington Hotel, $106.73; and to various restaurants, taxi drivers, and others in nominal amounts. (3) Transportation, $84.76; hotel, $106.73; meals, $17.65; entertaining, $36.20; taxis, $16.15; tips and incidentals, $5.80. (4) None. (5) Sugar legislation.

Wooten, Edward W., Wine Institute, 900 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $3,000 quarterly salary as manager of the Washington office of the Wine Institute, principal offices at 717 Market Street, San Francisco. (2) Received by the undersigned for all personal services rendered as manager of this office, some of which services involve legislative activity. (3) See (1) and (2) above. No expenditures were made by undersigned to any other person for legislative purposes. (4) None. (5) Internal Revenue Code amendments relating to wine and brandy production operations (H. R. 1945, 1946, and 1947).

Werley, Harry F., 5353 Reno Road NW., Washington, D. C.; National Customs Service Association, Cleveland, Ohio (or Washington, D. C.). (1) He received only salary and reimbursement for travel, postage, office supplies, and incidental expenses. No part of money received for salary or expenses was expended in support of or opposition to any legislation. (2) See No. 1. (3) See No. 1. (4) Customs Service News, published monthly by the National Customs Service Association. He is the editor. It covers the activities of the association, news of prospective and enacted legislation, and news of personal interest to the membership. (5) He supports legislation which will benefit officers and employees of the Federal Government and opposes any legislation which is against their interests. He directs legislative, administrative, or court action affecting the interests of the officers and employees of the United States Customs Service. His appearance before the committees of Congress is incidental to other activities and forms only a small portion of the aggregate.

Wozencraft, Frank W., 410 Gulf States Building, Dallas, Tex., 725 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Independent Bankers Association, Twelfth Federal Reserve district. (1) $590 reimbursement for travel expenses; $4,000 fee for services. (Fee received by firm of Case & Wozencraft.) (2) Air lines, hotels, etc., in connection with travel involved. (3) See (2) above. (4) [Blank.] (5) Bank holding-company legislation.

Wright, Frank C., Jr., room 802, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Anthracite Institute, 237 Old River Road, Wilkes-Barre, Pa. (1) Impossible to make accurate segregation of income and expenses as between regular association work and legislative work. Total salary received was $1,250 per month. Total expenses received from March 31, 1947, to June 15, 1947, were $1,712.48 for rent, phones, travel, help, and related expenses. (2) Rent, Stoneleigh Court, $453; phone, $245.48; office help, postage, miscellaneous, $914. (3) Maintenance of office, telephones, help, travel, and expenses related to serving the industry's interest. (4) Anthracite Institute Bulletin. (5) Legislation affecting the mining and distribution of anthracite coal.

Yonkers, Andrew J., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. (1) Salary, $875. (This represents one-quarter of the amount of the registrant's annual remuneration which is attributable to the performance of duties which are subject to the Lobbying Act.) Reimbursement for money expended (in connection with duties related to the Lobbying Act), $198.37. (2) Air lines, railroads, taxis, hotels, restaurants, telephones, and tips. (3) Normal traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Young, Donald A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.; United States Chamber of Commerce. (1) Received: Salary, $2,500; expenses, $82.98. Expended: Transportation, $46.40; meals, $19.80; telephone, $12.38; miscellaneous, $4.40. (2) Taxi companies, telephone company, and restaurants. (3) Transportation to and from and communication with the Capitol, other normal and necessary expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation of interest to business, such as bills on taxes, budget control, portal-to-portal-pay suits, general labor, census, etc.

Ziegler, Vinton E., Citizens' Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons' Admissions Act.

Zook, John D., 820 Huntington Bank Building, 17 South High Street, Columbus, Ohio; Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio. (1) Pennsylvania Railroad Co., April 23–May 2, $49.39; Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., April 23–May 2, $84.71; meals and miscellaneous expenses, $111.05. (2) See above statement. (3) Actual and necessary traveling expenses on employer's business includes convention of United States Chamber of Commerce, April 28–May 2. (4) None. (5) Legislation dealing with taxation, social security, labor relations, and other matters of interest to our organization.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

SENATE

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1947

The Senate reassembled this day in its Chamber at the Capitol, in the city of Washington, in pursuance of the proclamation of the President of the United States of the 23d day of October 1947.

ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, President pro tempore, called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock meridian.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, we pray for Thy wisdom and Thy guidance for the Members of this body as they meet in this troubled hour to consider what this Nation should do about hunger that knows no politics and want that will not wait.

We cannot escape history: that we have found out. May we also discover that we cannot evade responsibility. By Thy Holy Spirit awaken the conscience of America, that our people may be willing to put humanity first.

Give to our leaders the highest motives, and the courage to propose that which will be worthy of Thy blessing, lest we do the right things for the wrong reasons.

Help our Senators to see what Thy plan is, in the name of Jesus Christ, who, being rich, for our sakes became poor. Amen.

PROCLAMATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the proclamation of the President under which this session of the Congress of the United States is assembled.

The legislative clerk (Emery L. Frazier) read the proclamation of the President, as follows:

Whereas the public interest requires that the Congress of the United States should be convened at 12 o'clock noon, on Monday, the 17th day of November 1947, to receive such communication as may be made by the Executive:

Now, therefore, I, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim and declare that an extraordinary occasion requires the Congress of the United States to convene at the Capitol in the city of Washington on Monday, the 17th day of November 1947, at 12 o'clock noon, of which all persons who shall at that time be entitled to act as Members thereof are hereby required to take notice.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of the United States.

Done at the city of Washington this 23d day of October in the year of our Lord 1947, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and seventy-second.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

By the President:

ROBERT A. LOVETT,
Acting Secretary of State.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hayden	Overton
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Bricker	Hill	Reed
Brooks	Hoey	Revercomb
Buck	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Ives	Robertson, Wyo
Butler	Jenner	Russell
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Capehart	Kem	Sparkman
Capper	Kilgore	Taft
Chavez	Knowland	Taylor
Connally	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McCarthy	Thye
Donnell	McClellan	Tydings
Dworshak	McGrath	Umstead
Eastland	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ecton	McMahon	Watkins
Ellender	Martin	Wherry
Ferguson	Maybank	White
Flanders	Millikin	Wiley
Fulbright	Moore	Williams
George	Morse	Wilson
Green	Myers	Young
Gurney	O'Conor	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is

absent on official business, attending the Geneva Conference.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is unavoidably detained on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent on public business in the State of Montana.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

THE JOURNAL

On motion of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, July 26, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

APPOINTMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON HOUSING AFTER ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore, subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate, under the authority of the order of the Senate of July 26, 1947, appointed Mr. TOBEY, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. CAIN, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. SPARKMAN as the members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Housing, established by House Concurrent Resolution 104.

APPOINTMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE IN CELEBRATION OF VICTORY OVER SPAIN AFTER ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore, subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate, under the authority of the order of the Senate of July 26, 1947, appointed Mr. MARTIN, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. CONNALLY, and Mr. GREEN as members on the part of the Senate of the joint committee to prepare an appropriate plan for the participation in the observance and celebration in Cuba during the summer of 1948 of the fiftieth anniversary of the victories of the military and naval forces of the United States and of their Cuban allies in the war with Spain resulting in the liberation of Cuba, established by House Concurrent Resolution 108.

APPOINTMENT OF TEMPORARY CONGRESSIONAL AVIATION POLICY BOARD AFTER ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore, subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate, under authority of the order of the Senate of July 26, 1947, appointed Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. HAWKES, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, and Mr. MCFARLAND, Members of the Senate, to the Temporary Congressional Aviation Policy Board, pursuant to Public Law 287.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED AFTER ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore, under the authority of Senate Concurrent Resolution 34, subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate, signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 272. An act to provide for the utilization of surplus War Department-owned military real property as national cemeteries, when feasible;

S. 885. An act to provide that the Canadian-built dredge *Ajax* and certain other dredging equipment owned by a United States corporation be documented under the laws of the United States;

S. 1198. An act to authorize leases of real or personal property by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes;

S. 1215. An act to authorize conversions of certain naval vessels;

S. 1326. An act to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act;

S. 1418. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to control and reduction of pollution in the waters of the New England States;

S. 1431. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Jakimowicz;

S. 1498. An act to provide support for wool, and for other purposes;

S. 1720. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended;

H. R. 174. An act to amend section 26, title I, chapter 1, of the act entitled "An act making further provisions for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 321), as amended by the act of May 31, 1938 (52 Stat. 588);

H. R. 452. An act to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act relating to marketing agreement and orders;

H. R. 479. An act relating to the income-tax liability of members of the armed forces dying in the service;

H. R. 493. An act to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 ed.);

H. R. 597. An act to protect American agriculture, horticulture, livestock, and the public health by prohibiting the unauthorized importation into, or the depositing in the territorial waters of, the United States of garbage derived from products originating outside of the continental United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 618. An act for the relief of Fred O. Dononue;

H. R. 629. An act for the relief of A. E. McCartney and O. A. Foster; P. W. Woodyard and J. R. Mahon; B. E. Truitt, T. L. Truitt, and W. B. Lacy; G. W. Cox, J. M. Cox, and F. T. Cox; W. W. Cox and Dr. J. W. Cox; Robert Cathcart and Claude Cathcart;

H. R. 642. An act for the relief of Frank F. Miles;

H. R. 859. An act to provide for the exploration, investigation, development, and maintenance of the fishing resources and development of the high seas fishing industry of the Territories and island possessions of the United States in the tropical and subtropical Pacific Ocean and intervening seas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 890. An act for the relief of Jessie Thompkins;

H. R. 1085. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Salamone;

H. R. 1260. An act to amend section 107 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934;

H. R. 1316. An act for the relief of Archer C. Gunter;

H. R. 1492. An act for the relief of P. L. (Spud) Murphey, owner and manager of Spud's Tailors, Laundry, and Dry Cleaning Works;

H. R. 1534. An act for the relief of Graff, Washbourne and Dunn;

H. R. 1544. An act to provide appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the armed forces who lost their lives in the armed services of the United States in World War II;

H. R. 1662. An act to stimulate exploration, development, and production from domestic mines by private enterprise, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1648. An act for the relief of Willie P. Goodwin, J. M. Thorud, and W. H. Stokley;

H. R. 1730. An act for the relief of Mrs. Beulah Hart;

H. R. 1736. An act for the relief of O. Dean Settles and Mrs. Ruth E. Settles, husband and wife; Mrs. Ruth E. Settles, individually; the estate of Ora H. Hatfield; and Mrs. Kittie B. Hatfield;

H. R. 1791. An act for the relief of Dr. Theodore A. Geissman;

H. R. 1810. An act to amend the Criminal Code and certain other legislation to permit part-time referees in bankruptcy to act as agents or attorneys for claimants against the United States;

H. R. 2173. An act to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 2793. An act authorizing an appropriation for the construction, extension, and improvement of a State tuberculosis sanatorium at Galen, Mont., to provide facilities for the treatment of tuberculous Indians in Montana;

H. R. 2181. An act relating to institutional on-farm training for veterans;

H. R. 2432. An act for the relief of Harry V. Ball;

H. R. 2534. An act for the relief of James H. Underwood;

H. R. 2659. An act to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance, and provide for the medical and scientific treatment of persons found to be alcoholics by the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2776. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 2811. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, former Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2857. An act to extend second-class mailing privileges to bulletins issued by State conservation and fish and game agencies or departments;

H. R. 3045. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe the processes and procedures for recording instruments of writing in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3064. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to the surviving members of the Laguna Band of Mission Indians of California;

H. R. 3173. An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3215. An act to revise the Medical Department of the Army and the Medical Department of the Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3308. An act to increase the minimum allowance payable for rehabilitation in certain service-connected cases;

H. R. 3309. An act to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico;

H. R. 3325. An act to enable Osage Indians who served in World War II to obtain loans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3332. An act creating the St. Lawrence Bridge Commission and authorizing said Commission and its successors to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y.;

H. R. 3394. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the evacuation and return of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States," approved May 16, 1946, in order to provide for the shipment of the remains of World War II dead to the homeland of the deceased or of next of kin, to provide for the disposition of group and mass burials, to provide for the burial of unknown American World War II dead in United States military cemeteries to be established overseas, to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire land overseas and to establish United States military cemeteries thereon, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3395. An act to add certain lands to the Modoc National Forest, Calif.;

H. R. 3501. An act to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, approved August 9, 1946 (Public Law 704, 79th Cong., 2d sess., 60 Stat. 963), and for other purposes;

H. R. 3546 An act to amend section 200 of Public Law 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, June 29, 1936, to permit recognition of officers and enlisted men retired from the military and naval forces of the United States as representatives of certain organizations in the presentation of claims to the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 3601. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3613. An act to amend sections 1802 (a), 1802 (b), and 3481 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 3632. An act to extend the time within which applications may be made to the Railroad Retirement Board for certain refunds from the Unemployment Trust Fund;

H. R. 3678. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3682. An act to extend the period for providing assistance for certain war-incurred school enrollments;

H. R. 3690. An act to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act;

H. R. 3696. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Daniel Broken Leg;

H. R. 3756. An act making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3830. An act to provide for the promotion and elimination of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3839. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and officers, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3845. An act for the relief of George J. Hiner;

H. R. 3862. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to grant and convey to Montgomery County, Pa., a certain parcel of land of the United States in Norristown Borough, Montgomery County, Pa., for the purpose of erecting an additional annex to the present courthouse;

H. R. 3870. An act to authorize certain expenditures from the appropriation of St. Elizabeths Hospital, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3874. An act to authorize the city of Pierre, S. Dak., to transfer Farm Island to the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4002. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

H. R. 4010. An act to authorize the Treasury Department and the United States Government Printing Office to furnish, or to procure and furnish, administrative materials, supplies, and equipment to public international organizations on a reimbursable basis;

H. R. 4069. An act to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II;

H. R. 4070. An act to carry into effect certain parts relating to patents of the treaties of peace with Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania, ratified by the Senate on June 5, 1947, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4075. An act to regulate commerce among the several States, with the Territories and possessions of the United States, and with foreign countries; to protect the welfare of consumers of sugars and of those engaged in the domestic sugar-producing industry; to promote the export trade of the United States; and for other purposes;

H. R. 4110. An act to amend title I of the act entitled "An act to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work and the more complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges," approved June 29, 1935 (the Bankhead-Jones Act);

H. R. 4111. An act authorizing the construction of flood-control works on the Little Sioux River and its tributaries in Iowa;

H. R. 4124. An act to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 4140. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4168. An act to provide for the reincorporation of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4257. An act to provide an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses;

H. R. 4269. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4308. An act to amend section 1 of the act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662), as amended, relating to the acceptance of decorations, orders, medals, and emblems by officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations, neutral nations, or other American Republics;

H. R. 4347. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 144. Joint resolution authorizing the President to bring into effect an agreement between the United States and the United Nations for the purpose of establishing permanent headquarters of the United Nations in the United States and authorizing the taking of measures necessary to facilitate compliance with the provisions of such agreement, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution fixing the date of meeting of the second regular session of the Eightieth Congress;

H. J. Res. 205. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell timber within the Tongass National Forest;

H. J. Res. 218. Joint resolution providing for the representation of the Government and people of the United States in the observance of the two-hundred anniversary of the founding of the city of Reading, Pa.;

H. J. Res. 238. Joint resolution to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930; and

H. J. Res. 245. Joint resolution amending Public Law 27, Eightieth Congress.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED AFTER ADJOURNMENT

The following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, heretofore duly signed by the President Officers of the two Houses, under authority of Senate Concurrent Resolution 34, were presented to the President of the United States by the Secretary of the Senate:

On July 28, 1947:

S. 609. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment on any claims arising out of the deaths of Norman Ray Pedron and Carl Franklin Morris;

S. 794. An act to authorize the sale of a small tract of land on the Cherokee Indian Reservation, N. C.;

S. 892. An act for the payment of claims of the Fidelity Trust Co. of Baltimore, Md., and others, covered by findings of fact made by the United States Court of Claims, dated June 5, 1944, and contained in Senate Document No. 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session;

S. 907. An act to provide for the orderly transaction of the public business in the event of the death, resignation, or separation from office of regional disbursing officers of the Treasury Department;

S. 1070. An act to provide for the cancellation of the capital stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the refund of moneys received for such stock, and for other purposes;

S. 1181. An act for the relief of Robert F. Parks;

S. 1350. An act to authorize relief of accountable officers of the Government, and for other purposes;

S. 1361. An act to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit loans, capital grants, or annual contributions for low-rent housing and slum clearance projects where construction costs exceed present cost limitations, upon conditions that local housing agencies pay the difference between cost limitations and the actual construction costs;

S. 1463. An act to amend section 12 of the Immigration Act of 1917;

S. 1480. An act authorizing the conveyance to the State of Delaware of a portion of Pea Patch Island;

S. 1494. An act to amend section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 387);

S. 1505. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Boise, Idaho, to the Boise Chamber of Commerce;

S. 1582. An act relating to the sale of Paxon Field, Duval County, Fla.;

S. 1590. An act to amend the District of Columbia rent control law so as to provide that schools and universities may recover possession of housing accommodations in certain cases;

S. 1633. An act to authorize attendance of the Marine Band at the National Convention of the American Legion to be held in New York, N. Y., August 28 to 31, 1947, and the National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, September 4 to 9, 1947;

S. 1661. An act to provide additional inducements to physicians and dentists to make a career of the United States military, naval, and public health services, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to establish a commission to formulate plans for the erection, in Grant Park, Chicago, Ill., of a Marine Corps memorial;

S. J. Res. 130. Joint resolution relating to safety in bituminous coal and lignite mines of the United States;

S. J. Res. 138. Joint Resolution to provide for returns of Italian property in the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 148. Joint resolution to authorize the temporary continuation of regulation of consumer credit.

On July 30, 1947:

S. 272. An act to provide for the utilization of surplus War Department owned military and real property as national cemeteries, when feasible;

S. 885. An act to provide that the Canadian-built dredge *Ajax* and certain other dredging equipment owned by a United States corporation be documented under the laws of the United States;

S. 1198. An act to authorize leases of real or personal property by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes;

S. 1215. An act to authorize conversions of certain naval vessels;

S. 1326. An act to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act;

S. 1418. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to control and reduction of pollution in the waters of the New England States;

S. 1431. An act for the relief of Mrs. Edna Mary Jakimowicz;

S. 1498. An act to provide support for wool, and for other purposes;

S. 1720. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended;

S. J. Res. 144. Joint resolution authorizing the President to bring into effect an agreement between the United States and the United Nations for the purpose of establishing the permanent headquarters of the United Nations in the United States and authorizing the taking of necessary steps to facilitate compliance with the provisions of such agreement, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution fixing the date of meeting of the second regular session of the Eightieth Congress.

APPROVAL OF SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS AFTER ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to the conditional adjournment of the first session of the Eightieth Congress, notified the Secretary of the Senate that he had approved acts and joint resolutions of the Senate, as follows:

On July 26, 1947:

S. 758. An act to promote the national security by providing for a Secretary of Defense; for a National Military Establishment; for a Department of the Army, a Department of the Navy, and a Department of the Air Force; and for the coordination of the activities of the National Military Establishment with other departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security.

On July 30, 1947:

S. 358. An act for the relief of Julian M. Thomas;

S. 364. An act to expedite the disposition of Government surplus airports, airport facilities, and equipment and to assure their disposition in such manner as will best encourage and foster the development of civilian aviation, and preserve for national defense purposes a strong, efficient, and properly maintained Nation-wide system of public airports, and for other purposes;

S. 483. An act to relocate the boundaries and reduce the area of the Gila Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes;

S. 616. An act to authorize the creation of a game refuge in the Francis Marion National Forest in the State of South Carolina;

S. 682. An act to regulate the interstate transportation of black bass and other game fish, and for other purposes;

S. 706. An act for the relief of William D. McCormick;

S. 1180. An act to authorize the issuance of a special series of commemorative stamps in honor of Gold Star mothers;

S. 1220. An act to transfer jurisdiction of certain lands comprising a portion of Acadia National Park, Maine, from the Department of the Interior to the Department of the Navy, and for other purposes;

S. 1348. An act to provide for the addition of certain revested Oregon & California Railroad grant lands to the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project, in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes;

S. 1368. An act to amend section 2455 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to increase the size of isolated or disconnected tracts or parcels of the public domain which may be sold, and for other purposes;

S. 1463. An act to amend section 12 of the Immigration Act of 1917;

S. 1505. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Boise, Idaho, to the Boise Chamber of Commerce;

S. 1519. An act to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 1633. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the national convention of the American Legion to be held in New York, N. Y., August 28–31, 1947, and the national convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, September 4–9, 1947.

On July 31, 1947:

S. 338. An act to amend the Plant Quarantine Act approved August 20, 1912, as amended, by adding a new proviso to section 1;

S. 885. An act to provide that the Canadian-built dredge *Ajax* and certain other dredging equipment owned by a United States corporation be documented under the laws of the United States;

S. 1185. An act to provide for the disposal of materials on the public lands of the United States;

S. 1361. An act to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit loans, capital grants, or annual contributions for low-rent housing and slum-clearance projects where construction costs exceed present cost limitations upon condition that local housing agencies pay the difference between cost limitations and the actual construction costs;

S. 1418. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to control and reduction of pollution in the waters of the New England States; and

S. 1431. An act for the relief of Mrs. Edna Mary Jakimowicz.

On August 1, 1947:

S. 794. An act to authorize the sale of a small tract of land on the Cherokee Indian Reservation, N. C.;

S. 907. An act to provide for the orderly transaction of the public business in the event of the death, resignation, or separation from office of regional disbursing officers of the Treasury Department;

S. 1215. An act to authorize conversions of certain naval vessels;

S. 1326. An act to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act;

S. 1350. An act to authorize relief of accountable officers of the Government and for other purposes; and

S. 1590. An act to amend the District of Columbia rent-control law so as to provide that schools and universities may recover possession to housing accommodations in certain cases.

On August 4, 1947:

S. 272. An act to provide for the utilization of surplus War Department-owned military real property as national cemeteries, when feasible;

S. 1181. An act for the relief of Robert F. Parks;

S. 1480. An act authorizing the conveyance to the State of Delaware of a portion of Pea Patch Island;

S. 1494. An act to amend section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 387);

S. 1582. An act relating to the sale of Paxon Field, Duval County, Fla.;

S. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to establish a commission to formulate plans for the erection, in Grant Park, Chicago, Ill., of a Marine Corps memorial;

S. J. Res. 130. Joint resolution relating to safety in bituminous-coal and lignite mines of the United States;

S. J. Res. 144. Joint resolution authorizing the President to bring into effect an agreement between the United States and the United Nations for the purpose of establishing the permanent headquarters of the United Nations in the United States and authorizing the taking of measures necessary to facilitate compliance with the provisions of such agreement, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution fixing the date of meeting of the second regular session of the Eightieth Congress.

On August 5, 1947:

S. 609. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claims arising out of the deaths of Norman Ray Pedron and Carl Franklin Morris;

S. 1070. An act to provide for the cancellation of the capital stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the refund of moneys received for such stock, and for other purposes;

S. 1198. An act to authorize leases of real or personal property by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes;

S. 1498. An act to provide support for wool, and for other purposes;

S 1661. An act to provide additional inducements to physicians, surgeons, and dentists to make a career of the United States military, naval, and public health services, and for other purposes;

S. 1720. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; and

S. J. Res. 138. Joint resolution to provide for return of Italian property in the United States, and for other purposes.

On August 8, 1947:

S. J. Res. 148. Joint resolution to authorize the temporary continuation of regulation of consumer credit.

DISAPPROVAL OF BILLS AFTER ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to the conditional adjournment of the first session of the Eightieth Congress, transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate lists of bills disapproved by him, with his reason for such action, as follows:

On August 6, 1947:

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT

S. 526. I am withholding my approval of S. 526, the National Science Foundation bill.

I take this action with deep regret. On several occasions I have urged the Congress to enact legislation to establish a National Science Foundation. Our national security and welfare require that we give direct support to basic scientific research and take steps to increase the number of trained scientists. I had hoped earnestly that the Congress would enact a bill to establish a suitable agency to stimulate and correlate the activities of the Government directed toward these ends.

However, this bill contains provisions which represent such a marked departure from sound principles for the administration of public affairs that I cannot give it my approval. It would, in effect, vest the determination of vital national policies, the expenditure of large public funds, and the administration of important governmental functions in a group of individuals who would be essentially private citizens. The proposed National Science Foundation would be divorced from control by the people to an extent that implies a distinct lack of faith in democratic processes.

Moreover, the organization prescribed in the bill is so complex and unwieldy that there is grave danger that it would impede rather than promote the Government's effort to encourage scientific research. The Government's expenditures for scientific research and development activities currently amount to hundreds of millions of dollars a year. Under present world conditions this work is vital to our national welfare and security. We cannot afford to jeopardize it by imposing upon it an organization so likely to prove unworkable.

Under S. 526 the powers of the proposed foundation would be vested in 24 members appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. These members would be part-time officials required to meet only once each year. This group would in turn select biennially from among its 24 members an executive committee of 9 members and would exercise its powers through the executive committee. This 9-member executive committee would also be a part-time body required to meet only six times a year.

The foundation would have a chief executive officer, known as the director. He would be appointed by the 9-member executive committee unless the 24-member body itself chose to appoint him. The power and duties of the director would be prescribed by the executive committee and exercised under its supervision.

There would be within the foundation a number of divisions, each exercising such duties and performing such functions as the foundation prescribed. There would be no limit upon the number of divisions which the foundation could establish. For each division there would be a divisional committee. In the case of the Committee for the Division of National Defense, there would be a limit of 26 members, half of whom would be appointed by the foundation and half of whom would be representatives of the armed services. In other cases, there would be no limit upon the number of members of each divisional committee and all of the members would be appointed by the foundation. Not only would these part-time committees furnish advice and make recommendations concerning the Government's scientific research program, but each divisional committee would also "exercise and perform the powers and duties of its division."

The foundation would also be empowered to appoint commissions in various fields of research. Three such commissions are specified in the bill, and the foundation could appoint as many additional special commissions as it saw fit. Each such commission would consist of six eminent scientists and five members from the general public. After making a survey of public and private research already being carried on, each of these commissions would recommend a research program within its field and constantly review the manner in which such program was being carried out.

Apart from the conflicts and confusion which would result from this complex organization, the bill would violate basic principles which make for responsible government.

The Constitution places upon the President the responsibility for seeing that the laws are faithfully executed. In the administration of this law, however, he would be deprived of effective means for discharging his constitutional responsibility.

Full governmental authority and responsibility would be placed in 24 part-time officers whom the President could not effectively hold responsible for proper administration. Neither could the Director be held responsible by the President for he would be the appointee of the foundation and would be insulated from the President by two layers of part-time boards. In the case of the divisions and special commissions, the lack of accountability would be even more aggravated.

The members of the foundation would also be authorized to appoint the full-time administrative head of an important agency in the executive branch of the Government as well as more than 70 additional part-time officials in whom important governmental powers would be vested. This represents a substantial denial of the President's appointing power, as well as an impairment of his ability to see that the laws are faithfully executed.

The ability of the President to meet his constitutional responsibility would be further impaired by the provisions of the bill which would establish an Interdepartmental Committee on Science. The members of this committee would be representatives of departments and agencies who are responsible to the President, but its chairman would be the Director of the foundation. It would be the duty of this committee to correlate data on all Federal scientific research activities and to make recommendations to the President, to the foundation, and to the other departments and agencies of the Government concerning the performance of their functions in this field. Thus an officer who is not appointed by the President, and not responsible to him would be the man primarily charged with the performance of functions which are peculiarly within the scope of the President's duties; that is, the coordination of the work of executive agencies. This is especially unwise when the activities concerned are so intimately related to the national welfare and security.

There are other compelling reasons why control over the administration of this law should not be vested in the part-time members of the foundation. The foundation would make grants of Federal funds to support scientific research. The recipients of these grants would be determined in the discretion of the foundation. The qualifications prescribed in the bill for members of the foundation would insure that most of them would be individuals employed by institutions or organizations eligible for the grants. Thus, there is created a conflict of interests which would inevitably give rise to suspicions of favoritism, regardless of the complete integrity of the members of the foundation.

It is unfair to individuals asked to accept public office that they should be put in such a vulnerable position. Moreover, colleges and universities and other organizations seeking aid for scientific research deserve the assurance that the manner and extent of their participation in a national program will be determined on a completely impartial and objective basis.

Adherence to the principle that responsibility for the administration of the law should be vested in full-time officers who can be held accountable will not prevent the Government from utilizing with great advantage the services of eminent scientists who are available only for part-time duty. We have ample evidence of the patriotic and unselfish contributions which such citizens can make to the success of governmental programs. The role to be played by such part-time participation, however, is more appropriately one of an advisory nature rather than of full responsibility. In other governmental programs of vast national importance this method is used to obtain advice and recommendations from impartial experts as well as from parties in interest. There is no reason why such a system cannot be incorporated in legislation establishing a National Science Foundation.

For the reasons I have indicated I believe that this bill raises basic issues of public policy. There would be no means for insuring responsible administration of the law. If the principles of this bill were extended throughout the Government, the result would be utter chaos. There is no justification in this case for not using sound principles for normal governmental operations. I cannot agree that our traditional democratic form of government is incapable of properly administering a program for encouraging scientific research and education.

It is unfortunate that this legislation cannot be approved in its present form. The withholding of my signature at this time, however, will not prevent the Government from engaging in the support of scientific research. Research activities are carried on extensively by various executive agencies under existing laws, and would continue to be carried on whether or not this bill became law. The only funds made available by the Congress for expenditure by the foundation are funds which might be transferred from other agencies, thereby reducing the amounts which those other agencies could spend for similar purposes. No funds were made available for the scholarships and fellowships authorized in the bill. Thus, there would be no immediate gains which would justify accepting the risks involved in the approval of this legislation.

I am convinced that the long-range interests of scientific research and educa-

tion will be best served by continuing our efforts to obtain a science foundation free from the vital defects of this bill. These defects in the structure of the proposed foundation are so fundamental that it would not be practicable to permit its establishment in this form with the hope that the defects might be corrected at a later date. We must start with a law which is basically sound.

I hope that the Congress will reconsider this question and enact such a law early in its next session.

On August 8, 1947:

FIDELITY TRUST CO., BALTIMORE, MD.

S. 892 (80th Cong., 1st sess.), entitled "A bill for the payment of claims of the Fidelity Trust Co., of Baltimore, Md., and others, covered by findings of fact made by the United States Court of Claims, dated June 5, 1944, and contained in Senate Document No. 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session," would authorize and direct the Treasury to refund bankers' special taxes paid under the War Revenue Act of June 13, 1898, and under the Emergency Revenue Act of October 22, 1914, and later held to have been erroneously and illegally collected by the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the *Fidelity & Deposit Co.* v. *United States* (259 U. S. 396) and the *United States* v. *Fidelity & Deposit Co.* (266 U. S. 587) even though no claim for refund was filed, the taxpayers failed to take the necessary steps to protect their interests and the period provided by statute for the filing of claims for refund of such taxes has long since expired.

S. 1645 (77th Cong., 1st sess.), a bill for the relief of the Fidelity Trust Co., of Baltimore, Md., and others, were referred to the Court of Claims in accordance with Senate Resolution 185 (77th Cong., 1st sess.), November 10, 1941. Petitions were thereafter filed with the court in 72 of the 78 cases referred to in S. 1645.

The Court of Claims in its findings of fact reviewed in detail the history of the claims covered by S. 1645, except the 6 claims for which no petitions were filed. The 72 claims considered by the court are now covered by S. 892, the bill here under consideration. Therefore, the background for the proposed special legislation is clearly and fully set forth in the opinion of the court in the case entitled *Fidelity Trust Co. et al.* v. *United States* (101 Ct. Cls. 831). See Senate Document No. 229 (78th Cong., 2d sess.).

The court points out that many claims for the refund of bankers' special taxes were filed and allowed, but that the 72 claims listed in S. 1645 were rejected by the Bureau of Internal Revenue on the ground that refund was barred because the claims were not filed within the time prescribed by law. The court also points out that since then numerous efforts have been made in behalf of the various taxpayers for remedial legislation, beginning with S. 5448 (70th Cong., 2d sess.), and continuing in practically every succeeding Congress, a total of 14 separate bills, all of which have been opposed by the Secretary of the Treasury. It was stated by the court, "Nor do we think that equitable grounds exist merely because some other taxpayers have come within the statute and been granted refunds. * * * The plaintiffs are not entitled to either legal or equitable relief. The claims are for gratuities. * * *"

One of the bills, S. 694 (74th Cong., 1st sess.), having passed both Houses of Congress, was presented to President Roosevelt, who vetoed the bill on June 18, 1935. In the veto message the President stated "Again I must express my belief that the field of special legislation should not be opened to relieve special classes of taxpayers from the consequences of their failure to perfect their claims for the refund of taxes within the period fixed by law."

Since that time the facts involved have been reconsidered and after very careful consideration I am unable to find any reason why an exception to the basic policy of the statute of limitations in the Internal Revenue Code should be made in these cases. The facts now presented are the same facts considered by the Court of Claims, and therefore there are no new facts now presented that might indicate that the action taken in 1935 by President Roosevelt was not proper. The suggestion that some claims were filed of which the Bureau of Internal Revenue has no record is believed to be without merit as these are issues of fact which were properly justifiable and moreover cannot be considered as an argument supporting this bill since admittedly only a very few of the claims are involved in this respect.

The Congress has determined that it is sound policy to include in the revenue laws statutes of limitations, by the operation of which, after a certain period of time, it becomes impossible for the Government to collect additional taxes or for the taxpayer to obtain a refund of an overpayment of taxes. This bill selects a special group of taxpayers for preferred treatment by excepting them from this policy. The whole body of Federal taxpayers is thus discriminated against, and a precedent is established, opening the door to relief in all cases in which the statute operates to the prejudice of a particular taxpayer or group of taxpayers, while leaving the door closed to the Government in those cases in which the statute operated to the disadvantage of the Government.

I have on prior occasions expressed my belief that the field of special legislation should not be opened to relieve special classes of taxpayers from the uniform operation of the revenue laws. I know of no circumstances which would justify the exception made by S. 892 to the basic policy of the statute of limitations in the Internal Revenue Code. Accordingly I withhold my approval from S. 892.

DEATH OF SENATOR BILBO

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, it becomes my sad duty to inform the Senate that since the last meeting of the Senate one of our colleagues, who had served with us for 12 years, has passed away.

Mississippi's senior Senator, THEODORE G. BILBO, died August 21, 1947, at the Foundation Hospital in New Orleans, after a lingering illness of several months. Faced with the inevitability of death, the fighting qualities which had made him known throughout the world were perhaps more greatly exemplified in his last days than in any other period of his long career. Though he must have known, undoubtedly did know, that the end was near, the wells of humor for which he was famous continued until the last, and I am informed that upon no occasion did he ever signify any token of surrender, but that he continued to live until the end with a vivid interest in the political affairs of his native State, with which he had been so long associated, as well as in his farm, family, and friends. In fact, he supervised the operation of his farm up until 2 or 3 weeks of the end.

His son, Col. Theodore G. Bilbo, Jr., who has had a brilliant career in the Army, had returned to America in time to be with his father, and I am sure that his presence was a great solace to the Senator when the end came.

I know that all Members of the Senate join me in the expression of sympathy to be extended to the family of the late Senator BILBO, who served in this body with distinction for so many years. He had been a member of the Mississippi State Senate, Lieutenant Governor of the State, and Governor of Mississippi twice, and upon behalf of the family and the State, I ask that the Senate, when it adjourns today, adjourn out of respect to the memory of the late Senator THEODORE G. BILBO.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 163) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. THEODORE G. BILBO, late a Senator from the State of Mississippi.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, do adjourn.

SENATOR FROM MISSISSIPPI

Mr. EASTLAND presented the credentials of JOHN C. STENNIS, of Mississippi, elected a Senator from the State for the unexpired term of THEODORE G. BILBO, deceased, ending on the 2d day of January 1953, which were read, as follows:

MISSISSIPPI EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Jackson.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November 1947, JOHN C. STENNIS was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Mississippi a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the unexpired term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1947.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Fielding L. Wright, and our seal hereto affixed at Jackson this the 10th day of November A. D. 1947.

F. L. WRIGHT,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL]

WALKER WOOD,
Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The credentials will be placed on file.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Senator-elect from Mississippi is present and desires to take the oath of office.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator-elect will present himself at the desk, and the oath will be administered.

Mr. STENNIS, escorted by Mr. EASTLAND, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to him by the President pro tempore.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 164) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is reassembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair appoints as the committee to wait upon the President of the United States the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

UNITED STATES-READING BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced the appointment of Mr. MARTIN and Mr. MYERS members on the part of the Senate of the United States-Reading Bicentennial Commission, established by Public Law No. 359, approved August 4, 1947.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORTS ON WAR CONTRACT TERMINATIONS AND SETTLEMENTS

Two letters from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the twelfth quarterly report of the Office of Contract Settlement, covering the period April 1 through July 30, 1947, and the thirteenth quarterly report on contract settlement, covering the period July 1 through September 30, 1947 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AIDS TO NAVIGATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL ALCOHOL ADMINISTRATION ACT, AS AMENDED

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

SERVICE CREDIT FOR CERTAIN ENLISTED MEN OF COAST GUARD

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to allow service credit for certain enlisted men of the Coast Guard who acted as policemen and guards at the Ivigtut Cryolite Mine, Greenland, during 1940 and 1941 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

TRANSPORTATION OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the transportation for certain Government and other personnel necessary for the effective prosecution of the war, for the period July 1, 1946, through June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

CLAIMS PAID BY THE PANAMA CANAL

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of claims paid by the Panama Canal for the period August 2, 1946, to June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his sixteenth report covering the period from May 1 through September 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Attorney General, withdrawing the name of Frederico Gonzalez-Benavides from a report relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended for more than 6 months, transmitted by him to the Senate on July 1, 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON FEDERAL TORT CLAIMS PAID BY POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on claims paid by the Post Office Department under the provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act from the date of the approval of that act to the end of the fiscal year 1946–47 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF CERTAIN NAVAL VESSELS

Nine letters from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, on the transfer of certain vessels by the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

TRANSPORTATION OF PERSONNEL ATTACHED TO NAVAL ESTABLISHMENTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relating to the adequate transportation to and from their places of employment for personnel attached to or employed by naval establishments and Navy contractors (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PAYMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGE CAUSED BY NAVAL VESSELS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the payment of claims for damage occasioned by naval vessels, which have been settled by the Navy Department (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGE CAUSED TO NAVAL VESSELS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the settlement of claims for damage caused to United States naval vessels, fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

ELIMINATION OF REQUIREMENT OF OATHS IN CERTAIN PUBLIC LAND MATTERS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to eliminate the requirement of oaths in certain public-land matters and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands.

DEVELOPMENT OF NUECES RIVER BASIN, TEX.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report and findings on a plan for water resources development of the Nueces River Basin, including Baffins Bay coastal area, Texas, together with related data and letters of comment on same (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

REPORT ON CONDITIONS IN UNDERGROUND BITUMINOUS-COAL AND LIGNITE MINES

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the first quarterly report covering conditions in all underground bituminous-coal and lignite mines investigated or inspected by Federal coal-mine inspectors (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Lands.

LEGISLATION PASSED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN AND ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Councils of St. Thomas and St. John and St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Councils of St. Thomas and St. John and St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

Three letters from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Councils of St. Thomas and St. John and St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LANDS FROM YUMA AUXILIARY PROJECT, ARIZONA

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation authorizing the transfer of certain lands from the Yuma auxiliary project, Arizona, to the Gila project, Arizona, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands.

COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS AND MARKETING QUOTAS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, relating to cotton acreage allotments and marketing quotas; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourteenth annual report of the Farm Credit Administration covering its operations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS ON CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the 30-day period ended July 28, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Two letters from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication

of foot-and-mouth disease for the months of August and September 1947 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SECOND DECONTROL ACT REPORT

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the first quarterly report under the Second Decontrol Act of 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BOUNDARY LINE BETWEEN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND VIRGINIA

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes," approved October 31, 1945 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of all tort claims paid by the Department of Commerce during the fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ESTIMATES OF PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

A letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report of personnel ceilings as determined and fixed pursuant to section 607 of the act as amended by section 14 of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1946 (Public Law 390, 79th Cong.) for the quarter ending June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Civil Service.

REPORT OF COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Comptroller of the Currency for the year 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AUDIT REPORT ON GOVERNMENT SERVICES, INC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on Government Services, Inc., for the period January 1, 1927, to December 31, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

AUDIT REPORTS OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION, ETC.

Two letters from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, volumes 2 and 7 of the Report on the Audit of reconstruction Finance Corporation and Affiliated Corporations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

AUDIT REPORT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS COMPANY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the audit of The Virgin Islands Company for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT ON CONTRACT BETWEEN MARITIME COMMISSION AND BETHLEHEM-FAIRFIELD SHIPYARD, INC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a report concerning the conversion of a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract between the United States Maritime Commission and Bethlehem-Fairfield Shipyard, Inc., to a fixed-price basis and the subsequent disposal of shipyard facilities and inventory to the contractor (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

AMENDMENT TO CHARTER AGREEMENT BETWEEN WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION AND MERCHANTS & MINERS TRANSPORTATION CO.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a report concerning an amendment to a charter agreement between the War Shipping Administration and Merchants & Miners Transportation Co. (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

HYDROELECTRIC PLANT AT BULL SHOALS DAM, ARK.

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting copy of an order of the Commission dismissing the application for license by the White River Power Co. for the construction, operation, and maintenance of a hydroelectric plant at the Bull Shoals Dam, Ark. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, copies of the newly issued reports on Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, 1946, and Natural Gas Company Cost Units (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Fourteenth Annual Report of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, covering reports of all its constituent units, the Federal Home Loan Bank System, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and the United States Housing Corporation for the fiscal year 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

TYPICAL RESIDENTIAL ELECTRIC BILLS

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of the newly issued "Typical Residential Electric Bills, Cities of 2,500 Population and More, 1947" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

TYPICAL ELECTRIC BILLS, RESIDENTIAL, COMMERCIAL, AND INDUSTRIAL SERVICES

A letter from the Secretary of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of the newly issued "Typical Electric Bills, Residential, Commercial, and Industrial Services, Cities of 50,000 Population and More, January 1, 1947" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Chairman of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the official proceedings of that Commission for the year 1946, with other information relating to the regulation and operation of the public utilities in the District of Columbia (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENDITURES FOR VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide basic authority for certain administrative expenditures for the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON ALASKAN OCEAN TRANSPORTATION ACTIVITIES

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting pursuant to law, the second report of that Commission on Alaskan Ocean Transportation Activities (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON WITHIN-GRADE SALARY ADVANCEMENTS IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a consolidated report and supporting data covering additional within-grade salary advancements as rewards for superior accomplishment made by the several Government departments and agencies during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETROL CORP. AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chief Clerk of the Court of Claims of the United States, Washington, D. C., reporting that the case of *Petrol Corp. v. United States*, Congressional No. 17848, had been dismissed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF OPERATIONS OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the Acting Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of that Bank for the period January-June 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION

Two letters from the Administrator of the War Assets Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the second and third quarterly reports of that Administration, for the year 1947 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

MENTAL PATIENTS AT ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the voluntary admission and treatment of mental patients at St. Elizabeths Hospital (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

A letter from the chairman of the District of Columbia Development Land Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that agency for the year 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman and Secretary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the operations of the Corporation for the period from the organization of the Corporation on February 2, 1932, to December 31, 1945, inclusive (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Chairman and Secretary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the operations of the Corporation for the period from the organization of the Corporation on February 2, 1932, to March 31, 1947, inclusive (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF ADMINISTRATOR OF RENT CONTROL

A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the eleventh semiannual report of the Administrator of Rent Control, covering the period January 1 to June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the Secretary of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a corrected copy of the eleventh semiannual report of the Administrator of Rent Control, covering the period January 1 to June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

LAWS PASSED BY ALASKA TERRITORIAL LEGISLATURE

A letter from the Secretary of Alaska, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the Laws of Alaska passed by the Alaska Territorial Legislature, Eighteenth Session, 1947 (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Public Lands.

REPORTS FILED DURING ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, reports filed pursuant to law with the Secretary of the Senate during the adjournment will be referred to the appropriate committees.

The reports are as follows:

LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS (H. DOC. NO. 437)

A message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the twenty-fourth report of operations under the Lend-Lease Act.

This report contains a brief statement of the latest reports of transfers made under the Lend-Lease Act since the date of enactment, and a description of the final settlements with the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Union of South Africa. The texts of the settlement agreements with those two countries are printed in the appendix. Both are in accord with the general principles of settlement followed in negotiating with all the lend-lease governments, and I am satisfied that they are in the best interests of the United States while adhering to the general principles set forth in the various master lend-lease agreements.

Quarterly reports will hereafter be based on the fiscal reports prepared by the Office of Lend-Lease Fiscal Operations of the Treasury Department. These reports contain statements of the total lend-lease aid rendered and show the status of the lend-lease appropriations in detail. As further final settlements are negotiated they will be included in the quarterly reports.

Lend-lease operations are now confined to wind-up activities. These consist of negotiating final lend-lease settlements, the disposal of the remainder of the lend-lease "pipe lines" and the collection and accounting activities handled by the Treasury Department. Negotiation of final settlements is now in process with the Governments of the U. S. S. R., China, Brazil, Norway, Czechoslovakia, Greece, and Yugoslavia. Delivery of the remaining goods in the "pipe lines" is being completed as rapidly as possible for those countries for which authorization was granted by the Congress in the supplemental appropriation act, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 10, 1947.*

REPORTS ON FOREIGN SURPLUS DISPOSAL

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the sixth report of that Department on the disposal of United States surplus property in foreign areas (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the seventh report of that Department on the disposal of United States surplus property in foreign areas (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Four letters from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of the activities and expenditures of the Corporation for the months of March, April, May, and June, 1947 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

APPRECIATION OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE AT CONFIRMATION BY SENATE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from James Forrestal, expressing his gratitude at the action of the Senate in confirming his nomination as Secretary of Defense, which was ordered to lie on the table.

CLARIFICATION OF PROCEDURE OF COMMITTEE INVESTIGATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a letter from Eric Johnston, of the Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., Washington, D. C., favoring the overhauling by Congress of its procedure in committee investigations to clarify and make secure the rights of individual citizens, which, together with a copy of my reply thereto, will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

POLITICAL CONDITIONS IN NICARAGUA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a letter from the Chief of Protocol of the State Department, transmitting a communication from the President of the National Assembly of Panama, relating to political conditions in Nicaragua, which, with the accompanying papers, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following petitions, etc., which were referred as indicated:

A resolution of the Guam Congress; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"Whereas the people of Guam through their official and duly elected representatives, the Guam Congress, are cognizant and appreciative of the Navy Department's endorsement of the Hopkins committee report regarding Guam's need of becoming permanently affiliated with the mother country by according its inhabitants American citizenship and providing also, its people with civil rights by the enactment of an organic law; and

"Whereas the Navy Department, throughout the 49 years of administration of the island of Guam, has enjoyed the confidence and friendship of the people of Guam; and

"Whereas the report that the Navy Department in harmony with other departments of the Government of the United States has officially gone on record as endorsing and approving the Hopkins committee report and has strengthened the friendship, good will, and confidence which the people of Guam have generally maintained with the Department of the Navy; and

"Whereas the duly elected representatives of the people of Guam, the Guam Congress, have maintained that the Navy Department is deserving of commendation for its interest and efforts for the betterment and general welfare of the people of Guam, despite the overdue extension and recognition of the people's faithfulness and desire to become a component part of the American Republic; and

"Whereas the people of Guam, through their official representatives, having thoroughly familiarized themselves with that part of the Hopkins committee report which recommends immediate granting of citizenship, an enactment of an organic act and a civil government for Guam, fully recognize and concur with that committee's recommendation that the Navy Department, through long years of experience and administration of the government of Guam, is well equipped to administer Guam for the interim, by virtue of its facilities and understanding of the economic situation and present position of the people of Guam in their efforts toward rehabilitation: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved by both houses of congress, the house of assembly and the house of council, in joint session assembled,* That in the light of present economic conditions on the island and by reason of the economic plight of the people of Guam as they seek to adjust their economic position and to rehabilitate themselves and be in a position to compete economically with the outside world not affected by the disaster brought about by the recent war, petition the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States, that the Navy Department continue to have the administrative responsibility of Guam, on an interim basis, pending the transfer to a civilian agency at the earliest possible date to be determined by the President of the United States, such date being, it is hoped, when the island has been completely rehabilitated and the economy of the island fully restored; be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Governor of Guam, the official representative of the United States, be requested to transmit this resolution via the Navy Department to the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States and that copies of this resolution be furnished the Navy Department, Department of the Interior, State Department, Labor Department, and other Government agencies concerned.

"Done this 6th day of September A. D. 1947."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 72

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States in the interest of public welfare to investigate the advisability of continuing certain agricultural programs, services, and aids heretofore financed and administered by the Federal Government

"Whereas the Congress of the United States in an effort to reduce Government expenditures has deemed it advisable to cut out certain bureaus and eliminate wasteful and ex-

travagant practices, including subsidies, doles, and paternalism; and

"Whereas Congress is to be congratulated for its endeavor to decrease governmental expenditures and thereby relieve the burden of heavy taxes on the people of this Nation; and

"Whereas there are certain existing programs including reforestation, soil conservation, and the school-lunch program which are now being administered by the Secretary of Agriculture which have been exceedingly beneficial to the rural areas and have improved and conserved our soil, increased farm production, replenished our forest crops and soil, including the establishment of better agricultural practices and improved health among our farm families and school children all of which have contributed much to our national well-being and to the successful prosecution of the recent war; and

"Whereas agricultural production during the war years has taken from our soil vast amounts of soil fertility which must be replaced if we are to provide sufficient and adequate food and forest products to meet our demands; and

"Whereas the school lunch program has provided more adequate nutrition for our school children and has increased the market for farm products, including dairy products; and

"Whereas it is the desire of this legislature in expressing the sentiment of the majority of the citizens in the State of Wisconsin to see agriculture and the people of the rural areas prosper and the Nation's soil, forest products, and other natural resources conserved: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be requested to reexamine the agricultural program and perpetuate and continue such portions thereof as it deems essential in the best interests of our Nation's welfare consistent with the policy of economy and the recognition of the rights of the States to conduct their own affairs without the interference of the Federal Government; be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly attested copies of this resolution be transmittted to each House of Congress and to each Wisconsin Member thereof."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Joint Resolution 48

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to make a study of the continuing housing shortage in the United States, the causes and possible remedies therefor, together with pending legislation relative thereto; and thereupon to formulate and enact legislation designed to hasten alleviation of the present housing plight

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin recognizes that a general housing shortage in the United States continues to exist and that the dwelling accommodations of many of our citizens, particularly veterans and their families, are inadequate and undesirable; and

"Whereas advanced building costs, scarcity of building materials, and other obstacles to mass home building threaten to prolong the time when residential construction will provide suitable living quarters for many of our poorly housed people; and

"Whereas this problem of Nation-wide private and public housing, so vital to the general welfare, requires profound thought and study of the causes and possible remedies of the housing deficiency as a basis for sound legislation which should be designed not only to furnish a decent home for those in need at the earliest possible time, but to recognize the interests of every individual and group affected: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring)*, That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to make a thorough study of private and public housing problems in the United States, the causes and possible remedies for the continuing housing shortage, together with pending legislation relative thereto; and thereupon formulate and enact legislation designed to hasten alleviation of the present housing plight with a view to recognizing the interests of every individual and group affected thereby; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That properly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to each House of the Congress and to each Wisconsin Member thereof."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 27

"Joint resolution memorializing the United States Senate to disapprove a convention between the United States of America and Canada, relating to fisheries of the Great Lakes and their connecting waters, signed at Washington, April 2, 1946

"Whereas a convention was negotiated and signed April 2, 1946, with the objective of providing for the development, protection, and conservation of the fisheries of the Great Lakes by joint action of governmental agencies of the United States and Canada; and

"Whereas as a means for achieving such objective the convention creates an international commission for the Great Lakes fisheries; and

"Whereas if such convention becomes effective, Wisconsin and other States of the Union having responsibility and valuable interests in such fisheries will lose jurisdiction over the same; and

"Whereas, of the waters affected, Lake Michigan and Green Bay lie wholly within the United States and are not international waters lying solely within the jurisdiction of the States of Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin respectively; and

"Whereas the inclusion of the waters of Lake Michigan in the proposed international treaty delegates for 10 years the sovereign rights of the United States and of the State of Wisconsin to an international governmental agency; and

"Whereas the interests of the State of Wisconsin in these waters and fisheries will best be served if the convention is not ratified; and

"Whereas Wisconsin residents of the territory bordering on these waters are very much opposed to the convention establishing an international authority over such fisheries: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring)*, That this legislature respectfully memorializes the Senate of the United States to disapprove ratification of the convention between the United States and Canada relating to fisheries of the Great Lakes and connecting waters signed at Washington April 2, 1946; and be it

"*Resolved*, That properly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Senate of the United States, to each Wisconsin Member of said Senate, and to the Governor and conservation commission respectively of the States of Michigan, Illinois, and Indiana; and be it

"*Resolved further*, That the attorney general of Wisconsin be directed to inform the appropriate Federal authorities of the desire of the State of Wisconsin to intervene before the appropriate senatorial committee in opposition to the treaty creating such international commission."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Senate Joint Resolution 72

"Joint resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to halt the diversion of war materials to Russia and other war-minded countries

"Whereas for some time prior to Pearl Harbor this country was eagerly and naively engaged in the sale and shipment of oil, steel, and scrap iron to Japan, thereby implementing Japanese military might and enabling her to kill, maim, or capture millions of citizens of America and its territories; and

"Whereas this country is today furnishing gasoline, fuel oil, and other materials of war to Russia and other war-minded nations in a tragic parallel to pre-Pearl Harbor policy: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring)*, That the Legislature of Wisconsin memorialize the President and the Congress of the United States to issue such orders and enact such legislation as may be necessary to halt the sale and shipment of such war materials to the war-minded nations; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the President, to the Clerks of both Houses of the Congress, and to each Wisconsin Member thereof."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 86

"Joint resolution requesting Congress to establish national veterans' cemeteries in Wisconsin

"Whereas the Veterans of Foreign Wars, department of Wisconsin, unanimously adopted at its twenty-sixth national encampment at Superior, on June 28, 1947, a resolution asking for the establishment of one national cemetery in this State; and

"Whereas there are presently no national cemeteries in Wisconsin: Now, therefore be it

"*Resolved by the assembly, the senate concurring*, That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to establish in Wisconsin one national cemetery for the burial of persons (including those disinterred) who were members of the United States armed forces in any of its wars and residents of Wisconsin; be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President, each House of Congress, and each Wisconsin Member thereof."

A resolution adopted at the convention of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners at Denver, Colo., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for a livestock-game-range study; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from J. E. MacDonald, commissioner of agriculture, State of Texas, relating to export controls on lard; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted by the Thirty-Second Division, Veteran Association, at Saginaw, Mich., favoring the enactment of legislation providing universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the State Council of New York, Junior Order United American Mechanics, assembled at Binghamton, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the maintenance and occupation under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States of all islands for air and naval bases which were acquired through conquest during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

The petition of Servillano Olivares, commander, and officers and members of the McKinley Brigade Guerrilla Unit, Second Battalion, First Infantry, Fil-American Irregular

Troops, Manila, Philippine Islands, expressing the gratitude of that organization for the independence of the Philippines and offering their services in any future conflict under the American flag (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted at the annual meeting of the American Bar Association in Cleveland, Ohio, relating to the court-martial procedure in the Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the State encampment of the department of Massachusetts, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Boston, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation authorizing GI's to sit on court-martial boards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the National Board of the Communist Party, New York, N. Y., signed by William Z. Foster, chairman, and Eugene Dennis, general secretary, relating to the so-called Marshall foreign relief plan and price control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Resolutions adopted by the State encampment of the Department of Massachusetts, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Boston, Mass., favoring the enactment of the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill providing for low-cost rental and sales housing for veterans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from Arthur F. Boyce, Buffalo, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of House bill 1389, to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, in order to define "active duty"; to the Committee on Civil Service.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Coral Clark, executive secretary, Society for the Study of Institutions, Washington, D. C., relating to the protest of Dr. James C. You, in being discharged as Administrative Officer, Central Translating Division of the State Department; to the Committee on Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the State Encampment of the Department of Massachusetts, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Boston, Mass., favoring the enactment of House bill 1889, the so-called Veterans of Foreign War's adjusted service bill; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the State Encampment of the Department of Massachusetts, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Boston, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation to empower the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to remit all excess National Service Life Insurance funds as dividends to insured veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Alabama State Board of Public Welfare, Montgomery, Ala., endorsing the action of the Alabama Legislature in petitioning Congress to broaden the public assistance and social insurance phases of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan, providing for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Florida Society of Military Chiropractors, Orlando, Fla., favoring the removal of Gen. Omar N. Bradley as Administrator of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter from the Chief of Protocol, of the Department of State, transmitting a letter from the Lithuanian Displaced Persons Camp, Gross Hesepe, Germany, expressing appreciation of certain displaced persons in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Great Lakes Harbors Association, at Toledo, Ohio, favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Supreme Council of the Tau Epsilon Rho Fraternity, Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the establishment of a national democratic and free Jewish home in Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the executive board of the Lithuanian-American Council, Chicago, Ill., praying for the restoration of independence of the republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Great Lakes Harbors Association, at Toledo, Ohio, favoring early and careful consideration to the problem of postwar restoration and rehabilitation of Great Lakes shipping and of the coastwise and intercoastal merchant marine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the State encampment of the Department of Massachusetts, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Boston, Mass., favoring the enactment of House bill 246, providing increases in the ceilings of on-the-job-training program for veterans; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Hawaiian Government Employees Association, favoring statehood for Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands.

The petition of Gottfried Seitz, of Honolulu, T. H., relating to his status as a citizen of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

The petition of Carmelo B. L. Martinez, of New York, N. Y., praying for the granting of statehood to Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Anne A. Christian, of New York City, N. Y., relating to legislation providing for flood control, and so forth; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the board of supervisors of the county of Maui, T. H., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for a post office and Federal building on the island of Maui; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the city of La Belle, Hendry County, Fla., favoring the enactment of legislation appropriating sufficient funds providing for proper water control of the Everglades from the Kissimmee Swamp to the southern end of the mainland of Florida; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the mayor and town council of Palm Beach, Palm Beach County, Fla., favoring the enactment of legislation providing proper water control of the Everglades from the Kissimmee Valley to the southern end of the mainland of Florida, for the purpose of protecting and preserving the great natural assets of the Everglades; to the Committee on Public Works.

The petition of Joseph William Hanley, Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to place old soldiers, sailors, and marines in Senate positions; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The petition of Alexander Laing and sundry other members of the faculty of Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H., relating to investigating committees of Congress; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A resolution adopted at the convention of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners at Denver, Colo., endorsing the Federal program for combating the foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted at the convention of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners at Denver, Colo., reaffirming support for an adequate, comprehensive, Nation-wide soil conservation program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted at the convention of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners at Denver, Colo., favoring preservation of wilderness areas; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted at the convention of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners at Denver, Colo., favoring national and international conservation programs; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted at the convention of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners at Denver, Colo., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for membership of that Association on National Forest Advisory Boards; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted at the convention of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners at Denver, Colo., reaffirming support of the program for consolidation of the roadless or wilderness areas in the Superior National Forest and for the establishment, in cooperation with the appropriate authorities in Canada, of an international wilderness memorial area; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted at the convention of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners at Denver, Colo., favoring the enactment of legislation providing sufficient funds for the United States Forest Service to properly administer the Forest Service; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted at the convention of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners at Denver, Colo., relating to the preservation of wildlife and recreational purposes in public projects; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted at the convention of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners at Denver, Colo., favoring the appointment of a standing committee of that organization by its president to make a study of the administrative procedures of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted at the convention of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners at Denver, Colo., favoring the enactment of House bill 1693, providing for use of proceeds of the excise tax on fishing tackle for fish conservation purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted at the convention of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners at Denver, Colo., favoring the enactment of House bill 3578, relating to the Parker River Wildlife Refuge in Essex County, Mass.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted at the convention of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners at Denver, Colo., favoring the enactment of House bill 2617, relating to an increase in the duck stamp fee and public hunting grounds in duck stamp refuges; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted at the convention of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners at Denver, Colo., favoring the enactment of House bill 2721, requiring management of upper Mississippi navigation facilities and maintenance of pool levels with consideration for the needs of fish and other wildlife resources; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted at the convention of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners at Denver, Colo., favoring continuation of regional meetings by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service with State game and fish or conservation officials for consideration of proposed migratory bird regulations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted at the convention of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners at Denver, Colo., relating to the protection of Canada geese and other migratory game birds in critical areas, including the Horseshoe Lake area in Illinois; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted at the convention of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners at Denver, Colo., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for a wildlife extension service; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A resolution adopted at the convention of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners at Denver, Colo., favoring the enactment of legislation providing adequate funds to continue the necessary field administration of the public domain lands included in grazing districts; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A resolution adopted at the convention of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners at Denver, Colo., protesting against the sale of Taylor grazing lands, National Forest Reserves, or any other public domain to any individuals for special interests; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A resolution adopted at the convention of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners at Denver, Colo., favoring the enactment of the so-called Wherry-Burke bills providing for the transfer of suitable surplus war lands to the States for wildlife purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A resolution adopted at the convention of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners at Denver, Colo., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 33, relating to the administration of the national forest grazing lands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A resolution adopted at the convention of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners at Denver, Colo., relating to the use and development of the water resources of the several States; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted at the convention of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners at Denver, Colo., relating to Federal water pollution control legislation; to the Committee on Public Works.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate reports for the months of June, July, and August 1947, from the chairman of a certain committee, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

SEPTEMBER 1947.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of a person employed by the committee who is not a full-time employee of the Senate or of the committee for the months of June, July, and August 1947, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

W. Harold Lane (beginning June 2), 1436 North Inglewood, Arlington, Va.; Bureau of Internal Revenue; annual salary, $7,102.20.

OWEN BREWSTER,
Chairman.

PEACE WITH JUSTICE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR VANDENBERG

[Mr. WHITE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject, Peace With Justice, delivered by Senator Mr. VANDENBERG, at the University of Michigan, November 3, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

CANDIDACY OF SAM H. JONES IN LOUISIANA—ADDRESS BY SENATOR OVERTON

[Mr. OVERTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by him on November 10, 1947, in behalf of Hon. Sam H. Jones, candidate for Governor of Louisiana, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LAW AND GOVERNMENT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Law and Government," delivered by him before the annual meeting of the American Bar Association, Cleveland, Ohio, September 24, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move that when the Senate adjourns today the adjournment be until Thursday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] be excused from attendance upon the sessions of the Senate during this week, because he has been unavoidably detained en route from Europe.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

(At this point, Mr. OVERTON asked and obtained leave to have certain matter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I do not wish to object to the request of the Senator from Louisiana, but it is very much hoped that the Senate may dispense with morning business, the call of the calendar, and other matters of the sort, today, so that at the earliest possible moment it may be able to proceed with the consideration of the legislation so vigorously urged by the President, the emergency foreign-aid bill. It is hoped that that will reach the floor a little later this week, possibly today. I hope the Senate will not today become involved in the transaction of morning business, or in efforts to have a call of the calendar. I make that as a suggestion, without objecting to the request of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator.

(Mr. WHITE asked and obtained leave to have certain matter printed in the Appendix.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It seems proper to the Chair, under the circumstances, that the Chair should invite any other insertions in the RECORD which may be desired.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make an observation. I hope the insertions which have just been authorized will not be regarded as establishing a precedent of the Senate with respect to the beginning of sessions of the Congress. The Parliamentarians of the two Houses have interpreted the mongrel resolution, under which the Congress was in recess, to mean that the present session is merely an extension of the last session, and therefore not the beginning of a new session in which we have to go through the ordinary routine. Heretofore when the Congress has convened in a new session it has been customary, as a matter of courtesy to the President of the United States, to take no action, even in regard to insertion of matters in the RECORD, until after the President has delivered his message. I hope that custom will not be violated, or that it will be interpreted that there has been a reversal of the former policy merely because during the session today, which is an extension of the last session, insertions in the RECORD have been permitted.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I am in complete concurrence with what the Senator from Kentucky has said, and I renew my motion that the Senate now stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would like to say to the Senator from Kentucky that it will be necessary to make one exception to his expressed wish, because the bill providing for foreign relief must be introduced today if the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is to begin consideration of it immediately.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I was not objecting to any of the procedure today, on the theory that the present session is simply an extension of the last session. I was hoping, however, that the procedure would not be taken as a precedent to govern us in the future when there is either a regular or an extraordinary session under the ordinary constitutional procedure.

THE NATURE OF THE PRESENT SESSION OF CONGRESS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield to me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. WHITE. May I ask for what purpose the Senator from Wisconsin desires to have me yield to him?

Mr. WILEY. In the first instance, I may say I want to follow the precedent which has just been set. I desire to comment for a minute on the question whether or not this is a special session of Congress or whether we are now in continuance of the regular session. I have had the subject briefed for me, and what I shall say will take only a minute.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I think the practice referred to by the Senator from Kentucky is so salutary that we ought not to depart from it. I yield in this instance, but I shall object to all further transgressions upon the practice.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the convening of Congress today raises a number of somewhat technical questions as to

whether or not this is a special or an extra session, and as to whether or not the first session of the Eightieth Congress has been terminated, or whether as we convene today we simply resume the first session of the Eightieth Congress. For a number of reasons it is desirable that the status of the present session be clearly defined.

As chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I have been concerned with one aspect of this problem. On January 3, 1947, at the beginning of the first regular session of the Eightieth Congress, the Attorney General reported to the Congress certain amendments of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure as adopted by the Supreme Court in its order of December 27, 1946, pursuant to the act of June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1064, 28 U. S. C., sec. 723 (c)). Rule 86 (b), as amended, provides for the effective date of the amendments, and reads, in part, as follows:

The amendments adopted by the Supreme Court on December 27, 1946, and transmitted to the Attorney General on January 2, 1947, shall take effect on the day which is 3 months subsequent to the adjournment of the first regular session of the Eightieth Congress, but if that day is prior to September 1, 1947, then these amendments shall take effect on September 1, 1947.

It is not my purpose to present a detailed legal discussion on this question, but I do wish to insert into the RECORD a comprehensive and rather detailed brief which the Federal Law Section of the Library of Congress prepared at my request, in which the conclusion is expressed that we are simply resuming the first regular session of the Eightieth Congress, and that this view causes no legislative difficulties and is the one most consonant with the Constitution, the law, and the precedents.

Accordingly I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the memorandum which the Federal Law Section has prepared for me with reference to the effective date of amendments of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, in which memorandum the status of the present session is defined.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
November 5, 1947.

To: Senate Committee on the Judiciary.
From: Federal Law Section.
With reference to: Effective date of amendments of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

On January 3, 1947, the Attorney General reported to Congress at the beginning of the first regular session of the Eightieth Congress certain amendments of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure as adopted by the Supreme Court in its order of December 27, 1946, pursuant to the act of June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1064, 28 U. S. C., sec. 723c). Rule 86 (b), as amended, provides for the effective date of the amendments and reads in part as follows:

"The amendments adopted by the Supreme Court on December 27, 1946, and transmitted to the Attorney General on January 2, 1947, shall take effect on the day which is 3 months subsequent to the adjournment of the first regular session of the Eightieth Congress; but if that day is prior to September 1, 1947, then these amendments shall take effect on September 1, 1947."

This is in accord with the terms of section 2 of the act of June 19, 1934, above referred to, which provides that the rules "shall not take effect until they shall have been reported to Congress by the Attorney General at the beginning of a regular session thereof and until after the close of such session."

The Senate and House of Representatives, sitting in the first regular session of the Eightieth Congress, adjourned pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 33, as amended, on July 27, 1947, to January 2, 1948, or to an earlier date on notification by the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, and the majority leaders of the Senate and House, all acting jointly. The terms of the resolution make it evident that the adjournment on July 27 was more in the nature of a recess and was not a final adjournment of the first regular session. This is borne out by the fact that Senate Joint Resolution 156, as enacted, fixes the date of the meeting of the second regular session as January 6, 1948. Further confirmation is found in the statement of the majority leader of the House, Mr. HALLECK, that the order of business on January 2, 1948, "will be a motion to adjourn sine die" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 26, 1947, p. 10521). Accordingly, the conclusion must be that the adjournment on July 27 was not the kind of final adjournment, ending the first regular session, as was contemplated by amended rule 86 (b). It is settled that when the two Houses adjourn for more than 3 days, and not to or beyond the day fixed by the Constitution or by law for the next regular session to begin, the present session is not thereby necessarily terminated (Fifth Hinds' Precedents of the House of Representatives (1907), secs. 6676, 6677). An adjournment other than sine die amounts only to a recess or dispersion of Congress for a certain period ((1892) 20 Op. Atty. Gen. 503). Hence, the amendments to the rules did not become effective on September 1, 1947, and will not become effective until 3 months after an adjournment sine die of the first regular session. This opinion is shared by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Mr. Chandler, as stated in his annual report of September 1947, and, unofficially, by Circuit Judge Charles E. Clark, the reporter for the Supreme Court's Advisory Committee on Rules of Civil Procedure. To the same effect, see Release No. 31, August 4, 1947, Tenth Federal Rules Service.

By proclamation of October 23, 1947, the President has declared that an "extraordinary occasion" requires that Congress convene on November 17, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon, of which proclamation "all persons who shall at that time be entitled to act as members thereof are hereby required to take notice" (12 Fed. Reg. 6941). This meeting of Congress, therefore, has been called by the President in the exercise of his powers and not by Congress itself pursuant to the terms of Senate Resolution 33. The question then arises as to the character of this session, for the answer to that question also indicates the time from which the three months prescribed in amended rule 86 (b) will begin to run. Three views are possible: (1) that the convening of Congress by the President begins a special session which in itself terminates the first regular session; (2) that the session commencing November 17 will be a special session during a recess of the first regular session but without terminating the first session; and (3) that the session beginning November 17 is only a resumption of the first regular session.

The first view above seems to be supported by Jefferson's Manual. Jefferson stated (House Rules and Manual, 80th Cong., p. 265):

"Congress separate in two ways only, to wit, by adjournment, or dissolution by the efflux of their time. What, then, constitutes a session with them? A dissolution certainly closes one session, and the meeting of the new Congress begins another. The Constitution authorizes the President 'on extraordinary occasions to convene both Houses or either of them.' (I, 3.) If convened by the President's proclamation, this must begin a new session, and of course determine the preceding one to have been a session."

Under this view the convening of Congress on November 17 would commence a special or extra session and at the same time would terminate the first session, presumably, as of 12 o'clock noon of that day. Accordingly the three months specified in Rule 86 (b) as amended would begin to run from that time.

The difficulty with this position, however, is that it reads into the President's constitutional power more than is stated therein and gives him the added power to terminate or dissolve a regular session of Congress. Article II, section 3, merely states that the President "may, on extraordinary occasions, convene both Houses, or either of them, and in case of disagreement between them, with respect to the time of adjournment, he may adjourn them to such time as he shall think proper." The only power conferred is one to convene Congress and the power to adjourn is expressly limited. It may be doubted, therefore, whether there is any constitutional warrant for the view that by convening Congress upon an extraordinary occasion the President may thereby terminate a regular session of Congress.

The second possibility is that the session commencing November 17 is a special or extra session which will take place during the recess of the first regular session but will not terminate it. Under this view the special session would have no effect with regard to the effectiveness of the rules if it were adjourned some time prior to January 2, 1948. Upon the advent of January 2, 1948 (the date fixed by resolution for the resumption of the first regular session) it would seem that the special session would then automatically terminate, unless Congress rescinded its previous resolution. (See and compare 2 Hinds' op. cit. supra, sec. 1160; 5 Hinds' op. cit. supra, secs. 6687, 6690, 6691, 6692.)

Hence, in either case, the 3 months prescribed in rule 86 (b) as amended would begin to run from January 2, 1948. Assuming for the moment, however, that Congress in special session could rescind its prior resolution relating to January 2, 1948, then upon such rescission the special session could continue until January 6, 1948, the time fixed by law for the beginning of the second regular session, and would then automatically terminate. Ibid. But in this case the exact date for the adjournment sine die of the first session would have to be fixed by Congress or else it could not be definitely determined.

The possibilities here advanced, however, are quite objectionable in that they invoke a strained interpretation of the situation, and are based on a technical construction which promotes the theory of a session within a session. Aside from the fact that this is difficult to conceive, except in the abstract, it would raise numerous problems of the legislative process which would cause great difficulty. Such an interpretation should be avoided if at all possible. Moreover, the Senate Judiciary Committee has taken the position that there can be no constructive recess of a regular session during which the Congress is assembled in an extra session—that instead, a recess is one where in actuality the Congress is not assembled at all. "An extraordinary session and a regular session cannot coexist." 5 Hinds', op. cit. supra, sec. 6687.

The third possible view is that when Congress convenes on November 17, it will there-

upon simply resume the first regular session of the Eightieth Congress. This view causes no legislative difficulties and is the one most consonant with the Constitution, the law, and the precedents. The President's constitutional power is one to convene Congress. The character of the session is not described in the Constitution, but the condition for the exercise of the power is described, i. e., "extraordinary occasions." The matter is left to the discretion of the President, to be acted upon as he sees fit at any time. (2 Watson on the Constitution (1910) 1001-1002.) If Congress is not in session, then an assembly pursuant to Presidential directive is in truth an extra or special session. Thus the President's proclamation of September 13, 1939, expressly convened the Congress "in extra session." (4 Fed. Reg. 3899.) But in the present situation, as already noted, Congress is simply in recess and a session of Congress is pending. Had Congress recessed on July 27 without making any express provision for its recall, it would still have been subject to the Presidential order to reassemble. The situation is not changed by Senate Concurrent Resolution 33, which only insured that Congress would retain the power to reassemble itself if it so desired. The President's constitutional power must necessarily be read into this resolution and becomes a part of it, even though not specifically mentioned therein. It was not essential for the resolution to include any reference to the Presidential power, since that was given him by the Constitution. Accordingly, the Presidential proclamation of October 23, 1947, is nothing more than a command to convene and when Congress convenes on November 17 it will be sitting in a continuation of the first regular session, which has never been legally terminated. This is borne out by the fact that the President's proclamation does not refer to a special or extra session, but simply states that "an extraordinary occasion requires the Congress of the United States to convene at the Capitol * * *" (12 Fed. Reg. 6941.) Therefore, since Congress will be reassembled at a date earlier than January 2, 1948 (the date set for final adjournment if nothing transpired) it would seem that that date has no further significance and the end of the first regular session will come whenever Congress adjourns sine die at some time prior to January 6, 1948. Accordingly, the 3 months prescribed in rule 86 (b) will begin to run from the time when such adjournment sine die is effected.

RECESS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I now renew my motion that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I decline to yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Maine that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair, and was called to order by the President pro tempore at 1 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that a committee of three Members had been appointed by the Speaker, on the part of the House of Representatives, to join with the committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House had assembled and that Congress was ready to receive any communication that he might be pleased to make.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 118) providing for a joint session of the two Houses of Congress on Monday, November 17, 1947, at 1:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. WHITE and Mr. BARKLEY appeared, and Mr. WHITE said: Mr. President, the joint committee has notified the President that the two Houses are in session, and the President authorizes the committee to say to the Congress that he sends his respects and good wishes, and that he accepts the invitation to address a joint session of the two Houses of Congress at 1:30 o'clock p. m. today.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hayden	Overton
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Bricker	Hill	Reed
Brooks	Hoey	Revercomb
Buck	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Ives	Robertson, Wyo
Butler	Jenner	Russell
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Capehart	Kem	Sparkman
Capper	Kilgore	Stennis
Chavez	Knowland	Taft
Connally	Lodge	Taylor
Cooper	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Dworshak	McGrath	Tydings
Eastland	McKellar	Umstead
Ecton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Martin	Watkins
Ferguson	Maybank	Wherry
Flanders	Millikin	White
Fulbright	Moore	Wiley
George	Morse	Williams
Green	Myers	Wilson
Gurney	O'Conor	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce, for the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and myself, a bill to implement the relief program, which we ask to have referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations as a basis for the work of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. CONNALLY (for himself and Mr. VANDENBERG), by request, introduced a bill (S. 1757) to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States by providing supplies to certain European countries on an emergency basis, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 118), which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, November 17, 1947, at 1:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I think the hour has arrived when we should normally and properly proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives. Before that is done, I desire to make a motion. I do so because I see no necessity for having the Senate return to this Chamber after the conclusion of the joint session. Therefore, I move that the Senate now proceed to the House of Representatives for attendance upon the joint session, and that at the conclusion of the joint session the Senate stand in adjournment as previously ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will repeat the essence of the order to the Senate, for its information. The Senate will now proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives, and will stand in adjournment following the joint session. The next meeting of the Senate will be on Thursday, at 12 o'clock noon.

So, following the joint session, the Senate will stand in adjournment until Thursday.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.), the Senate, preceded by the Secretary (Carl A. Loeffler) and the Sergeant at Arms (Edward F. McGinnis), and headed by the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of attending the joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives to receive communications from the President of the United States.

(The proceedings in the House of Representatives and the message delivered by the President of the United States at the joint session of the two Houses of Congress appear beginning on p. 10594 of the House proceedings in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

ADJOURNMENT

The joint session of the two Houses having been concluded, the Senate, at 2 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m., under the order previously entered, and as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Senator Bilbo, of Mississippi, stood in adjournment until Thursday, November 20, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the proclamation of the President of the

United States convening this extraordinary session of the Eightieth Congress:

The Clerk read as follows:

CONVENING THE CONGRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A PROCLAMATION

Whereas the public interest requires that the Congress of the United States should be convened at 12 o'clock noon on Monday, the 17th day of November 1947, to receive such communication as may be made by the Executive:

Now, therefore, I, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim and declare that an extraordinary occasion requires the Congress of the United States to convene at the Capitol in the city of Washington on Monday, the 17th day of November 1947, at 12 o'clock noon, of which all persons who shall at that time be entitled to act as Members thereof are hereby required to take notice.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of the United States.

Done at the city of Washington this 23d day of October, in the year of our Lord 1947, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and seventy-second.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

By the President:
ROBERT A. LOVETT,
Acting Secretary of State.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God be merciful unto us and bless us; and cause His face to shine upon us; that Thy way may be known upon earth, Thy saving health among all nations. Let the people praise Thee, O God; let all the people praise Thee. O let the nations be glad and sing for joy; for Thou shalt judge the people righteously, and govern the nations upon earth. Let the people praise Thee, O God; let all the people praise Thee. Then shall the earth yield her increase; and God, even our own God, shall bless us. God shall bless us, and all the ends of the earth shall fear Him.

Let us pray together our Lord's Prayer:

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever.

Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, July 26, 1947, was read and approved.

APPOINTMENTS MADE AFTER ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER, pursuant to the authority conferred upon him by House Resolution 296, Eightieth Congress, and the order of the House of July 26, 1947, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, did on July 29, 1947, appoint as members of the Select Committee on Foreign Aid, the following Members of the House: Mr. EATON, New Jersey, chairman; Mr. HERTER, Massachusetts; Mr. JENKINS, Ohio; Mr. WOLVERTON, New Jersey; Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Minnesota; Mr. CASE, South Dakota; Mr. KUNKEL, Pennsylvania; Mr. VORYS, Ohio; Mr. VURSELL, Illinois; Mr. MACY, New York; Mr. NIXON, California; Mr. COLMER, Mississippi; Mr. RICHARDS, South Carolina; Mr. WALTER, Pennsylvania; Mr. COOLEY, North Carolina; Mr. MAHON, Texas; Mr. BROOKS, Louisiana; Mr. KEOGH, New York; Mr. MONRONEY, Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER, pursuant to the authority conferred upon him by Public Law 203, Eightieth Congress, and the order of the House of July 26, 1947, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, did on July 30, 1947, appoint as commissioners of the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission the following Members on the part of the House to serve with himself: Mr. DIRKSEN, Illinois; Mr. HORAN, Washington; Mr. BLOOM, New York.

The SPEAKER, pursuant to the authority conferred upon him by House Concurrent Resolution 104, Eightieth Congress, and the order of the House of July 26, 1947, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, did on July 30, 1947, appoint as members of the Joint Committee on Housing the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. GAMBLE, New York; Mr. SUNDSTROM, New Jersey; Mr. MCMILLEN, Illinois; Mr. FLETCHER, California; Mr. PATMAN, Texas; Mr. RAINS, Alabama; Mr. BOGGS, Louisiana.

The SPEAKER, pursuant to the authority conferred upon him by Public Law 287, Eightieth Congress, and the order of the House of July 26, 1947, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House did on July 31, 1947, appoint as members of Congressional Aviation Policy Board the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. WOLVERTON, New Jersey; Mr. HINSHAW, California; Mr. STEFAN, Nebraska; Mr. BULWINKLE, North Carolina, Mr. KILDAY, Texas.

The SPEAKER, pursuant to the authority conferred upon him by Public Law 585, Seventy-ninth Congress, and the order of the House of July 26, 1947, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House did on July 31, 1947, appoint as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to fill the existing vacancy thereon Mr. LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas.

The SPEAKER, pursuant to the authority conferred upon him by Public Law 359, Eightieth Congress, and the order of the House of July 26, 1947, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, did on August 5, 1947, appoint as commissioners of the United States-Reading Bicentennial Commission the following Members on the part of the House to serve with himself: Mr. MUHLENBERG, Pennsylvania; Mr. WADSWORTH, New York; Mr. SIMPSON, Pennsylvania; Mr. EBERHARTER, Pennsylvania.

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE AFTER ADJOURNMENT

A message from the Senate, received by the Clerk of the House on July 27, 1947, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 452. An act to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act relating to marketing agreements and orders;

H. R. 618. An act for the relief of Fred O. Donohue;

H. R. 890. An act for the relief of Jessie Thompkins;

H. R. 1085. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Salamone;

H. R. 1260. An act to amend section 107 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934;

H. R. 1316. An act for the relief of Archer C. Gunter;

H. R. 1492. An act for the relief of P. L. (Spud) Murphey, owner and manager of Spud's Tailors, Laundry, & Dry Cleaning Works;

H. R. 1534. An act for the relief of Graff, Washbourne & Dunn;

H. R. 1730. An act for the relief of Mrs. Beulah Hart;

H. R. 1736. An act for the relief of O. Dean Settles and Mrs. Ruth E. Settles, husband and wife; Mrs. Ruth E. Settles, individually; the estate of Ora H. Hatfield; and Mrs. Kittie B. Hatfield;

H. R. 1810. An act to amend the Criminal Code and certain other legislation to permit part-time referees in bankruptcy to act as agents or attorneys for claimants against the United States;

H. R. 2793. An act authorizing an appropriation for the construction, extension, and improvement of a State tuberculosis sanatorium at Galen, Mont., to provide facilities for the treatment of tuberculous Indians in Montana;

H. R. 2811. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, former Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3064. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to the surviving members of the Laguna Band of Mission Indians of California;

H. R. 3308. An act to increase the minimum allowance payable for rehabilitation in certain service-connected cases;

H. R. 3325. An act to enable Osage Indians who served in World War II to obtain loans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3332. An act creating the St. Lawrence Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y.;

H. R. 3395. An act to add certain lands to the Modoc National Forest, Calif.;

H. R. 3613. An act to amend sections 1802 (a), 1802 (b), and 3481 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 3632. An act to extend the time within which applications may be made to the Railroad Retirement Board for certain refunds from the Unemployment Trust Fund;

H. R. 3682. An act to extend the period for providing assistance for certain war-incurred school enrollments;

H. R. 3696. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Daniel Broken Leg;

H. R. 3845. An act for the relief of George J. Hiner;

H. R. 3870. An act to authorize certain expenditures from the appropriation of St. Elizabeths Hospital, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3874. An act to authorize the city of Pierre, S. Dak., to transfer Farm Island to the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4010. An act to authorize the Treasury Department and the United States Government Printing Office to furnish, or to procure

and furnish, administrative materials, supplies, and equipment to public international organizations on a reimbursable basis;

H. R. 4110. An act to amend title I of the act entitled "An act to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work and the more complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges", approved June 29, 1935 (the Bankhead-Jones Act);

H. R. 4124. An act to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 4140. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4308. An act to amend section 1 of the act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662), as amended, relating to the acceptance of decorations, orders, medals, and emblems by officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations, neutral nations, or other American Republics; and

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution to provide for the creation of a joint committee to prepare a plan for the participation by the United States in the observance and celebration in Cuba of the fiftieth anniversary of American and Cuban victories in the War with Spain.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill and joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 272. An act to provide for the utilization of surplus War Department-owned military real property as national cemeteries, when feasible; and

S. J. Res. 144. Joint Resolution authorizing the President to bring into effect an agreement between the United States and the United Nations for the purpose of establishing the permanent headquarters of the United Nations in the United States and authorizing the taking of measures necessary to facilitate compliance with the provisions of such agreement, and for other purposes.

A message from the Senate, received by the Clerk of the House on July 30, 1947, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1544. An act to provide appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the armed forces who lost their lives in the armed services of the United States in World War II;

H. R. 3862. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to grant and convey to Montgomery County, Pa., a certain parcel of land of the United States in Norristown Borough, Montgomery County, Pa., for the purpose of erecting an additional annex to the present courthouse;

H. R. 4111. An act authorizing the construction of flood-control works on the Little Sioux River and its tributaries in Iowa;

H. J. Res. 205. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell timber within the Tongass National Forest; and

H. Con. Res. 107. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means to have printed for its use additional copies of the digest of testimony, index to hearings, and each part of the hearings held during the current session relative to tax revision, 1947-48.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1426. An act to extend veterans' preference benefits to widowed mothers of certain ex-servicemen.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 468. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Imperial Palace, Dramatic Order Knights of Khorassan," to increase the amount of property which the corporation may hold from $100,000 to $5,000,000.

S. 641. An act for the relief of Mrs. Roberta Flake Clayton;

S. 1133. An act providing for the per capita payment of certain moneys appropriated in settlement of certain claims of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in North Dakota;

S. 1235. An act for the relief of Merchants Motor Freight;

S. 1302. An act to aid the associations, groups, organizations, and institutions encouraging participation of the youth of the country in athletic and sports programs by making surplus athletic equipment available to such associations, groups, organizations, and institutions, and for other purposes;

S. 1529. An act to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Shawneetown, Ill.;

S. 1564. An act to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the centennial anniversary of the movement of Henderson and Seth Luelling to the Oregon country;

S. 1632. An act to authorize the transfer of certain troop kitchen railway cars to the War Department, and for other purposes;

S. 1696. An act to amend the act of August 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 784), so as to extend the jurisdiction of the United States District Court, Territory of Hawaii, over Canton and Enderbury Islands;

S. J. Res. 110. Joint resolution to provide for the relocation of the McMillan Fountain; and

S. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution establishing the Joint Committee on Government Information Programs.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had on July 28, 1947, examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of Representatives of the following titles:

H. R. 174. An act to amend section 26, title I, chapter 1, of the act entitled "An act making further provisions for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 321), as amended by the act of May 31, 1938 (52 Stat. 588);

H. R. 452. An act to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act relating to marketing agreement and orders;

H. R. 479. An act relating to the income-tax liability of members of the armed forces dying in the service;

H. R. 493. An act to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 ed.);

H. R. 597. An act to protect American agriculture, horticulture, livestock, and the public health by prohibiting the unauthorized importation into, or the depositing in the territorial waters of, the United States of garbage derived from products originating outside of the continental United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 618. An act for the relief of Fred O. Donohue;

H. R. 629. An act for the relief of A. E. McCartney and O. A. Foster; F. W. Woodyard and J. R. Mahon; B. E. Truitt, T. L. Truitt, and W. B. Lacy; G. W. Cox, J. M. Cox, and F. T. Cox; W. W. Cox and Dr. J. W. Cox; Robert Cathcart and Claude Cathcart;

H. R. 642. An act for the relief of Frank F. Miles;

H. R. 859. An act to provide for the exploration, investigation, development, and maintenance of the fishing resources and development of the high seas fishing industry of the Territories and island possessions of the United States in the tropical and subtropical Pacific Ocean and intervening seas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 890. An act for the relief of Jessie Thompkins;

H. R. 1085. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Salamone;

H. R. 1260. An act to amend section 107 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934;

H. R. 1316. An act for the relief of Arthur C. Gunter;

H. R. 1492. An act for the relief of P. L. (Spud) Murphey, owner and manager of Spud's Tailors, Laundry and Dry Cleaning Works;

H. R. 1534. An act for the relief of Graff, Washbourne and Dunn;

H. R. 1544. An act to provide appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the armed forces who lost their lives in the armed services of the United States in World War II;

H. R. 1602. An act to stimulate exploration, development, and production from domestic mines by private enterprise, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1648. An act for the relief of Willie P. Goodwin, J. M. Thorud, and W. H. Stokley;

H. R. 1730. An act for the relief of Mrs. Beulah Hart;

H. R. 1736. An act for the relief of O. Dean Settles and Mrs. Ruth E. Settles, husband and wife; Mrs. Ruth E. Settles, individually; the estate of Ora N. Hatfield; and Mrs. Kittie B. Hatfield;

H. R. 1791. An act for the relief of Dr. Theodore A. Geissman;

H. R. 1810. An act to amend the Criminal Code and certain other legislation to permit part-time referees in bankruptcy to act as agents or attorneys for claimants against the United States;

H. R. 2173. An act to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 2181. An act relating to institutional on-farm training for veterans;

H. R. 2432. An act for the relief of Harry V. Ball;

H. R. 2534. An act for the relief of James H. Underwood;

H. R. 2659. An act to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance, and provide for the medical and scientific treatment of persons found to be alcoholics by the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2776. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 2793. An act authorizing an appropriation for the construction, extension, and improvement of a State tuberculosis sanatorium at Galen, Mont., to provide facilities for the treatment of tuberculous Indians in Montana;

H. R. 2811. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, former Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2857. An act to extend second-class mailing privileges to bulletins issued by State conservation and fish and game agencies or departments;

H. R. 3045. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe the processes and procedures for

recording instruments of writing in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3064. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to the surviving members of the Laguna Band of Mission Indians of California;

H. R. 3173. An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3215. An act to revise the Medical Department of the Army and the Medical Department of the Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3308. An act to increase the minimum allowance payable for rehabilitation in certain service-connected cases;

H. R. 3309. An act to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico;

H. R. 3325. An act to enable Osage Indians who served in World War II to obtain loans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3332. An act creating the St. Lawrence Bridge Commission and authorizing said Commission and its successors to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y.;

H. R. 3394. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the evacuation and return of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States," approved May 16, 1946, in order to provide for the shipment of the remains of World War II dead to the homeland of the deceased or of next of kin, to provide for the disposition of group and mass burials, to provide for the burial of unknown American World War II dead in United States military cemeteries to be established overseas, to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire land overseas and to establish United States military cemeteries thereon, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3395. An act to add certain lands to the Modoc National Forest, Calif.;

H. R. 3501. An act to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, approved August 9, 1946 (Public Law 704, 79th Cong., 2d sess., 60 Stat. 963), and for other purposes;

H. R. 3546. An act to amend section 200 of Public Law 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, June 29, 1936, to permit recognition of officers and enlisted men retired from the military and naval forces of the United States as representatives of certain organizations in the presentation of claims to the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 3601. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3613. An act to amend sections 1802 (a), 1802 (b), and 3481 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 3632. An act to extend the time within which applications may be made to the Railroad Retirement Board for certain refunds from the Unemployment Trust Fund;

H. R. 3678. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3682. An act to extend the period for providing assistance for certain war-incurred school enrollments;

H. R. 3690. An act to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act;

H. R. 3696. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Daniel Broken Leg;

H. R. 3756. An act making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3830. An act to provide for the promotion and elimination of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3839. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3845. An act for the relief of George J. Hiner;

H. R. 3862. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to grant and convey to Montgomery County, Pa., a certain parcel of land of the United States in Norristown Borough, Montgomery County, Pa., for the purpose of erecting an additional annex to the present courthouse;

H. R. 3870. An act to authorize certain expenditures from the appropriation of Saint Elizabeths Hospital, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3874. An act to authorize the city of Pierre, S. Dak., to transfer Farm Island to the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4002. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4010. An act to authorize the Treasury Department and the United States Government Printing Office to furnish, or to procure and furnish, administrative materials, supplies, and equipment to public international organizations on a reimbursable basis;

H. R. 4069. An act to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II;

H. R. 4070. An act to carry into effect certain parts relating to patents of the treaties of peace with Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania ratified by the Senate on June 5, 1947, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4075. An act to regulate commerce among the several States with the Territories and possessions of the United States and with foreign countries, to protect the welfare of consumers of sugars and of those engaged in the domestic sugar-producing industry, to promote the export trade of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4110. An act to amend title I of the act entitled "An act to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work and the more complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges," approved June 29, 1935 (the Bankhead-Jones Act);

H. R. 4111. An act authorizing the construction of flood-control works on the Little Sioux River and its tributaries in Iowa;

H. R. 4124. An act to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 4140. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4168. An act to provide for the reincorporation of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4257. An act to provide an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses;

H. R. 4269. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4308. An act to amend section 1 of the act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662), as amended, relating to the acceptance of decorations, orders, medals, and emblems by officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations, neutral nations, or other American Republics;

H. R. 4547. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 205. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell timber within the Tongass National Forest;

H. J. Res. 218. Joint resolution providing for the representation of the Government and people of the United States in the observance of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Reading, Pa.;

H. J. Res. 238. Joint resolution to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930; and

H. J. Res. 245. Joint resolution amending Public Law 27, Eightieth Congress.

Pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker by Senate Concurrent Resolution 34, Eightieth Congress, he did on July 29, 1947, sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House, as follows:

H. R. 174. An act to amend section 26, title I, chapter 1, of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 321), as amended by the act of May 31, 1938 (52 Stat. 538);

H. R. 452. An act to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act relating to marketing agreement and orders;

H. R. 479. An act relating to the income-tax liability of members of the armed forces dying in the service;

H. R. 493. An act to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 ed.);

H. R. 597. An act to protect American agriculture, horticulture, livestock, and the public health by prohibiting the unauthorized importation into, or the depositing in the territorial waters of, the United States of garbage derived from products originating outside of the continental United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 618. An act for the relief of Fred O. Donohue;

H. R. 629. An act for the relief of A. E. McCartney and O. A. Foster; P. W. Woodyard, and J. R. Mahon; B. E. Truitt, T. L. Truitt, and W. B. Lacy; G. W. Cox, J. M. Cox, and F. T. Cox; W. W. Cox, and Dr. J. W. Cox; Robert Cathcart and Claude Cathcart;

H. R. 642. An act for the relief of Frank F. Miles;

H. R. 859. An act to provide for the exploration, investigation, development, and maintenance of the fishing resources and development of the high-seas fishing industry of the Territories and island possessions of the United States in the tropical and subtropical Pacific Ocean and intervening seas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 890. An act for the relief of Jessie Thompkins;

H. R. 1085. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Salamone;

H. R. 1260. An act to amend section 107 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934;

H. R. 1316. An act for the relief of Archer C. Gunter;

H. R. 1492. An act for the relief of P. L. (Spud) Murphey, owner and manager of Spud's Tailors, Laundry, and Dry Cleaning Works;

H. R. 1534. An act for the relief of Graff, Washbourne, and Dunn;

H. R. 1544. An act to provide appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the armed forces who lost their lives in the armed services of the United States in World War II;

H. R. 1602. An act to stimulate exploration, development, and production from domestic mines by private enterprise, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1648. An act for the relief of Willie P. Goodwin, J. M. Thorud, and W. H. Stokley;

H. R. 1730. An act for the relief of Mrs. Beulah Hart;

H. R. 1736. An act for the relief of O. Dean Settles and Mrs. Ruth E. Settles, husband and wife; Mrs. Ruth E. Settles, individually; the estate of Ora H. Hatfield; and Mrs. Kittie B. Hatfield;

H. R. 1791. An act for the relief of Dr. Theodore A. Geissman;

H. R. 1810. An act to amend the Criminal Code and certain other legislation to permit part-time referees in bankrupcy to act as agents or attorneys for claimants against the United States;

H. R. 2173. An act to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 2181. An act relating to institutional on-farm training for veterans;

H. R. 2432. An act for the relief of Harry V. Ball;

H. R. 2534. An act for the relief of James H. Underwood;

H. R. 2659. An act to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance, and provide for the medical and scientific treatment of persons found to be alcoholics by the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2776. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 2793. An act authorizing an appropriation for the construction, extension, and improvement of a State tuberculosis sanatorium at Galen, Mont., to provide facilities for the treatment of tuberculous Indians in Montana;

H. R. 2811. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, former Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2857. An act to extend second-class mailing privileges to bulletins issued by State conservation and fish and game agencies or departments;

H. R. 3045. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe the processes and procedures for recording instruments of writing in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3064. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to the surviving members of the Laguna Band of Mission Indians of California;

H. R. 3173. An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3215. An act to revise the Medical Department of the Army and the Medical Department of the Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3308. An act to increase the minimum allowance payable for rehabilitation in certain service-connected cases;

H. R. 3309. An act to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico;

H. R. 3325. An act to enable Osage Indians who served in World War II to obtain loans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3332. An act creating the St. Lawrence Bridge Commission and authorizing said Commission and its successors to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y.;

H. R. 3394. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the evacuation and return of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States," approved May 16, 1946, in order to provide for the shipment of the remains of World War II dead to the homeland of the deceased or of next of kin, to provide for the burial of unknown American World War II dead in United States military cemeteries to be established overseas, to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire land overseas and to establish United States military cemeteries thereon, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3395. An act to add certain lands to the Modoc National Forest, Calif.;

H. R. 3501. An act to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, approved August 9, 1946, (Public Law 704, 79th Cong., 2d sess., 60 Stat. 963), and for other purposes;

H. R. 3546. An act to amend section 200 of Public Law 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, June 29, 1936, to permit recognition of officers and enlisted men retired from the military and naval forces of the United States as representatives of certain organizations in the presentation of claims to the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 3601. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3613. An act to amend sections 1802 (a), 1802 (b), and 3481 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 3632. An act to extend the time within which application may be made to the Railroad Retirement Board for certain refunds from the unemployment trust fund;

H. R. 3678. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3682. An act to extend the period for providing assistance for certain war-incurred school enrollments;

H. R. 3690. An act to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act;

H. R. 3696. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Daniel Broken Leg.

H. R. 3756. An act making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3830. An act to provide for the promotion and elimination of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3839. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

H. R. 3845. An act for the relief of George J. Hiner;

H. R. 3862. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to grant and convey to Montgomery County, Pa., a certain parcel of land of the United States in Norristown Borough, Montgomery County, Pa., for the purpose of erecting an additional annex to the present courthouse;

H. R. 3870. An act to authorize certain expenditures from the appropriation of St. Elizabeths Hospital, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3874. An act to authorize the city of Pierre, S. Dak., to transfer Farm Island to the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4002. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4010. An act to authorize the Treasury Department and the United States Government Printing Office to furnish, or to procure and furnish, administrative materials, supplies, and equipment to public international organizations on a reimbursable basis;

H. R. 4069. An act to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II;

H. R. 4070. An act to carry into effect certain parts relating to patents of the treaties of peace with Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania, ratified by the Senate on June 5, 1947, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4075. An act to regulate commerce among the several States, with the Territories and possessions of the United States, and with foreign countries; to protect the welfare of consumers of sugars and of those engaged in the domestic sugar-producing industry; to promote the export trade of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4110. An act to amend title I of the act entitled "An act to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work and the more complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges," approved June 29, 1935 (the Bankhead-Jones Act);

H. R. 4111. An act authorizing the construction of flood-control works on the Little Sioux River and its tributaries in Iowa;

H. R. 4124. An act to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 4140. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4168. An act to provide for the reincorporation of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4257. An act to provide an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses;

H. R. 4269. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4308. An act to amend section 1 of the act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662), as amended, relating to the acceptance of decorations, orders, medals, and emblems by officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations, neutral nations, or other American Republics;

H. R. 4347. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 205. Joint Resolution to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell timber within the Tongass National Forest;

H. J. Res. 218. Joint resolution providing for the representation of the Government and people of the United States in the observance of the two-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Reading, Pa.;

H. J. Res. 238. Joint resolution to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930; and

H. J. Res. 245. Joint resolution amending Public Law 27, Eightieth Congress.

And enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the Senate as follows:

S. 272. An act to provide for the utilization of surplus war Department-owned military real property as national cemeteries, when feasible;

S. 885. An act to provide that the Canadian-built dredge *Ajax* and certain other dredging equipment owned by a United States corporation be documented under the laws of the United States;

S. 1196. An act to authorize leases of real or personal property by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes;

S. 1215. An act to authorize conversions of certain naval vessels.

S. 1326. An act to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act;

S. 1418. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to control and reduction of pollution in the waters of the New England States;

S. 1431. An act for the relief of Mrs. Edna Jakimowicz;

S. 1498. An act to provide support for wool and for other purposes;

S. 1720. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended;

S. J. Res. 144. Joint resolution authorizing the President to bring into effect an agreement between the United States and the United Nations for the purpose of establishing the permanent headquarters of the United Nations in the United States and authorizing the taking of measures necessary to facilitate compliance with the provisions of such agreement, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution fixing the date of meeting of the second regular session of the Eightieth Congress.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On July 26, 1947:

H. R. 72. An act to increase the number of authorized aviation stations operated by the Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H. R. 673. An act to repeal certain provisions authorizing the establishing of priorities in transportation by merchant vessels;

H. R. 1238. An act to permit vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and points in the continental United States;

H. R. 1341. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif.;

H. R. 1565. An act to codify and enact into positive law, title 1 of the United States Code, entitled "General Provisions";

H. R. 1566. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 4 of the United States Code, entitled "Flag and Seal, Seat of Government, and the States";

H. R. 1567. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 6 of the United States Code, entitled "Official and Penal Bonds";

H. R. 1633. An act to amend section 16 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia";

H. R. 1714. An act to exclude certain interns, student nurses, and other student employees of hospitals of the Federal Government from the Classification Act and other laws relating to compensation and benefits of Federal employees, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2054. An act to amend the act of April 14, 1930, to provide increased retired pay for certain members of the former Life Saving Service;

H. R. 2083. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 17 of the United States Code, entitled "Copyrights";

H. R. 2084. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 9 of the United States Code, entitled "Arbitration";

H. R. 2109. An act to amend section 1003 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 3022. An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, gas, and sulfur on lands acquired by the United States;

H. R. 3043. An act to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3541. An act to define the functions and duties of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3619. An act relating to the sale of the Mission Point Lighthouse Reservation, Grand Traverse County, Mich.;

H. R. 3818. An act to amend the Federal Insurance Contributions Act with respect to rates of tax on employers and employees, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4084. An act to authorize the creation of additional positions in the professional and scientific service in the War and Navy Departments; and

H. R. 4268. An act making supplemental appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

On July 29, 1947:

H. R. 174. An act to amend section 26, title I, chapter 1, of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 321), as amended by the act of May 31, 1938 (52 Stat. 588);

H. R. 452. An act to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act relating to marketing agreements and orders;

H. R. 479. An act relating to the income-tax liability of members of the armed forces dying in the service;

H. R. 493. An act to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 edition);

H. R. 597. An act to protect American agriculture, horticulture, livestock, and the public health by prohibiting the unauthorized importation into, or the depositing in the territorial waters of, the United States of garbage derived from products originating outside of the continental United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 618. An act for the relief of Fred O. Donohue;

H. R. 629. An act for the relief of A. E. McCartney and O. A. Foster; P. W. Woodyard and J. R. Mahon; B. E. Truitt, T. L. Truitt, and W. S. Lacy; O. W. Cox, J. M. Cox, and F. T. Cox; W. W. Cox and Dr. J. W. Cox; Robert Cathcart and Claude Cathcart.

H. R. 642. An act for the relief of Frank F. Miles;

H. R. 859. An act to provide for the exploration, investigation, development, and maintenance of the fishing resources and development of the high seas fishing industry of the Territories and island possessions of the United States in the tropical and subtropical Pacific Ocean and intervening seas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 890. An act for the relief of Jessie Thompkins;

H. R. 1085. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Salamone;

H. R. 1260. An act to amend section 107 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934;

H. R. 1316. An act for the relief of Archer C. Gunter;

H. R. 1492. An act for the relief P. L. (Spud) Murphey, owner and manager of Spud's Tailors, Laundry, and Dry Cleaning Works;

H. R. 1534. An act for the relief of Graff, Washbourne & Dunn;

H. R. 1544. An act to provide appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the armed forces who lost their lives in the armed services of the United States in World War II;

H. R. 1602. An act to stimulate exploration, development, and production from domestic mines by private enterprise, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1648. An act for the relief of Willie P. Goodwin, J. M. Thorud, and W. H. Stokley;

H. R. 1730. An act for the relief Mrs. Beulah Hart;

H. R. 1736. An act for the relief of O. Dean Settles and Mrs. Ruth E. Settles, husband and wife; Mrs. Ruth E. Settles, individually; the estate of Ora N. Hatfield; and Mrs. Kittie B. Hatfield;

H. R. 1791. An act for the relief of Dr. Theodore A. Geissman;

H. R. 1810. An act to amend the Criminal Code and certain other legislation to permit part-time referees in bankruptcy to act as agents or attorneys for claimants against the United States;

H. R. 2173. An act to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 2181. An act relating to institutional on-farm training for veterans;

H. R. 2432. An act for the relief of Harry V. Ball;

H. R. 2534. An act for the relief of James H. Underwood;

H. R. 2659. An act to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance, and provide for the medical and scientific treatment of persons found to be alcoholics by the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2776. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 2793. An act authorizing an appropriation for the construction, extension, and improvement of a State tuberculosis sanatorium at Galen, Mont., to provide facilities for the treatment of tuberculous Indians in Montana;

H. R. 2811. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, former Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2857. An act to extend second-class mailing privileges to bulletins issued by State conservation and fish and game agencies or departments;

H. R. 3045. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe the processes and procedures for recording instruments of writing in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3064. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to the surviving members of the Laguna Band of Mission Indians of California;

H. R. 3173. An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3215. An act to revise the Medical Department of the Army and the Medical Department of the Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3309. An act to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico;

H. R. 3308. An act to increase the minimum allowance payable for rehabilitation in certain service-connected cases;

H. R. 3325. An act to enable Osage Indians who served in World War II to obtain loans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3332. An act creating the St. Lawrence Bridge Commission and authorizing said Commission and its successors to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y.;

H. R. 3394. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the evacuation and return of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States," approved May 16, 1946, in order to provide for the shipment of the remains of World War II dead to the homeland of the deceased or of next of kin, to provide for the disposition of group and mass burials, to provide for the burial of unknown American World War II dead in United States military cemeteries to be established overseas, to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire land overseas and to establish United States military cemeteries thereon, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3395. An act to add certain lands to the Modoc National Forest, Calif.;

H. R. 3501. An act to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, approved August 9, 1946 (Public Law 704, 79th Cong., 2d sess., 60 Stat. 963), and for other purposes;

H. R. 3546. An act to amend section 200 of Public Law 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, June 29, 1946, to permit recognition of officers and enlisted men retired from the military and naval forces of the United States as representatives of certain organizations in the presentation of claims to the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 3601. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3613. An act to amend sections 1802 (a), 1802 (b), and 3481 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 3632. An act to extend the time within which applications may be made to the

Railroad Retirement Board for certain refunds from the Unemployment Trust Fund;

H. R. 3678. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3682. An act to extend the period for providing assistance for certain war-incurred school enrollments;

H. R. 3690. An act to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act;

H. R. 3696. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Daniel Broken Leg;

H. R. 3756. An act making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3839. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3845. An act for the relief of George J. Hiner;

H. R. 3862. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to grant and convey to Montgomery County, Pa., a certain parcel of land of the United States in Norristown Borough, Montgomery County, Pa., for the purpose of erecting an additional annex to the present courthouse;

H. R. 3870. An act to authorize certain expenditures from the appropriations of Saint Elizabeths Hospital, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3874. An act to authorize the city of Pierre, S. Dak., to transfer Farm Island to the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4002. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4010. An act to authorize the Treasury Department and the United States Government Printing Office to furnish, or to procure and furnish, administrative materials, supplies, and equipment to public international organizations on a reimbursable basis;

H. R. 4069. An act to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II;

H. R. 4070. An act to carry into effect certain parts relating to patents of the treaties of peace with Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania ratified by the Senate on June 5, 1947, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4075. An act to regulate commerce among the several States with the Territories and possessions of the United States and with foreign countries, to protect the welfare of consumers of sugars and of those engaged in the domestic sugar-producing industry, to promote the export trade of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4110. An act to amend title I of the act entitled "An act to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work and the more complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges," approved June 29, 1935 (the Bankhead-Jones Act);

H. R. 4111. An act authorizing the construction of flood-control works on the Little Sioux River and its tributaries in Iowa;

H. R. 4124. An act to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 4140. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4168. An act to provide for the reincorporation of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4257. An act to provide an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses;

H. R. 4269. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4308. An act to amend section 1 of the act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662), as amended, relating to the acceptance of decorations, orders, medals, and emblems by officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations, neutral nations, or other American Republics;

H. R. 4347. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 205. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell timber within the Tongass National Forest;

H. J. Res. 218. Joint resolution providing for the representation of the Government and the people of the United States in the observance of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Reading, Pa.;

H. J. Res. 238. Joint resolution to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930; and

H. J. Res. 245. Joint resolution to amend Public Law 27, Eightieth Congress.

On July 31, 1947:

H. R. 3830. An act to provide for the promotion and elimination of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS AFTER ADJOURNMENT

A message from the President of the United States, received by the Clerk of the House, reported that on the following dates the President had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On July 29, 1947:

H. R. 3767. An act to provide for the protection, preservation, and extension of the sockeye salmon fishery of the Fraser River system, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4263. An act making supplemental appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

On July 30, 1947:

H. R. 406. An act for the relief of Walter R. and Kathryn Marshall;

H. R. 434. An act for the relief of Lewis H. Rich;

H. R. 610. An act for the relief of Harley Shores;

H. R. 821. An act for the relief of Charles W. Taylor, Jr.;

H. R. 893. An act for the relief of Myron R. Leard;

H. R. 914. An act for the relief of George Corenevsky;

H. R. 1091. An act for the relief of Mrs. Georgia Lanser;

H. R. 1497. An act for the relief of the estate of George W. Coombs;

H. R. 1535. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Ralph Stanfield, a minor;

H. R. 1652. An act to provide for the naturalization of certain United States Army personnel—Yugoslav fliers;

H. R. 1737. An act for the relief of Owen R. Brewster;

H. R. 1995. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the return of the amount of deductions from the compensation of any employee who is separated from the service or transferred to a position not within the purview of such act before completing 10 years of service;

H. R. 2390. An act for the relief of Elmer A. Norris;

H. R. 2434. An act for the relief of Ruth A. Hairston;

H. R. 2507. An act for the relief of the firm of Barrett & Hilp;

H. R. 2511. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim 2 acres of land near Muirkirk, Md., to the Queens Chapel Methodist Church;

H. R. 2550. An act for the relief of Mack Gene Odom, a minor;

H. R. 2607. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of George Wesley Hobbs, a minor;

H. R. 2938. An act to amend section 1 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 497, 5 U. S. C., sec. 488), fixing the price of copies of records furnished by the Department of the Interior;

H. R. 3075. An act to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the classification and compensation of employees of the postal service, so as to provide proper recompense in the form of compensatory time for overtime performed by supervisors;

H. R. 3361. An act for the relief of J. Rutledge Alford;

H. R. 3601. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3678. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3756. An act making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3839. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3961. An act to provide increases in the rates of pensions payable to Spanish-American War and Civil War veterans and their dependents;

H. R. 4269. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 185. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Catholic Society of Alaska for use as a mission;

H. R. 197. An act to transfer part of block 14 and the school building thereon of Petersburg town site, Alaska, used for school purposes, to the town of Petersburg, Alaska;

H. R. 348. An act for the relief of Dr. Alma Richards and Mrs. Mary Block;

H. R. 405. An act for the relief of Thomas M. Farley, Mrs. Susie Farley, Mrs. Helen Moss, the legal guardian of Donna Louise Farley, and the legal guardian of Melvin Moss;

H. R. 1238. An act to permit vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and points in the continental United States;

H. R. 1565. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 1 of the United States Code entitled "General Provisions";

H. R. 1566. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 4 of the United States Code entitled "Flag and Seal, Seat of Government, and the States";

H. R. 1567. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 6 of the United States Code entitled "Official and Penal Bonds";

H. R. 2054. An act to amend the act of April 14, 1930, to provide increased retired pay for certain members of the former Life Saving Service;

H. R. 2083. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights";

H. R. 2084. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 9 of the United States Code entitled "Arbitration";

H. R. 3055. An act to permit the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War to supply utilities and related services to welfare activities, and persons whose businesses or residences are in the immediate vicinity of naval or military activities and require utilities or related services not otherwise obtainable locally, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3334. An act granting the consent of Congress to Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Susquehanna River;

H. R. 3376. An act to ratify and confirm Act 10 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1947, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945;

H. R. 3495. An act for the relief of Andrew C. Extrom and Harry C. Pearson;

H. R. 3587. An act to provide for the establishment of a temporary Congressional Aviation Policy Board; and

H. R. 3739. An act to authorize the Veterans' Administration to acquire certain land as a site for the proposed Veterans' Administration facility at Clarksburg, W. Va., and for other purposes.

On July 31, 1947:

H. R. 1316. An act for the relief of Archer C. Gunter;

H. R. 1648. An act for the relief of Willie P. Goodwin, J. M. Thorud, and W. H. Stokley;

H. R. 2005. An act to amend the act of April 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 88), entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of the segregated coal and asphalt deposits of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indian Nations, in Oklahoma, and for an extension of time within which purchasers of such deposits may complete payments";

H. R. 4002. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4110. An act to amend title I of the act entitled "An act to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work and the more complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges," approved June 29, 1935 (the Bankhead-Jones Act);

H. R. 4254. An act providing for the disposition of farm labor camps to public or semipublic agencies or nonprofit associations of farmers;

H. R. 4347. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 890. An act for the relief of Jessie Thompkins;

H. R. 1341. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif.;

H. R. 1379. An act to establish the United States Naval Postgraduate School, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1791. An act for the relief of Dr. Theodore A. Geissman;

H. R. 2534. An act for the relief of James H. Underwood;

H. R. 3127. An act to provide for the loan or gift of obsolete ordnance to State homes for former members of the armed forces; and

H. J. Res. 245. Joint resolution amending Public Law 27, Eightieth Congress.

On August 1, 1947:

H. R. 452. An act to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act relating to marketing agreements and orders;

H. R. 618. An act for the relief of Fred O. Donohue;

H. R. 1544. An act to provide appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the armed forces who lost their lives in the armed services of the United States in World War II;

H. R. 1633. An act to amend section 16 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia";

H. R. 2173. An act to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 3131. An act to extend for 3 months the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended;

H. R. 3448. An act to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3619. An act relating to the sale of the Mission Point Lighthouse Reservation, Grand Traverse County, Mich.;

H. R. 4084. An act to authorize the creation of additional positions in the professional and scientific service in the War and Navy Departments;

H. R. 4308. An act to amend section 1 of the act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662), as amended, relating to the acceptance of decorations, orders, medals, and emblems by officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations, neutral nations, or other American Republics.

H. R. 3444. An act to amend section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code.

H. R. 3546. An act to amend section 200 of Public Law 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, June 29, 1936, to permit recognition of officers and enlisted men retired from the military and naval forces of the United States as representatives of certain organizations in the presentation of claims to the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 3682. An act to extend the period for providing assistance for certain war-incurred school enrollments.

H. R. 4124. An act to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 3690. An act to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act; and

H. J. Res. 238. Joint resolution to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930;

On August 4, 1947:

H. R. 3173. An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3215. An act to revise the Medical Department of the Army and the Medical Department of the Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 341. An act for the relief of the estate of Reuben Malkin;

H. R. 859. An act to provide for the exploration, investigation, development, and maintenance of the fishing resources and development of the high seas fishing industry of the Territories and island possessions of the United States in the tropical and subtropical Pacific Ocean and intervening seas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1714. An act to exclude certain interns, student nurses, and other student-employees of hospitals of the Federal Government from the Classification Act and other laws relating to compensation and benefits of Federal employees, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2776. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 2793. An act authorizing an appropriation for the construction, extension, and improvement of a State tuberculosis sanatorium at Galen, Mont., to provide facilities for the treatment of tuberculous Indians in Montana;

H. R. 2811. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, former Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3045. An act to authorize the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia to purchase machines for the recording of deeds, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3064. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to the surviving members of the Laguna Band of Mission Indians of California;

H. R. 3308. An act to increase the minimum allowance payable for rehabilitation in certain service-connected cases;

H. R. 3395. An act to add certain lands to the Modoc National Forest, Calif.;

H. R. 3696. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Daniel Broken Leg;

H. R. 3874. An act to authorize the city of Pierre, S. Dak., to transfer Farm Island to the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4111. An act authorizing the construction of flood-control works on the Little Sioux River and its tributaries in Iowa;

H. R. 493. An act to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia, to provide penalties to prescribe rules of evidence, and for other purposes," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 edition);

H. R. 1085. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Salamone;

H. R. 1260. An act to amend section 107 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, approved July 19, 1934;

H. R. 1736. An act for the relief of O. Dean Settles and Mrs. Ruth E. Settles, husband and wife; Mrs. Ruth E. Settles, individually; the estate of Ora H. Hatfield; and Mrs. Kittie B. Hatfield;

H. R. 2109. An act to amend section 1003 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 2659. An act to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance, and provide for the medical and scientific treatment of persons found to be alcoholics by the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2857. An act to extend second-class mailing privileges to bulletins issued by State conservation and fish and game agencies or departments;

H. R. 3325. An act to enable Osage Indians who served in World War II to obtain loans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3501. An act to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, approved August 9, 1946 (Public Law 704, 79th Cong., 2d sess., 60 Stat. 963), and for other purposes;

H. R. 3845. An act for the relief of George J. Hiner;

H. R. 3852. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia," approved August 7, 1946;

H. R. 3862. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to grant and convey to Montgomery County, Pa., a certain parcel of land of the United States in Norristown Borough, Montgomery County, Pa., for the purpose of erecting an additional annex to the present courthouse;

H. R. 3870. An act to authorize certain expenditures from the appropriation of St. Elizabeths Hospital, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4010. An act to authorize the Treasury Department and the United States Government Printing Office to furnish, or to procure and furnish, administrative materials, supplies, and equipment to public international organizations on a reimbursable basis;

H. R. 4140. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4257. An act to provide an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses; and

H. J. Res. 218. Joint resolution providing for the representation of the Government and people of the United States in the observance of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Reading, Pa.;

On August 5, 1947:

H. R. 1492. An act for the relief of P. L. (Spud) Murphey, owner and manager of Spud's Tailors, Laundry & Dry Cleaning Works;

H. R. 3043. An act to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3309. An act to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico;

H. R. 629. An act for the relief of A. E. McCartney and others;

H. R. 3394. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the evacuation and return of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States," approved May 16, 1946, in order to provide for the shipment of the remains of World War II dead to the homeland of the deceased or of next of kin, to provide for the disposition of group and mass burials, to provide for the burial of unknown American World War II dead in United States military cemeteries to be established overseas, to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire land overseas, and to establish United States military cemeteries thereon, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4168. An act to provide for the reincorporation of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 479. An act relating to the income-tax liability of members of the armed forces dying in the service.

On August 6, 1947:

H. R. 72. An act to increase the number of authorized aviation stations operated by the Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2800. An act to amend section 5 of Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3738. An act to amend Public Law 83, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved June 23, 1945;

H. R. 4079. An act to amend the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), as amended June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1976);

H. R. 3541. An act to define the functions and duties of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4043. An act to change the order of priority for payment out of the German special deposit account, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2181. An act relating to institutional on-farm training for veterans.

H. R. 3632. An act to extend the time within which applications may be made to the Railroad Retirement Board for certain refunds from the Unemployment Trust Fund;

H. R. 3818. An act to amend the Federal Insurance Contributions Act with respect to rates of tax on employers and employees, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4070. An act to carry into effect certain parts relating to patents of the treaties of peace with Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania, ratified by the Senate on June 5, 1947, and for other purposes.

On August 7, 1947:

H. R. 3830. An act to provide for the promotion and elimination of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3022. An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, gas, and sulfur on lands acquired by the United States.

On August 8, 1947:

H. R. 174. An act to amend section 26, title I, chapter 1, of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 321), as amended by the act of May 31, 1938 (52 Stat. 588);

H. R. 4069. An act to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II;

H. R. 4075. An act to regulate commerce among the several States with the Territories and possessions of the United States, and with foreign countries; to protect the welfare of consumers of sugars and of those engaged in the domestic sugar-producing industry; to promote the export trade of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3613. An act to amend sections 1802 (a), 1802 (b), and 3481 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code; and

H. J. Res. 205. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell timber within the Tongass National Forest.

DISAPPROVAL OF BILLS AFTER ADJOURNMENT

The message also announced that the President had vetoed the following bills of the House on the dates indicated:

DISPOSAL OF GARBAGE

H. R. 597. I have withheld my approval from H. R. 597, "To protect American agriculture, horticulture, livestock, and the public health by prohibiting the unauthorized importation into, or the depositing in the territorial waters of, the United States of garbage derived from products originating outside of the continental United States, and for other purposes," for the following reasons:

1. In section 1 (6) it is provided that the term "United States" when not limited by the adjective "continental", includes all territories and possessions of the United States, "with the exception of the Philippine Islands and the Canal Zone." The reference to the Philippine Islands as a territory or possession of the United States, however inadvertently used, would be seriously embarrassing to this Government in its relations with the Republic of the Philippines, which became a sovereign nation on July 4, 1946.

2. In section 2 (a) it is prohibited and made unlawful to throw, discharge, or deposit garbage, or to cause, suffer or procure garbage to be thrown, discharged, or deposited, from any vessel, railway car, aircraft, or other vehicle entering the United States into any territorial waters of the United States "unless such garbage has been reduced to fluid form." This provision seems inadequate to prevent the placing in our territorial waters of garbage which is infected with human or animal diseases. It is necessary in addition to require that such garbage shall be disinfected prior to its discharge into our territorial waters. This requirement is of importance on account of the situation existing in the Canadian boundary waters, especially in the Great Lakes region, since such waters are used for human consumption. Under dates of April 1 and October 3, 1946, Canada and the United States submitted joint references to the International Joint Commission—United States and Canada, to consider measures for the suppression of the pollution of boundary waters consisting of the St. Marys River, St. Clair River, Lake St. Clair and the Detroit River. In connection with this investigation, it has been reported to me that measures may be taken to prevent the dumping of garbage from ships in the vicinity of the intakes of water systems. Such proceedings might be taken under the provision of section 13 of the act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1152; 33 U. S. C. 407).

3. By section 9 of the proposed legislation it is provided that nothing contained in section 13 of the act of March 3, 1939, shall be construed as forbidding the discharge of fluid garbage into the territorial waters of the United States. This provision would remove the legislation whereby proceedings could be instituted against persons dumping infected garbage into Canadian boundary waters although it had been reduced to a fluid state.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 7, 1947.*

FRANK F. MILES

H. R. 642. I have withheld my approval from H. R. 642, "An act for the relief of Frank F. Miles."

The purpose of this bill is to compensate the beneficiary for terminal-leave pay due him from the War Department when he was granted leave from active duty as a major in the Army of the United States to go abroad as a war correspondent for the American Legion publications.

It appears that on May 22, 1944, Maj. Frank F. Miles, then assigned to the Iowa State Selective Service Headquarters, Des Moines, Iowa, submitted a request to the Director of Selective Service for relief from active military duty effective June 10, 1944, so that he could accept a position as a war correspondent for the American Legion magazine and the National Legionnaire. He stated in his request for relief from active duty that "if there are any restrictions which would prevent me from leaving the United States while in an annual or terminal-leave status I desire to be placed on an inactive-duty status without such terminal leave." The War Department approved Major Miles' request for relief from active duty, but apparently the date of his intended departure was uncertain and for that reason appropriate orders, dated June 24, 1944, were issued granting Major Miles terminal leave of absence of 2 months and 20 days (the amount of his accumulated leave), commencing on June 29, 1944, and relieving him from active duty effective September 17, 1944, the date upon which this period of terminal leave would expire. In a letter addressed to The Adjutant General, dated July 15, 1944, Major Miles requested authorization to leave the United States while he was in a terminal-leave status, and he further requested that, if such authority to leave the United States could not be granted, his terminal leave of absence be terminated on August 5, 1944. Since the existing regulations prohibited granting him permission to enter a theater of operations while in a leave status, amended orders were issued on August 2, 1944, granting Major Miles terminal leave of absence of 1 month and 8 days, commencing on June 29, 1944, and relieving him from active duty effective August 5, 1944, which resulted in a reduction by 1 month and 12 days in the period of terminal leave which had theretofore been granted to him.

Since the date of Major Miles' relief from active duty was changed to August 5, 1944, at his own request in order to permit him to accept a remunerative position of his own selection outside the United States and the period of terminal leave allowed him was thereby necessarily reduced, there is no equitable basis for an award to Major Miles to compensate him for terminal leave after August 5, 1944. Moreover, such legislation would be discriminatory in character in

that it would grant a special benefit to Major Miles which is denied to other Army officers similarly situated.

In the light of the foregoing facts I feel obliged to withhold my approval from the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 5, 1947.*

TRANSPORTATION BY MERCHANT VESSELS

H. R. 673. I am withholding my approval from the bill (H. R. 673) to repeal certain provisions authorizing the establishing of priorities in transportation by merchant vessels.

The purpose of the bill is to repeal the act of July 14, 1941, entitled "An act to provide for priorities in transportation by merchant vessels in the interests of national defense, and for other purposes," as amended and extended (55 Stat. 591; 56 Stat. 271).

The act in question, which was known as the Ship Warrants Act, authorized the War Shipping Administration to establish a system of ship warrants which became effective upon approval by President Roosevelt on January 4, 1943. On June 6, 1946, the ship warrant rules and regulations were revoked and on July 25, 1947, the act was repealed by Public Law No. 239.

Accordingly, this legislation is not necessary.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 6, 1947.*

MARY JANE SHERMAN AND W. D. SHERMAN

H. R. 704. I have withheld my approval from H. R. 704, a bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Jane Sherman and W. D. Sherman.

The purpose of this bill is to pay to Mrs. Mary Jane Sherman the sum of $6,203.20 and to W. D. Sherman the sum of $311.11 for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and property damage sustained as the result of a collision involving an Army truck which occurred on May 18, 1943, at the intersection of Waukegan Road and Shermer Avenue, Northbrook, Ill.

It appears that on May 18, 1943, at about 11:50 a. m., a Packard sedan owned by W. D. Sherman, and operated by his wife, Mrs. Mary Jane Sherman, had stopped on Shermer Road facing east at its intersection with Waukegan Road in Northbrook, waiting for an automatic traffic light to change from red to green. At the same time an Army 2½-ton truck, operated by an enlisted man on official business, was proceeding south on Waukegan Road at an estimated speed of about 15 miles per hour approaching said intersection. A tractor with a semitrailer attached, owned by the Kool-Rite Sales Co., of Chicago, Ill., and operated by its employee, Frank Zvokel, Jr., was also proceeding south on Waukegan Road following the Army truck. The Army driver gave a signal indicating his intention to make a right turn onto Shermer Road and had started to make such turn when the driver of the tractor and semitrailer of the Kool-Rite Sales Co. attempted to pass the Army truck on the right and the tractor struck the Army truck on its right rear fender, running board, and front fender, forcing the Army vehicle to the left where it stopped in the center of the intersection. The civilian tractor and semitrailer continued across Shermer Road and collided with the front part of the Sherman automobile. As a result of the collision Mr. Sherman's automobile was damaged in the amount of $311.11 and Mrs. Sherman was personally injured. Mr. Sherman was not riding in his automobile at the time of the accident.

While Mrs. Sherman received bruises and shock in the accident, it does not appear that she sustained any fracture. It appears that Mrs. Sherman was suffering from a rather severe arterial hypertension at the time of the accident, which finally culminated in an apoplectic stroke in August 1944, and that she has been treated by a number of physicians since the time of the accident and has incurred a considerable amount of medical and hospital expenses. It further appears that at the time of her admission to a hospital in August 1944 she had a blood pressure of 220/125, and that the diagnosis upon her admission to the hospital was "malignant hypertension with encephalopathy." Some of her physicians have attributed her condition subsequent to the accident to the injuries sustained by her in the accident, while others disagree.

After a review of the evidence relating to the injury of Mrs. Sherman and her subsequent condition, the Surgeon General of the Army in a statement, dated July 28, 1947, said:

> Following a careful review of the case of Mrs. Mary Jane Sherman by this office, no direct relationship can be found between injuries sustained in an accident May 18, 1943, and a cerebral vascular accident that she suffered on or about August 5, 1944.

It appears that the insurance company which carried the liability insurance on the Kool-Rite Sales Co.'s tractor and semitrailer involved in this accident paid to Mrs. Sherman the sum of $3,500 upon her execution of a covenant not to sue said insured for the personal injuries which she sustained as a result of the accident.

I am convinced that this accident was primarily due to the negligence of the driver of the vehicle of the Kool-Rite Sales Co. in that he was operating said vehicle at a speed which was greater than was reasonable and prudent under the conditions then existing, was not maintaining a proper lookout, and was attempting to pass the Army truck on the right while the latter vehicle was entering an intersection, without assuring himself that such a movement could be made in safety. I am of the further view that there is no equitable basis on which Mrs. Sherman, after having been paid a substantial sum by the insurer of the Kool-Rite Sales Co. for the personal injuries sustained by her in this accident—the insurer thereby tacitly recognizing the liability of its insured for the accident and the resulting injury of Mrs. Sherman and the damage caused to Mr. Sherman's automobile—should now be paid an additional sum by the United States. Moreover, it appears that the sum of $3,500 paid to Mrs. Sherman by the insurer of the Kool-Rite Sales Co. constitutes an adequate settlement for all of the injuries sustained by her which may reasonably be attributed to this accident.

In the light of the foregoing facts there would not appear to be any justifiable basis for the granting of awards to these claimants. I, therefore, feel obligated to withhold my approval from the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 1, 1947.*

REFUND OF TAXES

H. R. 981. I have withheld my approval of H. R. 981, a bill "to amend section 2 of the act of January 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 21), relating to the refund of taxes illegally paid by Indian citizens."

H. R. 981 would amend section 2 of the act of January 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 21), to direct the refund of certain income taxes to Indians falling within designated classes who filed claims for refunds under that act but whose claims were rejected. All claims for refund properly filed under the act of January 29, 1942, relating to taxes illegally assessed upon the income of the Indians concerned, have been paid. The rejected claims which H. R. 981 would allow, related to legally collected taxes paid on income received during the taxable years from 1913 to April 26, 1931, the termination date for all restrictions on alienability and taxability of lands belonging to the affected Indians.

It has been clearly established by the courts that the Indians in question were fully taxable upon the income involved. Accordingly, the effect of H. R. 981 is to set up retroactively a period of exemption prior to 1931 when it is clear that the Indians concerned were taxable during that period. There appears to be no satisfactory reason why a particular group on whom taxes were legally assessed should be classified with other groups from whom taxes were collected illegally.

Another objectionable feature of the bill is the provision for the payment of interest at 4 percent per annum for the years before and since 1931 when these persons had no claim, legal or equitable, to refund of the taxes paid. The amount of interest payable under the bill would almost equal the taxes. It would be unsound policy and an inadvisable precedent to provide for the payment of interest on these refunds of taxes which were legally and properly collected.

For these reasons, I have withheld my approval of the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 30, 1947.*

COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES

H. R. 1180. I am withholding my approval of H. R. 1180, to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of Wisconsin into the Union as a State.

The proposed legislation would authorize the coinage of not to exceed 500,000 silver 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of Wisconsin into the Union.

A year ago when I approved the legislation authorizing special coins honoring the late Booker T. Washington and the one-hundredth anniversary of the admission of Iowa into the Union, I stated that I would have preferred to approve legislation providing for commemorative medals and that in the future I would look with disfavor upon legislation authorizing the issuance of commemorative coins. My stand in this matter and the compelling reasons therefor were reiterated in a letter to the House Banking and Currency Committee on February 26, 1947.

I am well aware of the great accomplishments of the State of Wisconsin and its splendid citizens. My failure to approve the bill, H. R. 1180, should not be construed as a lack of appreciation of their contributions to the welfare of the United States. In withholding my approval of this bill, I am continuing the wise policy adopted by my predecessors, former President Hoover and the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt. This policy was given legislative sanction by the Congress when it enacted the act of August 5, 1939, prohibiting the coinage of or the issuance of special commemorative coins authorized prior to March 1, 1939.

There are pending before the Congress 18 bills commemorating 12 events of importance in the history of our great country, all of which are well deserving of commemoration. In such a situation, it is evident that it is impossible to enact one bill and ignore all the others. Thus the Senate has, at the session just closed, passed eight additional bills providing for commemorative coins.

Former President Hoover, in a message to the Congress vetoing a bill which would have authorized coins in commemoration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Gadsden Purchase, expressed very precisely the dilemma which confronts the Congress and the Chief Executive with reference to commemorative coin legislation. He said:

> There are a great many historical events which it is not only highly proper but desirable to commemorate in a suitable way, but the longer use of our coins for this purpose is unsuitable and unwise. This would seem to be clear from the very number of events to be commemorated, and past experience indicates how difficult it is to draw the line and how such a practice, once it is recognized, tends constantly to grow. If this bill is to become law, it is not apparent on what grounds similar measures, no matter how numerous, may be rejected. Yet their enactment in such numbers must bring further confusion to our monetary system.

I have pointed out before that the multiplicity of designs on United States coins resulting from the coinage of commemorative coins tends to create confusion, to increase the possibility of counterfeiting, to encourage traffic in commemorative coins for private profit, and, in general, to detract from the f ndamental purpose for which money is issued, namely, to provide a medium of exchange.

I take this opportunity to call attention again to my request of February 26, 1947, for the enactment of commemorative medal legislation. Such legislation was reported by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on March 10, 1947, and is still pending in the Senate. It is my hope that the Congress will enact such legislation at its next session in order to prevent abuses to, and to preserve the integrity of, the coinage system of the United States.

I regret the necessity of withholding my approval of H. R. 1180, and I take this action only because of the compelling reasons indicated above.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 31, 1947.*

HERMAN TRAHN

H. R. 1502. I have withheld my approval from the enrolled bill (H. R. 1502) "for the relief of Herman Trahn."

The bill provides that notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C., App. 303), and the provisions of Public Law 205, Seventy-ninth Congress (8 U. S. C. 224), Herman Trahn may be permitted to become a naturalized citizen of the United States if he can otherwise meet the requirements of existing law relating to citizenship.

Section 3 (a) of the Selective Service and Training Act of 1940 provides, among other things, that a citizen or subject of a neutral country shall be relieved from liability for training and service under the act if, prior to his induction, he has made application to be so relieved in the manner prescribed by the President. It is also provided that any person making such application "shall thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States."

Public Law 205, Seventy-ninth Congress adds to the definition of the term "ineligible to citizenship," individuals who are debarred from citizenship under section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.

Mr. Trahn was born in Lulea, Sweden, on December 27, 1904, and is a citizen of that country. He first arrived in the United States on November 16, 1941, as a temporary visitor while he was engaged in the import and export business. He last arrived in the United States on December 17, 1943, as a temporary visitor for a period of 8 months. He has been granted two extensions.

In September 1942, Mr. Trahn received instructions from his employers to proceed to Mexico on company business. He applied for an exit permit and was advised by the State Department that it was necessary to file a statement from his Selective Training and Service Board indicating whether there was any objection to his leaving the country. The alien filed Selective Service Form 301 with the draft board. This form is an application for relief from military service. It is available to aliens of friendly foreign nations. However, section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, provides that any alien making application for relief from military service "shall thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States." It appears that Mr. Trahn did not go to Mexico. He later applied for an immigration visa rather than for an extension of his stay in the United States and was advised that because of his application for relief from military service he was precluded from receiving a visa.

Mr. Trahn states that the only reason he filed the form was to obtain permission to visit Mexico, and that he did not intend to avoid military service. An examination of the form would seem to indicate that a person using it could hardly be misled as to its purpose. The form is headed "Application by alien for relief from military service." At the bottom of the form, section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 is printed in heavy black type and includes the phrase, "Any person who makes such application shall thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States."

It would seem therefore, that Mr. Trahn was aware of the consequences which would result from signing Selective Service Form 301. It is important to note that it was not necessary for Mr. Trahn to sign Form 301. Exit permits were issued if the Government was satisfied that the individual concerned would return to the United States after a temporary absence.

It is for the foregoing reasons that I have been constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 30, 1947.*

GRAFF, WASHBOURNE, AND DUNN

H. R. 1534. I am withholding my approval from enrolled enactment H. R. 1534, for the relief of Graff, Washbourne, and Dunn.

The purpose of the enactment is to effect the payment of $7,204.72 to Graff, Washbourne, and Dunn, a corporation, to compensate it for losses apparently suffered in furnishing torpedo parts to the Navy Department under the contracts specified in the enactment.

It appears that, subsequent to the execution of the contracts, the present management of the corporation advised the United States Navy Purchasing Office, Newport, R. I., that it was planning to take over the ownership and management of the business and that the supplies covered by the contracts would be furnished to the Navy, provided a fair adjustment be made in the contract prices which, it was contended, were far too low.

In letter of April 4, 1942, the Navy Supply Officer, Newport, R. I., advised the contractor, in pertinent part, as follows:

> These contracts were awarded to your company on the basis of the preliminary price agreements entered into after negotiations between your company and the Naval Torpedo Station, Newport, R. I.
>
> In your letter you state that you desire to go forward with these contracts on a basis that will not cause financial ruination to your company, and now request readjustment in the prices because they are too low. In order to relieve you of any direct loss on these contracts and to save time in obtaining deliveries under the present war conditions, consideration will be given to adjusting the prices shown on the contracts on completion on a fair and reasonable basis to agree with your actual costs for labor and overhead expense in accordance with Treasury Decision 5000. No change will be made in

the allowance for profit as set forth on the preliminary price agreement pertaining to each contract. A certified statement of the actual cost on each contract will be submitted by your company.

Thereupon, the contractor proceeded with the completion of the contracts in accordance with their terms and subsequently submitted an invoice for $32,375 alleged to represent the amount due for adjusted costs under the contracts. The amount of the invoice subsequently was reduced to $12,656.64. It appears that Navy auditors later found that the contractor had incurred a net loss of $7,204.72, the amount carried in the enrolled enactment, in performing two of its contracts.

In the consideration of the claim by the Navy Department, the contracting officer made a finding of fact wherein it was stated:

That claim as presented by the contractor does not establish that said price increase is necessary to the continued operation of said contracts, or will effect the contractor's ability to carry out contracts in the future or impair the productibility of the contractor.

That said claim as presented does not establish that the contractor performed any services in excess of the performance required under the contracts or gave up any rights or benefits to which it was entitled under the terms of said contracts, and that by reason thereof, the contracting officer finds that said request for increase is not accompanied by a substantial consideration as defined in Navy Department letter of July 7, 1943, dealing with amendments and modifications of contracts and agreements, pursuant to the First War Powers Act of December 18, 1941, Executive Order 9001.

That in the opinion of the undersigned, based upon the material as hereinbefore set forth, contractor's claim, as presented, should be disallowed.

It is to be noted that the contractor merely was advised that "consideration will be given to adjusting the prices shown on the contracts on completion." Moreover, even if such statement be construed as an assurance that the contract prices would be adjusted upward upon completion of performance, such action by a representative of the Government could not impose on the Government any obligation in addition to that imposed by the written contract.

The provisions of the enrolled enactment would afford preferential treatment to the instant contractor over other contractors who have been required to bear losses under similar circumstances. Furthermore, by the act of August 7, 1946 (60. Stat. 902; Public Law 657, 79th Cong.), the Congress provided a procedure and fixed a standard by which relief was to be granted to war contractors. The relief proposed in the enrolled enactment apparently would be contrary to that standard of relief; and since no sufficient reason appears for departing from such standard, I am withholding my approval from the enrolled enactment.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 6, 1947.*

DOMESTIC MINES

H. R. 1602. I am withholding approval of H. R. 1602, a bill to stimulate exploration, development, and production from domestic mines by private enterprise, and for other purposes.

I am taking this action only after the most careful consideration of its effects upon the mining industries directly concerned and its relation to the general interests of the public.

This bill would require the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to continue to make premium payments to subsidize high-cost production of copper, lead, and zinc, and would provide new subsidies for domestic manganese production. Payments of $70,000,000 would be authorized for the 2-year period ending June 30, 1949, with not to exceed $35,000,000 of this available in the fiscal year 1948.

The premium price plan was initiated early in the war. It was effective in stimulating production of nonferrous metals for war purposes, while maintaining price ceilings at prewar levels. Two years ago in signing Public Law 88 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, authorizing continuance of these and other wartime subsidies, I urged that these programs be reduced or discontinued as rapidly as feasible whenever such payments became no longer necessary for war purposes. With the end of hostilities and the decontrol of prices, almost all other wartime subsidy programs have been discontinued. No adequate reason is apparent for continuing to subsidize the output of copper, lead, and zinc; and even less reason exists for adding to the list of subsidized commodities.

Continuance of the present plan would contribute very little, if at all, to production of the metals now in shortest supply. Since the removal of price ceilings, prices of all these metals have risen sharply. The market prices of copper and lead, the two scarcest of these metals, have been high enough in the last 6 months so that only a negligible share of the total output has been eligible for subsidy payments. With the minor exception of payments for exploration and development work, therefore, continuance of the present plan could not materially increase the supply of these metals. If the plan were restored, the great bulk of the subsidy payments, in fact, would continue to go for high-cost production of zinc, the supply of which is becoming relatively ample. Similarly, the industrial demand for manganese does not now justify subsidy payments to make available a relatively minor increase in low-grade domestic ore.

Even if there were sufficient justification for continuing to subsidize production of these metals, the plan provided in this bill would be too inflexible to meet present needs. Since it was specifically designed to meet wartime needs, the largest amounts of subsidies were authorized for production of zinc and copper, the metals then in shortest supply. Now, lead is the scarcest of these three metals and zinc is in relatively adequate supply. Yet this bill would not permit any major revisions in payments to shift the emphasis from zinc to copper and lead production. If it were to become law, the taxpayer would be subsidizing primarily zinc production, and the benefits to lead and copper production would be of minor significance.

Most important, continuation of this wartime subsidy program would conflict with our long-run peacetime objective of conserving domestic mineral resources. While the provisions of the bill would encourage exploration and development of new ore bodies, other more efficient methods would be preferable—methods which do not inevitably involve the premature exhaustion of the newly discovered reserve. It is particularly short-sighted in time of peace to continue to encourage extraction of metal from previously produced dumps and tailings instead of allowing these to remain available for future emergencies.

H. R. 1602 would authorize $35,000,000 in subsidy payments in both the present fiscal year and the fiscal year 1949. The bill, however, would provide subsidy payments at rates which would probably require even larger amounts than those authorized, especially in the event of a decline in market prices of any one or more of these metals. Accordingly, supplemental authorizations might well be necessary to carry out the provisions of the bill. In the present fiscal situation, neither the expenditures specifically authorized by the bill nor such possible additional expenditures appear justified.

I am not unmindful of the dislocations in the mining industry which are caused by the expiration of the premium-price plan. We must all agree, however, that we cannot regard this plan as a permanent part of our economy. It is clear that the changes in employment and other adjustments which are necessary at the time of the plan's termination, whenever it occurs, can be made more readily and with less hardship in a period of high employment and business activity, such as the present, than at any other time. Consequently, this seems to be the best time for making this inevitable postwar adjustment.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 8, 1947.*

MRS. BEULAH HART

H. R. 1730. I have withheld my approval from H. R. 1730, an act for the relief of Mrs. Beulah Hart.

The purpose of this bill is to compensate Mrs. Beulah Hart for the death of her son, Gath Daniel Meeks, as a result of a shot fired by a United States Army sentry.

It appears that during the evening of January 9, 1942, Gath Daniel Meeks, of Palm City, Calif., accompanied by his sister and two other persons, drove his truck north on Coronado Avenue in Imperial Beach, Calif., and into an area where a secret Army radio installation was situated. The area in question was guarded by soldiers, and upon approaching the entrance thereto the truck was stopped by a sentry, who inspected the vehicle and questioned its occupants and then allowed them to pass. Some time later—variously estimated as 10 to 45 minutes—at about 9:25 p. m., Mr. Meeks, having turned around at a point out of the range of vision of the sentry, returned to the entrance to the restricted area. It further appears that as he again approached the sentry, traveling at a speed variously estimated at 10 to 25 miles an hour, the sentry proceeded into

the intersection of Coronado Avenue and Second Street with the view of halting the vehicle for the required inspection; that Mr. Meeks did not stop his vehicle or reduce its speed; that the sentry, stepping back out of the path of the oncoming vehicle, shouted "Halt"; that the vehicle continued on its course with no perceptible reduction in speed; that the sentry thereupon ran after the truck, again shouted "Halt," and there being no response to this order, fired one round into the air; that he continued to pursue the truck, and after a short interval, as it did not stop he fired upon it, aiming at the taillight; that the bullet apparently struck the hard surface of the road behind the vehicle and then ricocheted upward, passing through the tailgate of the truck, the back of the cab, the back of the seat, through Mr. Meeks' body, emerging just above his heart. One of the passengers in the truck applied the brakes and guided the vehicle to the curb. Mr. Meeks died a few minutes later.

It appears that the deceased and his companions had no legitimate business in Imperial Beach at the time he met his death and the party apparently drove there out of curiosity. It is impossible to determine whether Mr. Meeks' failure to obey the command of the sentry to halt was deliberate or unintentional. All three of the passengers in the truck stated that upon their return to the entrance to the area the sentry was not in the middle of the intersection, but was standing at the side of the road, and gave no signal for them to stop and that they heard no order from him to halt. All of them, however, admitted having heard the warning shot fired by the sentry, and one of them stated that upon hearing such shot she told Mr. Meeks to stop and that he had placed his foot on the brake pedal and was in fact stopping the car when he was struck by the second shot fired. It appears that there was an interval of about 20 seconds between the two shots. The sentry who shot Mr. Meeks stated that as the civilian vehicle approached on its return to the entrance to the area he stepped out in the road with his gun "at port arms," remained there until the car was within 10 or 15 feet of him, and then, stepping out of its way to the side of the road, shouted "Halt" before firing the warning shot. Another soldier who was on duty at the sentry post corroborated these statements.

I am unable to escape the conclusion that Mr. Meeks came to his death through his own negligence. He was negligent, first, in failing to stop his vehicle when he approached the sentry, whether or not he heard the latter's command to halt. He had been compelled to stop when he entered the restricted area and he should have known that he would have to stop before leaving it. He was further negligent in failing to stop immediately upon hearing the warning shot. The sentry is chargeable with no negligent or improper act, since his procedure was wholly in accordance with the orders given him by his superior officers with a view to the protection of important Army installations under wartime conditions. This incident occurred only about 1 month after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, at a time when there was reason to fear similar attacks on the west coast of continental United States and every precaution was being taken to guard the country from such attacks.

In the light of the foregoing facts there is no justifiable basis for the granting of an award in this case. Therefore, while deeply regretting this tragic occurrence, I feel obliged to withhold my approval from the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 5, 1947.*

REFEREES IN BANKRUPTCY

H. R. 1810. I return herewith, without my approval, the enrolled bill (H. R. 1810) to amend the Criminal Code and certain other legislation to permit part-time referees in bankruptcy to act as agents or attorneys for claimants against the United States.

The bill, inter alia, exempts part-time referees in bankruptcy from the provisions of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code (18 U. S. C. 198, 203).

Section 109 of the Criminal Code provides that whoever, being an officer of the United States, or a person holding any place of trust or profit, or discharging any official function under, or in connection with any executive department of the Government of the United States, or under the Senate or House of Representatives, shall act as an agent or attorney for prosecuting any claim against the United States, or receive any gratuity in consideration of having aided or assisted in the prosecution of such a claim, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

Section 113 of the Criminal Code provides that any officer or employee of the United States who receives any compensation for representing a person before any governmental department or bureau shall be fined not more than $10,000 and imprisoned not more than 2 years, and shall thereafter be barred from holding any office of honor, trust, or profit under the Government of the United States.

Although it is believed that there would be relatively few, if any, officials who would intentionally abuse the privileges and powers of their positions, the foregoing provisions of the Criminal Code have been considered desirable as a deterrent to those few who might carelessly or through temptation besmirch the integrity of, and consequently undermine the public's respect for and confidence in, the Government. They also serve to discourage any undue influence which a Government officer or employee might exert, intentionally or not, in representing a client before any of the various Government departments, regardless of how remotely such representation may relate to the official duties of the officer or employee. In summary, the provisions are an assurance that the Government will not sanction either the practice or the appearance of officials' or employees' taking improper advantages of their positions in the situations encompassed thereby.

It does not appear that sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code were intended to apply to any particular group or class of Government personnel, but to all officers and employees in general who come within their provisions. There are doubtless many Government officials and employees who would feel justified in seeking exemption from these provisions of law, on grounds as substantial as those which may be advanced by part-time referees in bankruptcy. If, however, the scope of the sections is narrowed by amendments to the point where there is an inference that only certain designated groups of officials are above error or reproach while others are not, the statutes may become less effective, as well as discriminatory and embarrassing.

It is for the foregoing reasons that I am constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 5, 1947.*

AMENDING INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

H. R. 2331. I am withholding my approval from the enrolled bill (H. R. 2331) to amend section 20a of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Section 1 of this bill would amend the definition of "carrier" in section 20a of of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to include sleeping-car companies among the carriers whose financing is subject to approval by the Interstate Commerce Commission. There appears to be no reason why sleeping-car companies, which are common carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, should not be regulated by the Commission in respect of their financing, and I find no objection to this section.

Section 2 of the bill, however, is highly objectionable in that it would facilitate banker control of railroads and would sanction a departure from the long-established policy against interlocking directorates.

Paragraph 12 of section 20a of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, now prohibits an officer or director of any carrier to receive for his own benefit, directly or indirectly, any money or thing of value in respect of the negotiation, hypothecation, or sale of any securities issued by such carrier, or to share in any of the proceeds thereof.

Section 2 of the bill here under consideration would provide an exception to this prohibition in regard to dealings in securities with another corporation, firm, partnership, or association, when the carrier shall have as officer or director any person who is at the same time a director, member, manager, or purchasing or selling officer of, or who has any substantial interest in, such other corporation, firm, partnership, or association, if such dealings shall be with the bidder whose bid is the most favorable to such carrier, to be ascertained by competitive bidding under regulations prescribed by rule or otherwise by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and if such participation is due solely to such officer's or director's relationship with such other corporation, firm, partnership, or association, and not to his relationship with such carrier.

It has been stated that one of the results of the existing law was to make it difficult or impossible for a railroad to award prospective security issues to banking or investment concerns with which some of its directors were connected and that since regulations now require that railroad securities be marketed as a general rule through competitive bidding, the restriction is unnecessary. It was the express purpose of existing law to make it difficult or impossible for railroads to deal with banking or investment companies with interlocking directorates and the requirement of competitive bidding is established, not by statute but by a recent Commission decision and is, therefore, subject to change at any time. Moreover, this bill would facilitate and encourage the banker control of railroads, which is the subject of complaint in an important Government antitrust suit now pending against the railroads. The eradication of such control is sufficiently difficult, without the enactment of new legislation, to facilitate the establishment of such control. The evil of the kind of transactions here involved has long been recognized. It is merely one species of the general principle, recognized in the law governing the conduct of fiduciaries, that dealings in which both parties to the transaction are under common control should be avoided. The companies on both sides of the transaction are entitled arm's-length dealing by independent managements.

It is for the foregoing reasons that I am withholding my approval from the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 30, 1947.*

HARRY V. BALL

H. R. 2432. I have withheld my approval of enrolled enactment H. R. 2432, entitled "An act for the relief of Harry V. Ball."

This enactment would authorize the payment of compensation to Harry V. Ball covering a period of 5 months during which he rendered no service to the United States. Mr. Ball's claim for compensation during the involved period was presented to and disallowed by the General Accounting Office, whose records show that Mr. Ball was released from his employment at the Naval Shipyard at Pearl Harbor, March 27, 1945, due to disability; that he was advised to complete and return a "letter of destination" upon his arrival at his final destination within the United States; that such letter was completed and returned, but due to some error he did not receive formal notice of his separation until shortly after September 25, 1945. The enrolled enactment recites at length the basis of Mr. Ball's claim, such recital evidently being drawn from statements by Mr. Ball to the effect that he was prevented from obtaining employment during this period due to regulations of the War Manpower Commission because he could not establish his status with respect to employment with the Navy Department.

The fact remains, however, that Mr. Ball rendered no service to the United States during the period in question, and it has been the established rule for years that a Government employee is not entitled to compensation for any period when no services are rendered unless the absence is covered by authorized leave.

If it were unquestionably clear that Mr. Ball was prevented due to the action or nonaction of the Government from obtaining other employment during the elapsed period, some basis might be suggested for an equitable or moral claim in his favor. But on that point the Navy Department has reported:

> During this period the War Manpower Commission regulations were effective. These regulations required an employee to present a release from his previous employer in order to secure further employment. These regulations further provided, however, that in absence of such release, the War Manpower Commission itself could issue clearance for further employment if in its discretion the circumstances appeared to warrant this action. It is a well-known fact that the War Manpower Commission and its various local offices, including those of the United States Employment Service, were not reluctant to make use of this authorization and did in fact freely issue such releases if a man's services were desired or needed. In many cases these releases were issued not only in absence of a release from the previous employer but also in the face of refusal by the previous employer to grant such a release. There is, therefore, nothing except Mr. Ball's own unsupported statement to bear out his contention that his failure to acquire other employment prior to his receipt of formal separation notice was due to his lack of such notice.

Accordingly, and since no adequate basis appears for excepting this case from the general rule, I am withholding Executive approval of the enactment.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 4, 1947.*

UNITED STATES PARK POLICE

H. R. 2471. I am withholding my approval from H. R. 2471, an act to provide for periodical reimbursement of the general fund of the District of Columbia for certain expenditures made for the compensation, uniforms, equipment, and other expenses of the United States Park Police force.

The purpose of the enrolled enactment is to require, beginning with the current fiscal year, the Director of the National Park Service, from sums appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury, for such purpose, to deposit in the general fund of the District of Columbia, within 30 days after the end of each quarter, an amount equal to the total amount expended during such quarter from sums appropriated from the general fund of the District of Columbia for the compensation, uniforms, equipment, and other expenses of the United States Park Police force.

In other words, the enrolled enactment contemplates two appropriations: one out of the general fund of the District of Columbia for the purpose of compensating, uniforming, and equipping the United States Park Police, and another out of the general fund of the Treasury for quarterly reimbursement to the general fund of the District, of the amount expended for this purpose from the District appropriation.

The Department of the Interior, in reporting to me upon this measure, expressed the view that the procedure set forth in the bill represents an unnecessary duplication of appropriations for expenditure for the purposes indicated, and thereby increases accounting and other costs.

Moreover, the provisions of the bill, in calling for quarterly reimbursement to the general fund of the District of Columbia from appropriations out of the general fund of the Treasury, would be ineffectual for the first one or two quarters of the fiscal year 1948, since no such appropriations have been made, and cannot be made until such time as the Congress shall have again assembled.

It seems to me that this is a matter to which the Congress might well and profitably give further consideration, including in its study the question of whether, in view of the Federal contribution to the District of Columbia, which has been increased for the present year from $8,000,000 to $12,000,000, all or any part of the expenses of operating and maintaining the parks in the city of Washington should be paid from the general fund of the Treasury instead of, as at present, from the general fund of the District.

Under the circumstances, I feel constrained to withhold my approval of the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 4, 1947.*

COWLITZ COUNTY, WASH.

H. R. 2693. I am withholding my approval of H. R. 2693, entitled "For the relief of Public Utility District No. 1, of Cowlitz County, Wash."

The bill provides for the payment of the sum of $62,299.38 to Public Utility District No. 1, Cowlitz County, Wash., in full settlement of that district's claim against the United States for a fee paid to the clerk of the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington in cause No. 8592.

It appears that in 1940 the Cowlitz County Public Utility District acquired the electrical properties of the Washington Gas & Electric Co. at a price of approximately $6,000,000. In accordance with the law which was in effect at that time (43 Stat. 857; 8 U. S. C. 555), the district was obliged to pay to the clerk of the district court a fee of $62,299.38 when the court entered a decree of appropriation for the acquisition of the property. Shortly thereafter the law under which the fee was imposed was repealed. The repeal, however, was not retroactive. It further appears that the fee paid by the district was specifically mentioned during the consideration of the bill which was later enacted into the repealing law. The bill under consideration would refund the above fee to the district.

If the district, which paid the fee for some 6 months prior to the repeal of the law that imposed it, is entitled to a refund, it would appear only equitable that all persons who were required to pay the fee provided for by the same law should also be reimbursed. The difference seems to be only one of time and degree, and not of principle.

For the foregoing reasons I am constrained to withhold my approval from this bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 6, 1947.*

ST. LAWRENCE BRIDGE COMMISSION

H. R. 3332. I have withheld my approval from H. R. 3332, a bill entitled "An act creating the St. Lawrence Bridge Commission and authorizing said Commission and its successors to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y."

A very similar bill was passed during the Seventy-third Congress and approved June 14, 1933 (48 Stat. 141), which created the St. Lawrence Bridge Commission with authority to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg. Section 4 of that act contained, among other provisions, the following:

The bridge constructed under the authority of this act shall be deemed to be an instrumentality for international commerce authorized by the Government of the United States, and said bridge and ferry or ferries and the bonds issued in connection therewith and the income derived therefrom shall be exempt from all Federal, State, municipal, and local taxation.

The bridge has not been constructed under the authority granted by said act, but during the years subsequent to 1933 acts were passed by the Congress and approved to extend the times for commencing and completing its construction, the last such act having been approved October 16, 1945. In the meantime, however, the policy was adopted by the executive and legislative branches of the Government that legislation of this nature should contain no provisions exempting the facilities constructed pursuant thereto or the obligations created to meet the cost thereof or the revenues derived therefrom from taxation. It was recognized that the matter of exempting such facilities and obligations created to defray the cost of their construction from State taxation should be a matter for determination by the States in which the facilities might be located, and not by the Federal Government. It was further recognized that the Federal Government should not provide exemption from Federal taxes to facilities of this class and to income derived from their operation and from obligations issued and outstanding to cover the cost of constructing such facilities any more than it should provide such exemption to other classes of facilities. Pursuant to this policy, a number of bills enacted by the Congress with tax exemption provisions therein were vetoed by the President, and when in 1940 a bill (H. R. 9411) was enacted and approved June 8, 1940 (54 Stat. 259), to further extend the times for commencing and completing the proposed bridge at Ogdensburg it provided for repeal of the above quoted provision from section 4 of the act of June 14, 1933, and inserted in lieu thereof the following:

The bridge hereby authorized or the income therefrom shall be subject to Federal, State, municipal, or local taxation only to the extent that a like structure or the income therefrom owned and operated by the public authority or public agency of the State of New York shall be subject to taxation. The bonds or obligations of the Commission, from time to time outstanding, and the income therefrom owned and operated by taxation in the hands of the holders thereof.

The effect of the bill now before me, except for certain changes to which no objection is made, would be to reenact as new legislation the act as originally approved June 14, 1933, including the objectionable tax exemption provision. I, therefore, do not feel that I can give it my approval. However, I am not otherwise opposed to legislation to authorize the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at Ogdensburg.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 7, 1947.*

VENDORS OF NEWSPAPERS AND MAGAZINES

H. R. 3997. I am withholding my approval of H. R. 3997, a bill "To exclude certain vendors of newspapers or magazines from certain provisions of the Social Security Act and Internal Revenue Code."

This bill proceeds in a direction which is exactly opposed to the one our Nation should pursue. It restricts and narrows coverage under our social-security law, while our objective should be to enlarge that coverage. The strength, security, and welfare of the entire Nation, as well as that of the groups now excluded, demand an expanded social-security system.

H. R. 3997 would remove social-security protection from news vendors who make a full-time job of selling papers and who are dependent on that job for their livelihood. They and their families are exposed to the same risks of loss of income from old age, premature death, or unemployment as are factory hands or day laborers. They unquestionably fall in the group for whose protection our social-security laws were devised.

Many, perhaps most, street vendors of newspapers are excluded even at present from coverage under the Social Security Act because they are independent contractors rather than employees of the publishers whose papers they sell. But some vendors work under arrangements which make them bona fide employees of the publishers and, consequently, are entitled to the benefits of the Social Security Act. The standards used for determining whether or not the employer-employee relationship exists are the same in the newspaper business as they are in other enterprises. There is no justification for changing these standards so as to discriminate against employees in this particular industry.

It is said that the publishers have difficulty in keeping the necessary records and in collecting the employee contributions required by the social-security system. In those cases where the vendors are so closely associated with the paper as to be its employees, the difficulties are no greater than those confronting many other employers of outside salesmen, or indeed employers of other kinds of labor. Certainly, it has not been shown that these difficulties are so formidable as to warrant a special rule of exclusion and the consequent destruction of benefit rights of insured persons and their dependents.

H. R. 3997 would invite other employers to seek exemptions whenever they can allege that the law is inconvenient or difficult for them to comply with. It would establish a precedent for special exemption, and the exclusion of one group would lead to efforts to remove social-security protection from workers in other activities. Demands for further special legislation would be inevitable.

We must not open our social-security structure to piecemeal attack and to slow undermining. We must, instead, devote our energies to expanding and strengthening that system.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 6, 1947.*

RESIGNATIONS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communications:

OCTOBER 1, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
The Speaker's Rooms,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to advise you that on October 1, 1947, I submitted to the Honorable Dwight H. Green, Governor, State of Illinois, my resignation as Representative in Congress from the Twenty-first Congressional District of Illinois, effective at midnight October 5, 1947.

Respectfully and sincerely yours,

EVAN HOWELL,
Member of Congress,
Twenty-first District, Illinois.

SEPTEMBER 12, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I beg leave to inform you that I have this day transmitted to His Excellency Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York, my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Fourteenth District, effective as of the date of the receipt thereof.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

LEO F. RAYFIEL.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills, joint resolutions, and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 342. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Reading, Pa.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 468. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Imperial Palace, Dramatic Order Knights of Khorassan," to increase the amount of property which the corporation may hold from $100,000 to $5,000,000; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 641. An act for the relief of Mrs. Roberta Flake Clayton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 722. An act to authorize the issuance of Oregon Trail commemorative 50-cent pieces to the Oregon Trail Monument Association, Idaho Unit, Inc.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1082. An act to credit certain service performed by employees of the postal service who are transferred from one position to another within the service for purposes of determining eligibility for promotion; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1133. An act providing for the per capita payment of certain moneys appropriated in settlement of certain claims of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in North Dakota; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 1235. An act for the relief of Merchants Motor Freight; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1362. An act to aid the associations, groups, organizations, and institutions encouraging participation of the youth of the country in athletic and sports programs by making surplus athletic equipment available to such associations, groups, organizations, and institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 1393. An act to increase the permitted rate of allowance and compensation for training on the job under Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 1529. An act to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Shawneetown, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1551. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell to Anthony P. Miller, Inc., a parcel of unimproved land adjacent to the Anchorage housing project at Middletown, R. I.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1564. An act to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the centennial anniversary of the movement of Henderson and Seth Luelling to the Oregon country; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1632. An act to authorize the transfer of certain troop kitchen railway cars to the War Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1696. An act to amend the act of August 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 784), so as to extend the jurisdiction of the United States District Court, Territory of Hawaii, over Canton and Enderbury Islands; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. J. Res. 110. Joint resolution to provide for the relocation of the McMillan Fountain; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution establishing the Joint Committee on Government Information Programs; to the Committee on Rules.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll of Members of the House in order to determine whether or not a quorum is present.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members answered to their names:

[Roll No. 134]

Abernethy	Bates, Mass.	Brown, Ohio
Albert	Battle	Bryson
Allen, Calif.	Beall	Buck
Allen, Ill.	Beckworth	Buckley
Allen, La.	Bell	Buffett
Almond	Bender	Burke
Andersen, H. Carl	Bennett, Mich.	Burleson
	Bennett, Mo.	Busbey
Anderson, Calif.	Bishop	Butler
Andresen, August H.	Blackney	Byrne, N. Y.
	Blatnik	Byrnes, Wis.
Andrews, Ala.	Bloom	Camp
Andrews, N. Y.	Boggs, Del.	Canfield
Angell	Boggs, La.	Cannon
Arends	Bolton	Carroll
Arnold	Bonner	Carson
Auchincloss	Boykin	Case, N. J.
Bakewell	Bradley	Case, S. Dak.
Banta	Bramblett	Celler
Barden	Brehm	Chadwick
Barrett	Brophy	Chapman
Bates, Ky.	Brown, Ga.	Chelf
Chenoweth	Heselton	Murray, Tenn.
Chiperfield	Hess	Murray, Wis.
Church	Hill	Nixon
Clark	Hobbs	Nodar
Clason	Hoeven	Norblad
Clements	Hoffman	Norrell
Clevenger	Holmes	Norton
Clippinger	Hope	O'Brien
Cole, Kans.	Horan	O'Hara
Cole, Mo.	Huber	O'Toole
Cole, N. Y.	Hull	Owens
Colmer	Jackson, Calif.	Pace
Combs	Jackson, Wash.	Passman
Cooley	Jarman	Patman
Cooper	Javits	Patterson
Cotton	Jenison	Peden
Courtney	Jenkins, Ohio	Peterson
Cox	Jenkins, Pa.	Pfeifer
Cravens	Jennings	Philbin
Crawford	Jensen	Phillips, Calif.
Cresser	Johnson, Calif.	Phillips, Tenn.
Crow	Johnson, Ill.	Pickett
Cunningham	Johnson, Ind.	Ploeser
Curtis	Johnson, Okla.	Plumley
Dague	Johnson, Tex.	Poage
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Ala.	Potts
Davis, Tenn.	Jones, N. C.	Preston
Davis, Wis.	Jones, Wash.	Price, Fla.
Dawson, Utah	Jonkman	Priest
Deane	Judd	Rabin
Delaney	Karsten, Mo.	Rains
Devitt	Kean	Ramey
D'Ewart	Kearney	Rankin
Dirksen	Kearns	Rayburn
Dolliver	Keating	Redden
Domengeaux	Kee	Reed, Ill.
Dondero	Keefe	Rees
Donohue	Kefauver	Reeves
Dorn	Kelley	Rich
Doughton	Kennedy	Richards
Douglas	Keogh	Riehlman
Drewry	Kilburn	Riley
Durham	Kilday	Rivers
Eaton	King	Rizley
Eberharter	Kirwan	Robertson
Ellis	Klein	Rogers, Fla.
Ellsworth	Knutson	Rogers, Mass.
Elsaesser	Kunkel	Rohrbough
Elston	Landis	Rooney
Engel, Mich.	Lane	Ross
Engle, Calif.	Lanham	Russell
Evins	Larcade	Sadlak
Fallon	Latham	Sadowski
Fenton	Lea	St. George
Fernandez	LeCompte	Sanborn
Fisher	LeFevre	Sarbacher
Flannagan	Lemke	Sasscer
Fletcher	Lesinski	Schwabe, Okla.
Folger	Lodge	Scoblick
Foote	Love	Scott, Hardie
Forand	Lucas	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Fuller	Ludlow	
Fulton	Lusk	Scrivner
Gallagher	Lyle	Seely-Brown
Gamble	Lynch	Shafer
Garmatz	McConnell	Sheppard
Gary	McCormack	Short
Gathings	McCowen	Simpson, Ill.
Gavin	McDonough	Simpson, Pa.
Gearhart	McDowell	Smathers
Gillette	McGarvey	Smith, Kans.
Goff	McGregor	Smith, Maine
Goodwin	McMahon	Smith, Ohio
Gordon	McMillan, S. C.	Smith, Va.
Gore	McMillen, Ill.	Smith, Wis.
Gorski	Mack	Snyder
Gossett	MacKinnon	Somers
Graham	Macy	Spence
Granger	Madden	Stanley
Grant, Ind.	Mahon	Stefan
Gregory	Maloney	Stevenson
Griffiths	Manasco	Stigler
Gross	Mansfield	Stockman
Gwinn, N. Y.	Marcantonio	Stratton
Gwynne, Iowa	Martin, Iowa	Sundstrom
Hagen	Mason	Taber
Hale	Mathews	Talle
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Meade, Ky.	Teague
	Meade, Md.	Thomas, N. J.
Hall, Leonard W.	Merrow	Tibbott
	Meyer	Tollefson
Halleck	Michener	Trimble
Hand	Miller, Calif.	Twyman
Hardy	Miller, Conn.	Vail
Harless, Ariz.	Miller, Md.	Van Zandt
Harness, Ind.	Miller, Nebr.	Vinson
Harris	Mills	Vorys
Harrison	Mitchell	Vursell
Hart	Monroney	Wadsworth
Hartley	Morgan	Walter
Havenner	Morris	Weichel
Hays	Morrison	Welch
Hébert	Morton	West
Hedrick	Muhlenberg	Wheeler
Heffernan	Mundt	Whitten
Herter	Murdock	Whittington
Wigglesworth	Winstead	Worley
Williams	Wolcott	Youngblood
Wilson, Ind.	Wolverton	Zimmerman
Wilson, Tex.	Woodruff	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 386 Members have answered to their names. A quorum of the House is present.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 353) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of three members be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House is assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communications that he may be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to join a like committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President that a quorum of each House is assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communications that he may be pleased to make, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

RESIGNATION FROM SELECT COMMITTEE ON EUROPEAN AID

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following resignation from a committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

I deeply appreciate the honor of appointment to the important Select Committee on European Aid, but in view of the fact that important duties here will prevent my making the intended study abroad and in order that some other Member who can make the trip may be appointed I respectfully tender my resignation from the committee. With best wishes and renewed assurances of my appreciation, respectfully yours,

WILLIAM M. COLMER,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following resignation from a committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

NOVEMBER 17, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith tender my resignation from the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Sincerely,

HERBERT C. BONNER.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO SELECT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AID

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces that pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 296, Eightieth Congress, and

the order of the House of July 26, 1947, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, he did on August 19, 1947, appoint as a member of the Select Committee on Foreign Aid the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES—FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF WAR WITH SPAIN

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 108, Eightieth Congress, and the order of the House of July 26, 1947, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House did on September 22, 1947, appoint as members of the joint committee to prepare an appropriate plan for the participation in the observance and celebration in Cuba during the summer of 1948 of the fiftieth anniversary of the victories of the military and naval forces of the United States and their Cuban allies in the war with Spain, the following members on the part of the House: Mr. MICHENER, of Michigan; Mr. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania; Mr. KEARNEY, of New York; Mr. LANE, of Massachusetts.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES—EMPIRE PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

The SPEAKER. The Chair further announces that pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 110, Eightieth Congress, and the order of the House of July 26, 1947, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, did on September 22, 1947, appoint the following Members on the part of the House to attend the meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association, to be held in the Bahamas beginning December 28, 1947: Mr. TALLE, Iowa, chairman; Mr. CORBETT, Pennsylvania; Mr. KEFAUVER, Tennessee; Mr. WORLEY, Texas.

TWENTY-FOURTH REPORT OF OPERATIONS UNDER LEND-LEASE ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 437)

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NOVEMBER 17, 1947.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a message from the President of the United States, addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, received in the office of the Clerk at 12:05 p. m., November 10, 1947.

Very truly yours,
JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the twenty-fourth report of operations under the Lend-Lease Act.

This report contains a brief statement of the latest reports of transfers made under the Lend-Lease Act since the date of enactment, and a description of the final settlements with the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Union of South Africa. The texts of the settlement agreements with those two countries are printed in the appendix. Both are in accord with the general principles of settlement followed in negotiating with all the lend-lease governments, and I am satisfied that they are in the best interests of the United States while adhering to the general principles set forth in the various master lend-lease agreements.

Quarterly reports will hereafter be based on the fiscal reports prepared by the Office of Lend-Lease Fiscal Operations of the Treasury Department. These reports contain statements of the total lend-lease aid rendered and show the status of the lend-lease appropriations in detail. As further final settlements are negotiated, they will be included in the quarterly reports.

Lend-lease operations are now confined to wind-up activities. These consist of negotiating final lend-lease settlements, the disposal of the remainder of the lend-lease "pipe lines," and the collection and accounting activities handled by the Treasury Department. Negotiation of final settlements is now in process with the Governments of the U. S. S. R., China, Brazil, Norway, Czechoslovakia, Greece, and Yugoslavia. Delivery of the remaining goods in the "pipe lines" is being completed as rapidly as possible for those countries for which authorization was granted by the Congress in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 10, 1947.*

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION (H. DOC. NO. 438)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

NOVEMBER 17, 1947.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I transmit herewith the eleventh quarterly report covering the operations of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, filed with the Clerk on August 29, 1947.

Very truly yours,
JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the eleventh quarterly report covering the operations of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and the expenditure of funds appropriated by the Congress for this purpose.

During the quarter under review (January 1 to March 31, 1947) estimated shipments of supplies from the United States to UNRRA receiving countries amounted to approximately 1,970,000 tons, valued at approximately $212,230,000. Cumulative world shipments by UNRRA as of March 31, 1947, were approximately 22,239,217 tons, valued at approximately $2,597,299,000. Of these totals, shipments from the United States were approximately 16,650,000 tons, valued at approximately $1,900,000,000, or, respectively, 75 percent and 73 percent of the total.

The end of UNRRA operations has been in sight for several months. Further action was required to maintain the vital pipe line of food and other basic essentials of life. Public Law 84, approved on May 31, 1947, authorized the appropriation of $350,000,000 "for the provision of relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war." The United States recognized the fact that, if the great work which we had begun by contributing 73 percent of UNRRA's available funds were to be continued, the devastated countries had to be provided with additional assistance in 1947 after the termination of UNRRA, in order to prevent economic retrogression. Other governments than the United States have made known their own plans for joining us to meet these emergency relief needs.

Long-term plans have been inaugurated by our Government under which it is hoped that devastated countries will achieve economic health through cooperation among themselves and with such long-range help as the United States is able to give under proper international arrangements.

This UNRRA report, covering the first quarter of 1947, gives an indication of the extent to which that administration made use of the resources contributed by member governments. It shows also that UNRRA has planned an orderly liquidation and that other international organizations will carry on in the fields of health and welfare, agriculture, and displaced persons. With respect to the latter, the International Refugee Organization took over from UNRRA on July 1, 1947, the responsibility for the care of displaced persons. The United States continues its great concern for these unfortunate people, and the Congress has authorized a United States contribution to the work of IRO in the hope that this organization may conclude the task of resettling or otherwise repatriating the bulk of these people who have suffered so long.

While the contributions of other governments to UNRRA may be used for the rest of the year 1947 and into 1948, the

United States contribution cannot be obligated after June 30, 1947. On that date UNRRA had obligated practically the entire $2,700,000,000 contributed by the United States.

The figures in my next report to Congress on the operations of UNRRA will contain information as to the situation as of June 30, 1947. I am sure that, when these figures are known, the Congress and the people will be proud of the success of this international organization.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 29, 1947.*

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolutions:

Senate Resolution 163

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. THEODORE G. BILEO, late a Senator-elect from the State of Mississippi.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deecased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, do adjourn.

Senate Resolution 164

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is reassembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed on the part of the House to join a committee on the part of the Senate to wait upon the President of the United States and notify him that a quorum of the two Houses was assembled, and that Congress was ready to receive any communication that he might be pleased to make, has performed that duty. The President has informed the committee that he would communicate to the House a message in person at 1:30 o'clock today.

PROVISION FOR JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I present a resolution (H. Con. Res. 118) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, November 17, 1947, at 1:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States may be pleased to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

AUTHORITY TO DECLARE RECESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time during the day subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—FIRST REPORT TO CONGRESS ON ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

To the honorable the President of the Senate pro tempore and the honorable the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

Last May the Congress enacted Public Law 75 enabling the United States to render financial, technical, and material aid to the Governments of Greece and Turkey. This was done in response to urgent appeals by those Governments, which found that as a result of conditions arising out of the war their respective economies were unable to bear alone the financial burdens of reconstruction, of providing supplies for the civil population, even on a subsistence level, and of supporting the armed forces essential for the maintenance of security.

By Executive Order 9857, dated May 22, 1947, primary responsibility for the program's execution was delegated by me to the Secretary of State. The Department of State enjoys full cooperation of all other departments and agencies of the Government which can help in the implementation of the act.

Pursuant to the provisions of the act, I am submitting this, the first quarterly report on the activities and expenditure of funds under the authority of the act.

The economic situation in Greece has not basically improved since I addressed the Congress last spring about the need for American assistance. Although economic collapse, which might otherwise have resulted, has so far been averted through the extension of our aid, underlying causes of economic and political unrest remain of grave concern.

The first period of administration of the act has been largely one of preparation. Missions have been assembled and sent to Greece and to Turkey and are now working with the respective governments of those countries to assure effective and proper use of American aid funds. While many operational steps of major importance have been taken, such as the letting of contracts and the ordering and delivery of supplies, the effects of many of these actions will not be discernible until later in the fiscal year. The enclosed report reveals in some detail the action that has been taken thus far and some of the problems which have yet to be solved.

Since the time when the amount of assistance needed was determined, there have been several unfavorable developments which materially affect both programs but most seriously that for Greece. The Greek cereals harvest has been reduced by the general European drought, and by guerrilla activity, to a point where the expenditure of foreign exchange for food imports will be a great deal more than originally estimated if hunger and starvation are to be avoided. Intensification of military operations in that country has necessitated a transfer of funds from the economic to the military program. Rising prices in the United States and elsewhere have reduced the buying power of foreign exchange available to the Greek Government, with the effect that greater sums than were anticipated must be spent for minimum basic essentials. An added factor in Greece is that exports have not, because of internal economic and security conditions, reached as high a level as might reasonably have been expected some months ago.

The difficulties which hamper the success of this program must be overcome. Continuation of marginal subsistence only in Greece, without real progress toward recovery, will provide fertile ground for totalitarian ideologies.

Our missions in both countries are striving to achieve one main objective—that of helping free peoples in their effort to maintain the form and composition of their governments in accordance with the wishes of the majority. If this end is attained, every dollar that we have or will put into Greece and Turkey will have been fully justified. The United States, in accordance with its obligations under the United Nations Charter, will have served all peace-loving nations of the world in contributing to the security and well-being of a vital area, which, under circumstances of economic collapse and disorder, would threaten peace and tranquillity throughout the world.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 7, 1947.*

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess until 1:10 p. m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.), the House stood in recess until 1:10 p. m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 118. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress on November 17, 1947.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE

At 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the President pro

tempore of the Senate and the Members of the United States Senate.

The Senate, preceded by the President pro tempore of the Senate and by their Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore of the Senate took the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate took the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House, the Chair appoints the following members of the committee to conduct the President of the United States into the Chamber: The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore of the Senate. On the part of the Senate, the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

At 1 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 1 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the distinguished honor of presenting to you the President of the United States.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 430)

The PRESIDENT. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Eightieth Congress, the Congress has been convened to consider two problems of major concern to the citizens of the United States and to the peoples of the world. The future of the free nations of Europe hangs in the balance. The future of our own economy is in jeopardy. The action which you take will be written large in the history of this Nation and of the world.

The Secretary of State and other representatives of the executive branch have appeared before Committees of the Congress during the past week to present the facts regarding the necessity for immediate assistance by the United States to certain European countries. Austria, France, and Italy have nearly exhausted their financial resources. They must be helped if their peoples are to survive the coming winter, and if their political and economic systems are not to disintegrate. Exceedingly bad weather has brought on crop failures and fuel shortages, and has caused intense suffering. The food and fuel stocks of these countries are now near the vanishing point. Their peoples are in a dangerously weakened condition, due to years of short rations. Additional medical supplies and facilities are urgently necessary.

Austria needs $42,000,000, Italy needs $227,000,000, and France needs $328,000,000 to buy food, fuel, and other essential goods during the next 4½ months. Detailed information has been presented to your committees concerning these needs and the purposes for which funds to be appropriated by the Congress would be spent.

Additional funds will also be required to maintain our position in occupied areas.

Emergency assistance by itself will not solve European problems. Emergency aid is no substitute for a long-range recovery program, but it is a vital prerequisite to such a program. If the western European nations should collapse this winter, as a result of our failure to bridge the gap between their resources and their needs, there would be no chance for them—or for us—to look forward to their economic recovery. The providing of interim aid will give us time to plan our part in an economic recovery program and it will give the peoples of Europe the strength to hold out until such a program begins.

I shall shortly submit to the Congress my recommendations concerning the long-range European recovery program. This program is the result of the combined efforts of thoughtful men of two continents whose concern has been the most effective manner in which 16 European nations, western Germany, and the United States can work together for European recovery, world prosperity, and lasting peace.

It is a tribute to the strength of our democracy that we are able to make so great a contribution to the freedom and welfare of other nations and other peoples. This Nation is strong both in material resources and in the spirit of its people. Our economic strength, born of our system of free institutions, has contributed to raising the standard of living the world over. Our moral strength, resulting from our faith in human rights, is the inspiration of freemen everywhere.

I refer to the strength of this Nation with humility, for it is an awe-inspiring truth that the manner in which we exert our strength now, and in the future, will have a decisive effect on the course of civilization.

This is a truth whose significance grows with the experience of each passing day. The American people are becoming more and more deeply aware of their world position. They are learning that great responsibility goes with great power.

Our people know that our influence in the world gives us an opportunity—unmatched in history—to conduct ourselves in such a manner that men and women of all the world can move out of the shadows of fear and war into the light of freedom and peace. [Applause.]

We must make the most of that opportunity.

For we have learned, by the costly lesson of two World Wars, that what happens beyond our shores determines how we live our own lives. We have learned that, if we want to live in freedom and security, we must work with all the world for freedom and security.

Human misery and chaos lead to strife and conquest.

Hunger and poverty tempt the strong to prey upon the weak.

Twice within this generation we have had to take up arms against nations whose leaders, misled by the hope of easy conquest, sought to dominate the world.

We are convinced that the best way to prevent future wars is to work for the independence and well-being of all nations. [Applause.] This conviction guides our present efforts, and will guide our future decisions. We have participated fully and gladly in the growth of the United Nations and we seek now to strengthen and improve it. We are assisting free nations who have sought our aid in maintaining their independence. We have contributed large sums to help rebuild countries devastated by the war. We have taken the lead in breaking down barriers to world trade.

In our efforts, however, to achieve the conditions of peace, we have encountered unforeseen and unwelcome obstacles.

We have found that not all nations seem to share our aims or approve our methods. We regret the differences which have arisen and the criticisms so loudly expressed. And yet we cannot afford, and we do not intend, to let current differences with some nations deter our efforts to cooperate in friendly fashion and to assist other nations who, like us, cherish freedom and seek to promote the peace and stability of the world. [Applause.]

The actions of this Government must be of a stature to match the dignity and influence of the United States in world affairs. The prompt provision by the Congress for interim aid will be convincing proof to all nations of our sincere determination to support the freedom-loving countries of Western Europe in their endeavors to remain free and to become fully self-supporting once again. [Applause.]

If that action is followed by the enactment of the long-range European recovery program, this Congress will have written a noble page in world annals.

I have spoken of the economic and moral strength of the United States and of the way in which we must use that strength if we are to build a world community of free, strong, and independent nations.

The strength of the United States is not due to chance. It is due to the wise decisions and bold actions taken by free and courageous men throughout the history of our democracy.

The time is at hand for new decisions and new actions of equal wisdom.

On several occasions during the past year I have reported to the Congress and to the Nation on our general economic situation. These reports have told of new high levels of production and employment. Farmers are producing 37 percent more than in 1929. Industry is producing 65 percent more. In terms of actual purchasing power, the average income of individuals, after taxes, has risen 39 percent. The rapid growth of our postwar economic activity has exceeded expectations and has received anew the potentialities of our economy.

In each of my reports, however, I have had to warn of dangers which lay ahead.

Today inflation stands as an ominous threat to the prosperity we have achieved. We can no longer treat inflation—with spiraling prices and living costs—as some vague condition we may encounter in the future. We already have an alarming degree of inflation. And, even more alarming, it is getting worse.

Since the middle of 1946, fuel has gone up 13 percent; clothing prices have gone up 19 percent; retail food prices have gone up 40 percent. The average for all cost-of-living items has risen 23 percent.

The housewife who goes to buy food today must spend $10 to buy what $7 bought a year and a half ago.

The cost of living is still climbing. In the past 4 months it has risen at a rate of 16 percent a year.

Wholesale prices are rising, too. They affect every industry and trade, and they are soon translated into retail prices.

Since the middle of 1946, wholesale textile prices have gone up 32 percent; metals have gone up 36 percent; building materials have gone up 42 percent. Wholesale prices on the average have gone up 40 percent.

The harsh effects of price inflation are clear. They are felt by wage earners, farmers, and businessmen. Wage earners are finding that bigger pay checks this year buy less than smaller pay checks bought last year. Despite generalities about high farm prices, the income of many farm families cannot keep up with the rising costs of the things they buy. Small businessmen are being squeezed by rising costs. Even those who are well off are asking, "How long can it last? When is the break coming?"

In addition, price inflation threatens our entire program of foreign aid. We cannot abandon foreign aid, nor can we abandon our own people to the ravages of unchecked inflation.

We cannot allow the strength of this Nation to be wasted and our people's confidence in our free institutions to be shaken by an economic catastrophe. We shall be inviting that catastrophe unless we take steps now to halt runaway prices.

Our immediate approach to the problems of high prices and inflation should consist of three types of measures: One, to relieve monetary pressures; two, to channel scarce goods into the most essential uses; three, to deal directly with specific high prices.

One way to reduce monetary pressure is by restraining the excessive use of credit. At a time when the economy is already producing at capacity, a further expansion of credit simply gives people more dollars to use in bidding up the prices of goods.

Consumer credit is increasing at a disturbing rate. The amount outstanding has risen from $6,500,000,000 in 1945 to more than $11,000,000,000 today. Even more rapid expansion is under way now, because the controls on consumer credit exercised by the Federal Reserve System expired November 1. These credit controls should be restored. Also, some restraint should be placed on inflationary bank credit.

Legislation is required, moreover, to prevent excessive speculation on the commodity exchanges.

Another effective weapon against inflation is increased savings by the public. Every dollar that is saved instead of spent is a dollar fighting against inflation. In order to encourage additional savings, the Government should intensify its vigorous efforts to sell savings bonds. [Applause.]

The second part of the program to curb inflation is to secure the most efficient use of scarce goods and otherwise channel their flow so as to relieve inflationary pressures. Grain, for example, is too badly needed to permit wasteful feeding to livestock. Steel, as another example, is too scarce to be used for nonessential purposes.

Legislation is required to authorize the allocation of scarce commodities which basically affect the cost of living, or basically affect industrial production. In these limited areas inventory control powers are also needed.

Authority to allocate transportation services should be extended.

In addition, existing export controls should be continued and strengthened. Goods that we cannot wisely export must be kept here, and the shipments we make must go where they are needed most. Profiteering in exports must be prevented.

The measures which I have already discussed will, when taken together, aid substantially in relieving inflationary pressures. For large segments of the economy, they should be adequate to meet the requirements of the present situation. However, there are limited areas of acute danger in which these measures cannot be regarded as guaranteeing adequate protection.

For example, present forecasts indicate that we are likely to have less grain and meat next year than we have had this year. The pressure on the prices of these foods would then become increasingly great. If these pressures are permitted to bring further sharp increases in food prices, they may well set off a chain reaction that would spread throughout the economy. It is surely better to take timely action to check adverse forces at particular trouble spots than to wait until general inflation has become so serious as to require drastic controls over our whole economic life.

Therefore, we need a third group of measures to combat inflation. Legislation should be enacted, authorizing the Government to impose price ceilings on vital commodities in short supply that basically affect the cost of living. Basic elements in the cost of living are food, clothing, fuel, and rent. In addition, the legislation should be broad enough to authorize price ceilings on those vital commodities in short supply that basically affect industrial production. This will enable us to stamp out profiteering and speculation in these important areas.

This does not mean that price ceilings should be imposed on all items within the classes I have mentioned. For example, price ceilings would not be necessary for staple food and clothing items not in short supply or for any delicacies or luxuries. The same principle of selective treatment would apply to industrial items. This selective treatment of a relatively few danger spots is very different from over-all wartime price controls.

Even should the shortages of a few commodities at the consumer level remain serious for a time, I believe that the fair distribution of such commodities can be largely accomplished without consumer rationing. But no one can foretell exactly how serious some shortages may become next year. With serious shortages, a free market works cruel hardships on countless families and puts an unbearable pressure on prices. I, therefore, recommend that authority be granted, as a preparedness measure, to ration basic cost-of-living items on a highly selective basis.

Adequate protection from high prices and unfair distribution can be assured only by establishing authority for price ceilings and rationing in fields of critical importance. It takes several months to set up an organization and make the administrative arrangements necessary to put price control and rationing into effect. Thus, the only prudent course is to establish the authority at this time so the necessary preparations can be started. If we fail to prepare and disaster results from our unpreparedness, we will have gambled with our national safety—and lost.

If the Government imposes price ceilings covering a specific area of production, it should in all fairness have the authority, in that same area, to prevent wage increases which will make it impossible to maintain the price ceilings. This authority should be granted, although I believe that there would be few occasions for its use.

I am confident that, if the cost of living can be brought and held in reasonable relationship to the incomes of the people, wage adjustments through collective bargaining, will be consistent with productivity and will avoid an inflationary round of wage increases.

Next to food, the most important element in the cost of living is rent. Under the modified rent-control law rents are rising at the rate of about 1 percent a

month. A 12-percent annual increase in rents imposes an intolerable strain upon the family budget. The rent-control law should be extended and the weaknesses in the present law should be corrected.

I am well aware that some of my proposals are drastic measures. No one regrets more than I the necessity for considering their use. But if we face the facts squarely it is apparent that no other methods can safely be counted upon to protect our people from the dangers of excessively high prices and ruinous inflation.

The American people want adequate protection from these dangers, and they are entitled to it. It should not be denied them. Nor should they be misled with half measures.

Even with the authority to impose price ceilings, the Government will intensify its efforts to obtain voluntary action. Wherever voluntary action will do the job there will be no necessity to impose the Government's authority. But the very existence of these powers should have a salutary effect. They will demonstrate to each of our citizens the importance of carefully weighing each step that might lead to higher prices. They will support expanded and more specific efforts to obtain voluntary action by businessmen, labor leaders, farmers, and consumers to hold prices down.

All the actions I have described are essential to a fair and effective anti-inflation program. I look upon them as short-run insurance against the impairment of our prosperity and the threat to our future development.

We should all ponder these questions:

What would it avail the farmer, in the long run, if farm prices should go substantially higher only to be followed by a disaster such as occurred after the First World War?

What would it avail the worker, in the long run, to obtain inflationary wage increases if they were followed by a repetition of the bitter experience when 15,000,000 workers were out of jobs?

What would it avail the businessman to have record-breaking profits soar even higher if they were followed by a depression which would imperil our whole system of enterprise?

The program which I have outlined is one designed to meet the existing emergencies of inflation and exorbitant price levels. It is an emergency program which should be adopted to protect our standard of living for the immediate present and to make possible economic security in the future.

But a program designed to meet a crisis cannot by itself be a program designed to build for the future. We must also make plans to prevent future difficulty of the same nature.

Our long-range programs must stress ever-increasing production.

To accomplish this for agriculture, we need a comprehensive farm program. We shall need programs to increase the use of farm products by industry and consumers in this country when other countries become more nearly self-sufficient. Long-range national measures will be needed to protect the farm population against ruinous deflation in farm production and prices.

To expand industrial output, we need a long-range program to overcome basic shortages in capacity and equipment. To provide markets for increased output of farm and factory, we shall need long-range programs to raise the standard of living, particularly for families of low income.

But the first step toward this progress in the future is to deal with the critical present. We must win the battle against inflation, so that our long-range efforts may start from high levels of prosperity and not from the depths of depression.

In summary, the immediate anti-inflation program that I recommend calls for the following legislative action:

First. To restore consumer credit controls and to restrain the creation of inflationary bank credit.

Second. To authorize the regulation of speculative trading on the commodity exchanges.

Third. To extend and strengthen export controls.

Fourth. To extend authority to allocate transportation facilities and equipment.

Fifth. To authorize measures which will induce the marketing of livestock and poultry at weights and grades that represent the most efficient utilization of grain.

Sixth. To enable the Department of Agriculture to expand its program of encouraging conservation practices in this country, and to authorize measures designed to increase the production of foods in foreign countries.

Seventh. To authorize allocation and inventory control of scarce commodities which basically affect the cost of living or industrial production.

Eighth. To extend and strengthen rent control.

Ninth. To authorize consumer rationing on products in short supply which basically affect the cost of living.

Tenth. To authorize price ceilings on products in short supply which basically affect the cost of living or industrial production, and to authorize such wage ceilings as are essential to maintain the necessary price ceilings.

If we neglect our economic ills at home, if we fail to halt the march of inflation, we may bring on a depression from which our economic system, as we know it, might not recover. And if we turn our backs on nations still struggling to recover from the agony of war, not yet able to stand on their own feet, we may lose for all time the chance to obtain a world where free peoples can live in enduring peace.

The freedom that we cherish in our own economy and the freedom that we enjoy in the world today are both at stake.

I have recommended interim aid for certain western European countries and a program to curb inflation in the United States. I regard the measures which I have presented to you as vital and essential to the welfare of the Nation.

When the American people have faced decisions of such magnitude in the past, they have taken the right course.

I am confident that the Congress, guided by the will of the people, will take the right course on this occasion. [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 2 o'clock p. m., the President retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The members of the President's Cabinet retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

At 2 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m., the Speaker announced that the joint session was dissolved.

Thereupon the President pro tempore and the Members of the Senate returned to their Chamber.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess for 30 minutes.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2:41 o'clock p. m.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President, just presented, be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

REPRESENTATIVES-ELECT TO THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

NOVEMBER 17, 1947.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Certificates of election in due form of law of the following Representatives-elect to the Eightieth Congress to fill vacancies have been filed in this office, viz:

Eleventh Michigan District: CHARLES E. POTTER, Representative-elect; Fred Bradley, predecessor.

Ninth Texas District: CLARK W. THOMPSON, Representative-elect; Joseph J. Mansfield, predecessor.

Sixteenth Texas District: KEN REGAN, Representative-elect; R. Ewing Thomason, predecessor.

Eighth Pennsylvania District: FRANKLIN H. LICHTENWALTER, Representative-elect; Charles L. Gerlach, predecessor.

Fourth Ohio District: WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, Representative-elect; Robert F. Jones, predecessor.

Fourteenth New York District: ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Representative-elect; Leo F. Rayfiel, predecessor.

Tenth Indiana District: RALPH HARVEY, Representative-elect; Raymond S. Springer, predecessor.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF NEW MEMBERS

Hon. CHARLES E. POTTER, Hon. CLARK W. THOMPSON, Hon. KEN REGAN, Hon.

FRANKLIN H. LICHTENWALTER, Hon. WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Hon. RALPH HARVEY appeared in the well of the House and took the oath of office.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I do this in order to interrogate the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] with reference to the legislative program. Many Members are very much interested to know whether there will be a legislative program this week.

Mr. HALLECK. I am glad to respond to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, first indicating that I have discussed the matter with him and other leaders of the House.

It is quite apparent that none of the legislation sought in the special session will be ready for floor consideration this week. It is necessary, of course, that careful committee consideration be given to the various matters. That committee consideration is being given. So it is my plan to have the House meet tomorrow and then adjourn from tomorrow until Thursday, and then adjourn from Thursday until Monday.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state at this time that the Chair will not entertain requests for 1-minute speeches this afternoon, except for eulogies of deceased Members. The Chair will, however, entertain requests to extend remarks in the RECORD.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 hour tomorrow after the disposition of legislative matters on the Speaker's desk, to make a report on the journey and the work of the Joint Committee on Armed Forces.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes on tomorrow following the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next following the legislative business of the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes on Thursday next following the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow and on Thursday as well, after the conclusion of the other special orders I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address delivered by former Postmaster General James A. Farley at the University of Wisconsin centennial dinner, at the Commodore Hotel, New York City, recently.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a radio address by Mr. George Reedy.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio and Mr. MILLER of Maryland asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. POTTS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution and a letter.

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a world report entitled "How Europe Wastes Food Supplies."

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Wall Street Journal.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a news item.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a recent radio address.

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McDOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from Dr. Charles S. Collier in the Washington Post.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by former Congressman Samuel Pettingill on The Man Who Got Rich.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three separate instances and in each to include newspaper articles and letters.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he made last Saturday at Wilberforce University in Ohio.

Mr. MORRISON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from one of his constituents.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances.

Mr. NIXON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include three bills, one the American Legion asked me to introduce, one a Veterans' Administration bill, and another bill requested by the War Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the New York Sun entitled "Now, You Tell Us, Mr. President."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BUCHANAN (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK, on account of illness.

To Mr. COOPER, for 4 weeks, on account of official business, while serving as a United States Delegate to the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment, at Habana, Cuba.

To Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin, from November 17 to November 24, on account of official business for Committee on Education and Labor.

To Mr. REED of New York (at the request of Mr. JENKINS of Ohio), on account of illness.

THE LATE THEODORE G. BILBO

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk a resolution (H. Res. 354) and ask that it be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. THEODORE G. BILBO, a Senator-elect of the United States from the State of Mississippi who passed away at Foundation Hospital in New Orleans, La., on August 21, 1947.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator-elect.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO, of Mississippi, marked the passing of one of the most courageous men I have ever known in public life. He and I did not always agree; but any man who ever crossed swords with him realized that he was a man of unusual ability and of indomitable courage.

Senator BILBO was born October 13, 1877, on a farm in Pearl River County,

Miss. He was elected to the State senate in 1907. In 1911 he was elected lieutenant governor, in which position he served for 4 years.

In 1915 he was elected Governor, and again in 1927, serving 4 years each time. In 1934, in 1940, and in 1946 he was elected to the United States Senate by overwhelming majorities.

No man who has ever served in that great body suffered the unjust treatment that was meted out to this humble representative of the toiling masses of Mississippi. Whatever else might be said of THEODORE G. BILBO, he never lost the common touch. His heart went out to the toiling people of his State, and whenever their interest was at stake they knew exactly where he stood.

Senator BILBO also stood for those traditions which have characterized the people of the South from the earliest settlements and for those policies of segregation by which alone the two races can live together in peace and harmony in that great section of the country. For that he was abused and accused of race prejudice. As a matter of fact, the colored people in Mississippi and other Southern States have enjoyed more peace, more happiness, more prosperity, more protection, and more security than they have ever enjoyed anywhere else in the United States or anywhere else in the world under similar circumstances.

As Governor of the State, Mr. BILBO never failed to see that they were protected.

Dying of cancer, suffering the agonies of the damned, he stood on the floor of the United States Senate and fought to protect you and me and the people we represent from one side of this country to the other against those vicious measures that strike at the very heart of this Republic.

For that reason he was abused and maligned and even denied the right to go on the floor of the Senate and defend himself against the most vicious accusations.

Special trainloads of Communists, many of whom really hate the Government of the United States, poured into Washington, swarmed into the galleries of the United States Senate, and packed the corridors of this Capitol demanding that he be denied, not only his seat in the Senate to which he had been elected, but also the right to defend himself on that floor.

When he took the floor to fight against the so-called FEPC, one of the most vicious pieces of communistic legislation that has ever been proposed in the Congress of the United States, he was advised by his physicians that such exertions might cost him his life, which it did. When he was denied his right to his seat in the Senate and denied the right to defend himself against those accusations, he returned to his home at Poplarville and was sent by his physicians to this hospital in New Orleans, where he passed away on August 21.

Not satisfied with that, those enemies within our gates continued the most ghoulish attacks that I have ever known, and some of them are continuing them today.

Nothing that I can say will add to the stature of this courageous man.

Nothing that I can say will have any effect on his place in the history of this Republic. But when the impartial historian comes to write the history of the Eightieth Congress, one of the most shameful chapters will be the mistreatment of this man who gave his life for the protection of the people of the South, for Americanism, for American principles, and to the end that our Government might endure.

Mr. Speaker, this closes a historical chapter.

But I want to say in closing that the battles that Senator BILBO fought, and for which he was so severely punished, were the battles of the people of Mississippi, the people he loved and served throughout a long and stormy career.

As Bishop Calloway said of L. Q. C. Lamar:

When Life's fitful fever was over and he was called across the silent river
He asked no greater boon, he craved no grander privilege,
He desired no loftier honor than to be permitted to sleep in the generous bosom of Mississippi's sacred soil.

I now yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I express the sentiment of the people of Mississippi when I say that the death of the late Senator and Senator-elect, THEODORE G. BILBO, and especially the circumstances of his passing, brought deep and wide regret. THEODORE G. BILBO came from a good family. His father and his mother were among the pioneers of Mississippi. He was well educated. After attending preparatory schools in Mississippi he went to Peabody College and Vanderbilt University, among the leading institutions of the South. He subsequently attended the University of Michigan. He possessed an unusual personality. He was personally and politically courageous. In intense political campaigns, while others were excited, he was always calm. He possessed what I call a good nerve. He was able to relax.

He was a lawyer by profession and a farmer by practice. He operated the farm on which he lived, of which he was proud, and which he greatly improved. Most of his life was spent in holding public office. He was State Senator, Lieutenant Governor, twice Governor of Mississippi, twice United States Senator, and was elected for a third term as Senator.

He and I did not agree on some public questions, nor did we in many cases agree as to political methods.

His career was unique. He was honored with high office as were but few Mississippians. Notwithstanding any faults or imperfections, he had a larger personal following than any other man in public life in Mississippi at the time of his death. There are two factions or groups in Mississippi, and while we have but one party, the primary elections are as bitterly contested as are general elections in other States. His friends were loyal and his political enemies were active and bitter in their opposition.

Senator BILBO possessed remarkable political intuition. He had the faculty of anticipating progressive issues and he capitalized upon this faculty by posing as the champion of the progressive and liberal policies which he had anticipated or adopted.

He advocated measures in the interest of the average man. With him, the welfare of the common people was paramount.

As a Member of the Senate, because of his racial and other views, he had antagonized many people in other States. Attempts were made by nonresidents of Mississippi to defeat Senator BILBO in the election, and these attempts were especially pronounced in the attempts to prevent his being seated after his election.

I believe in the rights of the States to select their own Senators and Representatives without outside interference or dictation. I have always advocated that the Senator or Representative who presents the credentials of his State or district is entitled to be seated. I am aware that both branches have the right to expel after a Member is seated.

Two wrongs never make one right. The people of Mississippi know that, in the last election of Senator BILBO, there was no intimidation, fraud, or corruption. There were denunciations and there were appeals, but no qualified citizen was denied the right to vote in the primary in which Senator BILBO was successful. The people of Mississippi resented the attempts to deny Senator BILBO's seat to him because of his political views or because of his alleged improper conduct and the alleged improper conduct of some of his supporters in a previous senatorial campaign in which he was not a candidate. He succeeded in convincing the people of Mississippi that he was the vicarious sufferer in behalf of their constitutional rights to representation in the Senate. If he had been denied admission he would have been promptly and overwhelmingly reelected.

The name of THEODORE G. BILBO will be long remembered in the State of Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in their statements of regret in the passing of the late Senator from Mississippi, Hon. THEODORE G. BILBO. Senator BILBO had a long and successful career in public affairs. He served as State senator in Mississippi, Lieutenant Governor, twice as Governor of the State, and two terms as United States Senator, being elected to a third term last November. Senator BILBO at all times enjoyed the friendship and support of many Mississippians, and with the exception of one campaign was elected each time he ran for high office. Always he had an opposition, which at times bordered on being bitter. Yet this

never seemed to be reflected in his demeanor; others might become angry, but never Senator BILBO. During his entire political career his chief support was with the average man, and usually he had a big percentage of the working people of Mississippi. Contrary to the reputation built up in the national press during recent years, Senator BILBO was identified with liberal measures, consolidation of schools, good roads, and, some of you may be surprised, but for 30 years Senator BILBO advocated the repeal of the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting in Mississippi. He felt, however, that the State of Mississippi was the only power that had the right to remove such requirement from its constitution and that the National Congress was without authority to repeal such provision of the Constitution of the State of Mississippi.

Throughout Senator BILBO's service in public office, the people of Mississippi were divided in their support of him as a candidate. However, in one matter they were united and that was in the belief that Senator BILBO was wrongfully withheld from taking his seat as United States Senator. Senator BILBO was nominated in the Democratic primary of 1946. He was elected in November 1946 by the people of the sovereign State of Mississippi as their representative in the Senate of the United States, and, yet, with his credentials in proper order, his seat in that great body was withheld from him, and the State of Mississippi was deprived of one of its Senators. Senator BILBO was denied the opportunity to defend the charges made against him, yet through it all he carried on the fight to the last as he had many others. The failure to seat Senator BILBO and to give him the opportunity to be heard with regard to the charges, in my judgment, may be the beginning of a practice in the Congress of the United States that would be highly dangerous to the future welfare of our great Nation.

Senator BILBO is gone, and while some may differ with his methods, few Mississippians but what believe in the causes he so well espoused in the United States Senate. He will long be remembered by the people of the great State of Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, since the Congress recessed last, another outstanding Member of the Congress has passed into the Great Beyond in the person of the late and lamented Senator THEODORE G. BILBO, a Senator from the State of Mississippi.

His passing is mourned by many of his fellow citizens and many admiring friends throughout the Nation. Senator BILBO lived at Poplarville, Miss., in my congressional district. He was the second United States Senator from my congressional district to die within the past few years, the other being the late and lamented Senator Pat Harrison.

Senator BILBO has been honored as few men in the Nation have been honored by their constituents. He was elected State senator, Lieutenant Governor, was twice elected Governor of his State, and twice elected as a United States Senator from the State of Mississippi. He had a great hold upon the people of Mississippi, and although his political career was a tempestous one it cannot be gainsaid that he was a master of the art of politics. He was possessed of many good qualities. His loyalty to his friends knew no bounds.

Whether Mississippians approved of the method of approach to the problems that he stood for is another matter; but the fact remains that Mississippi and the people of that great sovereign State, during the hearings before an investigating committee of the other body with reference to Senator BILBO, resented the method by which he was denied his seat in the United States Senate. They further resented, as a great sovereign people, the interference of outside influence in the affairs of Mississippi, and they will ever resent, and properly so, any interference with their right to select their own officials and have those officials seated in the Congress of the United States, whether that be in the House of Representatives or in the Senate of the United States. Even his political enemies in Mississippi felt that he was entitled to his seat in that body and resented the action of that body in denying him that seat pending a fair and impartial hearing upon the charges made against him. And even though Senator BILBO is dead, the principle of the southern way of life, of which he was a most vocal and persistent advocate, lives on.

Mr. Speaker, a great, outstanding son of Mississippi has gone to join the spirit of his ancestors, and while it might be said of him as of others who have passed along death's trail, that the day's work is done, it cannot be said that the work itself is accomplished. The tomb is not a blind alley nor a dead-end street. Edith Davis Rowe gave thought to this expression when she wrote:

Some day our ears will cease to hear,
Our limbs will cease to walk,
Our eyes will close to mortal scenes,
Our tongue no more will talk;
Our hands will never work again,
Our heart will stop its beat,
But yet for years our work will stay
To make our lives complete.
The things we made will still be used,
The things we write be read,
The things we've said will, too, live on
In others' minds instead.
And so our lives go on and on.
Through generations more,
The products of the human mind
Are tripled by the score.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in the sentiment expressed with regard to the passing of the late senior Senator from Mississippi, THEODORE G. BILBO.

Senator BILBO lived a great and useful life. His political career was most unusual and marked with great success. In all of the history of our State no other Mississippian was honored as was he.

He was highly educated, intelligent, and physically and mentally strong. He came from a family of average means and throughout his lengthy political career as State senator, Lieutenant Governor, twice Governor and United States Senator for 12 years, he never once swerved from his efforts in behalf of the average man. His service as Governor was marked with legislation and activity for the common people. As one of my colleagues has so correctly stated, Senator BILBO was, contrary to the opinions of many so-called liberal leaders, a real liberal and progressive public official. On the other hand he believed, as do his fellow Mississippians, in the constitutional rights of the States to govern themselves, free of Federal encroachment and intervention.

Although there were thousands of Mississippians who never supported him politically they believed in his right to be seated for a third term in the Senate of the United States. The primary election in which he was nominated for a third term was a free and fair election. There was no fraud. There was no coercion. Mississippians went to the polls and freely cast their ballots for the one of their choice. The result was that Senator BILBO was lawfully reelected to a third term in the Senate. His credentials were properly certified and in order. And, Mississippians as a body were behind him in his fight on the floor of the United States Senate. At the time of his death he had not gained his seat, but indicative of his fighting qualities he never surrendered. Throughout his official career he was never known to surrender from the principles which he believed to be fair and right. His convictions remained fast until death overtook him. When he last departed from Washington, a very sick man, his words were that he would return to make the political fight of his life. We know not what the result would have been, but those of us who had seen him cross swords in many political battles know that he would have surely returned and carried the fight to his enemies.

In the great hill section of Mississippi, which I am honored to represent, Senator BILBO counted his friends by the thousands. He usually fired the opening gun of his political campaigns in one of the counties of my district, Pontotoc County. A vast majority of the people of this county, as well as those in many other sections of Mississippi, supported and admired Senator BILBO. He loved people. He liked to mix and mingle among them. As evidence thereof he once, while Governor, suspended business in the spacious offices of the State capitol and reopened what he termed the "Summer capitol among the people" in Pontotoc County.

He was a man of courage and strong convictions. He was energetic. He was successful as a farmer and public official. It is doubtful that his political success will ever be equaled by another Mississippian. He has crossed the river to a better land. He will be long remembered by the people of my great State who miss him and mourn his passing.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO, Mississippi has lost one of her most noted sons. Few men have ever been honored to public office, in Mississippi or any other State, as was Senator BILBO. He was a man of unusual ability, unique personality, and was truly a man of action.

Senator BILBO served as State senator from 1908 to 1912, served as Lieutenant Governor of Mississippi from 1912 to 1916, and as Governor for two full terms, from 1916 to 1920 and from 1928 to 1932. He was elected three times to the United States Senate.

Senator BILBO was a great friend to the underprivileged people of his State, and a man of unquestionable loyalty and faithfulness to his friends and the people of Mississippi. The record reveals that Senator BILBO was a strong advocate of progressive educational programs, highway programs, and eleemosynary institutions. The people of Mississippi were frequently divided in their support of Senator BILBO throughout his career, as is true of most public officers, yet the people of our great State were united in their belief that Senator BILBO was elected as their Senator, and in their further belief that he should have been given his seat in that great body, so that he might have defended the charges made against him.

Senator BILBO will long be remembered by the people of my State for the worthy causes he supported.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in mourning the passing of Senator BILBO.

Mr. Speaker, the passing of THEODORE GILMORE BILBO removes from the national political arena one of the most controversial figures ever to possess a senatorial toga.

Known as the stormy petrel of Mississippi politics, THEODORE G. BILBO became the most honored man in the history of that great State, and in return he devoted his entire life to the service of his fellow Mississippians.

Launching his career of service as a member of the Mississippi State Senate in 1908, THEODORE G. BILBO later served as Lieutenant Governor, Governor, and in 1928 became the only man in the history of Mississippi to be twice elected to the post of chief executive. He was elected to the United States Senate in 1934, where he continued to serve until January 1947, when he was denied the seat to which he had been overwhelmingly elected by the people of the State of Mississippi.

Despite the many successes of his stormy career, Senator BILBO never lost his sympathetic regard for the average or common man, nor ever failed to evince his sincere gratitude to the people responsible for his success. He never enjoyed the support of the press of his State, nor of those in his State whose interests conflicted with the general welfare of his State and his people.

No man could better judge the sentiments of his people; no man ever served his people with more vigor and determination than did BILBO. He was a man of indomitable spirit and almost inexhaustible energy, with a deep sense of charity and adamant and fervent faith in the teachings and principles of Christianity.

Probably no man who ever represented a sovereign State of this Nation suffered more personal abuse from a hostile press and radio than did BILBO. And yet, in the face of these unjustifiable insults, he continued to fight—in the way that only BILBO could fight—for the principles in which his conscientious beliefs were rooted.

Whatever may be said about "The Man" BILBO, it must be said to his everlasting credit that he had the courage of his convictions and the will to back them.

The action of the other body in denying to Senator BILBO the seat to which he had been duly and constitutionally elected will be resented deeply by the people of Mississippi for all time to come—even by those Mississippians who have been politically opposed to him throughout the years.

Although he was the victim of this unwarranted abuse, and though surgeons had pronounced upon him a sentence of death by cancer, Senator BILBO never lost his will to live and his faith in his fellow Mississippians.

He did not die—as many would believe—with a broken heart. On the contrary, he passed away comforted in the knowledge that he was still first in the hearts of his native Mississippians.

Mississippi and the United States have suffered an irreparable loss.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the death of Senator BILBO may revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HALLECK assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

THE LATE HONORABLE CHARLES L. GIFFORD

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 355) which I send to the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. CHARLES L. GIFFORD, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad duty to offer this resolution conveying as it does the information to the House of the death of a beloved colleague; a man whose close friendship I cherished for 37 years. CHARLIE GIFFORD, whose death we mourn, was admired and respected by all. No middle aisle divided the House in its appreciation of this great American Congressman.

It was back in 1912, when, as a very youthful member of the Massachusetts Legislature, I first became acquainted with CHARLIE GIFFORD. He was a veteran of the legislature, and his friendly, kindly aid helped me over some rough passages. Then started a warm friendship that increased with the passing of time. Later Mr. GIFFORD went to the senate and I followed him. There we served 3 years together. Then he came to Congress, and, 2 years later, I joined him, and for more than 23 years we served together here in this great parliamentary body. We had many things in common, and this permitted me to appreciate his sterling character, his fine grasp of Government affairs, and his rugged Americanism.

He had the courage of his convictions. He never dodged an unpopular issue or refrained from expressing his opinion, even if it at the time might be unpopular. He was a stalwart fighter for the cause of republicanism, in which he sincerely believed. He loved the rough and tumble of debate, yet with all his sturdy love of party and stout support of his party's principles his barbs were shot without malice.

The death of CHARLIE GIFFORD is a great loss of this Congress, his State, and the country. He had served on the great Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, he had been a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency and of the Committee on Expenditures, and he served at the time of his death as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. Through service on these four great committees he acquired an immense knowledge of national problems, knowledge that would have been of tremendous value to the country as we go forward to crucial and perilous days.

So it is with sorrow and sadness today I offer this resolution. It is my sincere hope that in the other world to which he has gone he will find the fullest measure of contentment and happiness.

To his beloved family I offer my deepest sympathy at their great loss.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is exceedingly difficult for me to stand here and try to eulogize my good friend, CHARLIE GIFFORD. We were friends for many years. He was so well known, so highly respected, and so loved in the House on both sides of the aisle that words in his praise seem almost superfluous and fulsome. He was one of that fast-disappearing race of Massachusetts Cape Codders, known for his every-ready wit and humor, always

coupled with solid thinking and constructive suggestion. During his long and distinguished service as a legislator in both the General Court of Massachusetts and the Congress of the United States his popularity was not confined to any one party; he was loved by all, even though his well-placed barbs during debate often struck home. He was understood—everyone knew of his sincerity of effort in trying to save the country money. His service on the Committees on Merchant Marine, Banking and Currency, and Ways and Means was constructive service, and the welfare of our Nation always had precedence in his thoughts and acts.

In mourning his loss as a colleague and friend, our deep understanding and sympathy go to his devoted wife, daughter, and the grandchildren of whom he was so proud. One of the loveliest things, I think, about CHARLIE GIFFORD was his devotion and comradeship with his grandchildren. He was building them up to be great Americans.

All that could die of CHARLIE GIFFORD has passed away, but the memory of his friendship, his humor, his ready sympathy, his loyal patriotism, and his high statesmanship will live always. We shall miss him greatly.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, together with every other Member of the House, I sincerely mourn the passing of Massachusetts Representative CHARLES L. GIFFORD. Here was an unusual man whose friends were only limited by his acquaintances. Always cheerful, his fund of good humor, ready wit, and practical knowledge made him the spark plug of any group of which he was a part.

I came here with the Sixty-sixth Congress. Mr. GIFFORD came with the Sixty-seventh Congress, and his service was continuous until his death. Our families lived at the same hotel. Our acquaintance was, therefore, more than formal and was, indeed, intimate. Of strong character, decisive views, and a student of all public questions, his worth was soon recognized and appreciated. He was not only effective in the committee room, but he was interesting, entertaining, and persuasive in debate.

The pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD throughout his service bear witness to his activity on the floor. Seldom was there an important issue before the House he did not discuss, and time has shown that he was always logical. His integrity was never questioned. While he was positive in his views, yet he was always tolerant of the sincerity of his opponents. During the last few years of his service he was not a well man, yet he kept the faith, performed his duties well, and was always on the job, especially when the interests of his own New England and his own Massachusetts were in any way particularly involved. He served long, honorably, and conscientiously. Indeed, during recent years he worked when he should have been resting. He understood this, but was deaf to the suggestions of his colleagues that his health should come first. His passing was not unexpected. I talked with him the day before he left Washington, and it was only then that I realized that CHARLIE GIFFORD probably would not return to the Halls of Congress. His career here was such that he left without anything to regret. His public service established a pattern that can profitably be followed by those who are to come after, and I join with the others in paying this tribute of honor, love, and respect to his memory. He has left a splendid heritage to the bereaved family, and we all sorrow with them.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in the death of our able and beloved colleague, CHARLIE GIFFORD, the State of Massachusetts and the Nation as a whole have lost the services of an outstanding public servant.

For 2 years a member of the house of representative in Massachusetts, for 6 years a member of the senate in Massachusetts, for 26 years a Member of this House, a total of 34 years, he served both State and Nation with fidelity and with distinction.

Bringing to his work great ability, great courage, and an unfailing sense of humor that endeared him to all, he always fought for his convictions and for the best interests of this Nation of ours.

In many ways CHARLIE GIFFORD seems to me to have been typical of the rugged individualism, of the independence of thought and action which laid the foundations of America.

I have known CHARLIE GIFFORD and his family, personally, for many years. I owe him and them a great debt for help given me through the years during my service in this House.

No one could serve with him as closely as I have during the past 19 years without having for him both high regard and deep affection.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that he will be greatly missed by all Members on both sides of the aisle who had the privilege of knowing him and working with him here.

The House will not be quite the same without CHARLIE GIFFORD.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be allowed to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of our late colleague and friend, CHARLIE GIFFORD, the House has lost one of its most distinguished Members. CHARLIE GIFFORD in debate, as we all remember, had probably the most unique and impressive way of presenting his thoughts in argument. He was a man who strongly believed in the principles and the policies of his party.

He was a man of great warmth of heart, a man, as one of my colleagues from Massachusetts ably expressed, who was individualistic in his thoughts. Those of us who are acquainted with the history of the Cape Cod section of Massachusetts can appreciate that CHARLIE GIFFORD was truly representative of those who had settled in that section generations ago and who made such a marked contribution to the progress of Massachusetts, and to our country under colonial and under constitutional form of government.

I always enjoyed listening to CHARLIE GIFFORD. He presented his arguments capably and he had a sincerity about him which, no matter how sharp and strong his arguments may have been, we all knew he was purely impersonal. My years of association with him in this body developed and knitted together a friendship which I valued very much during his lifetime and which I shall always treasure as long as I live. With the passing of CHARLIE GIFFORD we lost a man who best typified the strong-willed New Englander who braved hardship so that our country might came into being. His ancestors and his constituents might well be proud of his noble efforts in the Congress. His passing is a loss to Massachusetts, to New England, and to the Nation. I have lost a dear personal friend. The Congress has lost an able legislator. We will miss him greatly.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity at this moment also to say a word for an old friend who away back in 1918 or 1919 I had an opportunity to serve with in the Legislature of Massachusetts. As the Speaker and minority leader have said, they have had many years of personal experience in official capacity with him. CHARLES GIFFORD came down with me through that 30-year period of time in continuous public service. We who knew him loved him. We revered him when he was here. We revere his memory now. He was a true servant of the people in every respect. He was an old schoolmaster starting out in his public career years ago, and by hard work and diligence and devotion to the public weal he made an outstanding public servant. But with all the seriousness of which he was possessed, he also had a sense of humor, and I know that during the discussions on the floor of the House in which he participated that it was always to the interest of the Members to gather as closely as possible in order to enable them to enjoy some of his wit in the midst of a serious debate in which he was tremendously interested. It may well be said in this case, well done, good and faithful servant.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, CHARLIE GIFFORD and I served together on the special reorganization committee for two separate Congresses. It was our privilege to lead the fight here over 3

weeks on the floor against the first reorganization bill, and to be able at the end to recommit it.

CHARLIE was a forceful and able speaker, and a tremendous worker in committee. Outside the House he was one of the finest and most pleasant men one could meet. The world sees too few men of the type and character of CHARLIE GIFFORD.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, CHARLIE L. GIFFORD will long be remembered by those who served with him in Congress. Coming to Washington after serving notably in the General Court of Massachusetts, he quickly built up a reputation as a keen legislator. As the years passed he gained in influence and esteem among the veteran Members. Those of us who came to Congress in his later years will always remember him as a sharp, witty debater, and even more as a kind, friendly comrade. To the Members of the Massachusetts delegation his death has come as a very great personal loss.

I had the privilege of spending many pleasant evenings with the late Congressman Allen Treadway and Mr. GIFFORD, who were close friends. Usually JOHN TABER was present also. Mr. GIFFORD took Mr. Treadway's place on the great Committee on Ways and Means. He always voted in accordance with his own personal convictions. His departure from this Hall leaves a vacancy which it will be hard to fill. All of us join in extending our deepest sympathy to his widow and daughter.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, it is seldom that a man so completely deserves the term "delightful" as did CHARLIE GIFFORD. He was a delightful man to know. Personally, I count it one of the great privileges of membership here that shortly after I entered this Hall I came to enjoy his friendship and his encouragement.

Reference has been made by many of the speakers to the humor with which he graced his arguments. That was certainly true. One of the classics was his manner of greeting the presentation of a new budget to the Congress. Into a statistical review, he would inject something like this:

> Cheer up, Budget, don't you cry,
> You'll be a deficit bye and bye.

In one of his brilliant speeches anticipating the arguments of a forthcoming speech by a man in the White House who was accustomed to using the radio, he wound up with this:

> You may fireside when you are ready, Mr. President.

I have always thought that particular sally, spontaneous as it was, showed the natural wit of CHARLIE GIFFORD at its characteristic best—pointed but courteous, barbed but delightful, even to its victims.

His speeches will bear reading again and again. Members of the House for years to come can go through his speeches and renew the pleasure that came from knowing such a delightful man as CHARLIE GIFFORD.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this emergency session, when we face problems of grave import to the Nation and the world, it is fitting that we pay tribute to the memory of a colleague whose advice we now sorely miss.

CHARLES GIFFORD served the people of the Ninth Massachusetts District and the interests of the Nation as a whole, through his labors in this House of Representatives, for a quarter of a century.

Born in Cotuit, Mass., and educated in the public schools, he went into the teaching profession for 10 years and then branched out into the real estate business. In 1912–13, he was a representative to the general court of his home State. From 1914 to 1919 he served in the Massachusetts Senate.

First elected to the Sixty-seventh Congress, he served continuously from that time until the end of the first session of the Eightieth Congress. During his long and consistent career, in which he put the welfare of his district and the Nation before all personal considerations, he grew up with the Congress. In that process he acquired a knowledge of the complexities of government that was second to none. Out of this experience came the sage advice that was especially helpful to the younger members of this legislative assembly. CHARLIE GIFFORD had that homespun quality, that down-to-earth directness that could strip away all pretexts in language and in law, penetrating to the very heart of any matter. In recognition of his talents, he was appointed to the most important committee of the House—Ways and Means—where he served long and faithfully until death summoned him to a higher life.

CHARLIE GIFFORD did not retire. Although younger men are worn out before their time by the exacting responsibilities and demands of public office, CHARLIE GIFFORD stuck to his guns. With true Yankee tenacity, he died "with his boots on" in service to the people.

This was the basis of his freeman's faith. The development of character and intelligence in each individual would best meet the needs of that voluntary cooperation which is required to solve the problems of modern society.

Congressman GIFFORD was a Republican. Through most of his career as a national legislator, he worked with a Democratic-controlled Congress. The respect which he earned is measured by the affection in which he was held by those of us who belong to the opposition party.

In time of critical debate, when tension mounted and tempers flared, CHARLIE GIFFORD could be depended upon to ease the situation from his rich fund of wit.

Some claim that government is an experimental science. It is also an art, requiring a deep knowledge of human nature in order to resolve opposing points of view and promote cooperation.

The late Congressman GIFFORD had that human touch which is the essence of our democratic way of life. He was an individual in the best meaning of that word, with understanding of, and respect for, his fellow individuals. It was this charming quality of kinship that attracted us to him, somehow feeling that this is the virtue which makes people strong and protects them from dictatorship.

CHARLIE GIFFORD has returned to the little town whence he came, where his mortal remains have found rest in company with those early New Englanders who braved the wilderness to give birth to a new civilization.

His work is done. His accomplishments are part of the bloodstream of this Nation which he loved.

In ways still beyond the range of human perception, the comradeship we once knew will be with us yet. It will inspire us to raise this Congress to the full stature of the people's hopes and expectations.

We call it memory, but it is the living legacy which men like CHARLIE GIFFORD leave to us.

We shall cherish his spirit even as we cherished him when he was such a familiar figure in this Congress.

Congressman GIFFORD is gone but he is not forgotten.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN].

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, with a heart still heavy at the loss of a personal friend as well as a respected and beloved colleague, I rise to support the resolution. CHARLIE GIFFORD was unique among the Members of Congress. He seemed to reflect in a manner dramatic and yet delightful the individuality of the particular section of our country which he had represented for a quarter century with such signal honor and proud distinction. In Massachusetts we know it as the Cape. Elsewhere it is known as Cape Cod. And just as throughout the length and breadth of this land there is only one Cape Cod, so there was only one CHARLIE GIFFORD.

He had a rare faculty in debate of using satire and wit to enforce the point he wished to make. Yet, even though the shafts of his wit and satire when engaged in debate occasionally seemed to come pretty close to the personal, I doubt if there was ever an instance when a forensic adversary was conscious of the slightest feeling of resentment. He was universally respected and admired by his colleagues on both sides of the Chamber. I have admired him for the many traits of character, as well as for the many qualities of statesmanship which enshrined him in the hearts of the people in his district. They respected him and honored him for the devotion that he showed to a beloved wife and for the pride that he had in an accomplished daughter who has gone far in civic and political life in Massachusetts, and the

pride he felt in his splendid grandchildren.

Just as he was in the habit, in debate, of taking out of his vest pocket a little book from which he would select a quotation which he believed was apt for his purpose, so now in this hour of remembrance as I add my tribute of respect and affection for a friend whose wise counsel and helpful advice on many occasions I shall never forget, I make use of a verse of poetry which it seems to me CHARLIE GIFFORD, in an endeavor to be helpful to everybody, must have made a part of his philosophy of life:

I live for those who love me, for those know me true,
For the heaven that smiles above me, and awaits my spirit, too;
For the cause that lacks assistance, for the wrongs that need resistance;
For the future in the distance and the good that I can do.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, for many years before I had the honor of coming to Congress I was privileged to know CHARLIE GIFFORD and to sit at his feet and he helped, not only by his wise counsels, but by his really true and abiding friendship. He was one of the kindliest men I have ever known. His family were a devoted family. They were fine people, and all of us who knew them were proud to call them friends.

His service, first to the State and then to the Nation, is one of which anyone could be proud. His family has every right to feel real pride in the contribution he has made to his country.

The Congress will miss him. Those of us who knew him intimately will miss him terribly as a friend. The Nation will miss him terribly as a great public servant. I doubt whether for many years to come this House can have anyone serve in it who can match him both for wisdom and for wit. We all grieve with his family at this time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the Speaker of the House, the other Representatives from Massachusetts and other Members of the House in paying tribute today to our good friend, CHARLIE GIFFORD. I learned to know CHARLIE GIFFORD best while serving with him as a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. We all remember his fine service on the floor of the House.

I wish to extend sympathy to his wife, his daughter, and his grandchildren.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it was with a profound sense of grief and personal loss that I learned of the passing of our old and valued friend, CHARLIE GIFFORD. For many years, even before I came to this Chamber, I knew him and loved him for his fine qualities as a man and as an American.

As has been so eloquently said here today by my grief-stricken colleagues, CHARLIE GIFFORD was unique. He was unique in many respects; in the ruggedness of his character; in the graciousness of his personality; in the generosity of his spirit; in his capacity for striking a witty and satirical phrase, never desiring to injure one's feelings; always with the intention to add something to the debate, and to make our daily lives more pleasurable and tolerable in the stress of the heavy duties that sometimes confront us.

Congressman GIFFORD was indeed an American of many-sided interests and many-sided abilities. Sprung from the heart of old New England not far from the hallowed spot where the Pilgrim Fathers landed on these shores, he was possessed of profound attachment to fundamental virtues. Simple of habit, forthright in manner, and plain-spoken in opinion, yet direct and forceful when occasion demanded—warm in his friendships, generous in all his impulses, ready of wit, penetrating of intellect, this noble soul from Cape Cod during his service in this body made an indelible imprint upon our times and the legislative record of his era.

Next in impressiveness to me, to his sound rugged character was his capacity for warm and sympathetic friendship. His friends were legion in and out of this body. To many of us in the early days of our service here, regardless of party affiliation or sectional origin, he gave unstintingly of his wise counsel and the fruits of his ripe and varied experience in public affairs. In truth, he was a humorous, withal a wise and generous "philosopher king"—a man of broad knowledge and sound principles.

His passing leaves a great void in this House which it will never be possible to fill. As friends and colleagues we mourn the loss of one who by his human understanding and kindliness of character had won a deep and sure place in our affections. As public servants we mourn the loss which his constituency, State, and Nation have suffered in the passing of such an able, devoted, and inspiring American gentleman who served faithfully and well the moving causes of his time and generation.

To his family, upon whom he lavished unrestrained devotion and love, we join today in giving this humble expression of our profound sympathy. Those who remain after him in the family circle can take consolation from his long life of intelligent, courageous, patriotic service. And we who were privileged to serve with him may and can well continue to be inspired and strengthened by the happy memory of his ardent friendship and his many impressive and invaluable contributions to our own lives and to the well-being and security of our common country. CHARLIE GIFFORD was a real man. We shall not hope to look upon his like again.

It is, therefore, my very high privilege, though a sad one, to pay my humble tribute to the loving memory of a great American, a devoted husband, a loyal father, a noble son of Massachusetts, and a true friend.

May he rest in peace.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, although I was acquainted with our colleague CHARLIE GIFFORD before I came here, it was not until I did come here that I learned to know the great richness of character and the qualities of mind and heart which have been referred to this afternoon. I heartily join in everything that has been said about him, his life, and his devotion to duty and to country.

I last saw CHARLIE GIFFORD as he was leaving us to go home. He had frequently spoken to me of how unhappy he was in not being able to remain here during the rest of the session. I am certain that he knew then that he would never come back here. Yet he faced that knowledge with all the courage of a lovable, fine, and Christian soul. His memory will be very dear to me, as it will be to all of you.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, during the congressional recess two of our distinguished colleagues and dear personal friends passed away: Hon. CHARLES L. GIFFORD, of the Ninth Massachusetts District, and Judge RAYMOND S. SPRINGER, of the Tenth Indiana District. I was greatly shocked and deeply grieved to learn of the death of these two dear friends during the congressional recess. I am addressing my remarks at this time more especially to the passing of Mr. GIFFORD. I shall have more to say later on in the day in respect to the death of Judge SPRINGER.

Mr. GIFFORD came from the famous Plymouth Rock District. Evidently, the lives of the Pilgrim fathers and mothers and their religious and political principles had a profound effect on the life of our colleague. He was a man of unusual intelligence; his character was beyond question. He truly believed in the American way of life. He served many years in the Massachusetts House and Senate. I was serving my second term when he came to the House, where he has served with distinction ever since. He was a true American patriot, statesman, and soldier. Few men have made a more profound impression in this body than our colleague, Mr. GIFFORD. He was greatly admired and respected by each and every Member of the House. In his passing, I feel that I have lost a personal friend and the inspiration of a beautiful and wonderful life. This Nation will no longer have the benefit of the services of this great American.

I wish I might be able to say something that would be comforting to Mr. GIFFORD's splendid wife, to his children and grandchildren whom he loved dearly. They must, however, find some comfort in the fact that he led a very honorable and useful life and that his great work and character will continue to be an inspiration to his own family and friends and to millions of loyal American citizens. We could do no better than to follow in his footsteps. I wish to extend to his family my profound sympathy.

May Our Heavenly Father soothe and heal their sorrow.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues who have spoken today in expressing my deep regret at the passing of two of my most beloved and esteemed colleagues, Mr. GIFFORD, of Massachusetts, and Mr. SPRINGER, of Indiana.

Seldom in the annals of the Congress have Members been saddened by the death of two such worthy men within so short a time. I shall always be proud that Mr. GIFFORD and Mr. SPRINGER were particularly personally friendly to me.

As late as 3 months ago my family and I had the pleasure of being on a trip by ship to and from the Panama Canal in company with RAY SPRINGER and his charming wife, and never could anyone wish more congenial and delightful companionship than we enjoyed in their company.

The memory of RAY SPRINGER and of CHARLIE GIFFORD will remain fresh within me during the remainder of my days.

The Congress of the United States can ill afford, in these trying times, to lose men of such high character and ability as was possessed by these two. Their lives will be an example to all other Members of this body.

May their souls rest in peace at the side of their Creator.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, early in the history of our country the States of Massachusetts and South Carolina stood out prominently among the States of the Union by reason of the great men who then represented those States in the Congress. In assigning offices to present Members of Congress the late, beloved, and lamented Congressman from Massachusetts, CHARLES L. GIFFORD, was alongside the office which I occupy. Thus Massachusetts and South Carolina found themselves separated only by one thin wall.

As the next-door neighbor of Congressman GIFFORD, I had the privilege of knowing him intimately for a good many years. On Sundays, after church, it was our custom to meet at our offices where life's many problems were discussed, because only then did we seem to have time to visit socially.

Mr. GIFFORD, though many years my senior both in the span of his lifetime and in his years of experience, was always sympathetic, kind, and understanding. I recall our discussions with reference to the chief industries of our two States, Massachusetts formerly the great textile State and South Carolina the present leader in the field of textiles.

The many experiences of our late colleague included that of teaching, one of the greatest of all callings.

I often observed how attentive Congressman GIFFORD was to children. Even my youngest children respected him and were always eager to hear his interesting and helpful stories. One of the surest ways of determining the character of a man is said to be the attitude of children toward him.

The Grim Reaper of death struck next door to my office for no good reason at all, save only that Congressman GIFFORD had finished his work in a very acceptable manner and was ready when the call came.

Although I belonged to a different political party than that to which Congressman GIFFORD belonged, we respected each other's views in spite of our political differences.

Mr. Horace C. Carlisle has portrayed the character of Congressman GIFFORD in the following beautiful verses:

CONGRESSMAN GIFFORD GONE TO HIS REWARD

When the Congressman GIFFORD went to his reward,
Massachusetts and all the whole country sustained
A great loss, but, if this had not been in accord
With God's will, he on earth would have longer remained.

Recognized as a statesman of power and poise,
With a keen intellect and a purposeful will,
In performance of duty he found his chief joys,
As he counseled his colleagues on Capitol Hill.

Sacred honor stood uppermost in his great mind,
For without sacred honor to safeguard the rest,
All the other great virtues that God has enshrined
In man's being would perish, still-born, in his breast.

Yea, without sacred honor, religion and law,
He declared, would mean nothing, for justice and right
Would be into oblivion banished, and awe
Would destroy peace on earth, and enshroud it in night.

He'll be missed in the Congress, where he loved to serve,
With a courage unequaled by most of his peers,
Where he taxed every muscle and sinew and nerve,
To serve God and mankind, in these challenging years.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, my long-time friend CHARLES GIFFORD is dead.

He was an institution; the length and shadow of all those men of Massachusetts who preceded him in the House of Representatives to help make Massachusetts great.

Perchance he was, as some have said, a dreamer; yet while—

• • • the dreamer dies but never dies fair dream.
Though death shall call the whirlwind to his aid
Enlist men's passions, trick their hearts with hate,
Still the fair vision lives.
Say nevermore that dreams are fragile things;
What else endures
Of all this broken world save only dreams?

Read that again. He was a dreamer. Yet CHARLES GIFFORD was more than a dreamer for that the substance was in him—that which makes the shadow. He recast, relived and did all things that do become a man, between him and the sun.

He was born in Cotuit out of which he came to serve the district of which it is a part. He went to Cotuit's public schools; was a profound student; taught school himself in his own home district, which is a tribute and a test and the measure of a man.

He represented his townspeople—than which there can be no greater honor; than which there is no more valuable recognition of one's standing with his own—in the Massachusetts Legislature, its general court, and went forward to the Massachusetts Senate where he distinguished himself and earned recognition on the basis of outstanding ability, adequately shown.

Then these folks who had known him through all the years sent him down to Congress to represent them here, proud as they were of him, and justifiedly so.

So he came to Congress. Here he served from the Sixty-seventh to the Eightieth Congress, and died with his boots on, as he would have had it, in the midst of the battle of the century. God rest his soul.

He was a knight sans peur, sans reproche.

• • • better than martial woe, and the pageant of civic sorrow;
Better than praise of today, or the statue we build tomorrow;
Better than honor and glory, and history's iron pen,
Was the thought of duty done and the love of his fellowmen.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE HONORABLE RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 356).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER, a Representative from the State of Indiana.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce the passing of one of the men who has served with us in the House of Representatives. It has seemed to me that such occasions have been coming along all too frequently. The pressure of the work and service in the Congress and the high degree of responsibility has been taking a heavy toll.

Mr. Speaker, there are no words by which I can adequately express how deeply I feel the loss of my very dear friend and colleague, RAY SPRINGER. He was one of the finest men I have ever known. Those of us who knew him and served with him here will miss him not only as a friend, but we shall miss him as a Member of Congress who contributed in so many ways to our deliberations and our efforts.

Ray was born in Connersville, Ind., on April 26, 1882. After graduation from common schools and high school he attended Butler University in Indianapolis, Ind., and subsequently, in 1904, received his law degree from Indiana Law School.

During the First World War Ray answered the call to the colors and served as a captain of the infantry. He continued active in military and veterans' affairs. He held the commission of lieutenant colonel of infantry in the Officers' Reserve Corps, and was the first State commander of the American Legion in Indiana. Later he served as national executive committeeman from Indiana for the American Legion.

He was always held in the highest esteem. On two occasions—in 1932 and 1936—the Republicans of Indiana selected him as their candidate for governor.

Since 1939 RAY SPRINGER has represented the Tenth District of Indiana here in Congress. He was constant in attendance. We all recall how he regularly occupied the seat at the end of the committee table. His attention to duty and diligence in the service of his constituency was so appreciated by the people of his district—yes, even by those who did not always agree with his position on some particular question—that he was returned to Congress by an outstanding majority in each election.

As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary he worked constantly on the problems that came before that great committee. At this time I especially recall his outstanding contribution in connection with the legislation dealing with the termination of war powers. He brought to that committee not only tireless energy but also a fine legal mind and judicial temperament.

Prior to coming to Congress he had served for 6 years as a judge of the thirty-seventh judicial circuit of Indiana. His justice was always tempered with mercy and sympathetic understanding.

RAY SPRINGER served his country well. Of him it can be truly said, he was a soldier, a jurist, a statesman, and a patriot.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the right to extend their remarks on the life, character and service of the late RAY SPRINGER at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, RAY SPRINGER had all the qualifications for a Member of Congress, and particularly for a place on the Judiciary Committee.

He was a good lawyer. He had what the lawyers call a legal mind. Painstaking study and actual experience both as a practicing attorney and as a trial judge had given him a broad understanding of the principles of our jurisprudence.

He was a sound legislator. All bills he sponsored or supported were carefully studied. He was regular in his attendance at committee meetings and in the sessions of the House. No problem was too difficult for him to undertake; no task was so trivial that he did not accord it the benefit of his complete and sympathetic attention.

I mention these things simply to enumerate the technical qualifications he had for his important position. He went far beyond that. He brought to the work an unswerving devotion to the principles of representative government, an abiding faith in a free people. He was always friendly and considerate of others, and in the help he gave to his colleagues he often went beyond the mere call of duty.

If called upon to describe RAY SPRINGER in one word, I would say simply that he was an American. The blood of the pioneer was in his veins. He was untouched by the cynical attitude, now too prevalent, which expresses itself in a doubting of our form of government and in a disregard of the traditions that have made us great.

It need not be mentioned to some of you that I personally have lost a close and beloved friend. America too has lost a friend—a valiant and true friend—and at a time when his tireless energy, his wise counsel, his unfaltering patriotism will be greatly missed.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, RAYMOND SMILEY SPRINGER, Representative in Congress from the Tenth Indiana District, died of heart disease on the night of August 23, 10 minutes after removal from his home at Connersville, Ind., to a local hospital.

His passing is another illustration of the strain of congressional service, resulting with frightening frequency in death and impaired health. It adds one more to the casualties of the Eightieth Congress and accentuates the toll by coming so soon after the death of another Member, Representative CHARLES GIFFORD, of Massachusetts, who was stricken when apparently he had many years of usefulness before him.

Funeral services for Mr. SPRINGER were held on Labor Day, September 1, at the First Methodist Church of Connersville, and were conducted by Rev. Joseph C. Moore, pastor of the church. The edifice was packed to its capacity. Among the distinguished persons present were Senator W. E. Jenner, Gov. Ralph Gates, Representative and Mrs. Forest Harness, Representative and Mrs. George W. Gillie, and Representative Earl Wilson. Richard Nash Elliott, former Representative in Congress of the district and later Assistant Comptroller General, and Mrs. Elliott, and Mrs. Ludlow and I went from Washington to attend the funeral. I have never witnessed a more genuine outpouring of sorrow than I saw there.

The pastor in his eloquent sermon said of Mr. SPRINGER:

> He helped everyone regardless of race, religion, or politics. He wore himself out in service to others.

Everyone present knew that this was merited praise. Although the Congressman had been in failing health for months, he worked until the last. A few days before his death he returned from a trip of inspection to the Canal Zone as a member of a congressional committee. With characteristic thoughtfulness he brought to me messages of greetings and felicitations from many of my old friends at the Canal Zone including Federal Judge Bunk Gardner and Willis Crittenberger, commanding general of our military forces there. On the day of his death he spent the entire day at his office, conferring with constituents.

Governor Gates was in New York attending the American Legion convention when he heard of Mr. SPRINGER's death and he gave out the following statement:

> In addition to this being a real loss to Indiana and its people, to me it is the loss of a lifelong personal friend. He has proved his worth as a Congressman, and as a true representative of the people of his district and State ever since he first assumed his congressional responsibilities.
>
> He was loved and admired by all who knew him for his sincerity, simplicity, and fairness. These same fine characteristics had gained for him the admiration and confidence of all those with whom he served in our Nation's Congress.

An interesting contribution to the pastor's sermon was a tribute from Mrs. William E. Ochiltree, the octogenarian former president of the American War Mothers and known to servicemen everywhere as Mother Ochiltree. She resides in Connersville and was an intimate friend of the Congressman. Speaking of his devotion to the public service she said:

> Our CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS carry the story of his efforts to serve his State and Nation and the history of his daily life carries a continuous effort on his part to serve his fellowmen.

RAYMOND SPRINGER and I grew up on adjoining farms in Fayette County, Ind., and his grandfather, Thomas Smiley, was my uncle. His mother, one of the sweetest souls I ever knew, was my cousin. He came from sturdy pioneer stock of the type of which Wendell Willkie was a shining exemplar. Willkie's wife's grandfather was a brother of Mrs. Thomas Smiley. Eastern Indiana produced many of these homespun characters who accredited themselves with distinction in the public service of State and Nation.

I shall miss the inspiration of Raymond's wholesome example. It is impossible for me to realize that he has left us. James Whitcomb Riley once suffered a similar bereavement and I do not know how to express my feelings better than to quote the poet's words:

> I cannot say, and I will not say,
> That he is dead—he is just away.
> With a cheery smile and a wave of the hand
> He vanished into an unknown land.

The messages of consolation which came to Mrs. Springer from all over the country attest the high esteem in which Mr. SPRINGER was held. To her, the last survivor of the Springer family, the sympathy of the Congress goes out in unbounded measure.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the memory of my friend, the late RAYMOND S. SPRINGER, who served as Member of Congress from the Tenth District of Indiana.

It was a great shock to his Indiana colleagues and every Member of the House to learn of his sudden and unexpected passing.

During his lifetime RAYMOND SPRINGER achieved exceptional honors as a citizen,

a lawyer, a jurist, and a statesman. He was endowed with the highest qualities of mind and heart. The service of his country, both in peace and war, was always his foremost interest. During his career as a lawyer, he served with distinction as a circuit judge in the thirty-seventh judicial district of Indiana.

As a soldier, he was an infantry captain in World War I, and has always been a champion for the cause of the veteran, as a citizen and legislator.

He was honored by the American Legion of Indiana, in serving as its first State commander.

RAYMOND SPRINGER achieved outstanding recognition as a citizen because of his sincere interest and active participation in the affairs of his community, district, and State, and because of his sincere affection for, and consideration of, his fellowman.

He gave unstintingly of his time and talents to numerous civic organizations. His broad and sympathetic understanding of human instincts enabled him to counsel wisely those who sought his aid, which he was ever ready to extend.

His natural abilities, untiring devotion to his work, and sound judgment, earned for him a wide and lucrative practice at the bar. He possessed unusual powers of perception and analysis; and the clarity of his vision was not beclouded by partisanship or restrictive doctrines.

Probably the two factors which contributed to his success more than any others were the unbounded confidence his clients had in his advice and the persuasive manner in which he represented their interests in court and at the counsel table.

He was an eminent jurist because of his deep understanding of the fundamental principles of jurisprudence and a thorough appreciation of the principles of natural justice.

He possessed a sympathetic and tolerant attitude which enabled him to administer the law with mercy and legislate with tolerance. RAYMOND SPRINGER always gave his clients and constituents an attentive and sympathetic hearing and decisions passed on careful research and thought. He was highly respected and greatly admired by all who were fortunate enough to become his friend.

His friends knew and loved him for his loyalty, sincerity, and kindliness. All his acquaintances throughout Indiana and the Nation mourn the passing of an able lawyer, distinguished judge, experienced legislator, and sincere friend.

CONGRESSMAN RAYMOND SPRINGER, 1882–1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the last time I saw Congressman RAY SPRINGER was at the end of the first session of the Eightieth Congress. He looked thin, but he said that he felt fine.

Death, although inevitable, shocks us when it removes one with whom we have worked in harmony, and upon whose judgment and moderation, we had come to depend.

The sudden loss of a colleague and a friend fills us with a grief that we accept in humility and reverence. The words do not come easily to express the desolation that we feel.

RAYMOND SPRINGER was an able and conscientious representative of the people whom he served. In times of crisis he was unfailingly patient and understanding. His passing makes us acutely aware of that interdependence from which all worth-while endeavor makes its forward progress. Because he was a gentleman, we shall miss that spirit of cooperation which quietly helped us in so many ways.

For the purposes of the record, let us write his epitaph.

RAYMOND SMILEY SPRINGER, Republican, of Connersville, Ind., was born near Dunreith in Rush County, Ind., April 26, 1882; lawyer by profession, graduate of common and high schools; attended Butler University, Indianapolis, Ind.; was graduated from the Indiana Law School, at Indianapolis, with a degree of LL. B., in 1904; served as judge of the thirty-seventh judicial court of Indiana, 1916–22; captain of infantry in the First World War; then a lieutenant colonel of infantry in the Officers' Reserve Corps; served as first State commander of the American Legion in Indiana, in 1919–20, and as national executive committeeman from Indiana for the American Legion, 1929–31; was a candidate for Governor of Indiana in 1932 and 1936; married; no children; thirty-second degree Mason; belonged to Elks, Eagles, Knights of Pythias lodges; member of the Forty and Eight; elected to the Seventy-sixth Congress on November 8, 1938; the Seventy-seventh Congress on November 5, 1940; the Seventy-eighth Congress on November 3, 1942; the Seventy-ninth Congress on November 7, 1944; and to the Eightieth Congress on November 5, 1946.

He was a Republican, and I am a Democrat. We served together on the Judiciary Committee. By his example he taught me that, though men differ in their opinions, they can arrive at common areas of understanding through mutual respect.

RAY SPRINGER is gone, but if we follow through with the tolerance which was his, the problems among men will be easier to solve.

Let the memory of his character and his services guide us in that direction.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, it was with a sense of personal loss that I learned of the death of our colleague, Judge RAYMOND S. SPRINGER. During my earliest days as a Member of this House I had become accustomed to think of Congressman SPRINGER as one of the few constant attendants upon all the sessions. He usually occupied one particular seat, up at the end of the committee table. After I became a member of the Committee on the Judiciary I very soon learned that this characteristic of constant attendance was only typical of Judge SPRINGER's attitude in all phases of public service. He was constant in attendance at meetings of our committee, was usually the first one there and the last to leave. He was a profound student and seemed to be content with his study of a problem only after the most searching analysis of all the facts available. He was effective in committee discussion and in debate on the floor for the reason that he refrained from participation until he felt that he was prepared.

Judge SPRINGER will be sorely missed in the Judiciary Committee where his wise counsel and mature judgment was so generally sought by his fellow members. He will be sadly missed on the floor of the House where there will be now literally a vacant chair. Among his former colleagues, as well as I am sure among his constituents back home, he will be missed for many lovable characteristics of heart and hand, not the least of which was a sincere and serious desire to perform well the work at hand. He will be remembered as long as men point with admiration and respect to those too few public servants who seem to typify to the utmost unswerving devotion to duty.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, during the recess death claimed two of the distinguished Members of this House—Judge RAYMOND S. SPRINGER, of the Tenth Indiana District, and Hon. CHARLES L. GIFFORD, of the Ninth Massachusetts District. The death of each of them is a genuine loss to the people of their respective districts and States, and to our country.

I have already spoken at some length of the character and service of Mr. GIFFORD. I wish to add that in the passing of Judge SPRINGER, his fine family, the people of his district, and his great State suffered an irreparable loss. I have been bereft of a very dear and personal friend. He and I have been for many years members of the Judiciary Committee of the House. We generally sat together on the floor of the House. Last year he did me the honor to request me to go to his district to make a speech in his behalf urging his reelection. I did go and learned there at first hand the very high esteem in which he was held by those he had the honor to represent in the Tenth Congressional District. He was reelected by approximately 27,000 majority. During our years of service on the Judiciary Committee I sat near him almost daily and had many opportunities to learn of his unusual ability, his nobility of character, and his great love for our country and its institutions. He served our country in war and in peace, as a judge and as a legislator. He loved his family. He truthfully was a great American, a soldier, and statesman. While he is no longer with us in the flesh, he will live with us until death in the spirit and sweet memories. We could not live a nobler life and have a greater reverence for all those things that are high and noble than to follow in his footsteps and emulate his patriotism and his nobility of soul.

The House of Representatives and our country have lost two truly great Americans in the deaths of Congressman GIFFORD and Congressman SPRINGER. I wish to take this occasion to extend my deepest sympathy for Mrs. Springer and to the other members of their family. They can take much comfort in the fine life

that Judge SPRINGER has lived, and this is true also of Mr. GIFFORD. May the soul of each of them rest in peace, and may it be our good fortune to join them in a better world when we have finished our work here.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I could not let this occasion pass without adding my few words in tribute to the memory of our departed friend, RAYMOND S. SPRINGER.

RAY SPRINGER had long been one of Indiana's most outstanding citizens, when, in 1938, the people of the Tenth Congressional District elected him to represent them in our Nation's Congress. For five successive terms he was elected and reelected by ever-increasing majorities as a tribute to the respect and the admiration they held for him.

It was my privilege to have come to Congress along with RAY SPRINGER. During those 9 years that we served together there grew up between us a firm and lasting friendship. RAY SPRINGER was known by all who served with him as one of the most able, the most industrious, and the most loved Members of Congress ever to serve in the House of Representatives.

America can ill afford to lose men of the caliber of RAY SPRINGER. His untimely passing comes at a critical time for our country.

To his widow we join in expressing our deepest sympathy. She should be assured in the fact that the world is a better place for all of us for RAY SPRINGER having been with us these many years.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of RAYMOND S. SPRINGER we have all lost a true and loyal friend, and the Nation, a patriotic servant of the highest order.

As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, RAY SPRINGER has rendered conspicuous service in matters of the utmost importance to the welfare of our people and often of great complexity. At no time was this better demonstrated than at the last session when he conducted hearings and guided through the committee and then the House, the intricate bills relating to various controls over our economy.

In the mind of this statesman, so serious in purpose and so indefatigable in efforts, at no time did considerations of narrow partisanship becloud his vision or dictate his action.

Although the Nation has suffered an irreparable loss, we who enjoyed the high privilege of working day in and day out with RAY SPRINGER are affected in a very personal and specific manner. He was always so very ready to share his breadth of vision and his wealth of experience with all of us. He was a great team player, always preferring, with unassuming modesty, to advance the common interest rather than his own personal fortunes. We can all be consoled in our loss and take comfort from the sure knowledge that he now enjoys the rewards of a "good and faithful servant."

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, I grasp this opportunity to express my great loss and sorrow in the passing of our colleague, Congressman RAYMOND SMILEY SPRINGER, of Indiana.

Though members of different political faith, a strong bond of fellowship had arisen between Congressman SPRINGER and myself. Probably the most impressive feature of Mr. SPRINGER's character was his devotion to the task assigned him. I have never known a man more conscientious in his work than RAYMOND SPRINGER.

Judge SPRINGER has served his country well, both in war and peace. The going of this good man reminds me of the scriptural verse: "Then shall two be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left."

It is difficult to become reconciled to the passing of our friends and loved ones. But when the grim reaper of death strikes suddenly the shock is always greatest; however, the sudden going seems preferable. I would prefer to go without helpless lingering as expressed by the poet John Oxenham:

> Lord, when Thou see'est
> That my work is done,
> Let me not linger here
> With failing powers,
> A workless worker in a
> World of work;
> But with a word,
> Just bid me home
> And I will come,
> Right gladly will I come
> Yes—right gladly will I
> Come.

The Congress of the United States, the country at large, the State of Indiana, and the family of RAYMOND SMILEY SPRINGER can review with pride the efficient, unselfish, devoted service rendered by so good a man.

As a part of my remarks, I attach hereto the following poem:

CONGRESSMAN SPRINGER CALLED HOME

The Congressman RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
Has gone the way of all the earth,
Bemoaned, throughout all Indiana,
By all those who best knew his worth—
And by all the Members of Congress
In both Houses he will be missed,
Till they at the call of Death's angel
Shall lie down, and cease to exist.

He could not exclaim, "It is finished,"
When he laid his earthly cross down,
To dwell in the mansions of glory,
And there wear his robe and his crown—
He planned other things to accomplish,
Which purposely he'd hoped to do—
'T was his chief delight to help others
To make their own dreams to come true.

He sought opportunities, often,
To help those in need of his aid,
Without ever asking or thinking
Of whether or not he'd be paid;
For, in the footsteps of the Master,
He, too, went about doing good—
To spend and be spent was his mission,
That he might befriend humanhood.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, RAY SPRINGER's life has run its compass. He has gone to that undiscovered country from whose bourne no traveler returns.

We shall miss him. We who served the years with him here are stirred with a poignant regret. Those of us who associated with him on the Judiciary Committee are brought low with sorrow. We shall miss a personality both pleasant and gentle. We shall miss a character elevated by wisdom and the practice of virtue. We shall indeed miss RAY SPRINGER, whose whole being was animated by a spirit of lofty enterprise.

The great Socrates at his trial said that his purpose in life was to make his fellow citizens happy. RAY SPRINGER's credo in life was to confer happiness.

He had an unbounded desire to help others. What stood out most in my mind concerning him was his kindness. His kindness was like the generous harvest in the autumn. His was ever the voice of comfort to despair. His was the soft answer that turned away wrath. Amidst the excitement of debate and the turbulence of controversy in the committee room or in the well of this House he was ever temperate and patient, yet strong, wise, and forthright.

He was faithful to his God, faithful to his family, faithful to his country, and faithful to his work here. He was to his own self true; therefore it followed as night the day he could never be false to any man.

Death found him a shining mark, honored and revered in the Congress and out of the Congress. He lies in deathless peace. He leaves a name enriched with service to man and country.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the death of RAY SPRINGER was saddening. From the beginning of his service in this House he won the respect and admiration of its Members, and his ability and sound judgment became more and more evident as his activities increased. Those of us who were privileged to serve with him on the Committee on the Judiciary were particularly impressed with his fine legal mind, his sense of fairness, his concept of our American system of justice. As chairman of one of our important subcommittees, these characteristics became more manifest. Affable, reasonable, thorough, and extremely courteous, he won and retained the veneration of colleagues, witnesses, and observers.

As a public official, as a private citizen, as a chance acquaintance he was always a perfect gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, in participating in these memorial services I am not performing a perfunctory duty. The late Representative RAYMOND S. SPRINGER was not only my colleague, my associate, and my coworker on the Committee on the Judiciary—he was more—he was my friend in all that term implies.

For a number of years our offices were on the same corridor. We visited each other frequently. I soon learned the manner of man he was, the value of his counsel, and his general inclination to be helpful in every particular.

Other speakers have made reference to his military service and public service before entering Congress. Coming from Michigan, which adjoins Indiana, I knew him by reputation and with that knowledge I soon understood why his constituents sent him to Congress. He had great ability. He was ever industrious. He took his work seriously and any task undertaken by him was always well done. He was meticulous about detail. Of judicial temperament, blessed with an abundance of tolerance, it was his notion that the ultimate objective of all legislation is justice. He believed in the common people and was firmly convinced that our Constitutional system was best suited to secure justice for all of our people. He was mindful of the fact that a Member of Congress could not hope to accomplish much in this forum unless he had the confidence and respect of his colleagues. Judge SPRINGER had that confidence and respect. When he addressed the House, he always had the attention of his auditors. He realized that with 435 Members it was not possible for each Member to have his own way in the writing of laws. While he never compromised on fundamental principles, yet he was practical. In short, he was an effective legislator.

When he came to Congress he accepted a place on the Committee on Claims, and when Judge SPRINGER recommended the payment of a claim by the Government everybody knew that, in his opinion, at least, the claim was justified. His inherent honesty compelled him to study these claims just the same as he would had he been a judge in a court. Work on claims is most exacting, yet he never shirked.

His principal committee work, however, was on the Committee on the Judiciary where he was soon recognized as one of that committee's outstanding members. At the beginning of the Eightieth Congress he was made chairman of Subcommittee No. 4, and in this capacity had charge of the initial consideration of much important legislation, including continuation of war powers. There was no member on this committee who worked harder and accomplished more than did Judge SPRINGER. Many a law now on the statute book is a better law because Judge SPRINGER helped to write it. As chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I relied much upon him.

It made no difference whether the work had to be done in his office, at his home in the evening, in his subcommittee, in the full committee, or presenting the matter to the House, he always carried more than his share of the load. I am convinced that his life was shortened because of his conscientious application to his work. None of us had any idea, however, that he was so soon to pay the price which overwork usually exacts. The closing days of the last session were full days indeed for Judge SPRINGER. It can be truly said that he died in harness.

Judge SPRINGER liked people, and people liked him. He was a rock of trust. He hated deceit. While forward looking, he never coveted the success of others. He was real and entirely void of sham. He was never touched by the pomp of power and never lured from the realities of human fellowship. He served his Nation, his State, and his district well. His service in the Congress was especially valuable in these days of conflicting emotions and difficult problems, and in his going we have lost a personal friend and the Nation has lost a distinguished, conscientious, worth-while Member of Congress. To his family we express our genuine sympathy.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BYRNE].

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, when I heard the radio at 6 o'clock at night announce at my home the passing of RAY SPRINGER, I was very deeply shocked, for it seemed only a very short time before that, as a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, we had talked with one another about the return to our duties after the recess, and he had outlined a great number of improvements that he hoped to make in the conduct of the committee for the future. He was also speaking of the years to come, not only this year but years in the future, when it might be possible for him and others of us to perform duties that, in his opinion, were constructive and would be of aid and comfort to our constituency and also to our countrymen. I could not believe, of course, it was possible that this fine, scholarly, attentive, and studious gentleman at all times passed away, but it was only too true, as I found out the following day from the newspaper accounts that he was gone to the other shore. I have always thought of Ray as one of those great Americans who was never satisfied with the service he rendered to his people. He seemed to be rather overanxious, I sometimes thought, to sacrifice himself and his health to the performance of his duties. As the ranking member on his Subcommittee No. 4, I was always hopeful that some morning I would get to the committee room before he arrived. But I was never able to get there ahead of him. He was always first on the job. He was always the last to stay. He was always most anxious to demonstrate that he would give all the time necessary to those who appeared before him; nevertheless, he was always certain that he would not make any mistake if he could possibly prevent it in his judgment upon the bills that came before him. We had a great number of claim bills during the past session, and he gave extreme attention to those—extreme attention. In other words, he was always anxious to know that there was not a single thread lost in the fabric to which he gave his attention.

I cannot conceive that a loving Creator would not give him a very special place at His right hand. My prayer goes up to the throne on high that our dear colleague, our associate, our patriotic attendant upon the duties of government, will for eternity have peace, contentment, and the satisfaction of knowing that his life work had been completed in perfect accord with the wishes of his Creator.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, as I contemplate in sorrow the passing of my beloved friend and colleague, RAYMOND SMILEY SPRINGER, I am painfully aware of the inadequacy of mere words to pay him fitting tribute.

Nothing we can say or do here can add luster to the shining epitaph which Ray himself engraved through a richly productive life devoted in the service of his country and his fellow men. I shall feel rewarded, however, if I can help in the smallest way to emphasize the true greatness of our departed colleague.

It was my great, good fortune to know and to work with Judge SPRINGER for more than a quarter of a century. I met him first as we returned from service after the First World War. Ray had served his country faithfully and well in that period of danger, but that was merely the beginning of his life of public service. He laid aside his soldier's uniform to plunge at once into an unbroken series of labors for his fellow veterans, his community, his State, and his country.

Ray was a moving spirit in the organization of the American Legion, and served as our first State commander in Indiana. To the day of his death, Ray remained active in the promotion of veterans' welfare and in the advancement of the American Legion as an institution of service to country.

Despite his many other duties and responsibilities, Judge SPRINGER throughout the years maintained an active interest in his country's defenses and cherished his commission as a Reserve officer.

RAY SPRINGER earned the title "Judge," a title which we all used with a sense of deep respect, through his service on the Indiana bench. He more fully proved the fine quality of his legal mind in his service on the Judiciary Committee of the House throughout the 9 years he was a Member of this body.

Rarely is an individual so richly endowed with all the qualities which make for human greatness as was our departed colleague. Seldom is any man so wholly and unselfishly devoted to his country and his fellow man.

His passing is to me a great personal loss. But far more than that, RAY SPRINGER'S untimely death is a tragic loss to his family, his native State and his country, all of which he served so faithfully and well.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, as a fellow member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I personally mourn the loss of my colleague RAYMOND S. SPRINGER. He was an outstanding member of that committee. He served ably as chairman of Subcommittee No. 4 of the Judiciary Committee and furnished intelligent leadership to our group. Always he was patient and tactful. He was most appreciative of differences of viewpoint among members of the subcommittee. He possessed great judicial character.

Judge SPRINGER was a kind and cheerful person. He was friendly and lovable. Truthfully he was a great American and a great statesman. The Committee on the Judiciary, the Congress of the United

States, and the Nation at large will miss him greatly.

I express to the members of his family my profound sorrow on the passing of our friend and colleague, RAYMOND S. SPRINGER.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, membership in the House of Representatives affords the opportunity to meet, know intimately, and enjoy the friendship of someone worth knowing from every section of this great country.

To know, understand, and enjoy a warm friendship with a man you must live with him and work with him. For months, after coming to Washington, I lived in the same hotel with Judge RAYMOND S. SPRINGER. I early learned that all who came within the magnetic circle of his presence were impressed with his natural courtesy and capacity for friendship. He was kind and friendly to everyone. Every man has two sides to his nature—one to face the world with and one to show a woman when he loves her. To his devoted wife Judge SPRINGER was the living embodiment of care and loving consideration. He lived the truth—the bravest are the tenderest—the loving are the daring. He had friends because he showed himself friendly. Richly endowed with the common divinity that makes the whole world kin, Judge SPRINGER had an understanding heart. Always a gentleman, considerate, kind, with a cheery word for everyone, he grappled his friends unto his soul with hoops of steel.

He especially delighted to entertain his friends from home. Many were the times he called me to a table in the House restaurant and with unassumed joy and pride favored me with an introduction to splendid people from his beloved Indiana. He spent his money—but not his friends—he kept them.

In October 1946, it was my great pleasure and privilege to be with him at Greenfield, Hancock County, where James Whitcomb Riley was born and lived. Every day in Greenfield is Riley Day; while Judge SPRINGER was there it was Springer Day. Before the torch light procession preceding the speaking in American Legion Hall, the lobby of the Riley Hotel was thronged with his friends. Accompanied by Mrs. Springer, the greeting they both received was a spontaneous, genuine, heartfelt, typical Indiana political love feast. There was nothing artificial—it was genuine. In his speech, Judge SPRINGER gave back in drops what he took from his friends and hearers in spray. And at the conclusion of the meeting he was at the door, shaking hands and exchanging greetings with every member of the great audience. I have seen many public men on the hustings and in contact with their people; none excelled and but few equaled Judge SPRINGER in his sympathetic and understanding hold on the affections and confidence of his home folks. He loved Indiana and Indiana loved him.

In Washington, by his courtesy, devotion to duty, integrity, ability, boundless energy and industry, he bought golden opinions from all who knew him. His popularity and friendships transcended party lines. He was loved by both Democrats and Republicans.

To his duties as a member of the Judiciary Committee of the House, he brought his profound knowledge of the law, the training of a lawyer of long and successful practice of his profession, and his 6 years distinguished experience and service as the judge of the thirty-seventh judicial circuit of Indiana. For 6 years it was my privilege to work side by side with him as a member of the Judiciary Committee and for 7 months as a member of the Committee on Claims. The work of these committees, especially during the first session of this Congress, was heavy and exacting. Judge SPRINGER literally worked himself to death. He was chairman of Subcommittee No. 4. This committee held almost constant hearings on important legislation. Judge SPRINGER drafted intricate and able reports on every measure considered by his subcommittee and favorably reported to the House. He took a leading part in the debates on these measures. He was always at his post of duty. His industry was untiring and constant. Whatever his hand found to do, he did it with his might, and did it well. He had the courage of his convictions. He was intellectually honest. He never bent the pregnant hinges of the knee that thrift might follow fawning. He never ducked or dodged an issue. In his consideration of a question he never "stuck in the bark." He went to the heart of the problem. He delighted to walk with measured tread the beaten path of precedent.

During the latter part of the session, it was apparent that his health was failing. His friends urged him to get out of Washington and take a much-needed rest. He pushed himself too hard.

His was a full, rounded life. In the First World War he was captain of infantry and at the time of his death was a lieutenant colonel of infantry in the Officers' Reserve Corps. His love for his fellow man led him into the great fraternities, the Masons, Elks, Eagles, and Knights of Pythias. He was a thirty-second degree Mason.

A MAN THAT HATH FRIENDS MUST SHOW HIMSELF FRIENDLY

RAYMOND SPRINGER'S intuitive knowledge of human nature, the intimate and friendly terms on which he lived with his colleagues undoubtedly enabled him to know we admired, respected, and loved him. This knowledge on his part must have enriched his service among us.

If you have a friend worth loving, love him,
Yes, and let him know that you love him
Ere Life's evening tinge his brow with sunset glow.
Why should good words ne'er be said of a friend till he is dead?

"Wearing the white flower of a blameless life," in the fierce light that beats upon a public servant, RAYMOND SPRINGER was the proud captain of his own soul. In him death found a shining mark.

The prayer of Josiah Gilbert Holland is answered in the life and service of Judge SPRINGER.

God give us men! A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor; men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagogue
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking;
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty and in private thinking.

To the very last, he lived and toiled for those he loved. He pushed himself beyond the call of duty. He lives in the minds and hearts of those who knew and loved him and in his enduring services to his country and his people.

Life is ever Lord of Death
And Love can never lose its own.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep sorrow and a sense of personal loss that I learned of the death of RAYMOND S. SPRINGER, of Indiana. He was a sort of sponsor, friend, and father confessor to me since I first came to Washington.

I relied on his discerning judgment and sought his advice many times while I was learning my way around in the beginning. I am sure my interruptions of his own work were inconvenient at times, but with the great patience and deliberation so characteristic of "the Judge," as we fondly called him, he never once lost his temper or seemed ruffled by my questions.

My sincerest sympathies go out to his splendid wife and bereaved family. The world sorely needs modern Solomons, men of wisdom and conscience, such as RAYMOND SPRINGER. This Congress will miss him and the steadiness of his guiding words in times of strain upon us.

RAYMOND SPRINGER left the world a better place for his having been here. I know as you do, that he gave the utmost of his time, ability, and strength in the causes of God and this country.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life and character of our deceased Members.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, as a further mark of respect to the memory of our departed colleagues, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 18, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1002. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report on the audit of The Virgin Islands Company for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 441); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1003. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting reports on Grand (Neosho) River and its tributaries, Oklahoma, Kansas, Missouri, and Arkansas (H. Doc. No. 442); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1004. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of Santa Clara River, Calif., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 28, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 443); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1005. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report on the audit of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and affiliated companies, Rubber Reserve Company and Rubber Development Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 444); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1006. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 24, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on the Arkansas River and tributaries, with a view to flood protection for the towns of Carthage and Monett, Mo., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on October 8, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 445); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1007. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting volume 2 of the Report on the Audit of Reconstruction Finance Corporation and Affiliated Corporations, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 450); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1008. A letter from the director, national legislative committee, the American Legion, transmitting the proceedings of the Twenty-ninth Annual National Convention of the American Legion, held in New York City, N. Y., August 28–31, 1947 (H. Doc. No. 425); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1009. A letter from the quartermaster general, United Spanish War Veterans, transmitting the proceedings of the stated convention of the Forty-ninth National Encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans, held in Kansas City, Mo., August 24–28, 1947 (H. Doc. No. 428); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1010. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture transmitting recommendation for the amending of the Research and Marketing Act of 1946; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1011. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the fourteenth annual report of the Farm Credit Administration, covering its operations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (H. Doc. No. 431); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1012. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease under the terms of that law for the 30-day period ended July 28, 1947; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1013. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease under the terms of that law for the 30-day period ended August 31, 1947; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1014. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease for the month ended September 30, 1947; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1015. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength," approved June 3, 1942 (56 Stat. 306); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1016. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend that part of the act of June 24, 1910 (36 Stat. 619), as amended (34 U. S. C. 542), relating to disposition of profits from sales of ships' stores; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1017. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to the restrictions on the use of crypt and window spaces of the United States Naval Academy chapel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1018. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 1 of Public Law 604, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1019. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act to credit certain service performed by members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service prior to reaching 18 years of age for the purpose of computing longevity pay, or for other pay purposes," approved March 6, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1020. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the disposition of certain lost or abandoned personal property coming under the jurisdiction of the War Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1021. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to the pay of the Superintendent of the Naval Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1022. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to provide salvage facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1023. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the crediting of moneys received from the disposition of serviceable supplies, materials, and equipment of the Navy Department to the applicable current Navy Department appropriation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1024. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting fifth annual report covering the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 779, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended by Public Law 338, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1025. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 605), as amended, so as to provide an equitable adjustment of retired pay for certain naval officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1026. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to accept donations of land and improvements for Naval Reserve training purposes and to purchase certain lands and improvements for such purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1027. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the advancement of certain lieutenants on the retired list of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1028. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the disposition of unclaimed personal effects of naval personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1029. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to repeal section 1 of the act of April 20, 1874, prescribing regulations governing inquiries to be made in connection with disbursements made by disbursing officers of the Army (18 Stat. 33; 10 U. S. C. 174); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1030. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the preservation of the frigate *Constellation* and to authorize the disposition of certain replaced parts of such vessel as souvenirs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1031. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Houston Council, Navy League of the United States, to construct a reflecting pool at the United States naval hospital, Houston, Tex.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1032. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of June 3, 1916, as amended, to make it applicable to the Canal Zone, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1033. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a copy of a memorandum recently sent to the Secretaries of Army, Navy, and Air Force, setting out the means by which the legislative programs and legislative comments of the three Departments are to be coordinated; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1034. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for retention in the service of certain disabled Army personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1035. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting report of proposed transfer of a submarine chaser, or vessel of similar type, to the Teen Age Canteen of Kearny, Kearny, N. J.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1036. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting report of proposed transfer of a landing craft (LCM), or craft of similar type, to the city of Portland, Oreg.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1037. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting report of proposed transfer of a 110-foot submarine chaser, or a vessel of similar type, to the Marine Navigation and Training Association, Inc.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1038. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting report of proposed transfer of a picket boat, or craft of similar

type, to the United States Coast Guard Auxiliary, Flotilla No. 12, of the Twelfth Coast Guard District, Monterey, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1039. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting report of proposed transfer of a motorboat to Utah County, Utah; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1040. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting report of proposed transfer of a landing ship, medium, or vessel of similar type, to Harry Carl Frederick's Ship, No. 5653, a post of the Department of New Jersey, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Inc.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1041. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting report of proposed transfer of a motor mine sweeper, or a vessel of similar type, to the Institutum Divi Thomae Foundation, Cincinnati, Ohio; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1042. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting report of proposed transfer of a landing ship, medium, or vessel of similar type, to the St. Petersburg Port Authority, St. Petersburg, Fla.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1043. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting report of proposed transfer of a motor launch, or a craft of similar type, to Auxiliary Flotilla 3, Division 1, Inc., Daytona Beach, Fla.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1044. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to increase the number of midshipmen allowed at the United States Naval Academy from the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1045. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of Public Law 779, Seventy-seventh Congress, amended by Public Law 338, Seventy-ninth Congress, a report for the fiscal year 1947; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1046. A letter from the secretary, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting three copies of a corrected report regarding the eleventh semiannual report of the Administrator of Rent Control recently submitted; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1047. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting semiannual report of the Administrator of Rent Control covering the period January 1, 1947, to June 30, 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1048. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes," approved October 31, 1945; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1049. A letter from the Chairman, Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of its official proceedings for the year ended December 31, 1946, with other information relating to the regulation and operation of the public utilities in the District of Columbia coming under the jurisdiction of said Commission; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1050. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, transmitting Annual Report of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1051. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the voluntary admission and treatment of mental patients at St. Elizabeths Hospital; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1052. A letter from the Secretary of State transmitting the Sixth Report of the Department of State on the Disposal of United States Surplus Property in Foreign Areas; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1053. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting the Seventh Report of the Department of State on the Disposal of United States Surplus Property in Foreign Areas; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1054. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report by the Comptroller General relative to the amendment of a charter agreement between the War Shipping Administration and Merchants & Miners Transportation Co.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1055. A letter from the Administrator, War Assets Administration, transmitting the quarterly progress report to the Congress by the War Assets Administration for the second quarter of 1947; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1056. A letter from the Administrator, War Assets Administration, transmitting the quarterly progress report to the Congress by the War Assets Administration for the third quarter of 1947; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1057. A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill providing for participation by the Government of the United States in the Pan American Railway Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1058. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of its newly issued Typical Residential Electric Bills, Cities of 2,500 Population and More, 1947; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1059. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting report covering its operations for the period from the organization of the Corporation on February 2, 1932, to March 31, 1947, inclusive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1060. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting a copy of the Annual Report of the Comptroller of the Currency for the Year 1946; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1061. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting report covering its operations for the period from the organization of the Corporation on February 2, 1932, to December 31, 1946, inclusive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1062. A letter from the Chairman, Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting the Fourteenth Annual Report of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, covering reports of all its constituent units, the Federal Home Loan Bank System, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and the United States Housing Corporation for the fiscal year 1946; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1063. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the Twelfth Quarterly Report of the Office of Contract Settlement, covering the period April 1 through June 30, 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1064. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the first quarterly report required under the Second Decontrol Act of 1947; to the Commitee on the Judiciary.

1065. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting report on the payment of claims for damage occasioned by naval vessels which have been settled by the Navy Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1066. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Howard A. Yeager; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1067. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the Thirteenth quarterly Report on Contract Settlement, covering the period July 1 through September 30, 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1068. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting report on the settlement of claims for damage caused to United States naval vessels which have been settled by the Navy Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1069. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a request for withdrawal of the case of Federico Gonzales-Benavides from those 74 cases involving suspension of deportation referred to in letter of July 1, 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1070. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting report of all claims paid by the Department of Commerce during fiscal year 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1071. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of claims paid by the Panama Railroad Company; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1072. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting the quarterly report of the United States Maritime Commission on the activities and transactions of the Commission under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 from April 1, 1947, through June 30, 1947, in accordance with section 13 of such act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1073. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to allow service credit for certain enlisted men of the Coast Guard who acted as policemen and guards at the Ivigtut cryolite mine, Greenland, during 1940 and 1941; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1074. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1075. A letter from the Secretary of Alaska, United States Department of the Interior, transmitting two copies of the laws of Alaska passed by the Alaska Territorial Legislature, Eighteenth Session, 1947; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1076. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and the Municipal Council of St. Croix; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1077. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1078. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and the Municipal Council of St. Croix; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1079. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation

passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix and the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1080. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the selection of superintendents of national cemeteries from meritorious and trustworthy male members of the armed forces who have been disabled in line of duty for active field service; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1081. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the first quarterly report, beginning July 1, 1947, covering conditions in all underground bituminous-coal and lignite mines investigated or inspected by Federal coal-mine inspectors during this quarter; all recommendations and notices sent to the mine owners or operators and State agencies; and the action taken by mine owners or operators and State agencies with respect to the Federal inspectors' findings and recommendations; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1082. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to eliminate the requirement of oaths in certain public-land matters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1083. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill authorizing the transfer of certain lands from the Yuma auxiliary project, Arizona, to the Gila project, Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1084. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and the Municipal Council of St. Croix; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1085. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report and findings on a plan for water-resources development of the Nueces River Basin, including Baffins Bay coastal area, Texas, together with related data and letters of comment on the report; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1086. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting the Twenty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1087. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting report of personnel ceilings for the quarter ending June 30, 1947; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1088. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a consolidated report and supporting data covering additional within-grade salary advancements as rewards for superior accomplishment made by the several Government departments and agencies during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1089. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of order regarding the White River Power Co.; to the Committee on Public Works.

1090. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 20, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Purviance Creek, New Hanover County, N. C., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1091. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 16, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of the area where Neale Creek, Md., empties into the Potomac River, with a view to removing the sand bar and providing a safe harbor, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1092. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 20, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Port Tobacco Creek, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1093. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 27, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Lake Kabetogama, Minn., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1094. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide basic authority for certain administrative expenditures for the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1095. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to transfer certain lands at Camp Phillips, Kans., to the War Department; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1096. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1097. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting report on the contest for a seat in the House of Representatives for the Eightieth Congress of the United States for the Fifth Congressional District of the State of Georgia, Helen Douglas Mankin against James C. Davis; and original testimony, papers, and documents relating thereto; to the Committee on House Administration.

1098. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting report on the contest for a seat in the House of Representatives for the Eightieth Congress of the United States for the Fifth Congressional District of the State of Georgia, Wyman C. Lowe against James C. Davis; and original testimony, papers, and documents relating thereto; to the Committee on House Administration.

1099. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize attendance of civilians at schools conducted by the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and joint-service schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1100. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report concerning the conversion of a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract between the United States Maritime Commission and Bethlehem-Fairfield Shipyard, Inc., to a fixed-price basis and the subsequent disposal of shipyard facilities and inventory to the contractor; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1101. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Government Services, Inc., for the period January 1, 1927, to December 31, 1945; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1102. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting the second report of Alaska Ocean Transportation Activities; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1103. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting the quarterly report of the United States Maritime Commission on the activities and transactions of the Commission under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 from July 1, 1947, through September 30, 1947; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1104. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $597,000,000 for interim aid to France, Italy, and Austria (H. Doc. No. 435); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1105. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Herbert L. Hunter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1106. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to the unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the armed forces of the United States during the Second World War; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1107. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 28, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on waterway from the Great Lakes to the Hudson River, with a view to ascertaining the damages resulting from the improvement of the Oswego and Erie Canals, N. Y., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on April 28, 1942, and also authorized by section 7 of the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 436); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1108. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting report of claims paid by the Post Office Department under the provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act from the date of the approval of that act to the end of the fiscal year 1946–47; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1109. A letter from the Public Printer, United States Government Printing Office, transmitting a report of the Public Printer covering the work of the Government Printing Office for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947; to the Committee on House Administration.

1110. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation (through the Clerk of the House of Representatives), transmitting the report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of its activities and expenditures for the month of March 1947; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1111. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation (through the Clerk of the House of Representatives), transmitting the report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of its activities and expenditures for the month of April 1947; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1112. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation (through the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting a report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of its activities and expenditures for the month of May 1947; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1113. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation (through the Clerk of the House of Representatives), transmitting a report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of its activities and expenditures for the month of June 1947; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1114. A letter from the Attorney General (through the Clerk of the House of Representatives), transmitting the Sixteenth Report of the Attorney General, covering the period from May 1 through September 30, 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1115. A letter from the adjutant and quartermaster general, Grand Army of the Republic, transmitting the Journal of Proceedings of the Eighty-first National Encampment, held at Cleveland, Ohio, August 10 to 14, 1947; to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Committee on Un-American Activities. House Report No. 1115. Report on Civil Rights Congress, as a Communist front organization. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 4459. A bill to provide free postage for gift packages of food and clothing mailed to certain foreign countres; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 4460. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Little Snake River and its tributaries originating in either of the two States and flowing into the other; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 4461. A bill approving the performance in the field of certain functions relating to the public lands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 4462. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in Park County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 4463. A bill to provide for the equal distribution among the States of Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah of the receipts of the Colorado River development fund for the years 1941 to 1955; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 4464. A bill to amend the act approved August 24, 1935, as amended May 23, 1938, entitled "An act to authorize the erection of a suitable memorial to Maj. Gen. George W. Goethals within the Canal Zone"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 4465. A bill adopting and authorizing the improvement of Bransons Cove, Lower Machodoc River, Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4466. A bill for preliminary examination and survey of Holdens Creek, Accomack County, Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4467. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Hacks Creek, Northumberland County, Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4468. A bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act, 1924, to increase the penalties specified in such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 4469. A bill to amend the act of July 7, 1947, so as to authorize the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government to procure the temporary or intermittent services of experts or consultants or organizations thereof; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BUCK:

H. R. 4470. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4471. A bill to amend section 51, title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4472. A bill to amend section 52 of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4473. A bill to grant naturalization rights to all persons regardless of race, color, or national origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 4474. A bill to extend to the veterans of the Mexican border service of 1916 and 1917 and their widows and minor children all the provisions, privileges, rights, and benefits of laws enacted for the benefit of veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio:

H. R. 4475. A bill to increase the pension payable to war veterans suffering from permanent total non-service-connected disabilities from $50 to $75 per month; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 4476. A bill to authorize the acquisition of a site for a national cemetery in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 4477. A bill designating the reservoir created by the construction of the Bull Shoals Dam in Baxter and Marion Counties, Ark., as Lake Tom Shiras; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 4478. A bill to provide basic authority for certain administrative expenditures for the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4479. A bill to transfer certain lands at Camp Phillips, Kans., to the War Department; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 4480. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 4481. A bill designating the reservoir created by the construction of the Bull Shoals Dam in Baxter and Marion Counties, Ark., as Lake Tom Shiras; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. R. 4482. A bill to bar un-American parties from the election ballot; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. J. Res. 255. Joint resolution to restore to the President all powers of the Price Control Act of 1942, including those of rationing or allocation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MASON:

H. J. Res. 256. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. J. Res. 257. Joint resolution to provide emergency relief for victims of floods in Florida, and for the restoration and reconstruction of the devastated areas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. Res. 357. Resolution for the relief of Laura F. Palmer; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to halt the diversion of war materials to Russia and other war-minded countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to make a study of the continuing housing shortage in the United States, the causes and possible remedies therefor, together with pending legislation relative thereto; and thereupon to formulate and enact legislation designed to hasten alleviation of the present housing plight; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Guam, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States regarding the Hopkins committee report, according the inhabitants of Guam American citizenship and providing the people with civil rights by the enactment of an organic law; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the legislature of the Eastern Republic of Uruguay, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with regard to its desire to grant amnesty to the political prisoners of Paraguay, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCK:

H. R. 4483. A bill for the relief of Domenico Marrazzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 4484. A bill for the relief of Theodore Loetsch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 4485. A bill for the relief of Rene Belbenoit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 4486. A bill for the relief of Zikmund Teba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4487. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Wells C. McCool; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

772. By Mr. HOLIFIELD: Petition of citizens of the United States residing in the State of California, for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on Rules.

773. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Board of County Commissioners of Palm Beach County, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting a Federal appropriation in an amount sufficient to give proper water control of the Everglades from the Kissimmee Swamp to the southern end of the mainland of Florida, for the purpose of protecting and preserving the great natural assets of the Everglades; to the Committee on Appropriations.

774. Also, petition of county clerk, County of Maui, T. H., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the urgent need of a new post office and Federal building in the town of Wailuku, County of Maui, T. H.; to the Committee on Appropriations

775. Also, petition of Lithuanian displaced-persons camp, Gross Hesepe, Germany, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their appreciation and gratefulness for the manner in which the American Government has defended the rights and freedom of human beings and of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

776. Also, petition of Federico B. Mutuc, Luzon, Philippine Islands, and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution

with reference to group recognition, as guerrillas, in the Philippine Army; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

777. Also, petition of National Council of State Garden Clubs, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to recommendation of legislation for the establishment of a scientific foundation with plant research an elemental part; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

778. Also, petition of the United Commercial Travelers of America, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

779. Also, petition of the Boston chapter of the Armenian Youth Federation, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to protesting a speech made by Maj. Gen. Lunsford E. Oliver, United States Army, on August 28, 1947, in Chicago; to the Committee on Armed Services.

780. Also, petition of the New York State Council, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to island possessions, maintenance and occupation by the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

781. Also, petition of the Board of Aldermen of the City of Chelsea, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the distribution of food and clothing to stricken European countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

782. Also, petition of the Great Lakes Harbors Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging the taking of all measures necessary to assure the early authorization and execution of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; to the Committee on Public Works.

783. Also, petition of the Great Lakes Harbors Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging early and careful consideration to the problem of postwar restoration and rehabilitation of Great Lakes shipping and of the coastwide and intercoastal merchant marine; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

784. Also, petition of the Department of Public Welfare, State of Alabama, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of Federal public-assistance and social-insurance legislation and public nursing homes for the chronically ill, relative to a memorial directed by the Legislature of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

785. Also, petition of the Council of the City of Dearborn, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to recommending and urging the adoption of the tax equality for home owners bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

786. Also, petition of Miss Marie Riede, New York, N. Y., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to protesting against the continuation of the policy initiated by the American military tribunal at Nuremberg, regarding the trying of 24 German scientists; to the Committee on Armed Services.

787. Also, petition of William C. Knoff, St. Petersburg, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

788. Also, petition of F. H. Patton, St. Petersburg, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

789. Also, petition of the city of La Belle, Hendry County, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to appropriation for proper water control of the Everglades for the protection and preservation of the great natural assets of the Everglades; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received for the third calendar quarter 1947.

To carry out the provisions of the Lobbying Act three forms were printed and used in making detailed statements (Form A), registrations (Form B), and filing quarterly reports (Form C).

Section 308 (b) requires the printing of information received and filed. Forms B and C, upon which this information was submitted, are reproduced as follows:

FORM B

REGISTRATION (IN DUPLICATE) WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SECRETARY OF THE SENATE UNDER THE LOBBYING ACT

(Public Law 601, 79th Cong.)

Name _____
Business address _____

INFORMATION REQUESTED FROM PERSON REGISTERING

(1) The name and address of the person by whom employed:
(1) _____
(2) In whose interest he appears or works:
(2) _____
(3) The duration of such employment:
(3) _____
(4) How much he is paid and is to receive:
(4) _____
(5) By whom he is paid or is to be paid:
(5) _____
(6) How much he is to be paid for expenses:
(6) _____
(7) What expenses are to be included:
(7) _____
See Form C for quarterly report to be filed.

OATH OF REGISTRANT

[Omitted in printing]

FORM C

QUARTERLY REPORT OF PERSONS REGISTERING UNDER LOBBYING ACT TO BE FILED, IN DUPLICATE, WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

(Public Law 601, 79th Cong.)

Name _____
Business address _____

INFORMATION REQUIRED IN QUARTERLY REPORT

Each such person so registering shall, between the 1st and 10th day of each calendar quarter, so long as his activity continues, file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and Secretary of the Senate—

(1) A detailed report under oath of all money received and expended by him during the preceding calendar quarter:
(1) _____
(2) To whom paid:
(2) _____
(3) For what purposes:
(3) _____
(4) The names of any papers, periodicals, magazines, or other publications in which he has caused to be published any articles or editorials:
(4) _____
(5) The proposed legislation he is employed to support or oppose:
(5) _____

OATH OF REGISTRANT FILING QUARTERLY REPORT

[Omitted in printing]

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were received for the third calendar quarter 1947, and filed, using Form B, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate:

(NOTE.—In order to reduce space, the questions in Form B (see above) are not repeated. Only the answers to questions are printed and are indicated by numbers in parentheses.)

Babbitt,[1] Elizabeth Clarke, 1819 Wyoming Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No one. Represent Service Store Legion, Inc. (2) For Service Store Legion, Inc. (3) By or according to appointment. (4) $25 (cover stationery, stamps, transportation, etc). (5) Secretary of Service Store Legion, Inc. (6) See above. (7) Stamps, stationery, transportation, etc.

Bison, Henry, Jr., 712 Jackson Place, Washington 6, D. C. (1) Tyre Taylor, 712 Jackson Place, Washington 6, D. C. (2) Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn. (3) Annual retainer. (4) $5,500 per annum. (5) Tyre Taylor, 712 Jackson Place, Washington 6, D. C. (6) None. (7) [Blank.]

Breitenbaugh,[1] Miss Dolly B., 3934 Campbell Street, Kansas City, Mo., Lee's Summit, Mo. (1) Not employed. A writer and artist. Member Independence, Mo., pioneer chapter DAR and Kansas City chapter, Daughters of American Colonists. (2) Patriotism. Restoring the original flag with added constellations as States entered the Union, as a peacetime flag for commercial use, to honor our founders. (3) Not employed. Favorable publicity in metropolitan papers (47) from Los Angeles Times to Seattle Post-Intelligencer, from San Francisco Examiner to Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch and from St. Paul Pioneer Press to Nashville Tennessean. (4) Not paid by anyone. Using my income. Sponsored by Independence, Mo., pioneer chapter, Daughters of American Revolution. (5) No one. Flag accepted by Vice President Curtis April 15, 1932; by United States Daughters of American Revolution, June 2, 1932; by President Roosevelt, March 1938; by Mr. Bankhead as Speaker of House, April 17, 1939; and on file with Library Committee of House, April 15, 1944. (6) Nothing. Delegate to National Daughters of American Revolution congress from Independence, Mo., pioneer chapter, Daughters of American Revolution 1939, 1941, 1942, 1943, 1947. (7) None. Delegate to national society, Daughters of American Colonists, from Mary Ball Washington chapter, Kansas City, Mo., 1947.

Caffrey, Charles G., 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The American Cotton Manufacturers Association, 203-A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte 2, N. C. (2) The above association. The activities to date are not believed to be within the purview of the act, but I am registering at this time in case future duties may possibly involve an activity within the scope of section 308. (3) Indeterminate, subject to the will of the president and the board of directors of the association. (4) $8,000 per year. (5) The American Cotton Manufacturers Association.

[1] Registration with the Secretary only.

(6) Out-of-pocket money. Reimbursement of actual expenses, including traveling and subsistence when away from home, also taxi fares, and other minor charges. (7) See answer under (6) above.

Carter, Asa L., 325 Ashland Avenue, Pittsburgh 16, Pa. (See Martindale's Legal Directory, 1950 to date.) (1) By such interested B-line abutters herein as join my clients on the lines mapped herein. (Attached to Vol. I of four volumes, submitted with registration.[2]) (2) I appear and work in the interests of B-line abutters herein. (3) The duration of my employment is permanent, perpetual, and forever for my heirs unless a "Rain Hill Prize" is provided herein. (4) I am paid and received in cash between $100 and $125 (receipts and expenditures) each of the last quarters (Form C) for 1946. I am yet unable to answer how much I am to receive as no definite information is available from the obvious facts of the case. (5) I am to be paid reasonable compensation for both professional and clerical work I perform, demanding always that abutters advance their reasonable costs and disbursements. (6) I am to be paid reasonable and fair expenses; example: Last two quarters cash balanced receipts and expenditures were, each quarter closing 1946, between $100 and $125. (7) Actual reasonable and fair costs, disbursements for clerical, professional time, and for each and all travel advertising conservatively required for a seeming long race. This is the second amendment request to register. (See pt. III, p. 308 ff. Four books, marked, pts. I, II, III, and vol. I are hereto attached,[2] repeated and alleged herein and made part hereof.)

Conn, Donald D., 105 West Adams Street, Chicago 3, Ill. (1) I am employed by the Transportation Association of America, a nonprofit membership corporation, composed of individual and corporate members, farmer cooperatives, industries, wholesalers, retailers, banks, insurance companies, and various forms of transport agencies. The association is devoted to economic research and public education. Its general offices are located at 105 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill. (2) I appear in the interest of an economic project, dedicated to the reappraisal of national transportation policies by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, pursuant to House Resolution 153. (3) Such activities should be completed within 2 years. (4) My salary is $20,000 per year, of which only a part is for any services in connection with this assignment. (5) I am to receive no compensation from any source except the association. (6) Total expenses approximate $8,000 per year devoted largely to travel, member meetings and luncheons, but which have nothing to do with legislation, as such. It is impossible now to advise how much of this will be the maximum expended in keeping the House committee advised in connection with this special work. (7) Expenses to be included in Form C quarterly will be personal expenses in connection with trips to Washington for such conferences with Chairman Wolverton and his staff.

Cullum, Robert M., 501 B Street NE., Washington 2, D. C. (1) Committee for Equality in Naturalization, 501 B Street NE., Washington 2, D. C. (2) Committee for Equality in Naturalization. (3) Until June 1948. (4) $500 per month. (5) Committee for Equality in Naturalization. (6) Reimbursement for actual expenses incurred. (7) Stenographic assistance, office space and supplies, travel, etc.

Douglas, Proctor, MacIntyre & Gates,[1] a law partnership composed of James H. Douglas, Jr., Robert Proctor, Malcolm A. MacIntyre, and Samuel E. Gates, with whom are associated Carl McGowan, John F. Meck, Jr., Maurice Winger, Jr., John S. Hancock, and Roy B. Kelly, 730 Southern Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Western Cemetery Alliance, 417 South Hill Street, Los Angeles 13, Calif. (2) Western Cemetery Alliance, 417 South Hill Street, Los Angeles 13, Calif. (3) Indefinite. (4) Attorney and client relationship. Reasonable fees for services rendered, plus expenses actually incurred. (5) Western Cemetery Alliance, 417 South Hill Street, Los Angeles 13, Calif. (6) Necessary expenses incurred. (7) Those customarily incurred in connection with legal work, such as traveling, telephone, and telegraph.

Dudley, Harold and Ruth, 1507 M Street NW, Washington, D. C. (1) American Council of Commercial Laboratories, Boston, Mass. (2) American Council of Commercial Laboratories. (3) Until January 1, 1948. (4) $300 per month. (5) American Council of Commercial Laboratories. (6) Maximum of $250 for 6-month period. (7) Travel.

Dunn, P. J., 139 North Wooster Avenue, Strasburg, Ohio. (1) Anti-Nepotism League of America. (2) Same. (3) Lifetime. (4) Nothing. (5) Anti-Nepotism League of America. (6) No expense. (7) None.

Echols, Oliver P., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., Shoreham Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington 5, D. C. (2) Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc. (3) President, elected to serve for a period of 1 year, to serve until his successor is elected and qualified. In the opinion of the registrant, none of his activities nor any contemplated for the future fall within the terms of Public Law 601 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. (4) Salary at the rate of $25,000 per annum, no part of which, however, is paid for activities covered by Public Law 601 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. (5) Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc. (6) No allowance. Actual expenses in connection with association activities to be reimbursed. (7) See (6).

Fitzpatrick, F. Stuart, 1615 H Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) The construction and civic development department of the United States Chamber of Commerce, of which I am manager, provides service for local chambers of commerce on their urban problems, including city planning, relief of traffic congestion, and rebuilding of blighted areas. This department answers inquiries, arranges meetings for interchange of information, and carries on other similar service activities. My duties include service as secretary of the chamber's construction and civic development department committee which initiates policy proposals in the fields of construction and urban development, for the consideration of the chamber's members. I also serve as the secretary of the construction industry advisory council, which was set up under the chamber's auspices to provide a forum for discussion of broad problems affecting the construction industry. Legal counsel advises that my activities do not fall under the specific language or apparent intent of Public Law 601, since any work which might be considered as having the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States is only incidental to the principal purposes of my employment and consumes only a very small portion of my time. My counsel has further advised, however, that this registration should be filed as a precaution against the possibility of future interpretations beyond the apparent scope of the act. Therefore, by filing this statement or any subsequent quarterly report, I do not concede that Public Law 601 applies to me. (3) As a full-time employee of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, registrant's period of employment is indefinite. (4) Matters of Federal legislation are not principal purpose of registrant's employment and he is not paid any stated or determinable amount in connection therewith. (5) Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America. (6) Reimbursement only for proper business expenses. (7) Routine business disbursements, such as transportation, telephone, and other proper business expense items.

Golob,[1] John L., national commander, Disabled American Veterans, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Disabled American Veterans, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (2) Disabled American Veterans. (All legislation affecting disabled veterans, their dependents, and dependents of deceased war veterans.) (3) Until June 30, 1948. (4) Actual expenses. (5) Disabled American Veterans. (6) Actual expenses on voucher. (7) Transportation, hotel, meals, telephone and telegrams, clerical assistance, cab fares, and tips.

Harllee,[1] Ella F., 1753 Lamont Street NW., Washington 10, D. C. (1) No one; representing the Service Star Legion, Inc. (2) For Service Star Legion, Inc., for enlisted personnel and their families. (3) By or according to appointment. (4) $10 (covers stationery, stamps, etc.). (5) See above. (6) See above. (7) Stamps, stationery, and transportation, etc.

Henderson, Joseph D., 602 Carondelet Building, New Orleans 12, La. (1) American Association of Small Business, 602 Carondelet Building, New Orleans 12, La. (2) Small business. (3) Permanent. (4) $6,000 per year salary. (5) American Association of Small Business. (6) None. (7) None.

Hess, Amiel Edgerton, managing director, Oil-Heat Institute of America, Inc., 6 East Thirty-ninth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) Oil-Heat Institute of America, Inc., 6 East Thirty-ninth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (2) The membership of the above trade association. (3) My employment is neither temporary nor part-time and any "lobbying" will be incidental. (4) As managing director of the institute my salary is $10,000 a year plus normal travel expense. (5) By the above trade association. (6) See No. 4. (7) See No. 4.

Howard, W. J., McKay Building, Missoula, Mont. (1) Tax Equality Association of Montana, McKay Building, Missoula, Mont.; not "employed," but performing voluntary services for. (2) Business interests of Montana which are in competition with tax-exempt organizations conducting buying and selling operations or rendering services normally engaged in for profit. (3) Unknown (not employed); see (1) above. (4) No salary. (5) [Blank.] (6) Actual out-of-pocket expense for travel and incident expense when appearing in behalf of and for purpose described in (2) above. (7) See (6) above. See Form C for quarterly report to be filed; previously submitted.

Howell, W. J., McKay Building, Missoula, Mont. (1) Tax Equality Association of Montana, McKay Building, Missoula, Mont.; not "employed," but performing voluntary services for. (2) Business interests of Montana which are in competition with tax-exempt organizations conducting buying and selling operations or rendering services normally engaged in for profit. (3) Unknown (not employed); see (1) above. (4) No salary. (5) [Blank.] (6) Actual out-of-pocket expense for travel and incident expense when appearing in behalf of and for the purpose described in (2) above. (7) See (6) above. See Form C for quarterly report to be filed; previously submitted.

Ingles, William, 717 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, Wash-

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[1] Registration with the Secretary only.

[1] Registration with the Secretary only.

ington, D. C. (2) National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (3) No definite duration. (4) $5,000. (5) National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (6) Nothing. (7) None.

Jones, Lyle W., 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington 6, D. C. (1) National Small Business Men's Association, Akron, Ohio. (2) National Small Business Men's Association. (3) Registrant was employed by the National Small Business Men's Association September 16, 1947. (4) $300 semimonthly less withholding and social-security taxes; expenses. (5) National Small Business Men's Association, Akron, Ohio. (6) No specific amount, but only amounts expended—such necessary expenses as transportation, taxi fares, hotel bills, occasional lunches, etc. (7) Transportation, taxi fares, telephone, telegrams, hotel bills, occasional lunches, etc.

Libby,[1] Frederick Joseph, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (3) September 1921 to date. (4) $4,500 annually. (5) National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (6) Refund of actual expenses incurred. (7) Transportation, lodging, taxis, telephone calls, porter and other small expenses in connection with speaking trips and field trips.

O'Connor, James J., 805 G Street NW. (1) Columbia Typographical Union, No. 101, 805 G Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (2) Members of Columbia Typographical Union. (3) Until June 19, 1949. (4) $107.50 per week for full-time service to union. (5) Columbia Typographical Union, No. 101. (6) $360 a year. (7) Transportation, telephone, telegraph.

Pritchard, E. Anthony, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) National Lead Co., 111 Broadway, New York 6, N. Y. (2) National Lead Co., 111 Broadway, New York 6, N. Y. (3) Indefinite. (4) Impossible to segregate salary paid for regular duties as assistant to the manager of the Washington office and salary paid for attempting to influence legislation. (5) National Lead Co., 111 Broadway, New York 6, N. Y. (6) For this purpose, expenses are not to exceed $50 per month. (7) All normal expenses, including taxi fares, telephone calls, and lunches.

Raesly, Leon,[1] 1218 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Thornton & Taylor, 311 California Street, San Francisco 4, Calif. (2) Thornton & Taylor, 311 California Street, San Francisco 4, Calif. (3) No fixed period. (4) No established method of compensation. (5) Thornton & Taylor. (6) Nothing. (7) None.

Rothkirch, Eduard von, 411 Times Annex. (1) Institute for Central European Research (Inc.), 411 Times Annex Minneapolis, 1, Minn. (2) On behalf of all treaties and legislation pertaining to Central Europe. (3) Indefinite. (4) One dollar per year. (5) Institute for Central European Research (Inc.) (6) Not to exceed $100 per session of Congress. (7) Taxi, lunches, printed matter.

Saylor, Richard D., National Lead Co., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington 6, D. C. (1) John T. Lewis & Bros. Co. (Philadelphia Branch of National Lead Co.), 910 Widener Building, Chestnut and Juniper Streets, Philadelphia 7, Pa. (2) National Lead Co., 111 Broadway, New York 6, N. Y. (3) Indefinite. (4) Impossible to segregate salary paid for regular duties as manager of the Washington office and salary paid for attempting to influence legislation. (5) John T. Lewis & Bros. Co. (Philadelphia branch of National Lead Co.). (6) For this purpose, expenses are not to exceed $50 per month. (7) All normal expenses including taxi fares, telephone calls, and lunches.

[1] Registration with the Secretary only.

Smith, Donald W., 49 Wall Street, New York 5, N. Y. (1) American Nurses' Association, 1790 Broadway, New York 19, N. Y. (2) American Nurses' Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) Fee for legal services based upon duration and nature of employment. (5) American Nurses' Association. (6) Reimbursement of actual expenses. (7) Travel and hotel expenses, postal and other incidental expenses.

Stebbins, Frank L., secretary, Illinois Associated Businessmen, Inc., room 1025, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Illinois Associated Businessmen, Inc., room 1025, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago 4, Ill. (2) Illinois Associated Businessmen, Inc., which committee is composed of and represents businessmen and firms in all lines in Illinois in an effort to further equality of taxation among competing businesses. (3) Indefinite. (4) No salary. He is to be reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses. (5) Illinois Associated Businessmen, Inc. (6) No fixed amount. (7) Transportation, food, lodging, taxi, telephone, telegraph, etc.

Temple, Miss Marjorie L.,[1] American Association of University Women, National Headquarters, 1634 I Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) American Association of University Women, National Headquarters, 1634 I Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) American Association of University Women (national organization). (3) September 8, 1947. (4) Four thousand dollars annual salary. (Possibly slightly over half of this is for duties in connection with legislative work.) (5) American Association of University Women, national headquarters. (6) Reimbursement for occasional expenses, such as 25 cents for carfare (perhaps twice a year), notary fees for any papers that have to be signed (such as the present papers). (7) See above under No. 6.

Thompson, Louis E., 35 Douglas Road, Glen Ridge, N. J. (1) Small Business Association of New Jersey, Inc. (2) Members of the Small Business Association of New Jersey, Inc. (3) One year. (4) No amount determined and nothing received. (5) By the Small Business Association of New Jersey, Inc. (6) All expenses are to be paid. (7) Expenses of the office, cost of bulletin service, and traveling expenses.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) Mr. John Frederick Firth-Hand, 1744 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) Mr. John Frederick Firth-Hand. (3) Indefinite. (4) No fee yet determined. The fee will be determined on the basis of legal services rendered and time expended. (5) Mr. John Frederick Firth-Hand. (6) Actual. (7) Telephone, telegraph, and incidental out-of-pocket expenses customarily reimbursed in connection with legal services.

Waters, Mrs. Agnes, 3267 N Street NW. (1) None. (2) My own interest and America. (3) No duration. (4) None. (5) No one. (6) None. (7) None.

Wimmer, Edward, 105 East Third Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) Employed by and is vice president of the National Federation of Small Business, Inc., of San Mateo, Calif. (2) Supporting all legislation that is favorable to small business and opposed to all legislation that is harmful to small business. (3) The term of employment is indefinite. (4) He is paid $100 per week and his actual expenses to and from all meetings, including all hotel bills, meals, etc. (5) National Federation of Small Business, Inc., of San Mateo, Calif. (6) Actual expenses to and from all meetings, including all hotel bills, meals, etc. (7) [Blank.]

Wright, Mrs. Leslie B., chairman of legislation, General Federation of Women's Clubs, 4620 Thirtieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Volunteer worker, as chairman of legislation, for General Federation of Women's Clubs. (2) As chairman of legislation in the General Federation of Women's Clubs, This organization supports legislation which pertains to the welfare of the home and to the general welfare, after given authority through the adoption of resolution by the delegate body. (3) Appointed for 3 years, June 1947–50. (4) No salary. (5) No salary. (6) Yearly appropriation, $100; expense attending yearly board meeting and convention of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. (7) Postage and typing.

Wright, Walter C., Jr., 44 Cooper Street, Woodbury, N. J. (1) Tax Equality Committee of New Jersey, Inc., 44 Cooper Street, Woodbury, N. J. (2) Tax Equality Committee of New Jersey, Inc. (3) Indefinite. (4) Reimbursement for actual expenses. (5) Tax Equality Committee of New Jersey, Inc. (6) Whatever they actually amount to, except that automobile travel expense is to be reimbursed at the rate of 6 cents per mile. (7) Travel, meals, lodging, postage, stationery, printing, telephone calls, telegrams, etc.

[1] Registration with the Secretary only.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were received for the third calendar quarter, 1947, and filed, using Form C, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate:

(NOTE.—In order to reduce space the questions in Form C (see p. 10615) are not repeated. Only the answers are printed and are indicated by numbers in parentheses.)

Abbott, Charlotte E., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None; compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement; employment terminated July 31, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Adkerson, J. Carson, 976 National Press Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) $73.10. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) Interested in any legislation having to do with manganese or strategic minerals.

Alifas, Nels Peter, room 303, Machinists' Building, Washington 1, D. C. (International Association of Machinists, District No. 44). (1) Salary, $1,999.98; $15 legislative expenses during quarter. (2) Taxi drivers and operators of eating and refreshment places. (3) Lobbying, i. e., supporting or opposing as the case may be, legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general. Not more than 25 percent of time spent on this work. (4) The Federal Machinist, a monthly periodical, of which he is editor. (5) All legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees, and occasionally organized labor in general.

Allen, William, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis 1, Mo. (1) None for legislative purposes. (2) None for legislative purposes. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at the present time.

American Nurses' Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Carfare, $0.60; taxi $0.60; telephone, $2.25; notary fees, $2. (2) Edith M. Beattie, chairman of American Nurses' Association special committee on Federal legislation. (3) See item No. 1. (4) The American Journal of Nursing is the official publication of the American Nurses' Association. Through the medium of the American Journal of Nursing, the membership is kept informed of pending legislation affecting nurses, nursing, or health by means of editorials or signed articles. (5) Legislation pertaining to health, nurses or nursing.

Aring, Hector M., 826 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See original registration form for complete explanation. No other contributions received. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None.

(5) Opposed to appropriation for cotton subsidy under section 32 of the Agriculture Appropriations Act, 1947—tax legislation.

Arnold, W. C., Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash. (1) $597.04. (2) Travel expense. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) None.

Atkinson, Arthur K., Wabash Railroad Co., 1618 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis 1, Mo. (1) None; see memorandum attached.[2] (2) See memorandum attached in answer to item (1).[2] (3) Inapplicable. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3861, which became Public Law 189, Eightieth Congress, on July 15, 1947; registrant's activities under his registration have therefore ceased.

Avent,[2] I. M., 1413 Wenonah Avenue, Berwyn, Ill. (Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc.). (1) Salary and expense check for week ending July 4, 1947, $54.67; July 11, $240.97; July 18, $115.56; July 25, $56.34; August 1, $56.30; August 8, $38.12; August 15, $48.74; August 22, $40.69; August 29, $51.58; September 5, $53.14; September 12, $242.71; September 19, $74.62; September 26, $44.34; October 3, $72.09. (2) No particular individual or organization. (3) Procurement of commodities of livelihood, goods, and services such as rent, food, shelter, utilities, transportation, hotel, garage, repair, postage, telephone, and maintenance of family. (4) Townsend National Weekly, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (5) H. R. 16 and such State legislation as may effect better care of aged and needy of Illinois.

N. W. Ayer & Son, Inc. (Ayer), a New York, corporation, and J. Vance Babb, an employee thereof (collectively herein called registrant). James R. Crowell formerly included as registrant on account of activities as an employee of Ayer, left Ayer's employ and ceased such activities on August 1, 1947; 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York 20, N. Y. (National Association of Electric Companies). (1) Ayer received from the National Association of Electric Companies $6,658.33, of which $6,332.15 represented compensation to Ayer and $326.18 was for out-of-pocket expenses (see item 2 below); the only money received or spent by Registrant J. Vance Babb was for out-of-pocket expense noted in item 2 below. (2) J. Vance Babb, James R. Crowell, Mary Blackford, R. C. Baker, and B. J. Kelly, employees of Ayer, for miscellaneous expenses, $75.01; materials, postage, messengers, clippings, photostats, telephone and telegrams, etc., $251.17. (3) The amounts described in items 1 and 2 above were received or expended by Ayer in the performance of its services in advising on public relations and in connection with publicity affecting the electric industry as described in Registration March 3, 1947; neither the services nor the expenditures involved lobbying within meaning of the Lobbying Act. (4) None. (5) None. This quarterly report is filed subject to the reservations contained in the registration dated March 3, 1947.

Babbitt,[2] Elizabeth Clarke, 1819 Wyoming Avenue NW. (1) No one; representing Service Star Legion, Inc., $25; this did not cover necessary expenses, stamps, stationery, typing, transportation. (2) To me, secretary of Service Star Legion, through R. O. Shay, 301 Indiana Avenue, St. Joseph, Mo. (3) To use as I saw fit. (4) Service Star Legion Magazine Quarterly. (5) Education, equalization, support; displaced persons, oppose; child welfare, support; public health and recreation, support.

Babcock,[2] Charles E., Route 4, Box 73, Vienna, Va.; National Board of Officers of the Junior Order United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, 3029 North Broad Street, Philadelphia 32, Pa. (1) Received an allowance of $50 per month for out-of-pocket expenses; no salary whatever paid to me as chairman of the national legislative committee of the national council, Junior Order United American Mechanics of the United States of North America. (2) Various (see below). (3) Services at gasoline stations; gasoline, oil, etc.; postage, telephone, telegrams, meals, and hotel rooms; all personal; transportation from my home in Vienna, Va., to Washington. (4) The Junior American, official organ of the Junior Order United American Mechanics of the United States of North America. (5) Immigration and naturalization matters; public-school measures; and anything we believe to be detrimental to the welfare of the American-born or naturalized citizen.

Bailey, C. Lloyd, Friends Committee on National Legislation, 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington 8, D. C. (1) Gross salary, July, August, September 1947, $900; travel expense, $346.14. (2) Various. (3) Travel is for the purpose of attending yearly meetings, quarterly meetings, or conferences of Friends and other groups to interpret developments in national and international policy with especial reference to legislation, and for other committee business. (4) The organization sends a news letter to a limited number of subscribers and Friends about once a month. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization and world economic stability, world disarmament, foreign relief, aid to refugees, protection for racial minorities; support for the rights of conscience, opposition to conscription and the militarization of America.

Baker, Gibbs L., 1011 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C.; Puget Sound Pulp & Timber Co., Bellingham, Wash. (1) Expended, $203.35. (2) Various. (3) In support of Senate Joint Resolution 118 and House Joint Resolution 205. (4) None. (5) Senate Joint Resolution 118 and House Joint Resolution 205; the latter became Public Law 385, Eightieth Congress.

Baldrige, H. M., United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C., and 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $1,500 per month or $4,500 for the quarter. No money expended on any legislative activity. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) In support of H. R. 4075 and S. 1584.

Baldwin & Mermey,[2] 205 East Forty-second Street, New York 17, N. Y.; Hershey Corp., Hershey, Pa. (1) Retainer from Hershey Corp., $6,750; reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses, $356.84. (2) Western Union Telegraph Co., New York Telephone Co., post office, Jelinek Letter Service Co., Pennsylvania Railroad, Apex Trucking Co., Baldwin & Mermey. (3) Telephone and telegraph service, postage, travel, carfares, messenger service, mimeographing, miscellaneous. (4) [Blank.] (5) Sugar legislation.

Bannister, L. Ward, attorney at law, 804 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.; California Electric Power Co., Riverside, Calif. (1) Received $711.73, whereof $690 for professional services and $21.73 for disbursements as outlined in (2) below. (2) Telephone calls made in April 1947 but covered by above payment, $9.58; telephone calls in July and August covered by above payment, $12.17. Disbursements for which reimbursements have not as yet been received, expense of trip to Kansas City on September 11, railroad fare, $55.90; hotel, $7.98; miscellaneous expenses, $8.65. (3) As per (5) below. (4) Editorial in Denver Post August 17, 1947. (5) Supports bills for development of water resources of river basins in the West by the Bureau of Reclamation and Army engineers and opposes developments under "regional authorities" bills unless they subordinate consumptive uses of water to State law.

Barber, Hartman, room 301, 10 Independence Avenue SW, Washington 4, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employes, 1015 Vine Street, seventh floor Brotherhood Building, Cincinnati 2, Ohio. (1) Expended, $136.65. (2) Various. (3) Various. (4) None. (5) All legislation directly or indirectly affecting labor in any manner whatsoever, especially railroad labor.

Barker, Richard B., 306 Southern Building, Washington 5, D. C.; Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester 4, N. Y. (1) No funds received. Expenses: July 24, 1947, telephone call to Rochester, $3.88; July 28, telephone call to Rochester, $1.69; September 16, telephone call to Rochester, $4.19; September 12, 1947, telephone call to Rochester, $2.31. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) Not applicable. (5) Excise tax on photographic materials.

Barker, Richard B., 306 Southern Building, Washington 5, D. C.; the Haloid Co., Rochester 3, N. Y. (1) No funds received. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) Not applicable. (5) Excise tax on photographic materials.

Barnett, Arthur R., National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Received salary of $2,750.01 as an officer and employee of the National Association of Electric Cos., and reimbursements of $411.05 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all duties and assignments, only a part of which salary and expenses were for those purposes described in section 308 (a) or otherwise within the scope of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, railroads, air lines, telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs, bookstores and stationers. (3) Railroad and transportation, $37.45; hotel and restaurants, $238.10; bookstores and stationers, $29.90; telephone and telegraph, $11.65; gratuities and miscellaneous $93.95. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Cos., of which I am an officer and employee, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association therefore is interested in legislation that might affect its members as going business concerns.

Bell, John Dickinson, editor and publisher of Unveiling the Universe, TM Reg U. S. Pat. Off. (John DiginsonNDigoutruth Bell); Post Office Box 3214, Washington 10, D. C., and Post Office Box 943, Scranton, Pa.; True Order PMA for UTU. (Prudent Moderate Americans of Perfect Mental Age, For You Too), Post Office Box 3214, Washington 10, D. C. (1) Received, none; expended, $1; have not been ready to collect the other $499,990. (2) Notary public for oath, $1. (3) For swearing and notarizing reports to the Congress of the United States. (4) Unveiling the Universe (TM Reg U. S. Pat. Off.). (5) To implement "The New Declaration of Independence," to have a more righteous commonweal; to enact laws which will more effectively control crime and subversives; to have more equitable labor laws which will prevent racketeering; to enact laws which will more effectively control "boozeleers" and the booze racket; to enact a law or a constitutional amendment which will prevent the election or appointment to any office whatsoever, where the person has any control over the lives, the livelihood, the liberty, the land, and/or the property of others when such become —— or cocktailed or sick or muddled or boozy from smoke or drink, and/or from other venoms that menace commonweal.

Bennett, Hugh M., 17 South High Street, Columbus 15, Ohio; Jewelers Vigilance Committee, Inc., 17 West Forty-fifth Street, New York 19, N. Y. (1) Attached exhibit[2] shows amount of money expended by me and not yet reimbursed for. (2) See attached exhibit.[2] (3) To attend meeting of the Indus-

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[2] Filed with the Clerk only.

[2] Filed with the Clerk only.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

try Tax Committee of the Jewelers Vigilance Committee, Inc. (4) None. (5) Jewelry excise tax elimination or revision.

Benson, Ernest H., 105 Chaddock Avenue, Hornell, N. Y.; Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit 2, Mich. (1) Received salary July 1 to July 31, $337.50, and expenses $268.76. (2) Hamilton Hotel, various restaurants, phone, telegrams, postage, laundry, pullman, and taxi fares. (3) Necessary living and transportation expenses. (4) None. (5) Work in connection with opposing S. 670 and H. R. 3150.

Berckes,[4] Herbert C., secretary, Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 Canal Building, New Orleans 12, La. (1) Received for services as secretary, $750; expended for travel expense, $1,283.39. (2) Various. (3) Legislation, transportation, and per diem. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation affecting the southern pine lumber industry.

Berckes,[5] Herbert C., Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 Canal Building, New Orleans 12, La. (1) Received for services as secretary, $750. Expended for travel expense, $1,143.19. (2) Various. (3) Legislation, transportation, and per diem. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation affecting the southern pine lumber industry.

Berenson, Anna, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; United Automobile Workers, CIO, 411 West Milwaukee Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Received, $980; expenses, $1,409.71. This includes salary and expenses for nonlegislative work as well as legislative work. (2) Hotels, restaurants, railroads, cab drivers, etc. (3) Subsistence and travel. (4) CIO News and Union News Service. (5) All housing and related legislation supported or opposed by CIO and UAW-CIO, supporting housing bills of aid to the general welfare, and opposing housing bills harmful to the general welfare.

Bergin, Preston B., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) $400 salary, $36.15 expenses. (2) Taxi drivers, streetcars, restaurants, telephone booths. (3) Taxi, streetcar travel, luncheons, and telephone. (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor law revision, social-security-law revision, inflammable-fabric legislation.

Bernard, William S., Citizens' Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To support H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admission Act.

Berns, Karl H., National Education Association of the United States, Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,750, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities. Estimated for legislative service, $350. (2) Self (salary). Expenses, hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein). Informative articles in State educational magazine. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Biorn, Norman E., 511-516 Commerce Building, St. Paul 1, Minn.; Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc. (1) Salary from Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc. (formerly Minnesota Small Business, Inc.), none; received for actual expenses, $275.80. Spent for legislative activities, none. (2) Northwest Bell Telephone Co., $30.06; Northwest Airlines, $47.95; miscellaneous travel expenses, $13.35; St. Paul Dispatch, $2.40; United States Post Office, $8.95; Donahue Temporary Service, $14; A. B. Dick Co., $85; State of Minnesota, $1; Brady Margulis, $6.75; Carnes Stamp Co., $6; McClain & Hedman, $16.25; Mary Louise Kustelski, $25. (3) Phone calls, telegrams, travel, newspapers, postage, stenographic services, mimeograph machine, filing amended articles of incorporation, paper, filing cards, corporate seal, typing. (4) None. (5) Elimination of inequalities in tax legislation.

Bishop, John H., 141 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.; Universal Zonolite Insulation Co., 135 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. The appointment terminated with the approval of the legislation on August 8, 1947. (1) January 1, 1947, to date: Received $3,866.25, fees at the rate of $15 per hour; $1,484.22 expense in traveling to and from Washington and living expenses while in Washington. Expended $1,484.22 for traveling and living expenses in Washington. (2) To railroads, air lines, hotels, and restaurants for transportation and living expenses, telephones and telegrams. (3) For transportation, living expenses, etc. (4) None. (5) Legislation making percentage depletion permanent for vermiculite.

Bloch, Charles J., 614-618 Persons Building, Macon, Ga.; Georgia Southern & Florida Railway Co., Washington, D. C. (1) Only money received by registrant was six semimonthly payments of $150 to his firm on annual salary, as stated in paragraph 4 of registration. Salary for clerk paid by Georgia Southern & Florida Railway Co. directly to Miss Gertrude Thorner; also payment to Hall & Bloch, August 11, 1947, of $15.72 for expenses as stated in paragraph 6 of registration. (2) Salary paid to registrant's firm was retained by it, and salary paid clerk was retained by her. The sum of $45.72 was expended by registrant in carrying on his work. (3) The sum of $45.72 was expended by registrant on one trip to Washington, being expended for meals, lodging, taxicab fares, and pullman, while in Washington, and traveling to and from there. (4) None. (5) The primary purpose of registrant's employment is not to support or oppose any legislation. As counsel for Georgia Southern & Florida Railway Co., as stated in paragraph 4 of registration sworn to June 25, 1947, and filed June 26, 1947, he has been requested to, and will support, the passage of Senate bill 110 and H. R. 1629.

Blunt, Joseph R., 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; West Coast Lumbermen's Association, 1410 Southwest Morrison Street, Portland, Oreg. (1) No money received or expended during third calender quarter for lobbying purposes. (2) Same as (1). (3) Same as (1). (4) None. (5) Legislation directly affecting the west-coast lumber-manufacturing industry.

Bodfish, Morton, United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago 1, Ill. (1) See attached statement.[3] (2) See attached statement.[3] (3) For travel, hotel, and maintenance in Washington, D. C. (4) None (other than the customary materials found in our trade papers, in our trade association periodicals, and in our trade association bulletins). (5) Support all legislation favorable to thrift and home ownership and particularly helpful to savings and loan associations and cooperative banks in carrying out their thrift and home financing objectives and oppose legislation detrimental to home ownership and these institutions.

Boehne, John W., Jr., 1058 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (National Association of Employees of Collectors of Internal Revenue). (1) National Association of Employees of Collectors of Internal Revenue, $900; postage and printing, $73.05. (2) John W. Boehne, Jr. (3) Counsel for the above association. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting employees of Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Bohannon, John N., Asheville, N. C. (1028 Connecticut Ave., Washington, D. C.); Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y. (1) Personal remuneration, including expenses during the preceding calendar quarter, $1,500. Money expended see (3) below. (2) See (3) below. (3) Personal subsistence, transportation, routine and other customary expenses only. Also see (6), Form B, heretofore filed. (4) None. (5) Any legislation that might affect producing, gathering, transportation, distribution, or sale of natural gas.

Bourg, Clarence J., 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (American Sugar Cane League). (1) $126.80 has been received and expended in connection with legislation and other contacts with Government, of which not more than one-fourth has been expended in connection with legislation, such as taxicab fares about Washington and an occasional lunch, when Congress is in session. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) Sugar Bulletin of New Orleans, La., Sugar Beet Journal of Saginaw, Mich. (5) Any legislation affecting the domestic sugar producer.

Bowden, Ray B., National Grain Trade Council, 604 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Statement attached.[2] (2) Shown in attached statement.[2] (3) As indicated on attached statement.[2] (4) None so far as known. (5) General legislation affecting the grain and feed trade.

Boyd, H. B., 1001 Tower Building, Washington 5, D. C. (United States Beet Sugar Association). (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Interested in legislation affecting sugar but not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing any legislation.

Boyle, Samuel E., 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans.; the Reformed Presbyterian Church, Synod of North America, for the Christian amendment movement, at above address, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh 22, Pa., denominational headquarters. (1) Salary received from J. S. Tibby for July, August, September, total, $791.67; travel money received from same source for same time, total, $392.33. (2) Salary used in personal and family expenses only; travel expenses used in payment of railway fares, hotel rooms, meals, and other incidentals in necessary travel for the Christian amendment movement. (3) See above. (4) United Evangelical Action, Cincinnati, Ohio, printed my article, Jesus Christ and the American Tradition, September 16, 1947, issue—voluntary publication of an article describing our campaign; other papers copied news releases, but we do not have any slipping service to furnish us complete reports on coverage. (5) Senate Joint Resolution 150 and House Joint Resolution 239, bills to propose a constitutional amendment which is to amend the preamble of the United States Constitution to acknowledge Jesus Christ as Saviour and King of Nations.

Bream,[3] John H., 22 South Third Street, Harrisburg, Pa.; Pennsylvania Tax Equality Committee, Inc. (1) $101.12. (2) Postage, rail and bus travel fare. (3) Personal expenses. (4) None. (5) Tax equality for all competitive business.

Brewbaker, James M., 623 Investment Building (National Association of Manufacturers). (1) Receipts: Salary, $1,258.33; expenses reimbursed by employers, $801.61; expenditures, $801.61. (2) Expenses paid to various restaurants, hotels, and taxicabs and railroads. (3) Traveling, attending meetings to discuss general conditions in Washington of interest to business and industry in particular. (4) [Blank.] (5) All bills affecting the following subjects: National labor policy, portal-to-portal wage claims, tax

[4] Filed for second quarter.
[5] Filed for third quarter.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[3] Filed with the Clerk only.

laws, reduction of Federal expenditures, control of atomic energy, Federal subsidization of research, patents and trademarks, wartime control powers, and revision of the SEC and RFC Acts.

Brickman, Paul B., Vernon Scott and Loring Schuler, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) None, other than regular salary as reported on Form B. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Bright, O. O., 1302 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (Southern Pine Industry Committee). (1) Salary, $1,050; expenses, $52.50. (2) To various hotels, cab drivers, etc. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the lumber manufacturing industry.

Brightman, Melvin H., 1112 Barr Building, Washington, D. C. (Dairy Industry Committee). (1) $3,000 salary as executive secretary of Dairy Industry Committee. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To observe legislation possibly affecting dairy industry.

Brocks, William F., National Grain Trade Council, 607 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary and expense received during period amounted to $1,647.60 of which only $5.45 was spent for any purpose covered by the act. (2) Taxicab fares, no one of which was in excess of $1.50. (3) Transportation. (4) None other than weekly newsletter published by employer. (5) Legislation affecting agriculture in general and the grain trade in particular.

Brown, Earle P., National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) July 1 to September 30, 1947, received $32.50 in reimbursement for expenses. (2) Various. (3) Various. (4) Attached list[1] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed; complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Legislation affecting the real estate industry.

Brown, Frederick E., Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C.; National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Clark & La Roe, law firm; received from the National Independent Meat Packers Association, $4,500, total of monthly payments for general legal services, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payment made to any other person. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) I have not supported or opposed any legislation during the past quarter.

Brown, Frederick E., Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C.; Seatrain Lines, Inc., 39 Broadway, New York 6, N. Y. (1) Clark & La Roe, law firm, received from Seatrain Lines, Inc., $1,875, monthly payments on annual retainer, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payments made to any other person. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) I have not supported or opposed any legislation during the past quarter.

Brown, Robert E., secretary, the Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc., Room 315, 38 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis 4, Ind. (1) Money received for salary, none; money received for reimbursement of actual expenses, $42.44. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) The Indianapolis News, the Indianapolis Times, and the Indianapolis Star. (5) Legislation to promote tax equality between competing businesses.

Bryson, Jack, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary received (net after withholding tax), $5,535; expense reimbursement, $1,601.90; expended, $7,136.90. (2) To self, $5.535; to Hotel Biltmore, Los Angeles, $843.54; to incidental expenses, $758.36 (for transportation, travel expense, car hire, stenographic service, and miscellaneous out-of-pocket expenses). (3) To self, for personal and family needs; to Hotel Biltmore and to incidental expenses as set forth in item (2) above, in connection with attendance at hearing in Los Angeles in August 1947 of subcommittee of House Committee on Education and Labor. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the motion-picture industry.

Buck, Elizabeth, Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. Employment terminated July 31, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910 Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Bugbee, George, American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago 10, Ill. (1) Quarterly salary, $4,749.96; reimbursement of travel expenses, $125.70. (2) Various air lines, railroads, hotels, and recipients of miscellaneous amounts for taxicabs, meals, and similar necessary expenses. (3) Necessary traveling expenses as indicated. (4) Hospitals, the official journal of the American Hospital Association; Trustee, the journal for members of hospital governing boards. (5) Legislation which might affect the quality of hospital service to the people of this country.

Bulow, William J., Jr., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received, $3,242.90; money expended, $21.50. (2) Various transportation, telephone and telegraph companies, and United States post office. (3) Customary business expense for transportation, telephone calls, telegrams, and postage. (4) None. (5) Postage-rate legislation.

Burger, George J., 250 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York 19, N. Y.; self. (1) Received $6,496.97 from operating Burger Tire Consultant Service, publishing National Independent and acting as director in charge of Washington office of National Federation of Small Business. Expended $4,869.31 for general operating expenses. (2) General office expenses. (3) Publications, weekly bulletins, travel expenses. (4) National Independent, Burger Tire Consultant Service weekly bulletin. (5) Tire bill; all legislation pertaining to small business.

Burke, Harold, United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary for 3 months at $625 per month equals $1,875. No expenses received or expended on any legislative activity. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Burke, Thomas F., the Employees Committee for Low Cost Retirement Benefits, 1186 Broadway, New York 1, N. Y. (1) Received $22.43 on August 27 from above-mentioned committee as part payment of $53.70 expended by me during July, August, and September, leaving a balance of $31.22 owed me by the committee for expenses, plus a $50 cash loan made to the committee on August 1. These figures do not include a cash loan to the committee on June 2, nor expenses of $14.85 incurred in June. These latter figures mentioned inasmuch as they were not previously reported. (2) Cash loans were made to the committee and balance was for carfare, train fare, telephone, and other miscellaneous expenses. (3) Cash loans were made to the committee to start it going and balance was for train fare, carefare, telephone, and other miscellaneous expenses incurred by me on behalf of the committee. (4) None. (5) Crosser Act, passed into law on July 31, 1946.

Burrows, Orrin A., International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL, 1200 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,500, expenses, $70.55, minus withholding and railroad retirement deductions. The expenses are deductible expenses (such as transportation, hotels, meals, including incidental items but none for lobbying purposes.) (2) Railroads, bus, and taxis for transportation; hotels, and restaurants for meals and lodging. (3) Transportation, meals, lodging, telegrams, telephone, and postage stamps. (4) The Journal of Electrical Workers and Operators is available to me. (5) All legislation affecting the electrical worker in particular and labor in general.

Butts, Joseph G., Jr., attorney, law offices of Gall & Lane, Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C., Nonsubsidized Insulation Manufacturers Committee, Riverton, Va. (1) $9,000. (2) Retainer paid to Gall & Lane. Expended: Government Printing Office, $1.50; taxi, $3.20; Western Union, $0.75; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $2.94. (3) Retainer for legal research, memoranda, and consultation. (4) None. (5) To support legislation to prevent Federal expenditures in competition with private enterprise.

Caffey, John W., 800 Southeastern Building, Greensboro, N. C.; Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) No expense incurred other than postage for about 15 letters, and about 15 telegrams. (2) United States post office and Western Union Telegraph Co. (3) To communicate data and information to some Members of the House of Representatives. (4) None. (5) H. R. 1945, H. R. 1946, and H. R. 1947.

Caffrey, Charles G., 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the American Cotton Manufacturers' Association, 203-A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte 2, N. C. (1) One-fourth of per annum salary of $8,000. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Calhoun, Leonard J., Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington 5, D. C.; Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc. (1) $3,000 received by Morgan & Calhoun for all services as Washington counsel for Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.; allocation between legislative and nonlegislative activities is not feasible. (2) No expenditures. (4) None. (4) None. At irregular intervals Unemployment Benefit Advisors publishes and distributes to its members, public officials who administer social-security programs, and a few others, mimeographed material related to current social-security problems, including legislation. I usually prepare this material. (5) All legislation affecting social-security benefits and contributions.

Calhoun, Leonard J., Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington 5, D. C.; National Tax Equality Association. (1) $3,100 received by Morgan & Calhoun for all services as Washington counsel for National Tax Equality Association. Allocation between legislative and nonlegislative activities is not feasible. Firm received $55.47 as reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses. (2) $19.97 paid to Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for telephone and telegraph service; $4.25 paid to taxicab drivers and $31.25 to various restaurants. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Firm retained as Washington counsel to prepare and present to congressional committee legal aspects of tax advantages enjoyed by cooperatives.

Calhoun, Leonard J., Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington 5, D. C.; National Rehabilitation Association, Inc. (1) $450 received by firm of Morgan & Calhoun from National Rehabilitation Association for all services as Washington counsel for the association. (2) No expenditures. (3) None. (4) None. (5) No particular legislation. The association is interested in any legislation affecting the vocational rehabilitation program.

Carter, Albert E., 1026 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.; Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Received $3,000 as compensation; reimbursed $365.01 for expenses advanced. Expended $656.55 which will be reimbursed as follows: Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $35.80; Munsey Real Estate Co., $350; travel expense, $250; Western

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Union, $9.35; incidentals, $11.40. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.; Munsey Real Estate Co.; Western Union Telegraph Co.; transportation and incidentals. (3) Telephone service, rent, telegraph service, transportation, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Retained to represent the company before administrative agencies and commissions and on legislative matters affecting company's interest.

Carter, Asa L., 325 Ashland Avenue, Pittsburgh 16, Pa. (1) I received and expended only $121.87; costs and disbursements herein divided: Petty cash, clerical work, searching records, addressing mail, etc., $55.20, and for postage, printing, telephoning, carfare, etc., $66.67. (2) It was paid to postmasters, printers, public-service companies, and standard clerical help at Pittsburgh, Pa. (3) For the purpose of furthering sentiment for a "Rainhill prize" for the best B-line electric pipe train locomotive for major heavy freight, maximum ton-miles and minimum time and space for passageway, rolling stock, labor per ton-mile, etc. (ocean power costs). (4) I publish nowhere except by first-class mail direct to abutters and contributors. (5) Everything for or against B-line.

Carver, Leslie O., National Paint, Varnish, and Lacquer Association, Inc., 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) No money received except regular salary as shown in registration form. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) During quarter closed merely wrote three letters to Members of Congress, all in relation to labor legislation pending in the Legislature of Alabama.

Case, Ralph H., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Quinaielt Tribe of Indians of Taholah, Wash., Taholah, Wash. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Case, Ralph H., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Three Affiliated Tribes, Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., Elbowoods, N. Dak. (1) Compensation as general counsel for above client, third quarter 1947, $1,000. Reimbursement of expense in part, $88.70. (2) Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., Northern Pacific Railroad Co., and Pullman Co., $142.44; A. Norton, stenographer, $75; subsistence while traveling, $52.55; sundries, $33.51; total, $303.50. (3) Purpose stated above. Conference with clients at Elbowoods, N. Dak. (4) None. (5) Negotiation of contract under act of July 31, 1947, making appropriations for civil functions, War Department.

Casey, D. E., 339 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C.; American Taxpayers' Association, Inc. (1) Received as salary $2,649.99. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None specified.

Cates, Lawrence, 1185 National Press Building, Washington 4, D. C.; Air Line Pilots Association, 3145 West Sixty-third Street, Chicago 29, Ill. (1) Net salary, $1,469.78; incidental expenses, $47.10. (2) Telegraph company, telephone company, taxi fares. (3) Telegrams, telephone calls, and taxicabs. (4) Air Line Pilot. (5) Aviation and labor legislation.

Chace, W. E., the National Fertilizer Association, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $2,375 salary applied to personal uses; none to lobbying activities. Reimbursed by the National Fertilizer Association for out-of-pocket expenses for cab fares, phone calls, and totaling approximately $20. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any specified legislation. During preceding quarter worked in general on public relations as to several matters affecting agriculture.

Chamblin, Walter, Jr., 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (the National Association of Manufacturers). (3) Receipts: Salary, $6,250; expenses in Washington reimbursed by employer, $937.19; expenditures in Washington, $937.19. (2) Expenses paid hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone company, trade associations, and clubs. (3) Attending meetings and making speeches to discuss general conditions in Washington of interest to business and industry in particular. (4) [Blank.] (5) Bills affecting national labor policy, tax laws, reduction of Federal expenditures, control of atomic energy, Federal subsidization of research, patents, and trade-marks, wartime control powers, and revision of the SEC and RFC Acts.

Chandler, E. L., 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., room 703; American Society of Civil Engineers, 33 West Thirty-ninth Street, New York 18, N. Y. (1) From American Society of Civil Engineers, $20. (2) Taxicabs, postage. (3) Taxicab fare, $15; postage, $5. (4) None. (5) International interchange of information and education, advance planning of public works, stream-pollution control, national science foundation.

Clements, J. C., Carroll Arms Hotel, Washington, D. C., National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $2,499.99 for calendar quarter. (2) No payment to anyone. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Postal rate legislation.

Clott, Herman, 930 F Street NW., room 521, Washington, D. C., International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, CIO, 222 West Adams Street, suite 1299, Chicago 6, Ill. (1) Salary, $1,081; taxi fares, $25; most activity during this quarter not on lobbying. (2) Herman Clott. (3) Paid as salary and taxi expenses around Washington. (4) The Union, official organ of the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, CIO. (5) Support all legislation in favor of membership of above-mentioned union and to oppose all legislation detrimental to said membership and to the welfare of the American people.

Cohn, Marcus, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C.; American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York 16, N. Y. (1) During a typical month, the registrant devotes a maximum of 5 percent of his time to matters which may possibly be regarded as embraced in section 308 (a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. The figures set forth here for the months of July, August, and September 1947 are based upon that percentage: salary, $93.75 travel, 60 cents; telephone, $11.28; office and miscellaneous expenses, $66. (2) Marcus Cohn. (3) See (1) above. (4) I have supplied information to the general press on immigration and other matters in which the American Jewish Committee is interested. (5) No specific legislation with the exception of immigration. See original registration statement and (1).

Colborn, Miss Fern M., Division of Social Education and Action, Board of Christian Education, Presbyterian Church, United States of America, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia 7, Pa. (1) Personal expenses refunded, i. e., $29.71 (travel, $20.76; food, $8.95); salary, $300 quarterly. (2) [Blank.] (3) Lobbying in the interest of social legislation on which the Presbyterian General Assembly has taken action. (4) Social Progress magazine and special bulletins. (5) Same as (3).

Colgan, Howard O., Jr., 15 Broad Street, New York 5, N. Y.; New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York 5, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) See answers to (1) and (2). (4) None. (5) Proposed Federal-tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

Collett, F. G., Box 1476, Main Post Office, Washington, D. C.; Indians of California, Inc., 2619 Regent Street, Berkeley, Calif. (1) The required report of money received is attached hereto.[2] (2) To various persons and concerns for miscellaneous services, such as stenographic typing, and mimeographing services, stationery and supplies, rooms and meals, telephone and telegraph services, postage, transportation, printing and photostating, etc. (See attached report of expenditures.[2]) (3) To secure remedial legislation. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to the Indians of California.

Coman, Ellis S., Agricultural Producers Labor Committee, 701 Architects Building, Los Angeles 13, Calif. (1) Regular salary of $700 per month as manager of Agricultural Producers Labor Committee; in addition, actual traveling and living expenses while in Washington, D. C. (and traveling), 17 days during past quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Passage of housing legislation (H. R. 4254).

Compton, R. T., 623 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (National Association of Manufacturers). (1) Receipts: Salary, $3,750; expenses reimbursed by employer, $667.63. Expenditures: $667.63. (2) Expenses paid to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone company. (3) For expenses incurred in course of business, such as travel, meals, and hotel accommodations and expenses of conducting conferences for discussion of business matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting industry, such as legislation relating to national labor policy, taxation, public expenditures, industrial controls, social security, research, patents, and investments.

Comstock, Boyd, legislative assistant, legislative Federal relations division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street N. W., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary: $1,175, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities. Estimated for legislative service, $235. Expenses. (2) Self (salary). Expenses: Hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Conn, Donald D., Transportation Association of America, 105 West Adams Street, Chicago 3, Ill. (1) See detailed statement attached.[2] (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Connaughton, John H., 316 Metropolitan Bank Building; Mrs. Cecil N. Broy, 524 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va. (1) None received during this quarter and no further payment due. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation providing for payment of claims against Germany out of German assets.

Connett, William C., IV, 1630 Boatmen's Bank Building, St. Louis 2, Mo.; American Crossarm & Conduit Co., 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) No moneys received this quarter. (2) Expenses of notary fees, $2; long-distance phone call, $6.56. (3) For ascertaining information with relation to proposed settlement. (4) None. (5) To support H. R. 2422.

Conover, Julian D., American Mining Congress, 1102 Ring Building, Washington 6, D. C. (1) Received no compensation other than regular salary as previously stated; expended, $7.30. (2) Sundry payees. (3) Taxicab fares, $2.40; telephone, $4.90. (4) Am editorial director of Mining Congress Journal, a monthly magazine for the mining industry. (5) Measures affecting the mining industry.

Conroy, Eugene J., the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (1) None. No activities during this quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Cooley Thomas M. II, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2)

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Cooperstock, John, 30 Bellingham Avenue, Revere, Mass.; Veterans Association of Federal Employees in Navy Yard, New York; Lenruth Hall, Waverly and Myrtle Avenues, Brooklyn, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

Corbett, John T., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 4, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1118 Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $200.01 for office rental; $2,722.22 as wages. (2) $200.01 to "Labor" for office rental in Labor Building. (3) As assistant grand chief engineer and national legislative representative, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, covering all services rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislation and legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor generally, employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act, and particularly the interests of various classes and crafts of railway employees represented by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

Corlett,[6] Spencer D., 400 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland 14, Ohio (Cleveland Chamber of Commerce). (1) No money received or expended by me during the first calendar quarter 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) The Clevelander published by the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce and Members' Bulletins published by same. (5) None.

Corlett,[4] Spencer D., 400 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland 14, Ohio (Cleveland Chamber of Commerce). (1) No money received or expended by me during the second calendar quarter 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) The Clevelander published by the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce and members' bulletins published by same. (5) None.

Courtney, Paul Lawrence, 233 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago 4, Ill. (1) None, except reimbursement for actual outlays. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any legislation that supports the principle of tax equality.

Covington, J. Harry, III, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C., Aluminum Research Institute. (1) Received $2,543.04 as payment of legal fees to law firm and reimbursement for disbursements; expended in connection with all matters for client, $7.79. (2) Taxicab drivers, $3.60; telegraph company, $4.19. (3) Telegrams and transportation within the District of Columbia. (4) None. (5) Legislation to secure continuation of duty free status on nonferrous scrap.

Covington, J. Harry, III, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (American Smelting & Refining Co.). (1) Received, none; expended in connection with all matters for client, $34.12. (2) Taxicab drivers, $2.50; telephone company, $29.70; Western Union Telegraph Co., $1.92. (3) Long distance telephone calls, telegrams, and transportation in the District of Columbia. (4) None. (5) Appropriation for continuation of drainage tunnel by Bureau of Mines at Leadville, Colo.

Cowling, W. C., National St. Lawrence Association, 1728 Buhl Building, Detroit 26, Mich. (1) $1,615.30, gross back wages due previous to October 1946; $169, expenses; $1,784.50, total. (2) Expenses, $169; train fare to and from Washington, hotel expenses, meals, taxis. (3) Consulting with officials of the National St. Lawrence Association on seaway program. (4) None. (5) St. Lawrence seaway legislation.

Crampton, C. J., attorney, 700 Insurance Building, San Antonio 5, Tex.; State Rights Association, Post Office Box 2371, Houston, Tex. (1) Statement attached.[2] (2) Statement attached.[2] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Statement attached.[2]

Crawford, James M., Indemnity Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia 1, Pa. (1) Deponent has neither received nor expended any money for attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress. He has merely been reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses in traveling to and from the District of Columbia. (2) No payments have been made except, as stated, for deponent's own transportation and subsistence. (3) As stated in (2). (4) None. (5) That relative to the regulation of insurance rates in the District of Columbia.

Crowley, Leo J., Colorado Railroad Association, Equitable Building, Denver, Colo. (1) Received attorney fees of $1,150 for period from July 1 to September 30, 1947, only part of which had to do with Federal legislation; $514 was expended by me during this period as expense money; this amount was expended for pullman fares, air-line transportation, hotel expenses, dining-car meals, restaurants, taxicabs, and other incidentals. (2) Various restaurants, Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., United Air Lines, Pullman Co., railroad companies, taxicab drivers. (3) $514 was expended by me during the period of this report for hotel expenses, meals in restaurants and dining cars, air-line ticket, pullman fares, taxicabs, tips, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting all railroads operating in and having trackage in the State of Colorado as set forth on registration Form B, heretofore filed.

Cruse, Donald, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.; the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J. (1) None; no activities during this quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Cuneo, John C., Post Office Box 1054, Modesto, Calif.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6275 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Received from Townsend National Recovery Plan, $2,058.43 less $334.50 deductions, $1,723.93; received, reimbursement for State council expenses, $37.54; received, reimbursement for telephone call, $4.13; donations to cover holding of conference, delegates, etc., Los Angeles, $105; total, $1,870.60; less salary drawn by John C. Cuneo, $780; balance available for office operations for State, $1,090.60. (2) See schedule attached[2] for total disbursements of $1,636.74. (3) See detail attached.[2] (4) None. (5) Support of the Townsend plan.

Curtiss, Ralph E., 1422 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C.; retained by Associated Tavern Owners of America, Inc., 215 Sixth Street, Racine, Wis. (1) Received, $319.88; expended, nothing. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) ATOA News (monthly publication of the association). (5) Any legislation affecting the tavern industry; i. e., House Joint Resolution 213, S. 265, H. R. 1269, H. R. 1270, H. R. 2570.

Daley, William L., 528 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Editorial Association, 222 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Compensation, $825; expenditures, $123.39. (2) Communication, transportation, and office-supply companies. (3) Telephone, telegraph services, office supplies. (4) Interpretative articles in official bulletins of national and State publishers' associations; also in trade publications of publishing industry. (5) Measures affecting the press.

Dameron, William V., grand lodge representative, International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington 1, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Danielian, N. R., National St. Lawrence Association, 1830 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,000 received from National St. Lawrence Association (retainer); $126.31 received as reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and incidental expenses; total, $2,126.31. (2) Railroads for fares, hotels, taxis. (3) Official travel for association. (4) [Blank.] (5) The principal purpose of engagement by the National St. Lawrence Association is to foster and increase trade for the products of manufacture, agriculture, natural resources, and any and all other forms of commerce between the ports of the Great Lakes, its tributaries, and waterways of the United States and Canada relating to the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin for the development of navigation and power.

Daugherty, Paul J., 820 Huntington Bank Building, 17 South High Street, Columbus 15, Ohio; Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Columbus 15, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) Actual and necessary traveling expenses on employer's business. (4) None. (5) Legislation dealing with taxation, social security, labor relations, and other matters of interest to our organization.

Davidson, John B., Michigan Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 902 Olds Tower Building, Lansing 8, Mich. (1) No money received or expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) None.

D'Avila, Sarah H., National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax, 127 B Street SE., Washington 3, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation to abolish the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in Federal elections.

Davis, John H., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Salary for July, August, and September 1947, $2,748 (before withholding taxes were deducted). Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Washington Situation, a weekly mimeographed news letter of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Dawson, Clarence E., 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C.; New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York 5, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) See answers to (1) and (2). (4) None. (5) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

Denning, William I., 1518 K Street NW., Washington 5, D. C.; National Publishers Association, Inc., 232 Madison Avenue, New York 16, N. Y. (1) $2,850 was received as retainer for services rendered plus $167.12 for personal expenses in connection with work for the association (National Publishers Association, 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (2) William I. Denning, 1518 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) For general legal representation in Washington, D. C. (4) None. (5) Not called upon during the quarter in connection with any legislation.

Dickerman, John M., National Association of Home Builders, Suite 1116, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,499.96; expenses, $66.68. The salary and expenses listed are charged against that portion of the association's budget allocated to the legislative department, of which I am in charge, which allocation is $18,000 for 1947. Only some of the functions of this department might be deemed as coming within the purview of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. (2) Paid out in cash to taxis, restaurants, telephone companies. (3) Transportation, phone calls, lunches. (4) News releases are sent to the Associated Press, International News Service, United Press, and other national newspaper wire services by the association for publication in subscriber papers and magazines, some of which releases may contain material deemed to affect legislation directly or indirectly. Neither the association nor I have any means of ascertain-

[4] Filed for second quarter.
[6] Filed for first quarter.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

ing a complete list of the publications utilizing such releases. (5) [Blank.]

Dickinson, A. W., American Mining Congress, 1102 Ring Building, Washington 2, D. C. (1) Received no compensation other than regular salary as previously reported; expended, $7.10. (2) Sundry payees. (3) Taxicab fares, $2.10; luncheon July 10, $5. (4) An associate editor of Mining Congress Journal, a monthly magazine for the mining industry. (5) Measures affecting the mining industry.

Disbrow, Walter L., Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F. Street NW., Room 314, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Salary, July, August, and September 1947, $1,018.20. (2) Walter L. Disbrow. (3) To represent members of the Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government on legislation affecting their welfare. (4) Quarterly Retirement News Bulletin. (5) Any and all legislation affecting the civil-service retirement laws.

Disney, Wesley E., 434 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (Independent Natural Gas Association of America et al). (1) For the quarter ending September 30, 1947, my total compensation for all services, including work related to legislation, was $10,600. This amount is reported for the reason that it is impossible to determine from the language of Public Law 601 what part, if any, of this compensation is in consideration of services within the scope of the Regulation of Lobbying Act. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Amendments to Natural Gas Act; percentage depletion, tax relief.

Dixon,[3] Karl S., United States Business Organizations, Inc., Bowen Building, 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $3,000 as straight quarterly salary; other sums expended, which have anything whatsoever to do with lobbying, are listed on an attached sheet [2] which is a part of this report. (2) The attached information sheet [2] gives the detail required. (3) These expenditures all represent telephone charges, telegrams, taxicabs, the firm of counselors, travel and hotels, postage, trade secretary luncheons, letters, pamphlets, etc. (4) Only publication is a leaflet entitled "How Cooperatives Escape Income Tax." (5) Equality of taxes between private enterprise and cooperatives, tax reduction, public expenditures, Government corporations, labor relations, social security.

Doage, Homer, 1244 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City. (1) $600 salary and $225 expense allowance. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., the postmaster, the Superintendent of Documents, and others. (3) Telephone service, postage, Government publications, rent, and minor office expenses. (4) None. (5) None.

Dougherty, John E., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington 5, D. C. (the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.) (1) Salary: $587.50 in July and August and $619.36 in September, which is paid for all the services rendered to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., only a part of which have to do with legislation; $48.69 was expended by me as expense money, during the third quarter of 1947, for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals; in addition to this amount I also received $254.51 for expense incurred in connection with other duties for the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., which have no relation to the purposes covered by this act. (2) Various transportation companies, restaurants, garages, communication companies, etc. (3) $48.69 was expended by me as expense money, during the third quarter of 1947, for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Dryden, Mrs. Mildred L., Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for this quarter, as heretofore reported on Form B, expenses, $11. (2) Taxicab fare, $11, from office to Capitol and return. (3) Visiting House and Senate offices. (4) [Blank.] (5) Am interested in amendments to Natural Gas Act.

DuBois, Ben, secretary of the Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn. (1) Salary as secretary of the Independent Bankers Association was raised from $5,000 to $6,500 a year, the change of salary starting as of June 1. Money received from the association and spent on a trip to Washington, D. C., starting July 12 and ending July 28, $392.68. (2) Air transportation, $103.38; the Willard Hotel, Washington, $83.35; railway transportation, $5.28; Curtiss Hotel, Minneapolis, $7; incidentals, sustenance, cab, tips, etc., $193.67. (3) [Blank.] (4) The association uses circular letters to express its views on legislation. (5) Legislation affecting banking.

Dudley,[3] Harold and Ruth, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $300 a month for July, August, and September; total of $152.71 for traveling expenses. (2) Harold and Ruth Dudley, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) For representing the interests of the American Council of Commercial Laboratories before Government agencies. (4) Article in New York Times on the tax status of nonprofit institutions. (5) Revision of internal-revenue form 990.

Dunbar, Charles E., Jr., care of Phelps, Dunbar, Marks & Claverie, United Fruit Building, New Orleans, La.; Louisiana Community Property Taxpayers Committee. (1) Retainer fees, as attorney, $3,000; received as reimbursement for traveling expenses to Washington, stenographic expenses, and postage, $548.33, itemized in attached statement.[3] (2) Self. (3) Retainer for July, August, and September 1947. See explanatory statement attached to Form A filed March 6, 1947, and supplemental statement filed July 14, 1947. (4) None. (5) See explanatory statement attached to Form A filed March 6, 1947, supplemental statement attached hereto, and supplemental statement filed July 14, 1947.

Dwyer, Joseph L., 1625 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.; American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York 20, N. Y. (1) Salary, previously reported; expenses reimbursed by employer, $964.26. (2) Various railroads, hotels, restaurants, grocery stores, taxicabs, telephone companies, Government Printing Office, Hickey Bros. (3) Administrative, traveling, and incidental expenses, newspapers, periodicals, cigars, cigarettes, etc., meals and entertainment. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting petroleum or its products or natural gas.

Dyer, G. W.,[4] Stahlman Building, Nashville 3, Tenn. (Southern States Industrial Council). (1) $450 salary, economic adviser, Southern States Industrial Council. (2) None. (3) None. (4) News bulletin, Southern States Industrial Council (editorials). (5) [Blank.]

Dyer, G. W.,[5] Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville 3, Tenn. (1) $450 salary, economic adviser, Southern States Industrial Council. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Editorials, news bulletins, Southern States Industrial Council. (5) Generally, that affecting industry.

Echols, Oliver P., Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Nothing received except salary, no part of which was paid for activities covered by Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress; no expenditures. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

Edelman, John W., 1031 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.; Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, 15 Union Square, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,300; $496.02 to reimburse actual expenses incurred; $48.75 of this amount for expenses incurred in Washington, remainder for expenses outside of Washington. (2) Railroads, hotels, restaurants, cab drivers, bus companies, air lines. (3) Personal expense and travel. (4) Textile Labor, CIO News, Labor Press Associates. (5) Support legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Elliott, John Doyle, 333 East Genesee Street, Syracuse, N. Y.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Income based upon 25 percent commission of total income from New York State of Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc.; total for third 1947 quarter, net, $895.02; donations from Townsend clubs for office overhead, $85; subrenting of office, $72; expenses: $948.35, total $1,032.02. (2) Various. (3) For rent and maintenance of office at 333 East Genesee Street, Syracuse, N. Y. For traveling and communication expenses to contact Townsend Clubs, other organizations, and citizens. (4) None. (5) H. R. 16, Eightieth Congress First Session, generally known as the Townsend Plan.

Ellison, Newell W., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington 5, D. C.; Arabian American Oil Co., 200 Bush Street, San Francisco 4, Calif. (1) None received and none expended during previous quarter, except incidental expenses for long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, and for taxis. (2) Telephone companies, telegraph companies, and taxicabs. (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Proposal to amend provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to United States corporations doing business abroad.

Ely, Northcutt, 730 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C.; legal representative of Colorado River Board of California and Six Agency Committee, 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) $12,925.87, of which $1,105.87 represents reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses and $11,820 represents legal fees for services of this office and in California in legislation and litigation affecting California interests in the Colorado River. Of this figure, $3,600 was paid by the Colorado River Board and $8,220 by the Six Agency Committee, and of the total, $8,540 represents payment for services rendered during the first and second quarters of 1947. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telephone and telegraph companies, suppliers of office materials; approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Conferences and reports to clients on H. R. 1349, 1597, 1598, 1615, 1772, 1848, 1886, 1977, 2001, 2583, 2873, 2874, 3123; S. 432, 433, 483, 539, 693, 912, 972, 1175; House Joint Resolution 226, Senate Joint Resolution 145, and related bills.

Ely, Northcutt, 730 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C.; attorney for department of water and power of the city of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) $2,400, representing legal fees, etc., for services of this office and in California in connection with power and water contracts, conferences with Government departments, and legislative matters incidental thereto; part of this amount represents payment for services rendered for periods prior to April 1, 1947. (2)

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[3] Filed with the Clerk only.
[4] Filed for second quarter.
[5] Filed for third quarter.
[7] Filed with the Secretary only.

Office staff, building owner for rent, telephone and telegraph companies, suppliers of office materials; approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Conferences and reports to clients on H. R. 83, 727, 728, 1833, 1886, 1977, 2583, 2673, 3574, 3036, 3123, 3562; S. 36, 37, 39, 433, 539, 554.

Ely, Northcutt, 730 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C.; attorney for Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif. (1) $2,100, representing legal fees, etc., for services of this office and in California in negotiations with other water and power users, the Government departments, litigation, and legislative matters relating thereto; part of this amount represents payment for services rendered for periods prior to July 1, 1947. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telegraph and telephone companies, suppliers of office materials; approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Conferences and reports to clients on H. R. 1615, 1848, 2001, 3123; S. 483, 693, 912.

Ely, Northcutt, 730 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C., attorney for Salt River Valley Water Users' Association, Phoenix, Ariz. (1) $2,200, of which $100 represents reimbursement of travel expenses, and $2,100 represents legal fees for services in connection with power contracts, tax matters and departmental business, and such incidental legislative questions as arose in connection therewith. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telephone and telegraph companies, suppliers of office materials; approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Conferences and reports to client on H. R. 3123, H. R. 1886, and related bills; S. 539.

Ely, Northcutt, 730 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C., attorney for Water Project Authority of the State of California, Public Works Building, Sacramento, Calif. (1) $1,500, the entire amount of which represents legal fees for services of this office and in California in connection with Central Valley power and water questions, and legislative matters incidental thereto; part of this amount represents payment for services rendered prior to July 1, 1947. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telephone and telegraph companies, suppliers of office materials; approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Conferences and reports to clients on H. R. 655, 656, 2052, 2334, 3123, 3143; Senate Resolution 21; S. 66, 912, 972.

Ervin, S. J., Jr., Ervin Building, Morganton, N. C.; Southern Railway System, Washington, D. C. (1) I have received a refund from the Southern Railway system of $48.46 of my own moneys which I expended for personal expenses while in Washington, D. C., during 8 days of June 1947 in connection with my work. This sum is the total of the unrefunded expenses reported by me in my statement of July 9, 1947. I received a refund of the same about September 30, 1947. For statement about my salary as trial counsel for the Southern Railway system in certain counties of North Carolina, see the reverse of this page. (2) As reported by me in my statement of July 9, 1947, the $48.46 mentioned above was spent by me for the following purposes and paid to the following persons: $20.90 to the Raleigh Hotel, Washington, D. C., for lodgings and telephone charges; $8.06 to Southern Railway Co. for Pullman berths between Morganton, N. C., and Washington, D. C., and return; $12.50 for meals at various cafes in Washington, D. C.; $6 to taxicabs in Washington; and $1 in tips to redcaps at Union Station in Washington. (3) The said sum of $48.46 was paid out by me to the persons named above for the purposes specified above in June 1947 and was refunded to me by the Southern Railway Co. about September 30, 1947. (4) None. (5) Bill offered in the House of Representatives by Congressman JOHN J. JENNINGS, JR., to amend venue provisions of Federal Employers Liability Act, and bill offered by Senator REED in the Senate to exempt railroads from prosecution under antitrust laws upon agreements approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Fairbanks, Joseph, 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C.; Descendants of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence, Milton Addison Thomas, secretary-general, 212 West Highland Avenue, Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) None. (This applies to the period from April 1 to October 1, 1947.) (2) No payments. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2673, a bill to incorporate the Descendants of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence.

Farquharson, James A., care of Tom J. McGrath, 729 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $840 received for services. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Resolution relating to Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin waterway and power project; legislation dealing with amendments to Natural Gas Act.

Farrington, Charles J., National Coal Association, 804 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $3,057.33 salary and expenses. (2) Out-of-pocket expenses, lunch, taxi, postage, telephone, etc. (3) See above. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation of interest to coal industry.

Farshing, Donald D., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C.; Management Planning of Washington, Inc. (1) $1,300 gross salary received; $113.20 expenses. (2) Transportation, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Transportation and other out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Fenning, Karl, Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Ralph D. Pittman, Bowen Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $446.45; expended $133.36. (2) Railways, hotels, telephone, and stenographer. (3) Travel and party. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2860.

Ferguson, John A., Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 Eye Street NW. (1) Salary for this quarter as heretofore reported on Form B; $23.50 expenses. (2) Taxicab fare, $23.50 from office to Capitol and return. (3) For the purpose of visiting House and Senate committees and Members of Congress on legislative matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) Am interested in legislation proposing amendments to the Natural Gas Act.

Ferris, Muriel, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C. (League of Women Voters). (1) Received $172.92 salary every 2 weeks; received and expended carfare to and from Capitol and travel, $26.40. (2) None expended in carrying on work except for carfare and travel. (3) Carfare and travel only. (4) Trends in Government, Action—publications of the League of Women Voters, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C. (5) I am employed principally to inform league members on legislative matters; secondarily, to influence legislation; for legislation, see league program adopted by national convention, 1946, attached.[2]

Filer, Harry L., 71 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn. (Howard S. Palmer, James Lee Loomis, and Henry B. Sawyer, trustees, the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co.). (1) Salary, $5,300; and expenses, $148.50. (2) Hotels, restaurants, transportation companies, taxis, telephone, etc. (3) Expenses for traveling and as shown in item 2. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting employer.

Fillius, Maurice W., 703 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Puerto Rico Rum Institute, San Juan, P. R. (1) Received retaining fee as reported on Form B filed January 7, 1947; engaged in no activities and made no expenditures in quarter ending September 30, 1947, for the purpose of influencing legislation. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None during calendar quarter ending September 30, 1947.

Finkel, William H., the Employees Committee for Low Cost Retirement Benefits, 1186 Broadway, New York 1, N. Y. (1) Received $30 on August 27 from above committee as part payment of $128.40 expenses incurred July, August, and September, leaving a balance of $98.40 owed me by the committee plus a cash loan made to the committee ($100) on August 1. These amounts do not include a cash loan of $150 made to the committee on June 2 or $18.35 in expenses for June; the latter two items mentioned inasmuch as they were not previously reported. (2) Cash loans made to the Employees Committee for Low Cost Retirement Benefits and balance made account of miscellaneous expenses. (3) Cash loans were necessary to start the committee; balance for railroad fare, carfare, telephone, and other miscellaneous expenses. (4) None. (5) Crosser Act, passed into law July 31, 1946.

Finucane, James F., National Council for the Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received or expended for lobbying during this quarter. (2) No one. (3) Inactive during quarter. (4) World—An International Newspaper, not in his capacity as lobbyist, however, but rather in his alternative capacity as newspaper writer. (5) To oppose universal military training and similar militaristic legislation, which is presumed to be contrary to the peace and good order of nations.

Fisher, Lewis H., 1416 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C.; National Association of Retired Civil Employees, Washington, D. C., and Canal Construction Service Committee, Balboa Heights, C. Z. (1) Receipts from National Association of Retired Civil Employees, Washington, D. C., $300 (no receipts from the Canal Construction Service Committee). Expenditures, $163.14. (2) Various individuals and companies. (3) Eleven meals, $20.74; taxicabs, $3.40; postage, $7; telephone, $35; stationery, $12; office help, $85. (4) Annuitant. (5) Support of legislation in the interest of annuitants and potential annuitants.

Flinn, W. G., grand lodge representative, International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington 1, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Floyd, William M., Regular Veterans' Association, 1115 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Only salary received. See Form A for money received and expended by Regular Veterans' Association. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) The Regular, 1115 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (5) Legislation in behalf of veterans.

Ford, Mrs. J. A., 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C. (Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc.). (1) In carrying on his work. Average approximately $30 per week. (2) Hotels, meals, when away from my own home, and traveling expenses. (3) Above. (4) Townsend National Weekly. (5)

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's Office.

H. R. 16, H. R. 2476; S. 7, S. 1510. To provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability from whatever cause for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows and children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys.

Ford, Tirey L., Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Foreman, Clark, 127 B Street SE., Washington, D. C.; Southern Conference for Human Welfare. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Fort, J. Carter, Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No expenses were incurred or received and no other money received in addition to salary as shown on registration (Form B), filed December 27, 1946. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting railroad interests.

Franklin, L. S., National Tax-Relief Coalition, box 103, route 7, Greensboro, N. C. (1) $380 received during last quarter, July, August, September, 1947. (2) $375 paid to L. S. Franklin. (3) Salary as director of national tax-relief coalition. (4) None. (5) Tax reform.

Franzen, John T. D., Citizens' Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Fifty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. Employment terminated July 15, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Fredrickson, Fred J., Lafayette Hotel, Washington 6, D. C. (home address, Valley City, N. Dak.); North Dakota Resources Board, Fargo, N. Dak., and North Dakota State Water Commission, Bismarck, N. Dak. (1) Quarterly salary for July, August, and September, 1947, $1,250, and $920.37 reimbursement for expenses. Only a small part of those items were for legislative work, the greater portion thereof being for nonlegislative work. (2) Lafayette Hotel, Washington, and several other hotels in other cities; various eating establishments in many cities; railroad, air-line, telephone, and telegraph companies; taxicabs; mimeographers, office suppliers, post offices. Only a small part thereof was paid out for legislative work. (3) Lodging and office space, meals, communications, transportation, mimeographing, office supplies, and postage. (4) None. (5) Various bills affecting irrigation, reclamation, water conservation, flood control, and development of water, land, and other natural resources in North Dakota, among them H. R. 1886, 2873, 2453, 3123, 4002, 4347.

Fuller, George M., National Lumber Manufacturers' Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) July, $304.70; August, $253.16; September, $100.05. (2) Miscellaneous. (3) Taxis and entertainment. (4) None. (5) Oppose any legislation inimical to the interests of the lumber industry and support any legislation which would be helpful to it.

Gannon, Peter J., American Shore and Beach Preservation Association, 1060 Broad Street, Newark 2, N. J. (1) The registrant received $150 for traveling expenses in connection with an endeavor to secure more members. (2) Traveling, hotel expenses, etc. (3) Explained under (1). (4) Official publication Shore and Beach. (5) Coastal preservation.

Gardiner, Elizabeth G., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. Employment terminated July 31, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Displaced Persons in 1947, article appeared in Living Church, March 1947, and in Methodist Woman, May 1947. (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admission Act.

Geary, Paul M., National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) None. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation under consideration.

Geaslin, Bon, 1740 G Street NW, Washington, D. C.; Waterman Steamship Corp., Merchants National Bank Building, Mobile, Ala. (1) $625. (2) Marshall F. Bannell. (3) Press relations and publicity services. (4) None. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation, but as an incident to my position as general counsel of Waterman Steamship Corporation, we are interested in all legislation affecting the merchant marine and civil aeronautics.

Gebhard, Mrs. Paul, 1751 North Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Division of Social Education and Action, Board of Christian Education, Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Personal expenses refunded, i. e., travel, $156.61; lodging and food, $95.54; total, $252.15. (2) [Blank.] (3) Lobbying in the interest of social legislation on which the Presbyterian General Assembly has taken action. (4) Social Progress Magazine; special bulletins. (5) Same as No. 3.

George, Leo E., National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.; (1) Salary: July, August, and September 1947. $2,499.99; travel and organization expenses not connected with the enactment of legislation, $335.96. (2) The travel and organization expenses referred to in (1) above were a reimbursement for actual expenses for transportation, hotels, meals, and incidental minor expenses. (3) See above. (4) The Union Postal Clerk, The Federation News Service Bulletin, The Federation Press Service. (5) Support of measures designed to improve the civil-service retirement system; improve and strengthen the civil service; improve the hours, wages, and conditions of post-office clerks and to improve the postal service.

Giddings, Ernest, assistant director, Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; (1) Salary: $1,300, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for service, $260; expenses. (2) Self (salary); expenses: hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash; NEA Journal (articles therein); informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Gilbert,[4] C. C., Stahlman Building, Nashville 3, Tenn.; (1) $1,500 as salary, secretary, Southern States Industrial Council. (2) None. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Gilbert,[5] C. C., Stahlman Building, Nashville 3, Tenn.; Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn. (1) $1,500 as salary, secretary, Southern States Industrial Council. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting industry in particular and all business in general.

Glazier, William, 521-930 F. Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. ((International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, CIO). (1) Gross salary, approximately $1,104; expenses in Washington, $195; all out-of-pocket expenses paid while traveling. (2) Expenses paid to taxicabs, phone calls, subscriptions to periodicals, etc. (3) See (2). (4) Dispatcher, publication of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's CIO; the Voice, publication of the National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards, CIO. (5) To support all legislation of interest to American workers and longshoremen, warehousemen and maritime workers specifically, oppose undemocratic legislation.

Gordon, Spencer, Union Trust Building, Washington 5, D. C.; American Institute of Accountants, 13 East Forty-first Street, New York 17, N. Y. (1) None received; $500 expended. (2) $500 to Gordon Rule. (3) Associate work. (4) The Journal of Accountancy and the Certified Public Accountant. (5) Opposing H. R. 2657.

Goss, Albert S., the National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) $1.875. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Goss,[4] Bert C., 211 National Press Building; Hill & Knowlton, Inc., Empire State Building, New York City. (1) Receive no salary or dividends directly for legislative work; receive salary and dividends as vice president and director of Hill & Knowlton, Inc. (2) Only expenditures were for cab fare and lunches, amounting to less than $100 for the quarter. (3) [Blank.] (4) Supervised issuance of press releases, but did not "cause" any articles to be published. (5) Interests of various clients of Hill & Knowlton.

Goss, Bert C.,[5] 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Hill & Knowlton, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary and dividends as officer of Hill & Knowlton. (2) No payments; expenses (cab, wires, lunches) on matters affecting legislation less than $100 for the quarter. (3) [Blank.] (4) Supervised issuance of releases, but unaware of exact extent of usage. (5) Interests of various clients of Hill & Knowlton.

Gourley, Lawrence L., 902 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (retainer) American Osteopathic Association, 139 North Clark Street, Chicago 2, Ill. (1) Retainer, $3,000. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Bills affecting the public health.

Greene, Ernest W., 731 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association). (1) None. (2) To one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any legislation but during the third quarter I supported H. R. 4075.

Greenstreet, M. F.,[5] home at 1917 Claremont Avenue, Independence, Mo.; no one, no salary; final report, am turning over to Economic Democracy, Box 835, Detroit 31, Mich., who is exempt being a paper. (1) July, August, September, postage, $10.85; stationery, envelopes, and mimeographing, $8.25; literature bought, total, $14.14; paid Economic Democracy, $6.30; still owe, $3; miscellaneous green ink and stickers, $1.40; total expenses, $34.65.[5] (2) Stamped envelopes, stamps, cards at post office; mimeographing at Lowellty Mimeo Service, Lowell, Mass.; peace literature at the Friends Service Committee (Quakers), Philadelphia; money papers, Craryville, N. Y. (3) Mimeographed circular letters, plus Economic Democracy, plus circulars on money reform, peace, pensions, and such like; am signing off and quitting future work with those who are exempt from Lobby Act. (4) Future articles, if any, may be with Show Window, Detroit 3, Mich., 511 West State Fair Avenue if and when printed; may mail to lumber yards merely as a mailer. (5) Not paid, no salary; $6.80 came in for to pay for subscriptions and stickers; I am in favor of interest-free money and pensions; expenses,

[4] Filed for second quarter.
[5] Filed for third quarter.

[4] Filed for second quarter.
[5] Filed for third quarter.
[5] Not registered as a lobbyist.

$34.65; income, $8.80; loss, $25.85; I have no more monetary club.

Greenway, J. Cole, 30 Vesey Street, New York 7, N. Y. (New York State Conference in Opposition to the St. Lawrence Project). (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) No expenses incurred in connection with work done for New York State Conference in Opposition to the St. Lawrence Project.

Greenwood, Joseph R., room 1102, 1029 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Grimes, Weston B., 433 Bowen Building, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C.; Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis 15, Minn. (1) Received (includes office and general expenses totaling $1,028.57), $4,353.56; expended (for purposes designated in the Lobbying Act), $5. (2) Taxicabs, $5. (3) Taxicabs to and from Capitol, $5. (4) None. (5) Export-import control laws, tax laws.

Grinberg,[1] P. Irving, Jewelers Vigilance Committee, Inc., 17 West Forty-fifth Street, New York 19, N. Y. (1) Jewelers Vigilance Committee, Inc.—expenses, $60. (2) Pennsylvania Railroad (stubs attached), $24.36; sundry—telephones, telegrams, taxi, etc.,—$14.64; hotel room and meals, $21; total, $60. (3) [Blank.] (4) National Jeweler, Jewelers' Circular-Keystone, Jewelry, Jewelers' Outlook, Jewelers' Newsletter, Executive Jeweler, ANRJA Bulletin, NACJ Bulletin, Mid-Continent Jeweler, Northwestern Jeweler, Southern Jeweler, Pacific Goldsmith, Trader and Canadian Jeweler, Manufacturing Jeweler. (5) Interested in securing relief from excise taxes as applying to jewelry.

Haas, Frank E., Western Association of Railway Executives, 204 South Canal Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary as per registration, and hotel, traveling, and personal expenses in the total amount of $235.89. (2) To Raleigh Hotel, Washington, D. C.; to the Pullman Co., and to various restaurants, taxicab companies, and individuals. (3) Meals, $92.90; lodging, $58.50; Pullman expense, $18.11; taxicab and local transportation, $18.45; local and long-distance calls, telegraph, postage, and miscellaneous incidental expenses, $47.93. (4) None. (5) Legislation of mutual interest to western railroads and their employees.

Haas, Herbert A., the Employees Committee for Low Cost Retirement Benefits, 1186 Broadway, New York 1, N. Y. (1) Received $25 on August 27, 1947, from above-mentioned committee as part payment of $92.60 expenses incurred July, August, and September, leaving a balance of $67.60 owed me by the committee plus a $50 cash loan made to the committee on August 1. This does not include $54.20 expenses for June and a $150 cash loan made to the committee in June. The latter two are mentioned inasmuch as they were not previously reported. (2) Cash loans made to Employees Committee for Low Cost Retirement Benefits and balance made account of miscellaneous expenses. (3) Cash loans necessary to start committee, balance for railroad fare, carfare, telephone, and other miscellaneous expenses. (4) None. (5) Crosser Act, passed into law July 31, 1946.

Haas, John A., National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) [Blank.]

Haddock, Hoyt S., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (CIO Maritime Committee). (1) $1,560 in salary and $130 for expenses. Only one-tenth should be charged to legislative work, due to the adjournment of Congress. (2) Expenses paid to taxi companies, telephone companies, dispensers of periodicals. (3) Salary, taxicabs, telephone, periodicals, etc. (4) None. (5) Any legislation which affects members of member unions.

Hallbeck, E. C., National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, July, August, and September 1947, $1,666.65; legislative expenses, July, August, and September 1947, $650.81; travel and organization expenses not connected with the enactment of legislation, $527.15. (2) Incidental expenses, streetcar, taxi, etc., $57.80; transportation and expenses, Mrs. Herman H. Lowe, Nashville, Tenn., president, Woman's Auxiliary, NFPOC, $112.69; United Typewriter Co., 813 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., $1.62; Ransdell, Inc., 810 Rhode Island Avenue NE., Washington, D. C., $374.70; Government Employees Council, A. F. of L., 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., $104. (3) The travel and organization expenses referred to in (1) above are an actual reimbursement for transportation, meals, hotels, and incidental expenses; United Typewriter Co., supplies; Government Employees Council, A. F. of L., and Ransdell, Inc., printing. (4) The Federation News Service Bulletin, Federation Press Service, the Union Postal Clerk. (5) Support of measures designed to improve the civil-service retirement system; improve the hours, wages, and conditions of post-office clerks and improve the postal service; and to improve and strengthen the United States civil service.

Hamlet, Harry G., Retired Officers Association, Inc., 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C. (1) Received $600; no part of this sum was received specifically for the purpose of attempting to influence legislative action. Expended: Nothing. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) Retired Officers Association Bulletin. (5) Legislation affecting retired officers, warrant officers, and nurses of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

Hanscom, William A., 1118 Twenty-fifth Street NW., Washington 7, D. C.; Oil Workers International Union, CIO, 301 East Fifth Street, Fort Worth 2, Tex. (1) Received salary, $1,080; expenses, $300. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) Union News Service and the International Oil Worker. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to those objectives.

Harllee, Ella F., 1753 Lamont Street NW., Washington 10, D. C. (1) None. Representing Service Star Legion, Inc.; $10, this did not cover necessary expenses. (2) (For Service Star Legion, Inc.) secretary, Service Star Legion through Mrs. R. O. Shay, 301 Indiana Avenue, St. Joseph, Mo. (3) By or according to appointment, given above. (4) Service Star Legion Magazine, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. (5) Education for equalization support, displaced persons' appeal, child-welfare support, public welfare.

Harper, Elsie Dorothy, National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York 22, N. Y. (1) Salary, $375; expenses, $269. (2) Elsie Dorothy Harper. (3) Presenting to the President, the Cabinet, and both Houses of Congress (a) the opinion on subjects related to (5) below, of the convention of the Young Women's Christian Associations held triennially and (b) the opinion of the national board of the Young Women's Christian Associations in line with actions taken by the convention. (4) None. (5) Legislation related to international security, social and economic justice, education, health, and civil liberties.

Harris, Mrs. Peggy, Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. Employment terminated July 31, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Harris, Winder R., room 203, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (Shipbuilders Council of America). (1) Received: Office expenses, $148.36; personal expenses, $94.90; total, $243.26. Expended: Office, $148.36; personal, $94.90; total, $243.26. (2) Various. (3) Various. (4) None. (5) Not employed for purpose indicated by question, but took incidental interest in subsection (2) of Senate amendment No. 36 to H. R. 3839.

Hart, Merwin K., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York 1, N. Y. (National Economic Council.) (1) Received from National Economic Council as salary: July 7, $200; July 14, $633.33; July 22, $400; August 9, $433.33; September 19, for disbursements, $255.50; total, $1,922.16. Disbursements: September 19, to Brooklyn Eagle Press for 10,000 copies of brief on labor legislation, $255.50. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) National Economic Council letter, published semimonthly; reprint of brief on labor legislation as Economic Council paper, volume IV, No. 4. (5) Labor legislation, bills to provide Federal aid to education, bills to permit increased immigration.

Harter, Dow W., 412–414 Washington Building, Washington 5, D. C., the B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio. (1) Receive annual retainer from the B. F. Goodrich Co. for all services as its Washington counsel. Allocation of amount paid for my services between legal and legislative activities is not feasible. Amount received during third quarter 1947, $1,875 (same amount received during each of first and second quarters 1947). In addition receive reimbursement for long-distance telephone, travel, taxicab fare, and out-of-pocket expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) The B. F. Goodrich Co. is interested in legislation relating to the maintenance of facilities for the production of an ample supply of synthetic rubber in the United States for commercial and national defense purposes. It has been interested in House Joint Resolution 77 and House Joint Resolution 118 and proposals now being studied for a long-range rubber program for this country.

Hawkins, Paul M., 1401 K Street NW., Washington 5, D. C.; American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York 19, N. Y. (1) Received $1,650 salary, only a small fraction of which was for lobbying activities; $260.97 expenses, only a small fraction of which was expended for lobbying activities. (2) Taxicabs, railroads, restaurants, hotels, air lines. (3) Transportation, meals, rooms. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the hotel industry.

Hayden, Harry Vere, Jr., 1608 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.; the American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) $233.34 salary semimonthly, less withholding and social-security taxes; $36.25 incidental expenses for months of July, August, and September, 1947; $101.78 reimbursement for traveling expenses during July, August, and September, 1947. (2) Harry Vere Hayden, Jr. (3) $101.78 reimbursement for traveling expenses, round trip to New York City, $36.25 incidental expenses for months of July, August, and September, 1947, taxi, carfare, phone calls, meals, (4) The American Legion Magazine, New York City; The National Legionnaire, Indianapolis, Ind. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense, Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children

[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations; the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

Hays, Joseph H., Western Association of Railway Executives, 204 South Canal Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary as per registration, and reimbursement by employer for expense incurred in total amount of $784.71. (2) To Mayflower and Shoreham Hotels, Washington, D. C., to Pullman Co., and to various restaurants, hotels, taxicab companies, to postage, and to various individuals in nominal amounts. (3) To Mayflower Hotel, including phone calls, meals, and miscellaneous charges, $232.95; to Shoreman Hotel, $171.41; to various restaurants for meals, $219.53; to Pullman Co. $6.49; to various taxicabs, busses, etc., for local transportation, $40.50; to postage, stationery and supplies, $48.03; to miscellaneous, including stenographic services, telephone calls, etc., $65.80. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting railroads in western district.

Hazen, John C., 1008 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C.; National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York 1, N. Y. (1) Meals, $112.05; hotel, $20.34; taxis, $34.05; miscellaneous, $9. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 1111.

Heberton, K. W., 1405 G Street NW., Washington 5, D. C.; Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York 13, N. Y. (1) Salary of $800 per month, which is paid for all services rendered, only a part of which concerns legislation. Out-of-pocket travel and incidental expenses, $101.40. (2) Taxi drivers and restaurants. (3) Transportation and luncheons. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the interests of the Western Union Telegraph Co.

Hecht, George J., 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York 17, N. Y.; American Parents Committee, 300 B Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $98.86 for traveling expenses, telephone calls, etc., from New York to Washington; expended $98.86. (2) Pennsylvania Railroad for railroad fare, also various hotels, etc. (3) Railroad fare, hotel accommodations, miscellaneous expenses. (4) The Parents' Magazine and School Management. (5) National School Health Services Act (H. R. 1980).

Heckendorn, William, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Salary for July, August, and September, 1947, $1,875 (before withholding taxes were deducted). Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Heiney, Robert B., National Canners Association, 1739 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) One thousand six hundred and twenty-five dollars as one-quarter year's salary as assistant to secretary of association for all work performed; less than one-third of time is spent on following legislative matters; $39.76 has been received as reimbursement for expenses incurred. (2) Taxi fares and miscellaneous expenses, $39.76. (3) See above. (4) National Canners Information Letter. (5) Routine following through CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and newspapers, and otherwise keeping informed on legislation affecting the canning industry.

Henderson, Elmer W., National Council for a Permanent FEPC, 930 F Street NW., room 901, Washington, D. C. (1) Travel, maintenance, and telephone calls, July 1 to September 30, 1947, $532.31; salary, July 1, to September 30, 1947 (after tax deductions), $1,156.20. (2) [Blank.] (3) Travel, maintenance, and telephone calls, July 1 to September 30, 1947, $532.31; salary after tax deductions, $1,156.20. (4) [Blank.] (5) Permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission, S. 984 and H. R. 2824.

Henderson, Joseph D.,[4] American Association of Small Business, 602 Carondelet Building, New Orleans 12, La. (1) Salary of $6,000 per year; this quarter, $1,500. (2) No expenses paid. (3) No expenses paid. (4) Official monthly publication of the American Association of Small Business, called the Defender, distributed to members only; name of publication changed effective with July 1947 issue to Small Business Review. (5) Any legislation for the good of the people, especially that favorable to small business; legislation detrimental to the people and small business in general is to be opposed.

Henderson, Joseph D.,[5] American Association of Small Business, 602 Carondelet Building, New Orleans, La. (1) Salary of $1,500 (based on $6,000 per year) received this quarter from the American Association of Small Business; no money expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Small Business Review, official monthly publication of the American Association of Small Business; routine news releases to newspapers and radio stations. (5) To support legislation favorable to small business; to oppose legislation unfavorable to small business, standing always for that which is right for the country and the will of the majority.

Hensel, Eugene L., 8 East Long Street, Columbus 15, Ohio (general law practice); National Association of Cooperatives, 407 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Per diem and expense reimbursement, as follows: July: per diem, $550; expense reimbursed $179.32. August: per diem, $1,600; expense reimbursed, $84.32. September: per diem, $350; expense reimbursed, $164.59. (2) Various persons. (3) In the partial maintenance of a general law office, and no segregation of fees received from any specific client or general office expenses. (4) Mimeographs distributed and prepared by the National Association of Cooperatives, of 407 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (5) Equitable treatment of cooperatives in the application of Federal income-tax laws or amendments thereto.

Hensel, Robert E., Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York 4, N. Y. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of the above address, of which registrant is an associate, expended $3.23 in connection with the proposed legislation described in item (5) hereof, for which it was or will be reimbursed by the American Tobacco Co. (2) New York Telephone Co., $2.38; United States Post Office Department, $0.35; public taxi, $0.50; total, $3.23. (3) Telephone toll calls, $2.38; postage stamps, $0.35; taxi fare, $6.50; total $3.23. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation extending the 85 percent dividend received credit to dividends received from resident foreign corporations to the extent that such resident foreign corporations derive income from United States sources.

Herrmann, Louis F., National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) [Blank.]

Hester, Ewart A., 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Boston Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass. (1) July—salary, $416.67; office rent, stenographic service, $100; telephone, transportation, etc., $68.53. August—salary $416.67; office rent, stenographic service, $100; telephone, $11.16. September—salary, $416.67; office rent, stenographic service, $100; telephone, $11.80. (2) Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (3) Office rent, stenographic service, telephone, transportation, etc. (4) None. (5) Wool legislation.

Hewes & Awalt (a law partnership, consisting of the following partners: Thomas Hewes, F. G. Awalt, Samuel O. Clark, Jr., Harold E. Mitchell, Raymond Sparks, Henry L. Shepherd, John S. Murtha, and Maxwell M. Merritt, 93 Elm Street, Hartford 6, Conn., and 822 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington 6, D. C.; Life Insurance Association of America, 165 Broadway, New York 6, N. Y. (1) See attached detailed statements.[2] (2) See attached detailed statement.[2] (3) Expenses for transportation, communication, transcripts of testimony, and copies of revenue revision hearings, as listed in the attached statement. (4) None. (5) Any revision of Internal Revenue Code affecting life insurance and annuities.

Higinbotham,[3] William A., Federation of American Scientists, 1749 L Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Received no money from the Federation of American Scientists during July, August, and September, 1947; salary and traveling expenses still owed me. (2) No payments made in connection with federation business or legislative matters, except traveling expenses. (3) [Blank.] (4) Splitting the Atom, by W. A. Higinbotham, published in Foreign Policy Association, Headline Series; this was strictly an educational article on splitting the atom. (5) I am not employed primarily to influence legislation; I have talked to a few Congressmen, informed the members of the federation, and recommended action with reference to the National Science Foundation legislation and the Mundt bill, H. R. 3342.

Hines, Lewis G., American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW. (1) $104. (2) Lewis G. Hines. (3) National legislative representative, taxis and phone calls. (4) [Blank.] (5) Affecting labor.

Hinman, Ray C., Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York 4, N. Y. (1) Money received: Salary, $1,250. (This represents one-quarter of the amount of registrant's annual remuneration which is attributable to the performance of duties which are subject to the Lobbying Act); reimbursement for traveling expenses, $133.71; money expended (in connection with duties related to the Lobbying Act), $138.71. (2) Railroads, air lines, taxis, hotels, restaurants, telephones, and tips. (3) Normal traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Hiss, Donald, Aluminum Research Institute, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $2,543.04 as payment of legal fees to law firm and reimbursement for disbursements; expended in connection with all matters for client, $7.79. (2) Taxicab drivers, $3.60; telegraph company, $4.19. (3) Telegrams and transportation within the District of Columbia. (4) None. (5) Legislation to secure continuation of duty-free status on nonferrous scrap.

Holloway, William J., 2816 First National Building, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., Third and Harvey Streets, Oklahoma City, Okla. (1) $2,400 received from Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. for legal services under Lobbying Act from June 19 to October 1, 1947; check of $1,153 for personal expenses from same company during the same period of time. (2) William J. Holloway, attorney at law, 2816 First National Building, Oklahoma City, Okla. (3) (a) Payment of attorney's fees; (b) payment of personal expenses incurred and paid out in

[4] Filed for second quarter.
[5] Filed for third quarter.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[3] Filed with the Clerk only.

performance of said legal services, said expenses being for railroad and pullman fare, hotel bills, meals, telephone and telegraph, and other incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. and particularly appropriations for Southwest Power Administration.

Holman, Charles W., National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended, $37.75. (2) Taxicabs. (3) Taxi fares. (4) None. (5) Any legislation which may affect milk producers.

Holmes, George T., Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 429 West Jefferson Street, Louisville 2, Ky. (1) No money was received or expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Holste, Oscar W., room 305, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 4, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati 2, Ohio. (1) Salary, $465; expenses, $230.54; no expenses other than personal maintenance. (2) Hotel Hamilton, taxicabs, telephone, postage, laundry, pullman fare, and various eating places. (3) All living expenses and transportation and telephone expense. (4) None. (5) All legislation pertaining to railroad labor, particularly opposing all bills affecting the now-existing railroad retirement and unemployment-insurance system.

Horsky, Charles A., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington 5, D. C.; P. E. Harris & Co., Dexter Horton Building, Seattle 4, Wash.; Libby, McNeill & Libby, Food Products, Chicago 9, Ill.; New England Fish Co., Smith Tower, Seattle, Wash.; Kadiak Fisheries Co., Lowman Building, Seattle, Wash.; Pacific American Fisheries, Inc., South Bellingham, Wash. (1) Received, none; expended, $39.07. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $32.14; Western Union, $5.53; Cab drivers, $1.40; total $39.07. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, and transportation within the District of Columbia. (4) None. (5) This employment is an ordinary attorney-client retainer on a per diem basis for the purpose of assisting in the formulation and presentation of a proposed legislative program, being developed jointly for presentation to Congress by various interested salmon-canning companies and the Department of Interior, relative to stabilizing certain phases of the Alaska salmon industry. The per diem is computed at $250 a day for each day of legal services rendered.

Howard, Paul, 1709 M Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.; American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago 11, Ill. (1) From American Library Association: Salary, $1,875; for expenses, $359.88. (2) Various. (3) Operation of office. (4) None. (5) [Blank.]

Howard, S. H., 1328 Evergreen Avenue, Millvale, Pa.; Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 4849 North Western Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary of $362.50 for the third quarter of 1947 and had expenses of $196.54 for this quarter. (2) Hamilton Hotel. (3) Lodging, meals, and transportation. (4) None. (5) All legislative proposals of concern to labor and railway labor in particular; working in opposition to bills to amend the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Insurance Acts.

Howard, W. J., McKay Building, Missoula, Mont.; performing voluntary services for Tax Equality Association of Montana. (1) Check No. 9, dated June 13, 1947, for $21.28, expense attending meeting. (2) See below. (3) To reimburse for expense in traveling to and from meeting. (4) None. (5) (Not employed.) Revision of the revenue act to eliminate income-tax exemptions now enjoyed by organizations engaged in buying or selling or rendering services normally competitive with such activities conducted by others for profit.

Howe, Harold K., 2480 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C.; American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill. (1) Received $1,500 as salary and $231.30 as reimbursement for general expenses. (2) Various; see answer to question (3). (3) Miscellaneous and incidental, including local transportation, lunches, gratuities, committee meeting expenses, and other incidental expenses of Washington office, American Institute of Laundering. (4) Not applicable under section 308 (a). (5) I am interested in all legislation affecting the laundry industry and the members thereof. My primary function as to legislation is to report status, prospects, etc., to my employer—the American Institute of Laundering. See, also, letter attached to Registration Form B, which is made a part hereof.

Howe, Robert E., Jr., 900 Fifteenth Street NW. and 907 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; United Mine Workers of America, 900 Fifteenth Street NW. (1) Since July 1, 1947, there has been received by affiant as salary the sum of $1,875, and as per diem for personal living expenses the sum of $552, a total of $2,427. (2) No sums in any amount have been paid by affiant to any person other than affiant's expenditures for normal, everyday living expenses, such as transportation, meals, etc., in the regular discharge of his duties. (3) Answered in (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.

Howell, W. J., Missoula, Mont., performing voluntary services for Tax Equality Association of Montana. (1) $24.16 for attending meeting; $95.50 for expense attending hearing, Seattle. (2) See below. (3) To reimburse for expense in traveling to and from meetings. (4) [Blank.] (5) (Not employed.) Revision of the revenue act to eliminate income-tax exemptions now enjoyed by organizations engaged in buying or selling or rendering services normally competitive with such activities conducted by others for profit.

Howrey, Edward F., 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C.; Peanut and Nut Salters Association, 133 Watts Street, New York 13, N. Y. (1) Peanut and Nut Salters Association, 133 Watts Street, New York 13, N. Y. Fee, none this quarter; expenses, $49.58. (2) Telephone Co., $15.12; Western Union, $1.84; notary fees, $1; transcript of House Banking and Currency Committee hearing on H. R. 3940, August 21, $31.62; total, $49.58. (3) As indicated by items above. (4) None. (5) Proposals affecting peanuts and tree nuts, particularly those placing limitations and restrictions on importation of nuts.

Hudson, Minor, Reserve Officers of the Naval Services, 1726 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Salary of $1,666.67 received during 3-month period ending September 30, 1947, used only for personal living expenses. (2) Minor Hudson. (3) Personal living expenses. (4) The Voice of the Reserve, the regular monthly publication of Reserve Officers of the Naval Services, which is distributed to the membership of the association. (5) Any legislation affecting the national security, the Navy, or the Reserve which Reserve officers of the naval services may decide to support or oppose.

Huntress, Carroll B., 1209 Whitehall Building, 17 Battery Place, New York City (New York State Conference in Opposition to the St. Lawrence Project). (1) Received from Norman Patton, treasurer, New York State Conference in Opposition to the St. Lawrence Project, $604.35, for telephone, postage, and traveling expenses. (2) New York Telephone Co., United States post office. (3) Informational. (4) [Blank.] (5) To support opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence project.

Hushing, W. C., chairman, national legislative committee, American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington 1, D. C. (1) Salary for 3 months, $2,080; expenses for July 1947, $59; August, $38; September, $64.20; total for 3 months, $161.20. (2) Taxi drivers, phone company (away from office), messengers, and incidentals. (3) As shown in (1). (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting workers.

Ingles, William, 717 Tower Building, Washington 5, D. C. (Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. et al.). (1) See schedule 1 (A) and 1 (B) attached.[2] (2) See schedule 2.[2] (3) Normal office operating expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting industry.

Institute of Public Relations, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York 17, N. Y. (1) See attached.[2] (2) See attached.[2] (3) See attached.[2] (4) General publicity releases of an informative character and publicity releases containing some of the testimony of hearing witnesses were distributed to the daily newspapers of the United States and to a considerable number of weekly newspapers. It is physically impossible for us to learn which of these used material similar to that we distributed or based on that which we distributed. (5) Amendments to Natural Gas Act, H. R. 2185.

Jackson, Charles E., general manager, National Fisheries Institute, Inc., suite 228, Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Jackson, Thomas J., 732 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C., Retired Officers League, Washington, D. C., San Antonio, Tex., and Islamorada, Fla. (1) $32.19 (covers period ending July); serving without pay. (2) $20 stamps, United States post office; $2.19, Western Union Telegraph Co., telegram; $2.25 reimbursed self for envelopes, $7.75 for mimeographing, Ace Letter Service (all Washington, D. C.). Money came from Retired Officers' League. (3) [Blank.] (4) Not applicable. (5) Veteran legislation.

Jhung, Walter, Hotel Pennsylvania, Washington 13, D. C.; Korean-American Trading Co., 105 East Houston Street, New York 2, N. Y. (1) Salaries received (June and July, at $333.33 per month), $666.66. (2) Various. (3) Rent, newspapers, etc. (4) [Blank.] (5) To support H. R. 860 (superseded by H. R. 2932) and S. 152.

Jobe, William T., National Association of Ice Industries, 1706 L Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Employed on a full-time annual basis as general counsel for the National Association of Ice Industries at a salary of $10,000 per annum. I have received my regular monthly salary for the past calendar quarter of 1947 and nothing more. Pursuant to the requirements of Public Law 601, I have expended no money. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Johnson, Curtis, Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None; compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Johnson, Elmer, president, National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The sum of $324 was received during the third quarter of 1947. (2) None. (3) Fee of $100 per month; $24 to cover transportation and purchase of meals. (4) The Annuitant (the official organ of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees). (5) In support of any measure designed to improve the Federal retirement system.

Johnson, Gilbert R., Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland 13, Ohio. (1) None. (2). None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Johnson, W. D., room 312 Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington 4, D. C.; Order of Railway Conductors of America, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. (1) January 1947, annual compensation of $8,500. (2) W. D. Johnson. (3) As vice president and national legislative representative of the Order of Railway Conductors of America, covering all services rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor generally, employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act, and particularly the interests of various classes and crafts of railway employees represented by the Order of Railway Conductors of America.

Jones, Bascom F., 390 Broadway, Nashville 3, Tenn.; Tennessee Railroad Association. (1) [Blank.] (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Jones, J. M., National Wool Growers Association, 509 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City 1, Utah. (1) Salary, $1,500; expense, $3,094.27; total, $4,594.27. (2) [Blank.] (3) The above paid to J. M. Jones as secretary of the National Wool Growers Association for duties in connection with association work. All expenses included for all work in Washington and elsewhere whether in connection with legislative work or not. (4) The National Wool Growers; coeditor, J. M. Jones. (5) Not employed to oppose or support any legislation only as legislation affects the sheep industry.

Kane, John E., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received regular salary as previously reported in Form B, heretofore filed pursuant to act; expenses reimbursed by employer, $146.60. (2) Various taxicab companies, restaurants, hotels, railroads, and air lines; other service establishments. (3) Administrative expenses, travel, meals, tobacco, and candy. (4) None. (5) Matters affecting the petroleum industry and its customers.

Keller, Joseph E., Secretary, District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee, 930 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $121.77 as treasurer of District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee; $253.08 has been expended on behalf of the committee during preceding calendar quarter. See schedule A attached [2] for expenditures of committee. (2) See schedule A attached. (3) See schedule A attached. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the sale and distribution of petroleum products in the District of Columbia.

Kennedy, Harold L., Suite 605, Commonwealth Building, Washington 6, D. C.; Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 308 Tulsa Building, Tulsa 3, Okla. (1) Received monthly salary; amount of salary previously reported in form B heretofore filed with Clerk of the House and Secretary of the Senate; expended, $17. (2) See No. (3) below. (3) Expended $8 for 20 taxi fares at (40 cents each) to and from the Capitol; six meals at $1.50 each, comprising a total of $9. (4) None. (5) All proposed legislation that might affect the oil and gas industry.

Ketchum, Omar B., Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $333 per month as salary minus social security and withholding taxes; $82.50 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW National News, VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combatting of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

King, Joseph T., Suite 302, the Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets NW., Washington 6, D. C.; National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, 1713 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,800 salary and $103.67 expenses. (2) Pullman Co., railroads, restaurants, hotels, cab drivers. (3) Meals, taxi fares, and tips while traveling on official business; business luncheons. (4) National Affairs Reports and Bulletins. (5) Legislation directly affecting the retail building supply dealers, such as Emergency Price Control Act, Fair Labor Standards Act, wage-and-hour legislation, housing legislation, tax legislation, and Second War Powers Act.

King, Willford I., Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) I have received during this quarter, in net salary after deductions, $546.40 total, plus expenses for the quarter of $246.47. (2) I am not a disbursing officer and have made no payments for the Committee for Constitutional Government, by whom I am employed. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Not employed for this purpose, but, incidentally, I occasionally oppose legislation which I believe to be antisocial and favor that which I believe to be socially beneficial.

Kitchen, C. W., United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 2017 S Street NW., Washington 9, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Various articles have been prepared and published in trade periodicals and association yearbooks on marketing subjects, none dealing specifically with legislative matters. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation.

Kline, Robert E., Jr., 703 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Koch, Robert M., 1426 K Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (National Agricultural Limestone Association). (1) It is estimated that, as secretary of the National Agricultural Limestone Association, Inc., $100 of my salary represents that part of my time covered by Public Law 601 during the third quarter of 1947. This was all disbursed for personal living expenses. In addition, I received $5 for reimbursement for taxis and carfare in connection with legislation of interest to members of the association. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Any legislation directly or indirectly affecting the agricultural limestone industry.

Kocher, Eric, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y.; Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None; compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement; employment terminated July 31, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Kreutz, Oscar R., executive manager, National Savings and Loan League, 1835 K. Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) $3,750 total salary for quarter; however, I actually devoted not more than 10 percent of my time to legislative matters during the third quarter; of total expenses incurred, only $432.19 could possibly be classified as legislative expense. (2) Post Office Department, Western Union, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., C. H. Ellingson, Statler Hotel, Congressional Country Club. (3) Postage, telegraph, telephone, fees for drafting bills, entertainment. (4) National Savings and Loan Journal, Investment Dealers Digest. (5) Support Reorganization Plan No. 3; S. 801, 802, 803, 804, 913, 1149; oppose some provisions of S. 866 and H. R. 3756.

Kruse,[4] Herman C.; Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco 6, Calif. (1) Salary for quarter, $1,875, for all services to employer, only part of which pertained to legislation; reimbursement of hotel, travel, and incidental expenses for quarter, $1,629.35. (2) Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., $985.40; United Air Lines, $148.42; restaurants, telephone and telegraph companies, taxis, and incidentals, $496.03. (3) Hotel, travel, and incidental expenses, as stated above. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting water and power projects, flood control, and reclamation.

Kruse,[5] Herman C., Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco 6, Calif. (1) Salary for quarter $1,950 for all services to employer, only part of which pertained to legislation; reimbursement of hotel, travel, and incidental expenses for quarter, $385. (2) Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., $488.62; American Air Lines, $154.68; restaurants, telephone and telegraph companies, taxis, and incidentals, $341.70. (3) Hotel, travel, and incidental expenses, as stated above. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting water and power projects, flood control, and reclamation.

Lacques, Paul H., 99 John Street, New York 7, N. Y.; Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston. (1) Received various sums during the quarterly period, July, August, September, at various times a total of $568.25 from Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston; none of such receipts exceeded $100. (2) Railroad companies; hotels, and club. (3) Transportation, accommodations, meals, telephone and telegraph charges. (4) None. (5) H. R. 669.

Lamb, Robert K., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C.; United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) $2,078.35, salary; $220.10 expenses. (2) Hotels, railroads, air lines, restaurants, cab drivers, etc., for expenses. (3) Personal expenses and travel away from Washington; cab fares in Washington. (4) CIO News; Steel Labor. (5) Support legislation authorized by the convention and executive board of the United Steelworkers, and by the convention and executive board of the national CIO; oppose legislation contrary to the stand of these organizations.

Lanham, Fritz G., Woodley Park Towers, 2737 Devonshire Place, Washington, D. C.; A. E. Brooks, 2202 Fort Worth National Bank Building, Fort Worth 2, Tex. (1) $1,000 as retainer; no expenditures except small sums for postage. (2) Post office. (3) Postage on correspondence. (4) None. (5) Legislation with reference to nonresident citizens of the United States engaged in business abroad.

Lanham, Fritz G., Woodley Park Towers, 2737 Devonshire Place, Washington 8, D. C., National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West Eleventh Avenue, Gary, Ind.; American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 1434 Eleventh Avenue, Gary, Ind.; Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 1308 Commercial Standard Building, Fort Worth 2, Tex. (1) From National Patent Council as retainer, $1,500; from American Fair Trade Council as retainer, $1,000.; from Trinity Improvement Association for rental and other expenses and clerical help, $750; there have been no expenditures except small sums for postage. (2) $381 paid to Woodley Park Towers, Washington, D. C. (3) Rental and garage. (4) None. (5) The three organizations listed are all nonprofit organizations, and I serve in an advisory capacity and not for the purposes of supporting or opposing legislation in Congress. Their purposes

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[4] Filed for second quarter.

[5] Filed for third quarter.

are principally educational, with reference to the objectives of their organizations.

Lanham, Fritz G., Woodley Park Towers, 273 Devonshire Place, Washington 8, D. C., State Rights Association, Houston, Tex. (1) $2,500 as part payment of retainer; no expenditures except small sums for postage. (2) Post office. (3) Postage for correspondence. (4) None. (5) Legislation to preserve and promote the rights of the States under our system of government, to return to the States such normal functions as they should rightfully assume, to restrict Federal agencies to Federal functions, and to equalize taxation in accordance with State laws.

Larkin, Frederick, Jr., Reserve Officers of the Naval Services, 1726 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Salary of $1,275 received during 3 months' period ending September 30, 1947, used only for personal living expenses. (2) Frederick Larkin, Jr. (3) Personal living expenses. (4) The Voice of the Reserve, the regular monthly publication of Reserve Officers of the Naval Services, which is distributed to the membership of the association. (5) Any legislation affecting the national security, the Navy, or the Reserve which Reserve Officers of the Naval Services may decide to support or oppose.

La Roe, Wilbur, Jr., Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C.; National Independent Meat Packers' Association, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Clark & La Roe, law firm, received from the National Independent Meat Packers' Association, $4,500, total of monthly payments for general legal services, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payment made to any other person. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) I have not supported or opposed any legislation during the past quarter.

La Roe, Wilbur, Jr., Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C.; Seatrain Lines, Inc., 39 Broadway, New York 6, N. Y. (1) Clark & La Roe, law firm, received from Seatrain Lines, Inc., $1,875, monthly payments on annual retainer, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payment made to any other person. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) I have not supported or opposed any legislation during the past quarter.

Lawrence, John V., American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration. He expended a total of $20.80. (2) The money was paid to various taxi drivers employed in taking registrant between his office and the Capitol or House or Senate Office Buildings, and to clerks and cashiers for lunches. (3) The money paid taxi drivers was for transportation to and from my office as indicated in (2). (4) Postwar Problems of the Trucking Industry, Contact magazine, Seven Bills Point Way to Monopoly, Motorway Transport magazine. (5) Any legislation affecting the trucking industry.

Lawrence, Joseph S., M. D., suite 301, 1302 Eighteenth Street NW. (American Medical Association). (1) Salary, $3,750; expended, $165. (2) Capitol Airlines, the Palmer House. (3) Travel, local transportation; hotels, conferences, incidental expenses, meals. (4) None. (5) Bills relating to public health endorsed or opposed by the action of the house of delegates of the American Medical Association or the principles espoused by that body.

Laylin, John G., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington 5, D. C. (Aluminum Research Institute). (1) Received: $2,543.04 as payment of legal fees to law firm and reimbursement for disbursements; expended in connection with all matters for client, $7.79. (2) Taxicab drivers, $3.60; telegraph company, $4.19. (3) Telegrams and transportation within the District of Columbia. (4) None. (5) Legislation to secure continuation of duty-free status on nonferrous scrap.

Laylin, John G., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington 5, D. C. (American Smelting & Refining Co.). (1) Received, none; expended in connection with all matters for client, $34.12. (2) Taxicab drivers, $2.50; telephone company, $29.70; Western Union Telegraph Co., $1.92. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, and transportation in the District of Columbia. (4) None. (5) Appropriation for continuation of drainage tunnel by Bureau of Mines at Leadville, Colo.

L'Ecluse, Esther, legislative representative, Japanese-American Citizens League Antidiscrimination Committee, Inc., Post Office Box 1626, Washington 13, D. C. (1) All moneys received include only monthly salary and expenses as explained in Form B, filed July 1, 1947; expended, $11.25. (2) Telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs. (3) Information, contacts, transportation. (4) News stories in Japanese language and Japanese-American newspapers relating to work here are only articles known to have published because of our contacts with them. (See accompanying list.[2]) (5) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States.

Lee, Ivy, and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York 17, N. Y.; United States Cuban Sugar Council, 136 Front Street, New York 5, N. Y. (1) See appended statement I.[2] (2) See appended statement I.[2] (3) See appended statement I.[2] (4) See appended statement II.[2] (5) Registrant advises the United States Cuban Sugar Council on public-relations matters pertaining to sugar legislation relating to the Sugar Act of 1948 and the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended.

Leiser, Clara, Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None; compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement; employment terminated July 31, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) To support H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Leonard, Richard T., United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, UAW-CIO, 411 West Milwaukee, Detroit 2, Mich. (1) Salary, $1,615.44; expenses, $875.35. (2) Hotels, restaurants, railroads, cab drivers, laundry, etc. (3) For living expenses incident to his work and travel expenses. (4) UAW-CIO publications. (5) All legislation supported or opposed by CIO and UAW-CIO, supporting bills of aid to the general welfare, and opposing bills harmful to the general welfare.

Leopold, Joseph F., 936 Liberty Bank Building, Dallas 1, Tex.; National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago 4, Ill. (1) Received regular salary only, as previously reported on Form B; neither received nor expended any money or anything of value for lobbying purposes. (2) None received or paid. (3) Note item (2) above. (4) None, excepting newspaper reports made voluntarily in newspapers following addresses and without solicitation on my part. (5) No specific legislation; the only interest is in tax equality generally.

Letts, Davis S., 901 Tower Building, Washington 5, D. C.; American Transit Association, 292 Madison Avenue, New York 17, N. Y. (1) Received $1,200 salary as attorney for the American Transit Association; received $119.28 reimbursement for actual business expenses; none for lobbying purposes. (2) Railroads, taxicabs, etc.; hotels and restaurants, merchants, and others. (3) Traveling and living expenses away from Washington; expenses in Washington for transportation, fees, dues, entertainment, and miscellaneous. (4) None. (5) He may support or oppose legislation affecting the transit industry.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Levine, Seth, Suite 1, 132 Third Street SE., Washington 3, D. C. (CIO Maritime Committee). (1) Salary, $1,365; expenses, $130. Only one-tenth of time spent on legislative activities due to the adjournment of Congress; 90 percent of time spent on research work. (2) Expenses paid to telephone company, dispensers of periodicals, and for taxis. (3) Taxis, telephone calls, and periodicals. (4) CIO News, ACA News, NMU Pilot, IFAWA Fisherman, The American Marine Engineer, CIO Maritime Committee Newsletter. (5) Support legislation in the interest of seamen, longshoremen, fishermen, and allied maritime workers; to oppose legislation detrimental to them.

Lewis, George J., Union Station, Lexington, Ky.; Kentucky Railroad Association, Louisville, Ky. (For fuller details see Form B, filed by me on June 3, 1947.) (1) No moneys received; amount expended, $35. (2) Hotel, restaurant, dining car, railway, pullman, taxis, telephone, etc. (3) For living and traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Employed to support legislation favorable to the railroad industry, and to oppose legislation detrimental to that industry.

Lewit,[1] Albert W., Suite 1008, Washington Gas Light Building, 740 Eleventh Street, Washington 1, D. C. (1) Received $2,500 contingent fee from the Combined Cab Co., Washington, D. C. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Libby, Frederick J., executive secretary, National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) $1,175.06 (Salary, $1,125; expenses, $50.06). (2) Expenses for railroad tickets, hotels, taxis, porters, telegraph service, postage, and small miscellaneous expenses. (3) Attending meetings, making speaking trips, conferences out of town. (4) Peace Action, monthly news bulletin of National Council for Prevention of War. (5) Supports, in pursuance of the purposes of the organization, legislation that promotes peace and opposes legislation which, in our judgment, leads to war.

Linton, D. H., Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates, 250 Stuart Street, Boston 16, Mass. (1) $1,588.83 (compensation, $750; expenses, $838.83). (2) Various. (3) Traveling and incidentals. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2185, 2569, 2956, 4051, 4089, 2235, 2292, and S. 734.

Little, Charles R. (executive secretary), Kenwood Rd., Box 153-M, RR 508, Cincinnati 27, Ohio; Ohio Valley Conservation and Flood Control Congress (Dr. Charles E. Holzer, president), Holzer Hospital, Gallipolis, Ohio. (1) Received for expenses, $600; expenses, $320.99. (2) Various railroads, hotels, restaurants, etc. (3) Transportation, $119.57; lodging, $72.18; meals, $50.57; tips, $13.47; office expense (periodicals, communication, postage, stationery, supplies), $65.20. (4) None. (5) Any dealing with conservation and flood control in the Ohio Valley, including appropriation bills.

Little, Walter J., 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles 14, Calif. (Southern Pacific Co. et al.). (1) Received from Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, Southern Pacific, Union Pacific, Northwestern Pacific, and Western Pacific Railroads, for expenses, $1,337.55. (2) Railroads, airlines, and other transportation, $99.99; hotels (meals and lodging), $412.56; incidental, $825. (3) Transportation and living costs. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting the railroads.

Lockwood, Maurice H., the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $200 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Fertilizer News and Fertilizer Review, both published by the National Fertilizer Associ-

[1] Filed with the Secretary only.

ation, Inc., Washington 5, D. C. I issued and distributed, in the customary manner, a press release on prospective fertilizer supplies for 1947–48 and one on early buying of fertilizer for fall wheat, but do not know what publications may have published them in whole or in part. (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eighth Congress as H. R. 2494, H. R. 3421, S. 1251 and H. R. 869.

Lodge, F. S., the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $50 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribuation of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 2494, 3421, S. 1251, and H. R. 869.

Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York City, and 1614 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.; agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broadway, New York City. (1) $10,000 received during August 1947. (2) No disbursements made during third quarter of 1947. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 4043, Eightieth Congress.

Louchheim, Joseph H., Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York 19, N. Y. (1) Salary received, $1,500; expenses received, $60.30; total, $1,560.30. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) National health insurance.

Lucas, James C., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) $200 salary, $24.05 expenses. (2) Taxi drivers, streetcars. (3) Taxi, streetcar travel. (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor-law revision, social-security-law revision, inflammable-fabric legislation.

Lyon, A. E., executive secretary, Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) No money received except regular salary and expenses; no money expended for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation; total salary for quarter, $2,250; total expenses for quarter; $715.90. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Incidental to other and varied duties which comprise the major part of work, all legislative proposals of concern to labor and railway labor in particular.

McBride,[6] Don, secretary-manager, National Reclamation Association, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Total receipts for period, $7,938.19 (see schedule VI);[5] total expenditures for period, $9,179.32 (see schedule V).[5] (2) See attached schedules VI and V.[5] (3) See attached schedules VI and V.[5] (4) National Reclamation Association Bulletin (see Bulletin attached).[5] (5) Amendment to the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 and any other legislation affecting resources of the 17 Western States. (See sec. 3, purposes, first page, our constitution enclosed in first quarterly report.)

McBride, Jonas A., 10 Independence Avenue, Washington 4, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland 15, Ohio. (1) See attached sheet.[2] (2) See attached sheet.[2] (3) For maintenance of office of vice president, national legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting the interests of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

McCarthy, Frank J., the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Salary: $1,232.50 per month, which is paid for all the services rendered to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., only a part of which have to do with legislation; $101.56 was expended by me as expense money, during the third quarter of 1947, for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. In addition to this amount, I also received $574.54 for expenses incurred in connection with other duties performed for the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., which have no relation to the purposes covered by this act. (2) Various transportation companies, restaurants, garages, communication companies, etc. (3) $101.56 was expended by me as expense money, during the third quarter of 1947, for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

McClure, Warren C., Box 207, Camden, Ark.; Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis 1, Mo. (1) One-half of expenses in connection with legislative matters reimbursed by Mississippi Valley Association, $90.85. (2) Various. (3) Travel, subsistence, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to soil conservation and flood control.

McCrory, Samuel H., 6811 Sixth Street NW., Washington 12, D. C., Hemp Producers Association, Juneau, Wis. (1) $500. (2) Takoma Letter Shop, $15.75. (3) Typing and duplicating. (4) None. (5) None.

McFarland, Rev. A. J., 814 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans. (Christian Amendment Movement). (1) Salary, $750; expense, $250; total, $1,000. (2) Salary to self for home expense. Expenses: Travel, hotel, board, room. (3) Answered above. (4) The Christian Patriot, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans.; The Covenanter Witness, 1121 Buchanan Street, Topeka, Kans. (5) Supporting House Joint Resolution 239 and Senate Joint Resolution 150, a bill to amend the Constitution of the United States, by placing an acknowledgment of the Lord Jesus Christ, as King and Saviour of our Nation, in the preamble to the Constitution.

McGlue, Arthur F., in care of Post Office, Lynn, Mass.; National Association of Post Office Custodial Employees, Post Office Box 1611, Washington 13, D. C. (1) Expenses, $250 trainfare, hotels, taxis, postage, stationery, and entertainment. (2) [Blank.] (3) In support of all beneficial legislation for all postal employees. (4) Post Office Custodial News, published monthly by the National Association of Post Office Custodial Employees. (5) All beneficial legislation for postal employees.

McGough, Richard, 515 Hoge Building, Seattle 4, Wash.; Northern Pacific Railway Co., Union Pacific Railroad Co., Great Northern Railway Co., the Milwaukee Road, Seattle, Wash. (1) Salary as stated in original registration. Expenditures for meals, $106.05; hotel accommodations, $119.19; taxi fares, $12.30; postage and telegrams, $4.60; pullman fares, $39.73; laundry and valet service, $8.58. (2) Restaurants, hotels, taxi companies, railroad companies, etc. (3) Living and traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting transcontinental railroads operating in the State of Washington.

McGrath, Thomas Edward, 626 I Street NW., Washington, D. C., Taxpayers of United States of America, United States Treasury. (1) Approximate $165. (2) Thomas Edward McGrath. (3) To use as I see fit which fitness I consider most valuable, via lobbying, per Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (4) Published for a fee, none. Soliciting press support via lobbying Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, numerous. (5) It's my desire to run the gamut, pro or and con of all legislation before Congress, but with 400-plus Representatives, 90-plus Senators, and the Executive and Press I fall far short of my objective. I do the best I can in 24 hours, Sunday, holidays, et al.

McGrath, Tom J., 729 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Chesapeake & Ohio Railway, Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates, National Coal Association, Richmond, Va.; Boston, Mass.; Washington, D. C. (1) No payments received. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Opposing natural gas legislation.

McGrath, Tom J., National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 729 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,670 received from National St. Lawrence Project Conference for services; $435.70 received from National St. Lawrence Project Conference for petty cash expenses. (Note: Mr. McGrath's services for National St. Lawrence Project Conference terminated as of September 30, 1947.) (2) United States post office, Western Union, restaurants, railroads. (3) Postage, telegrams, meals, travel expenses. (4) None. (5) Resolution relating to Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin waterway and power project.

McIsaac,[3] John R., 26 Brooks Street, Brighton, Mass.; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) I received as salary July 10 to 17, inclusive, $136; I received, as per diem July 10 to 17, inclusive, $94; salary received, $17 per day; per diem, $11.80 per day. (2) The above money totaling $220.40 paid to the undersigned. (3) Service rendered to the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen at Washington, D. C. (4) None. (5) H. R. 1639.

McKeehan, Merrick, Arter & Stewart, a partnership, 2800 Terminal Tower, Cleveland 13, Ohio; the Holstein-Friesian Association of America, Brattleboro, Vt. (1) Received $305.90 for disbursements in this matter through July 1947 (part of disbursements were reported in previous report); expended $220.27 in this matter through August 1947 (see par. (3)). (2) Miscellaneous telephone and telegraph companies, railroad companies and their employees, taxi drivers, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Telephoning, $106.42; telegrams, $6.36; traveling expenses to and in Washington, $107.49; total, $220.27. (4) None. (5) To support H. R. 3884.

McKeehan, Merrick, Arter & Stewart, 2800 Terminal Tower, Cleveland 13, Ohio; the Lincoln Electric Co., 12818 Coit Road, Cleveland 1, Ohio. (1) Received, none; paid out, $62.21. (2) Railroad, hotel, restaurants. (3) Traveling expenses, Cleveland, Ohio, to Washington, D. C., and return. (4) None. (5) Pension trust statutes and Internal Revenue Code, section 23 (a).

McLaughlin, Robert E., AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), Victor Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No expense money drawn or expended, except petty cash for taxi fares. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) National AMVET and AMVET Letter. (5) Legislation providing care and assistance for veterans of World War II.

McLaurin, Joseph H., United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 837 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) See attachment.[2] (2) See answer to (1) attached.[2] (3) See answer to (1) attached.[2] (4) Bulletin service of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc. (5) No legislation in particular, any legislation in general affecting the interests of wholesale grocers. He was later specifically authorized by the executive committee of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association to support or oppose general labor legislation and fair-employment-practice legislation.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[3] Filed with the Clerk only.
[5] Not printed. Filed in the Secretary's office.
[6] Filed with the Secretary only.

McMahon, W. E., 5545 Park Lane, Dallas 9, Tex. (formerly Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.); West Virginia Oil and Natural Gas Association, Box 48, Fairmont, W. Va. (1) $1,500 received from West Virginia Oil and Natural Gas Association, Box 48, Fairmont, W. Va.; also about $200 traveling expenses in process of collection. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Amendments to Natural Gas Act of 1938.

McMains, W. H., Distilled Spirits Institute, Inc., 1135 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,500, which is in payment for all services rendered, only a part of which deal with legislation. No expenses have been authorized or incurred for purposes listed under this act. (2) See (1) (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the industry represented is reported to members, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as Senate Joint Resolution 123, S. 265, H. R. 2571, and H. R. 4388.

McMillan, Robert W., Management Planning of Washington, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,100, with less than one-twentieth of the time and service for which such compensation was paid being for activities which might conceivably be construed as coming within the purview of any of the provisions of title III of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; $70.90, reimbursement of expenses allocable to foregoing activities. (2) Taxi drivers and operators of eating and refreshment places. (3) Transportation and other normal out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

MacCracken, William P., Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington 4, D. C.; engaged in the general practice of law. (1) Money received: $2,625.17, American Optometric Association; $2,500, Remington Rand, Inc. Money expended: $125.17 for the account of the American Optometric Association. (2) Telephone tolls, $62.63; telegrams, $25.29; mimeographing, $25.95; taxis, etc., $11.20. (3) See answer in (2) above. (4) None. (5) On behalf of the American Optometric Association development fund, I supported the passage of the Medical Service Corps bill for the Army and Navy. These services included appearing before the subcommittee and the full committee of the House, interviewing other witnesses who appeared before the committee, and conferences with members of the committee. I also appeared on behalf of the association before the subcommittee of the House was considering the Army and Navy integration bill for the purpose of making certain that when these bills were enacted into law, they would be consistent with the provisions of the Medical Service Corps bill. Both of these measures were enacted into law. I also appeared before the Senate Committee for Expenditures in the Executive Department and suggested possible amendments to S. 140 and S. 712. This legislation is still pending. My services on behalf of Remington Rand, Inc., had to do with the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill fixing the ceiling price paid by the Government for typewriters. This client was also interested in the legislation extending the time for the free importation of copper and the legislation pertaining to alien property.

Mack, James Edward, National Home and Property Owners' Foundation, 1773 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Since July 1, 1947, and up to October 1, 1947, I have received the proportionate part of my salary as reported in registration filed October 3, 1946. In addition, I have received $20, being the amount of expense incurred by me. My expenditures have been only the said amount. (2) Pennsylvania Railroad and others. (3) Travel to Philadelphia, Pa., and return. (4) The Property Owner, regular publication of the National Home and Property Owners' Foundation. (5) Any legislation vitally affecting the owners of homes, the owners of other real property, and those interested in the private ownership of property.

Macleay, Lachlan, Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) Total reimbursable expenses in connection with general work done for the Mississippi Valley Association, all reimbursed by association, $771.24. (2) Railroads, etc., $278.91; hotels and miscellaneous, $492.33. (3) Travel, subsistence, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) A portion of Mr. Macleay's time was used in regard to legislation relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement, the American merchant marine, soil conservation, flood control, regulation of domestic transportation.

MacNamee, W. Bruce, Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Magee, Elizabeth S., the National Consumers' League, 348 Engineers' Building, Cleveland 14, Ohio. (1) Salary, part time, July through September 1947, $416.65; travel, July, travel to Washington, D. C., $25.31. (2) Elizabeth S. Magee. (3) Salary and travel expenses. (4) National Consumers' League Bulletin. (5) Supporting minimum-wage legislation, extension of social security.

Manly, Milo A., National Council for a Permanent FEPC, 930 F Street NW., room 901, Washington, D. C. (1) Travel, maintenance, and telephone calls, July 1 to September 30, 1947, $514.56; salary, July 1 to September 30, 1947 (after tax deductions), $1,070.40. (2) [Blank.] (3) Travel, maintenance, and telephone calls, July 1 to September 30, 1947, $514.56; salary after tax deductions, $1,070.40. (4) [Blank.] (5) Permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission, S. 984 and H. R. 2824.

Margolin, Leo Jay, Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) Salary and expenses as stated in registration statement. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2910, displaced persons emergency admission.

Margolin, (Mrs.) Olya, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C.; National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y. (1) $875 in salary received from National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y., none of which spent in connection with work; $15.19, received from above, spent for postage and carfare. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Not employed specifically to support or oppose any legislation, but for the purpose of securing information to be transmitted to headquarters for the preparation of educational and other material.

Mark, James, Jr., United Mine Workers of America, 900 Fifteenth Street NW. (1) Since July 1, 1947, there has been received by affiant as salary the sum of $1,750 and as per diem for personal living expenses the sum of $552, a total of $2,302. (2) No sums in any amount have been paid by affiant to any person other than affiant's expenditures for normal, everyday living expenses, such as transportation, meals, etc., in the regular discharge of his duties. (3) Answered in (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.

Marks, Raymond E., Southern Pacific Co., 139 North Virginia Street, Reno, Nev. (1) Nothing to report for the third quarter 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Marran, Donald J., Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York 4, N. Y. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of the above address, of which registrant is an associate, expended $323 in connection with the proposed legislation described in item (5) hereof, for which it was or will be reimbursed by the American Tobacco Co. (2) Various. (3) Telephone toll calls, postage stamps, taxi fare. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation extending the 85-percent dividend-received credit to dividends received from resident foreign corporations, to the extent that such resident foreign corporations derive income from United States sources.

Marsh, Benjamin C., Peoples Lobby, Inc., 810 F Street, NW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) Total receipts, largest contribution, $75 = $1,941.94; salaries and wages, $685.05; printing and bulletin, $632.15; postage, $224.81; rent, $165; Andrew Walker, $15.65; collector internal revenue, $173.54; workmen's compensation, $13.36; Government Printing Office, $73.85; Frank Chappell, audit book, $50; incidentals, $41. (2) Salaries and wages, Benj. C. Marsh; Arline Ryan; Walter Clyde; printing, Graphic Arts Press; postage, United States Post Office; rent, J. B. Stein; Andrew Walker; supplies, withholding tax, workmen's compensation; Government Printing Office, printing; Frank Chappelle, audit books, 1946. (3) Salaries and wages, for publicity and clerical work, other for maintaining office and getting out material. (4) Have sent and distributed material to hundreds of papers, magazines, etc., but have not caused any to be published; it was intelligence on their part. (5) Support attached program [2] and oppose that against it.

Marshall, J. Paull, 528 Union Trust Building, Washington 5, D. C.; Railroad Security Owners Association, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $4,000 received; no money expended. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Support H. R. 2298 and S. 249 as originally introduced and oppose H. R. 3237 and H. R. 3980 and the Reed-Myers amendments to S. 249.

Marshall,[3] Mrs. Katharine Lee, 1734 F Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.; Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (United States section), 2006 Walnut Street, Philadelphia 3, Pa. (national administration headquarters). (1) Salary, $300; expenses, $25.52. (2) $600 (salary) to landlord, grocers, United States Government, savings, etc.; $23.52 (expenses) to railroads, restaurants, and taxicab drivers. (3) $600 (salary) for personal living expenses, taxes, savings, etc.; $26.52 for my own expenses incurred while attending meetings, conferences held by WILPF or other organizations; for my own taxi fare to Capitol Hill. (4) None. (5) Support strengthening UN and its specialized agencies; extension reciprocal trade program; European relief and aid to reconstruction; emergency admission displaced persons on nonquota basis; permanent and Federal FEPC; Federal antilynch law. Oppose universal military training; United States arming Latin-American countries; reduction Federal income taxes; restrictions of imports.

Marston, R. B., director, legislative-Federal relations division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,012.50, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $402.50; expenses. (2) Salary, self. Expenses: Hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash; NEA Journal (articles therein); informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Masaoka, Mike M., national legislative director, Japanese-American Citizens League, Anti-Discrimination Committee, Inc., Post Office Box 1628, Washington 13, D. C.; Japanese-American Citizens League, Anti-Discrimination Committee, Inc., 403 Beason Building, Salt Lake City 1, Utah. (1) All moneys received include only monthly salary

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[3] Filed with the Clerk only.

and expenses as is Form B, filed January 22, 1947. See atached supplementary sheet for expenses.[2] (2) Telephone and telegraph companies and taxicabs. (3) Information, contacts, and transportation. (4) News stories in Japanese language and Japanese-American newspapers relating to work here are only articles known to have published because of our contacts with them. See accompanying list. (5) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States.

Maslow, Will, American Jewish Congress, 1834 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y. (1) Received salary, $112.50; expended approximately $10. (2) Telephone company, taxicab owners, and restaurant owners. (3) Telephone calls, taxicabs, and lunches. (4) May–June 1947 issue of Lawyers Guild Review. Signed letter to New York Times, August 6, 1947. (5) Support legislation designed to eliminate racism and religious or racial discrimination; to keep separate church and state; to preserve civil liberties; to liberalize immigration laws; specifically, bills listed under question 5, quarterly report July 2, 1947, plus H. R. 29, antipoll tax.

Mason, Walter J., American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW. (1) $110. (2) Walter J. Mason. (3) National legislative representative; taxis and phone calls. (4) [Blank.] (5) Affecting labor.

Mecartney, Malcolm, 10 South LaSalle Street, Chicago 3, Ill. (Protective committee for the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway.) (1) Received from protective committee for the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway 7 percent and 6 percent preferred stock, $1,175 to apply on account of fees (see note below) and $1,389.69 for expenses, of which $1,288.80 was expended during the quarter. (Note: Payment of $75 per week on account of fees under conditions stated in item 4 of registration Form B was subsequently modified by the committee to $100 per week under the same conditions, retroactive to January 1, 1947. (2) Various. (3) Hotels, operating automobile, telegrams, etc. (4) None. (5) I was not employed to support or oppose any legislation. I was employed in 1935 as associate stockholder of the Rock Island Railway in the pending reorganization proceedings, and incident to such general employment, I was asked by the committee to urge the support of legislation (such as S. 1253, 79th Cong.) designed to prevent the unwarranted forfeiture of railroad securities, including Rock Island preferred stock, now imminently threatened in pending reorganization proceedings.

Mechem, Frank L., 603 Central Building, Seattle 4, Wash.; P. E. Harris & Co. et al., Seattle 4, Wash. (1) As stated in answer to question (4) on Form B, the only money received by registrant is (a) legal fee on per diem basis for services performed and (b) reimbursement for traveling expenses. No money was received during the preceding calendar quarter by way of legal fees and the total amount of reimbursement for traveling expenses was $597.05. (2) See (3). (3) The only expenditures during the preceding calendar quarter consisted of traveling expenses covering air and railroad transportation, hotel, meals, telephone, and telegraph tolls. (4) None. (5) The formulation and presentation of proposed legislative program designed to stabilize certain phases of the Alaska salmon industry.

Meeks, E. A., National League of District Postmasters of the United States, 1110 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) $1,500 salary for quarter ending September 30, 1947. (2) E. A. Meeks. (3) Salary. (4) The Postmasters' Advocate. (5) Any legislation affecting postmasters.

Messer, A. Ross, National Association of Post Office Custodial Employees, Post Office Box 1611, Washington 13, D. C. (525 New Jersey Avenue NW.). (1) Salary, $1,000; expenses, $435.48; expenses include telephone, telegraph, post office box rent, taxi, stationery, and office supplies, etc., necessary for the operation of an office handling legislation and grievances for the membership. (2) [Blank.] (3) In support of all beneficial legislation for postal employees, and in handling grievances between the membership and the Post Office Department. (4) Post Office Custodial News, published monthly by the National Association of Post Office Custodial Employees. (5) All beneficial legislation for all postal employees, custodial in particular.

Middleton, P. Harvey, Railway Business Association, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago 3, Ill. (1) The only money received by me during the period from July 1 to September 30, 1947, was $4,000 in salary gross. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) I have not, during this period, engaged in any efforts to support or oppose any particular legislation.

Miles, Clarence R., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C., United States Chamber of Commerce. (1) Received: Salary, $3,750; expenses, $24.68. Expended: Transportation, $15; meals, $4; telephone calls, $5.38. (2) Taxi companies, telephone company, restaurants. (3) Transportation to, and communication with, the Capitol; other normal and necessary expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation of interest to business, such as bills on taxes, budget control, labor legislation, business census, basic farm programs, etc.

Miller, Charles C., 715 Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y. (1) I received from my employer, the Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., during the past quarter a total of $1,262.50, prorated to cover time spent in legislative activities, and reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses, such as transportation, luncheons, office and secretarial expenses, printing, etc., totaling an additional $368.67; apart from salary in this quarter, the total outlay, with no expenditure exceeding $10, except for office rent, included $90.01 for transportation, meals, and miscellaneous expenses, and $278.66 for office expenses, including office supplies, secretarial services, mimeographing, phone, office rent, prorated on the basis of time devoted to legislative activities, as indicated in our letter of February 17, 1947, attached to our registration forms of that date. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Press coverage consisted of general news reports covering the routine monthly reports of rubber consumption, tire production, etc. (5) Bills pertaining to long-term legislation on national rubber policy, on proposed revisions of excise taxes, and on the regulation of transportation of flammable materials.

Miller, Dale, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.; Dallas Chamber of Commerce, Dallas, Tex.; Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, Houston, Tex.; Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N. Y.; State Rights Association, Houston, Tex. (1) Received $1,500, plus $750 expenses, from Dallas Chamber of Commerce; $1,500, plus $298.96 expenses, from Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas; $1,500, plus $732.61 expenses, from Texas Gulf Sulphur Co.; $2,500, no expenses, from State Rights Association. Expended $1,781.57; this sum includes all business expenses in Washington, only a small portion of which would apply to activities within the purview of the act. (2) Carlyn Apartments, Mayflower Hotel, United States post office, telephone and telegraph companies, local transportation facilities, stationers, food and beverage establishments. (3) Apartment rent, $438; office rent (including air conditioning), $490; taxi fares, etc., $130; telephone and telegraph, $288.77; stamps, stationery, other usual office expenses, $142.50; entertainment and miscellaneous, $292.30. (4) Monthly article in Dallas Magazine, official publication of Dallas Chamber of Commerce. (5) Legislation affecting flood control, water transportation, river and harbor improvement, and taxes.

Milton, Charles J., 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N. J.; Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3237 and S. 249.

Mollin,[4] F. E., 515 Cooper Building, Denver 2, Colo.; American National Live Stock Association. (1) No special receipts for lobbying purposes; the association finances handled in normal fashion. (2) No payments to anyone in connection with lobbying activities; only part of the expense of myself as executive secretary of the association on trips to Washington in past quarter could be chargeable to such; total expense for this purpose was $863.37, plus telephone and telegraph $214.98; Washington stenographer, $211.78. (3) [Blank.] (4) Our own official magazine, the American Cattle Producer. (5) Legislation to authorize and finance participation of our Bureau of Animal Industry in Mexican campaign against foot-and-mouth disease; appropriation bill for market news service.

Mollin,[5] F. E., American National Live Stock Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver 2, Colo. (1) Have had no special contributions for lobbying purposes. The association finances handled in normal fashion. (2) No payments to anyone in connection with lobbying activities. Only part of the expense of myself as executive secretary of the association on trips to Washington in past quarter could be chargeable to such. Total expense for this purpose was: $303.52; telephone and telegraph, $80.87; Washington stenographer, $50.30. (3) [Blank.] (4) Our own official magazine, the American Cattle Producer. (5) Appropriation for foot-and-mouth disease campaign in Mexico; Barrett bills amending Taylor Grazing Act; Gillie-Wherry bills calling for cattle grub research and control; H. R. 597 for regulation of garbage disposal.

Molnar,[3] Joseph, 229 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $138. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Bill for the unemployed.

Mooney, William W., 505 South Eleventh Street, Tacoma, Wash.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, headquarters 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (1) Money allowed on the commission basis under which I am working was $1,076.05. Deductions from this amount: Withholding tax, $142.40; social security, $10.65; leaving a balance of $923. Out of this amount I must pay my travel expenses while out over the State, which is part of my duties. This amounted to $244.35, leaving a balance for personal use of $678.65. (2) Commissions paid to William W. Mooney. Expenses paid for train, bus, and auto travel and hotel expense while out of home city. (3) Duties are to promote interest in the Townsend National Recovery Plan bills now in the United States Congress, known as H. R. 16 and H. R. 2476; to organize clubs or units, create moral and social activities, and request financial contributions for national promotional and educational activities favorable to the bills. (4) At times, send announcements of meetings to local papers, also to the Townsend National Weekly, printed at 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. At times, may send articles to be published in the Townsend Weekly, as well as local papers. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan bills now in congress, known as H. R. 16 and H. R. 2476 and S. 690 in the Senate. Bills all identical.

Moore, Chester B., 606 South Hill Street, Los Angeles, Calif.; Western Growers Association. (1) Regular salary as managing director of Western Growers Association, plus

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[3] Filed with the Clerk only.

[4] Filed for second quarter.

[5] Filed for third quarter.

traveling expenses. (2) To all regular accounts of my personal and business life. (3) [Blank.] (4) Western Grower and Shipper. (5) Am paid regular salary. Not directly employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. I do oppose or support any legislation of interest to our members.

Moore, Clayton, R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N. C. (1) Actual expenses incurred, $245.19. No receipts other than annual salary as set forth in registration form. (2) Eastern Air Lines, $16.56; railroad and pullman fares, $33.28; gasoline and storage, $16.50; taxicabs, $12.50; hotel, meals, and phones, $166.35. (3) Travel, taxi fares, hotel, telephone, and meals. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation affecting R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.

Moran, Raymond H., 46 Burnside Avenue, Cranford, N. J. (International Association of Machinists). (1) Salary, $400; expenses, $83.16; no other expenditures except living expenses. (2) Hotels Hamilton and Ambassador, taxicabs, meals in restaurants, laundry, telephone, postage, etc. (3) All living, transportation, telephone, and telegraph expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation pertaining to railroad labor, particularly opposing bills affecting the now-existing Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Acts.

Morelock, Phil D., Commerce Trust Building, Kansas City, Mo.; Massman Construction Co., Kansas City, Mo. (1) None with respect to this or any other matters before the legislature. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2192 for the relief of Massman Construction Co., Kansas City, Mo.

Morrow, Giles, Freight Forwarders Institute, 225 Colorado Building. (1) Received salary as set forth in Form B, previously filed, plus $178.54 as reimbursement for traveling expenses, taxi fares, and other incidental expenses incurred on office business. Salary and reimbursement of expenses covered services rendered Freight Forwarders Institute, none of which related to legislation during this quarter. (2) Pennsylvania Railroad and various restaurants and taxi drivers in Washington and New York. (3) For actual expenses while away from Washington and for transportation on office business in Washington. (4) Articles in ICC Practitioners' Journal regarding matters of interest to practitioners before the Interstate Commerce Commission. (5) Any legislation directly affecting the interests of freight forwarders subject to part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Morse, Henry Hoyt, 99 Pearl Street, Gardner, Mass. Institute of Cooking and Heating Appliances Manufacturers, Shoreham Hotel, Washington 8, D. C. (1) No money received. (2) No money paid. (3) No work undertaken. (4) Stove Builder. (5) None.

Mosier, Harold G., Hotel Shoreham, Washington, D. C.; the Glenn L. Martin Co., Middle River, Baltimore, Md. (1) See attached sheet.[2] (2) See attached sheet.[2] (3) See attached sheets.[2] (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting aviation.

Murph, Daniel S., the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $100 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3.) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 2494, H. R. 3421, H. R. 869, and S. 1251.

Murphy, Dr. Emmett J., 5737 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington 11, D. C. (National Chiropratic Insurance Co.) (1) None received. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) National Chiropractic Journal. (5) None specified. At present time supporting S. 1428, the Langer bill.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Myrup, Andrew William, 932 Bowen Building, 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C.; Bakery and Confectionery Workers International Union, 2719 North Wilton Avenue, Chicago 14, Ill. (1) Received salary of $108 per week; $1,404 for the quarter. (2) To the registrant. (3) Salary for conducting the research department of the international union with the following duties in the interests of our membership: To collect statistical data and compile same for use of the member locals in negotiation, such surveys to cover hours and earnings, contract clauses, economic data on the industries in which our members work. Also to act as liaison between our organization and various Government agencies, such as NLRB, Labor, Commerce, Agriculture, Social Security, etc., and to watch the progress of legislation both Federal and State in nature. (4) None. (5) None.

National Postal Committee for Books, room 305, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York 19, N. Y.; see registration for statement of membership of committee, American Book Publishers Council, Inc., et al. (1) No receipts. Expenditures: Fees for legal services and disbursements, $8,961.55. (2) $3,242.90 to William J. Bulow, Jr., Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C.; $5,718.65 to Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, 49 Wall Street, New York 5, N. Y. (3) See answer to question (1), above. (4) None. (5) The committee opposes unfair increase in postage rates and discrimination in postage rates such as contained in H. R. 2408 and H. R. 3519.

Neel, Samuel E., 407 Chandler Building, 1427 I Street NW., Washington 5, D. C.; Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago 2, Ill. (1) From July 1 to September 30, 1947: Received, July, $916.66; August, $916.66; September, $916.66; total, $2,749.98; expended, none. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Washington News Letter, published biweekly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America; Letter to Members, published biweekly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America; The Mortgage Banker, published irregularly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America. (5) Matters affecting the mortgage banking industry.

Nelson, George R., grand lodge representative, International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington 1, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5). None.

Newcomb, Elliott H., AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), Victor Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No expense money drawn or expended, except petty cash for taxi fares. (2) See (1). (2) See (1). (4) National AMVET and AMVET Letter. (5) Legislation providing care and assistance for veterans of World War II.

Newton, R. Wayne, National Association of Cooperatives, 407 South Dearborn Street, Chicago 5, Ill. (1) Expense account: July 3, $139.62; July 11, $105.71. Salary: July 14, $354.17; July 31, $354.17. Expense account: August 4, $218.77; meeting expense: August 7, $3.40. Salary: August 14, $354.16; August 29, $354.17; September 15, $354.17; September 30, $354.16. (2) R. Wayne Newton. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Employed to counteract the antifarmer co-op lobbying activities of (1) the National Tax Equality Association, (2) Vernon Scott and Loring Schuler, whether lobbying individually, as officers and employees of the National Tax Equality Association or as a firm or organization and industry counselors claiming the National Tax Equality Association as a client, (3) all State and local tax-equality associations and all national, State, and local small-business or other associations, however known, which are subsidized from, or contributors to, the lobbying funds of the National Tax Equality Association.

Nixon, Russ, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C.; United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, CIO, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,040; expenses, $300. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers, etc. (3) Personal expenses in Washington and travel. These expenses covered both legislative and nonlegislative work. (4) UE News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Noble, William R., National Retail Farm Equipment Association and National Retail Hardware Association, 1024 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Out-of-pocket expenses, $83.45. (2) Public transportation, telephone company, restaurants, and hotels. (3) Taxi fares, phone calls, and luncheons. (4) Farm Equipment Retailing, Hardware Retailer. (5) No specific legislation. Have taken position on wage-and-hour legislation, taxation matters and several minor bills.

Norgord,[1] Christian P., Washington representative, 1617 Rhode Island Avenue NW. (1) September to and including December 1946, salary, $293.01. (2) No money paid. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

O'Connor, Edward H., Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago 3, Ill. (1) Salary received during quarter, $2,125.02; reimbursement for traveling expenses, $391.57. (2) Paid out, $391.57 in traveling expenses to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, and miscellaneous items of personal expense. (3) For personal traveling expenses of the undersigned incurred in carrying out my work for the Insurance Economics Society of America; no moneys expended during this quarter for lobbying activities. (4) None. (5) The Howell bill, H. R. 3150, and its companion, Senate bill 670, by Hawkes, and S. 1320 and its companion, H. R. 3548.

O'Connor,[1] John J., 423 Washington Building, Washington 5, D. C.; the Society of Merchant Marine Inspectors, Post Office Box No. 628, Benjamin Franklin Station, Washington 4, D. C. (1) $2,400 received, $696.38 expended. (2) Western Union; Telephone Co.; miscellaneous. (3) Telegrams, telephones, carfares, and miscellaneous. (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 3494; all activities ceased July 16, 1947.

O'Dunne, Eugene, Jr., Southern Building, Washington 5, D. C.; National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York 16, N. Y. (1) 80 cents, expenditures. (2) [Blank.] (3) 80 cents, taxicab fares. (4) None. (5) S. 814, amendment to section 4 as reported by House Agriculture Committee; H. R. 2860, amendment to section 1 (b).

Ogg, William Raymond, 857 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 58 East Washington Street, Chicago 2, Ill. (1) Approximately $73.55 expended. (See item (6) of Form B, filed December 1946.) (2) Taxis, restaurants. (3) Transportation, luncheon conferences. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Extension of temporary farm-labor program; establishment of a permanent farm-labor program; amendments to Federal Farm Loan Act and Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act; extension of Commodity Credit Corporation; establishment of a national soil-fertility policy and program; extension of Sugar Act; wool price support; marketing agreement amendments; housing; Federal aid to education; amendments to Reclamation Act; taxation; amendments to National Labor Relations Act; St. Lawrence waterway; foreign trade; International Trade Organization; Inland Waterways Corporation; abolishment of Jackson

[1] Filed with the Clerk only.
[1] Filed with the Secretary only.

Hole Monument; agricultural appropriations; crop insurance; appropriation for Hospital Survey and Construction Act; Insecticide Act; plant quarantine; foreign relief; statute of limitations; displaced persons; appropriations for agricultural program of TVA; transfer of Crab Orchard project in Illinois to Department of Interior; Parker River Wildlife Refuge in Massachusetts; coordination of agricultural agencies.

O'Hara, Bart W., secretary to treasurer, Colorado Tax and Equality Commission, Inc., 450 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Oliver, John P., Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington 8, D. C. (1) July 1947, $625 plus $17.25 taxi fares; August 1947, $625 plus $3.30 taxi fares; September 1947, $625 plus $10.60 taxi fares. (2) The grocer, the baker, the landlord, the taxi driver, etc. (3) Living expenses for self and family, transportation, taxes of various kinds. (4) The Reserve Officer, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington 8, D. C. (5) Legislation for the development of a military policy for the United States which will provide adequate national security.

O'Neal, Edward A., American Farm Bureau Federation, 58 East Washington Street, Chicago 2, Ill. (1) Approximately $160.57 expended. (See item (6) of Form B filed December 1946.) (2) Taxi fares, train fares, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Transportation, lodging, and luncheon conferences. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Extension of temporary farm-labor program; establishment of a permanent farm-labor program; amendments to Federal Farm Loan Act and Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act; extension of Commodity Credit Corporation; establishment of a national soil-fertility policy and program; extension of Sugar Act; wool price support; marketing-agreement amendments; housing; Federal aid to education; amendments to Reclamation Act; taxation; amendments to National Labor Relations Act; St. Lawrence waterway; foreign trade; International Trade Organization; Inland Waterways Corporation; abolishment of Jackson Hole Monument; agricultural appropriations; crop insurance; appropriations for Hospital Survey and Construction Act; Insecticide Act; plant quarantine; foreign relief; statute of limitations; displaced persons; appropriations for agricultural program of TVA; transfer of Crab Orchard project in Illinois to Department of the Interior; Parker River Wild Life Refuge in Massachusetts; coordination of agricultural agencies.

O'Neil, Thomas G., Upstate New York Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 83 Main Street, Sidney, N. Y. (1) $35. (2) Disbursements, travel, hotel, etc. Trip to Washington, D. C., July 20, for meeting in connection with tax-equality program. (3) As stated in No. 2 above. (4) None. (5) No particular legislation; legislation tending toward tax equality.

Owens, T. R., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; United Rubber Workers of America, High at Mill Street, Akron, Ohio. (1) Salary, $1,040; expenses, $1,022. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, and other travel expense. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) United Rubber Worker. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Oxholm, Mrs. Theodor, Volunteer Worker for Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 654 Madison Avenue, New York 21, N. Y. (1) None. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) [Blank.] (5) Federal legislation specifically affecting children and child welfare.

Parel, James Donald, 857 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C., American Farm Bureau Federation, 58 East Washington Street, Chicago 2, Ill. (1) Approximately $27.30 expended. (See item (6) of form B, filed December 1946.) (2) Taxis, restaurants. (3) Transportation, luncheon conferences. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting, resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Extension of temporary farm-labor program, establishment of permanent farm-labor program, amendments to Federal Farm Loan Act and Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, extension of Commodity Credit Corporation, establishment of a national soil-fertility policy and program, extension of Sugar Act, wool price support, marketing agreement amendments, housing, Federal aid to education, amendments to Reclamation Act, taxation, amendments to National Labor Relations Act, St. Lawrence waterway, foreign trade, International Trade Organization, Inland Waterways Corporation, abolishment of Jackson Hole Monument, agricultural appropriations, crop insurance, appropriation for Hospital Survey and Construction Act; Insecticide Act, plant quarantine, foreign relief, statute of limitations, displaced persons, appropriations for agricultural program of TVA, transfer of Crab Orchard project in Illinois to Department of Interior, Parker River wildlife refuge in Massachusetts, coordination of agricultural agencies.

Paulson, Nathan J., 1536 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Investors League, Inc., 175 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) $137.75. (2) Railroads, taxis, telephone company, stenographers, stationers, etc. (3) Transportation, telephone calls, stenographic work, office supplies, etc. (4) I write a monthly column for the league bulletin; an article on seniority rule in Congress was published in Forbes Magazine. (5) All legislation affecting investors.

Payne, Albert Alford, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards). (1) Expended, $45.45. (2) Various. (3) Taxis, lunch, etc. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Pearson, Robert W., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None; compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement; deceased July 30, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Perry,[3] Leslie S., National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Per annum salary of Leslie S. Perry increased from $3,600 to $4,200. No expenditures. (2) No expenditures. (3) [Blank.] (4) NAACP bulletin. (5) FEPC, antipoll tax, antilynch, minimum wage, Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing, Murray-Dingell health, Wagner-Murray-Dingell social security, and similar social-welfare legislation.

Peterson, Esther, 1034 Earle Building, Washington, D. C.; Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 15 Union Square, New York 3, N. Y. (1) Received salary of $1,105. Received $396.74 to reimburse actual expenses incurred—$269.60 of this amount was for expenses incurred in Washington, remainder for expenses outside of Washington. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) CIO News and the Advance. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

[3] Filed with the Clerk only.

Petersen, William J., Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, 704 Insurance Building, Madison, Wis. (1) Received my regular salary as executive secretary for the Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, for which I performed my regular duties as chief administrative officer of the chamber, which said duties were related only incidentally to Federal legislation. Aside from my regular salary nothing was received or spent for the purpose of influencing Federal legislation. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Such legislation affecting business and industry generally as I may be instructed to give attention to from time to time.

Pierson, A. T., 71 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.; Howard S. Palmer, James Lee Loomis, and Henry B. Sawyer, trustees, the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. (1) Salary, $1,815, and expenses, $344.55. (2) Hotels, restaurants, transportation companies, taxis, telephones, etc. (3) Expenses for traveling and as shown in item 2. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting employer.

Place, Henry C., care of Townsend, Elliott & Munson, 1100 Provident Trust Building, Seventeenth and Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia 3, Pa.; National Association of Electric Companies. (1) The firm received from the National Association of Electric Companies $6,225 for legal services for the quarter and reimbursement of $524.06 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all legal services to the association, only a part of which fee and expenses was for those purposes described in section 308 (a) or otherwise within the scope of Public Law No. 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, railroads, taxicabs, telephone and telegraph companies. (3) Railroad and transportation, $151.90; hotel and meals, $204.66; telephone and telegraph, $154.64; miscellaneous, $12.86. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which our firm is counsel, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on all problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association therefore is interested in any and all legislation that might affect its members directly or indirectly as going business concerns.

Pollitzer,[3] Miss Anita, 144 B Street NE., Washington 2, D. C. (National Woman's Party). (1) August 7 for traveling expenses, $25. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Pope Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C. (California Fruit Growers Exchange et al.). (1) Receipts, $402.25; expenditures, $1.20. (2) Taxi drivers. (3) Taxi fares. (4) None. (5) H. R. 452, S. 306; H. R. 1825; H. R. 2160.

Posner, Stanley I., 1002 Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.; Linen Supply Association of America, 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago 3, Ill., National Industrial Launderers and Cleaners Association, 333 North Noble Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) Linen Supply Association of America, $2,273.61; National Industrial Launderers, $131.26. (2) No disbursements for purposes of section 307. (3) None. (4) Mimeographed bulletins of the Linen Supply Association and mimeographed bulletins of the National industrial Launderers. (5) Labor legislation, such as Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

Poston, Robert R., 1608 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.; the American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) $201.63, salary semimonthly, less withholding tax; $17.58, incidental expenses for July, August, and September 1947; $110.88, traveling expenses during July, August, and September 1947. (2) Robert R. Poston. (3) $17.58, incidental expenses for July, August, and

[3] Filed with the Clerk only.

September 1947, carfare, lunches; $110.88, reimbursement for traveling expenses, round trip to New York City. (4) The American Legion Magazine, New York City; the National Legionnaire, Indianapolis, Ind. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare; not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations, the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

Poulton, J. E., grand lodge representative, International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington 1, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Prentice, Howard A., 1329 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American-Maize Products Co., New York City. (1) Notary public, $1; taxi, $1.60. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) S. 244; H. R. 1047.

Press, William H., Washington Board of Trade, 204 Star Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,666.65; expenses, $120.10. (2) Miscellaneous taxis and transportation, $27.55; supplies and literature, $1.50; miscellaneous dinners, lunches, etc., $37.25; miscellaneous expenses of visitors, $53.80. (3) Normal operating expenses. (4) Releases sent to Washington newspapers--Evening Star, Washington Post, Times-Herald, and Washington Daily News. (5) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia.

Proctor, Harry E., attorney at law, 1106 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C.; Oliver & Donnally, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York 17, N. Y. (1) $2,000 paid the registrant as salary by Oliver & Donnally; no expenditures. (2) No expenditures. (3) None. (4) The registrant contributed articles for the July, August, and September issues of Mutual Savings Banking, a trade publication of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks. (5) The registrant studied and analyzed a number of bills pertaining to banks, savings and loan associations, taxes, railroads, veterans, and housing.

Publicity Associates, Inc., Empire State Building, New York 1, N. Y. (National Association of Margarine Manufacturers). (1) From National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, $3,476.62; for professional services, $2,250; for out-of-pocket expenses, $1,226.62. (2) Publicity Associates, Inc., for professional services, $2,250. See exhibit A (attached)[2] for detail of out-of-pocket expenses totaling $1,226.62. (3) Compiling and distributing information. (4) See exhibit B (attached).[2] (5) To support legislation designed to free margarine from unfair taxes and other unfair trade barriers, and to oppose legislation creating such taxes and other trade barriers.

Pullen, Donald D., 1010 Seventeenth Street, Denver, Colo. (Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc.) (1) $1,341.30 (April, May, June, 1947); all expenses for handling the State taken out of the above, such as office supplies, traveling expenses, gas, oil, car, hotel bills, etc. (2) No money paid for services rendered, such as secretary or deputy. (3) [Blank.] (4) Townsend National Weekly. (5) The Townsend plan.

Purves, Edmund R., director of public and professional relations, the American Institute of Architects, 1741 New York Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) None, except salary for this period, which amounted to $2,500. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation in relation to the architectural profession.

Pyke, John S., Jones, Day, Cockley & Reavis, 1759 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland 14, Ohio. (1) $1,200 fees, $8.33 reimbursement for expenditures; received from Wine Institute, San Francisco, Calif., part of which was to compensate for services performed within the meaning of the Lobbying Act; money expended, $8.33. (2) Western Union, $1.26; Ohio Bell Telephone Co., $7.07. (3) Telegrams and telephone calls. (4) None. (5) H. R. 1945 and H. R. 1946.

Quigley, Frank, 725 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) $897.21. (2) Hotels, taxicabs, clubs, restaurants, toll-road charges and ferries, and incidental expenses connected with traveling. (3) Conferring with field representatives of American Telephone and Telegraph Co., the Ohio Bell Telephone Co., the Wisconsin Bell Telephone Co., the Northwestern Bell Telephone Co., the Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Co., the Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co., on general matters of information and public relations affecting their varicus companies. (4) None. (5) None.

Raebeck, Helen, National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y. (1) $1,025, pro rata salary received from the National Council of Jewish Women. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Spotlight, a house organ of the National Council of Jewish Women, a small part of which is devoted to asking membership support of certain legislative measures. (5) None; my job is to keep the membership informed on legislative developments and indicate action they can take in support of certain bills.

Ramspeck, Robert, Air Transport Association of America, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Have received no compensation other than my regular salary as previously reported. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Article for August issue of Airports Magazine on sea-air controversy. (5) Legislation for the proper advancement of the air-line industry in the public interest; opposed any amendment to existing law regarding the participation of steamship companies and other surface carriers in air transportation; opposed the enactment of H. R. 2365, to authorize cities and municipalities to apply for designation as terminal points or intermediate points on routes of air carriers; supported legislation to repeal the Federal transportation tax; supported H. R. 2109, to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to permit the establishment of through service between air carriers and surface carriers without the necessity of joint rates; supported request for supplemental appropriations for the Coast Guard to provide for Loran and ocean weather stations.

Rankin,[4] J. Lee, Beghtol & Rankin, partnership, 714 Stuart Building, Lincoln 8, Nebr. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation designed to bring about equality of taxation between private business and cooperatives.

Rankin,[5] J. Lee, Beghtol & Rankin, partnership, 714 Stuart Building, Lincoln 8, Nebr. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation designed to bring about equality of taxation between private business and cooperatives.

Rapp, Leslie M., Simpson Thacher & Bartlett, 120 Broadway, New York 5, N. Y. (1) $118.16 representing reimbursement from the law firm of Simpson, Thacher & Bartlett for out-of-pocket expenses incurred in behalf of Wabash Railroad Co.; Simpson, Thacher & Bartlett has not been reimbursed by said railroad for any expenses, nor has it yet received any fee for registrant's services on behalf of said railroad. (2) Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., Pennsylvania Railroad, and various taxi drivers. (3) Meals, lodging, and transportation. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3861, which, on July 15, 1947, became Public Law No. 169.

Ray, L. S., 2015 Lanier Drive, Silver Spring, Md.; Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $300 ($1,200 yearly). (2) None. (3) Salary as legislative adviser. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2108 and H. R. 1898.

Reck, Jacob, 1023 National Press Building, Washington 4, D. C.; National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers' Association, 270 Park Avenue, New York 17, N. Y. (1) None for lobbying purposes. (2) None. (3) None. (4) National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers' Association Bulletin, which is issued by registrant in his capacity as counsel and Washington representative of National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers' Association. (5) H. R. 3825; this activity is a small portion of my other duties as counsel for the National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers' Association.

Reinhold, James P., 525 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C.; the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago 4, Ill. (1) Received salary for calendar quarter as reported in Registration Form B; $933.33 per month for July and August, and $1,033.33 for September; also received and expended by me, $167.40, for purposes covered in act. (2) Paid for meals in hotels and various restaurants, expended for taxicabs and automobile, telephone calls, and postage. (3) In furtherance of duties described in Registration Form B, of which personal legislative activity is not my principal purpose but is occasional and incidental. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.

Rhodes, Hubert M., room 209, 3308 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington 10, D. C.; Credit Union National Association, Inc., postoffice box 431, Madison 1, Wis. (1) Registrant is a regular employee of the Credit Union National Association and receives no additional compensation for service on legislative work; the amount received and expended by him was $3.74. (2) Taxicab fares for various taxicabs, streetcar fares, and mileage, $3.64; telephone tolls, 10 cents. (3) Trips to House and Senate Office Buildings and telephone calls. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting credit unions.

Rice, Richard M., Wisconsin Tax Equality Association, 231 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis. (1) No money was received for salary; no money was received or expended for purposes falling within the scope of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation designed to effect tax equality as between similar businesses.

Rice, Roland, 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Trucking Associations, Inc. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration; no money was spent. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Commercial News, Los Angeles,

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[4] Filed for second quarter.

[5] Filed for third quarter.

Calif., September 30, 1947. (5) Any legislation affecting the trucking industry.

Richardson, Mrs. Pearl, Citizens' Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None; compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement; employment terminated July 31, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) To support H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Richman, Paul, 1003 K Street NW., Washington 1, D. C. (Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith). (1) Approximately $125. (2) Paul Richman. (3) Office, telephone, salary, and expenses. (4) Washington News Letter. (5) Fair employment practices; immigration.

Richter, Irving, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America UAW-CIO). (1) Salary, $1,120; Expenses, $1,738.61; above includes salary and expenses for nonlegislative work as well as legislative work. (2) Hotels, restaurants, railroads, cab drivers, laundry, etc. (3) Subsistence and travel. (4) CIO News, various UAW-CIO local papers, CIO papers, Wisconsin CIO, Minnesota CIO, Labor Journal, Ammunition, and various labor publications. (5) All legislation supported or opposed by CIO and UAW-CIO, supporting bills to aid the general welfare, and opposing bills harmful to the general welfare.

Riggle, John J., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Salary for July, August, and September 1947, $1,875 (before withholding taxes were deducted). Less than 10 percent of this amount would be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Legislative Digest, a mimeographed résumé of legislation introduced which is of interest to agriculture. Distributed to members of National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Rising, E. W., Suite No. 3, 1215 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (Western Beet Growers Association, Post Office Box 742, Great Falls, Mont.) (1) From Water Conservation Conference, continuing committee, $267.34; from Western Beet Growers Association, $610.32. (2) Miscellaneous expenses in connection with second annual water conservation conference, at Kansas City, Mo., September 18–19, 1947, $117.34; for share office rent and expenses, $150; services rendered Western Beet Growers Association by E. W. Rising during July, August, September, 1947, $610.32. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Roark, L. E., National Founders Association, 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Annual salary, National Founders Association, $15,000. Expensse, nominal travel, hotel, and meals. (2) Common carriers for travel. Hotels for room and meals. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) Labor legislation, tax legislation, and legislation affecting the foundry industry.

Robb, George Mackay, 2517 South Salina Street, Syracuse 5, N. Y. (formerly 942 Church Lane, Yeadon, Pa.); the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America. (1) Salary from J. S. Tibby, treasurer, for July and August 1947 (not on salary from this source in September), $458.33; receipts as on attached sheets,[2] $125.54. (2) Expenditure of $458.33 salary received of J. S. Tibby, as of item 1, was for personal living expenses, hence not accounted here. Expenditures for travel and other expenses as itemized on attached sheet,[2] $78.81. (3) Expenditure of $78.81 as itemized on attached sheet,[2] was incurred in interviewing Members of Congress in connection with introduction of legislation; also interviewing religious leaders. (4) The Covenanter Witness, D. R. Taggart, editor, 1209 Boswell Avenue, Topeka, Kans.; the Christian Patriot, S. E. Boyle, editor, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans. (5) In support of House Joint Resolution 239 and Senate Joint Resolution 150.

Robbins, Paul H., 1359 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; National Society of Professional Engineers. (1) Received salary, $437.50, and expenses, $50, for July, August, September, 1947, for attention to legislative matters. (2) Regular office and travel expenses. (3) As executive director, National Society of Professional Engineers. (4) American Engineer, Legislative Bulletin, National Society of Professional Engineers. (5) All legislation affecting the welfare of professional engineers.

Roemer, Ruth, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, CIO, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York 22, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,040; expenses, $190. (2) Hotels, restaurants, railroads, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses in Washington and travel. These expenses covered both legislative and nonlegislative work. (4) UE News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Rogers, James P., Western Woods Employers, 710 Lewis Building, Portland 4, Oreg. (1) Salary, $2,500; expenses, $1,210.44. None of the foregoing amounts concerns the influence of legislation. (2) Northwest Airlines, United Air Lines, Statler Hotel, Shoreham Hotel. (3) Traveling expenses, $593.41; living expenses and miscellaneous, $317.03. (4) None. (5) General labor bills and Fair Labor Standards Act amendments.

Rogers, Watson, National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (5) None.

Root, Ballantine, Harlan, Bushby & Palmer, 31 Nassau Street, New York 6, N. Y.; 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C.; Greenwich Country Day School, Inc., Old Church Road, Greenwich, Conn. (1) No receipts or expenditures. (2) See No. (1). (3) See No. (1). (4) None. (5) Legislation to extend old-age and survivors' insurance benefits on a permissive basis to school teachers.

Rowe, Roland H., United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 837 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) No money was received by the undersigned during the past quarter for purposes of influencing legislation except $15 (5 hours at $3 per hour) as part of annual salary of $5,480 as vice president and secretary of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., allocable to the preparation of bulletin for signature of president of the organization on "proposed amendment to the Robinson-Patman Act" and a communication on trade surplus of canned foods for use in relief feeding abroad, including request to members to wire Senators and Congressmen to support such inclusion in foreign relief feeding. Also preparation of questionnaire to members on taxing cooperatives, accompanied by covering letter. (NOTE.—The cost to the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association for reproducing copies of bulletin on taxing cooperatives and accompanying letter and mailing out to members was $47.92 (estimated).) (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) Washington News Letter Service of United States Wholesale Grocers' Association and bulletin service of that association. (5) No legislation in particular, any legislation in general affecting the interests of wholesale grocers. He was later specifically authorized by the executive committee of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association to support or oppose general labor legislation and fair employment practice legislation.

Rule, Gordon W., Union Trust Building, Washington 5, D. C.; Spencer Gordon, counsel for American Institute of Accountants, 13 East Forty-first Street, New York 17, N. Y. (1) $500 received from Spencer Gordon on July 17, 1947, for services to that date; none expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) Associate work with Mr. Gordon in opposing H. R. 2657 in first session of Eightieth Congress. (4) I have not caused any such articles or editorials. See Mr. Gordon's Form C, dated October 1947. (5) Opposing H. R. 2657.

Rule, Gordon W., Union Trust Building, Washington 5, D. C.; Gillette Safety Razor Co., Boston, Mass. (1) None received or expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Retained in connection with a proposed amendment to the Revenue Code relating to the foreign tax credit.

Rumely, Edward A., Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City. (1) I received only my salary, commissions, and expenses as reported on earlier Form B; the corporation has reported its disbursements separately on Form A. (2) Disbursements were corporation disbursements and are reported separately on Form A. (3) [Blank.] (4) We never pay to have news articles printed but issue press releases, some of which are reprinted, and of these I have no record. (5) I am not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing legislation. Sometimes the committee trustees take a stand for or against an issue (on legislation) where they think a constitutional principle is involved. Then, I distribute educational material on the question.

Rundquist, George E., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None; compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement; employment terminated July 31, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Rush,[2] Charles J., 1417 K Street NW. (1) Received $666.66 per month as executive secretary. (2) None paid out. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Measures affecting the ownership and operation of real estate.

Russell, Frank E., 112 C Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Star Route Mail Carriers Association. Hotel and living expenses, $930; stenographer, 3 months, $600; office supplies, postage, etc., $150; office rent, $105; total, $1,785. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) The Star Carrier. (5) Legislation of benefit to star route mail carriers.

Russell, Richard M., 30 State Street, Boston 9, Mass.; estate of Charles W. Taintor (administrator, Merchants National Bank and Alexander Whiteside), care of Alexander Whiteside, 30 State Street, Boston, Mass. (1) Money received, $155.47 from administrators of estate of Charles W. Taintor; money expended, $155.47 for actual disbursements. (2) Various. (3) Air lines, hotels, etc., (4) None. (5) S. 483, a bill to reallocate the boundaries and reduce the area of the Gila Federal reclamation project and for other purposes, and its companion, H. R. 1597, to the same effect.

Ryan, M. O., 1401 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York 19, N. Y. (1) Salary for quarter, $3,000, July 1, 1947, to September 30, 1947, inclusive; total personal expenses for taxis, lunches and dinners, phones, etc., in Washington, D. C., were $542.55, of which insignificant amount was for activities related in any way to lobbying. (2) Taxis, Washington restaurants and hotels. (3) Transportation, lunches, and dinners. (4) Organizational bulletins for American Hotel Association. (5) Any legislation affecting hotel industry.

Sabin, L. C., Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland 13, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[2] Filed with the Secretary only.

St. Clair, Lahert, 2633 Fifteenth Street NW.; National Automobile Dealers Association, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $1,250, no expenditures. (See previous quarterly reports for detailed break-down of fee.) (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Anything of interest to retail automobile dealers.

Sanders, J. T.,[3] The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Transportation, $9.35; meals, $7.55. (2) Transportation agencies and restaurants. (3) Transportation, food, etc. (4) None. (5) General agricultural legislation, labor legislation, and other bills related to agriculture.

Sands, Charles E., 4211 Second Street NW., Washington 11, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Support labor legislation, social welfare legislation; oppose dry legislation.

Sasuly, Elizabeth, 930 F Street NW, room 516, Washington, D. C.; Food, Tobacco, Agricultural, and Allied Workers Union of America, CIO, Twentieth and Race Streets, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Salary, $1,125; expenses, $244.78. (2) Hotels, restaurants, railroads, air lines, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) [Blank.] (5) My organization supports all legislation to advance the interest of peace, security, democracy, and the general welfare of the working people. We oppose legislation which would defeat these objectives.

Saylor, Richard D., National Lead Co., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington 6, D. C.; John T. Lewis & Bros. Co. (Philadelphia branch of National Lead Co.), 910 Widener Building, Chestnut and Juniper Streets, Philadelphia 7, Pa. (1) All money received and expended by this registrant was used solely for the maintenance of the Washington office in carrying out its function as manufacturer's representative and no part of it whatsoever was expended in an attempt to influence legislation. (2) Office lessor, telephone company, stationers, etc. (3) Rent, telephone service, supplies needed in carrying out duties as manager of the Washington office. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the operation of the National Lead Co., including the manufacture and sale of its products.

Schoen, Paul W., Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, post-office box 692, Valdosta, Ga. (1) None. (2) None (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at present.

Schoene, Frechill, Kramer & Fanelli, a law partnership composed of Lester P. Schoene, Joseph H. Freehill, Milton Kramer, and Joseph A. Fanelli, 1744 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.; Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None. (Compensation and reimbursement of expenses received as stated on registration statement.) (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 2910.

Schoene, Freehill, Kramer & Fanelli, a law partnership composed of Lester P. Schoene, Joseph H. Freehill, Milton Kramer, and Joseph A. Fanelli, 1625 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.; Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) None received or expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) All written materials are delivered to the client and dissemination is entirely in the client's control. (5) Railroad-retirement and unemployment-insurance matters.

Scott, John R., Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $375 per month as salary, minus social-security and withholding taxes; $12.20 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW National News, VFW Foreign Service, and VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration, and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

Scott, John W., 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. Victor J. Evans & Co., et al. (as previously stated in original registration statement). (1) None, other than monthly salary as indicated at time of original registration. (2) None to anyone. (3) Does not apply. (4) None. (5) As previously stated in my registration statement.

Scott, William C. (report as attorney for National Postal Committee for Books), 49 Wall Street, New York 5, N. Y.; National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York 19, N. Y. (1) No money received during said period. Receipts of the firm of which I am a member are reported in the quarterly report of Mr. Ethelbert Warfield. No expenditures during said period. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to postage rates on books.

Scott, Vernon and Schuler, Loring A., constituting the partnership of Vernon Scott and Loring A. Schuler, organizers and counselors, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago 4, Ill., see attached statement (list of 15 names and addresses[2]). (1) No money was expended for purposes within the scope of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. For money received, see attached statement.[2] (2) No one. See answer to paragraph (1). (3) See answer to paragraph (2). (4) None. (5) Legislation designed to equalize the taxes borne by various types of business corporations.

Scott, Vernon, and Schuler, Loring A., constituting the partnership of Vernon Scott and Loring A. Schuler, organizers and counselors, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago 4, Ill., see attached list (list of 33 names and addresses[2]). (1) No money received; money expended, $60.25. (2) Mark Hopkins Hotel, $37.80; St. Francis Hotel, $22.45. (3) Food. (4) None. (5) Legislation designed to equalize the taxes borne by various types of business corporations.

Seay, Temple W., 902 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C., Massman Construction Co., Kansas City, Mo. (1) None with respect to this or any other matters before the legislature. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2192, for the relief of Massman Construction Co., Kansas City, Mo.

See, Harry, 130 Third Street SE., Washington 3, D. C. (Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen). (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Opposing antilabor legislation and favoring legislation of benefit to labor.

Selby,[4] Meredith, Citizens' Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Selby,[5] Mrs. Meredith, Citizens' Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Shandros, Geraldine, 5 Beekman Street, New York City and 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.; American Communications Association, CIO, 5 Beekman Street, New York 5, N. Y. (1) Salary, $280 (this constitutes one-half of salary received and is so reported, since time spent in activities covered by the act constitutes about one-half of working time); miscellaneous, $20; total, $300. (2) Miscellaneous—taxis, telephone calls, newspapers, etc. (3) Explained above. (4) ACA News. (5) Legislation affecting workers in the communications industry and American working men and women generally.

Shaw, Mark R., 114 Trenton Street, Melrose 76, Mass.; National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Salary, $512.50; traveling expenses, $119.15; refund of actual amounts paid for travel when away from home. (2) Railroads, bus lines, gas stations, hotels, restaurants. (3) Travel for speaking dates, conferences, meetings, etc. (4) Peace Action, bulletins of the NCPW., Boston Herald, Boston Traveler, Melrose Free Press. (5) Universal military training, oppose; economic relief measures for Europe and Asia, favor; other measures related to the issue of war and peace.

Shealey, R. Preston, 503 Colorado Building, Washington 5, D. C.; National Retail Credit Association, 218 Shell Building, St. Louis 3, Mo. (1) From July 1 to September 30, 1947, $1,050 (retainer). This retainer includes services of every description performed for the National Retail Credit Association during the period indicated, none of which during that period was for lobbying; $140.13 (expense account). (2) Stenographer, $365; rent, Colorado Building, $73; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $35; stamps, $15; cabs, $10.50, office supplies, $0.70; lunches, $15.55. (3) Legal services, information releases, surveys. (4) See (3). (5) The National Retail Credit Association has not sponsored or opposed, nor has affiant, legislation in Congress during the period covered by this quarterly report, other than testifying before the Senate and House Post Office Committees on mail rates. See statement this question previous quarterly report.

Shields, Robert H., 1001 Tower Building, Washington 5, D. C.; United States Beet Sugar Association. (1) $16.95. Report subject to the qualifications stated in my registration of February 7, 1947. (2) Taxicab drivers. (3) Transportation. (4) None. (5) Interested in legislation affecting sugar but not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing any legislation.

Shorb, Paul E., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Railroad Security Owners Association, Inc., New York, N. Y. (1) None received, and only small sums expended for long-distance calls. (2) Telephone company. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) Support legislation as proposed in H. R. 2298 and S. 249, as originally introduced, and to oppose H. R. 3237, H. R. 3930, and S. 249 with Reed-Myers amendments.

Shuford, Helen Alcott, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York City. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Sifton,[4] Paul, Committee for the Extension of Labor Education, 2117 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington 7, D. C. (1) Salary, $500; travel expenses, $24.18. (2) Paid to self. (3) Living expenses for self. (4) Occasional articles and releases sent out through Labor Press Associates. (5) Bill for a labor-extension service in the Department of Labor.

Sifton,[5] Paul, National Council for a Permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee, 930 F Street NW., room 901, Washington,

[3] Filed with the Clerk only.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[4] Filed for second quarter.

[5] Filed for third quarter.

D. C. (1) Travel, telephone calls, and living expenses, July 1, 1947, to September 30, 1947, $133.39; salary, July 1, 1947, to September 30, 1947 (after tax deductions), $975.15. (2) [Blank.] (3) For travel, telephone calls, and living expenses, $133.39; salary, after tax deductions, $970.15. (4) [Blank.] (5) Permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee, S. 984 and H. R. 2824.

Slayman, Charles H., Jr., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.]. (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Smith, Allen L., Louisiana Tax Equality Association, Inc., P. O. box 1526, Baton Rouge, La. (1) No money received nor expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To support any legislation designated to amend the Internal Revenue Code that will improve basic taxation principles providing for removal of tax disparities between business competitors.

Smith, Donald W. (report as attorney for American Nurses' Association), 49 Wall Street, New York 5, N. Y.; American Nurses' Association, 1790 Broadway, New York 19, N. Y. (1) No receipts for legislative activities during said period; fee for general services did not cover any legislative activities. Expenditures: Transportation, $21.92; hotel rooms, $6.60; meals, $7.80; taxi fares, $3.20; carfares, $0.15; miscellaneous, $0.20. (2) Various railroad, hotels, restaurants, taxicab companies, and transportation companies. (3) Transportation, hotel rooms, and meals, taxi fares and carfares. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to nurses, nursing or health, on which the American Nurses' Association has taken a stand; to support specifically the extension of social-security coverage to include employees of nonprofit institutions and self-employed nurses.

Smith, Dudley, Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) $1,000 a month from the Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, but not for the principal purpose of influencing legislation, which is a minor part of my activities. (2) None for the purpose of influencing legislation. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 4075, subject to the conditions stated in (1) above.

Smith, Harold O., Jr., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C., National Confectioners' Association of the United States, Inc., 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago 2, Ill. (1) During the past quarter I did not have occasion to engage in any activities which could be construed as lobbying. The purpose of my employment with this organization, as manager of their Washington office, is to serve as liaison with the Government agencies and such other matters as emanate from Washington. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Smith, Howard J., Central Arizona Project Association, 507 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz. (1) July, salary, $750; August, salary, $750 plus travel expense, $29.95; September, salary, $750 plus travel expense, $146.98. (2) Howard J. Smith, executive secretary, Central Arizona Project Association, 507 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz. (3) Salary, travel expense, room and board when engaged in travel in interest of the association. (4) The Case for Water in Central Arizona, Work for Water, California's Stake in Arizona's Share of the Colorado River. (5) Employed to support Senate bill S. 1175.

Smith, Lloyd W., room 425, Shoreham Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C., Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary as reported on registration Form B, for services as special representative of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. during period July 1 to September 30, 1947, as well as reimbursement for routine expenses of $327.50 in July, $219.60 in August, and $424.37 in September 1947. (2) Various restaurants, hotels, taxicabs, telephone, telegraph, Pullman Co., stationers, etc. (3) In furtherance of duties described in registration Form B, which involve legislation only incidentally and to a limited extent. Affiant states upon information and belief, that none of his activity during the period covered by this report was within the scope of section 307 of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting interests of Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. Other duties for said company comprise the major part of his work.

Smith, Purcell L., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (National Association of Electric Companies). (1) Received salary of $16,250 as president of the National Association of Electric Companies and reimbursements of $420.29 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all official duties, only a part of which salary and expenses were for those purposes described in the act. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, clubs, railroads, air lines, taxicabs, telephone and telegraph companies. (3) Railroad and transportation, $74.34; hotel, clubs, and restaurant, $205.56; subscriptions, gratuities, and miscellaneous, $131.94; telephone and telegraph, $8.45. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which I am president, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association therefore is interested in legislation that might affect its members as going business concerns.

Smith, Robert E., 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y., Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association. (1) Received, $1,500; expended, $151.90. See attached.[2] (2) See attached.[2] (3) See attached.[2] (4) See attached.[2] (5) See attached.[2]

Smith, Robert E., 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y., National Conference of Railroad Investors. (1) Received, $974.97; expended, $267.33. See attached.[3] (2) See attached.[3] (3) See attached.[2] (4) See attached.[2] (5) See attached.[2]

Smith, Russell,[4] [7] 300 B Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Only salary and actual expenses. (2) Various taxicab drivers and restaurants. (3) Transportation and meals in course of business. (4) None. (5) All major legislation pending in Congress.

Smith, Sylvester C., Jr., 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J., the Prudential Insurance Co. of America. (1) Nothing. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) [Blank.]

Snyder, Calvin K., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards.) (1) See attached.[2] (2) See attached.[2] (3) See attached.[2] (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Spencer, Lyndon, Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland 13, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Spofford, Charles M., Davis, Polk, Wardwell, Sunderland & Kiendl, 15 Broad Street, New York 5, N. Y. (1) The law firm of Davis, Polk, Wardwell, Sunderland & Kiendl, of which registrant is a member, received $3,420.13, of which $3,000 represents legal fee and $420.13 represents reimbursement of disbursements. (Reference is made to attached rider[2] for further details.) (2) Reference is made to the attached rider.[2] (3) Reference is made to the attached rider.[2] (4) None. (5) S. 591, an act to amend the act of January 5, 1905, to incorporate the American National Red Cross. S. 591 was signed by the President on May 8, 1947, as Public Law 47.

Stebbins, Frank, room 1025, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago 4, Ill.; Illinois Associated Businessmen, Inc., 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago 4, Ill. (1) Money received as reimbursement for traveling expenses, $197.30. (2) Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, $66.55; Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., $18.50; food and incidentals, $32.25. (3) Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, transportation; Statler Hotel, lodging—restaurants, bars, taxies, phones, incidentals. (4) None. (5) All legislation helpful to businesses.

Steele, Raymond E., general counsel, National Fisheries Institute, Inc., 228 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) No particular legislation.

Steffan, Arthur A., 1616 I Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.; Petrol Corp., Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Fees, $1,400; expenses, $1,595.68. (2) Railroads, hotels, employees, restaurants, etc. (3) Secretarial, travel, and office expense. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3499 for relief of Petrol Corp.

Stein, Margaret I., Committee for the Nation's Health, 914 G Place NW., Washington 1, D. C.; Committee for the Nation's Health, 1790 Broadway, New York 19, N. Y. (1) Received salary, $666.67; received expenses, none. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) National health insurance.

Steinert, Blossom, Citizens' Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement; employment terminated July 31, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) To support H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Stellwagen, Herbert P., Indemnity Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia 1, Pa. (1) Deponent has neither received nor expended any money for attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress. He has merely been reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses in traveling to and from the District of Columbia. (2) No payments have been made except as stated for deponent's own transportation and subsistence. (3) As stated in (2). (4) None. (5) That relative to the regulation of insurance rates in the District of Columbia.

Stewart,[5] Annalee (Mrs. Alexander Stewart), 1734 F Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.; Women's Committee To Oppose Conscription, 2006 Walnut Street, Philadelphia 3, Pa. (1) Railroad, $72.56; hotel or room rent, $53.50; meals, $56.95; taxi and carfare, $21.60; tips, $2.85; postage and telephone, $12.66. (2) [Blank.] (3) Railroad fare, room and board, and actual living expenses while in Washington working to oppose universal military training. (4) [Blank.] (5) Oppose universal military training.

Stewart,[3] [4] Annalee (Mrs. Alexander Stewart), 1734 F Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.; Women's Committee To Oppose Conscription, 2006 Walnut Street, Philadelphia 3, Pa. (1) Railroad fare, $14.07; hotel and room, $75; meals, $65.07; taxi and carfare, $25.15; tips, $4.80; postage and telephone, $13.73; secretarial help, $22. (2) [Blank.] (3) Railroad fare, room and board, and actual living expenses while in Washington working to oppose universal military training. (4)

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[3] Filed with the Clerk only.
[4] Filed for second quarter.
[5] Filed with the Secretary only.
[6] Filed for first quarter.

[Blank.] (5) Oppose universal military training.

Stewart, Charles T., 1737 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, public relations department. (1) Salary (half time), $1,500; for expenses, $4.90. (2) Various. (3) Taxi fares, etc. (4) Attached list[2] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by those publications is not available. (5) Legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Stoll, Edwin L., National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) July 1–September 30, 1947; Salary, $850 (half time); for expenses, $31.53. (2) Various. (3) Taxis, papers, etc. (4) Attached list[2] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Legislation affecting the real estate industry.

Stringer, Harry R., Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Strong, Arthur D., Upper Mississippi Waterway Association, 1034 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis 1, Minn. (1) Salary, July 1 to September 30, 1947, $625; reimbursement for expenses, $358.76; total, $1,183.76. (2) Arthur D. Strong. (3) Salary and reimbursement for traveling, hotels, entertaining, attending meetings, hearings, and conventions. (4) None. (5) Registrant is employed to support legislation relating to the improvement and development of navigable waterways in the upper Mississippi River, together with legislation relating to flood control, conservation, pollution, recreation, fish and wildlife, including all legislation that has to do with the development of water resources of the upper Mississippi River and its tributaries as this legislation relates to all types of public benefits. He is employed to oppose legislation detrimental to the above.

Sturgis, Arthur, Jr., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Salary, $200; expenses $7.05. (2) Taxi drivers, streetcars. (3) Taxi, streetcar travel. (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor law revision, social-security law revision, inflammable fabric legislation.

Sturrock, J. E., Texas Water Conservation Association, 607–609 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex. (1) Salary for July, August, and September 1947, $1,500, less income tax. Traveling expenses for July, August, and September 1947, $327.90. (2) $327.90 traveling expenses paid to various railroads, airlines, and taxi companies, hotels and restaurants. (3) Covering transportation, meals and lodging, and entertainment. (4) Texas Water Conservation Association Bulletins and various analyses of bills pending in Congress and Texas Legislature. (5) Employed to support all legislation, both State and National, having to do with the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of Texas' water resources through existing State and Federal agencies; to oppose all legislation creating Federal valley authorities and all legislation which seeks to superimpose Federal control over State control in the distribution of the State's water resources.

Sullivan, Francis M., director of national legislation, Disabled American Veterans, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (Disabled American Veterans). (1) The Disabled American Veterans paid to Francis M. Sullivan, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., as salary and expenses for the period of July, August, September 1947, the sum of $1,818.39. (2) Francis M. Sullivan. (3) Salary and expenses. (4) DAV Semimonthly. (5) All legislation pertaining to disabled war veterans, their families, and dependents of deceased war veterans.

Sutlive, Carey R., 623 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (National Association of Manufacturers). (1) Receipts: Salary, $2,000; expenses reimbursed by employer, $400.11. Expenditures: $400.11. (2) Expenses paid to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, etc. (3) For expenses incurred in course of business, such as travel, meals, and hotel accommodations and expenses of conducting conferences for discussion of business matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting industry, such as legislation relating to national labor policy, taxation, public expenditures, industrial controls, social security, research, patents, and investments.

Swanson, Walter S. J., National Highway Users Conference, 938 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration. He expended a total of $3.20. (2) The money was paid to various taxi drivers employed in transporting registrant between his office and the Capitol. (3) For taxi transportation between office and Capitol. (4) Prepared, circularized, and filed a petition to Congress urging the repeal of the Federal automotive excise taxes. Prepared articles in Highway Highlights, published by the National Highway Users Conference. (5) Within the general responsibility of my office I carried on the work outlined above. The only legislation to which this activity has been directed is a modification of the Federal automotive excise taxes for which no bills have been introduced.

Swomley,[3] John M., Jr., 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) $195.18 for out-of-pocket expenses between Washington and New York City. Works on voluntary basis. (2) John M. Swomley, Jr., acting director of the National Council Against Conscription. (3) Above-noted out-of-pocket travel expenses. (4) Conscription News weekly news bulletin (suspended during summer) and Progressive Magazine. (5) Compulsory military training in peacetime, and support of international abolition of conscription.

Tarver, Malcolm C., Dalton, Ga., committee on taxation, barytes industry (Mr. Holland W. Smith, chairman), 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York City. (1) $2,500 as balance of agreed compensation; all services contracted for having now been performed and the employment ended. (2) Malcolm C. Tarver. (3) For the purposes stated in answering (1). (4) None. (5) Legislation to restore depletion credit for barytes, provided in section 124, Revenue Act of 1943, and which expired December 31, 1946.

Taylor, John Thomas, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., the American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) $417.77 salary, semimonthly, less withholding and social-security taxes; $520.35 reimbursement for traveling expenses during July, August, and September 1947; $20.20 incidental expenses for July, August, and September 1947. (2) John Thomas Taylor. (3) $520.35 reimbursement for traveling expenses, round trips to New York City, Appleton, Wis., and Salt Lake City, Utah. $20.20 incidental expenses for July, August, and September 1947. (4) The American Legion Magazine, New York City; the National Legionnaire, Indianapolis, Ind. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense, Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immgraton and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and asistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations, the development of sound civil-aviation programs and policies; the developmeent of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

Taylor, Margaret K., 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation). (1) Expenses, $10.95. (2) Various. (3) Taxi fares. (4) None. (5) Any legislation which may affect milk producers.

Taylor,[4] Tyre, 712 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn. (1) Received $3,375.02 as one-quarter of adjusted annual retainer by Southern States Industrial Council. Expenditures as follows: (*a*) Adjusted regular office expenses amounting to $471.18; (*b*) for research and technical assistance, $1,375.02; (*c*) travel expense, $78. (2) (*a*) Landlord, printer, stamps, telephone, etc.; (*b*) Henry Bison, Jr.; (*c*) Washington taxicab operators. (3) See (1) above for purposes. (4) Semimonthly news bulletin of Southern States Industrial Council, National Grocers' bulletin (published monthly). (5) The general legislative program of the council with particular emphasis on legislation favorable to the maintenance of a free-enterprise system.

Taylor,[5] Tyre, 712 Jackson Place, Washington 6, D. C.; Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville 3, Tenn. (1) Received $3,375.02 as one-quarter of adjusted annual retainer by Southern States Industrial Council. Expenditures as follows: (*a*) Adjusted regular office expenses amounting to $454.53; (*b*) research and technical assistance, $1,375.02; (*c*) travel expense, $78. (2) Landlord, printer, stamps, telephone, etc.; (*b*) Henry Bison, Jr.; (*c*) Washington taxicab operators. (3) See (1) above for purposes. (4) Semimonthly news bulletin of Southern States Industrial Council, National Grocers' bulletin (published monthly). (5) The general legislative program of the council with particular emphasis on legislation favorable to the maintenance of a free-enterprise system.

Thompson, Chester C., the American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) Received salary from the American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C.—$4,500, covering July, August, September 1947. (2) Miscellaneous expenses, $26.50. (3) Local transportation expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting domestic water carrier and operator industry of the United States.

Thomson, Mrs. Dorothy W., American Parents Committee, 300 B Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) $44.71. (2) Various. (3)

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[3] Filed with the Secretary only.

[4] Filed for second quarter.

[5] Filed for third quarter.

Telephone calls, cab fares, lunches, and other miscellaneous expense. (4) The Parents' Magazine. (5) National School Health Services Act.

Tinney, William H., the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Salary: $487.74 in July and August, and $519.36 in September, which is paid for all the services rendered to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., only a part of which have to do with legislation; $56.88 was expended by me as expense money during the third quarter of 1947 for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals; in addition to this amount, I also received $265.87 for expenses incurred in connection with other duties performed for the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., which have no relation to the purposes covered by this act. (2) Various transportation companies, restaurants, garages, communication companies, etc. (3) $265.87 was expended by me as expense money during the third quarter of 1947 for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Tobin, Fred A., 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers Union of America, 222 East Michigan Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) My salary is $1,000 per month or $3,000 for quarter year. I do not incur any expenses in performance of legislative work. (2) Fred A. Tobin. (3) I am an attorney representing the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers Union and its affiliated locals before the Interstate Commerce Commission and the National Labor Relations Board. Am the liaison representative between various Government agencies and international union and the affiliated locals. The above includes general services of a nonlegislative nature pertaining to business and operation of International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals; also for part-time services in connection with legislation, both Federal and State, for the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals. (4) I do not have any connection with any newspaper. (5) Legislation, Federal and State, which may affect the interests of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals, particularly in the field of labor law.

Tobler, H. Willis, 857 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 58 East Washington Street, Chicago 2, Ill. (1) Approximately $35 expended. (See item No. 6 of Form B, filed December 1946.) (2) Taxis. (3) Transportation. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Extension of temporary farm-labor program; establishment of permanent farm-labor program; amendments to Federal Farm Loan Act and Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act; extension of Commodity Credit Corporation; establishment of a national soil-fertility policy and program; extension of Sugar Act; wool-price support; marketing-agreement amendments; housing; Federal aid to education; amendments to Reclamation Act; taxation; amendments to National Labor Relations Act; St. Lawrence waterway; foreign trade; International Trade Organization; Inland Waterways Corporation; abolishment of Jackson Hole Monument; agricultural appropriations; crop insurance; appropriation for Hospital Survey and Construction Act; Insecticide Act; plant quarantine; foreign relief; statute of limitations; displaced persons; appropriations for agricultural program of TVA; transfer of Crab Orchard project in Illinois to Department of the Interior; Parker River Wildlife Refuge in Massachusetts; coordination of agricultural agencies.

Tone, Joseph M., legislative representative, International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington 1, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Truitt, Paul T., National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any margarine legislation.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. John Frederick Firth-Hand, 1744 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) S. 1742, Eightieth Congress, first session, a bill for the relief of John Frederick Firth-Hand.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, the Insurance Co. of the State of Pennsylvania, 308 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation for the just payment of French spoliation claims.

Van Arnum, John R., 512 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (National League of Wholesale Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Distributors). (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Vance C. W., Room 312, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 4, D. C.; Order of Railway Conductors of America, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. (1) Salary, $434; expenses, $294.62; no money expended except for personal maintenance. (2) Hamilton Hotel, taxicabs, telephone, telegraph, postage, laundry, cleaning, pullman fare, and various restaurants. (3) Necessary living, transportation, communication, and living expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting railway labor and particularly to oppose bills detrimentally affecting the existing railroad retirement and railroad unemployment insurance system.

Vernon, Weston, Jr., 15 Broad Street, New York 5, N. Y.; New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York 5, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) See answers to (1) and (2). (4) None. (5) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

Vogt, Joseph F., the Employees Committee for Low-Cost Retirement Benefits, 1186 Broadway, New York 1, N. Y. (1) Received $15 on August 27, 1947, from the above-mentioned committee as part payment of expenses of $72.30 incurred in July, August, and September, leaving a balance of $57.30 due me for this period plus a cash loan of $50 made to the committee on August 1. These figures do not include a cash loan of $150 made to the committee on June 2 and expenses of $15.45 incurred in June. These are mentioned inasmuch as they were not previously reported. (2) Cash loans were made to the committee and balance was for train fare, carfare, telephone, and other miscellaneous expenses. (3) Cash loans were made to the above-mentioned committee to start it going. Balance was for train fare, car fare, telephone, and other miscellaneous expenses. (4) None. (5) Crosser Act, passed into law July 31, 1946.

Voorhis,[1] Jerry, 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill., the Cooperative League of the United States of America. (1) See letter attached.[2] (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Walsh, George, 1 Gardner Street, Newton, Mass.; World War Veterans of the United States Merchant Marine, 287 Hanover Street, Boston, Mass. (1) No money received. (2) No money paid out. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 476; S. 429.

Walter, Stephen M., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Electric Companies et al. (1) See exhibit I.[2] (2) See exhibit II.[2] (3) See exhibit II.[2] (4) None. (5) All pending or proposed Federal legislation affecting the interests of the electric utility industry.

Ward, D. J., 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Imported Nut Section, Association of Food Distributors, 161 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Fee, $1,500; expenses, $84.83. (2) Telephone and telegraph, cabs, travel, entertaining, business publications, duplicating, etc., $34.88. (3) Same. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting imports of tree nuts.

Warfield, Ethelbert (report as attorney for American General Corp.), 49 Wall Street, New York 5, N. Y.; American General Corp., 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N. J. (1) Receipts: No money received during said period. Expenditures: Transportation and travel expenses, $16.60; hotel expense, $12.82; meals, $10.20; telephone calls, $12.90; telegrams, $3.30; postage, $0.83; total, $56.65. (2) Various railroad companies; Hotel Carlton, Washington, D. C.; various restaurants and telephone companies; Western Union; United States Post Office. (3) Transportation, hotel rooms, meals, telephone calls, telegrams, and postage. (4) None. (5) To oppose S. 859 and H. R. 3351.

Warfield, Ethelbert (report as attorney for National Postal Committee for Books), 49 Wall Street, New York 5, N. Y.; National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York 19, N. Y. (1) Receipts: $5,718.65, for legal fees and disbursements (current and past). Expenditures: Hotel rooms and meals, $16.77; telephone calls, $13.45; postage, $1.56; carfare, $0.10; above fee paid to Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens for services by firm as counsel in all capacities. (2) Various hotels, telephone companies, United States Post Office and various transportation companies. (3) Hotel rooms and meals, telephone calls, postage, and carfare. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to postage rates on books.

Warner, Milo J., 1631 Nicholas Building, Toledo 4, Ohio (The Prudential Insurance Co. of America). (1) See exhibit No. 1 attached.[2] (2) See exhibit No. 1.[2] (3) See exhibits No. 1 and 2.[2] (4) None. (5) See exhibit No. 2.[2]

Wasserman, Jack, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C.; Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None; compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement; employment with Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons terminated July 31, 1947. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2910.

Waterfield, Maynard H., Citizens National Committee, Inc., 2844 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,124; expense (taxi fare), $59.85. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Washington Close-up, 'Round Washington, miscellaneous research reports. (5) None.

Watson, J. R., Mississippi Railroad Association, Room 1, Illinois Central Railroad passenger station, Jackson, Miss. (1) Salary monthly, without segregation, as stated in registration; and reimbursement of expenses incurred in the total amount of $284. (2) Hotel Raleigh, for room and other charges, $66.30; Pullman Co., for pullman tickets, $21; telephone company, $5.25; telegraph company, $3.84; various restaurants, dining cars, taxicabs; nominal sums, including tips, to individuals; postage and other incidental travel and subsistence expenses in the aggregate sum of $187.61. (3) For hotel, travel, meals, and other expenses incident to my employment, as stated above. (4) None. (5) As stated in my registration, my employment is primarily for purposes not related to Federal legislation but as an incident thereto any such legislation pertaining to railroads in Mississippi.

Waybur, Bruce, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., United Electrical, Radio

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Filed with the Clerk only.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

and Machine Workers of America, CIO, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,040; expenses, $130. (2) Restaurants, cab drivers, etc. (3) Personal expenses in Washington. These expenses covered both legislative and nonlegislative work. (4) UE News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Weathersby, Newton Patrick, Room 303, Machinists Building, Washington 1, D. C.; International Association of Machinists, District No. 44. (1) Salary, $1,000; $20 legislative expenses during quarter. (2) Taxi drivers and operators of eating and refreshment places. (3) Lobbying; i. e., supporting or opposing, as the case may be, legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general. Not more than 10 percent of time spent on this work. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and occasionally organized labor in general.

Webb, William H., National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) See attached schedule.[3] (2) Charles F. Kraft, treasurer; Superintendent of Documents; Law Reporter Printing Co.; Hotel Statler; Hamilton National Bank; Washington Daily News; National Reclamation Association. (3) As indicated in attached schedule and for miscellaneous office, personal, and traveling expenses. (4) The Waterways Journal. (5) All laws and regulations needed to promote the maintenance and improvement of waterways, the development and protection of water transportation, etc.

Wellington, Beatrice M., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None; compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement; employment terminated July 31, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Welliver, Edward M., American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration; he expended a total of $16.75. (2) The money was paid to various taxi drivers employed in taking registrant between his office and the Capitol or House or Senate Office Buildings and to clerks or cashiers in lunchrooms. (3) The money paid taxi drivers was for transportation to and from my office as indicated in (2), and the money paid to clerks or cashiers was for lunches. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the trucking industry.

Welch, Don, post-office box 231, Madill, Okla.; the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co. See original declaration. (1) My salary as shown in my original declaration and traveling expenses of $569.55, as stated below. (2) For traveling expenses only while in Washington, D. C., from July 1 to 21, 1947, and expense of trip from Washington, D. C., to my home in Madill, Okla., July 21–25, 1947, total expenses, $569.55. (3) For traveling expenses only. (4) None. (5) S. 110, H. R. 221, H. R. 3150, H. R. 1639, and S. 670.

Westcott, James B., 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago 2, Ill., Salt Producers Association, Book Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) Telegrams, $3.18; telephone, $8.60. (2) Western Union Telegraph Co. and Illinois Bell Telephone Co. (3) The expenses incurred were in connection with H. R. 2717. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2717.

White, Richard P., American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 636 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts of salary, $2,500; expenses reimbursed by employers, $648.73. (2) Expenses paid to various air lines, railroads, hotels, clubs, restaurants, taxies, associations, etc. (3) Attending meetings of association committees; local associations; and payment for miscellaneous publications. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation affecting the nursery industry.

Whitehall, Albert V., 1834 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C., American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Quarterly salary, $1,895.94; reimbursement of travel expenses, $386.02. (2) Various air lines, railroads, hotels, and recipients of miscellaneous amounts for taxicabs, meals, and similar necessary expenses. (3) Necessary traveling expenses as indicated. (4) Hospitals, the official journal of the American Hospital Association; Trustee, the journal for members of hospital governing boards. (5) Legislation which might affect the quality of hospital service to the people of this country.

Whitlock, Douglas, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C.; Building Products Institute, 1756 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) From Building Products Institute, Washington, D. C.: Fee, $1,500; expenses, $482.79. (2) Telephone and telegraph, $84.44; restaurant, $33.75; taxi, $7.95; traveling, $356.65. (3) As indicated by items above. (4) None. (5) All legislation which may affect the producers of building materials.

Whyte, Louis E., Independent National Gas Association of America, 1700 Eye Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Salary, as reported on Form B; expenses, $7.50. (2) Taxicabs. (3) Trips to Capitol and return. (4) Natural Gas News Letter. (5) Am interested in legislation proposing amendments to the Natural Gas Act.

Wickenden, Elizabeth, 522 Transportation Building, Washington 6, D. C.; American Public Welfare Association, 1313 East Sixtieth Street, Chicago 37, Ill. (1) $800 (half time), salary received. (2) None. (3) None. (4) APWA Letter to Members. (5) Any legislation affecting public welfare administration.

Wicklein, Louis M., general vice president, Sheet Metal Workers' International Association, 642 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (Sheet Metal Workers' International Association). (1) No money received except regular salary and expenses; no money expended for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation; total salary for quarter, $2,250; total expenses for quarter, $2,100. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Spasmodic and incidental to my work as general vice president of the Sheet Metal Workers' International Association; the only time I do any legislative work is when any legislation is pending which would affect the railroad membership of our organization.

Wilkinson,[4] Ernest L., and Wilkinson, Glen A., doing business in the name of Ernest L. Wilkinson, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C. (Menominee Tribe of Indians). (1) $2,600 annually for legal services; although no amount is paid for supporting or opposing legislation, we state views of Menominee Tribe when so requested by them. (2) None paid except for communication, necessary local transportation, and trip by Glen A. Wilkinson to Chicago to confer with representatives of Indian Office and members of Menominee Advisory Council; amount from May 20, 1947, to present is $38.17 for expenses. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) Supporting H. R. 2484.

Wilkinson,[5] Ernest L., and Wilkinson, Glen A., doing business in the name of Ernest L. Wilkinson, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C.; Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Reservation, Keshena, Wis. (1) $2,600 annually for legal services. Although no amount is paid for supporting or opposing legislation, we state view of Menominee Tribe when so requested by them. (2) None paid except for communication and necessary local transportation. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) Supporting H. R. 2484.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., Goodwin, Francis M., Wilkinson, Glen A., Deem, Woodruff J., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Klamath, Modoc, and Yahooskin Bands of Snake Indians, known as the Klamath Tribe of Indians of Klamath Indian Agency, Oregon. (1) Received $1,125 quarterly payment for legal services, of which legislative matters constitute only a part; expenditures amounted to $243.12. (2) For taxicab, telephone, telegrams, and delivery charges and postage and trip of Glen A. Wilkinson to Klamath Reservation and return for senatorial hearing. (3) Transportation to and from Capitol and telegrams to Klamath Agency, Oreg., and telephone calls to Klamath Agency, Oregon. (4) None. (5) Supporting H. R. 2501, H. R. 2502, H. R. 2775, and S. 1222.

Willard, Charles H., Davis, Polk, Wardwell, Sunderland & Kiendl, 15 Broad Street, New York 5, N. Y. (1) Reference is made to the rider accompanying the report, dated July 18, 1947, of Charles M. Spofford. (2) Reference is made to the rider accompanying the report dated July 18, 1947, of Charles M. Spofford. (3) Reference is made to the rider accompanying the report dated July 18, 1947, of Charles M. Spofford. (4) None. (5) S. 591, an act to amend the act of January 5, 1905, to incorporate the American National Red Cross; S. 591 was signed by the President on May 8, 1947, as Public Law 47.

Willenbucher, Franz Otto, Retired Officers Association, Inc., 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C. (1) Received $750; no part of this sum was received specifically for the purpose of attempting to influence legislative action. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) Retired Officers Association Bulletin. (5) Legislation affecting retired officers, warrant officers, and nurses of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

Williamson,[6] C. J., 901 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C.; California State Chamber of Commerce. (1) During the period of April 1 to June 30, 1947, none of my activities fell under the provisions of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Williamson,[4] John C., Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $500 per month as salary minus social-security and withholding taxes; $108.05 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW National News, VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

Williamson,[5] John C., Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $500 per month as salary minus social-security and

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[4] Filed for second quarter.

[5] Filed for third quarter.

[6] Filed with the Clerk only.

[4] Filed for second quarter.

[5] Filed for third quarter.

withholding taxes; $33.15 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW National News, VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

Wilson, E. Raymond, Friends Committee on National Legislation, 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington 8, D. C. (1) Gross salary, July, August, September, 1947, $1,375; travel expense, $271.28. (2) Carfare, $190.43; meals, $15.15; telephone and telegraph, $9.70; miscellaneous, $56; total, July–September 1947, $271.28. (3) Travel is for the purpose of attending yearly meetings, quarterly meetings, or conferences of Friends and other groups to interpret developments in national and international policy, with special reference to legislation, and for other committee business. (4) We send a newsletter to a limited number of subscribers and Friends about once a month. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization and world economic stability, world disarmament, foreign relief, aid to refugees, protection for racial minorities; support for the rights of conscience; opposition to conscription and the militarization of America.

Wilson, Eugene E., Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

Wilson, Everett B., Jr., 728 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C.: Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) $750 monthly from Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, but not for principal purpose of influencing legislation, which is a minor part of my activities. (2) None for purpose of influencing legislation. (3) None. (4) Newspapers in Puerto Rico only. (5) Certain legislation pertaining to sugar or Puerto Rico.

Wilson, J. B., Wyoming Wool Growers Association, McKinley, Wyo. (1) Salary, Wyoming Wool Growers Association, $1,500. Expenses paid by National Wool Growers Association and Wyoming Wool Growers Association, $1,699. (2) J. B. Wilson, whose principal employment is as secretary of the Wyoming Wool Growers Association; lobbying for or against legislation is a part of his duty, but not his principal occupation and for which he receives no added compensation. His expenses, however, are paid by the National Wool Growers Association as chairman of their legislative committee and by the Wyoming Wool Growers Association. (3) Hotels, meals, stenographer, etc. (4) J. B. Wilson is secretary of the Wyoming Wool Growers Association and editor of the Wyoming Wool Grower, a semimonthly publication, published by the Wyoming Wool Growers Association for its members. (5) To support any legislation affecting wool-growing industry, including wool bills, tariff, public-land legislation, etc.

Wilson, Lacey C., room 310, 10 Independence Avenue; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland 15, Ohio. (1) Salary, $300; expenses, $300. (2) Lacey C. Wilson. (3) Salary and personal expenses while working in behalf of legislation in which the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen is interested. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting the interest of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

Wingert, E. L., 1 West Main Street, Madison 3, Wis. (Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce). (1) Received my share of retainer fee paid my firm for general services as legal counsel for Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, involving mainly services unrelated to Federal legislation. Aside from that, received nothing for use in influencing Federal legislation and expended nothing for that purpose. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Such legislation affecting business and industry generally as I may be instructed to give attention to from time to time.

Winn, Arthur L., Jr., Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C.: National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Clark & La Roe, law firm, received from the National Independent Meat Packers Association $4,500 total of monthly payments for general legal services, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payment made to any other person. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) I have not supported or opposed any legislation during the past quarter.

Winn, Arthur L., Jr., Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C.: Seatrain Lines, Inc., 39 Broadway, New York 6, N. Y. (1) Clark & La Roe, law firm, received from Seatrain Lines, Inc., $1,875 monthly payments on annual retainer, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payments made to any other person. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) I have not supported or opposed any legislation during the past quarter.

Winter, Everett T., 705 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.; Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) None for legislative purposes. (2) None for legislative purposes. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at the present time.

Wisdom, John Minor, care of Wisdom & Stone, 312 Whitney Building, New Orleans, La., Louisiana Community Property Taxpayers Committee. (1) Retainer fees, as attorney, $1,249.48; received as reimbursement for traveling expenses to Washington, stenographic expenses, and postage, $608.14, itemized in attached statement.[2] (2) Self. (3) Retainer for July, August, September, 1947. See explanatory statement attached to Form A filed March 6, 1947, and supplemental statement filed July 14, 1947. (4) None. (5) See explanatory statement attached to Form A filed March 6, 1947; supplemental statement attached hereto; and supplemental statement filed July 14, 1947.

Woodman, Russell John, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 4, D. C.; the Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis 8, Mo. (1) Received a salary of $100 and actual expenses as follows: Hotel, $18.50; meals, $18; telephone and telegraph, $0.80; transportation, $14.53. No money expended for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislative proposals of concern to labor and railway labor in particular. Working in opposition to bills to amend the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Acts.

Woodrum, Clifton A., president, American Plant Food Council, Inc., 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) [Blank.]

Woodson, George W., 424 North Washington Avenue, Lansing 30, Mich.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (1) I will receive a commission of 25 percent on nearly all the gross receipts from the State of Michigan. I spend it for hotel, meals, telephone, telegraph, postage, transportation, and clerical hire. I spent none for political purposes. (2) Mrs. Marie West. (3) Clerical work. (4) None. (5) H. R. 16 (Townsend bill).

Woodul, Walter F., 818 Chronicle Building, Houston 2, Tex.; Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Kelly's, Tex.; Burlington-Rock Island Railroad Co., Houston, Tex.; the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; Fort Worth & Denver City Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Co., Galveston, Tex.; the Kansas City Southern Railway Co., Kansas City, Mo.; Louisiana & Arkansas Railway Co., Kansas City, Mo.; International-Great Northern Railroad, Houston, Tex.; Missouri-Kansas-Texas of Texas, Dallas, Tex.; New Orleans, Texas & Mexico Railway Co., Houston, Tex.; Panhandle & Santa Fe Railway Co., Amarillo, Tex.; Paris & Mount Pleasant Railroad Co., Paris, Tex.; Quanah, Acme & Pacific Railway Co., Quanah, Tex.; St. Louis, San Francisco & Texas Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; St. Louis, Southwestern Railway Co. of Texas, St. Louis, Mo.; Southern Pacific Co., San Francisco, Calif.; Texas Electric Railway Co., Dallas, Tex.; Texas & New Orleans Railroad Co., Houston, Tex.; Texas South-Eastern Railroad Co., Diboll, Tex.; the Texas & Pacific Railway Co., Dallas, Tex.; the Texas Mexican Railway Co., Laredo, Tex; the Union Terminal Co., Dallas, Tex.; Wichita Falls & Southern Railroad Co., Wichita Falls, Tex.; the Wichita Valley Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex. (1) Compensation as previously reported and $1,276 for out-of-pocket expense for months of June, July, and August 1947. (2) Pullman Co., $17.13; Eastern Air Lines, $83.38; Washington Hotel, $113.93; Shoreham Hotel, $43.72; Antlers Hotel, $15.75; Yellowstone Park Hotel, $21; Banff Springs Hotel, $19.40; Jasper Park Lodge, $155.18. (3) Transportation and auto expense, $163.01; hotels, $441.27; meals, $140.96; tips, taxis, telephone and telegraph, $60.22; entertaining, $67.47. (4) None. (5) All railroad legislation affecting Texas railroads.

Woodul, Walter F., 818 Chronicle Building, Houston 2, Tex.; Imperial Sugar Co., Sugar Land, Tex. (1) Compensation as reported previously, plus $568.10 out-of-pocket expenses covering months of June, July, and August 1947. (2) Pullman Co., $7.34; Eastern Air Lines, $83.37; Washington Hotel, $113.94; and various other expenses in items less than $10 each. (3) Transportation, $90.72; hotels, $113.94; meals, $60.87; tips, telegrams, taxis, and telephones, $38.03; entertaining and incidentals, $67.47. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting cane-sugar-refining industry.

Wootton, Edward W., Wine Institute, 900 National Press Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) $3,000 quarterly, salary as manager of the Washington office of the Wine Institute, principal offices at 717 Market Street, San Francisco. (2) Received by the registrant for all personal services rendered as manager of this office, some of which services involve legislative activity. (3) See (1) and (2) above. No expenditures were made by registrant to any other person for legislative purposes. (4) None. (5) Internal Revenue Code amendments relating to wine- and brandy-production operations (H. R. 1945, 1946, and 1947).

Worley, Harry F., national president, National Customs Service Association, 5353 Reno Road NW., Washington 15, D. C. (1) He received only salary and reimbursement for travel, postage, office supplies, office and incidental expenses. No part of money received for salary or expenses was expended in support of or opposition to any legislation. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) Customs Service News, published monthly by the National Customs Service Association. He is the editor. It covers the activities of the association, news of prospective and enacted legislation, and news of personal interest to

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

the membership. (5) He supports legislation which would benefit officers and employees of the Federal Government and opposes legislation which is against their interests. He directs legislative, administrative, or court action affecting the interests of the officers and employees of the United States Customs Service. His appearance before the committees of Congress is incidental to other activities, and forms only a small portion of the aggregate.

Wozencraft, Frank W., 300 Hibbs Building, 725 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. Independent Bankers Association, Twelfth Federal Reserve District, 410 Gulf States Building, Dallas, Tex. (1) $4,000, fees for services (received by firm of Case & Wozencraft); $1,268.20, reimbursement for traveling, telephone, and telegraph expenses; this includes amount reimbursed to firm of Case & Wozencraft, as well as to me personally. (2) Air lines, hotels, etc., in connection with travel involved; Western Union and telephone company. (3) See (2) above. (4) [Blank.] (5) Bank holding company legislation.

Wright, Mrs. Leslie B., chairman of legislation, General Federation of Women's Clubs, 4620 Thirtieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) For July, August, and September 1947: $14.81, postage, office supplies, and miscellaneous. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) Bulletin to be published by General Federation of Women's Clubs in course of preparation. (5) Not "employed" for pay. A volunteer worker for the General Federation of Women's Clubs. The General Federation supports legislation which pertains to the welfare of the home and to the general welfare, after given authority through the adoption of resolution by the delegate body.

Wright, Walter C., Jr., Tax Equality Committee of New Jersey, Inc., 44 Cooper Street, Woodbury, N. J. (1) Receipts, none; expenditures, $1.34. (2) Railway Express Agency. (3) Expressage on delivery of some packages. (4) None. (5) I am supporting any and all legislation tending to place cooperative associations on the same tax basis as noncooperative associations. More particularly, I am opposed to the virtual exemption from Federal income taxes the co-ops enjoy at present.

Yonkers, Andrew J., Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York 4, N. Y. (1) Salary, $875; reimbursement for traveling expenses, $62.79; total, $937.79. (2) Air lines, railroads, taxis, hotels, restaurants, telephones, and tips. (3) Normal traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Young, Donald A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C., United States Chamber of Commerce. (1) Received: Salary, $2,500; expenses, $30.38. Expended: Transportation, $18.50; meals, $5.25; telephone calls, $6.63. (2) Taxi companies, telephone company, restaurants. (3) Transportation to and from and communication with the Capitol—other normal and necessary expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation of interest to business, such as bills on taxes, budget control, labor legislation, business census, basic farm programs, etc.

Ziegler, Vinton E., Citizens' Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement; employment terminated July 31, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) In support of H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Zook, John D., 820 Huntington Bank Building, 17 South High Street, Columbus 15, Ohio; Ohio Chamber of Commerce, 17 South High Street, Columbus 15, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) Actual and necessary traveling expenses on employer's business. (4) None. (5) Legislation dealing with taxation, social security, labor relations, and other matters of interest to our organization.